RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below-regional average walkability score?	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity Focus Area?	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and middle?) wage jobs	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and community service access?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET14. Is the project in a tract area with longer transit access to jobs travel times (lower score) than regional average?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?		0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety action plan?	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes

1

RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Safe System	besign elements prioritize pedestrian	used for pedestrian functions according to	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	designated walking zone) of a K-12	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14: Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section? CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks		0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	(CSS rating = 5 stars)	and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	IIMPROVES/ANDS STREET CONNECTIVITY	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	IIMPROVES/300S STREET CONNECTIVITY	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	(CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated. May score 3 points. Povious project scope, particularly response to Project.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes

RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	IIN a designated 7040 Land lise center	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	limparvious surfaces to mitigate for	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	infrastructure and decreases	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate Action and Resilience section?			No	N/A	No
Mobility Options		MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options		MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options		MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	Is the project located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/GIS evaluted	1	No	No	No
Mobility Options	IREQUICES DELAY FOR TRANSIT	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	2	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?			No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional average?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Harget Industries	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes

RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	average? TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use designation?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)? TE15. Do you have any comments about any	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?			No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	where no preferred treatments, score 0. Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?			No	N/A	No

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary Table of Contents

Project ID	Project Name	Applicant	Page Number
0550	Clackamas Industrial Area Improvements: SE Jennifer		
CFP3	Street Multi-use Path	Clackamas County	6
CEDE	NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal Safety and	Portland Bureau of	10
<u>CFP5</u>	Access	Transportation	10
CFP6	Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City	King City	14
CEDO	OR 212/224 Sunrise Hwy Phase 2: Bike/Ped Facilities		10
CFP8	and Interchange Improvements (CON)	Happy Valley	18
CFP9	Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck Rd	Portland Parks	22
CED10		Tualatin Hills Parks and	26
<u>CFP10</u>	Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the Westside Trail	Recreation District	20
CED11	Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th Avenue to		30
CFP11	Linwood Avenue	Milwaukie	30
CED13			34
CFP12	Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge Construction	Gladstone	34
CED12	NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192nd Avenue -		38
CFP13	201st Avenue	Gresham	38
	OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th Street to		
CFP14	Tumwater village: Shared-Use Path and Streetscape		42
	Enhancements Project Development	Oregon City	
<u>CFP15</u>	NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine Dr Safety		46
CFP13	Corridor Planning	Multnomah County	40
<u>CFP16</u>			50
<u>C11 10</u>	Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Improvements	Washington County	30
<u>CFP17</u>	Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall Blvd – 3rd St to		54
<u>C11 17</u>	5th St	Beaverton	34
<u>CFP18</u>	NW Division Street Complete Street: Gresham-		58
<u>C11 10</u>	Fairview Trail - Birdsdale Avenue	Gresham	30
<u>CFP19</u>	Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Signal	Portland Bureau of	62
<u>C11 13</u>	Improvements)	Transportation	02
CFP21			66
<u> </u>	Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Better Bus Project	Hillsboro	
CFP22	North Dakota Street (Fanno Creek) Bridge		70
	Replacement	Tigard	
CFP23	NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Transit	Portland BOT	74
CFP24	NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodal Safety and		78
	Access	Portland BOT	
<u>CFP25</u>	Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan Rd	Lake Oswego	82
<u>CFP26</u>	W Burnside Green Loop Crossing	Portland BOT	86
CFP27	SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to SW Kemmer		90
<u> </u>	Road	Washington County	
CFP28	Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Transit		94
	Enhancements	Washington County	
CFP29	Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR		98
<u> </u>	99W	Sherwood	

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Clackamas Industrial Area Improvements: SE Jennifer Street Multi-Use Path

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP3 Clackamas Industrial Area Improveme	nts: SE Jennifer Street Multi-use Path						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Focus Area (FEA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Encus Area (EEA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	for BIPOC, underserved communities		1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation Equitable	for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map? ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Transportation Equitable Transportation	for BIPOC, underserved communities Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	frequent transit route or stop? ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along	0.00	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope	3	No No	N/A Yes	No Yes
		frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?		elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.				
Equitable Transportation		ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	·	ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity Focus Area?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and middle?) wage jobs	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and	ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and community service access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and	ET14. Is the project in a tract area with longer transit access to jobs travel times (lower score) than regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	2.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Ibarriers (jobs. transit, services for	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	1.00	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Int access to vehicle/high housing +	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	4.33	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System		SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	_	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Ipriority for safety improvements	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety action plan?	0.67	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	project location is designated as a	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	1.33	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for	1	No	Yes	Yes
	Fills (completely, partially) AT or			completely filling gap (SS9).				

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Clackamas Industrial Area Improvements: SE Jennifer Street Multi-Use Path

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP3 Clackamas Industrial Area Improveme	nts: SE Jennifer Street Multi-use Path						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.67	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.33	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	1.67	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No

7

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Clackamas Industrial Area Improvements: SE Jennifer Street Multi-Use Path

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP3 Clackamas Industrial Area Improveme	nts: SE Jennifer Street Multi-use Path						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Ilncreases tree canony green	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater. CAR24. Do you have any comments about	0.33	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		any of the topics covered in the Climate Action and Resilience section?				No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.33	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options		MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	0.67	mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	0.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	No	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	IReduces delay for fransif	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	1.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to	average? TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	_	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and	Iand use area? TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	3.00	within or connecting to a 2040 land use area. This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	· ·	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport	designation? TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	access to industrial and transport	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Clackamas Industrial Area Improvements: SE Jennifer Street Multi-Use Path

Project ID:	CFP3	anto, CE Jannifor Streat Mills Dath						
Project Name: RTP Goal Area	Clackamas Industrial Area Improveme Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Regional street	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	2.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	1.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

