

Section I. Project meets minimum MARC/State DOT/Federal DOT Requirements

TA Set-Aside Project Eligibility

The Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) provides flexible funding to address State and local transportation needs. This includes dedicated funding for projects defined as “TA Set-Aside” projects, formerly referred to as Transportation Enhancements Activities (TE) or Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) projects. To be eligible for TA Set-Aside funds, an application must meet the following criteria:

- 1) Relate to surface transportation in terms of function, proximity, and impact.
 - **Function** – The project will serve as a functional component of the transportation system. This can include a bicycle and pedestrian path, the provision of bicycle racks or benches for pedestrians, etc.
 - **Proximity** – The project is located within the immediate vicinity of the transportation system and may be visible to the general public, such as the acquisition of scenic easements or landscaping. Proximity alone is not enough to establish the relationship to surface transportation.
 - **Impact** – The project has a physical impact on the transportation system, such as retrofitting an existing highway by creating a wetland to filter runoff from the highway. Projects with this type of transportation relationship are usually associated with ongoing or planned highway projects.
- 2) Include at least one of the federally designated TA Set-Aside activities that MARC has condensed into five categories:
 - I. **Active Transportation Infrastructure Projects**
 - Infrastructure projects — both on-road and off-road — related to bicycle, pedestrian and other non-motorized forms of transportation.
 - Recreational Trails Program projects
 - Safe Routes to School infrastructure-related projects
 - II. **Historic Preservation/Archaeological Projects**
 - Historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities.
 - Archaeological activities relating to impacts from implementation of transportation projects.¹
 - III. **Transportation Aesthetics and Scenic Values**
 - Inventory, control, or removal of outdoor advertising.
 - Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas.
 - IV. **Environmental Mitigation and Vegetation Management**
 - Environmental mitigation projects — including pollution prevention and pollution abatement projects and mitigation — to:
 - Address stormwater management, control, and water pollution prevention or abatement related to highway construction or due to highway runoff.²
 - Reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality or to restore and maintain connectivity among terrestrial or aquatic habitats.
 - Vegetation management practices in transportation rights-of-way to improve roadway safety, prevent against invasive species, and provide erosion control.
 - V. **Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Projects**
 - Safety and educational projects targeting children in Kindergarten through 8th grade.^{3, 3}

¹ Must be eligible under title 23, U.S.C.

² Includes activities described in sections 113(b)(11), 328(a), and 329 of title 23, U.S.C.

³ Traffic education, enforcement, and encouragement activities must take place within approximately two miles of a primary or middle school (grades K-8).

- 3) Project applications must be submitted by an eligible entity under section 133 of title 23, U.S.C.

This includes:

- a. Local governments
- b. Regional transportation authorities
- c. Transit agencies
- d. Natural resource or public land agencies
- e. School district, local education agencies, or schools
- f. Tribal governments
- g. Nonprofit entity responsible for the administration of local transportation safety programs
- h. Any other local or regional entity with responsibility for oversight of transportation or recreational trails (other than a metropolitan planning organization [MPO] or a State agency) that the State determines to be eligible.

Note: State DOTs and MPOs are not eligible project sponsors for TA Set-Aside funds; however, they may partner with any eligible entity project sponsor to carry out a project. Nonprofit organizations not eligible under section 133 of title 23, U.S.C. are eligible to partner with any eligible entity on a TA Set-Aside project, if State or local requirements permit.

All TA Set-Aside projects will be evaluated for adherence with the *MARC Complete Streets Policy*, available at: <https://www.marc.org/sites/default/files/2024-03/Complete-Streets-Policy.pdf>

TA Set-Aside Project Funding, Budgeting and Programming

STBG functions as a reimbursement program; therefore, it's important the applicant demonstrate financial feasibility while carrying their TA Set-Aside project(s) forward to completion in a timely manner. Project sponsors will assume financial responsibility for the entire project pending reimbursement, minus their portion (i.e., local match) of the eligible costs. It's important that:

