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	ETG. 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 "YE5" 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 commen? 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	SSS. 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 "VES," 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

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		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. I point available if project describes and explicitly references the project dements 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- bdds-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 A1 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 wehicle, bicycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and baltities? 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

RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in	GIS Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review	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.	Question 3	Question No	Question	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 "VES" 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	MOS. 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 - flar yidentified 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

	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in	GIS Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review	Scoring
RTP Goal Area	Terrormance measure	evaluation question enterio	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES"	Question	Question	Question	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 loss dependent question. See dis response to TET. If marked "TES 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		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		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		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 TEB, 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		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		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 "VES" 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		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
	best possible improvement in project area, based on functional	D2. Based on the functions appropriate for the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being prioritized?	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 33 and 36. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being prioritized in the scope of work? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5.	5	No	Yes	Yes
Design	area based on functional	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 2. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments, are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design	area, based on functional	D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	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-2024/1025-1.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, RGW, 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		D6. Do you have any comments about any of the topics covered in the Design section?			No	N/A	No

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

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

Appendix 2

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

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP3 Clackamas Industrial Area Improvement	ents: SE Jennifer Street Multi-use Path						
			Project		Max Points	GIS Evaluated	Subjective	Scoring
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Scored Question	Review Question	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	ETG. 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 "YE5" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 piont if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR blcycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND blcycle 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)	ETIS. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkabity and community service access, analyor 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 vehicle access in tract area with lower than average walkability and community service; 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: S. 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	SSS. 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 Tail, 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: Project Name:	CFP3 Clackamas Industrial Area Improveme	ents: SE Jennifer Street Multi-use Path						
Project Name:	Clackamas maastriai Area improveme	ents. Se sennijer Street Multi-use Putil	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application	Instructions on How to Score	Available in	Evaluated Scored	Review	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?	Average Score	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 #1 and #4.2. 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.	Question 3	Question	Question	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	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	Trails network gap 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/bking/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. I 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 pullo ust). 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 of 5 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 to ther 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 help, 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 pedestrain of Bkoycke 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 fir project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	plan? 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)	Investment? CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	1.67	Investment Strategy. Cis evaluated. Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No

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	ante: CE lannifar Street Multi Dut						
Project Name:	Clackamas Industrial Area Improveme	ents: SE Jennifer Street Multi-use Path	David and		Maria Dallada	GIS	Cubbanton	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	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 "VES" 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 "VES," 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 (Si 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 fici Sependent question. Please reference responses to MOI and CA88 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 juny 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	MOS. 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 bircycle 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://timee.org/about/performane.html/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 Improveme	ents: SE Jennifer Street Multi-use Path				GIE -		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-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 TEB 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 TER, 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 TELO, if marked "VES" 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 dassification 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.oregommetro.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 perferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregommetro.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, financia), ROW, etc.]? What efforts were made to mitigate these constraints? How well did the project design adapt and sought to the design classifician 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 wehicle travel lane widthet 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

Project ID:	CFP5							
Project Name:	NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal	Safety and Access	Drojest		Max Points	GIS	Cubinstive	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
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	ETG. 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 "YE5" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 2 plont if project includes/addresse pedestrian OR blcycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project include/3/addresses pedestrian AND blcycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional plont if pedestrian or blcycle 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	SSS. 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

al Results 4.11.2025

Project ID:	CFP5 NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal	Safety and Arress						
Project Name:	NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal	sajety and Access	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application	Instructions on How to Score	Available in	Evaluated Scored	Review	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.	Question 3	Question	Question	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 ETA. 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. I point available if project description includes walking/bliking/foiling 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 dements 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-systemvide-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. declicated 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)	CARS. 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 at	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 to the response is "YES," review the project 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 and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and 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	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)	plan? 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

Project ID:	CFP5							
Project Name:	NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal S	Safety and Access				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	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 "VES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR and 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 circultous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling linfrastructure focused? A partially 61 Gependent question. Place reference responses to MO1 and CAB8 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 them 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	MOS. 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 freatments 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

Project ID:	CFP5							
Project Name:	NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal	Safety and Access	0			GIS	California	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	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 TES 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 TEB, 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 potion (e.g. upgrades a ne sixting bloycle han 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 priority functions of the design dassification 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-aid-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 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 Tralls Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sistes/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Tralls-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, financia), 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 wehicle 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 blke/bus conflict. But stop redesign does not include transit signal priority.		No	N/A	No

Project ID:	CFP6							
Project Name:	Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City		Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	Caratan
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	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	ETG. 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 "YE5" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score joint if project includes/addresse pedestrian OR blcycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND blcycle 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	SSS. 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

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP6 Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City							
Project Name:	westside trail segment 1 - king City		Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	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	Question	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	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. I point available if project description includes walking/biking/foiling safely dements 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 is 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). Relevale 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 and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and and 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 I 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

Project ID:	CFP6							
Project Name:	Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City					GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	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 ananopy, 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 include 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 I point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR and 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 linfrastructure focused? A partially Gis dependent question. Place 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	MOS. 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? Its, od, othe 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.html#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

Project ID:	CFP6							
Project Name:	Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City					GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in	Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review	Scoring Question
			Average Score		Question	Question	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?)	TES. 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 TES. 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 TEB 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 I 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.oregometro.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 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 Tralls 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, financia), RGW, 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 wehiled 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

Project ID:	CFP8	. (0. 45 17 41 1	(con)					
Project Name:	OR 212/224 Sunrise Hwy Phase 2: Bik	e/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements	(CON) Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus	1.00	Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Question	No	Yes
Transportation Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	Area (EFA)? ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-	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	Income. GIS evaluated. 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	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	communities Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ETS. 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 BIPCC, underserved communities	ETG. 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 "YE5" 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, walkabity 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 valiability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each improving yehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving wallability and community service access in tract area with lower than average wallability 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: S. 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	SSS. 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 D.1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D.1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Steet. Regional Tail, 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

