



**TIP 2020-24 Program Scoring Sheet**

COMMITTEE: 3PC  
PROGRAM: MULTI-USE TRAILS

Criteria	Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Plan & Policy Support	Regional Plan & Policy Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Safety	Social Equity (PICK ONE)	MAX SCORE						
1)	<b>Number of Communities Connected</b>	5	<b>Number of employed within 1/2 mile of project area</b>	10	<b>Connections to Conservation Corridors</b>	5	<b>Project documentaion:</b>	5	<b>Planning or funding agreements with either:</b>	5	<b>Overmatch</b>	5	<b>Law enforcement &amp; EMS patrol policies in place</b>	5	<b>Location of project in Environmental Justice area</b>	5
	Connects two or more communities or completes a gap in a trail corridor	5	Over 250 employed	10	Connects/crosses corridor	5	Complete Streets Policy / Citation in Comp or thoroughfare plan / Parks Plan / Bicycle Parking Ordinance / Set-aside in subdivision codes / Enhanced trails maintenance plan adopted / Railroad agreements / TOD Plans		INDOT / Other jurisdictions / Advocacy groups / Foundations / Businesses / School Districts		> 30% local match or PE funds	5	Yes	5	50% or more of project is within EJ area	5
	Extension of existing or funded trail segment	3	100 to 249 employed	5			Three or more above satisfied	5	Partnerships including funding	5	25 to 29% local match	3			< 50% in EJ area	3
	Isolated trail segments	1	25 to 99	3			Two or more	3	Other partnerships	3	21 to 24% local	1				
2)	<b>Trip Generators within 1/2 mile of project area</b>	10					<b>Priority Trails Adherence</b>	25			<b>Right-of-way ownership</b>	5			<b>Senior or disabled center within 1/2 mile of project</b>	5
	# of parks, schools, post offices, libraries, civic facilities, 10+ businesses:	10					Project on High Priority Corridor	25			Completely or owned by NIPSCO	5				
	10 or more	5					Project on Medium Priority Corridor	20			Minor amounts required (less than half acre)	3				
	9 to 5	2					Project on Low Priority Corridor	15			At least 50% owned by sponsor	1				
	4 or less						Project connects two Priority Corridors	10								
							Project connects to one Priority Corridor	5								
3)	<b>Transit access within 1/2 mile of project</b>	3					<b>Visionary Trail</b>	5								
	More than one stop	3														
	1 stop	2														
	OR Trailhead parking included	2														
4)	<b>Residential density within 1/2 mile of project (based on TAP app)</b>	4														
	Two dwelling units per acre	4														
5)	<b>Connections to existing on-road bicycle routes</b>	3														
	Trail crossing bike lanes or signed routes	3														
<b>MAX Criteria Score</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100</b>					