	THE THE SECRET SET SETTING THE THIRD CONTROL	Safety and Access						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Eocus Area (EEA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Question Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below-regional average walkability score?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	2.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation		ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	noor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation		ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Inder community health dutcomes	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity Focus Area?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and middle?) wage jobs	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	barriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and community service access?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and	ET14. Is the project in a tract area with longer transit access to jobs travel times (lower score) than regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	1.00	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	IOT access to vehicle/high holising +	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	4.67	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System		SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Infinity for catety improvements	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety action plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	project location is designated as a	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	3.00	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.	3	No	Yes	Yes
	Fills (completely, partially) AT or	SS8. Does the project address a network	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		gap?		Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for				

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP5 NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal S	Safety and Access						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major	1	Question Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	school walkshed? SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	conditions question #7 in project application. This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to	1.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	transit? CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.67	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	2.33	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP5 NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal S	Safety and Access						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	0.33	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate		required.		No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	Action and Resilience section? MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.67	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	0.67	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	0.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.33	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	No	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional average?		Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	2.00	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use designation?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP5							
Project Name:	NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal S	Safety and Access						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Community Street	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	4.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	5.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP6 Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City							
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in	GIS Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review	Scoring Question
Equitable	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus	Average Score	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	Question 1	Question Yes	Question No	Yes
Transportation Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	Area (EFA)? ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below-regional average walkability score?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation		ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	2.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and middle?) wage jobs	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	equity communities) Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and community service access?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET14. Is the project in a tract area with longer transit access to jobs travel times (lower score) than regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	1.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	1.00	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	4.33	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety action plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	2.33	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.	3	No	Yes	Yes
	Fills (completely, partially) AT or	SS8. Does the project address a network	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Trails network gap	gap?	1.00	Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for	_		. 65	

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP6 Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City							
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.67	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	2.00	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP6 Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City		Droiget		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	1.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate		required.		No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	Action and Resilience section? MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.33	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	0.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	0.67	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	No	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score.	1	No	Yes	Yes
,	Target Industries	average? TE3. Does project improve access to a tract		Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?				-
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	with # of developable acres > regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	0.67	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use designation?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City

Project ID:	CFP6							
Project Name: RTP Goal Area	Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Trail/Multi- Use Path	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	3.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	4.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	2.00	Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

Project Name:	OR 212/224 Sunrise Hwy Phase 2: Bike	e/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	IIN an Equity Enclis Area (EEA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below- regional average walkability score?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	2.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	·	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Incor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	•	ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity Focus Area?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and	ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and community service access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and	ET14. Is the project in a tract area with longer transit access to jobs travel times (lower score) than regional average?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	3.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Tharriers (jobs. transit, services for	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	0.67	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	3.33	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System		SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System		SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety action plan?	0.67	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	priority for safety improvements	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	1.00	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.		No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP8 OR 212/224 Sunrise Hwy Phase 2: Bike	e/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements	(CON)					
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.67	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.67	1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.33	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP8 OR 212/224 Sunrise Hwy Phase 2: Bike/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements (CON)								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.33	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.67	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	0.67	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate		required.		No	N/A	No	
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	Action and Resilience section? MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.00	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	0.33	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	0.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	0.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	Yes	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.67	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.67	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional		Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	2.67	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use designation?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes	

Project ID:	CFP8	And Fredrick	(601)					
Project Name:	OR 212/224 Sunrise Hwy Phase 2: Bike	e/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements 	(CON)			CIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	1.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Regional street	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	1.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	1.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	1.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP9 Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck	Rd						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?		Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Question Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below-regional average walkability score?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation		ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation		ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Inder community health dutcomes	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity Focus Area?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and community service access?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation		ET14. Is the project in a tract area with longer transit access to jobs travel times (lower score) than regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	1.00	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	IOT access to vehicle/high holising +	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	4.33	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	-	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Inflority for safety improvements	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety action plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	project location is designated as a	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	safety	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	3.00	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for	1	No	Yes	Yes
				completely filling gap (SS9).		I		1

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP9 Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck	Rd						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.67	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.33	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP9 Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck	Rd						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in	GIS Evaluated	Subjective Review	Scoring
	Increases tree canopy, green	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green	Average Score	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope	Question	Scored Question	Question	Question
Climate Action and Resilience	infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.00	elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	1.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate				No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	Action and Resilience section? MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.67	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	0.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	0.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	No	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional		Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	average? TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional	No	to get around with in or get to that tract? Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	average? TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.00	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	designation? TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP9							
Project Name:	Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck	Rd I						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	access to industrial and transport	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy		TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	best possible improvement in project	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Trail/Multi- Use Path	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design	best possible improvement in project area, based on functional	D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	4.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	area hased on functional	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	area, based on functional	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	4.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	IROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	IReviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

