

**CENTRAL MINNESOTA AREA TRANSPORTATION PARTNERSHIP
 FY 2029 TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES (TA) PROGRAM
 BIKE/PEDESTRIAN GROUPING PROJECT REVIEW AND SCORE SHEET**

Proposed Project Title:		Reviewer:	
Applicant:		Review Date:	
Proposed Project Submitted for Earlier TAP Funding:		No or Yes (review sheets attached)	
CRITERION #1 - Plan Identification		Score #1	xx
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (17-20 pts)	Project specifically identified in multiple adopted/approved Regional, Tribal, or Local Plans that demonstrated a high level of public involvement. Specific sections of regional or local plans provided for reference.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Above Average (13-16 pts)	Project specifically identified in one adopted/approved Regional, Tribal, or Local Plan that demonstrated a high level of public involvement. Specific sections of regional or local plans provided for reference.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Average (9-12 pts)	Project consistent w/one or more Regional, Tribal, or Local Plans with some public involvement. Specific sections of regional or local plans may or may not have been provided.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fair (5-8 pts)	Planning explanation/documentation is very limited.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Poor (0-4 pts)	No planning documentation provided to support the project.		
Strengths/Weakness			
CRITERION #2 - Connectivity		Score #2	xx
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (17-20 pts)	Applicant details the existing condition of the project area and how project will improve conditions. Project fulfills, starts or completes a critical facility in the local/regional active transportation network. Details have been provided on the status of the other necessary components and the anticipated completion of the full scope of the larger project.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Above Average (13-16 pts)	Applicant details the existing condition of the project area and how project will improve conditions. Project contributes to (but does not complete or fully integrate into) the existing local/regional active transportation network. Details have been provided on the status of the other necessary components and the anticipated completion of the full scope of the larger project.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Average (9-12 pts)	Details on the existing condition of the project area are incomplete. Project contributes to (but does not complete or fully integrate into) the existing local/regional active transportation network. Details on the status of other necessary components and the anticipated completion of the full scope of the larger project are missing or incomplete.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fair (5-8 pts)	Details on the existing condition of the project are incomplete. Project's contribution to the existing local/regional active transportation network unclear. Details on the status of other necessary components and the anticipated completion of the full scope of the larger project are missing or incomplete.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Poor (0-4 pts)	Details on the existing condition of the project area are missing. Project is a standalone project with no plans to complete or integrate with the existing local/regional active transportation network.		
Strengths/Weakness			
CRITERION #3 - Bike/Pedestrian Facilities		Score #3	xx
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (13-15 pts)	Applicant details the main users by types and gives approximate number of users. Applicant gives percentages from Space Tool. Applicant details how project helps traditionally underserved or marginally disadvantaged populations or if there are adverse impacts, how this will affect their everyday lives. Project serves multiple trip generators within 0.5 mi. distance of proposed facility.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Above Average (10-12 pts)	Applicant details the main users by types and gives approximate number of users. Applicant gives percentages from Space Tool. Applicant lacks details how project helps traditionally underserved or marginally disadvantaged populations or if there are adverse impacts, how this will affect their everyday lives. Project serves multiple trip generators within 1 mi. distance of proposed facility.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Average (7-9 pts)	Applicant missing details on main user by types and estimated number of users. Project has the potential to help traditionally underserved or marginally disadvantaged populations given proximity, however, lacks details. Project serves trip generators within 1.5 mi. of proposed facility.		

<input type="checkbox"/> Fair (4-6 pts)	Applicant missing details on main user by types and estimated number of users. Project does not impact traditionally underserved or marginally disadvantaged populations. Project serves trip generators within 2 mi. of proposed facility.
<input type="checkbox"/> Poor (0-3 pts)	No description of main users of the facility. Details on traditionally underserved or marginally disadvantaged populations missing. Project is in isolated area with little or no development, i.e. long distances between likely trip generators (greater than 2 mi.).
Strengths/Weakness	
CRITERION #4 - Safety	
	Score #4
	xx
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (13-15 pts)	Existing usage of project corridor has (or has the potential) for fatal or serious injury crashes involving active transportation users. Project incorporates several safety features to minimize/mitigate conflict between vehicles and vulnerable road users.
<input type="checkbox"/> Above Average (10-12 pts)	Existing usage of project corridor has (or has the potential) for fatal or serious injury crashes involving active transportation users. Project incorporates a few safety features to minimize/mitigate conflict between vehicles and vulnerable road users.
<input type="checkbox"/> Average (7-9 pts)	Existing usage of project corridor has the potential for fatal or serious injury crashes involving active transportation users. Project incorporates 1 or 2 safety features to minimize/mitigate conflict between vehicles and vulnerable road users.
<input type="checkbox"/> Fair (4-6 pts)	Existing usage of project corridor has potential for fatal or serious injury crashes involving active transportation users. Project fails to mention safety features incorporated to minimize/mitigate conflict between vehicles and vulnerable road users.
<input type="checkbox"/> Poor (0-3 pts)	Existing usage of project corridor does not have a potential for fatal or serious injury crashes involving active transportation users. Project does not mention safety features incorporated to minimize/mitigate conflict between vehicles and vulnerable road users.
Strengths/Weakness	
CRITERION #5 - Feasibility	
	Score #5
	xx
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (17-20 pts)	20-year maintenance plan is clearly identified. Facility proposed will be used year round. Project Development has been identified. Any bridges have been identified and vetted. Environmental path has been identified along w/all potential permits needed to complete project. Financial plan describes how applicant will be leveraging local match for the federal TA program funds.
<input type="checkbox"/> Above Average (13-16 pts)	20-year maintenance plan is clearly identified. Facility proposed will be used year round. Project development is in progress/nearing completion. Any bridges have been identified and vetted. Environmental path has been identified but lacking mention of potential permits needed to complete the project. Financial plan describes how applicant will be leveraging the local match for the federal TA program funds.
<input type="checkbox"/> Average (9-12 pts)	20-year maintenance plan is clearly identified but proposed facility will only be used part of the year. Detailed scoping study has been completed. No mention of bridges. Environmental path has been identified but lacking mention of potential permits needed to complete the project. Financial plan missing details on how applicant will be leveraging the local match for the federal TA program funds.
<input type="checkbox"/> Fair (5-8 pts)	20-year maintenance plan is unclear. Facility will only be used part of the year. Detailed scoping study is in progress/nearing completion. No mention of bridges. Environmental path has not been identified. Financial plan is missing details on how applicant will be leveraging the local match for the federal TA program funds.
<input type="checkbox"/> Poor (0-4 pts)	20-year maintenance plan is unclear. Facility will only be used part of the year. Scoping study has not started. No mention of bridges. Environmental path has not been identified. Financial plan is missing.
Strengths/Weakness	
CRITERION #6 - Right of Way (ROW)	
	Score #6
	xx
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent (9-10 pts)	No ROW acquisition or easements needed. (ROW is 100% owned.)

<input type="checkbox"/> Above Average (7-8 pts)	Some ROW acquisition or easements needed from another public entity; negotiations have begun and agreements have been drafted and execution is likely.
<input type="checkbox"/> Average (5-6 pts)	Some ROW acquisition or easements is needed from 1 or more public & private property owners. Negotiations have begun, but no agreements are in place.
<input type="checkbox"/> Fair (3-4 pts)	Significant ROW acquisition or easements still needed from 1 or more public & private property owners with little to no negotiations having been started.
<input type="checkbox"/> Poor (0-2 pts)	None of ROW acquired or easements have been acquired and/or no negotiations have started.
Strengths/Weakness	
(100 Total Points Available) - TOTAL SCORE	
0	