TIP 2020-24 Program Scoring Sheet

COMMITTEE: EMPC  
PROGRAM: Air Quality

Criteria	Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Plan & Policy Support	Regional Plan & Policy Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Safety	Social Equity	MAX SCORE									
1)	Potential of the Vehicle to enhance access and connections for people, or Potential of Alt Fuel or TSE infrastructure to close an access gap, or Percent of Education Project budget focusing on access and connection to low emission transportation modes	10	Economic Benefit /ton cumulative mobile source emission reductions of Criterion Pollutants Mobile Source Source Sector HD Diesel = \$360,000/ton PM2.5+230,000/tonSOx+6,500/ton NOx X useful life	5	Emission Reduction Total - CAA(Sum of reduction of all Criteria Air pollutant emissions in CMAQ Emissions Calculator Toolkit x useful life)	10	Extent to which the applicant has embraced air quality and energy efficiency improvements in operations, community plans, policies, and programs.	5	Supports Regional Transit Asset Management Plan or Priority Alt Fuel Corridors or education project Implements Strategies Identified in 2040 Implementation Matrix (Choose One)	5	Participates in Regional Air Quality Initiatives such as NWI Green Fleets, NWI Partners for Clean Air, Green Building Council, South Shore Clean Cities	5	Procurement Readiness (choose one)	5	Investment in Safety Training for Alt Fuels and Infrastructure or public education on health risk during air quality action days. (choose one)	5	Emission reductions benefit Environmental Justice populations	5	
	If Vehicle retrofit, repower, or purchase, Vehicle is a Transit Revenue Vehicle. If Alt Fuel or TSE Infrastructure, Infrastructure is 5 miles or greater from same with public/commercial access. If education program focuses on < 50% transit and non-motorized mode shift.	10	\$4M+	5	Tons per useful life > 3	10	Green Fleets Plan, Idle Reduction Ordinance, Education and Incentives Programs for Residents and Businesses, Urban Forestry Plan, Energy Efficiency, Green Building Standards or related documents.	5	Project is within 5 mile of a national priority Alt Fuel Corridor	5	Project Sponsor is active member in more than one group above.	5	Vehicles or certified retrofit equipment meeting specifications for the project are on existing Quantity Purchase Agreements or have competitive procurement documentation examples from other jurisdictions are provided.	5	If Alt Fuel project applicant engages in alternative fuel or electric vehicle or infrastructure safety training for maintenance workers.	5	100% of vehicle operation for project is within EJ areas, or fueling station /TSE and vehicle operation within EJ area. Education Project wholly within EJ Area.	5	
	If Vehicle Retrofit/repower/purchase is a School Bus. If Alt Fuel Infrastructure/TSE is less than 5 miles from same and offers limited but shared access with other entities. If education program includes focus > 50% transit and non-motorized mode shift	5	\$3-4M	4	Tons per useful life = 2-3	6	Three or more above satisfied	3	Vehicle Replacement is in regional TAM or applicable planning document and near end of federal useful life	5	Project Sponsor is active member in one group above.	3	If a public partnership (ie. School Bus or non-LPA public entity) the a cooperative agreement with LPA to apply and manage the project has been secured.	5	If non-alt-fuel project, applicant demonstrates commitment to promoting public information on health and air quality action days	5	75-99% of vehicle operation for project is within EJ areas, or fueling station or TSE is within EJ area. Percent of Education Project expenditures in EJ Area.	4	
	Non-Transportation Vehicle/Alt Fuel Infrastructure has no mechanism to share access, education program limited re: mode shift aspects	0	\$2-3 M	3	Tons per useful life = 1-2	4	Two or more	2	Education project activities are included in the 2040 Plan Implementation Matrix	5			Infrastructure or TSE Project is to be installed on public property	5		50-75% of vehicle operation for project is within EJ areas, or fueling station or TSE is within EJ area. Percent of Education Project expenditures in EJ Area.	3		
			\$1-2M	2	Tons per useful life = <1	2	One satisfied	1					If education project, all promotional items are identified specifically in the application.	5		25-49% of vehicle operation for project is within EJ areas, or fueling station or TSE is within EJ area. Percent of Education Project expenditures in EJ Area.	2		
			<\$1M	1				0					No Public Private Partnerships with pre-identified private partner will be allowed. These must be competitively procured.	0					
2)	Increase Access to Clean Air: (based on population of census blocks within 1000 ft of project)	5	Return on Investment: If Alt Fuel Vehicle, Idle Reduction, or TSE: Return on investment =(annual energy and/or fuel cost savings to public applicant) x Useful Life/ project cost	5	GHG- Emission Reduction Total =(Sum of GHG Equivalents reduced/year) x useful life)	10	Community Air Quality Education and Promotion	5				Operational Readiness	5		Reduce exposure of sensitive populations to diesel vehicle emissions	5			
	Population in census blocks within 1000 ft of transit or school bus route + ridership, fueling station, or idling location + ridership >5000	5	ROI=100%	5	Tons per useful life > 500 tons	10	Applicant initiates education, outreach, and awareness of air quality related activities, behaviors, etc.(at least annual newsletter, water bill inserts, or eblasts over 3 year prior)	5				Fuel purchasing plan or infrastructure is in place to support alt. fuel vehicles, or all vehicles.	5		Number of Schools, senior centers/nursing homes, hospitals, and recreational facilities within half mile of transit or school bus route, fueling station or idling location, or planned public education events > 10	5			
	Population in census blocks within 1000 ft of transit or school bus route + ridership, fueling station, or idling location 4000-5000	4	ROI=75 - 100%	4	Tons per useful life = 300-400	8									Number of Schools, senior centers/nursing homes, hospitals, and recreational facilities within half mile of transit or school bus route, fueling station, idling location, or planned public education events: 8-10	4			
	Population in census blocks within 1000 ft. of transit or school bus route + ridership, fueling station, or idling location + 3000-4000	3	ROI = 50 - 75%	3	Tons per useful life = 200-300	6									Number of Schools, hospitals, senior centers/nursing homes and recreational facilities within half mile of transit or school bus route, fueling station, idling location, or planned public education events: 4-7	3			
	Population in census blocks within 1000 ft of transit or school bus route + ridership, fueling station, or idling location. 2000-3000	2	ROI = 25 - 50%	2	Tons per useful life = 100-200	4									Number of Schools, hospitals, senior centers/nursing homes and recreational facilities within half mile of transit or school bus route, fueling station, idling location, or planned public education events: 2-3	2			
	Population within 1000 ft. of transit or school bus route + ridership, fueling station, or idling location. 1000-2000	1	ROI = 1-25%	1	<100	2									Number of Schools, hospitals, senior centers/nursing homes and recreational facilities within half mile of transit or school bus route, fueling station, idling location, or planned public education events: 1	1			
3)					Emission Reduction Cost Effectiveness (CMAQ \$/ Kg)= CMAQ\$/ (sum all pollutants kg.yr)* Useful Life	10													
					CMAQ cost per kg >\$10,000	2													
					CMAQ cost per kg \$5,000-10,000	4													
					CMAQ cost per kg \$2500-5000	6													
					CMAQ cost per kg \$1000-2500	8													
					CMAQ cost per kg < \$1000	10													
MAX Criteria Score		15		10		30		10		5		5		10		5		10	100



