

I. SCORING AND RANKING SUPPLEMENTAL

COMPASS issues an annual call for projects seeking applications for the federal and local funding sources administered by COMPASS. In response, project sponsors submit Phase I and Phase II project applications. The Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) is then responsible for recommending a ranked list of project applications to the COMPASS Board of Directors for approval.

A rank will be assigned to all project applications regardless of project type, including applications to the following funding sources:

1. Federal funds
 - a. Boise Urbanized Area:
 - i. Surface Transportation Block Grant – Transportation Management Area (STBG-TMA)
 - ii. Transportation Alternatives Program – Transportation Management Area (TAP-TMA)
 - iii. Carbon Reduction Program – Transportation Management Area (CRP-TMA)
 - b. Nampa Small Urban Area:
 - i. Surface Transportation Block Grant – Large Urban (STBG-LU)
 - ii. Carbon Reduction Program – Large Urban (CRP-LU)
2. COMPASS funds
 - a. *Communities in Motion* Implementation Grants
 - b. Project Development Program

This document outlines the ranking process and describes how projects will be evaluated. The ranking procedure is described in Section 1, and the project evaluation process (transportation improvement program [TIP] scoring) is described in Section 2. The scoring criteria are provided in full in Section 3.

1. RANKING PROCESS

Project applications go through a multi-step process between the end of the call for projects and the allocation of funds (programming). Project applications proceed to scoring, then to ranking, before funds are awarded. However, the ranking process varies depending upon the type of project submitted and the type of funding sought.

Project applications seeking federal-aid funding are scored before receiving a rank (with the exception of studies and planning products, as well as some projects eligible for CRP funds). Project applications for COMPASS funds and applications for studies and plans, as well as some applications for CRP funding remain unscored, and are ranked using a paired comparison process. Applications are assigned a CIM

Score as a component of the total score indicating their alignment with *Communities in Motion 2050* (CIM 2050). These ranking processes are described in more detail below.

Alignment with *Communities in Motion 2050*

All roadway project applications seeking federal-aid funding are first assigned a CIM Score. The CIM score is given to projects that correspond directly to all or part of a [priority project](#)¹ identified in CIM 2050, using one-tenth of the score (e.g. the CIM score is 79, the adjusted CIM score is 7.9). Applications not included on the CIM priority list do not receive additional points. Roadway projects also receive a “TIP” score.

CIM Scored projects are presented with the results of the TIP scoring process and the score assigned to the corresponding project using the [CIM 2050 scoring process](#).²

Active transportation priorities are identified in CIM 2050. Active transportation applications will be scored a “high” “medium” or “low” CIM score of 10 5 or 3 point(s) respectively. Active transportation projects also receive a TIP score.

Scored Projects: Scoring and Ranking

To aid RTAC in ranking project applications, all capital, maintenance, and intelligent transportation system (ITS) projects seeking federal funds are scored. COMPASS staff determine the score using the “TIP scoring process” (described in section 2). This scoring process evaluates each project’s contribution toward the region’s vision, goals, and performance measures described in CIM 2050.

COMPASS staff will present the results of the scoring process and a draft project ranking to RTAC members at a workshop on February 8, 2024. The draft ranking will be developed by ordering the project applications, from the highest-scoring project to the lowest-scoring project.

Once projects are ranked, COMPASS staff will present the initial ranking results to RTAC for review and discussion. After review, RTAC will recommend final rankings. COMPASS staff will allocate available funding to the highest-ranked projects. RTAC members will review the initial allocation of funding at an optional workshop on March 7, 2024, before recommending the final allocation of funding for approval.

Unscored Projects: Paired Comparison

Projects competing for COMPASS funds (Project Development Program and CIM Implementation funds) as well as federal-aid applications for plans and studies, as well as some CRP eligible projects remain unscored. Rather, these projects are ranked using the paired comparison method.

¹ [Project Priorities - Communities in Motion 2050 \(compassidaho.org\)](#)

² [CIM2050 PrioritizationProcess.pdf \(compassidaho.org\)](#)

The [paired comparison](#)³ process compares each project to every other project eligible for the same funding. Each project is paired with another competing project, and the RTAC member selects the preferred option. This process is repeated until every project is paired with and compared to every other competing project.

RTAC members will determine which of the two projects better aligns with the goals and vision of CIM 2050, as well as which projects have a higher need for the region.

RTAC members will have two weeks to complete the paired comparison process by indicating their preferences on a provided worksheet. Once the deadline passes, the responses will be compiled, and applications will be ranked based on the total number of times each is selected across all responses.

Once projects are ranked, COMPASS staff will present the initial ranking results to RTAC for review and discussion. After review, RTAC will recommend final rankings. COMPASS staff will allocate available funding to the highest-ranked projects. RTAC members will review the initial allocation of funding at an optional workshop on June 5, 2024, before recommending the final allocation of funding for approval.