Project ID:	CFP8	e/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements	(CON)					
Project Name:	OK 212/224 Suillise Hwy Phuse 2. Biki	prea racinales and interchange improvements	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	Candina
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Review Question	Scoring Question
				This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9.				
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS8. Does the project address a network gap?	1.00	Total pts available = 2. 1 point for partial fill (SS8); 1 additional point for	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or	SS9. Does the project completely fill the	0.00	completely filling gap (SS9). See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or	gap? SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major	1	Yes	No	Yes
	Trails network gap Fills (completely, partially) AT or	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12		Investment Strategy. Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current				
Safe System	Trails network gap	school walkshed?	Yes	conditions question #7 in project application. This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If	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	Inis is a US dependent question. 3 each response to question 331. 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. I 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 reteining, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. declicated 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)	CARS. 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 that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle and streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicycle 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 ETA.	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	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of TSMO) as part of the project (Climate Smart Strategy rating = 3 stars)	investment? CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.33	Investment Strategy. GIs evaluated. Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11in 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 2001 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 acopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects.	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP8	e/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements	(CON)					
Project Name:	OR 212/224 Sullise Hwy Phase 2. Bike	yrea raciities and interchange improvements	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Review Question	Scoring Question
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 hazar dimitigation 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 fici Sependent question. Place reference responses to MOI and CAB8 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 them 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 waste", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrain 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.	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	Yes	https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-transit-strategy Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Mobility Options	Reduces delay for transit	ultimately reliability)? 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://krinet.org/about/performance.htmlfroute	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	average: TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE3. If marked "YES" then review project scope and score. Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal access to get around with in or get to that tharch? 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) increase 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

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP8 OR 212/224 Sunrise Hwy Phase 2: Bik	e/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements	(CON)					
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
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 multimotioal 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 potion (e.g. upgrades an estisting biotyle flam 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 priority functions of the design dassification 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.oregometro.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 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.oregometro.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 S. 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: **Rarrowing traffic lanes to add more separation **Rading pedestrian interval **Rajnt 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

esults 4.11.2025 21

Project ID:	CFP9 Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck	Dd						
Project Name:	Rea Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck	Ka .	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	Carrier .
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	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	ETS. 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	ETG. 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 "YE5" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR bloycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bloycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if feedstrian or bloycle 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 walkablity 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 availability 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	SSS. 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

Project ID:	CFP9							
Project Name:	Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck	nu .	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	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	Question	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/foiling 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	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)	transit? CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/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 puil 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)	CARS. 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

Project ID:	CFP9							
Project Name:	Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck I	Rd				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	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," hen 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 "VES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR and 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 opcing infrastructure focused? A partially fici Sependent question. Flore reference responses to MOI and CAB8 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

Project ID:	CFP9							
Project Name:	Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck	Rd				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	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 thact? 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 TEB 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 TEB, 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.oregometro.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 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 in the scope, score 1. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no 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 Tralls Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/defauit/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Trails-Guide-2024/1025-1.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 miligate 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 while 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

Project ID:	CFP10							
Project Name:	Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the We	stside Trail	Duniant		Adam Dalata	GIS	Coldandon	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	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	ETS. 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	ETG. 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 "YE5" 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)	ETIS. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkabilty 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 will lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each improving yehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving valiability 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	SSS. 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 88 and 89. 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 10 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Tail, if the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP10							
Project Name:	Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the We	stside Trail	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	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 #4 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.	3	Question	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. I point available if project description includes validing/blink(prolling 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. I point available if project describes and explicitly references the project dements 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 retining, 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)	CARS. 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 while, biscycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and admitted? 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)	plan? 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

Project ID:	CFP10							
Project Name:	Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the Wes	stside Trail				210		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-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 and 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. Place reference responses to MOI and CAB8 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 them 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	MOS. 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 "MES," 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 projects 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

Project ID:	CFP10	shelds Tool						
Project Name:	Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the We	stside Trail				GIS	California	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	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.	question 1	Question 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 TEB 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 TEB, score only if marked "YES."Max score I 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 "VES" 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 potion (e.g. upgrades a nessiting bitoyle 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-Lpdf 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 dassification 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 nimimal 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 miligate 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	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable Transportation	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	ETG. 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 "YE5" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 2 plont if groups can cloudes/addresse pedestrian OR blcycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND blcycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional plont if pedestrian or blcycle 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 walkablity 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 walkablity and community services access in tract area with lower than average walkablity 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	SSS. 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

