



## SJTPO PROJECT EVALUATION PROCESS

Through the development of this iteration of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2050 update, staff worked to review and update the Project Evaluation Process, which is used to aid in selecting projects for inclusion in the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) and RTP. The TIP includes projects programmed in the near term, years 1-10, whereas the RTP also encompasses projects programmed for years 11 and beyond. There are distinct differences between these two project timelines, necessitating tailored evaluation approaches. Near-term projects (1-10 years) can be assessed with greater accuracy and detail due to the availability of comprehensive information. In contrast, long-term projects (11+ years) are evaluated more broadly, focusing on their potential impact and alignment with strategic emphasis areas despite the limited information available at this stage. This dual approach ensures that both immediate and future transportation needs are addressed effectively within the planning framework. Additionally, both approaches allow the opportunity for feedback and adjustments.

As part of both approaches, projects are evaluated using criteria focusing on the Performance-Based Planning Process, RTP Goals (Planning Factors), and SJTPO Planning Initiatives. Those projects in years 1-10 will first be reviewed using a Pre-Evaluation Screening Process, which evaluates projects, not simply to passively assess the quality of the project but actively encourage improvements to projects to better align with regional, state, and federal guidance and priorities, such as safety, Complete Streets, Environmental Justice, and other priorities. The elements of the Pre-Evaluation Screening Process, as well as Performance-Based Planning and SJTPO Planning Initiatives, will be used in the evaluation of projects anticipated in Years 11 and beyond. In addition to a numerical score, feedback and the notation of the potential for the project to impact the various criteria will be shared. This allows the projects to better align with the identified priorities earlier in the project development process.



## Project Evaluation Submissions Process

Sponsors of proposed projects for consideration in the SJTPO TIP and RTP are asked to submit the information below. The submission items include basic project information that focuses on an expanded project description narrative, as appropriate to the project, to assist in the planning-level evaluation of potential projects. For projects anticipated in years 11 and beyond, some of the more detailed information may not be applicable. Specific information, based on the anticipated project year, is noted below:

### Projects Anticipated in Years 1-10

1. Project Name
2. County, Municipality
3. SRI, Route, Roadway Name
4. Structure # (if applicable)
5. Milepost of the beginning and end points of every segment or intersection
6. General project narrative: Describe existing conditions and issues, as well as the project description, in as much detail as possible. Things to consider when writing a narrative include:
  - Impact on congestion, if any
  - Impact on non-vehicular modes and users without vehicular access
  - Was the impact on disadvantaged users considered and addressed? If so, how?
  - Impact on tourism, if any. Factors may include but are not limited to the promotion of regional trails, byways, and access to shore areas or other tourism amenities in the region
  - Impact on freight movement, if any
  - Safety issues present and considerations given to targeted or systemic safety solutions, including rumble strips, Safety Edge, upgrades to ADA ramps or other amenities
  - Bridge condition (i.e., Structurally Deficient, Functionally Obsolete, or Scour Critical), if applicable
7. Phases of work requested with Project Cost Estimate for each fiscal year of request
8. AADTs for the project corridor or intersection and the year of AADTs
9. Any relevant truck counts, traffic counts, traffic projections, travel time studies, HCS capacity analyses, SYNCHRO studies, if available
10. Number (and width) of lanes and shoulders – (Existing and Proposed), if applicable
11. Year of completion and/or Open to Traffic
12. NJDOT projects should also include scores from the Pavement Management System, Safety Management System, Congestion Management System, and other system scores as relevant to the project

### Projects Anticipated in Years 11+

1. Project Name
2. County, Municipality
3. SRI, Route, Roadway Name
4. Structure # (if applicable)
5. Milepost of the beginning and end points of every segment or intersection
6. Purpose and Need for the Project
7. Phases of work requested with Project Cost Estimate for each fiscal year of request
8. Year of completion and/or Open to Traffic
9. NJDOT projects should also include scores from the Pavement Management System, Safety Management System, Congestion Management System, and other system scores as relevant to the project
10. Has the project been subject to previous studies?
11. Has the project been referenced in a County/Municipal Master Plan?