2. SCORING PROCESS

All capital, maintenance, and ITS projects seeking federal funds will be scored. CIM scored projects correspond directly to a priority project in CIM 2050 and will receive both a TIP score and a CIM 2050 score. Projects that do not correspond directly to an identified CIM2050 priority project are scored only using the TIP scoring process. Each scoring process is described below.

Key regional roadway priorities were identified for CIM 2050 using a sophisticated scoring [process](#)⁴ that combined a project's contributions to the region's goals and objectives with a technical analysis describing the project's contributions to regional mobility.

This ranking process recognizes the sophistication and regional perspective of the CIM 2050 scoring process and supports the resulting priorities. All priorities identified in CIM 2050 are combined with the CIM Score and both the TIP score and (where available) the CIM 2050 score are presented.

TIP Scoring Process

The TIP scoring process will be used to further evaluate and prioritize specific project applications. Applications will be evaluated using criteria derived from the

³ <https://mse.isri.cmu.edu/facstaff/faculty1/faculty-publications/miranda/sasaopairedcomparisonexperiencereport.pdf>

⁴ [CIM2050 PrioritizationProcess.pdf \(compassidaho.org\)](#)

CIM Vision and goals and the COMPASS Performance Measure Framework. Additional COMPASS plans and policies are also integrated into the scoring criteria.

Each scored project is first categorized according to the “primary mode” impacted—roadway (auto), active transportation (bicycle and/or pedestrian), or public transportation (transit or vanpool)—and is scored with criteria developed specifically for that mode. The modal splits are further defined in the table below.

Primary Project Mode	Definition and Examples
Roadway	Auto oriented projects that improve, maintain, modify, or add vehicle travel lanes, roadway geometry, intersection design, intersection controls, and/or roadway operations. Examples: Added travel lanes, added turning lanes, roadway resurfacing, roadway realignments, intersection improvements, signal control modifications, Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO), and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) improvements.
Active Mode	Active mode user-oriented projects that improve, maintain, modify, or add active mode facilities without <i>extensive impact</i> to the roadway. ⁵ Examples: New or improved pathway, bikeway or sidewalk; improved bike or pedestrian crossings; minor operational changes benefiting pedestrians (e.g., leading pedestrian signals); traffic calming; addressing Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance issues; and/or adding permanent active mode data collection devices.
Public Transportation	Projects that improve, maintain, replace, modify, or add facilities, equipment, technologies, or capital supporting public transportation and/or vanpool services. Examples: Improving bus stops, replacing vehicles and equipment, maintaining facilities, adopting improved technology, or addressing ADA compliance issues within public transportation facilities.

Once each project application has been assigned a primary mode, it is then scored using criteria developed specifically for that mode. For example, an intersection reconfiguration or roadway resurfacing project is evaluated using different criteria than a non-motorized pathway extension or a sidewalk replacement project. The criteria for each mode are provided in full in Section 3, below.

The results of the scoring process will be summarized and provided to RTAC members prior to the workshop on February 8, 2024. At the workshop, RTAC members will have an opportunity to discuss the results and share any additional information about the projects prior to providing their input.

⁵ Here, “extensive impact” to the roadway would include a change in the number of vehicle-travel lanes but would exclude a reduction in lane widths to accommodate a pathway, for example.

Throughout the project evaluation process, instances may arise where the criteria described in Section 3 do not accurately reflect the known impact or contribution of a project. In this case, COMPASS staff will review the project and the relevant scoring criterion and may modify (increase or decrease) the points awarded. Staff will note the modification and provide a justification for the change to RTAC along with the summary of the scoring results and draft ranking.

3. SCORING CRITERIA

The criteria used to evaluate each project type are provided on pages 6–22.

Note that for all project types, the scoring summary has a maximum of 130 points. There are multiple ways for a project application to receive 130 points. If a project application is eligible for more than 130 points, only the maximum 130 points are awarded.

Roadway Project Scoring Summary

Performance Assessment:

Safety Page 7

Does the project address a known auto safety issue?	30
Does the project address a known active transportation safety issue?	30
Does the project improve safety for auto users?	10
Does the project improve safety for active transportation users?	10

Maximum Total:⁶ 40

Economic Vitality Page 8

Does the project address a congestion issue using a non-capacity adding strategy?	10
Does the project improve a facility in "fair" or "poor" condition?	10
Does the project improve freight mobility?	5

Maximum Total: 25

Convenience Page 10

Does the project improve connectivity to a regional activity center?	10
Does the project improve auto and/or active and public transportation accessibility to key destinations? ⁷	8
Does the project address a gap in the network?	11

Maximum Total:⁸ 20

Quality of Life Page 11

Does the project benefit an underserved area?	10
Does the project address any environmental impacts?	5

Maximum Total: 15

Maximum Performance Total: 100

Programming Assessment:

Readiness and Support Page 11

Is the project a priority to the sponsor agency?	10
Does the sponsor agency provide match above the required minimum?	10
Is the project ready for Federal implementation?	10

Maximum Programming Total: 30

Total Maximum Score: 130

⁶ Only a maximum of 40 points will be allocated, even if more points could be awarded.

⁷ Only applies if the previous question on regional activity centers is not applicable.