# TIP 2020-24 Program Scoring Sheet

COMMITTEE: LUC  
PROGRAM: Quality of Place

## Eligible Projects

1- Divided Highway conversion to boulevard  
2- Traffic Calming  
3- Inventory/ control/ removal of outdoor advertising  
4- Roadway expansion  
5- Historic preserve of historic transportation facilities  
6- Turnouts/ overlook

Criteria	Access & Connections		Economic Generation		Environmental Benefits		Local Plan & Policy Support		Regional Plan & Policy Support		Partnerships		Project Readiness		Safety		Social Equity		MAX SCORE
1)	Walk score for project area	5	Improve the quality of life of the project area	5	Emission reduction	4	Project documentation (citation):	10	Project documentation	10	Planning or funding agreements with either	5	Overmatch	10	All crashes within project area	5	Project located in an Environmental Justice area	5	100
	100-75	5	Attract business or enhance existing business area	3	Cost per ton < \$1,000,000 (under review)	4	Citation in local comprehensive/ strategic/ redevelopment plan	5	Regional Corridor Study	5	Three or more partnerships	5	> 30% local match or PE locally funded	10	Project located in one of the top crash locations of all modes in NIRPC Long Range Plan	5	Within an EJ area (map)	5	
	74-50	3	Increase the number of visitors/ users	2	Cost per ton between \$1M and \$2M (under review)	3	Citation in traffic/ safety study	3	NIRPC Long Range Plan	5	Two partnerships	3	25 to 29% local match	6					
	< 49	2					Capital Improvement Plan	2			One partnership	2	21 to 24% local match	2					
2)	Improve major centers areas	10			Green Infrastructure Standards*	4							ROW Owned	10	# Accidents per 100 million vehicles	5			100
	Major employment area (map)	4			5 or more	4							ROW completely owned	10	High value : > 200 crashes per 100 million vehicle mile	5			
	CLC (map)	4			3 to 4	3							75% + ROW owned	7	Medium value: 150-199 crashes per 100 million vehicle mile	3			
	Arterial Route	2			1 to 2	1							50%+ ROW	3					
	Collector Route	1																	
3)	Transit access within 1/2 mile of project	4			Improve visual appearance	2													100
	More than one stop	4																	
	1 stop	2																	
4)	Ease of mobility/ safety	6																	100
	Separate transportation	2																	
	Universal Design	2																	
	Removal of a distraction	2																	
	<b>MAX Criteria Score</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100</b>				

\* Stormwater management- Rain garden- Air quality- Biodiversity- Land conservation- Bioswales- Vegetation in the road rights-of-way- Permeable pavement in right-of-ways- bioretention curb extension

# TIP 2020-24 Program Scoring Sheet

COMMITTEE: LUC

PROGRAM: Planning

Criteria	Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits (PICK ONE)	Local Plan & Policy Support	Regional Plan & Policy Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Safety	Social Equity	MAX SCORE	
1)	<b>Walk score for project area</b> 5 100-75 0 74-50 3 < 49 5	<b>Improve the quality of life of the project area</b> 6 Attract business or enhance existing business area 3 Increase the number of visitors/ users 3	<b>Emission reduction</b> 3 Cost per ton < \$1,000,000 4 Cost per ton between \$1M and \$2M 3	<b>Project documentation</b> 5 Citation in local comprehensive/ strategic/ redevelopment plan 3 Local Transit Plan 2	<b>Project Documentation</b> 10 CLC Report 4 RDA / NICTD Plans 3 I-65 & Us 30 Study 3	<b>Planning or funding agreements with either:</b> 5 Three or more partnerships 5 Two partnerships 3 One partnership 2	<b>Overmatch</b> 6 > 30% local match 6 25 to 29% local match 4 21 to 24% local match 2	<b>Increase safety of all modes - motorized/ non-motorized</b> 8 Decrease speed limit 2 Clearly marked mid-block and intersection crossings 3 Curb extensions and center medians to shorten the distance pedestrians need to negotiate 2 ADA consideration 3	<b>Project located in an Environmental Justice area</b> 5 Within an EJ area 5		
2)	<b>Improve connectivity with easy access to jobs and services</b> 10 Major employment area 5 CLC/ Downtown 5	<b>Increase livability</b> 9 Increase in population 4 Increase of housing 3 Seating - sidewalks- street lights- landscape- parks 2	<b>Green Infrastructure Standards*</b> 2 > 70% 4 30-69 3 <30 1			<b>Public Outreach</b> 5 Full and fair participation by all potentially affected areas 5	<b>Create the groundwork for future implementation</b> 4 Create the groundwork for future implementation projects 2 Implementation plan 2	<b># accidents per 100 million vehicles</b> 7 High value : > 200 crashes per 100 million vehicle mile travel 7 Medium value: 150-199 crashes per 100 million vehicle mile travel 4			
3)	<b>Transit access within 1/2 mile of project</b> 5 > one stop 5 1 stop 4										
4)	<b>Ease of mobility/ safety</b> 5 Separate transportation modes 3 Improve traffic flow 2										
	<b>MAX Criteria Score</b> 25	15	5	5	10	10	10	15	5	<b>100</b>	

