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

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	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
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. 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/ 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. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	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

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	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
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

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	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. 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. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use designation?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE9. Does the project scope includes elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new connection and/or multimodal connection).	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE8, score only if marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements to increase access to industrial and transport facilities?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE10. Is the project located on the regional freight network	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE11. Does project make improvements to freight network?	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE10, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infill, bicycle facilities infill or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infill near transit stops	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE12. Is the project located in a Title 4 industrial center?	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE13. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within a Title 4 industrial center?	This is a GIS depdent question. See GIS response to TE8 and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Max score 1 point. Score 1 point if scope elements add new mobility option or enhances existing option (e.g. upgrades an existing bicycle lane from buffered to protected) in or connecting to the Title 4 industrial center.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	TE14. Is project in tract with an above-regional average number of jobs within 30 mins. (all modes)?	Score 1 point if project is in an area with an above regional average number of jobs accessible within 30 minutes (by all modes). GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	Yes	No
Thriving Economy	Reviewer feedback	TE15. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Thriving Economy section?			No	N/A	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D1. What is the design classification of the project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design classification.	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	Yes	No	No
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects 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 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

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

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	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. 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
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/ 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. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	1.67	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	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

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	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
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. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No

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	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	1.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	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		Project seeks to address well documented problems and clearly demonstrates most vulnerable and lowest income residents would be served by project. Clear demonstration of community and business support. The project speed is very high and would be beneficial to pedestrian and bicycle safety to consider, but the project does aim to address safety risks for people walking and biking and the design classification of the facility will likely be updated to Industrial Street. Project only includes basic stormwater management and no green infrastructure. Concern that segment between 114th and 120th only has bike lane on one side.		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

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	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. 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
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/ GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.67	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	2.33	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes

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	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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	2.00	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	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 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		Crossings, access to transit, affordable housing access are barriers addressed by project. Project is part of multiple plans and priority of 82nd Avenue coalition. Bike up and over at transit stops supports transit efficiency and reliability by reducing bike/bus conflict. But stop redesign does not include transit signal priority.		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

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	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. 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
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/ 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. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	2.00	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes

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	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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	0.67	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	4.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	2.00	Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Feedback	Reviewer feedback	Comments provided by reviewers on this project		Social vulnerability index disparity identifies proximity of 3 mobile home locations. Great public engagement and documentation. Project provides redundant route in event of flooding.		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

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	SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	0.00	See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	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/ 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. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.33	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban heat island?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for climate change	CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or other green infrastructure to reduce heat island effects?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR16. If marked "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes

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	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
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. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	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

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	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	1.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	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 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		Added turn lanes are predicted to reduce delay by 5 seconds, could lead to an improvement for transit mobility, increased access to various 2040 designations and access for people living in the five identified mobile home parks. Pedestrian and bike gaps remain on either end of project extent and no clear vision for active transportation in the corridor. Project may increase traffic volumes and will increase crossing width by adding turn lanes. Some of the project's bike and pedestrian elements do not have enough vertical separation for a highway facility this project is located on. Consideration or discussion of tradeoffs of the following design and safety features were not presented in the proposal: •Narrowing traffic lanes to add more separation •Leading pedestrian interval •High visibility crosswalks Lastly, the project did not indicate results of a safety audit indicating that turn lanes are the best solution to improve safety (e.g. speed could be a major factor). Could not find any public input specific to this project. Based on material provided and described, there appeared to be strong opposition to bike elements in general.		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

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	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. 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
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/ 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. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.33	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes

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	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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	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 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		Identified as priority in Transportation System Plan. Makes improvements to address mobility barriers for seniors and people with disabilities. Is a safe routes to school project. Lots of public engagement.		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

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	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. 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
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/ 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. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	1.33	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes

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	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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	2.00	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	3.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	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 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 evaluators comments		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

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	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. 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
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/ 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. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.33	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

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	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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.67	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.	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
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? 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?	n/a	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	n/a	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	n/a	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	n/a	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		Liked the ties between the project and building future transit service and how the project will serve students who use the corridor for bus service. While the project is not located on/as high injury corridor, recognition there are injuries/crashes in the proximity.		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

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	SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	1.00	See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major 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/ GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	1.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.00	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	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

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	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
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. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.00	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