⁸ Only a maximum of 20 points will be allocated, even if more points could be awarded.

Roadway Project Scoring Criteria and Thresholds

Safety Criteria and Thresholds:

<i>Does the project address a known auto safety issue?</i>	
Points	Criteria
30	Project is located on a segment or intersection with an extensive (≥ 5) fatal and/or serious (class A) crash history within the last five years of available data AND Project addresses cause of crashes (applicant must explain how the project addresses cause of crashes).
20	Project is located on a segment or intersection with a moderate (2-4) fatal and/or serious injury (class A) crash history within the last five years with available data AND Project addresses cause of crashes (applicant must explain how the project addresses cause of crashes).
10	Project is located on a segment or intersection with one fatal crash or serious injury within the last five years with available data AND Project addresses cause of the crash (applicant must explain how the project addresses cause of crashes).
5	Project is located on a segment or intersection with a known history of non-injury crashes or near misses (applicant must submit evidence and/or documentation) AND Project addresses cause of crash or safety concern (applicant must explain how the project addresses cause of crashes).
0	Project is located on a segment or intersection with no fatal and/or serious injury (class A) crash history within the last five years with available data.
<p>Note: See the Regional crash data⁹ and Bike/Ped-Only crash map¹⁰, and the Crash Modification Factor Clearinghouse.¹¹ To qualify as a known safety issue (without a serious crash history), the applicant must describe the issue and submit supporting documentation. COMPASS staff may adjust point values awarded if the proposed improvement does not address all crash types in the project area or CMF indicates only a small improvement. Reasoning for adjustments will be provided to the applicant.</p>	

<i>Does the project address a known active transportation safety issue?</i>	
Points	Criteria
30	Project is located on a segment or intersection with extensive (≥ 3) fatal and/or injury of a bicyclist or pedestrian (class A, B, and/or C) crash history within the last five years. AND Project is expected to address cause of crashes (applicant must submit CMF).
20	Project is located on a segment or intersection with some (1-2) fatal and/or serious injury of a bicyclist or pedestrian (class A, B, and/or C) crashes within the last five years. AND

⁹ Regional Crash Data:

<https://compassidaho.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=b8f3a5ffb25843deb72a4d09b4d23c89> and [Bike/Ped-Only crash map](#):

<https://compassidaho.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=1acc624622504b03bf755967c50c1099>

¹⁰ Bike/Ped-Only crash map:

<https://compassidaho.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=1acc624622504b03bf755967c50c1099>

¹¹ CMF Clearinghouse: <https://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/>

	Project is expected to address cause of crashes (applicant must submit CMF).
5	Project is located on a segment or intersection with a known history of active transportation near misses (applicant must submit evidence and/or documentation). AND Project is expected to address cause of safety concerns (applicant must submit CMF).
0	Project is located on a segment or intersection with no fatal and/or serious injury (class A, B, and/or C) crashes or known near misses within the last five years.

<i>Does the project improve safety for auto users?</i>	
Points	Criteria
10	Project is expected to improve the safety of any facility for auto users (applicant must submit CMF ¹²).
0	Project is not expected to improve the safety of a facility for auto users.

<i>Does the project improve safety for active transportation users?</i>	
Points	Criteria
10	Conforms to national, state, or local adopted standards. ¹³
5	Project otherwise improves safety of facility for active transportation users.
0	Project is not expected to improve the safety of a facility for active transportation users.

Economic Vitality Criteria and Thresholds:

<i>Does the project address a congestion issue using a non-capacity adding strategy?</i>	
Points	Criteria
10	Project is located on a segment or intersection considered "highly congested" or "unreliable" in the COMPASS Congestion Management Process (CMP). ¹⁴ AND Project will improve congestion without adding capacity.
7	Project is located on a segment or intersection considered "moderately congested" in the COMPASS CMP. AND Project is expected to improve congestion without adding capacity.
5	Project adds capacity to a segment or intersection considered "highly congested" or "unreliable" in the COMPASS CMP.

¹² CMF Clearinghouse: <https://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/>

¹³ Standards used such as: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Bikeway Design Guide, American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO), Idaho State Public Works Construction, Idaho Transportation Department, or local agency adopted standards.

¹⁴ COMPASS Congestion Management Web app:

<https://compassidaho.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=850393d8071e4e119c7a43ed2782a0b6>

3	Project adds capacity to a segment or intersection considered “moderately congested” in the COMPASS CMP.
0	Project is not located on a congested segment.

Note: Examples of projects that improve congestion without adding capacity can be found in the [COMPASS Congestion Management Process Toolkit](#),¹⁵ the [I-84 Corridor Operations Plan](#),¹⁶ and the [Treasure Valley Transportation Systems Management and Operations \(TSMO\) Strategic Plan](#).¹⁷ The Congestion Management Process [analysis](#),¹⁸ provides congestion metrics for most roadways classified as major arterials and above. If a project addresses congestion a roadway not covered by this analysis, the applicant may submit other congestion data.