30

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 Reilroad Avenue Multiuse Both, 27th	Augusta Linuaged Augusta						
Project Name:	Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th	Avenue to Linwood Avenue	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application	Instructions on How to Score	Available in	Evaluated Scored	Review	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.	Question 3	Question	Question	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 validing/blink(prolling safely dements 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 dements 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	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)	transit? CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/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. declicated 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)	CARS. 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 Resillence	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR8. Is project likely to encourage local traffic to use local and collector streets to minimize bocal 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 be to the project to the response is "YES," review the project 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 which, 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	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)	plan? 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: Project Name CFP11 nue Multiuse Path: 37th Avenue to Linwood Avenue n a designated 2040 Land Use cente CAR14. Is project located in a designated Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR14. If market "YES" then review project scope and score. Max score 1 point. Score if AR15. Is project located in or impro Yes multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area? Resilience project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements or corridor (or connects to?) within or connecting to a 2040 land use area Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Urban heat island Climate Action and CAR16. Is the project is located in an urban defined here as 'project located in census tract in top quartile of tract urban heat index deviation from average'. No N/A No Resilience npervious surfaces to mitigate for heat island? limate change creases tree canopy, greer CAR17. Does the scope adds street trees or Climate Action and nfrastructure and decreases "YES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project 0.00 other green infrastructure to reduce heat Yes Yes Resilience mpervious surfaces to mitigate for ncludes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green sland effects? climate change Increases tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address urban heat effects. Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. High environmental CAR18. Project is located in a high Climate Action and nfrastructure and decreases mpervious surfaces to mitigate for 0 No hazard potential defined here as 'project located in census tract in top No N/A No Resilience ntal hazard potential risk area? uartile of tract hazard index climate change ncreases tree canopy, green Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. Low canopy coverage limate Action and AR19. Is the project located in an area with nfrastructure and decreases defined here as 'project located in census tract in bottom quartile of tract N/A No Resilience mpervious surfaces to mitigate for ow canopy coverage? anopy coverage percentage' limate change This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If increases tree canopy, green infrastructure and decreases impervious surfaces to mitigate for This is a double GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CAR18. If marked "YES The neview 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. CAR20. Does the project scope includes nitigation element? Examples include green Climate Action and infrastructure to manage stormwater of street trees in areas with lower than av 0.00 Nο Yes Yes Climate Action and Resilience Addresses an Emergency Transportation Route CAR21. Is the project on an Emergency Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated N/A Νο This is a triple GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR18. CAR22. Does the project scope elements rins is a tiple distribution (see this legion), see this legiones to CARLO, CARZO, and CARZI. 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 redunc along an Emergency Transportation Route. look to increase the resilience of infrastructure (e.g. seismic, flooding, wildfires) or add mobility options? ddresses an Emergency 0.00 Yes eview project scope. Score 1 point if scope description includes ormwater management features beyond what may be considered Climate Action and Resilience CAR23. Project scope includes elements to required. 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 NO1. Does the project increases street onnectivity to support direct and multiple oute options? mproves/adds street connectivity Aobility Options Review project scope. Does the project create new paths or redundancies in the network that reduces circuitous travel? Are the naths nedestrian or MO2. Does the project provide shorter trips cycling infrastructure focused? A partially GIS dependent question. Pleas proves/adds street connectivity for people walking, bicycle, and/or accestransit. Mobility Options 0.67 No Yes Yes culing immastructure. The distribution of the project of the country of the count MO3. Is the project located within a ½ mile mproves/adds street connectivity Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. No 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 crashes (all severities) Iternative to a high-crash location? This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D1, This is a GIS depedent question. Review response to project question D.I design classification. Based on the design classification, are reliability treatments - If any identified and for any mode - consistent with design of Lassification? 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 validability and efficiency. MO5. Does the project include treatments to increase reliability and efficiency for all modes, considering roadway/street functional classification and design classification? creases reliability and efficiency for Mobility Options 0.67 Yes Yes eliability and efficiency. MO6. Does the project fill a gap or deficience This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS responses to CAR9 and CAR10. If Provides/increases transportation Aobility Options 1.00 No Yes Yes in AT network? either marked "YES"then score 1 point. 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 MO7. Does the project include elements that improve transit reliability? 1obility Options Reduces delay for transit MO8. Is the project located on a segment of transit network that suffers from delay (and Mobility Ontions Reduces delay for transit Nο Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. 1 Yes Nο Yes Itimately reliability)? This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS This is a partially GIS dependent question. See response to MO7 and GIS response to MO7 and GIS response to MOS. If MOS 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 MO9. Does the project scope address transit delay and reliability? Mobility Options Reduces delay for transit 0.00 Yes Yes Yes MO10. Does the project improve reliability This is a GIS depdendent question. See GIS responses to TE10 and TE12. If by removing a barrier or making an marked "YES" to any, review scope elements and review responses to Mobility Options nproves freight reliability 0.00 Yes Yes nprovement on the regional freight TE11 and TE13. If project scope appears to be removing a barrier or enhancing mobility on the freight network, then score 1 point. vstem? TE1. Is the project located in a tract with # o upport/provide/increases access to hriving Economy target industries greater than (>) the Yes Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. 0 No N/A No Target Industries egional average? This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to TE1. If marked "YES TE2. Does project improve access to a tract with # of target industries > regional upport/provide/increases access to 1.00 riving Economy No Yes Yes Target Industries Does the project include scope elements that increases multimodal acces average? to get around with in or get to that tract? TE3. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional dustrial/Commercial developa teference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated. riving Economy 0 No N/A No average?

nal Results 4.11.2025

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: Project Name:	CFP11 Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th.	Avenue to Linwood Avenue					-	
Project Name.	Namoda Avende Maidase Futh. 37th	Avenue to Linwood Avenue	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application	Instructions on How to Score	Available in	Evaluated Scored	Review	Scoring Question
			Average Score		Question	Question	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 TES. 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 TEB 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 multimotial 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 potion (e.g. upgrades a nessiting biotyle flam 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 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.oregommetro.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 2. 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 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 Tralls Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6-Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregommetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Tralls-Guide-2024/1025-1.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, financia), RGW, 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 wehicle 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	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	ET1. Is the project located in an Equity Focus		Score 1 point if project is in or touches an EFA. GIS evaluated.	1	Question	No	Yes
Transportation Equitable Transportation	In an Equity Focus Area (EFA)	Area (EFA)? ET2. Is the project located in an EFA for all three focus communities?	0.00	Score 1 point if project is in an EFA with all three focus communities. Focus communities are: Persons of Color, Limited English Proficiency, Low-Income. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Equitable Transportation	Improves access to community places for BIPOC, underserved communities	ET3. Is project located in tract with a below- regional average walkability score?	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	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	communities 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 BIPCC, 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 "YE5" 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, walkabity 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 whelshifty and community services 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: S. Score 1 - S, 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 - S 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	SSS. 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 Steet, Regional Tail, 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				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
- 4	Fills (completely, partially) AT or	SS8. Does the project address a network		This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9.				
Safe System	Trails network gap	gap?	1.00	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 "VES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/pikinig/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. signaterining, 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 the pit to complete a well-connected network of collector and local streets that provide for local circulation and direct wehicle, 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 ETA.	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	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	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of	investment? CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.00	Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated. Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development 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 CARIA. If marked "VES" 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: Project Name:	CFP12 Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge	Construction						
Project Name:	Gladitalic Historic Holley Hall Bridge	Construction	Project		Max Points	GIS Evaluated	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Scored	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	Question 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 hazar dimitigation 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 and 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 CARB 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. Place reference responses to MOI and CA88 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. Dot 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	MOS. 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 bicyres ignable to support the "green waste", signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrain 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://lrimet.org/about/performance.htmlfroute	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	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 tharch? 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 TES. 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 TEB 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	TE8. Is the project located in or within a .5 mile distance to a Title 4 land use	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No

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 bitycle 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 Traifs 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-Traifs-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 priority functions of the design dassification 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 2. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 2. Projects where minimal 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 Traifs Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.orgonmetro.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 3.5 core 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

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP13 NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192	nd Avenue - 201st Avenue						
			Project		Max Points	GIS Evaluated	Subjective	Scoring
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Scored Question	Review Question	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	ETG. 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 service; 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	SSS. 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 Testil 88 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