March Marc	Project ID: Project Name:	CFP10 Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the Wes	stside Trail						
Property	RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application		Available in	Evaluated Scored	Review	Scoring Question
The control of the	Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)							Yes
The content of the	Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all	1.00	communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-	1	Yes	No	Yes
	Equitable Transportation			0.00		1	Yes	No	Yes
Company	Equitable Transportation	·	1	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Part Part	Equitable Transportation			Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Programme	Equitable Transportation		the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along	2.67	ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap	3	No	Yes	Yes
April Company Compan	Equitable Transportation	•		0.00	, , , ,	1	Yes	No	Yes
Secretary of the control of the cont	Equitable Transportation	•	higher than regional average diesel	1.00		1	Yes	No	Yes
Comparison Com	Equitable Transportation	•		0.00		1	Yes	No	Yes
Part Control Part Control Part Control Part Control Part Pa	Equitable Transportation		corridor or intersection within an Equity	0.00		1	Yes	No	Yes
Comparison Com	Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS	1	Yes	No	Yes
Services and an experimental process of the process of any operation of the process of the proc	Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Source of the control	Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	than regional average walkability and	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
This is a CM development of the CM in page of th	Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET14. Is the project in a tract area with longer transit access to jobs travel times	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Somewhat the control programment of the control	Equitable Transportation	barriers (jobs, transit, services for	project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service	0.67	marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving	3	No	Yes	Yes
Advances for which fight all courses processes of the pro	Equitable Transportation	barriers (jobs, transit, services for		0.67	those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address	1	No	Yes	Yes
contact of the proposed in area with this pix lack of the proposed of an area with higher throughout the proposed of the proposed that are eight on the proposed of the proposed that are eight on the proposed of the proposed that are eight on the proposed of the proposed that are eight on the proposed of the proposed that are eight on the proposed of the proposed that are eight on the proposed that are eight on the proposed that are eight of the proposed that are eight of the proposed that are eight on the proposed that are eight on the proposed that are eight of the proposed that are eight of the proposed that are eight of the proposed that are eight on the proposed that are eight of the proposed that are eight of the proposed that are eight on the proposed that ar	Equitable Transportation	of access to vehicle/high housing +	than regional average level of renter housing	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Improvements a many with high body a class of seekforth housing a class seekforth housing a clas	Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens	1.00	burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing	1	Yes	No	Yes
Solution of the topics covered in the equitable interruptival and the project located of a legispated as a pointy for sefety improvements and the project located on a high injury conduct. So solution is designated as a pointy for sefety improvements are application extensive. Solution project location is designated as a pointy for sefety improvements. So little project located on a high injury conduct. So solution is designated as a pointy for sefety improvements. So little project application of the locally adopted application of the project located and in locally adopted affety action plan? Solution project location is designated as a pointy for sefety improvements. So little project application of the locally adopted affety action plan? No Bettermore only. No points allocated. Gis evaluated. Project location is designated as a pointy for sefety improvements. Solide System Project location is designated as a pointy for sefety improvements. Solide System Project location is designated as a pointy for sefety improvements. Solide System Project location is designated as a pointy for sefety improvements. Solide System Project location is designated as a pointy for sefety improvements. Solide System Project location is designated as a pointy for sefety improvements. Solide System Project location is designated as a pointy for sefety improvements. Solide System Project location is designated as a pointy for sefety improvements. Solide System Project location is designated as a pointy for sefety improvements. Solide System Project location is designated as a pointy for sefety improvements. Solide System Project location is designated as a point for sefety improvements. Solide System Project location is designated as a point for sefety improvements. Solide System Design elements prioritize pedestrian functions for the pedestrian functions for the pedestrian functions for the pedestrian functions for the pedestrian functions action in publication and design design factors. Design elements	Equitable Transportation	of access to vehicle/high housing +		4.67	Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and	5	No	Yes	Yes
Sole System project location is designated as a protect for safety improvements or designated as a protect for safety improvements or designated as a protect form or beyole high improvements or designated as a protect form or beyole high improvements or designated as a protect form or beyole high improvements or designated as a protect form or beyole high improvements or designated as a protect form or beyole high improvements or designated as a protect form or beyole high improvements or designated as a protect form or beyole high improvements or designated as a protect form or beyole high improvements or designated as a protect form or beyole high improvements or designated as a protect form or beyole high improvements or designated as a protect form or	Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	of the topics covered in the Equitable			0	No	N/A	No
project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements Safe System Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements Safe System Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements Safe System Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements Safe System Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements Safe System Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements Safe System Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements Safe System Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements Safe System Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements Safe System Design elements prioritize pedestrian functions for the project sospin contained priority for safety improvements Safe System Design elements prioritize pedestrian functions for the project sospin contained priority for safety improvements Safe System Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements Safe System Design elements prioritize pedestrian functions for the project sospin contained priority for safety improvements Safe System Design elements prioritize pedestrian functions for the project sospin contained priority design dassification safety safety safety Design elements prioritize pedestrian functions according to the functional dass and design dassification? Safe System Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements Safe System Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements Safe System Design elements prioritize pedestrian or brojects design dassification safety safet	Safe System		SS1. Is the project located on a high injury	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements or safety in the specific areas in the priority for safety improvements or safety in the spec	Safe System			0.00		1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System Project location is designated as a orionity for safety improvements Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements SSS. Is project area, with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many? Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety Design elements prioritize pedestrian functions for the pedestrian safety Design elements prioritize pedestrian functions for the pedestrian safety SSS. Are the preferred design elements being safety SSS. Are the preferred design elements being safety SSS. Are the preferred design elements being safety SSS. Are the preferred design classification? SSS. Does the project address a network gap? SSS. Are the preferred design classification and safety safety may be a project address and design classification or design safety safety. This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to DI. Score 1 point if the project does not carry one of these design classifications; Resease score 0. Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project does not carry one of these design classifications places score 0. Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project does not carry one of these design classifications, places score 0. Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design classification and score design score projects and an available score of 3 points.	Safe System		project is included in a locally adopted safety	1.00		1	No	Yes	Yes
Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements Siafe System Design elements prioritize pedestrian after pedestrian safety Design elements prioritize pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classifications and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design classifications and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design according to design according to design design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design according to design according to design according to specification. To help, see responses to design section application application access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application section application on protection specification for predestrian removement conditions section application on protection of production specifications. To help, see responses to design section protection section application on protection of predestrian func	Safe System	_	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm? 1.00 Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0. Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements prioritize pedestrian priority design according to the functional class and design classification? SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification? SS8. Does the project's design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context. This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8): 1 additional point for completely, partially) AT or Completely, partially) AT or SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap? SS9. Does the project someletely fill the gap? OR 33. See instructions in SS8.	Safe System		a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How		"YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1	1	No	Yes	Yes
Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification? SS8. Does the project address a network gap? SS8. Does the project address a network gap? Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap Fills (completely, partially) AT or SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap 2 to 33 See instructions in SS8. SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap 2 to 33 See instructions in SS8. SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap 2 to 33 See instructions in SS8. SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap 2 to 33 See instructions in SS8. SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap 2 to 33 See instructions in SS8.	Safe System		include prioritized functions for the	1.00	the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these		No	Yes	Yes
Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap SS8. Does the project address a network gap? SS8. Does the project address a network gap? Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9). Fills (completely, partially) AT or SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	Safe System		used for pedestrian functions according to		classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application		No	Yes	Yes
completely filling gap (SS9). Fills (completely, partially) AT or SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap? O 33. See instructions in SS8. 1. No. Yes Yes	Safe System			1.00	marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9.	1	No	Yes	Yes
	Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	0.33	completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID: Project Name:									
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question	
Safe System	Itills (completely partially) A1 or	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Safe System		SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes	
Safe System	walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	(CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.33	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.		No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Ilmnroves/adds street connectivity	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Ilmnroves/adds street connectivity	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	TSMO) as part of the project (Climate	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	1.33	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	_	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	TIN A DESIGNATED JUBILLAND LISE CENTER	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	impervious surfaces to mitigate for	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No	