<i>Does the project improve a facility in “fair” or “poor” condition?</i>	
Points	Criteria
10	Project improves a facility (pavement, bridge deck, bridge, pathway, sidewalk) in a “poor” condition rating.
5	Project improves a facility (pavement, bridge deck, bridge, pathway, sidewalk) in a “fair” condition rating.
0	Project improves a facility (pavement, bridge deck, bridge, pathway, sidewalk) in a “good” condition rating.

Note: Facility (pavement, bridge deck, bridge, pathway, sidewalk) condition will be determined using data provided to COMPASS for performance monitoring.¹⁹ If facility condition rating is not available, the applicant must provide a condition rating and the method used to generate condition. Sponsor can check with local highway district or Idaho Transportation Department for condition data if they do not have their own

<i>Does the project improve freight mobility?</i>	
Points	Criteria
5	Project is located on a freight primary or secondary corridor per the COMPASS Complete Network Policy . ²⁰ AND Project improves freight mobility (applicant must describe compliance issue and improvement).
0	Project is not located on a freight primary or secondary corridor. OR Project does not improve freight mobility.

¹⁵ COMPASS Congestion Management Process Toolkit: <https://compassidaho.org/wp-content/uploads/2022CongestionManagementSystemTechnicalDocument.pdf>

¹⁶ COMPASS I-84 Corridor Operations Plan: https://compassidaho.org/wp-content/uploads/COMPASS_I-84_CorridorOperationsPlan_2-28-23.pdf

¹⁷ Treasure Valley Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) Strategic Plan: https://compassidaho.org/wp-content/uploads/COMPASSTSMOPlan_FINAL.pdf

¹⁸ COMPASS Congestion Management Process Performance Measures: <https://compassidaho.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=850393d8071e4e119c7a43ed2782a0b6>

¹⁹ Add facility condition data to web map.

²⁰ ArcGIS - Complete Streets Network Policy Map-Web Version: <https://www.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=15b81c9a92684b6b8c9fdfa7fd2d3639&extent=-116.7871,43.4583,-115.9179,43.8052>

Convenience Criteria and Thresholds:

<i>Does the project improve connectivity to a regional activity center?</i>	
Points	Criteria
10	Project is located within the bounds of a regional activity center.
5	Project is located within two miles of a regional activity center.
0	Project is not located within two miles of a regional activity center.
Notes: The Complete Network Policy identified regional activity centers . ²¹	

<i>If the previous question is not applicable, does the project improve auto and/or active and public transportation accessibility to key destinations?</i>	
Points	Criteria
8	Project improves auto and active and/or public transportation accessibility within 1/2 mile of many (≥ 3) key destinations (applicant must identify compliance issue and describe improvement).
6	Project improves auto accessibility within 1/2 mile of many (≥ 3) key destinations (applicant must identify compliance issue and describe improvement).
4	Project improves auto and active and/or public transportation accessibility within 1/2 mile of some (1-2) key destinations (applicant must identify compliance issue and describe improvement).
2	Project improves auto accessibility within 1/2 mile of some (1-2) key destinations (applicant must identify compliance issue and describe improvement).
0	Project does not improve auto and/or active and/or public transportation accessibility within 1/2 mile of a key destination.
Notes: Key destinations are defined as employment centers ²² , hospitals, grocery stores, public schools, parks, and transit facilities.	

<i>Does the project address a gap in the network? (Sum of all that apply)</i>	
Points	Criteria
5	Project addresses a gap in the roadway network by adding a missing segment or removing a bottleneck.
3	Project addresses a gap in the active transportation network.
3	Project includes improvements to public transportation facilities.
0	Project does not address a gap.

²¹ Complete Streets Network Policy Map:

<https://www.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=15b81c9a92684b6b8c9fdfa7fd2d3639&extent=-116.7871,43.4583,-115.9179,43.8052>

²² Employment center is defined as "downtown" or an area identified in an economic development plan. (Must be referenced)

Note: Sponsor must describe how the project addresses a gap.

Quality of Life Criteria and Thresholds:

Does the project benefit an underserved area?

Points	Criteria
10	Project is located in and will provide benefits to an underserved area as defined by the COMPASS Equity Index (applicant must explain benefit).
5	Project is not located in, but will still provide benefits to, an underserved area as defined by the COMPASS Equity Index (applicant must explain benefit).
0	Project is not located in or does not benefit an underserved area.

Note: See the [COMPASS Equity Index](#).²³ 'High' Equity score (7-12).

Does the project address any environmental impacts?

Points	Points
5	Project addresses all environmental impacts identified in the COMPASS Environmental Review Map.
3	Project address two or more environmental impacts identified in the COMPASS Environmental Review Map.
1	Project addresses at least one environmental impact identified in the COMPASS Environmental Review Map.
0	Project does not address at least one environmental impact identified in the COMPASS Environmental Review Map.

Note: See the COMPASS [Environmental Review Map](#).²⁴ The data provided were developed to inform capitol roadway project development. Applications need only respond to relevant environmental issues. Sponsor may provide supplemental documentation that shows their project addresses environmental impacts, if corridor is not included in COMPASS Environmental Review Map.