- a. The TA Set-Aside project goes beyond activities customarily incorporated into motor vehicle roadway, highway and transit projects.
- b. The TA Set-Aside funding request does NOT include request for funds to support preliminary engineering and design work.
- c. Each TA Set-Aside project budget includes the required local match of at least 20 percent, available within the project's timeframe.
- d. TA Set-Aside projects be completed with the TA Set-Aside funds requested and the matching funds pledged by the applicant.
- e. TA Set-Aside project cost estimates are reasonable and of sufficient detail to ensure successful project implementation.
- f. Project sponsors demonstrate adequate plans for and consider ongoing maintenance costs for at least 25 years or the project's expected life as TA Set-Aside funds can NOT be used for routine maintenance and operations.
- g. Entities submitting multiple applications, or jurisdictions with multiple projects in their communities, identify and prioritize projects.
- h. TA Set-Aside projects categorized as Historic Preservation/Archaeological Projects must submit a letter of eligibility determination from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) certifying that the project is listed, or eligible to be listed, on the National Register of Historic Places before any monies may be reimbursed.

TA Set-Aside Project Funding Restraints

Project funding requests are limited to \$1,500,000 per project. This applies to both Kansas and Missouri projects.

Public Support

For TA Set-Aside project applications, it's important that a public involvement process can be demonstrated and documentation for support is included in the supplementary narrative.

Projects are expected to be available for public use in perpetuity and should be consistent with local comprehensive, land use, and transportation plans.

Section II. Project scoring criteria

TA Set-Aside Project Scoring

A number of federally designated programs and projects are eligible for TA Set-Aside funding. MARC has condensed these activities into five categories: Active Transportation Infrastructure Projects, Historic Preservation/Archaeological Projects, Transportation Aesthetics and Scenic Values, Environmental Mitigation and Vegetation Management, and Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Projects. TA Set-Aside projects are scored based on the particular category an application is categorized under.

The scoring criteria and point system are based on a process that reflects the goals of *ConnectedKC 2050*. Each category has a rating system based on a total of 100 points. These ratings and the resulting project rankings are intended to provide information to MARC's Active Transportation Programming Committee to aid their decision-making process for developing funding recommendations to MARC's Total Transportation Policy Committee.

Note: The project scores determined through this process provide information about how each project relates to regional transportation policy goals and objectives. They are not the sole factor for determining funding recommendations.

| Category I: Active Transportation Infrastructure Projects | | | |
|--|------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Connected KC 2050 Policy Goals and Objectives | All | Category | Total |
| Transportation Choices | -- | 15 | 15 |
| Public Health | -- | -- | |
| Economic Vitality | -- | 10 | 10 |
| Climate Change and Energy use | -- | 5 | 5 |
| Environment | -- | 5 | 5 |
| Place Making | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| Safety and Security | -- | 15 | 15 |
| System Condition | -- | -- | 0 |
| System Performance | -- | 10 | 10 |
| Fairness | 10 | -- | 10 |
| Implementation | 10 | -- | 10 |
| Local Match | 5 | -- | 5 |
| Total | 30 | 70 | 100 |

| Category II: Historic Preservation/Archeological Projects | | | |
|--|------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Connected KC 2050 Policy Goals and Objectives | All | Category | Total |
| Transportation Choices | -- | 15 | 15 |
| Economic Vitality | -- | 10 | 10 |
| Climate Change and Energy use | -- | 5 | 5 |
| Environment | -- | 5 | 5 |
| Place Making | 5 | 15 | 20 |
| Public Health | -- | -- | 0 |
| Safety and Security | -- | 0 | 0 |
| System Condition | -- | 15 | 15 |
| System Performance | -- | 5 | 5 |
| Fairness | 10 | -- | 10 |
| Implementation | 10 | -- | 10 |
| Local Match | 5 | -- | 5 |
| Total | 30 | 70 | 100 |

| Category III: Transportation Aesthetics & Scenic Values | | | |
|--|------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Connected KC 2050 Policy Goals and Objectives | All | Category | Total |
| Transportation Choices | -- | 15 | 15 |
| Economic Vitality | -- | 10 | 10 |
| Climate Change and Energy use | -- | 10 | 10 |
| Environment | -- | 5 | 5 |
| Place Making | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Public Health | -- | 5 | 5 |
| Safety and Security | -- | -- | 0 |
| System Condition | -- | 10 | 10 |
| System Performance | -- | 10 | 10 |
| Fairness | 10 | -- | 10 |
| Implementation | 10 | -- | 10 |
| Local Match | 5 | -- | 5 |
| Total | 30 | 70 | 100 |