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP10 Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the Wes	Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the Westside Trail								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question		
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases free canony green	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	1.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate Action and Resilience section?				No	N/A	No		
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.67	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2	0	No	N/A	No		
Mobility Options		MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	0.67	mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	0.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	No	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Mobility Options	IReduces delay for fransif	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No		
Thriving Economy	Harget Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional average?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Thriving Economy		TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional	No	to get around with in or get to that tract? Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Thriving Economy		TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Thriving Economy	laccase to industrial and transport	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	2.00	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes		
Thriving Economy	•	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport	designation? TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Thriving Economy	laccess to industrial and transport	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes		

Project ID:	CFP10							
Project Name: RTP Goal Area	Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the We. Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Trail/Multi- Use Path	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	5.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	3.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		e D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	5.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	IRUM atc 12 Mhat attorts ware made to		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th Avenue to Linwood Avenue

Project Name:	Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th A	Avenue to Linwood Avenue	- Due in the		May Point	GIS	Cubicati	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Encus Area (EEA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below-regional average walkability score?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	3.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	_ I	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Incor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	·	ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity Focus Area?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation		ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	•	ET14. Is the project in a tract area with longer transit access to jobs travel times	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Tharriers (jobs. transit, services for	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	0.67	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	3.00	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System		SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System		SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety action plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	priority for safety improvements	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	3.00	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.		No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th Avenue to Linwood Avenue

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP11 Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th A							
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.33	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.33	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.67	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.00	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th Avenue to Linwood Avenue

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP11 Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th A	Avenue to Linwood Avenue						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	1.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate Action and Resilience section?		reganieur		No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.33	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	0.67	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	0.33	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	0.67	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	No	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional average?		Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional	No	to get around with in or get to that tract? Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.67	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	designation? TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th Avenue to Linwood Avenue

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP11 Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th Avenue to Linwood Avenue									
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question		
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No		
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No		
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Community street	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No		
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	3.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes		
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes		
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	3.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes		
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes		
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No		

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge Construction

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP12 e: Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge Construction							
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below- regional average walkability score?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation		ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	2.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and middle?) wage jobs	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	equity communities) Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	community service access? ET14. Is the project in a tract area with	N-	Defense and New sints allowed CIC well-stand		No	21/2	No.
Transportation	barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	longer transit access to jobs travel times (lower score) than regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	2.00	marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	1.00	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	4.00	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	action plan? SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	3.00	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.		No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge Construction

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP12 Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge	Construction						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in	GIS Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review	Scoring Question
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	Average Score	See instructions in SS8.	Question 1	Question	Question Yes	Yes
Safe System	Trails network gap Fills (completely, partially) AT or	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Trails network gap Fills (completely, partially) AT or	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12	Yes	Investment Strategy. Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current	0	No	N/A	Yes
Sure System	Trails network gap Project is within 1 mile (or designated)	school walkshed? SS12. Does project contain elements that	163	conditions question #7 in project application. This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If	ŭ			103
Safe System	walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	1.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.00	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	applications. Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge Construction

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP12 Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge Construction								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	1.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	1.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	1.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate		required.		No	N/A	No	
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	Action and Resilience section? MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	1.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	0.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	No	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional average?		Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.00	within or connecting to a 2040 land use area. This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	designation? TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes	

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge Construction

Project ID:	CFP12	Control						
Project Name: RTP Goal Area	Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge Performance Measure	Construction Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in	GIS Evaluated	Subjective Review	Scoring
			Average Score		Question	Scored Question	Question	Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Trail/Multi- Use Path	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	4.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	3.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP13 NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192	2nd Avenue - 201st Avenue						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Englis Area (EEA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below-regional average walkability score?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	2.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	•	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	noor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation		ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	makes improvements in area with	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Transportation Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	than regional average vehicle access? ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Transportation	equity communities)	community service access? ET14. Is the project in a tract area with			-		.4	
Equitable Transportation	barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	longer transit access to jobs travel times (lower score) than regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Tharriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	0.33	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	3.00	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	·	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	2.00	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.		No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP13 NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192	nd Avenue - 201st Avenue						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score		Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	0.33	See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System			0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	section? CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.67	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.33	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of	investment? CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	1.00	Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated. Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change Increases tree canopy, green	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP13 NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192	2nd Avenue - 201st Avenue				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	1.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.33	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	0.67	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate		required.		No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	Action and Resilience section? MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.33	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	0.67	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	0.67	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES" then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	No	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional		Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thirting Economy	Target Industries	average? TE3. Does project improve access to a tract	0.00	Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	-		103	
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	with # of developable acres > regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.67	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use designation?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP13							
Project Name: RTP Goal Area	NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192 Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Community street	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	2.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	2.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Enclis Area (EEA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below-regional average walkability score?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	3.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	•	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	noor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	_ I	ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Transportation Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	community service access? ET14. Is the project in a tract area with			_			
Transportation	barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	longer transit access to jobs travel times (lower score) than regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Tharriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	1.00	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	4.00	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	·	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	project location is designated as a	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	2.67	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.		No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP14 OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th Street to Tumwater village: Shared-Use Path and Streetscape Enhancements Project Development								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question	
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	1.00	See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes	
Safe System		SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.00	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development	3	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	applications. Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change Increases tree canopy, green	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No	

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP14 OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th Street to Tumwater village: Shared-Use Path and Streetscape Enhancements Project Development								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	0.67	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate Action and Resilience section?		- equition		No	N/A	No	
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	0.33	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	0.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	1.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	Yes	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	1.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional average?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	2.00	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	designation? TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes	