Project ID:	CFP13 NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192	nd Avenue - 201st Avenue						
Project Name:	ive riuisey street complete street: 192	ING AVERIUE - ZOIST AVERUE	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	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. On belp, 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 #83 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.	Question	Question 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/blking/foiling 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	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)	transit? CAR2. Is project on an Enhanced Transit Corridor pilot list?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is categorized as an ETC project in the 2023 RTP. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Provides/increases transit option (CSS rating = 5 stars)	CAR3. Is the project included in the Better Bus segment groupings analysis?	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is located along the Better Bus Analysis Segments, highlighted here: https://nelsonnygaard.shinyapps.io/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 in savailable. 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. decitated 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)	CARS. 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 and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and and 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

Project ID:	CFP13							
Project Name:	NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192	nd Avenue - 201st Avenue				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	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 and 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 linfastructure focused? A partially fici Sependent question. Flore reference responses to MO1 and CAB8 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	MOS. 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? It 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

Project ID:	CFP13	and August 201st Augus						
Project Name:	NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192	anu Avenue - ZUIST AVENUE	Desirat		May Paint	GIS	Cubicativa	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	TE4. Does project improve access to a tract with # of developable acres > regional average?	Average Score 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 within or get to that tract? Review application responses to Project Detail questions 14, 15, and 16 to be helpful here.	1	Question 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 TEB, 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 TEL0, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infilli, 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 potion (e.g. upgrades a ne sixting bitycle 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 priority functions of the design dassification 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.oregommetro.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 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?	DS. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financia), 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

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP14 OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th 5	Street to Tumwater village: Shared-Use Path a	nd Streetscape E	Enhancements Project Development				
		Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points	GIS Evaluated	Subjective	Scoring
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Scored Question	Review Question	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	ETG. 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 ETJ, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 2 plont if project includes/addresse pedestrian OR blcycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND blcycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional plont if pedestrian or blcycle 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)	з	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: S. Score 1 - S, 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 - S 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	SSS. 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 Steek. Regional Tail, if the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP14 OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th 5	Street to Tumwater village: Shared-Use Path a	nd Streetscape E	inhancements Project Development				
			Project		Max Points	GIS Evaluated	Subjective	Scoring
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Scored Question	Review Question	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 ETA. 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	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. I 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 dements 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-systemvide-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. decilicate fight 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)	CARS. 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 Lpoint if project includes pedestrian OR bicyde system completion elements. No distinguishment with this question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an ETA.	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 ETA.	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	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)	plan? 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 1 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

Project ID:	CFP14							
Project Name:	OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th S	treet to Tumwater village: Shared-Use Path ar	nd Streetscape E	Enhancements Project Development		210		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-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 and 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 linfastructure focused? A partially fici Sependent question. Flore reference responses to MO1 and CAB8 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	MOS. 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

Project ID:	CFP14							
Project Name:	OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th S	treet to Tumwater village: Shared-Use Path a	nd Streetscape E	nhancements Project Development		CIC		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	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 TEB, 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 priority functions of the design dassification 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.oregommetro.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-aid-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 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 Tralls 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-Tralls-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 wehicle 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

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP15 NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine	Dr Safety Corridor Planning						
			Project		Max Points	GIS Evaluated	Subjective	Scoring
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Scored Question	Review Question	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	ETG. 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 ETJ, 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 bloycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bloycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bloycle 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 service; 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 + housine)?	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	SSS. 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

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP15 NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine	Dr Safety Corridor Planning						
			Project		Max Points	GIS Evaluated	Subjective	Scoring
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Scored Question	Review Question	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	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "NO" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	0.67	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project describes and explicitly references the project elements address a school identified safety hazard. If SS11 response is "No" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
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 pullo uts). 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)	CARS. 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 cit's 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 ful filling of gap. No distinguishment if projects is na EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	plan? 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 1 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

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP15 NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine	Dr Safety Corridor Planning						
Project Name:	NE 22310 AVE. NE GIISUN TO NE MIAIME	Dr Sujety Cornadi Flamming	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Review Question	Scoring Question
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 "VES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR and 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 (5I 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 opcing infrastructure focused? A partially fici Sependent question. Floate reference responses to MOI and CAB8 to help inform scoring. Score 1 point, if project stope 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 them 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	MOS. 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 projects 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

Project ID:	CFP15	a De Cafatu Caedde - Namela -						
Project Name:	NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine	P Dr Safety Corridor Planning				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in	Evaluated	Subjective Review	Scoring
			Average Score		Question	Scored Question	Question	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 TEB 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 TEB, 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 potion (e.g. upgrades a nessiting biotycle 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-Lpdf 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 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.oregometro.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 core is 3. Score on a 1-3 cale. 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 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/sitse//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, financia), RGW, etc.] Y 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 wehicle 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

Project ID:	CFP16							
Project Name:	Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Im	provements				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
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	ETS. 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	ETG. 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 "YE5" 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)	ETIS. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkabilty 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 will lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each improving yehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving valiability 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	SSS. 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 88 and 89. 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 10 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Tail, if the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP16 Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Im.							
Project Name:	Beaverton Creek Trail: Werlo Roda Im	provements	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	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	Question	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/blking/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 dements 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. declicated 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)	CARS. 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 admitted 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	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)	plan? 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 1 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

Project ID:	CFP16							
Project Name:	Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Imp	provements				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	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 "VES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR and 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 circultous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling linfrastructure focused? A partially fici dependent question. Plose reference responses to MO1 and CA88 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 them 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	MOS. 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? It 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

	1							
Project ID: Project Name:	CFP16 Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Im	provements						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
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 TES. 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 TES 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 potion (e.g. upgrades an estisting bitycle 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.oregommetro.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 priority functions of the design dassification 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 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 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?	DS. 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 which teravel 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
	1	In see.	1	l				

Project ID:	CFP17 Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall E	third 2rd Ce to Eth Ce						
Project Name:	Beaver ton Downtown Loop. SW Hair E	Wu = 314 31 10 3111 31	Project		Max Points	GIS Evaluated	Subjective	Scoring
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Scored Question	Review Question	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	ETS. 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	ETG. 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 "YE5" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresse 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 walkablity 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 walkablity and community services access in tract area with lower than average walkablity 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: S. 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	SSS. 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 Testil 88 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 Boulevary, Community Doubevary, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP17 Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall E	Rhid = 3rd St to 5th St						
Project Name:	Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall E	siva – 3ra St to 5th St	Description 1		Mary Balance	GIS	Cubbankar	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Safe System	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	Question	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	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. I point available if project description includes walking/biking/foiling safely dements 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 in savailable. 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. decitated 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)	CARS. 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	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