| Category IV: Environmental Mitigation and Vegetation Management | | | |
|--|------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Connected KC 2050 Policy Goals and Objectives | All | Category | Total |
| Transportation Choices | -- | 15 | 15 |
| Economic Vitality | -- | 10 | 10 |
| Climate Change and Energy use | -- | 10 | 10 |
| Environment | -- | 15 | 15 |
| Place Making | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Public Health | -- | 5 | 5 |
| Safety and Security | -- | -- | 0 |
| System Condition | -- | -- | 0 |
| System Performance | -- | 10 | 10 |
| Fairness | 10 | -- | 10 |
| Implementation | 10 | -- | 10 |
| Local Match | 5 | -- | 5 |
| Total | 30 | 70 | 100 |

+

| Category V: Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Projects | | | |
|--|------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Connected KC 2050 Policy Goals and Objectives | All | Category | Total |
| Transportation Choices | -- | 10 | 10 |
| Economic Vitality | -- | 5 | 5 |
| Climate Change and Energy use | -- | -- | 0 |
| Environment | -- | -- | 0 |
| Place Making | 5 | -- | 5 |
| Public Health | -- | -- | 0 |
| Safety and Security | -- | 15 | 15 |
| System Condition | -- | 20 | 20 |
| System Performance | -- | 20 | 20 |
| Fairness | 10 | -- | 10 |
| Implementation | 10 | -- | 10 |
| Local Match | 5 | -- | 5 |
| Total | 30 | 70 | 100 |

| All Projects | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| A. Implementation | 7 Points |
| Right of way | 2 possible (tiered) |
| Not yet started | 0 |
| In process | 1 |
| Completed (using federal guidelines) or not required | 2 |
| Project Readiness | 3 possible (tiered) |
| Conceptual only | 1 |
| Preliminary engineering complete | 2 |
| Final design plans complete | 3 |
| Project has multi-jurisdictional support (through funding, easements, letters of support, signed partnership agreement, etc.) | 2 |
| B. Historically Disadvantaged Communities and Areas of Persistent Poverty | 13 Points |
| | 5 possible (tiered) |
| Project is not in a historically disadvantaged community and area of persistent poverty | 0 |
| Project is not in a similar tract but applicant clearly explains how project improves access for such tracts | 2 |
| Project is in a tract identified as an area of persistent poverty and applicant clearly explains how project improves access for that area | 5 |
| Public Participation | 8 possible (cumulative) |
| No public participation cited | 0 |
| Project included previous public engagement, which is clearly described in the application | 4 |
| Previous engagement process identified potentially impacted transportation disadvantaged communities and employed tactics to inform and include these populations. Transportation disadvantaged populations include, but are not limited to, low-income, disabled, zero-car households and veterans. | 4 |
| Project applicant intends to conduct engagement for remainder of project timeline. | 2 |
| C. Place Making | 5 Points |
| Supports one or more values in the ConnectedKC 2050 policy framework (Access to Opportunity, Economic Vitality, Healthy Environment, Housing, Public Health and Safety, and/or Transportation Choices) | 5 |
| D. Local Match | 5 Points |
| The cost estimate is detailed, complete, and realistic and includes a minimum of 20% local match (points for local match %) | 5 possible |
| 20-29% | 2 |
| 30-39% | 3 |
| 40-49% | 4 |
| >50% | 5 |
| All Projects Total Possible | 30 Points |