Project ID:	CFP14 •: OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th Street to Tumwater village: Shared-Use Path and Streetscape Enhancements Project Development								
Project Name: RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No	
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No	
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Highway, Community boulevard, Regional boulevard	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No	
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	3.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes	
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes	
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	3.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes	
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	1.33	Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes	
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No	

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP15 NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question	
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Englis Area (EEA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below- regional average walkability score?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	2.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes	
Equitable Transportation	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Equitable Transportation	makes improvements in area with	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Equitable Transportation	·	ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Equitable Transportation	makes improvements in area with	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Transportation Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	community service access? ET14. Is the project in a tract area with					_		
Transportation	barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	longer transit access to jobs travel times (lower score) than regional average?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	2.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes	
Equitable Transportation	Ibarriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	1.00	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	4.33	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes	
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No	
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Safe System		SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Safe System	project location is designated as a	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes	
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	2.67	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.		No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System		SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes	

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP15 NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine	e Dr Safety Corridor Planning						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Safe System	Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	1.00	See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	IFILIS (COMPLETELY PARTIALLY) AT OR	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System		SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	IWAIKING ZONELOTA K-12 SCHOOL SATE	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System			0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	section? CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	1.67	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	1.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.67	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Ilmproves/adds street connectivity	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Ilmnroves/adds street connectivity	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		plan? CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of	investment? CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.00	Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated. Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	_	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	TIN 2 RECIGNATED JUJULI AND LICE CENTER	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP15 NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine	Dr Safety Corridor Planning						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Ilncreases tree canony green	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	1.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	1.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater. CAR24. Do you have any comments about	0.33	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		any of the topics covered in the Climate Action and Resilience section?				No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.67	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	0.67	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options		MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	1.00	mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	1.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	1.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	Yes	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	IReduces delay for fransif	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	1.33	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	1.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional average?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy		TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	laccass to industrial and transport	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	3.00	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	•	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport	designation? TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	access to industrial and transport	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP15	2.6.6.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2						
Project Name:	NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine	e Dr Safety Corridor Planning						1
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	1.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Community boulevard	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	3.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	3.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	II) nee the project design represent the	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	1.67	Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Englis Area (EEA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below-regional average walkability score?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	3.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	makes improvements in area with	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	·	ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and	Focus Area? ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Transportation Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	community service access? ET14. Is the project in a tract area with					_	
Transportation	barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	longer transit access to jobs travel times (lower score) than regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Ibarriers (jobs. transit, services for	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	1.00	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	2.00	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System		SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	project location is designated as a	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	3.00	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.		No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP16 Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Imp	provements				010		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	1.00	See instructions in SS8.	1	Question No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	1.33	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP16 Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Imp	provements						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Uncreases tree canony green	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	1.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	1.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate Action and Resilience section?				No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options		MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	1.00	mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	1.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	No	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	IReduces delay for fransif	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Harget Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional average?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional	Yes	to get around with in or get to that tract? Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	average? TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy		TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.67	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	· ·	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport	designation? TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	laccess to industrial and transport	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP16							
Project Name:	Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Im	provements 				OIC		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Trail/Multi- Use Path	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	4.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	4.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	II) has the project design represent the	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall Boulevard - 3rd Street to 5th Street

Project ID: Project Name:								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Englis Area (EEA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below- regional average walkability score?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	•	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	noor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation		ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Transportation Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	community service access? ET14. Is the project in a tract area with						
Transportation	barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	longer transit access to jobs travel times (lower score) than regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Tharriers (jobs. transit, services for	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	1.00	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	4.33	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	·	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	project location is designated as a	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	2.33	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.		No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall Boulevard - 3rd Street to 5th Street

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP17 Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall B	Blvd – 3rd St to 5th St				CIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	0.00	See instructions in SS8.	1	Question No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	2.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	1.33	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	1.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.33	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall Boulevard - 3rd Street to 5th Street

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP17 Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall Blvd – 3rd St to 5th St								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate		required.		No	N/A	No	
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	Action and Resilience section? MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	0.67	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	0.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	1.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	1.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	Yes	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	2.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional average?		Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional	No	to get around with in or get to that tract? Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	average? TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	2.00	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use designation?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes	

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall Boulevard - 3rd Street to 5th Street

Project ID:	CFP17							
Project Name:	Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall E	Blvd – 3rd St to 5th St				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Regional boulevard	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	4.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	3.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Englis Area (EEA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below-regional average walkability score?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	3.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	makes improvements in area with	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	·	ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	makes improvements in area with	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Transportation Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	community service access? ET14. Is the project in a tract area with	N.				21/2	N.
Transportation Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	longer transit access to jobs travel times (lower score) than regional average? ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	No 2.00	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving	3	No No	N/A Yes	No Yes
Equitable Transportation	Ibarriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	1.00	transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times) Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable	Improvement in area with high lack	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing	Yes	that barrier. Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Transportation Equitable	Improvement in area with high lack	burden? ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	(transportation + housing)? ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	3.33	cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated. Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	Transportation section? SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	2.67	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.		No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP18 NW Division Street Complete Street: G	218 V Division Street Complete Street: Gresham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale Avenue						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in	GIS Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review	Scoring Question
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	Average Score 0.33	See instructions in SS8.	Question 1	Question No	Question Yes	Yes
Safe System	Trails network gap Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System		SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	2.67	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	applications. Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP18 NW Division Street Complete Street: G							
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	2.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	1.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	1.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate		required.		No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	Action and Resilience section? MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.67	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	0.00	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	0.67	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	0.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	No	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional average?		Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional	Yes	to get around with in or get to that tract? Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	average? TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.33	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use designation?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP18							
Project Name:	NW Division Street Complete Street: G	resham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale Avenue				CIC		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Community street	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	4.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	4.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	3.00	Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP19 Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Signal Improvements)							
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below- regional average walkability score?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation		ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and middle?) wage jobs	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	equity communities) Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	community service access? ET14. Is the project in a tract area with longer transit access to jobs travel times	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	0.33	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	2.00	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety action plan?	0.67	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	1.00	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.		No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP19 Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Signal Improvements)								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question	
Safe System	Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	0.00	See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Itills (completely partially) A1 or	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes	
Safe System	walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.67	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	0.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	1.67	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.33	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.		No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	management strategies (outside of	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.67	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development	3	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No	