Project ID:	CFP17							
Project Name:	Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall B	lvd – 3rd St to 5th St				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
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 and 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 opting infrastructure focused? A partially fici Sependent question. Flore reference responses to MOI 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	MOS. 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

I Results 4.11.2025 56

Project ID:	CFP17							
Project Name:	Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall E	Rivd – 3rd St to 5th St				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in	Evaluated	Subjective Review	Scoring
			Average Score		Question	Scored Question	Question	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 TES. 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 TEB 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 TEB, 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 dements 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 potion (e.g. upgrades a nessiting biotycle 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 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 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.oregommetro.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, RGW, 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 wehicle 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

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP18 NW Division Street Complete Street: G	resham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale Avenue						
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in	GIS Evaluated	Subjective Review	Scoring
	Terrormance incasare		Average Score	and actions on now to start	Question	Scored Question	Question	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	ETG. 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 "YE5" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 2 plont if fra joets includes/addresse pedestrian OR blcycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND blcycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional plont if pedestrian or blcycle 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 service; 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 + housine)?	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: S. 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	SSS. 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

Project ID:	CFP18	iresham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale Avenue						
Project Name:	NW Division Street Complete Street: G	resnam-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale Avenue	Description 1		Mary Balance	GIS	Cubbankar	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
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 ETA. 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/blking/foiling 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 dements 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.shlnyapps.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 is 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). Relevale 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)	CARS. 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 and 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 ETA.	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 I 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

Project ID:	CFP18							
Project Name:	NW Division Street Complete Street: G	resham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale Avenue				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	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," hen 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 and mobility potions/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 (GI 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 opting infrastructure focused? A partially fici Sependent question. Flore reference responses to MOI 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	MOS. 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

	NW Division Street Complete Street: C	resham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale Avenue						
Project Name:	NW Division Street Complete Street: G	resnam-rairview Traii - Birasaale Avenue				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in	Evaluated	Subjective Review	Scoring
			Average Score		Question	Scored Question	Question	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 TEB for reference): 3) makes improvements to a segment of identified (either source) freight routes or connectors.	ω	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 potion (e.g. upgrades a nesisting 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 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 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.oregommetro.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?	DS. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financia), 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
		Comments provided by reviewers on this		Project fills critical gap. Identified in Active Transportation Plan which				

Project ID:	CFP19							
Project Name:	Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Sig	anal Improvements)	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	Review Question	Scoring Question
Equitable	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	Question	No	Yes
Transportation 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	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	communities 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 BIPDC, underserved communities	ETG. 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 IEFA. 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)	ETIS. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkabity 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 yethicle access in tract areas with lower than average whelshifty and community services 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: S. Score 1 - S, 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 - S 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	SSS. 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

Project ID:	CFP19							
Project Name:	Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Sig	nal Improvements)				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
- 4	Fills (completely, partially) AT or	SS8. Does the project address a network		This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response from ET4. If ET4 is marked "YES" then score questions SS8 and SS9.				
Safe System	Trails network gap	gap?	0.67	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/bilking/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. I 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 inno-infrastructure modifying elements (i.e. signaterining, 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 that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicyde and streets that provide for local circulation and direct vehicle, bicyde 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 ETA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system plan?	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR12. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major	0.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to SS10. If marked "YES," then score 1 point if the project is on the Regional Trails Major	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Integrates transportation demand management strategies (outside of	investment? CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.67	Investment Strategy. GIS evaluated. Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR15. Is project located in or improves multimodal connections to a designated 2040 land use area?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to CARIA. 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

Project ID:	CFP19 Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Sig	and Improvements)						
Project Name:	Outer Haisey and Outer Foster (115 Sig	nai improvements)	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	Review Question	Scoring Question
	Increases tree canopy, green		Average Score		Question	Question	Question	
Climate Action and Resilience	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 hazar dimitigation 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, CAR2D, 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 and mobility potions/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 CARB 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. Place reference responses to MOI and CA88 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. Dot 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	MOS. 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 waste"; signal timing, travel time messages, and leading pedestrain 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 evailable here: https://linter.org/about/performance.htmlfroute	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 TE3.1 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	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?)	TES. 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 TES. 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 TEB 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

Project ID:	CFP19									
Project Name:	Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Sig	nal 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 priority functions of the design dassification 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 a rail around half of the scope elements are preferred designs, score 2. Projects where minimal 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.orgonmetro.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, RGW, 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: Project Name:	CFP21 Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Bette	er Bus Project						
			Project		Max Points	GIS Evaluated	Subjective	Scoring
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Scored Question	Review Question	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	ETS. 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	ETG. 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 blcycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND blcycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or blcycle 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, walkabity 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	SSS. 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 Steet, Regional Tail, 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: Project Name:	CFP21 Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Bett	er Bus Project						
Project Name:	Smart SW 185th Avenue 115 and bett	i bus rioject	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	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	Question	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	SS9. Does the project completely fill the gap?	0.00	See instructions in SS8.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Trails network gap Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	SS10. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project identified as a regional trails major 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 detenties 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)	CARS. 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)	CARB. 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 pedestrain 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	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)	plan? 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)	Investment? CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	0.33	Investment Strategy. Cis zevaluated. 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 Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Bette	or Rus Project						
Project Name:	Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Bette	er Bus Project	Denient		May Dainte	GIS	Cubinativa	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	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 14 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 (iS 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 circultous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially fici Sependent question. Please reference responses to MOI and CA88 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	MOS. 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 TE3.1 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 Bett	er Bus Project				GIS	6.11			
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question		
Thriving Economy	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 TEB 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 TEIO, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal acces 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 TEB and TE12; if marked "YES" then review project scope elements. Mas 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 th 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.oregommetro.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 perferred designs, score 3. Projects where around half of the scope elements are preferred designs score 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes		
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	2.33	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregometro.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 doss 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: Project Name:	CFP22 North Dakota Street (Fanno Creek) Br	idae Replacement						
			Project		Max Points	GIS Evaluated	Subjective	Scoring
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Scored Question	Review Question	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	ETG. 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 "YE5" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 2 plont if project includes/addresse pedestrian OR blcycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND blcycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional plont if pedestrian or blcycle 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. Indicate it ract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving welhidle access in tract areas with lower than average evalued 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	SSS. 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 pedestriar 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 Observat, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes

Results 4.11.2025 70

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) Br	idge Replacement				GIS	California -	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Safe System	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	Question	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 ETA. 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/bliking/foiling 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 dements 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.shlnyapps.io/trimet-bdda-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)	CARS. 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 eitements. 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 1 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) Brid	dge Replacement				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored 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," hen 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 and 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 fici Sependent question. Flower reference responses to MOI and CAB8 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	MOS. 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) Bri	idge Replacement				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
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	Question 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 TES. 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 I 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 TELD, if marked "FES" 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 potion (e.g. upgrades an estiting bitycle 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.oregometro.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 Tralls Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetor.gov/sites/default/files/2024/10/25/Designing-Livable-Streets-and-Tralls-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 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 Tralls 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?	DS. What constraints were articulated that the project faces (geographic, financia), 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
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

Project ID: Project Name:	FP23 E MLK Ir Blvd Safety and Access to Transit										
			Project		Max Points	GIS Evaluated	Subjective	Scoring			
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Scored Question	Review Question	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	ETG. 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 "YE5" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 2 plont if project includes/addresse 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. In tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving vehicle access in tract areas with lower than average evhicle 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	SSS. 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 "VES," 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 Testal #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 Tail, if the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes			

Project ID:	CFP23							
Project Name: RTP Goal Area	NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to 1 Performance Measure	ransit Evaluation Question-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	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/rolling safety elements to the network leading to the school(s). If SS11 response is "No" score as 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS13. Does the project address a school identified safety hazard?	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 dements 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 reteining, etc.); score 2 points if project includes infrastructure modifying (i.e. decilized 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)	CARS. 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 Resillence	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 additional formation and 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 bicyde 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 I 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

Project ID:	CFP23 NF MLK Ir Rhyd Safety and Access to Tr	ransit						
Project Name:	NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Tr	unsit	Broinet		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	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 and mobility potions/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 fici Sependent question. Flore reference responses to MOI and CAB8 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	MOS. 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 "given 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

Project ID:	CFP23							
Project Name:	NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to T	ransit				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	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 TEB 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 'VES' then review project scope elements enhance multimodal acces on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This cain include sidewalk infill, blcyde 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 bloycle han 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-2024/1025-1.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 dassification 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.oregommetro.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 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 Tralls Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregommetro.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 wehicle 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

Project ID:	CFP24							
Project Name:	NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodo	l Safety and Access				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
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	ETG. 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 ETJ, ET4 - ET5 first. If ET1 and ET4 are marked "YES" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 2 plont if project includes/addresse pedestrian OR blcycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND blcycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional plont if pedestrian or blcycle 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 yehicle 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 fere 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	SSS. 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 88 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 Steek, Regional Tail if the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP24 NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodo	al Safety and Access						
			Project		Max Points	GIS Evaluated	Subjective	Scoring
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Scored Question	Review Question	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	0.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a Gis dependent question. See Gis response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. 1 point available if project description includes walking/biking/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 dements 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-systemvide-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. declicated 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)	CARS. 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 of S 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 bicyde 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 fulf filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an ETA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	plan? 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 1 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

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP24 NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimoda	l Safety and Access						
			Project		Max Points	GIS Evaluated	Subjective	Scoring
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Scored Question	Review Question	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 "VES," then review project scope and score. Score 1 point if project includes scope elements (e.g. street trees, tree canopy, green infrastructure) which address vrash neat 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 mittigation 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 I point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR and 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 circultous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling infrastructure focused? A partially folis 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 pedestrain 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 esegment being served is one of in terms of high riddership 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	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No

Project ID:	CFP24							
Project Name:	NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodo	l Safety and Access				210		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-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 TEB 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 TER, 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.oregometro.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 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-Lpdf 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?		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 which cravel 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

Project ID:	CFP25							
Project Name:	Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan R	d .				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
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	ETS. 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	ETG. 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 "YE5" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresse pedestrian OR bloycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bloycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bloycle 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)	ETIS. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkabilty 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 will lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each improving yehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving valiability 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	SSS. 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

Project ID:	CFP25							
Project Name:	Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan R	d	Description 1		Adam Dalasta	GIS	Coldension	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in	Evaluated Scored	Subjective Review	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 leasification. 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 #83 and 4 related to speeds for pedestrian environment context.	Question 3	Question	Question	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/foiling 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 7.7 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)	CARS. 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

Project ID:	CFP25							
Project Name:	Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan R	d				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	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 "VES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR and 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 circultous travel? Are the paths pedestrian or cycling linfrastructure focused? A partially fici dependent question. Plose reference responses to MO1 and CA88 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	MOS. 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

Project ID:	CFP25							
Project Name:	Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan R	d				210		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-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 TEB, 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 potion (e.g. upgrades a nessiting bit) elem 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-Lpdf 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 priority functions of the design dassification 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-aid-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 mindle preferred designs, score 2. Projects where mindle preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where mindle 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 Tralls Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sistes/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, financia], 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 wehicle 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

Project ID:	CFP26							
Project Name:	W Burnside Green Loop Crossing					GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
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	ETS. 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	ETG. 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 "YE5" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresse pedestrian OR bloycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND bloycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional 1 point if pedestrian or bloycle 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)	ETIS. Based on the GIS responses, does the project improve travel options in an area with lower than regional average vehicle access, walkabilty 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 will lower than regional average vehicle access and/or walkability and community services access. Total available points is 3. (One point for each improving yehicle access in tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; improving valiability 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	SSS. 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 Observed, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes

nal Results 4.11.2025

Project ID:	CFP26							
Project Name:	W Burnside Green Loop Crossing		Brojest		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	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	Question	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 validing/blink[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 dements 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-systemvide-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. declicated 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 1 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

al Results 4.11.2025

Project ID:	CFP26							
Project Name:	W Burnside Green Loop Crossing					GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	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 "VES" to any, the review project scope elements. Score 1 point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR and 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 opcing infrastructure focused? A partially fici Sependent question. Flore reference responses to MOI and CAB8 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	MOS. 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 "VES," 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 light indership 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

Project ID:	CFP26							
Project Name:	W Burnside Green Loop Crossing					CIC		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	GIS Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	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 TEB, 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-Lpdf 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 priority functions of the design dassification 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.oregommetro.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 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 Tralls 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-Tralls-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 wehicle 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