\* Stormwater management- Rain garden- Air quality- Biodiversity- Land conservation- Bioswales- Vegetation in the road rights-of-way- Permeable pavement in right-of-ways- bioretention curb extension

**TIP 2020-2024 Program Scoring Sheet**

COMMITTEE: STC  
PROGRAM: Roadway Improvements

Criteria	Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Plan & Policy Support	Regional Plan Adherence	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Safety	Social Equity	MAX SCORE								
1)	<b>Functional Classification of roadway improved</b>	8	<b>Access to job commuters</b>	10	<b>Emission reduction</b>	5	<b>Local Plan Adherence</b>	10	<b>Regional Plan Adherence</b>	5	<b>Planning or funding agreements with either:</b>	5	<b>Overmatch</b>	5	<b>Location on high priority corridors</b>	5	<b>Location of project in Environmental Justice area</b>	5
	Principal Arterial	8	Project is located in a major employment area (map)	10	Cost per ton < \$1,000,000 (Under Review)	5	Cited in local comprehensive or master plan, thoroughfare plan, capital improvements program, traffic impact fee plan, asset management plan, or other local plan/study	10	Cited in Creating Livable Communities, At-Grade Crossings Study or other published plan for the region that includes at least all of Lake, Porter, and LaPorte Counties	5	INDOT / Other jurisdictions / Other Transportation Owners or Operators / Railroads / Businesses / Advocacy Groups / Foundations	5	> 30% local match across each project phase or 100% PE by LPA	5	Project located in one of top crash corridors in NIRPC 2040 Long Range Plan	5	50% or more of project is within EJ area (map)	5
	Minor Arterial	6	Project is located in a moderate employment area (map)	5	Cost per ton between \$1M and \$2M (Under Review)	3		5		5		5	25 to 29% local match	3		5	< 49% in EJ area (map)	3
	Major Collector	4					Cited in at least 2 of the above	10	Cited in at least 2 of the above plans	5	Two or more partnerships	5	21 to 24% local match	1				
	Minor Collector	2					Cited in at least 1 of the above	5	Cited in 1 of the above plans	3	One partnership	3						
2)	<b>Residential density within 1 mile of project</b>	5			<b>Green Infrastructure Standards Incorporated into project</b>	5			<b>Congestion Management Process (CMP) Adherence</b>	5			<b>Right-of-way controlled by LPA</b>	5	<b>Crash Rate in project area</b>	5	<b>Progress toward ADA transition plans</b>	5
	5 or more residential dwelling units per acre	5			5 or more	5			Located on a corridor with Level of Service (LOS) E or F	5				5	Project is in a high crash location (map)			
	2-4.99 dwelling units per acre	3			3 to 4	3			Located on a corridor with Level of Service (LOS) D	3				5	Project is in a high crash location (map)			
	1-1.99 dwelling units per acre	1			1 to 2	1								3	Project is in a moderate crash location (map)			
3)	<b>Transit access within 1/2 mile of project</b>	2							<b>Asset Management</b>	5								
	More than one stop	2							Pavement PASER < 5	5								
	1 stop	1							Bridge suff. Rating < 50	5								
4)	<b>Network Connectivity within 3 miles</b>	5																
	Connects to Other Principal Arterials (OPAs) or Higher Functional Classification on both sides	5																
	Connects to an Other Principal Arterial (OPA) or Higher Functional Classification on one side	3																
	Connects to a Minor Arterial (MA)	1																
<b>MAX Criteria Score</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>	

\* Stormwater management- Rain garden- Air quality- Biodiversity- Land conservation- Bioswales- Vegetation in the road rights-of-way- Permeable pavement in right-of-ways- bioretention curb extension - infiltration trench - wildlife crossing