| Category I: Active Transportation Infrastructure Projects | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| A. Transportation Choices | 15 Points |
| Improves the walking or bicycling network: | 10 possible (tiered) |
| 1- Bicycle and trail projects: | |
| General improvements (no plans referenced) | 2 |
| Fulfills part or all of a preferred alternative in a local plan (including Planning Sustainable Places plans) | 5 |
| Fulfills part of an alignment of a planned regional network (MetroGreen or Regional Bikeway Plan) | 10 |
| 2- Pedestrian-only projects | |
| General improvements (no plans referenced) | 2 |
| Consistent w/ pedestrian component of comprehensive plan, local sidewalk retrofit policy, or complete streets policy/ordinance | 5 |
| Implements pedestrian component of a corridor or area plan, or meets need identified by pedestrian infrastructure gap analysis | 10 |
| 3- Safe Routes to Schools pedestrian projects consistent with goals of the Regional Pedestrian Policy Plan: | |
| General improvements (no plans referenced) | 0 |
| Consistent w/ pedestrian component of comprehensive plan, sidewalk retrofit policy, complete streets policy/ordinance, pedestrian plan, pedestrian component of corridor plan, or meets need identified by pedestrian infrastructure inventory | 5 |
| Project complements the E's of SRTS (+1 point for each) ⁴: | |
| Education | 1 |
| Enforcement | 1 |
| Encouragement | 1 |
| Evaluation | 1 |
| Engineering | 1 |
| All projects: Improves the bike or pedestrian network within ¼ mile of an active public transportation stop | 5 |

⁴ See pg. 15 for SRTS E's definitions

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| B. Economic Vitality | 10 Points |
| Serves regional activity centers – If the project sponsor believes the intensity of the adjacent activity center is higher than shown, project sponsor may submit documentation showing how served (adjacent) activity center has increased in intensity. | 10 possible (tiered) |
| Project does not meet any criteria below | 0 |
| Project serves (is adjacent to) any activity center | 4 |
| Project serves (is adjacent to) an activity center of medium intensity according to MARC’s activity center map. | 6 |
| Project serves (is adjacent to) an activity center of high or very high intensity according to MARC’s activity center map AND/OR project implements a preferred alternative from a Creating Sustainable Places plan or a Planning Sustainable Places plan. | 10 |
| C. Climate Change and Energy Use | 5 Points |
| Project includes elements that use renewable energy sources, recycled materials, or other green technologies | 2 |
| Project reduces VMT | 3 |
| D. Environment | 5 Points |
| Applicant submits a plan to improve environmental metrics: | 5 possible (tiered) |
| Applicant provides a map identifying priority natural resource conservation and restoration opportunities along the project corridor and in the project’s watershed, such as streams, wetlands, or forests. | 1 |
| Applicant provides a specific plan to protect and/or restore a targeted natural resource or habitat within the project’s footprint, such as incorporating tree plantings, vegetated buffers, or permeable pavements. The response also indicates which resources will be required. | 3 |
| Applicant provides a data-driven plan that demonstrates how the project will improve a specific environmental metric, such as enhancing water quality, reducing stormwater runoff, or mitigating the urban heat island effect, by using nature-based solutions. | 5 |
| E. Place Making | 10 Points |
| Supports Creating Sustainable Places guiding principles ⁵ . Project achieves 40% or more of concepts within: | 10 possible (tiered) |
| 1 Principle | 1 |
| 2 Principles | 2 |
| 3 Principles | 4 |
| 4 Principles | 6 |
| 5 Principles | 8 |
| 6 Principles | 9 |
| 7 Principles | 10 |
| F. Safety and Security | 15 Points |
| Federally recognized Proven Safety Countermeasures are provided at intersections and crossings: | 5 possible (tiered) |
| Project includes two or more Proven Safety Countermeasures of any category | 1 |
| Project includes two or more Proven Safety Countermeasures of the Pedestrian/Bicyclist category | 3 |
| Project includes two or more Proven Safety Countermeasures of the Pedestrian/Bicyclist category, and two more countermeasures of any other category | 5 |
| High-Injury Network (HIN) and High-Risk Network (HRN) (see MARC’s Crash Data Dashboard for maps of the High-Injury and High-Risk Networks): | 5 possible (tiered) |
| Project does not improve bicycle/pedestrian safety along or across either the HRN or HIN | 0 |
| Provides bike/ped facilities along the HRN or crossings using Proven Safety Countermeasures across HRN segments | 3 |
| Provides bike/ped facilities along the HIN or crossings using Proven Safety Countermeasures across HIN segments | 5 |
| Facility Type | |
| 1- On-Street Bicycle Facilities | 5 possible (tiered) |
| Striped bike lanes, minimum 5-foot wide | 2 |
| Buffered bike lanes, minimum 5-foot wide (excluding buffer) | 3 |
| Separated bike lanes, minimum 6.5 feet for one-way lanes or minimum 10 feet wide for two-way lanes | 5 |
| 2- Trail Facilities | 5 possible (tiered) |
| Shared-use path, 10 feet wide | 4 |
| Shared use path, 11 feet wide or wider | 5 |
| 3- Pedestrian Facilities | 5 possible (tiered) |
| Sidewalk, one side, minimum 5 feet wide | 1 |
| Sidewalk, both sides, minimum 5 feet wide | 3 |
| Sidewalk, both sides, one or both equal or greater than 6 feet wide | 5 |
| <i>In the case of a project with both bicycle, trail, and/or pedestrian facilities, scores do not stack. The highest score will be used.</i> | |
| G. System Performance | 10 Points |
| Population residents & employees w/in 1-mi radius | 10 possible |
| <5,000 | 2 |
| 5,000-9,999 | 4 |
| 10,000-14,999 | 6 |
| 15,000-20,000 | 8 |
| >20,000 | 10 |
| Active Transportation Infrastructure Projects Total Possible | 70 Points |