The Project Pre-Evaluation and Evaluation Processes will be conducted by SJTPO staff and will be coordinated with the project sponsor, the SJTPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and the Policy Board, as described below. The Project Pre-Evaluation shall only be conducted for projects anticipated in Years 1-10.

1. SJTPO staff will pre-scan materials received to ensure necessary items have been included and will follow up with project sponsors, if needed
2. SJTPO staff will review the proposed year of completion and/or Open to Traffic to determine which scoring criteria are appropriate (Years 1-10 or Years 11+)
3. SJTPO staff will conduct a site visit of the project location, as required or appropriate given the proposed year of completion
4. SJTPO staff will conduct a Pre-Evaluation Screening of proposed projects and will reach out to sponsors with any clarifications or to discuss recommendations for improvements applicable to projects in Years 1-10 only
5. SJTPO staff will divide Scoring based on areas of expertise and conduct initial Project Evaluation Scoring
6. SJTPO staff will meet to discuss the results of the initial Project Evaluation Scoring and finalize the Draft Scoring
7. SJTPO Executive Director will conduct an overall final internal review of Draft Scoring
8. SJTPO staff will send a Draft Scoring of projects to their sponsors for review and comment, offering clarification and providing additional information, if necessary
9. SJTPO staff will make edits to the Scoring, if needed, based on information from sponsors and finalize Draft Scoring Recommendations
9. SJTPO staff will submit Draft Scoring Recommendations to the TAC for review, comment, and final recommendation to the Policy Board. If the final TAC recommendation deviates from the written Evaluation Criteria and Scoring, supporting documentation (explanation) will be included
10. SJTPO staff will submit TAC Final Scoring Recommendations to the Policy Board for approval

## Projects Anticipated in Years 1-10

The emphasis areas for projects planned within the next 1-10 years are paramount to SJTPO's planning efforts. Unlike long-term projects, those within this shorter timeframe can be assessed more accurately regarding their impacts on these emphasis areas. Detailed project information is typically available, allowing for a thorough evaluation of the various criteria.

### Project Pre-Evaluation Screening *applicable only for projects anticipated in Years 1-10*

Before a project is advanced for prioritization using the project evaluation process, SJTPO will assess projects for the following items to address opportunities to enhance projects to better meet federal, state, and regional guidance, targets, and priorities. Additionally, this feedback is intended to help local public agencies adjust and enhance to ensure their projects and the scope of work aligns closely with the identified planning priorities. In addition to a desk review, this assessment will include a site visit by SJTPO staff to the project location to better understand the context of the project.

#### **A. Substantive safety considerations are incorporated as appropriate**

All projects will be evaluated for their ability to improve safety for all users. Safety design elements should be incorporated into all projects as they are relevant to their context, including roadway characteristics, crash history, and constraints. SJTPO will aid applicants to ensure appropriate safety countermeasures are considered in all projects.

The New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) developed Network Screening Lists for each county in the SJTPO region. Five high crash location lists were developed for Roadway Corridors, Pedestrian/Bicycle Corridors, Intersections, High-Risk Rural Roads, and Pedestrian/Bicycle Intersections.



SJTPO engaged consultant support to develop Countywide Local Road Safety Plans for each county. The plans included a comprehensive approach to safety, focusing on mitigating past crashes (Hot Spot Approach) and mitigating crash risk (Systemic Approach). This dual approach to reducing and ultimately eliminating roadway deaths allows for creating a Candidate Project Location and Systemic Intersection and Corridor Lists.

Projects appearing on the Top 50 of the Network Screening Lists or on any of the lists developed as part of the Countywide Local Road Safety Plans will be evaluated with greater scrutiny to ensure that the safety issues contributing to their crash performance are addressed in any MPO-funded projects.