**TIP 2020-2024 Program Scoring Sheet**

COMMITTEE: STC  
PROGRAM: New Roadways

Criteria	Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Plan & Policy Support	Regional Plan & Policy Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Safety	Social Equity	MAX SCORE									
1)	<b>Functional Classification of route</b>	8	<b>Access to job commuters</b>	15	<b>Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) Reduction</b>	5	<b>Local Plan Adherence</b>	10	<b>Regional Plan Adherence</b>	10	<b>Planning or funding agreements with either:</b>	10	<b>Overmatch</b>	5	<b>Crash Rate in project area</b>	5	<b>Location of project in Environmental Justice area</b>	5	
	Principal Arterial	8	Project is located in a major employment area (map)	15	1,000 daily VHT or more reduced compared to no-build scenario as a result of new roadway according to NIRPC Travel Demand Model (Under Review)	5	Cited in local comprehensive or master plan, thoroughfare plan, capital improvements program, traffic impact fee plan, or other local plan/study	10	Cited in current long-range plan, Creating Livable Communities, or other published plan for the region that includes at least all of Lake, Porter, and LaPorte Counties	5	INDOT / Other jurisdictions / Other Transportation Owners or Operators / Railroads / Businesses / Advocacy Groups / Foundations	10	> 30% local match across all project phases or 100% PE by LPA	5	Project is in a high crash location (map)	5	50% or more of project is within EJ area (map)	5	
	Minor Arterial	6	Project is located in a moderate employment area (map)	10	500-999 daily VHT reduced (Under Review)	3		10	One of the 22 segments identified in the Regional Corridors Study	5		10	25 to 29% local match	3		5	< 49% in EJ area (map)	3	
	Major Collector	4					Cited in at least 2 of the above	10			10	Two or more partnerships	10	21 to 24% local match	1	Project is in a high crash location (map)	5		
	Minor Collector	2					Cited in 1 of the above	5			5	One partnership	5			Project is in a moderate crash location (map)	3		
2)	<b>Residential density within 1 mile of project</b>	5			<b>Green Infrastructure Standards*</b>	5			<b>Congestion Management Process (CMP) Adherence</b>	5			<b>Right-of-way controlled by LPA</b>	5					
	5 or more residential dwelling units per acre	5			5 or more	5			Connects to or serves within 1 mile of a corridor with Level of Service (LOS) E or F (map)	5									
		3			3 to 4	3			Connects to or serves within 1 mile of a corridor with Level of Service (LOS) D (map)	3									
	2-4.99 dwelling units per acre 1-1.99 dwelling units per acre	1			1 to 2	1													
3)	<b>Transit access within 1/2 mile of project</b>	2																	
	More than one stop 1 stop	2 1																	
4)	<b>Network Connectivity</b>	5																	
	Connects to Other Principal Arterials (OPAs) or Higher Functional Classification on both sides	5																	
	Connects to an Other Principal Arterial (OPA) or Higher Functional Classification on one side Connects to a Minor Arterial (MA)	3 1																	
<b>MAX Criteria Score</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100</b>								

\* Stormwater management- Rain garden- Air quality- Biodiversity- Land conservation- Bioswales- Vegetation in the road rights-of-way- Permeable pavement in right-of-ways- bioretention curb extension - infiltration trench - wildlife crossing