⁵ See pg. 15 for Creating Sustainable Places guiding principles

| Category I: Active Transportation Infrastructure Projects (REGIONAL PLAN ALTERNATIVE SCORING) | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Regional Bikeway Plan: Projects may use this scoring if the project implements part of an alignment of the Regional Bikeway Network from the Greater Kansas City Regional Bikeway Plan | |
| Facility Type: | |
| Option 1- Trail Facilities | 70 possible (tiered) |
| Shared use path, 10 feet wide | 60 |
| Shared use path, 11 feet wide or wider | 70 |
| Option 2- On-Street Bicycle Facilities | 70 possible (tiered) |
| Striped bike lanes, minimum 5 feet wide, on a street with a posted speed limit of 30 mph or less | 50 |
| Buffered Bike lanes, minimum 5-feet wide (excluding buffer), on a street with a posted speed limit of 30 mph or less | 60 |
| Separated bike lanes, minimum of 6.5 feet for one-way lanes or minimum 10 feet wide for two-way lanes | 70 |
| <i>If a project implements both on-street and trail facilities, points do not stack. The highest scoring tier is used.</i> | |
| <i>Segments of the Regional Bikeway Network that already have bike facilities are still eligible for this scoring table if the project improves these facilities, subject to the project's eligibility for STBG-SA funds. The score is based on the end result description of the facilities above.</i> | |
| Regional Bikeway Plan Total Possible | 70 Points |
| MetroGreen: use this scoring if the project implements part of an alignment of the proposed MetroGreen trail network | |
| Trail Facilities | 70 possible (tiered) |
| Shared use path, 10 feet wide | 60 |
| Shared use path, 11 feet wide or wider | 70 |
| <i>If a project fulfills both a Regional Bikeway Plan alignment and a MetroGreen alignment, points do not stack. The highest scoring tier is used.</i> | |
| MetroGreen Total Possible | 70 Points |