**B. Context-appropriate design is included, as dictated by the project location**

All projects will be evaluated to ensure they adhere to context-sensitive Complete Streets design principles. The [New Jersey Complete Streets Design Guide](#) will assist in this effort. This evaluation will emphasize context-appropriate design, which will likely require more accommodation in urban contexts and less in rural contexts. Any accommodation shall align with Environmental Justice considerations and must reflect realistic constraints, such as environmental and permitting issues, right-of-way, and property conflicts.

Projects located within a Complete Streets Priority Area will be evaluated with greater scrutiny to ensure that the context of the location, land use, and needs of users are addressed in any MPO-funded projects.

**C. Environmental Justice**

All projects will be evaluated to ensure they adhere to federal requirements for Environmental Justice, which dictate that projects may not create burdens on any Environmental Justice population greater than burdens on Non-Environmental Justice populations. It similarly requires that any Environmental Justice population receive benefits equal to those of Non-Environmental Justice populations. Benefits and burdens may include, but are not limited to, safety, inclusion of non-vehicular modes, environmental impacts, and impacts on quality of life. If any project does not adhere to these Environmental Justice principles, then mitigation or accommodation will need to be included to ensure that benefits are at least shared equally with these populations and that project burdens do not fall disproportionately on these populations. SJTPO will also need to evaluate the pool of projects in their totality to ensure that project improvements are not disproportionately concentrated in areas that do not benefit Environmental Justice populations.

**D. Freight Considerations**

All projects will be evaluated on their potential impact on freight activity, with the objective being to align the project with the goals and recommendations in SJTPO's Regional Freight Plan, as appropriate. Consideration will include if the project is in or near one (or more) Recommended Regional Actions, as referenced in the 2024 Regional Freight Plan, or if the project is in the vicinity of a high concentration of freight activity, or if the project is on or near roadways with high truck volumes (i.e., truck volumes exceeding 10% of total traffic volume), or located in the vicinity of non-truck related freight facilities.

**E. Requested projects align with available funding**

All project requests will be evaluated against available funds by year and by Urbanized Area funding pool (200K+, 50-200K, 5-50K, and <5K).

**F. Air Quality Assessment**

If the project is determined to be "Regionally Significant" and thus not exempt from SJTPO air quality conformity, as defined by the SJTPO Interagency Group, SJTPO shall ensure that all necessary data has been collected and assessment of air quality impact has been evaluated.



## Project Evaluation Criteria and Scoring

The following tables describe the planning level evaluation criteria to be used by the professional judgment of SJTPO staff to develop a score that reflects the adherence of projects to federal, state, and SJTPO planning priorities and mandates. Sections 1 and 2 reflect the degree to which projects support performance-based planning targets and SJTPO planning initiatives. In addition, Sections 1 and 2 align with the RTP planning goals, which are noted under each criterion. Section 3 measures the project's potential impact, while Section 4 measures the project's cost-effectiveness. Criteria where no data are provided and unavailable to SJTPO will receive zero points. These criteria and Scoring apply only for projects anticipated in Years 1-10.

Except for Pavement Condition and Bridge Condition, all criteria will be scored based on a professional qualitative assessment of the degree to which the proposed projects, as described, will advance the criteria below. A project shall be scored using Pavement Condition or Bridge Condition criteria. If the project improvement is for a bridge, the Pavement Condition score for the project shall receive 0 points. Conversely, the Bridge Condition score shall receive 0 points if the project includes repaving.

