# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Performance Measures Criteria and Scoring Questions

| 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 |
| 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Performance Measures Criteria and Scoring Questions

| 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 | Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap | 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.<br><br>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 | Fills (completely, partially) AT or 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 | 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? | 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? | | 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? | 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 (CSS rating = 5 stars) | 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/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/<br>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. | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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? | 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? | 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? | 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. | 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? | 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? | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Performance Measures Criteria and Scoring Questions

| 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 | 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? | 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? | 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 | 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. | 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 | Improves/adds street connectivity | 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 within a ½ mile of a high injury corridor or intersection? | 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? | This is a GIS dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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? | 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? | 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)? | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 1 | No | No | No |
| Mobility Options | Reduces 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 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? | This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score.<br>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? | 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? | This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score.<br>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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Performance Measures Criteria and Scoring Questions

| 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 | 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)? | 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?<br>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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 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<br><br>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 |

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


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

# Appendix 2
# 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* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *Clackamas Industrial Area Improvements: 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 | In an Equity Focus Area (EFA) | 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 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 | 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 | 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? | 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 barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities) | 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 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 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? | 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? | 2.00 | 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 | 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 |
| 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? | 0.67 | 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? | 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? | 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 | 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.<br><br>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? | 0.00 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 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* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *Clackamas Industrial Area Improvements: 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 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? | 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 |
| 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/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/<br>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? | 0.67 | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 | 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 | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 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* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *Clackamas Industrial Area Improvements: 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 | 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 |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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? | 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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 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* | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *Clackamas Industrial Area Improvements: 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** |
| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Regional street | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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<br><br>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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal Safety and Access

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP5* |
| **Project Name:** | *NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | 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 | 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 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 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 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 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? | 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? | 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 |
| 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? | 0.00 | 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. | 3 | 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.<br><br>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? | 0.67 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal Safety and Access

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP5* |
| **Project Name:** | *NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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/<br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal Safety and Access

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP5* |
| **Project Name:** | *NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal 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 |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal Safety and Access

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP5* |
| **Project Name:** | *NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Community Street | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 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<br><br>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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

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

| **Project ID:** | *CFP6* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | 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 | 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 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 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 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 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? | 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? | 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? | No | 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 |
| 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 |
| 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.<br><br>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? | 0.67 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

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

| **Project ID:** | *CFP6* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *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 investment? | 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 | 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 |
| 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/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/<br>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? | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 | 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 |

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

| **Project ID:** | *CFP6* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP6* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Trail/Multi-Use Path | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 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<br><br>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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# OR 212/224 Sunrise Hwy Phase 2: Bike/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements (CON)

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP8* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | 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 | 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? | 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 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 barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities) | 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 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 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? | 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 | 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? | 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 |
| 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? | 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? | 0.67 | 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? | 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? | 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? | 1.00 | This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9.<br><br>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? | 0.00 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# OR 212/224 Sunrise Hwy Phase 2: Bike/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements (CON)

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP8* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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/<br>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? | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# OR 212/224 Sunrise Hwy Phase 2: Bike/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements (CON)

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP8* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 required. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |
| 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. | 0.33 | 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# OR 212/224 Sunrise Hwy Phase 2: Bike/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements (CON)

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP8* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Regional street | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 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<br><br>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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck Rd

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP9* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Equitable Transportation | In an Equity Focus Area (EFA) | 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 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 | 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 | 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 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 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 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 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? | 1.00 | 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 | 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? | No | 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)? | 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 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 |
| 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? | 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. | 3 | 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.<br><br>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? | 0.00 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck Rd

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP9* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 investment? | 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 | 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 |
| 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/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/<br>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? | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck Rd

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP9* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck Rd

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP9* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Trail/Multi-Use Path | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 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<br><br>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? | 2.33 | 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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the Westside Trail