Project ID: Project Name:								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases free canony green	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate Action and Resilience section?				No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.00	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	0.00	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options		MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	0.67	mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	1.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.67	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	Yes	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	IReduces delay for fransif	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.67	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	1.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to	average? TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy		TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional	Yes	to get around with in or get to that tract? Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy		TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	laccass to industrial and transport	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.67	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	•	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport	designation? TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	access to industrial and transport	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP19							
Project Name:	Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Sig	nal Improvements) I				010		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	access to industrial and transport	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.67	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy		TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	best possible improvement in project	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Regional street	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design	best possible improvement in project area, based on functional	D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	1.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	area hased on functional	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	0.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	area, based on functional	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	2.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	IROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	IReviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP21 Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Better Bus Project							
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below-regional average walkability score?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation		ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and middle?) wage jobs	Focus Area? ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	community service access? ET14. Is the project in a tract area with longer transit access to jobs travel times	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	1.00	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	2.67	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety action plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	1.00	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP21 Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Better Bus Project								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question	
Safe System	Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	0.00	See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Itills (completely partially) A1 or	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes	
Safe System	walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	2.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	0.33	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	2.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.33	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.		No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of	investment? CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.33	Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated. Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development	3	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	applications. Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	III a designated 7040 Land Lise center	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No	

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP21 Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Bette	r Bus Project						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in	GIS Evaluated	Subjective Review	Scoring
			Average Score		Question	Scored Question	Question	Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.33	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.67	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	0.33	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate		required.		No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	Action and Resilience section? MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.00	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	0.33	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	0.67	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	0.67	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	1.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	Yes	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	1.33	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	average? TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.00	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use designation?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP21							-
Project Name:	Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Bette	r Bus Project						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Regional street	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	2.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	1.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: North Dakota Street (Fanno Creek) Bridge Replacement

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP22 : North Dakota Street (Fanno Creek) Bridge Replacement							
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below-regional average walkability score?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation		ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and middle?) wage jobs	Focus Area? ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	equity communities) Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and community service access?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET14. Is the project in a tract area with longer transit access to jobs travel times	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	0.67	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	4.00	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety action plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	2.00	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: North Dakota Street (Fanno Creek) Bridge Replacement

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP22 North Dakota Street (Fanno Creek) Bri	dge Replacement				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	0.33	See instructions in SS8.	1	Question No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System			0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	section? CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to	1.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and	Provides/increases transit option	transit? CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	(CSS rating = 5 stars) Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	GIS evaluated. Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.33	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.33	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	1.00	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: North Dakota Street (Fanno Creek) Bridge Replacement

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP22 North Dakota Street (Fanno Creek) Bri	idge Replacement						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.33	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	1.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate		required.		No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	Action and Resilience section? MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.00	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	0.33	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. This is a CIS dependent question. Povious if project is located within a 1/2.	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	0.33	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	0.33	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.33	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	No	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional average?		Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	2.00	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use designation?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: North Dakota Street (Fanno Creek) Bridge Replacement

Project ID:	CFP22							
Project Name:	North Dakota Street (Fanno Creek) Bri	idge Replacement						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Trail/Multi- Use Path	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	3.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	3.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below- regional average walkability score?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation		ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	2.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and middle?) wage jobs	Focus Area? ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	equity communities) Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	community service access? ET14. Is the project in a tract area with longer transit access to jobs travel times	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	1.00	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	3.67	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety action plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a priority for safety improvements	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	2.67	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.		No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP23 NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Tr	ransit						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score		Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	0.00	See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System			0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	section? CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	1.33	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.33	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of	investment? CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.67	Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated. Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change Increases tree canopy, green	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP23 NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Tr	ransit						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.67	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.33	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate		required.		No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	Action and Resilience section? MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.33	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	1.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	1.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	Yes	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional average?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	2.00	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	designation? TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP23							
Project Name: RTP Goal Area	NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to To	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Question No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Regional boulevard	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	3.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	4.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	2.00	Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP24 NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimoda	l Safety and Access			FValuated					
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question		
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Encus Area (EEA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below- regional average walkability score?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	2.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes		
Equitable Transportation	·	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Equitable Transportation	noor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Equitable Transportation	•	ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and	Focus Area? ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Transportation Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	community service access? ET14. Is the project in a tract area with					_			
Transportation	barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	longer transit access to jobs travel times (lower score) than regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes		
Equitable Transportation	Tharriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	1.00	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	4.67	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes		
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No		
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Safe System	_	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Safe System	project location is designated as a	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes		
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	3.00	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.		No	Yes	Yes		
Safe System		SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes		

Project ID: Project Name:										
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question		
Safe System	Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	0.00	See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Safe System	IFILIS (COMPLETELY PARTIALLY) AT Or	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Safe System		SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes		
Safe System	walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Safe System	IWalking zonel of a K-12 school Safe	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No		
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	•	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	•	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	2.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.67	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.33	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.		No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	IIMproves/adds street connectivity	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	IIMproves/adds street connectivity	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major	1	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of	investment? CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	1.67	Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated. Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development	3	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	applications. Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	impervious surfaces to mitigate for	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No		
Climate Action and Resilience	impervious surfaces to mitigate for	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No		
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No		

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP24 NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimoda	l Safety and Access						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.67	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate Action and Resilience section?		required.		No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	1.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	0.67	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	1.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	Yes	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	1.67	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional average?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.67	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	designation? TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP24							
Project Name:	NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimoda	ıl Safety and Access				010		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Regional street	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	4.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	4.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP25 Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan Rd	d						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Englis Area (EEA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below-regional average walkability score?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	•	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	noor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation		ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	makes improvements in area with	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and	Focus Area? ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	barriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and	community service access? ET14. Is the project in a tract area with longer transit access to jobs travel times	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	1.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Tharriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	0.67	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	,	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Int access to vehicle/high holising +	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	0.33	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	·	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	project location is designated as a	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety action plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	project location is designated as a	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	2.00	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.		No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP25 Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan Rd								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question	
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	0.00	See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes	
Safe System		SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.33	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or complete filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.00	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change Increases tree canopy, green	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No	