**TIP 2020-24 Program Scoring Sheet**

COMMITTEE: TOR  
PROGRAM: Operating

Criteria	Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Plan & Policy Support	Regional Plan & Policy Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Safety	Social Equity	MAX SCORE
<b>Description</b>	Connections to: •Hospitals and medical facilities •Other transit networks •Across city boundaries •Across county boundaries •Decreased trip time/wait time <b>15</b>	Connections to job centers <b>5</b>	Use of Alternative Fuel Vehicles <b>5</b>	•Compatibility with the ADA Transition Plan •Compatibility with neighboring transit systems destinations and policies •Compatability with Title IV Plan <b>15</b>	•Density threshold for fixed route or demand response service •Coordinated Transit Plan •Long Range Plan •Capital projects on the state QPA <b>5</b>	•Other transit operators •Local medical providers •Non-profits •Municipalities •Counties •Businesses (Local match, fare partnerships, service links, consolidated services) <b>10</b>	•Overmatch •Dedicated local match •Reductions in other routes/service areas •Robust feasibility study <b>25</b>	•Safety Plan Compliance •Performance of on-time preventative maintenance •Meeting required performance targets for maintenance <b>10</b>	•Service to and from EJ areas •Increase access for individuals with disabilities and the elderly <b>10</b>	
1)	Does the proposed project provide cross over city or township boundaries? If so, where and how? (Y/N) <b>3</b>	Does the proposed project connect to a "Livable Center," as identified in the Creating Livable Communities plan? If so where? (Y/N) <b>3</b>	Does the proposed project utilize alternative fuel vehicles? If so, how many vehicles and what fuel type? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Does the proposed project coordinate with a neighboring transit system's policies, such as; fares, paratransit eligibility, service descriptions, service hours, and other policies? If so, how? (Y/N) <b>10</b>	Is the proposed project within the identified density thresholds for fixed route and demand response transit? (Y/N) <b>3</b>	Will the proposed project utilize a formal partnership with another entity such as a non-profit, local government, business, or human service agency? If so, which agency and what kind of partnership? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Has the proposed project been in operation for more than three years? (Y/N) <b>15</b>	Has the operator been on time with preventative maintenance schedule? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Does the proposed project connect within EJ areas? If so, where and how? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	
2)	Does the proposed project cross over county boundaries? If so, where and how?(Y/N) <b>3</b>	Does the proposed project connect to another job center outside of a "Livable Center?" <b>2</b>		Is the proposed project compable, directly referenced, or supportive of a local ADA transition plan? If so, how? (Y/N) <b>3</b>	Is the proposed project supported by a strategy in the Coordinated Transit Plan? If so which strategy(ies)? (Y/N) <b>1</b>	Does the proposed project share services, staff, or other resources with another transit operator or other human project agency? If so what and with whom? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Does the project have an identified and committed source of local match? If so, what and from whom? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Has the operator met the required performance metrics for vehicle maintenance? (Y/N) <b>3</b>	Does the proposed project connections to the 65+ population or people who are disabled? If so where and how? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	
3)	Does the proposed project provide connections to hospitals and other medical facilities? Please list? (Y/N) <b>3</b>			Is the project referenced in a corresponding Title VI Plan? If so, how? (Y/N) <b>2</b>	Is the proposed project supported by a strategy in the Long Range Plan? If so which strategy(ies)? (Y/N) <b>1</b>		Will this project be overmatched? By what percentage? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Is the operator in compliance with their Safety Plan? (Y/N) <b>2</b>		
4)	Will the proposed project decrease the wait times of passengers? If so, where and how? (Y/N) <b>3</b>									
5)	Will the proposed project connect to other transit networks? Which ones and where? If so, where and how?(Y/N) <b>3</b>									
<b>MAX Criteria Score</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>

**TIP 2020-24 Program Scoring Sheet**

COMMITTEE: TOR  
PROGRAM: Asset Management

Criteria	Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Plan & Policy Support	Regional Plan & Policy Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Safety	Social Equity	MAX SCORE
Description	Use of Universal Design Standards 5	N/A 0	Use of Alternative Fuel Vehicles 5	Demonstrated need for type of capital purchase 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinated Transit Plan</li> <li>Long Range Plan</li> <li>Transit Asset Management Plan</li> <li>On state QPC</li> </ul> 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other transit operators</li> <li>Local medical providers</li> <li>Non-profits</li> <li>Municipalities</li> <li>Counties</li> <li>Businesses</li> <li>(Local match, fare partnerships, service links, consolidated services)</li> </ul> 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overmatch</li> <li>Dedicated local match</li> <li>Service precedent</li> </ul> 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety Plan Compliance</li> <li>Performance of on-time preventative maintenance</li> <li>Meeting required performance targets for maintenance</li> </ul> 10	Improve efficiency of service or overall quality of assets within EJ areas 10	
1)	Does the proposed project utilize Universal Design Standards? If so how? (Y/N) 5	N/A 0	Does the proposed service utilize alternative fuel vehicles? If so, how many vehicles and what fuel type? (Y/N) 5	Do the specifications of the proposed asset match its intended need? Please demonstrate (Y/N) 5	Is the proposed capital asset compliant with your Transit Asset Management plan? If so, how? (Y/N) 15	Does the proposed project share services, staff, or other resources with another transit operator or other human project agency? If so what and with whom? (Y/N) 5	Is this a preventative maintenance project that was previously funded for more than three years? (Y/N) 10	Has the operator been on time with preventative maintenance schedule? (Y/N) 5	Does the proposed project improve or maintain the efficiency of service or overall quality of capital assets operating within EJ areas? If so, how? (Y/N) 10	
2)					Is the proposed project supported by a strategy in the Coordinated Transit Plan? If so which strategy(ies)? (Y/N) 10	Does the proposed project utilize a formal partnership with a local municipality, business, non-profit or other organization. If so, what and with whom? (Y/N) 5	Does the project have an identified and committed source of local match? If so, what and from whom? (Y/N) 5	Has the operator met the required performance metrics for vehicle maintenance? (Y/N) 3		
3)					Is the proposed project comptable with the Long Range Plan? If so, how? (Y/N) 5		Will this project be overmatched? By what percentage? (Y/N) 5	Is the operator in compliance with their Safety Plan? (Y/N) 2		
4)							If the proposed project is a capital project, is it on the State QPA or another idnidentified state cooperative agreement? If so what and where? (Y/N) 5			
	MAX Criteria Score 5	0	5	5	30	10	25	10	10	100