Project Readiness and Support Criteria and Thresholds:

Is the project a priority to the sponsor agency?

Points	Criteria
10	Project is the highest priority application from sponsor.
7	Project is the 2 nd highest priority application from sponsor.
5	Project is in the top half of highest priority applications from an applicant (and does not fall into a category above).
0	Project is not in the top half highest priority applications from an applicant (and does not fall into a category above).

²³ Equity index:

<https://compassidaho.maps.arcgis.com/apps/instant/portfolio/index.html?appid=6c1eebca233d49c4935825136f338fac>

²⁴ Environmental Review 2050 Map (arcgis.com)

<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/dashboards/06b44c3005564daeb2cb9b43602480b0>

<i>Does the partner agency provide match above the required minimum?</i>	
Points	Criteria
10	Agency provides more than 20% above the required local match amount.
5	Agency provides more than 10% above the required local match amount.
0	Agency provides only the required local match amount.

<i>Is the project ready for Federal implementation? (Sum of all that apply)</i>		
✓ If complete	Points	Criteria
	1	Project has a pre-concept report complete or equivalent.
	1	Project has a preliminary design complete.
	1	Project has environmental complete.
	1	Project has final design complete.
	1	Project has Right-of-Way plans complete (or not needed).
	3	Project has Right-of-Way acquired (or not needed).
	2	Project has PS&E and is ready for letting.

Active Transportation Project Scoring Summary

Performance Assessment:

Safety	Page 14
--------	---------

Does the project address a known active transportation safety issue?	30
--	----

Does the project improve safety for active transportation users?	20
--	----

Maximum Total:²⁵ 40

Economic Vitality	Page 15
-------------------	---------

Does the project address a priority gap in the active transportation network?	10
---	----

Does the project improve a facility in "fair" or "poor" condition?	10
--	----

Does the project provide an active mode alternative to a congested roadway segment?	5
---	---

Maximum Total: 25

Convenience	Page 16
-------------	---------

Does the project improve active mode connectivity to public transportation?	10
---	----

Does the project improve active mode connectivity to key destinations?	10
--	----

Maximum Total: 20

Quality of Life	Page 17
-----------------	---------

Does the project benefit an underserved area?	10
---	----

Does the project address an environmental impact?	5
---	---

Does the project address an existing Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance issue?	5
--	---

Maximum Total:²⁶ 15

Maximum Performance Total: 100

Programming Assessment:

Readiness and Support	Page 17
-----------------------	---------

Is the project a priority to the sponsor agency?	10
--	----

Does the sponsor provide match above the required minimum?	10
--	----

Is the project ready for Federal implementation?	10
--	----

Maximum Programming Total: 30

Total Maximum Score: 130

²⁵ Only a maximum of 40 points will be allocated, even if more points could be awarded.

²⁶ Only a maximum of 15 points will be allocated, even if more points could be awarded

Active Transportation Project Scoring Criteria and Thresholds

Safety Criteria and Thresholds:

<i>Does the project address a known active transportation safety issue?</i>	
Points	Criteria
30	Project is located on a segment or intersection with extensive (≥ 3) fatal and/or injury (class A, B, and/or C) bicyclist or pedestrian crashes within the last five years. AND Project is expected to address cause of crashes (applicant must explain how the project addresses cause of crashes)
20	Project is located on a segment or intersection with some (1-2) fatal and/or serious injury (class A, B, and/or C) bicyclist or pedestrian crashes within the last five years. AND Project is expected to address cause of crashes (applicant must explain how the project addresses cause of crashes).
5	Project is located on a segment or intersection with a known active transportation safety issue. AND Project is expected to address cause of safety concerns (applicant must explain how the project addresses cause of crashes).
0	Project is located on a segment or intersection with no fatal and/or serious injury (class A, B, and/or C) crashes within the last five years.
Note: See the Regional crash data , ²⁷ Bike/Ped-Only crash map , ²⁸ and the CMF Clearinghouse ²⁹ . To qualify as a known safety issue (without a serious crash history), the applicant must describe the issue and submit any documentation. COMPASS staff may adjust point values awarded if the proposed improvement does not address all crash types in the project area or CMF indicates only a small improvement. Reasoning for adjustments will be provided to applicant.	

<i>Does the project improve safety for active transportation users?</i>	
Points	Criteria
10	Project conforms to national, state, or local adopted standards. ^{30 31} The Project is expected to improve safety of active transportation users (applicant must submit CMF that shows a 25% decrease or more).
7	Project is expected to improve safety of active transportation users (applicant must submit CMF that shows a 10%-24% decrease).
5	Project is expected to improve safety of active transportation users (applicant must submit CMF that shows a 5%-10% decrease).
3	Project is expected to improve safety of active transportation users (applicant must submit CMF that shows a 1%-5% decrease).
0	Project is not expected to improve safety of active transportation users.