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP10* |
| **Project Name:** | *Bridge 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | 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 | Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes | 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 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? | 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 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 barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities) | 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 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 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? | 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? | 0.67 | 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)? | 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 of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden | 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 |
| 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? | 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? | 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? | 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 |
| 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.<br><br>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? | 0.33 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the Westside Trail

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP10* |
| **Project Name:** | *Bridge 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | 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 | 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? | 0.33 | 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 |
| 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/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/<br>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? | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the Westside Trail

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP10* |
| **Project Name:** | *Bridge 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 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 |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the Westside Trail

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP10* |
| **Project Name:** | *Bridge 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Trail/Multi-Use Path | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 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<br><br>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? | 2.33 | 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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP11* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | 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 | 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 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 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 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 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? | 1.00 | 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? | 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 |
| 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? | 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? | 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. | 3 | 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.<br><br>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? | 0.67 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP11* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/<br>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? | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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? | 0.33 | 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? | 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 |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP11* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP11* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Community street | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 1.67 | 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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP12* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 | 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 | 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 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 barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities) | 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 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 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? | 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? | 2.00 | 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 | 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 |
| 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? | 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. | 3 | 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.<br><br>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? | 1.00 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP12* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | 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 | 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 |
| 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/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/<br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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? | 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 |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP12* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP12* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Trail/Multi-Use Path | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 2.67 | 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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192nd Avenue - 201st Avenue

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP13* |
| **Project Name:** | *NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192nd 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 | 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? | 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 | 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 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 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 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 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 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? | 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? | 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? | 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 |
| 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? | 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? | 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? | 2.00 | 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? | 1.00 | This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9.<br><br>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? | 0.33 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192nd Avenue - 201st Avenue

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP13* |
| **Project Name:** | *NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192nd 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/<br>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? | 0.67 | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 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 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 | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192nd Avenue - 201st Avenue

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP13* |
| **Project Name:** | *NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192nd 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 required. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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? | 0.33 | This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192nd Avenue - 201st Avenue

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP13* |
| **Project Name:** | *NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192nd 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Community street | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 0.33 | 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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th Street to Tumwater village

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP14* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | 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 | 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 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)? | 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 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 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? | 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? | 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 | 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 |
| 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? | 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. | 3 | 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.<br><br>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? | 1.00 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th Street to Tumwater village

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP14* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 | 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 | 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? | 0.00 | 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 |
| 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/<br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 | 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 | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th Street to Tumwater village

| **Project ID:** | *CFP14* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th Street to Tumwater village

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP14* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Highway, Community boulevard, Regional boulevard | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 3.00 | 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<br><br>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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine Dr Safety Corridor Planning

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP15* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | 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 | 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 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 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 barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities) | 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 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 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? | 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 | 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 |
| 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? | 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? | 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. | 3 | 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.<br><br>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? | 1.00 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine Dr Safety Corridor Planning

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP15* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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/<br>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. | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 | 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 | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine Dr Safety Corridor Planning

| **Project ID:** | *CFP15* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *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 | 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? | 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. | 0.33 | Review project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes stormwater management features beyond what may be considered required. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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? | 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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? | 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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine Dr Safety Corridor Planning

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP15* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Community boulevard | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 1.67 | 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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Improvements

| **Project ID:** | *CFP16* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road 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 | 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 | 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 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 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 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 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? | 1.00 | 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 | 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? | No | 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)? | 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 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 |
| 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? | 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? | 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. | 3 | 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.<br><br>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? | 1.00 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Improvements

| **Project ID:** | *CFP16* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road 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 | Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap | 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 | 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 |
| 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/<br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Improvements

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP16* |
| **Project Name:** | *Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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. | 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 |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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)? | No | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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? | 1.67 | 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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Improvements