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP27 SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to	SW Kemmer Road						
	3W 173th besign. SW condoi tune to	SW KEMMEI NOOU	Project		Max Points	GIS Evaluated	Subjective	Scoring
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Scored Question	Review Question	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	ETG. 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 "YE5" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 1 point if project includes/addresse 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 walkablity 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 walkablity and community services access in tract area with lower than average walkablity 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: S. 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	SSS. 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 questions continued to the project 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 Boulevary, Community Doubevary, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP27							
Project Name:	SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to	SW Kemmer Road	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	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.	Question 3	Question	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 "VES" 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. I point available if project description includes validing/blink(prolling 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. I point available if project describes and explicitly references the project dements 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)	CARS. 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 while, biscycle and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and admitted? 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)	plan? 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

sults 4.11.2025 91

Project ID:	CFP27	CW/Keepers Descri						
Project Name:	SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to	SW Kemmer Road				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
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 anappy, 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		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," hen 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 and 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		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. Place reference responses to MO1 and CAB8 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		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 them 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		MOS. 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	Partures 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		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 "WES," 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		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

Part	Project ID:	CFP27							
March Marc	Project Name:	SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to	SW Kemmer Road				GIS		
Les Observed Comment of an elegation of the comment	RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application	Instructions on How to Score	Available in	Evaluated Scored	Review	
The control of the co	Thriving Economy	Industrial/Commercial developability	with # of developable acres > regional	0.00	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	1	No	Yes	Yes
The properties of the properti	Thriving Economy			No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
And the control of th	Thriving Economy		multimodal connection to a designated 2040	0.33	project scope includes elements to enhance multimodal improvements	1	No	Yes	Yes
section to including and transport sections. Section to including and transport sections. The section of the se	Thriving Economy	access to industrial and transport	address a substandard active transportation facility and/or increases access to transit	0.33	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	3	No	Yes	Yes
secretary individual common se	Thriving Economy	access to industrial and transport	mile distance to a Title 4 land use	No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Accordance to industrial and transport. For expert extension of the project decision on the right of the project decision of the project decision of the project decision. For the project decision represent the proje	Thriving Economy	access to industrial and transport	elements to increase access industrial and transport facilities (e.g. creates a new	0.00	marked "YES."Max score 1 point. Does the project scope include elements	1	No	Yes	Yes
Trices multimodi mobility and management to investigation of the project thank improvements to frequency and the project thank improvement to frequency and the pr	Thriving Economy	access to industrial and transport		No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
Access to industrial and transport (active) Access to industrial and support (active) TELLS. Does the project increase multimodal access or industrial and support (active) TELLS. Does the project increase multimodal access and options within all an above-region and area multimodal access and options within all an above-region and area multimodal access and options within all an above-region and area multimodal access and options within all an above-region and area multimodal access and options within all an above-region and area multimodal access and options within all an above-region and area multimodal access and options within all an above-region and area multimodal access and options within all an above-region and area multimodal access and options within all an above-region and area multimodal access and options within all an above-region and area multimodal access and options within all an above-region and area multimodal access and access and options within all an above-region and area multimodal access and access an	Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport		0.00	"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	1	No	Yes	Yes
tricenses multimodal mobility and screenses multimodal access to industrial and transport facilities. TELS flows the project forces access to industrial and transport facilities. TELS is project in tract with an above-regional average number of plos within 30 miles of the best possible improvement in project race, based on functional distillation? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project race, based on functional distillation? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project race, based on functional distillation? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project race, based on functional distillation? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project race, based on functional distillation? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project race, based on functional distillation? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project race, based on functional distillation? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project race, based on functional distillation? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project race, based on functional distillation? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project race, based on functional distillation? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project race, based on functional distillation? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project race, based on functional distillation? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project race, based on functional distillation? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project race, based on functional distillation? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project race, based on functional distillation? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in pr	Thriving Economy	access to industrial and transport		No	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No
regional average number of jobs within 30 mins, (aff modes)? Does the project design represent projects average of the best possible improvement in project average hased of functional dissolfication? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project average hased of functional dissolfication? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project average hased of functional dissolfication? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project average hased of functional dissolfication? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project average hased of functional dissolfication? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project average hased for functional dissolfication? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project average hased of functional dissolfication? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project average hased of functional dissolfication? Does the project design represent the project design represent the best possible improvement in project average hased of functional dissolfication? Does the project design represent the proj	Thriving Economy	Increases multimodal mobility and access to industrial and transport	access and options within a Title 4 industrial	0.00	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	1	No	Yes	Yes
Does the project design represent by least possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification. Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification. Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification. Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification. Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area. Based on functional classification are the design classification are the design classification are the design classification best project design represent the best possible improvement in project area. Based on functional classification are the design classification best project design represent the best possible improvement in project area. Based on functional classification being applied as part of the best possible improvement in project area. Based on functional classification being applied as part of the best possible improvement in project area. Based on functional classification being applied as part of the best possible improvement in project area. Based on functional classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area. Based on functional classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area. Based on functional classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area. Based on functional classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project purpose and scope elements are preferred designs, score 2. Projects where an advantage applied as part of the project applied as part of the project applied as part of the project applied as part of the	Thriving Economy	Increases access to jobs	regional average number of jobs within 30	1.00		0	Yes	Yes	No
Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification and the project area, based on functional classification and project area and project area and project area. Based on functional classification and project area and project area and project area and	Design	the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional	project roadway? NOTE: Trails do not have a design		Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.		Yes	No	No
Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification? Da. Are the preferred designs according to design classification being applied as part of the scope of work for the project? Present the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification and functional classification? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification and function	Design	the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional	the design classification, are the design recommended prioritized functions being	n/a	Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/filles/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 56. Based on the responses, are the priority functions of the design classification being	5	No	Yes	Yes
Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification and functional class identified for the project? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5. Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification? Does the project design and description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5. Review the responses in the Design section of the application. Does the project design and description reflects an overall appropriate design on a constrained Now not be project design and description reflects an overall appropriate design on a constrained Now as afficient compromise given the identified constraints? Always score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5. Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scale of 1-5. Review the responses to the Design section of the application, particularly of the trade-offs question. Does the project design and description reflects an overall appropriate design for the facility's primary purposes? Max score is 5. Score on a scal	Design	the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional	design classification being applied as part of	n/a	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 2. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where minimal preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects	3	No	Yes	Yes
Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification? Does the project design represent the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional classification? All the project design and destruction and prioritized functions in light of these constraints? How well did the project design and serior 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 and description reflects a sufficient compromise given the identified constraints? Max score 3 points. An example of this is a project design in a constrainted ROW reducing vehicle travel lane width to provide/improve bike and walking facilities, even though each mode may have a less-than-preferred design.	Design	the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional	elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class	n/a	Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregometro.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	5	No	Yes	Yes
	Design	the best possible improvement in project area, based on functional	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	n/a	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	3	No	Yes	Yes
reduck Reviewer reedback project No evaluators comments.	Feedback	Reviewer feedback			No evaluators comments.		No	N/A	No