²⁷ Regional Crash Data:

<https://compassidaho.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=b8f3a5ffb25843deb72a4d09b4d23c89>

²⁸ Bike/Ped Only Crash Map: [Select and Export Crash Data Bike/Ped \(arcgis.com\)](#)

²⁹ CMF Clearinghouse: <https://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/>

³⁰ Standards used such as: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Bikeway Design Guide, American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO), Idaho State Public Works Construction, Idaho Transportation Department, or local agency adopted standards.

³¹ Bikeway Selection Guide: https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/tools_solve/docs/fhwasa18077.pdf

Note: Increased physical separation would include separated multi-use pathways, separated sidewalks, and bike lanes buffered with a physical curb. Increased physical separation can also include providing an alternative facility to high-speed roadways for active transportation users.

Economic Vitality Criteria and Thresholds:

Does the project address a priority gap in the active transportation network?

Points	Criteria
10	Project addresses a gap as identified in CIM 2050 Priority Corridors and Projects ³² : High Priority
5	Project addresses a gap as identified in CIM 2050 Priority Pathways ³³ : Medium/Low Priority
3	Project addresses a gap identified in Bike Walk COMPASS ³⁴
0	Project does not address an active transportation gap.

Note: See the [COMPASS Bike-Ped Priority Gaps](#).³⁵

Does the project improve a facility in "fair" or "poor" condition?

Points	Criteria
5	Project improves a facility (pavement, bridge deck, bridge, pathway, sidewalk) with a "poor" condition rating.
3	Project improves a facility (pavement, bridge deck, bridge, pathway, sidewalk) with a "fair" condition rating.
3	Adds a new facility where none previously existed.
0	Project improves a facility (pavement, bridge deck, bridge, pathway, sidewalk) with a "good" condition rating.

Note: Facility condition rating is determined using the rating provided by the COMPASS [Data Bike program](#)³⁶ (only applicable to off system pathways). If a rating is not available, the applicant may request one by contacting COMPASS staff.

Does the project provide an active mode alternative to a congested roadway segment?

Points	Criteria
--------	----------

³² CIM 2050 Priority Corridors and Projects : <https://cim2050.compassidaho.org/wp-content/uploads/PriorityProjectsPathway.pdf> for CIM 2050 Prioritized Regional Pathways: <https://cim2050.compassidaho.org/wp-content/uploads/ActiveTransportation.pdf> (page 6)

³³ CIM 2050 Prioritized Regional Pathways: <https://cim2050.compassidaho.org/wp-content/uploads/ActiveTransportation.pdf> (page 6)

³⁴ Bike Walk COMPASS: <https://compassidaho.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8a567a39377a46bfb7e38f8172261809>

³⁵ COMPASS Bike-Ped Priority Gaps: <https://compassidaho.maps.arcgis.com/apps/instant/portfolio/index.html?appid=6c1eebca233d49c4935825136f338fa>

³⁶ Bicycle and Pedestrian Counters: <https://compassidaho.org/bicycle-and-pedestrian-counters/>

5	Project runs parallel to (within 1/4 mile) a roadway segment considered “highly congested” and/or “unreliable” in the COMPASS Congestion Management Process (CMP). AND Project provides or improves active transportation facilities or connections.
3	Project runs parallel to (1/4 mile) a roadway segment considered “moderately congested” in the COMPASS CMP. AND Project provides or improves active transportation facilities or connections.
0	Project is not located on a congested segment per the COMPASS CMP.

Note: The [CMP analysis](#)³⁷ provides congestion metrics for most roadways classified as major arterials and above. If a project addresses congestion on a roadway covered in the CMP, other congestion data may be included.

Convenience Criteria and Thresholds:

<i>Does the project improve active mode connectivity to public transportation?</i>	
Points	Criteria
10	Project improves active transportation connectivity along a corridor with current public transportation service ³⁸ .
5	Project improves active transportation connectivity along a corridor with planned public transportation service per CIM 2050. ³⁹
0	Project is not located along any current or planned public transportation corridor and does not directly support public transportation.

<i>Does the project improve active mode connectivity to key destinations?</i>	
Points	Criteria
10	Project improves active transportation facilities within the bounds of a regional activity center. OR Project improves active transportation facilities within 1/2 mile of several (3 or more) key destinations
5	Improves active transportation facilities within 1/2 mile of some (1-2) key destinations.
5	Improves active transportation facilities within 1/2 mile of a regional activity center.
0	Project does not improve active mode connections to a regional activity center or key destinations.

³⁷ CMP Analysis:

<https://compassidaho.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=850393d8071e4e119c7a43ed2782a0b6>

³⁸ Inquire with Valley Regional Transit for details.

³⁹ Funded Routes:

<https://compassidaho.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?webmap=41e9ca50ff264abb82efde7bdb79dfb3>

Note: The Complete Network Policy identified [regional activity centers](#).⁴⁰ Notes: Key destinations are defined as employment centers⁴¹, hospitals, grocery stores, public schools, parks, and transit facilities..

Quality of Life Criteria and Thresholds:

Does the project benefit an underserved area?