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP16* |
| **Project Name:** | *Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Trail/Multi-Use Path | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 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<br><br>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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall Blvd – 3rd St to 5th St

| **Project ID:** | *CFP17* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | 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 | 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? | 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 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 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 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? | 1.00 | 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 | 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 |
| 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? | 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? | 0.00 | 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? | 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? | 2.33 | 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 | 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.<br><br>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? | 0.00 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall Blvd – 3rd St to 5th St

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP17* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/<br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall Blvd – 3rd St to 5th St

| **Project ID:** | *CFP17* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *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 required. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |
| 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. | 0.67 | 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall Blvd – 3rd St to 5th St

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP17* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Regional boulevard | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 1.67 | 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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NW Division Street Complete Street: Gresham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale Avenue

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP18* |
| **Project Name:** | *NW Division Street Complete Street: Gresham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale 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 | 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 | 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 | 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? | 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 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 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 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 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? | 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? | 2.00 | 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 | 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? | 3.33 | 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 |
| 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? | 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? | 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? | 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? | 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. | 3 | 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.<br><br>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? | 0.33 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NW Division Street Complete Street: Gresham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale Avenue

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP18* |
| **Project Name:** | *NW Division Street Complete Street: Gresham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | 0.00 | 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 |
| 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/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/<br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 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 | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NW Division Street Complete Street: Gresham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale Avenue

| **Project ID:** | *CFP18* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *NW Division Street Complete Street: Gresham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale 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. | 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 |
| 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. | 0.00 | 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NW Division Street Complete Street: Gresham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale Avenue

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP18* |
| **Project Name:** | *NW Division Street Complete Street: Gresham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Community street | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 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<br><br>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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Signal Improvements)

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP19* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 | 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? | 0.33 | 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 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 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 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 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 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? | 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? | 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 |
| 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. | 3 | 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.<br><br>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? | 0.00 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Signal Improvements)

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP19* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 | 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 |
| 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/<br>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? | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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? | 0.67 | 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 | 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? | 0.67 | 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 | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Signal Improvements)

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP19* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | 0.00 | 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 |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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? | 0.67 | 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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? | 1.67 | 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. | 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? | 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). | 0.00 | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Signal Improvements)

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP19* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Regional street | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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? | 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<br><br>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? | 2.00 | 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<br><br>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? | 0.00 | 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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Better Bus Project

| **Project ID:** | *CFP21* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *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? | 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? | 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 | 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 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 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 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 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 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? | 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? | No | 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)? | 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 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 |
| 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.<br><br>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? | 0.00 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Better Bus Project

| **Project ID:** | *CFP21* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *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 | 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 |
| 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? | 1.00 | 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/<br>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? | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Better Bus Project

| **Project ID:** | *CFP21* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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. | 0.33 | 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Better Bus Project

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP21* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Regional street | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 0.00 | 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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 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) 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? | 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? | 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? | 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 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 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 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 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? | 1.00 | 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 |
| 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.<br><br>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? | 0.33 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 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) 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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/<br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 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) 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 required. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |
| 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. | 0.33 | 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 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) 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Trail/Multi-Use Path | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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<br><br>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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Transit

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP23* |
| **Project Name:** | *NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Transit* |

| 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 | 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 | 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 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 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 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 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? | 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 |
| 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. | 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.<br><br>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? | 0.00 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Transit

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP23* |
| **Project Name:** | *NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Transit* |

| 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? | 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 |
| 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/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/<br>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? | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 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? | 0.67 | 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 | 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 | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Transit

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP23* |
| **Project Name:** | *NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Transit* |

| 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 |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Transit

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP23* |
| **Project Name:** | *NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Transit* |

| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Regional boulevard | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 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<br><br>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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodal Safety and Access

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP24* |
| **Project Name:** | *NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodal 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | 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 | 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 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 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 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 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? | 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? | 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 |
| 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? | 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 | 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.<br><br>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? | 0.00 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodal Safety and Access

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP24* |
| **Project Name:** | *NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodal 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/<br>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? | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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? | 0.00 | 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 | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodal Safety and Access

| **Project ID:** | *CFP24* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodal 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 |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodal Safety and Access