**TIP 2020-24 Program Scoring Sheet**

COMMITTEE: TOR

PROGRAM: Customer Experience

Criteria	Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Plan & Policy Support	Regional Plan & Policy Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Safety	Social Equity	MAX SCORE
Description	Use of Universal Design Standards <b>10</b>	Connections to job centers <b>5</b>	Green infrastructure <b>5</b>	•Feasibility study for new passenger facilities •Compatibility with the ADA Transition Plan <b>10</b>	•Coordinated Transit Plan •Long Range Plan •CLC Plan •G+B Plan •30 & I-65 Plan •State QPA <b>5</b>	•Other transit operators •Local medical providers •Non-profits •Municipalities •Counties •Businesses (Local match, fare partnerships, service links, consolidated services) <b>5</b>	•Overmatch •Dedicated local match •Service precedent <b>40</b>	•Safety Plan Compliance •Performance of on-time preventative maintenance •Meeting required performance targets for maintenance <b>10</b>	Improve efficiency of service or overall quality of assets within EJ areas <b>10</b>	
1)	Does the proposed project utilize Universal Design Standards? If so how? (Y/N) <b>10</b>	Does the proposed project connect to a "Livable Center," as identified in the Creating Livable Communities plan? If so where? (Y/N) <b>3</b>	Does the proposed project utilize green infrastructure techniques, or another method of reducing carbon emissions or water quality preservation? If so, what? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Is there a feasibility study for implementing the project? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Is the proposed project supported by a strategy in the Coordinated Transit Plan? If so which strategy(ies)? (Y/N) <b>3</b>	Does the proposed project share services, staff, or other resources with another transit operator or other human project agency? If so what and with whom? (Y/N) <b>3</b>	Does the proposed project support a specific element of your transit system that has been in operation for more than three years? (Y/N) <b>20</b>	Has the operator been on time with preventative maintenance schedule? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Does the proposed passenger facility, training program, improve the overall quality of assets within EJ areas? If so, how? (Y/N) <b>10</b>	
2)		Does the proposed project connect to another job center outside of a "Livable Center?" If so where? (Y/N) <b>2</b>		Is the proposed project compatible, directly referenced, or supportive of a local ADA transition plan? If so, how? (Y/N) <b>3</b>	Is the proposed project supported by any of the following plans? If so, which one and how? (LRP, CLC, G+B, 30 & I-65) (Y/N) <b>2</b>	Does the proposed project utilize a formal partnership with a local municipality, business, non-profit or other organization. If so, what and with whom? (Y/N) <b>2</b>	Does the project have an identified and committed source of local match? If so, what and from whom? (Y/N) <b>10</b>	Has the operator met the required performance metrics for vehicle maintenance? (Y/N) <b>3</b>		
3)				Is the project referenced in a corresponding Title VI Plan? If so, how? (Y/N) <b>2</b>			Will this project be overmatched? By what percentage? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Is the operator in compliance with their Safety Plan? (Y/N) <b>2</b>		
4)							If the proposed project is a capital project, is it on the State QPA or another identified state cooperative agreement? If so what and where? (Y/N) <b>5</b>			
5)										
	<b>MAX Criteria Score</b> <b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>