| Category II: Historic Preservation/Archaeological Projects | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| A. Transportation Choices: Relationship to Transportation | 15 Points |
| Extent to which project currently does or will serve a specific transportation function | 10 |
| Extent to which project addresses a specific transportation impact | 5 |
| B. Economic Vitality | 10 Points |
| Serves regional activity centers – If the project sponsor believes the intensity of the adjacent activity center is higher than shown, project sponsor may submit documentation showing how served (adjacent) activity center has increased in intensity. | 10 possible (tiered) |
| Project does not meet any criteria below | 0 |
| Project serves (is adjacent to) any activity center | 4 |
| Project serves (is adjacent to) an activity center of medium intensity according to MARC's activity center map | 6 |
| Project serves (is adjacent to) an activity center of high or very high intensity according to MARC's activity center map AND/OR project implements a preferred alternative from a Creating Sustainable Places plan or a Planning Sustainable Places plan. | 10 |
| C. Climate Change and Energy Use | 5 Points |
| Project reduces VMT by increasing access to multimodal transportation options (connecting trails, park and rides, transit) | 3 |
| Project uses recycled materials, renewable materials, or retains/reuses existing materials AND/OR reduces carbon-based fuel use through landscaping/right-of-way management | 2 |
| D. Environment | 5 Points |
| Applicant submits a plan to improve environmental metrics: | 5 possible (tiered) |
| Applicant provides a map identifying priority natural resource conservation and restoration opportunities along the project corridor and in the project's watershed, such as streams, wetlands, or forests. | 1 |
| Applicant provides a specific plan to protect and/or restore a targeted natural resource or habitat within the project's footprint, such as incorporating tree plantings, vegetated buffers, or permeable pavements. The response also indicates which resources will be required. | 3 |
| Applicant provides a data-driven plan that demonstrates how the project will improve a specific environmental metric, such as enhancing water quality, reducing stormwater runoff, or mitigating the urban heat island effect, by using nature-based solutions. | 5 |
| E. Place Making | 15 Points |
| Adequate documentation of project's historic significance and uniqueness to region or place | 10 possible (tiered) |
| Project site has undergone review and recognition by a local historic register | 10 |
| Project site is a local historic landmark OR within a local historic district | 8 |
| Project site has local historic significance and uniqueness | 5 |
| Supports Creating Sustainable Places guiding principles ⁶ . Project achieves 40% or more of the concepts within: | 5 possible (tiered) |
| 1-2 Principles | 1 |
| 3-4 Principles | 2 |
| 5 Principles | 4 |
| 6+ Principles | 5 |
| F. System Condition | 15 Points |
| Relieves a threat to an existing historic resource | 5 |
| Preserves/restores existing condition of the site or facility AND meets preservation/restoration standards | 5 |
| Addresses long-term maintenance/preservation or the site in the future | 5 |
| G. System Performance | 5 Points |
| Creates community partnerships between government and non-governmental organizations | 5 |
| Historic Preservation/Archaeological Projects Total Possible | 70 Points |

⁶ See pg. 15 for Creating Sustainable Places guiding principles

| Category III: Transportation Aesthetics and Scenic Values | |
|--|----------------------------|
| A. Transportation Choices: Relationship to Transportation | 15 Points |
| Extent to which project currently does or will serve a specific transportation function | 10 |
| Extent to which project addresses a specific transportation impact | 5 |
| B. Economic Vitality | 10 Points |
| Serves regional activity centers- If the project sponsor believes the intensity of the adjacent activity center is higher than shown, project sponsor may submit documentation showing how served (adjacent) activity center has increased in intensity. | <i>10 possible</i> |
| Project does not meet any criteria below | 0 |
| Project serves (is adjacent to) any activity center | 4 |
| Project serves (is adjacent to) an activity center of medium intensity according to MARC's activity center map. | 6 |
| Project serves (is adjacent to) an activity center of high or very high intensity according to MARC's activity center map AND/OR project implements a preferred alternative from a Creating Sustainable Places plan or a Planning Sustainable Places plan. | 10 |
| C. Climate Change and Energy Use | 10 Points |
| Project includes elements that use renewable energy sources, recycled materials, or other green technologies | 10 |
| D. Environment | 5 Points |
| Applicant submits a plan to improve environmental metrics: | <i>5 possible (tiered)</i> |
| Applicant provides a data-driven plan that demonstrates how the project will improve a specific environmental metric, such as enhancing water quality, reducing stormwater runoff, or mitigating the urban heat island effect, by using nature-based solutions. The plan describes how the project will protect and/or restore a targeted natural resource or habitat within its footprint and a map is provided identifying those conservation and restoration opportunities. | 5 |
| Applicant demonstrates how the project will protect and/or restore a targeted natural resource or habitat within the project's footprint, such as incorporating tree plantings, vegetated buffers, or permeable pavements. The response also indicates which resources will be required. The application includes a map identifying those conservation and restoration opportunities. | 3 |
| Applicant provides a map identifying priority natural resource conservation and restoration opportunities along the project corridor and in the project's watershed, such as streams, wetlands, or forests. | 1 |
| E. Place Making | 5 Points |
| Supports Creating Sustainable Places guiding principles ⁷ . Project achieves 40% or more of the concepts within: | <i>5 possible</i> |
| 1-2 Principles | 1 |
| 3-4 Principles | 2 |
| 5 Principles | 4 |
| 6+ Principles | 5 |
| F. Public Health | 5 Points |
| Includes facilities for active modes (walking, bicycling or transit) | <i>5 possible</i> |
| 1 mode | 1 |
| 2 modes | 3 |
| 3 modes | 5 |
| G. System Condition | 10 Points |
| The project will remove a visual blight | 5 |
| The project will enhance the visual environment | 5 |
| H. System Performance | 10 Points |
| Number of people directly benefitting from project | <i>5 possible</i> |
| Residents & employees within a 1-mile radius | |
| <5,000 | 1 |
| 5,000-20,000 | 3 |
| >20,000 | 5 |
| I. Vehicular traffic at project location | 5 possible |
| AADT | |
| <20,000 | 1 |
| 20,000-50,000 | 3 |
| >50,000 | 5 |
| Transportation Aesthetics and Scenic Values Total Possible | 70 Points |

