



Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO) Bike/Pedestrian Project Ranking Process

APPROVED BY THE MPO: May 18, 2011

BACKGROUND: The MPO assigned a Bike/Pedestrian subcommittee in May 2010 with the task of developing criteria to recommend projects to the MUMPO based on a comprehensive and technically-oriented project ranking process. Since the total value of proposed projects often significantly exceeds available funds, an objective evaluation of proposals is necessary to determine the best use of Bike/Pedestrian funds.

The following project ranking criteria process is the result of research and discussions by transportation professionals from the MUMPO region. The committee considered specific quantitative criteria for each of the categories, although this did not always prove to be feasible. The overarching goal was to create a thorough assessment that did not place undue burdens upon the applicant. When a quantitative measure of the absolute effectiveness of the project was not possible or reasonable, criteria based on a yes/no answer was created.

The scoring list below contains work discussed over the course of four subcommittee meetings in July 2010, January 2011, February 2011 and March 2011.

FINAL PRODUCT: The MUMPO will have a process available that allows a wide variety of eligible projects to be evaluated for funding, without creating undue burdens on applicants.

PROJECT RANKING CRITERIA

Minimum Requirement

Project statement of justification: Proved a written **transportation purpose** statement for the project. Appropriate map exhibits and photographs must be submitted to describe proposed facility, destinations, and surrounding land uses.

- 1. Connectivity and Access (50 points possible):** Points will be awarded based on described strengths in design, location and function of facility per the following attributes:
 - a. Length to destination:** For this category determine if your project's greater need is bike or pedestrian. If the project serves both modes of travel, then the applicant may choose

either category (i.e. greenways and multi-modal paths). If the specific project is not directly adjacent to the noted destination, the project must be part of a greater bicycle or pedestrian system which connects to the destination, then the applicant may count that already built portion of the length to destination. Distance should be measured from the shortest distance of the un-built facility to the described destination. (Only use one category pedestrian or bike)

Pedestrian (miles to destination)	Bike (mile to destination)	Points
0.0-.25	0.0-1.0	10
0.26-0.5	1.01-3.0	8
0.51-1.0	3.01-5.0	6
1.01-3.0	5.01-7.5	4
3.01-5.0	7.51-10.0	2
5.01>	10.01>	0

- b. Directness of facility:** Is the path of the facility the most direct feasible route from origin to destination (i.e.-shortest distance from origin to destination)?
 - i. Yes = 5 points
 - ii. No = 0 points
- c. Accessibility of facility design:** Is the facility designed above a minimum accessible manner (slope, materials, ADA, etc)? *Applicant must detail and show references to be granted points.*
 - i. Yes = 5 points
 - ii. No = 0 points
- d. Quality and perceived interest in getting to existing destination:** The following are examples of destinations of high interest: town center, transit stations, major employment center and mixed use commercial. Each high interest location is worth five (5) points. The following are examples of destinations of moderate interest: multi-family residential developments, schools, parks, bus stops and park-n-rides. Each moderate interest location is worth three (3) points. The following are examples of destinations of lower interest: low-density residential or privately accessible property. Each low interest location is worth one (1) point. A maximum of **20 points** can be earned for this section. This total is accumulated by adding each item of interest that is a destination for the project.
- e. Regional nature of facility and destinations:** Has the proposed project been identified through a previous planning effort or policy?
 - i. Identified in current adopted plan = 5 points
 - Transportation (LRTP, TIP, CTP, Bicycle Plan, Pedestrian Plan or other locally adopted transportation plan or list for community)
 - Land Use or Comprehensive Plan
 - Recreation Plan
 - Economic Development Plan

- b. Vehicular speed:** Proposed project design encourages a reduction in vehicular speeds (i.e. - traffic calming devices, narrowed travel lanes, or lower speed limits).
 - i. Yes = 5 points
 - ii. No = 0 points
- c. Reduced exposure:** Proposed project reduces the exposure between the motor vehicles, bicyclists and/or pedestrians. Examples of a physical barrier may include an off-road greenway, pedestrian refuge island, or a bike boulevard separated by a vertical structure. Examples of a defined space include striped bike lanes, sidewalks adjacent to the curb, crosswalks, and signed bike routes. The applicant should recognize any new safety risks introduced by the project design, such as placing a multi-modal side-path separate from the roadway but crossing multiple driveways or conflict points.
 - i. Physical barrier = 10 points
 - ii. Defined space = 5 points
 - iii. No reduced exposure = 0 points