1. Contributions to Performance-Based Planning Targets		75 Points
(Categories adapted from performance measures established under federal legislation)		
Evaluation Criteria	Points	Scoring Instructions
<b>Traffic Congestion</b> (RTP Goal 2: Mitigate Traffic Congestion and promote efficient system operation)	0-15	To what degree will the project improve traffic congestion?
<b>Pavement Condition</b> (RTP Goal 3: Restore, Preserve, and Maintain the existing transportation system)	0-15	<p>If the project includes repaving in the scope, what is the Surface Distress Index (SDI) from the SJTPO Pavement Management System or International Roughness Index (IRI) based on the NJDOT IRI Guidelines?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SJTPO SDI 0–1 (Very Poor) or NJ IRI Deficient = 15 points</li> <li>• SJTPO SDI &gt; 1–2 (Poor) or NJ IRI Fair = 12 points</li> <li>• SJTPO SDI &gt; 2–3 (Fair) = 5 points</li> <li>• SJTPO SDI &gt; 3–4 (Good) or NJ IRI Good = 2 points</li> <li>• SJTPO SDI &gt; 4–5 (Very Good) or NJ IRI Excellent or no data = 0 points</li> </ul> <p>The NJ IRI Guidelines are scored as Excellent, Good, Fair, and Deficient based on both IRI scores and three categories of roadways, including 1.) Interstate Freeways NHS Highways, 2.) Non-NHS Highways, and 3.) Other County Highways. For roadways that have an SJTPO SDI score, those numbers will serve as the primary indicator of condition.</p>
<b>OR</b>		
<b>Bridge Condition</b> (RTP Goal 3: Restore, Preserve, and Maintain the existing transportation system)	0,5,10,15	<p>Bridge projects will be scored as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridges deemed "Structurally Deficient" will receive 15 points</li> <li>• Bridges deemed "Functionally Obsolete" or "Scour Critical" will receive 10 points</li> <li>• Projects that preserve or restore all other bridges will receive 5 points</li> <li>• All other projects will receive 0 points</li> </ul>



<b>Freight Movement</b> <i>(RTP Goal 4: Support the Regional Economy)</i>	0-15	To what degree will the project improve freight movement on the regional network?
<b>Fatalities and Serious Injuries</b> <i>(RTP Goal 7: Improve Transportation Safety)</i>	0-15	To what degree will the project improve safety for drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians through the advancement of substantive safety improvements?  Projects that only improve driver safety can receive no more than 10 points.
<b>On-Road Mobile Source Emissions</b> <i>(RTP Goal 9: Protect and enhance the Environment and complement land use planning)</i>	0-15	To what degree will the project reduce or mitigate on-road mobile source emissions?
<b>SECTION 1 TOTAL</b>	0-75	Sum of scores for <b>all five</b> Evaluation Criteria in this category.

**2. Advances Emphasis Areas from SJTPO Planning Initiatives 25 Points**

<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Scoring Instructions</i>
<b>Environmental Justice</b> <i>(RTP Goal 1: Promote Accessibility and Mobility for the Movement of People and Goods)</i>  <i>Environmental Justice (EJ) Areas are defined as a block group that meets the following criteria: the number of Minorities is greater or equal to 45%, AND the number of Low-Income residents is greater than or equal to 22%.</i>  <i>Transportation Justice (TJ) Areas included additional criteria, including the number of residents aged 75 or over, Households with no vehicle available, and households with a disabled resident, whose values are greater than 0.5 standard deviations over the regional average.</i>	0-5	<p>As Section C of the Project Pre-Evaluation Screening describes, all projects must mitigate or eliminate any disproportionate burdens imposed by a project and provide equal benefits to Environmental Justice populations to advance.</p> <p>Using the SJTPO Environmental Justice (EJ) Report, Approved November 27, 2023, projects are evaluated based on their being in an EJ Area and using criteria to define TJ Areas. Projects are evaluated based on the degree to which the project benefits these populations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0-5 points: The project is in an EJ Area <b>and</b> in a TJ area</li> <li>• 0-3 points: The project is in an EJ Area <b>or</b> TJ area</li> </ul>
<b>Flood Zones</b> <i>(RTP Goal 5: Improve the Resiliency and Reliability of the transportation infrastructure, particularly along the Atlantic and Delaware Bay shorelines)</i>	0-5	<p>Projects within the most recent FEMA 1 Percent (100-year) floodplain will be evaluated for their ability to improve the performance of that facility in flood conditions and receive a score of 0-5 points.</p> <p>Projects within the most recent FEMA 0.2 Percent (500-year) floodplain will be similarly evaluated and receive a score of 0-2 points.</p> <p>More information about these floodplains is available at <a href="http://www.fema.gov/flood-zones">www.fema.gov/flood-zones</a>.</p>