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	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	3.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	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		There was extensive involvement of a Community Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee, as well as clear changes to the project design from community involvement related to the alternatives. Hits all priorities. This project does create more access to jobs and a regional center for an equity focus area by active transportation. While no local TSAP, the project provides a safe alternative to avoid two separate high injury intersections for active transportation users. Meets standards for typical rail path. Ideally would be wider and have mode separation. Meets width requirements generally, but could be better in path design and completing gaps. Portland Avenue is still missing facilities so gap not totally closed. Ideally would connect to bike facilities on the north side, to the trail to the east, or at least some on-street treatments (e.g. striping, sharrow, signage) on Clackamas Boulevard to the west or Portland Avenue to the north. Not clear on the landing designs. Identified and mitigated environmental concern, and design within constraints. Demonstrates good financial stewardship.		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

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	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. 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
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/ 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. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major 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

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	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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.67	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	2.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	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 evaluators comments.		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

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	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. 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
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/ GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	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

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	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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	2.00	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.	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
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? 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?	n/a	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	n/a	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	n/a	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	n/a	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 evaluators comments.		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

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	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. 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
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/ 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. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	1.67	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes

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	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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	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
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? 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?	n/a	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	n/a	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	n/a	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	n/a	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		As a project development application, was scored for activities mentioned in the application but understand that these may not be actualized in the final design.		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

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	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. 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
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/ GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	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

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	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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	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 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 evaluators comments.		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

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	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. 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
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/ GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	2.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	1.33	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	1.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.33	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes

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	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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	2.00	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	3.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	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		Would like to see more transit priority on a high capacity transit route. Would like to see more discussion of why the project scope includes more landscaping instead of more bus priority.		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

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	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. 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
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/ GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	2.67	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	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**
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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.33	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	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 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		Project fills critical gap. Identified in Active Transportation Plan which included equity and safety measures. Health disparities identified, including high levels of diabetes. Fills gap to improve access to transit.		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

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	SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	0.00	See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR1. Is the project completing sidewalks and trails gaps near transit? Does project add/improve an prioritized connection to transit?	1.00	Score 1 point if project is on a tier 1 or 2 priority level on the TriMet pedestrian plan map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/trimet-bdat-systemwide-simple/ GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.67	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. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.67	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

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	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
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. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	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

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	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
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? 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 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 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 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		While transit signal priority is noted as a possible next step, these areas are not noted in the cities Enhance Transit Concept Plan (except for a segment on Foster from 82nd to 122nd). This is a vehicle improvement project that could potentially be used for transit in the future. Narrative says project came from community comments and is in RTP and Transportation System Plan (TSP). Signals are in TSP but unconstrained for outer Halsey and Foster. These projects and description in RTP are more around active transportation improvements not part of this project for the Foster portion. Intelligent Transportation Systems is focus of Halsey project. Documentation of community comments would have been helpful to provide support to either. Includes pedestrian features but not of highest design according to classification and does not include bike or transit features. Responses to design questions indicate pedestrian priority, but not bike or transit, reduces speed of vehicles but increases reliability though not focus of classification. Would've liked to know why no bike or transit signal priority features and further discussion of tradeoffs.		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

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	Design elements prioritize pedestrian safety	SS7. Are the preferred design elements being used for pedestrian functions according to the functional class and design classification?	1.00	Max available score of 3 points. Score 1-3 points if the project design classification and design elements represent the highest pedestrian priority design according to design classification. To help, see responses to design section application questions #41 and #42. Are the pedestrian functions for the desired environment selected to show pedestrian access and mobility as "Priority?" Also look at the current conditions section application question #3 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9. Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for completely filling gap (SS9).	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	0.00	See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	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/ 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. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.33	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No

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	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
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. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No

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	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	1.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	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		Provided a discretionary transit point. Public involved in prioritizing corridor for improvements for Washington County Transit Study and Regional HCT Strategy. Baseline/185th identified in the TSAP and project does include one section of protected bike intersection. Project replaces existing facilities when redoing the existing curbs. While there are transit signal priority elements and a one-side protected bike intersection, the vast majority of this project is signal timing to reduce delay for vehicles. The bicycle facility remains substandard and the sidewalk the bare minimum. Responses to design questions and reference to design classification indicates vehicles should be accommodated but are currently prioritized. Cost is due to not making trade-offs.		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?	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?	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

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	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. 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
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/ GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.33	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.33	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	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?	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

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	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
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?	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?	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?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Support/provide/increases access to Target Industries	TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional average?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES" then score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	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
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	2.00	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	3.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	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		Safe Routes to School priority investment routes were informed by a huge engagement effort and identified by schools themselves. Project represents the value of investing in crossing improvements on high crash network for pedestrians.		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

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	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. 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
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/ 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. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major 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

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	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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	2.00	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	4.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	2.00	Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Feedback	Reviewer feedback	Comments provided by reviewers on this project		Demonstrated the project is in a high equity needs area, good public engagement and connects people to jobs. Considered a gap in the regional trail because it is a substandard facility and does not provide safe bike and pedestrian crossing of the trail. The project increases resilience for both seismic and flooding.		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

