



# Active Transportation TIP Project Evaluation Criteria Update



Susan Jaworski  
For H-GAC Transportation Improvement  
Program-Subcommittee  
September 2021

Regional Collaboration • Transportation Planning • Multimodal Mobility



# Overview - Purpose

- Ped/Bike Subcommittee identified need to revise evaluation criteria as part of 2045 Active Transportation Plan process
- Increase applicability of evaluation criteria to active transportation projects
- Anticipation of active transportation projects becoming eligible for CMAQ funding
- Align with current focus of service area members
  - Safety
  - Equity
  - Geographical Equity
  - Connectivity

# Overview - Process

- Ongoing collaboration engagement
- Ped/Bike Subcommittee
  - April 15, 2021
  - April 29, 2021
  - June 17, 2021
- Ped/Bike Subcommittee TIP Project Prioritization Workgroup
  - April 20, 2021
  - April 21, 2021
  - April 28, 2021
  - April 30, 2021
  - May 3, 2021
  - May 11, 2021
  - May 12, 2021
  - June 1, 2021
  - June 9, 2021

# Overview - Recommendations

- Scoring split - 80% planning factors and 20% Benefits Cost Analysis (BCA)
- Caveat that at least 65% of available TASA (Category 9) funds are designated solely for active transportation infrastructure projects
- CMAQ set-aside amounts:
  - CMAQ funds less than \$45 million, then at least 15% set aside for active transportation projects
  - CMAQ funds greater than \$45 million, then at least 20% set aside for active transportation projects

- Planning factors updated
- BCA revisions



# Overview - Planning Factors

- Consistent usage of publicly available tools (e.g. H-GAC's ACE tool, etc.)
- Overall Categories:
  - Connectivity (including Planning Coordination) – 39% (Max 62 points)
  - Safety – 25% (Max 40 points)
  - Equity – 24% (Max 39 points)
  - Barrier Elimination – 8% (Max 13 points)
  - Innovation – 4% (Max of 6 points)
- Total of 14 questions
- Focus today is on the revised sliding scale of points for multiple Planning Factors that were previously yes/no (presence/absence)

# Planning Factors – Proposed New Gradient Scoring

1	Barrier Elimination	Does the project provide safe and convenient routes across barriers (e.g. freeways, high use roads, wide roads, railroads, waterways, etc.)?	Yes - Eliminates freeway, railroad, or waterway barrier	13	GIS mapping
			Yes- Eliminates wide road or high use road barrier	9	
			Yes - Provides more direct route	5	
			No	0	

# Planning Factors – Proposed New Gradient Scoring

3	Connectivity	Will the project improve ADA accessibility, functionality, and comfort?	Yes - Improves ADA functionality and comfort	12	Project scope and design
			Yes- Improves ADA functionality or comfort	8	
			Yes - Improves ADA accessibility	6	
			Yes - Meets federal ADA requirements	4	

# Planning Factors – How is comfort defined?

## Four Types of Transportation Cyclists in Portland By Proportion of Population



Source: Four Types of Cyclists retrieved from [Microsoft Word - Four Types of Cyclists updated 2009.doc \(portlandoregon.gov\)](#)



# Planning Factors – Examples of improving comfort and functionality

- For the full 12 points:
  - Comfort is defined similar to high comfort bike facilities in general whereas at least 60% of the population would feel safe using the facility (the "interested but concerned group").
  - Bike Facility Examples: fully supports safe and comfortable use of ADA accessible bicycles (e.g. pedal assist, wheelchair accessible bikes, recumbent bikes, etc.), ADA bike parking, ADA accessible mechanic stations, audible signals/ADA signals, etc.
  - Pedestrian Facility Examples: fully supports safe and comfortable use of two or more mobility devices being able to pass safely, audible signals, extra crossing time, seating, ease of access to adjacent properties, textile demarcations, textile/audible wayfinding, etc.)

# Planning Factors – Examples of improving comfort or functionality

- For the 8 points “Improves ADA functionality or comfort”: This would be targeting those facilities with medium comfort or the “enthused and confident” users. The improvements would increase the use of the facility by vulnerable populations.
- For the 6 points “Improves ADA accessibility”: This would be more than the bare minimum of meeting federal requirements but not significantly increasing the ease of using the facility by vulnerable populations.
- For the 4 points “Meets federal ADA requirements”: This means the project meets the bare minimum features required by the ADA

# Planning Factors – Proposed New Gradient Scoring

4	Connectivity	Is there local support for the project or is it part of a regional or local plan (e.g. Livable Centers Study, Complete Communities Study, Long Range Transportation Plan, neighborhood strategy, voter approved bond, Vision Zero, Safe Routes to School, or similar safety goals, etc.)?	Yes - Part of a plan, and identified funding source, and letters of support. Has identified funding source.	15	H-GAC ACE Tool or LCN Tool or letters of support or voter approved bond or reference document
			Yes - Consistent with plan and letters of support	12	
			Yes - Letters of Support only	10	
			No	0	

# Planning Factors – Proposed New Gradient Scoring

8	Safety	Will the project add design elements to improve safety (e.g. pedestrian scale lighting, landscaping, bike amenities, public artwork features, wayfinding, etc.)?	Yes - Three (3) or more safety elements incorporated into project	14	Project scope
			Yes - Two (2) or less safety elements incorporated into project	7	
			No	0	

# Planning Factors – Proposed New Gradient Scoring

14	Innovation	Will this project implement innovative ideas that will improve regional connectivity and access (e.g. bike highway network, technology, etc.)?	Yes - Implements completely new innovative ideas that has regional impact	6	Supporting documentation
			Yes - Implements completely new innovative ideas that has local impact	5	
			Yes - Adopts existing innovative ideas applied in other locations outside of the region	3	
			No	0	

# Planning Factors – Proposed Keeping Original

2	Connectivity	Will the project connect to an existing ped/bike facility?	Yes - Connects to a ped/bike facility	12	H-GAC ACE Tool, LCN Tool, Bikeway/Sidewalk Viewer Mapping, GIS, etc.
			No	0	
9a	Safety	Does the project actively reduce crashes in those locations?	Yes	13	Supporting documentation
			No	0	



# Questions?



Regional Collaboration • Transportation Planning • Multimodal Mobility