<b>Tourism</b> <i>(RTP Goal 6: Increase and enhance opportunities for Travel and Tourism)</i>	0-5	Projects will be evaluated for their ability to enhance tourism in the region and will receive a score of 0-5 points. Factors may include but are not limited to, the promotion of regional trails, byways, and access to shore areas or other tourism amenities in the region.
<b>Complete Streets / Context Appropriate Design</b> <i>(RTP Goal 8: Enhance the Integration and Connectivity of the transportation system)</i>	0-5	Projects located within a Complete Streets Priority Area will be evaluated for their meaningful incorporation of Complete Streets elements and will receive a score of 0-5 points.  Projects not in these areas will be similarly evaluated and receive a score of 0-3 points.
<b>Evacuation Routes</b> <i>(RTP Goal 10: Improve Security)</i>	0-5	Projects on roadways designated as Evacuation Routes will be evaluated for their ability to improve evacuation and receive a score of 0-5 points.  Projects on roadways designated as Secondary Evacuation Routes will be evaluated for their ability to improve evacuation and receive a score of 0-3 points.
<b>SECTION 2 TOTAL</b>	0-25	Sum of scores for <b>all five</b> Evaluation Criteria in this category.

3. Impact of Project			10 Points
Evaluation Criteria	Points	Scoring Instructions	
<b>Weighted Length of Project</b>	1-5	<p>The weighted length of the project will be calculated using the following formula:</p> $\left( \frac{\text{Number of lanes}}{2} + \frac{\text{Number of shoulders}}{4} \times \right) \text{centerline miles} = \text{weighted length of project}$ <p>Shoulder for the purposes of assessing project length, will only include a shoulder of 5 feet in width or greater as such a facility has the potential to serve as a bicycle facility.</p> <p>The weighted length of the project will be scored as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weighted project length of greater than 4 miles will receive 5 points</li> <li>• Weighted project length of between 0.5 and 4 miles will receive 3 points</li> <li>• Weighted project length of less than 0.5 miles will receive 1 point</li> <li>• Intersection projects will receive 2 points for one intersection and receive 1 additional point for each intersection, up to 5 points</li> </ul>	
<b>Volume of Corridor</b>	1-5	<p>Bi-directional Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes of the project corridor will be scored as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corridor AADT of greater than 8,000 vehicles per day will receive 5 points</li> <li>• Corridor AADT between 5,000 and 7,999 vehicles per day will receive 4 points</li> <li>• Corridor AADT between 2,000 and 4,999 vehicles per day will receive 3 points</li> </ul>	



- Corridor AADT between 500 and 1,999 vehicles per day will receive 2 points
- Corridor AADT of less than 500 vehicles per day will receive 1 point

If a project corridor has multiple traffic volumes associated with different segments, SJTPO will work to create an average volume for the corridor.

<b>SECTION 3 TOTAL</b>	0-10	Sum of scores for <b>both</b> Evaluation Criteria in this category.
------------------------	------	---

**SUBTOTAL SCORE (SECTIONS 1-3) 110 Points**

<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Scoring Instructions</i>
<b>SUBTOTAL SCORE</b>	0-110	Sum of Scores from Sections 1-3.