Project ID:	CFP28							
Project Name:	Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to T	ransit Enhancements				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
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	ETG. 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 plont if project includes/addresses pedestrian OR blcycle system completion elements and in EFA Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND blcycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional plont if pedestrian or blcycle 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)	ETIS. 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	SSS. 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 D.1. Score 1 point if the project's scope includes prioritized pedestrian functions. Review project scope only if response to D.1 is one of the following design classifications: Regional Boulevard, Community Boulevard, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Tail, if the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP28 Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to To	ransit Enhancements						
Project Name.	ceda wiii better bas and recess to it	ansie Emancements	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	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 according to design design according to design design according to design design according to 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	Question 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/blking/folling safely 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 5511. 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 to ther 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 while, 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 pedestrain OR Bucycle 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 his question on partial or full filling of gap. No distinguishment if project is in an EFA.	1	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	CAR11. Applicable to Trail Projects: Is the project located on the regional trails system	0.00	Score 1 point if the trail project is on the regional trails system map. GIS evaluated.	1	Yes	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	Improves/adds street connectivity (CSS rating = 1 star)	plan? 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)	Investment? CAR13. Does the project scope include Transportation Demand Management strategies to support and compliment the infrastructure project?	2.33	Investment Strategy. Cis's evaluated. Max score 3 points. Review project scope, particularly response to Project Detail question 11 in application. Score if the project includes or speaks to any transportation demand management strategies implementation with the completion of the project. Do not score for project development applications.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Climate Action and Resilience	In a designated 2040 Land Use center or corridor (or connects to?)	CAR14. Is project located in a designated 2040 land use area?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. GIS evaluated.	0	No	N/A	No

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP28 Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to To	ransit Enhancements						
Project Name:	Cedar Milli Better Bus and Access to 11	ansit Ennancements	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Review Question	Scoring Question
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 "VES" 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 "VES," 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 fici Sependent question. Please reference responses to MOI and CA88 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 juny 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	MOS. 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 bircycle 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://timee.org/about/performane.html/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

Project ID:	CFP28 Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to T	ransit Enhancements						
Project Name:	cedar Ivilli better BUS and Access to I	unsic ciliuncements	Destrut		May Balan	GIS	Cultivation	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Thriving Economy	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 TEB 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 TELO, if marked "YES" then review project scope elements enhance multimodal access on the roadway. Max score 1 point. This can include sidewalk infili, bicycle facilities infili or enhancement (e.g. separation, protection), infili 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 potion (e.g. upgrades a nesisting betyle 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 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 no preferred treatments are in the scope, score 1. Projects where no preferred treatments, score 0.	3	No	Yes	Yes
Design		D4. Is the project purpose and scope elements, is the project consistent with the design classification and functional class identified for the project?	3.67	Refer to Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.orgonmetro.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 wehicle travel lane widthet 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

Project ID: Project Name:	CFP29 Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Ro	ov Rogers - OR 99W						
			Project		Max Points	GIS Evaluated	Subjective	Scoring
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Scored Question	Review Question	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	ETS. 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	ETG. 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 "YE5" then score this question. Total available points is 3. Score 2 plont if project includes/addresse pedestrian OR blcycle system completion elements and in EFA. Score 2 if project includes/addresses pedestrian AND blcycle system completion scope elements and in EFA. Score additional plont if pedestrian or blcycle 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. In tract areas with lower than average vehicle access; 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: S. 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	SSS. 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 Observed, Regional Street, Community Street, Regional Trail. If the project does not carry one of these design classifications, please score 0.	1	No	Yes	Yes

Project ID:	CFP29 Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Ra	ov Rogers - OR 99W						
Project Name:	cedar creeky ice Age ronquin Trail: Ra	y nogera - On 33W	Project		Max Points	GIS	Subjective	
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Available in Question	Evaluated Scored	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	Question	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	1.00	Score 1 point if the project is identified on the Regional Trails Major Investment Strategy.	1	Yes	No	Yes
Safe System	Fills (completely, partially) AT or Trails network gap	investment? SS11. Is the project located with a K-12 school walkshed?	Yes	Reference only. No points allocated. Verify responses all in current conditions question #7 in project application.	0	No	N/A	Yes
Safe System	Project is within 1 mile (or designated walking zone) of a K-12 school Safe Routes to School	SS12. Does project contain elements that improve active transportation access to a school?	1.00	This is a GIS dependent question. See GIS response to question SS11. If marked "YES," then score this question. I point available if project description includes walking/biking/foiling safely dements 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 dements 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.shlnyapps.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 if swaliable. 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. declicated 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)	CARS. 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 and pedestrian access to adjacent land uses and to transit for all ages and and 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)	plan? 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 I 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

Project ID:	CFP29							
Project Name:	Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Ro	y Rogers - OR 99W				GIS		
RTP Goal Area	Performance Measure	Evaluation Question-Criteria	Project Application Average Score	Instructions on How to Score	Max Points Available in Question	Evaluated Scored Question	Subjective Review Question	Scoring Question
Climate Action and Resilience	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 I point if the scope includes elements that increase resilience of infrastructure OR and 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 linfrastructure focused? A partially Gis dependent question. Place 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	MOS. 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

Results 4.11.2025 100

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 TEB, 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 TEL0, 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 potion (e.g. upgrades a nessiting bit) elem 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-Lpdf 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 priority functions of the design dassification 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-aid-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 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 Tralls Guidebook chapter 3, 4, and Chapter 6 - Table on page 6.4 https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sistes/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, financia], 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 wehicle 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	