Points	Criteria
10	Project is located in and will provide benefits to an underserved area as defined by the COMPASS Equity Index (applicant must explain benefit).
5	Project is not located in, but will still provide benefits to, an underserved area as defined by the COMPASS Equity Index (applicant must explain benefit).
0	Project is not located in or does not benefit an underserved area.

Note: See the [COMPASS equity index](#).⁴² High' Equity score is (7-12).

Does the project address any environmental impacts?

Points	Criteria
5	Project addresses all environmental impacts identified in COMPASS Environmental Review Map.
3	Project address two or more environmental impacts identified in the COMPASS Environmental Review Map.
1	Project addresses at least one environmental impact identified in COMPASS Environmental Review Map
0	Project does not address at least one environmental impact identified in the COMPASS Environmental Review Map.

Note: See the [COMPASS Environmental Review Map](#).⁴³ The data provided were developed to inform capitol roadway project development. Applications need only respond to relevant environmental issues. Applicant may provide supplemental documentation that shows their project addresses environmental impacts, if corridor is not included in COMPASS Environmental Review Map.

Does the project address an existing Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance issue?

Points	Criteria
5	Project addresses an existing ADA compliance issue (applicant must identify the compliance issue and describe improvement).

⁴⁰ Complete Streets and Regional Activity Centers:

<https://www.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=15b81c9a92684b6b8c9fdfa7fd2d3639&extent=-116.7871,43.4583,-115.9179,43.8052>

⁴¹ Employment center is defined as "downtown", or an area identified in an economic development plan. (Must be referenced)

⁴² CIM 2050 Equity Index:

<https://compassidahomaps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?webmap=a76f5dd73f6442129cf92761c8318707>

⁴³ Environmental Considerations Project Summary:

<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/dashboards/06b44c3005564daeb2cb9b43602480b0>

0	Project does not address an existing ADA compliance issue.
---	--

Project Readiness and Support Criteria and Thresholds:

<i>Is the project a priority to the sponsor agency?</i>	
Points	Criteria
10	Project is the highest priority application from sponsor.
5	Project is the 2 nd highest priority application from sponsor.
3	Project is in the top half of highest priority applications from an applicant (and does not fall into a category above).
0	Project is not in the top half of highest priority applications from an applicant (and does not fall into a category above).

<i>Does the sponsor agency provide match above the required minimum?</i>	
Points	Criteria
10	Agency provides more than 20% above the required local match amount.
5	Agency provides more than 10% above the required local match amount.
0	Agency provides only the required local match amount.

<i>Is the project ready for Federal implementation? (Sum of all that apply)</i>		
✓ If complete	Points	Criteria
	1	Project has a pre-concept report complete or equivalent.
	1	Project has a preliminary design complete.
	1	Project has environmental complete.
	1	Project has final design complete.
	1	Project has Right-of-Way plans complete (or not needed).
	3	Project has Right-of-Way acquired (or not needed).
	2	Project has PS&E and is ready for letting.

Public Transportation Project Scoring Summary

Performance Assessment:

Safety	Page 20
Does the project address a known safety issue for public transportation users?	40
Does the project improve safety for public transportation users?	20
Maximum Total:⁴⁴	40

Economic Vitality	Page 20
Does the project replace a vehicle (rolling stock) or equipment, and/or improve a facility consistent with the priorities of the Transit Asset Management Group (TAM) plan?	10
Does the project reduce travel time, improve speed and/or reliability of service?	10
Does the project include the purchase or maintenance of electric vehicles or related equipment?	5
Maximum Total:	25

Convenience	Page 21
Does the project improve public transportation access to regional activity centers?	10
Does the project address an existing Americans with Disability Act (ADA) compliance issue?	5
Does the project improve route transparency and information at transit connections?	5
Maximum Total:	20

Quality of Life	Page 21
Does the project benefit an area with potentially transit dependent populations?	10
Does the project adequately address any environmental impact?	5
Maximum Total:	15

Maximum Performance Total: 100

Programming Assessment:

Readiness and Support	Page 22
Is the project a priority to the sponsor agency or is the project in the TDP?	10
Does the sponsor agency provide match above the required minimum?	10
Is the project ready for Federal implementation?	10
Maximum Programming Total:	30

Total Maximum Score: 130

Public Transportation Project Scoring Criteria and Thresholds

Safety Criteria and Thresholds:

<i>Does the project address a known safety issue for public transportation users?</i>	
Points	Criteria
40	Project addresses a known safety issue for public transportation users (applicant must describe safety concern and improvement).
0	Project does not address a known safety issue.
Note: Public transportation users include cyclists and pedestrians in the immediate vicinity of a public transportation connection.	

<i>Does the project improve safety for public transportation users?</i>	
Points	Criteria
20	Project improves upon existing safety measures already in place.
0	Project does not improve upon existing safety measures already in place.