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP25 Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan R	d 				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.33	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	1.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	0.33	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate				No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	Action and Resilience section? MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.33	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	0.33	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	0.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	0.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	No	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional		Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score.	1	No	Yes	Yes
	Target Industries	average? TE3. Does project improve access to a tract		Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?				
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	with # of developable acres > regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.33	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use designation?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP25							
Project Name:	Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan Rd	d 				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Trail/Multi- Use Path	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	2.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	1.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	1.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	1.00	Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP26 W Burnside Green Loop Crossing							
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Englis Area (EEA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below-regional average walkability score?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	2.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	•	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	noor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation		ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	makes improvements in area with	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	community service access? ET14. Is the project in a tract area with longer transit access to jobs travel times	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	(lower score) than regional average? ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Tharriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	1.00	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	,	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	3.33	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	·	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	project location is designated as a	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	2.67	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.		No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP26 W Burnside Green Loop Crossing	ossina							
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question	
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	0.00	See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes	
Safe System		SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	1.33	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development	3	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No	

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP26 W Burnside Green Loop Crossing							
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	1.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate		required.		No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	Action and Resilience section? MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.67	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	0.67	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	1.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	1.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	0.00	reliability and efficiency. This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	option Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	Yes	https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	Options section? TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to	average? TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	Iand use area? TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.67	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and	designation? TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES." Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP26							
Project Name:	W Burnside Green Loop Crossing							
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Regional boulevard	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	3.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	1.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	3.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	1.00	Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP27 SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to	FP27 W 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to SW Kemmer Road						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Englis Area (EEA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below-regional average walkability score?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	1.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	makes improvements in area with	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	·	ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	makes improvements in area with	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	community service access? ET14. Is the project in a tract area with longer transit access to jobs travel times	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	1.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Ibarriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	0.33	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation		ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	3.67	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System		SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	project location is designated as a	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety action plan?	0.33	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	project location is designated as a	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	1.00	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.		No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID: Project Name:										
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in	GIS Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review	Scoring Question		
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	Average Score 0.33	See instructions in SS8.	Question 1	Question	Question	Yes		
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Safe System		investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Investment Strategy. Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes		
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No		
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	· ·	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	(CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	Ilmproves/adds street connectivity	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	limproves/adds street connectivity	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	Ilmnroves/adds street connectivity	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.00	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development	3	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	_	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No		
Climate Action and Resilience	TIN 2 decignated /II/III and Lice center	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No		
Climate Action and Resilience	Intrastructure and decreases	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes		
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No		
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No		

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP27 e: SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to SW Kemmer Road								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate Action and Resilience section?		required.		No	N/A	No	
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.33	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	0.33	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	0.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	0.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	No	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	0.33	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	designation? TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes	

Project ID:	CFP27	CM/Kamaran David						
Project Name:	SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to	SW Kemmer Road				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Community street	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	1.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	1.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	0.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	IR()W etc 12 What efforts were made to		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP28 Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Tr	ansit Enhancements						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Englis Area (EEA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below-regional average walkability score?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	2.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	•	ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	noor community health outcomes	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation		ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	makes improvements in area with	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Transportation Equitable	Removes, reduces disparities and	community service access? ET14. Is the project in a tract area with			_			
Transportation	barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	longer transit access to jobs travel times (lower score) than regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Tharriers (jobs. transit, services for	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	1.00	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	3.67	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	·	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	project location is designated as a	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety	0.33	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Design elements prioritize pedestrian	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	2.67	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.		No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP28 Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Transit Enhancements							
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score		Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	0.00	See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System			0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	section? CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	2.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience		CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	1.33	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of	investment? CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	2.33	Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated. Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change Increases tree canopy, green	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP28 Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Tr	ransit Enhancements						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.67	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate		required.		No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	Action and Resilience section? MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	0.00	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	0.67	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	1.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	1.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	1.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	Yes	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	1.33	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional average?		Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	average? TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.67	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use designation?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP28							
Project Name:	Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Tr	ransit Enhancements	Duningt		May Daints	May Paints GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Community boulevard	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	4.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	3.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	IDI NAI atc 12 M/hat attarts ward made to		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W

