Enhancements to Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Evaluation and Selection
Project Goals

Enhance...
  • Application Process
  • Coordination and Communication
  • Bike/Ped project evaluation/selection

In order to...
  • Get good projects on the ground!
Process Overview

- Review existing programs, practices
- Review best practices of peer regions
- Recommend enhancements
- Demonstrate application of enhancements
Review Existing Programs & Practices

- Stakeholder meetings
- Staff
- ARC program materials
Existing Programs

Application Process and Requirements Vary
Stakeholder Feedback Highlights

• More clarity among ARC’s transp. funding programs
• Many locals do not have robust data resources
• Before/after evaluation important
• Locals should provide better verification of constraints, more project context
• Quality of experience important
• Dense areas, transit connections, schools most important focus areas
Health

- Mainly about access to jobs, healthcare providers, healthy food
- Safety/injury
- Age, income also important to look at, but less useful in less densely pop. areas
### Best Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Streamlined application process (i.e. targeting project types to programs)</th>
<th>Clear, easy-to-access program information</th>
<th>Formalized information sharing and technical assistance</th>
<th>Emphasis on quantitative criteria</th>
<th>Post evaluation and reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg-Union MPO (MUMPO)</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Texas Council Governments (NCTCG))</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Region Council of Governments (DRCOG)</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG)</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Council (Twin Cities)</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO)</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process

- Two-stage application process
  - Unified “Expression of Interest” (i.e. “letter of interest”)
  - Full Application Schedule Based on Funding Program
- Internal/external review
- More predictable call for projects
Communication/Coordination

- Webpage content
- Pre-application and post-award meetings
- Staff assistance
- Internal staff trainings
Questions

• Does two-stage process make sense?
• Where can ARC staff offer the most service to local staff?
• What guidelines should be offered for project calls?
Evaluation Criteria

- 3 regional emphasis areas:
  - Safety
  - Mobility
  - Economic Development

- Project Evaluation:
  - Screening criteria
  - Technical evaluation criteria
Evaluation Criteria: Safety

Screening Criteria
• Crashes/crash rate

Technical Criteria
• Crash reduction factor
• Crash risk reduction
Evaluation Criteria: Mobility

Screening Criteria
• Connectivity-fills gaps/removes barrier

Technical Criteria
• VMT – high potential for mode shift
• Level of service – quality of facility
Evaluation Criteria: Economic Development

Screening Criteria
• Access – activity centers, transit

Technical Criteria
• Demand – actual or latent
• Equity – socioeconomic
• Health – access to resources
# Recommendations

## Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Criteria</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>Economic Development</th>
<th>Local Sponsor Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crashes</td>
<td>Crashes</td>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure/risk reduction</td>
<td>Exposure/risk reduction</td>
<td>VMT reduction</td>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>Urgency/timeliness of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash reduction/ modification factors</td>
<td>Crash reduction/ modification factors</td>
<td>Level of service/ traffic stress</td>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Supportive policies and programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Weight</th>
<th>Med. Weight</th>
<th>Low Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Technical Criteria**

- Crash reduction/ modification factors
- Level of service/ traffic stress
- Equity
- Health

- Previous performance
- Project readiness/ maturity of concept
Recommendations

Project Evaluation and Reporting

**ARC Role:** establish reporting method and performance measures

**Project Sponsor Role:** collect and analyze data, report findings
Process Recommendation

1. Shortlisted Projects
   - Regional Vision and Focus Areas
   - Technical Assistance
   - Regional Crash Data & Hotspot Map
   - Local Plan/CIP

2. Project Screening
   - General Need & Purpose Statement
   - Project Scope & Limits
   - Supporting Data: Safety, Mobility, Econ. Dev.
   - Budget, Phasing and Supporting Documentation

3. Selected Projects
   - Safety Criteria
   - Mobility Criteria
   - Economic Development Criteria
   - Local Sponsor Commitment (Supporting Policies, Prev. Perform)

4. Technical Evaluation/Project Selection
   - Pre-submittal Workshop
   - Post-Award Meeting
   - Post-Evaluation and Reporting
Demonstration – Intersection Safety Project

- **Project Identification**
  - Look at regional crash data

- **Project Screening**
  - High # of crashes associated with turning vehicles
  - Define project scope, limits
  - Assemble supporting data (field assessment)
  - Budget/phasing (likely single phase)

- **Technical Evaluation /Project Selection**
  - CRFs/CMFs available?
  - Or how is crash risk being reduced?

- **Post-Evaluation and Reporting**
Questions

• Are “emphasis areas” and criteria a good way to view bike/ped projects and impacts? Are the relative weighting levels correct?
• Are the "local sponsor commitment" criteria reasonable ways to assess projects?
• Should emphasis areas impacts be assessed independently or against each other?
• How can the “emphasis” areas and criteria best be tied back to long-range planning resources?