**4. Cost effectiveness 15 Points**

<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Scoring Instructions</i>
<b>SECTION 4 TOTAL</b>	0-15	<p><u>A benefit/cost ratio will be calculated as follows:</u></p> $\frac{\text{Subtotal Score (Sections 1-3)}}{\text{Cost of Project (in \$100Ks)}}$ <p>The benefit/cost ratio will be translated to a score by assigning 15 points to the highest ratio, 0 points to the lowest, and proportionately assigning all other scores on that scale to the nearest whole number.</p>

**TOTAL SCORE 125 Points**

<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Scoring Instructions</i>
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	0-125	Sum of Scores from Sections 1-4.



## Projects Anticipated in Years 11+

For projects anticipated to be implemented in 11 or more years, performance-based planning targets and various emphasis areas from SJTPO planning initiatives are of utmost importance. Given the long-term nature and developmental stages of these projects, it is challenging to determine their specific impacts on these areas at this stage. Nevertheless, it is crucial to acknowledge projects that align with these emphasis areas and ensure that these considerations are integrated into their planning. With limited information available beyond the project location, projects will be evaluated based on their potential to influence the various evaluation criteria. In addition to receiving a numerical score, reviewers will provide feedback to assist local public agencies in refining their project scopes as their projects advance in the project delivery process. The project scoring for Years 11 and beyond does not currently assess the positive or negative impacts on the evaluation criteria. As the project scope is defined and the local public agency completes further analysis, these impacts should be carefully considered. The agency should work to mitigate any adverse effects and increase the benefits. The scores alone shall not be used to assess whether the project shall advance from Years 11+ to Years 1-10.

Projects in Year 11+ shall not be ranked relative to other projects. Instead, they will be ranked based on their potential to address the performance-based planning targets and various emphasis areas from SJTPO's planning initiatives. Projects that move into Year 10 will be reevaluated using the more detailed and rigorous Scoring for Years 1-10, which will then assess the degree to which the project will positively or negatively impact the evaluation criteria and, ultimately, the RTP goals.

## Project Evaluation Criteria and Scoring

The following tables describe the planning level evaluation criteria to be used by SJTPO staff to develop a score that reflects the adherence of projects to federal, state, and SJTPO planning priorities and mandates. Sections 1 and 2 reflect the degree to which projects support performance-based planning targets and SJTPO planning initiatives. In addition, Sections 1 and 2 align with the RTP 2050 planning goals, which are noted under each criterion.

These criteria and Scoring apply only for projects anticipated in Years 11 and beyond.

All criteria will be scored based on the quantitative assessment of the degree to which the proposed projects, as described, will advance the criteria below. A project shall be scored using Pavement Condition or Bridge Condition criteria. If the project improvement is for a bridge, the Pavement Condition score for the project shall receive 0 points, and conversely, if the project includes repaving, the Bridge Condition score for the project shall receive 0 points.

1. Performance-Based Planning Targets (Categories adapted from performance measures established under federal legislation)	12 Points	
<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Scoring Instructions</i>
<b>Mobility Impact</b>	0-3	To what extent will the project improve mobility? Is the project located in an identified area of congestion, measured by the Total Logarithmic Delay from the SJTPO Bottleneck Location List? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is in an area with a total logarithmic delay &gt; 5.5 = 3 points</li> <li>The project is in an area with a total logarithmic delay of 4.5-5.5 = 2 points</li> <li>The project is in an area with a total logarithmic delay of 2.1-4.4 = 1 point</li> <li>All other projects will receive 0 points</li> </ul>