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	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. 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
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/ 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. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	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

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	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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.67	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	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 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		Adds buffered bike facilities, widens sidewalks, adds Business Access Transit lanes, crossings/access to transit. Part of multiple plans and priority of 82nd Avenue coalition. Widening to optimal width, bike lanes with more separation, enhanced.		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

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	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. 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
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/ 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. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.00	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

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	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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.33	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.	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
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? 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?	n/a	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	n/a	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	n/a	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	n/a	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 evaluators comments.		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

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	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. 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
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/ GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	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

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	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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	1.67	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	1.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	3.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	1.00	Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrained ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Feedback	Reviewer feedback	Comments provided by reviewers on this project		No evaluators comments.		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

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	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. 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
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/ GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	0.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	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

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	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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	0.33	This is a partial GIS depedent question. Max score available: 3. Score 1 point per: 1) if project addresses active transportation on a regional facility; 2) increases access to industrial and transport facilities (see GIS response to TE8 for reference); 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.	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
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? 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?	n/a	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	n/a	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	n/a	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	n/a	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 evaluators comments.		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

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	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. 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
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/ 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. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.33	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major 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

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	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
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?	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. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract?	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No

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	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	2.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	3.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	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		Noted as a safety location in Beaverton SPIS. Key intersection on high injury corridor map. Positive bikes on sidewalk at that key intersection is a safety improvement. However, project not addressing bike gap; bus improvements take from bike and pedestrian facilities and removing street trees rather than vehicle lanes. Bike improvement drops cyclists into a substandard facility. Would've liked discussion on why those trade-offs were made and why the bike gap was left.		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

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	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. 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
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/ GIS evaluated	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR4. Does project include scope elements to increase the efficiency of transit operations? Can include stop and/or intersection enhancements.	0.00	Refer to the Enhanced Transit treatments and toolbox (see page 4-19 or page 77 of Regional Transit Strategy (RTS) for description of enhanced transit type tools for operations). Max score 2 points available. Score 1 point if project includes non-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signal retiming, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. dedicated right of way, bus pull outs). Review the Regional Transit Strategy here. https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR5. Does project increase or add Active Transportation infrastructure?	1.00	Max score 1 point. Review project scope. Is the project adding new or expanding active transportation network? Score 1 point if project adds or expands AT infrastructure to make cycling/walking safer, easier and more attractive.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases bicycling/walking (CSS rating = 3 stars)	CAR6. Does project identify specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) investments in the project scope?	0.00	Review project scope. Max score 2 points available. Score if the project scope adds new or advances existing operation of digital, smart, and/or intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure to manage existing capacity on the project roadway. Examples can include fiber optic, upgraded traffic signals, traveler information, speed reduction warnings.	2	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR7. Is the project located on a planned minor or major arterial street according to the Motor Vehicle policy map in the 2023 RTP?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize local traffic on regional arterial streets?	1.00	Two ways to assess this measure. Max score 1 point available if either Part 1 or Part 2 applies. (Does not have to be both, just one) Part 1 is a GIS dependent question. See response to CAR7 and the GIS result. Part 1: See response to CAR7. If the response is "YES," review the project scope elements. Do the project other scope elements compliment and add elements (system management, etc.) to move vehicular traffic from adjacent collector and local streets? If scope elements include, then score 1 point. Part 2: If response to CAR7 is "NO," then review of project scope. Does the project help to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and abilities? This can include a minor collector making a connection or a dead end punch through. Should include complimentary complete streets elements.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR9. Does the project include or address gap in either the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian OR bicycle system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR10. Does the project include or address gap in BOTH the bicycle or pedestrian networks?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question ET4. Score 1 point if project includes pedestrian AND bicycle system completion scope elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	1.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major investment?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.00	Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes

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	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
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. 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

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	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE5. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Thriving Economy	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	TE6. Is project located in or provides multimodal connection to a designated 2040 land use area?	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE5. Score 1 point if project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements within or connecting to a 2040 land use area.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport facilities	TE7. Does the project scope fill a gap or address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit infrastructure on a regional facility?	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
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? 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 Refer to the responses to application Design section questions 41 - 57. Also look at the responses to Design section questions 35 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D3. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project?	3.00	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses to the Design section of the application. In particular, note where questions about preferred design treatments are being used. Max score is 3. Score on a 1-3 scale. Projects where a majority of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	3.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-20241025-1.pdf Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification?	D5. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financial, ROW, etc.)? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classification and prioritized functions in light of these constraints?	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 evaluators comments.		No	N/A	No