⁷ See pg. 15 for Creating Sustainable Places guiding principles

| Category IV: Environmental Mitigation and Vegetation Management | |
|--|----------------------------|
| A. Transportation Choices: Relationship to Transportation | 15 Points |
| Eliminates existing problem impacting transportation function of existing facility | 10 |
| Addresses future problems at a transportation facility | 5 |
| B. Economic Vitality | 10 Points |
| Serves regional activity centers – If the project sponsor believes the intensity of the adjacent activity center is higher than shown, project sponsor may submit documentation showing how served (adjacent) activity center has increased in intensity. | <i>10 possible</i> |
| Project does not meet any criteria below | 0 |
| Project serves (is adjacent to) any activity center | 4 |
| Project serves (is adjacent to) an activity center of medium intensity according to MARC’s activity center map. | 6 |
| Project serves (is adjacent to) an activity center of high or very high intensity according to MARC’s activity center map AND/OR project implements a preferred alternative from a Creating Sustainable Places plan or a Planning Sustainable Places plan. | 10 |
| C. Climate Change and Energy Use | 10 Points |
| Reduces VMT by increasing access to multimodal transportation options (connecting trails, park and rides, transit) | 6 |
| Reduces carbon-based fuel usage through alternative fuels, renewable energy or landscaping/right-of-way management | 4 |
| D. Environment | 15 Points |
| Applicant submits a plan to improve environmental metrics: | <i>5 possible (tiered)</i> |
| Applicant provides a map identifying priority natural resource conservation and restoration opportunities along the project corridor and in the project’s watershed, such as streams, wetlands, or forests. | 1 |
| Applicant demonstrates how the project will protect and/or restore a targeted natural resource or habitat within the project’s footprint, such as incorporating tree plantings, vegetated buffers, or permeable pavements. The response also indicates which resources will be required. The application includes a map identifying those conservation and restoration opportunities. | 3 |
| Applicant provides a data-driven plan that demonstrates how the project will improve a specific environmental metric, such as enhancing water quality, reducing stormwater runoff, or mitigating the urban heat island effect, by using nature-based solutions. The plan describes how the project will protect and/or restore a targeted natural resource or habitat within its footprint and a map is provided identifying those conservation and restoration opportunities. | 5 |
| E. Place Making | 5 Points |
| Supports Creating Sustainable Places guiding principles ⁸ . Project achieves 40% or more of the concepts within: | <i>5 possible</i> |
| 1-2 Principles | 1 |
| 3-4 Principles | 2 |
| 5 Principles | 4 |
| 6+ Principles | 5 |
| F. Public Health: Water Quality | 5 Points |
| Addresses problems created from stormwater runoff (e.g. soil erosion, water quality) | 3 |
| Applies strategies and practices from the MARC/APWA Manual of Best Management Practices to Protect Water Quality | 2 |
| G. System Performance | 10 Points |
| Approximate number of people directly benefiting from project annually | <i>10 possible</i> |
| <20,000 | 2.5 |
| 20,000-50,000 | 5 |
| >50,000 | 10 |
| Environmental Mitigation and Vegetation Management Total Possible | 70 Points |