<b>Current Conditions - Pavement</b>	0-3	To what extent can the project improve the current pavement conditions of the roadway? What is the Surface Distress Index (SDI) from the SJTPO Pavement Management System or International Roughness Index (IRI) based on the NJDOT IRI Guidelines?
<b>OR</b>		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SJTPO SDI 0–2 (Very Poor/Poor) or NJ IRI Deficient/Fair = 3 points</li> <li>• SJTPO SDI &gt; 2–3 (Fair) = 2 points</li> <li>• SJTPO SDI &gt; 3–4 (Good) or NJ IRI Good = 1 point</li> <li>• SJTPO SDI &gt; 4–5 (Very Good) or NJ IRI Excellent or no data = 0 points</li> </ul> <p>The NJ IRI Guidelines are scored as Excellent, Good, Fair, and Deficient based on both IRI scores as well as three categories of roadways, including 1.) Interstate Freeways NHS Highways, 2.) Non-NHS Highways, and 3.) Other County Highways. For roadways that have an SJTPO SDI score, those numbers will serve as the primary indicator of condition.</p>
<b>Current Conditions - Bridge</b>	0-3	<p>To what extent will the project improve the current bridge conditions? What is the current condition of the bridge from the NJDOT Bridge Inspection Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bridge is deemed "Structurally Deficient" = 3 points</li> <li>• The bridge is deemed "Functionally Obsolete" or "Scour Critical" = 2 points</li> <li>• The project will preserve or restore all other bridges = 1 point</li> <li>• All other projects will receive 0 points</li> </ul>
<b>Freight Movement Impact</b>	0-3	<p>To what extent can the project impact the movement of freight throughout the SJTPO region?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project is identified within the Prioritized List of Regional Actions as part of the SJTPO 2024 Regional Freight Plan? = 3 points</li> <li>• The project has a high concentration of freight activity, truck volumes exceeding 10%, trip origins or destinations for trucks, and/or locations near non-truck-related freight facilities. = 2 points</li> <li>• Does the project serve or provide access to the existing National or State Freight Networks? = 1 point</li> <li>• All other projects will receive 0 points</li> </ul>
<b>Safety Impact</b>	0-3	<p>To what extent will the project help reduce and eliminate fatal and serious injury crashes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project is identified as a Candidate Project Location within the SJTPO Countywide Local Road Safety Plans = 3 points</li> <li>• The project location is ranked in the Top 50 on the Network Screening Lists = 2 points</li> <li>• The project location is identified as a Systemic Intersection or Corridor = 1 point</li> </ul>
<p><i>Network Screening Lists have been developed for each county, ranking high crash locations Roadway Corridors, Pedestrian/Bicycle Corridors, Intersections, High-Risk Rural Roads, and Pedestrian/Bicycle Intersections</i></p>		



Systemic Intersection and Corridor Lists have been developed as part of the SJTPO Countywide Local Road Safety Plans

- All other projects will receive 0 points

**SECTION 1 TOTAL** 0-12 Sum of scores for **all four** Evaluation Criteria in this category.

**2. Emphasis Areas from SJTPO Planning Initiatives** **8 Points**

<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Scoring Instructions</i>
<b>Environmental Justice Impact</b>	0-2	<p>To what extent does the project have the potential to address Environmental Justice Areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project is located within an identified EJ Area or Moderate TJ Area from the SJTPO Environmental Justice Report = 2 points</li> <li>• All other projects will receive 0 points</li> </ul>
<b>Flood Zones Impact</b>	0-2	<p>To what extent does the project have the potential to address flooding?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project is located within the most recent FEMA 1 Percent (100-year) floodplain or 0.2 Percent (500-year) floodplain = 2 points</li> <li>• All other projects will receive 0 points</li> </ul>
<b>Complete Streets Impact</b>	0-2	<p>To what extent does the project have the potential to advance the safety, mobility, and accessibility needs of users of all ages and abilities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project is located within a Complete Streets Priority Area = 2 points</li> <li>• All other projects will receive 0 points</li> </ul>
<b>Evacuation Routes Impact</b>	0-2	<p>To what extent does the project have the potential to impact designated Evacuation Routes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project is located on a Primary or Secondary Evacuation Route = 2 points</li> <li>• All other projects will receive 0 points</li> </ul>
<b>SECTION 2 TOTAL</b>	0-8	Sum of scores for <b>all four</b> Evaluation Criteria in this category.

**TOTAL SCORE (SECTIONS 1-2)** **20 Points**

<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Scoring Instructions</i>
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	0-20	Sum of Scores from Sections 1 and 2.