Economic Vitality Criteria and Thresholds:

<i>Does the project replace a vehicle (rolling stock), maintain equipment, and/or improve a facility consistent with the priorities of the Transportation Asset Management Group (TAM) plan? (sum of all that apply)</i>	
Points	Criteria
10	Project replaces a vehicle, maintains equipment, and improves a facility consistent with the priorities of the TAM plan.
10	Project reduces travel time, improves the speed and/or reliability of service.
0	Project does not replace a vehicle, maintain equipment, or improve a facility consistent with the priorities of the TAM plan or does not reduce travel time, does not improve the speed and/or reliability of service.
Note: See Valley Regional Transit's Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plan . ⁴⁵	

<i>Does the project include the purchase or maintenance of electric vehicles or related equipment?</i>	
Points	Criteria
5	Project includes the purchase or maintenance of electric vehicles or related equipment.
0	Project does not include the purchase or maintenance of electric vehicles or related equipment.

⁴⁵ VRT TAM Plan: <https://www.valleyregionaltransit.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/2021TAMPlan.pdf>

Convenience Criteria and Thresholds:

<i>Does the project improve public transportation access to regional activity centers?</i>	
Points	Criteria
10	Project directly improves access within Regional Activity Centers.
5	Project indirectly supports public transportation access regionally.
0	Project does not support access to a Regional Activity Center
Note: The Complete Network Policy identifies regional activity centers . ⁴⁶ A project that “directly improves access” would include, but is not limited to, the addition of or improvements to pedestrian facilities, bike lanes, bus stops, or technology	

<i>Does the project address an existing Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance issue?</i>	
Points	Criteria
5	Project addresses a known ADA compliance issue.
0	Project does not address a known ADA compliance issue.

<i>Does the project improve route transparency and rider information at transit connections?</i>	
Points	Criteria
5	Project improves route transparency and rider information.
0	Project does not improve route transparency and rider information.
Note: Examples of projects that improve route transparency and rider information would include, but are not limited to, route schedules and timetables, dynamic “next arriving” signs, wayfinding, other technology informing riders.	

Quality of Life Criteria and Thresholds:

<i>Does the project benefit an area with potentially transit dependent populations?</i>	
Points	Criteria
10	Project directly improves connectivity or accessibility to an area with potentially transit dependent populations as defined by the COMPASS Equity Index (applicant must explain benefit).
5	Project indirectly benefits potentially transit dependent populations.
0	Project does not improve connectivity or accessibility of transit dependent populations.

⁴⁶ Complete Streets and Regional Activity Centers:

<https://www.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=15b81c9a92684b6b8c9fdaf7fd2d3639&extent=-116.7871,43.4583,-115.9179,43.8052>

Note: See the [COMPASS Equity Index](#).⁴⁷

Does the project address any environmental impacts?

Points	Criteria
5	Project addresses all environmental impacts identified in COMPASS Environmental Review Map.
3	Project address two or more environmental impacts identified in the COMPASS Environmental Review Map.
1	Project addresses at least one environmental impact identified in COMPASS Environmental Review Map.
0	Project does not address at least one environmental impact identified in the COMPASS Environmental Review Map.

Note: See the [COMPASS Environmental Review Map](#).⁴⁸ The data provided were developed to inform capitol roadway project development. Applications need only respond to relevant environmental issues. Applicant may provide supplemental documentation that shows their project addresses environmental impacts if corridor is not included in COMPASS Environmental Review Map.

Project Readiness and Support Criteria and Thresholds:

Is the project a priority to the sponsor agency?

Points	Criteria
10	Project is the highest priority application from sponsor and must be identified in the Transportation Development Plan (TDP) ⁴⁹ .
7	Project is the 2 nd highest priority application from sponsor and must be identified in the TDP ⁵⁰ .
5	Project is in the top half of highest priority applications from an applicant (and does not fall into a category above).
0	Project is not in the top half of highest priority applications from an applicant (and does not fall into a category above).

Does the partner agency provide match above the required minimum?

Points	Criteria
10	Agency provides more than 20% above the required local match amount.
5	Agency provides more than 10% above the required local match amount.
0	Agency provides only the required local match amount.

⁴⁷ COMPASS Equity Index:

<https://compassidaho.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?webmap=a76f5dd73f6442129cf92761c8318707>

⁴⁸ Environmental Considerations Project Summary:

<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/dashboards/06b44c3005564daeb2cb9b43602480b0>

⁴⁹ Transportation Development Plan: <https://www.valleyregionaltransit.org/planning/tdp/>

⁵⁰ Transportation Development Plan: <https://www.valleyregionaltransit.org/planning/tdp/>

<i>Is the project ready for Federal implementation? (Sum of all that apply)</i>		
✓ If complete	Points	Criteria
	1	Project has a pre-concept report complete or equivalent or N/A.
	1	Project has a preliminary design complete or N/A.
	1	Project has environmental complete or N/A.
	1	Project has final design complete or N/A.
	1	Project has Right-of-Way plans complete or N/A.
	3	Project has Right-of-Way acquired or N/A.
	2	Project has PS&E and is ready for letting or N/A.
Note: Public transportation projects may follow a different implementation sequence. Public transportation projects may have some criteria that is not applicable (i.e., a bus purchase does not require design plans). This is taken into consideration in evaluating project readiness.		