⁸ See pg. 15 for Creating Sustainable Places guiding principles

| Category V: Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Project | | |
|--|--|--------------------|
| A. Transportation Choices/Public Health | | 10 Points |
| | | <i>10 possible</i> |
| Addresses only walking or bicycling | | 5 |
| Addresses both walking and bicycling | | 10 |
| B. Economic Vitality | | 5 Points |
| Serves a primary or middle school (grades K-8) | | <i>5 possible</i> |
| Project does not address a primary or middle school (grades K-8) | | 0 |
| Project addresses a planned future primary or middle school (grades K-8) AND explains how project serves that school | | 1 |
| Project addresses a primary or middle school (grades K-8) AND explains how project serves that school | | 5 |
| C. Safety and Security | | 15 Points |
| Extent to which project addresses safety conflicts and one of three Safe Routes to School components | | <i>15 possible</i> |
| Education ^a | | 5 |
| Enforcement ^b | | 5 |
| Encouragement ^c | | 5 |
| D. System Condition | | 20 Points |
| Documents need for proposed services or program; does not duplicate or overlap existing programs or services | | 20 |
| F. System Performance | | 20 Points |
| Existing: Success in achieving goals & reaching target audience, or; New: Success of case studies or other examples OR innovates in field | | 5 |
| Extent to which project outcome is reasonable and attainable | | 5 |
| Extent to which program will be evaluated and monitored | | 5 |
| Approximate number of students directly benefiting from project annually | | <i>5 possible</i> |
| <1,000 | | 1 |
| 1,000-4,999 | | 2 |
| 5,000-9,999 | | 3 |
| 10,000-15,000 | | 4 |
| >15,000 | | 5 |
| Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Projects Total Possible | | 70 Points |

Note: The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) recommends that Safe Routes to School efforts incorporate – directly or indirectly – components, often referred to as “E’s”. Three of the E’s and examples of each include:

- a. Education – Teaching children about the broad range of transportation choices, instructing them in important lifelong bicycling and walking safety skills, and launching driver safety campaigns in the vicinity of schools.
- b. Enforcement – Partnering with local law enforcement to ensure traffic laws are obeyed in the vicinity of schools (this includes enforcement of speeds, yielding to pedestrians in crossings, and proper walking and bicycling behaviors), and initiating community enforcement such as crossing guard programs.
- c. Encouragement – Using events and activities to promote walking and bicycling.

| Creating Sustainable Places guiding principles | | |
|---|--|--------------------------|
| Sustainable places, wherever they occur, are vibrant, efficient, and enduring and are characterized by the following principles: | Project achieves 40% or more of the concepts within: | <i>5 points possible</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinvestment • Transportation Choices • Housing Choices • Development in Corridors and Activity Centers • Design for Healthier Lifestyles • Preservation of Unique Community Characteristics | 1-2 Principles | 1 pt. |
| | 3-4 Principles | 2 pts. |
| | 5 Principles | 4 pts. |
| | 6+ Principles | 5 pts. |

Safe Routes to School E's

Definitions from FHWA:

- **Education** – Teaching children about the broad range of transportation choices, instructing them in important lifelong bicycling and walking safety skills, and launching driver safety campaigns in the vicinity of schools.
- **Enforcement** – Partnering with local law enforcement to ensure traffic laws are obeyed in the vicinity of schools (this includes enforcement of speeds, yielding to pedestrians in crossings, and proper walking and bicycling behaviors), and initiating community enforcement such as crossing guard programs.
- **Encouragement** – Using events and activities to promote walking and bicycling.
- **Evaluation** – Monitoring and documenting outcomes and trends through the collection of data, including the collection of data before and after the intervention(s).

Definition from Safe Routes to School National Partnership:

- **Fairness** – Work to support safe, active, and healthy opportunities for children in low-income communities, communities of color, and beyond. Incorporate fairness concerns throughout the other E's to understand and address obstacles, create access, and ensure safe and fair outcomes.