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP24* |
| **Project Name:** | *NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodal 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Regional street | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 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<br><br>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? | 2.67 | 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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan Rd

| **Project ID:** | *CFP25* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | 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 | 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 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 barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities) | 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 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 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? | 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)? | 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 of access to vehicle/high housing + transportation burden | 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 |
| 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? | 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? | 2.00 | 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.<br><br>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? | 0.00 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan Rd

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP25* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 | 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? | 0.33 | 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 |
| 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/<br>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? | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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? | 0.00 | 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 | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan Rd

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP25* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan Rd

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP25* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Trail/Multi-Use Path | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 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<br><br>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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# W Burnside Green Loop Crossing

| | |
|---|---|
| **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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | 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 | 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 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 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 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 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? | 1.00 | 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 | 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? | 3.33 | 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 |
| 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? | 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? | 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. | 3 | 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.<br><br>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? | 0.00 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# W Burnside Green Loop Crossing

| | |
|---|---|
| **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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | 0.00 | 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 |
| 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/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/<br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# W Burnside Green Loop Crossing

| | |
|---|---|
| **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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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? | 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# W Burnside Green Loop Crossing

| | |
|---|---|
| **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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Regional boulevard | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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<br><br>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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to SW Kemmer Road

| **Project ID:** | *CFP27* |
|---|---|
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | 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 | 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 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 barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities) | 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 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 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? | 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? | 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? | 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? | 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 |
| 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? | 0.33 | 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 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? | 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? | 0.67 | This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9.<br><br>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? | 0.33 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to SW Kemmer Road

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP27* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | 0.33 | 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 |
| 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/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/<br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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? | 0.67 | 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? | 0.67 | 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 | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to SW Kemmer Road

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP27* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to SW Kemmer Road

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP27* |
| **Project Name:** | *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Community street | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 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<br><br>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? | 0.33 | 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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Transit Enhancements

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP28* |
| **Project Name:** | *Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Transit 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 | 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 | 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 | 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 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 barriers (jobs, transit, services for equity communities) | 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 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 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? | 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 | 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? | No | 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)? | 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 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 |
| 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? | 0.33 | 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 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? | 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. | 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.<br><br>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? | 0.00 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Transit Enhancements

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP28* |
| **Project Name:** | *Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Transit 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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? | 1.00 | 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/<br>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? | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Transit Enhancements

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP28* |
| **Project Name:** | *Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Transit 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 |
| 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. | 0.67 | 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 Outcomes Evaluation Individual Score Summary:
# Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Transit Enhancements

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project ID:** | *CFP28* |
| **Project Name:** | *Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Transit 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Community boulevard | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 1.67 | 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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |

# Appendix 2
# 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Equitable Transportation | In an Equity Focus Area (EFA) | 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 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 | 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 | Makes improvements in area with poor community health outcomes | 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 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 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)? | 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 equity communities) | 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 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 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? | 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? | 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 | 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? | No | 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)? | 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 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 |
| 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? | 0.67 | 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? | 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. | 3 | 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.<br><br>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? | 1.00 | See instructions in SS8. | 1 | No | Yes | Yes |

# Appendix 2
# 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | 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 | 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 |
| 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/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/<br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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 |

# Appendix 2
# 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 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 within a ½ mile of 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 dependent question. Review response to MO3. If project is located within a 1/2 mile of either direction of a high injury corridor or intersection then review project scope. Do the scope elements enhance 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 | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | 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 | 2 | 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 |
| 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.<br>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.<br>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. | 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? | 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 |

# Appendix 2
# 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 |
| 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?<br>NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification. | Trail/Multi-Use Path | Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. | | 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? | 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<br><br>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<br><br>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<br><br>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? | 2.33 | 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 |
| Feedback | Reviewer feedback | Comments provided by reviewers on this project | | | | No | N/A | No |