Project Name:	CFP29 Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Ro	y Rogers - OR 99W						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	IIn an Equity Encus Area (EEA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?		Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Question Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (FFA)	ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below-regional average walkability score?	1.00	Score 1 point if project tract has walkability score below regional average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET4. Is the project on either the pedestrian or bicycle gaps map?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET5. Is the project withing .25 mile of a frequent transit route or stop?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET6. If the project is on the gap map, does the project close an active transportation gaps or upgrades substandard facilities along frequent transit lines and stations in EFAs?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See responses to ET1, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bicycle gap completion is within .25 mile a frequent transit route in an EFA.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation		ET7. Is project tract area below regional average for life expectancy?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has life expectancy score below regional average (80.5 yrs). If no data for a specific tract, score 0. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Makes improvements in area with	ET8. Is the project located in an area to have higher than regional average diesel particulate matter concentration?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has diesel particulate matter level higher than regional average (0.62 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation		ET9. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of air toxics?	0.00	Score 1 point if project tract has air toxics level higher than regional average (0.57 ug/m3). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Inour community health outcomes	ET10. Is the project located on high injury corridor or intersection within an Equity Focus Area?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA AND is also located on a high injury corridor or intersection. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to low-(and	ET11. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located in a tract above region average. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for	mins. (all modes)? ET12. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average vehicle access?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	barriers (jobs, transit, services for	ET13. Is the project in a tract area with lower than regional average walkability and community service access?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and	ET14. Is the project in a tract area with longer transit access to jobs travel times (lower score) than regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET15. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkability and community service access, and/or transit access to jobs?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to ET12 - ET14 first. If marked "YES" in any of those, then score this question. Score 1, 2, or 3 points if the project scope describes making improvements in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each: improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving walkability and community service access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community services; improving transit access to jobs in tract areas with longer travel times)	3	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Removes, reduces disparities and barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities)	ET16. What other barriers exist that the project can address?	0.33	Score 1 if the applicant has clearly identified disparities or barriers beyond those listed above and identified how the project is intended to address that barrier.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	of access to vehicle/high housing +	ET17. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average level of renter housing burden?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Equitable Transportation	Improvement in area with high lack	ET18. Is the project in an area with higher than regional average cost burdens (transportation + housing)?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project tract has higher than regional average cost burdens (Transportation cost burden calculated in ET12, ET14. Housing cost burden calculated in ET17). GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	IOT access to vehicle/high holising +	ET19. How has public input informed project's prioritization?	2.67	Total available score: 5. Score 1 - 5, based on your review of Community Involvement application questions. Has the public been informed of the project and had sufficient opportunities to comment? Has that input informed how the project has been developed and prioritized for funding? Score 1 - 5 if there is demonstrated public involvement and implementation of that input.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Reviewer feedback	ET20. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Equitable Transportation section?			0	No	N/A	No
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS1. Is the project located on a high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is located at or on a high injury corridor.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	-	SS2.Is the project located on a regional pedestrian or bicycle high injury corridor?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is on either pedestrian or bicycle regional high injury corridor. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Infinity for safety improvements	SS3. Did the project application indicate the project is included in a locally adopted safety action plan?	0.67	Score 1 point if the project is identified in a locally adopted safety action plan (See response to application questions Project Detail #9)	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project location is designated as a	SS4. Are there any high injury intersections within the project area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	project location is designated as a	SS5. Is project addressing a specific area with a high level of fatal or severe crashes? How many?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to SS4. If marked "YES," then score this question. If there any high injury intersections in the project area, then review the project scope. In particular review application questions Project Detail #8 and #9. Based on responses, are there any scope elements to increase traffic safety in the specific area? If so, score 1 point. Max 1 point available.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	safety	SS6. Does the project's design classification include prioritized functions for the pedestrian realm?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to D1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	safety	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	3.00	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.	3	No	Yes	Yes
	Fills (completely, partially) AT or	SS8. Does the project address a network	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System		gap?	1.00	Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for	_			

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP29 Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question	
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes	
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Safe System	Reviewer feedback	SS14. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Safe System section?			0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimetbdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	1.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.00	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR18. Project is located in a high environmental hazard potential risk area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract hazard index'	0	No	N/A	No	
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR19. Is the project located in an area with low canopy coverage?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract canopy coverage percentage'.	0	No	N/A	No	

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP29 Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W							
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR20. Does the project scope includes mitigation element? Examples include green infrastructure to manage stormwater or street trees in areas with lower than average tree canopy coverage.	0.00	This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES" then review project scope. Score 1 point if project scope elements includes environmental hazard mitigation elements, such as green infrastructure, street trees, increased canopy coverage. If CAR19 is marked "YES," then score additional 1 point if scope includes tree canopy mitigation elements. Max score 2 points.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Transportation Route?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route	CAR22. Does the project scope elements look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options?	0.00	This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18, CAR20, and CAR21. If marked "YES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR add mobility options/mobility redundancy along an Emergency Transportation Route.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Decreases impervious surface	CAR23. Project scope includes elements to manage stormwater.	0.33	Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Reviewer feedback	CAR24. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Climate Action and Resilience section?				No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO1. Does the project increases street connectivity to support direct and multiple route options?	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project include a new street segments or proposes to convert a dead end street into a street connection for different modes of travel? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses in CAR8 to help inform scoring. If yes, then score 1 point. This can also include enhancing a substandard street to a complete street.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips for people walking, bicycle, and/or accessing transit.	1.00	Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Please reference responses to MO1 and CAR8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project scope reflects shorter travel and if project street connectivity elements includes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves/adds street connectivity	MO3. Is the project located on a high injury corridor or intersection?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Mobility Options	Project area has a high number of crashes (all severities)	MO4. Does the project provide a safer alternative to a high-crash location?	1.00	This is a GIS depedent question. Review if project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection. If located within 1/2 mile, then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhances or creates an alternate connection to a high crash location? Max score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Increases reliability and efficiency for all travel modes	MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification?	0.67	This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - if any identified and for any mode - consistent with design classification? If so, do the treatments increase reliability and efficiency? Examples include bicycle signals to support the "green wave", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrian intervals. Score 1 point if treatments are consistent with design classification and increase reliability and efficiency.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Provides/increases transportation option	MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficiency in AT network?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If either marked "YES"then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability?	0.00	Review project scope. Score 1 point if project contains elements from ETC toolbox or other transit-specific mobility elements. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and ultimately reliability)?	No	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluted	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability?	0.00	This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO8. If MO8 is a "YES," then review project scope. If scope addresses transit delay using elements in MO7 score 1 point. If the transit delay segment being served is one of in terms of high ridership routes, score additional 1 point. Ridership data available here: https://trimet.org/about/performance.htm#route	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Improves freight reliability	MO10. Does the project improve reliability by removing a barrier or making an improvement on the regional freight system?	0.00	This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Mobility Options	Reviewer feedback	MO11. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Mobility Options section?				No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # of target industries greater than (>) the regional average?		Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional	No	to get around with in or get to that tract? Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	average? TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.00	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility. 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.		No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use designation?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes

28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary: Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W

Project ID:	CFP29								
Project Name:	Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W								
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No	
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	0.00	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes	
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above- regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No	
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?				No	N/A	No	
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Trail/Multi- Use Path	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No	
Design		D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	3.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes	
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	3.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes	
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	3.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes	
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	IR()W. etc.)? What efforts were made to		Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes	
Design	Reviewer feedback	D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?				No	N/A	No	