**TIP 2020-24 Program Scoring Sheet**

COMMITTEE: TOR  
PROGRAM: Operating

Criteria	Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Plan & Policy Support	Regional Plan & Policy Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Safety	Social Equity	MAX SCORE
<b>Description</b>	Connections to: •Hospitals and medical facilities •Other transit networks •Across city boundaries •Across county boundaries •Decreased trip time/wait time	Connections to job centers	•Use of Alternative Fuel Vehicles •Emissions reduction	-Feasibility study for new passenger facilities -Compatibility with the ADA Transition Plan	-Density threshold for fixed route or demand response service -Coordinated Transit Plan -Long Range Plan - Capital project on state QPC	•Other transit operators •Local medical providers •Non-profits •Municipalities •Counties •Businesses (Local match, fare partnerships, service links, consolidated services)	•Overmatch •Dedicated local match •Reductions in other routes/service areas •Robust feasibility study	•Safety Plan Compliance •Performance of on-time preventative maintenance •Meeting required performance targets for maintenance	•Service to and from EJ areas •Increase access for individuals with disabilities and the elderly	
1)	Does the proposed project provide additional crossing over city and township boundaries? If so, where and how? (Y/N) <b>3</b>	Does the proposed project connect to a "Livable Center," as identified in the Creating Livable Communities plan? If so where? (Y/N) <b>3</b>	Does the proposed project utilize alternative fuel vehicles? If so, how many vehicles and what fuel type? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Is the proposed project compable, directly referenced, or supportive of a local ADA transition plan? If so, how? (Y/N) <b>4</b>	Is the proposed project within the identified density thresholds for fixed route and demand response transit? (Y/N) <b>4</b>	Will the proposed project utilize a formal partnership with another entity such as a non-profit, local government, business, or human service agency? If so, which agency and what kind of partnership? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Is there a feasibility study for implementing the project, including robust documentation of needs? (Y/N) <b>15</b>	Has the operator been on time with preventative maintenance schedule? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Is the proposed expansion within EJ areas? If so, how? (Y/N) <b>10</b>	
2)	Does the proposed project cross over county boundaries? If so, where and how?(Y/N) <b>2</b>	Does the proposed project connect to another job center outside of a "Livable Center?" <b>2</b>	Cost per ton < \$1,000,000 <b>3</b>	Is the project referenced in a corresponding Title VI Plan? If so, how? (Y/N) <b>1</b>	Is the proposed project supported by a strategy in the Coordinated Transit Plan? If so which strategy(ies)? (Y/N) <b>4</b>	Does the proposed project share services, staff, or other resources with another transit operator or other human project agency? If so what and with whom? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Does the project have an identified and committed source of local match? If so, what and from whom? (Y/N) <b>10</b>	Has the operator met the required performance metrics for vehicle maintenance? (Y/N) <b>3</b>		
3)	Will proposed project increase service hours or service days? (Y/N) <b>2</b>		Cost per ton between \$1M and \$2M <b>2</b>		Is the proposed project supported by a strategy in the Long Range Plan? If so which strategy(ies)? (Y/N) <b>2</b>		Will this project be overmatched? By what percentage? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Is the operator in compliance with their Safety Plan? (Y/N) <b>2</b>		
4)	Does the proposed project provide additional connections to hospitals and other medical facilities? Please list? (Y/N) <b>1</b>						If the proposed project is a capitol project, is it on the State QPA or another identified state cooperative agreement? If so what and where? (Y/N) <b>5</b>			
	Will the proposed project decrease the wait times of passengers? If so, where and how? (Y/N) <b>1</b>									
6)	Will the proposed project connect to other transit networks? Which ones and where? If so, where and how?(Y/N) <b>1</b>									
	<b>MAX Criteria Score</b> <b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>

**TIP 2020-24 Program Scoring Sheet**

COMMITTEE: TOR  
PROGRAM: **Safety**

Criteria	Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Plan & Policy Support	Regional Plan & Policy Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Safety	Social Equity	MAX SCORE
<b>Description</b>	Safety and security for persons with disabilities <b>10</b>	N/A <b>0</b>	N/A <b>0</b>	Robust safety plan <b>10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinated Transit Plan</li> <li>Long Range Plan</li> <li>Transit Asset Management Plan</li> </ul> <b>10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other transit operators</li> <li>Local medical providers</li> <li>Non-profits</li> <li>Municipalities</li> <li>Counties</li> <li>Businesses</li> <li>(Local match, fare partnerships, service links, consolidated services)</li> </ul> <b>10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overmatch</li> <li>Dedicated local match</li> <li>Robust feasibility study</li> </ul> <b>35</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety Plan Compliance</li> <li>Performance of on-time preventative maintenance</li> <li>Meeting required performance targets for maintenance</li> </ul> <b>15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety and security of EJ passenger facilities</li> </ul> <b>10</b>	
1)	Does the proposed increase the safety and security for persons with disabilities? If so, where and how? (Y/N) <b>10</b>	N/A	N/A	Does the operator have a robust safety plan? If so, how? (Y/N) How is this project in compliance with the needs identified in the safety plan? <b>10</b>	Is the proposed capital asset compliant with your Transit Asset Management plan? If so, how? (Y/N) <b>6</b>	Will the proposed project utilize a formal partnership with another entity such as a non-profit, local government, business, or human service agency? If so, which agency and what kind of partnership? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Has the proposed project been in operation for more than three years? (Y/N) <b>20</b>	Has the operator been on time with preventative maintenance schedule? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Does the proposed passenger facility, training program, improve the overall safety of people within EJ areas? If so, how? (Y/N) <b>10</b>	
2)					Is the proposed project compatible with the Coordinated Transit Plan? If so, how? (Y/N) <b>2</b>	Does the proposed project share services, staff, or other resources with another transit operator or other human project agency? If so what and with whom? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Does the project have an identified and committed source of local match? If so, what and from whom? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Has the operator met the required performance metrics for vehicle maintenance? (Y/N) <b>5</b>		
3)					Is the proposed project compatible with the Long Range Plan? If so, how? (Y/N) <b>2</b>		Will this project be overmatched? By what percentage? (Y/N) <b>5</b>	Is the operator in compliance with their Safety Plan? (Y/N) <b>5</b>		
4)							If the proposed project is a capital project, is it on the State QPA or another identified state cooperative agreement? If so what and where? (Y/N) <b>5</b>			
5)										
<b>MAX Criteria Score</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>