

Chapter III

Project Selection and Prioritization Process

This chapter describes the project selection process, criteria for evaluation of project eligibility and benefits, and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) modification process. The TIP has been updated and/or reprioritized regularly since the passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA). The metropolitan transportation planning/programming process provides for continual refinement of the TIP to make adjustments to projects as they near implementation.

With enactment of ISTEA came new responsibilities for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). Subsequent transportation bills, including the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), reconfirmed these responsibilities. State departments of transportation share project selection authority with MPOs for certain

transportation funding programs. The North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) and the Regional Transportation Council (RTC), as the MPO for the Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington Urbanized Area, the Denton-Lewisville Urbanized Area, and the McKinney Urbanized Area, are assigned project-level programming responsibilities for funding programs that focus on achieving the regional mobility and air quality objectives of the Metropolitan Area. The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) continues to select projects that focus on maintaining and improving the State and National Highway System both in areas outside and within the metropolitan area. Exhibits III-1 and III-2 illustrate the agencies responsible for selecting projects for each of the State and federal funding programs listed in the TIP.



The TRE carries commuters between Dallas Union Station and Fort Worth T & P Station.
Source: NCTCOG photo archives

EXHIBIT III-1**Roadway Section Program Selection Responsibility**

CATEGORY	PROGRAM TITLE	SELECTED BY:
1/1P1	Preventive Maintenance and Rehabilitation	TxDOT
2M/2MP1	Metropolitan Corridor Projects	TxDOT/MPO
2U	Urban Corridor Projects	TxDOT/MPO
3	Non-Traditionally Funded Transportation Projects	TxDOT/MPO
3LC	Local Contribution	Local Government/ Transportation Agencies
3TDC (MPO)	Transportation Development Credits	MPO
3TDC (TTC)	Transportation Development Credits	TxDOT
4/4P1/4-3C	Statewide Connectivity Corridor Projects	TxDOT
5	Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Improvement Program	MPO
6	Structures Replacement and Rehabilitation	TxDOT
7	Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) [Previously called Surface Transportation Program- Metropolitan Mobility (STP-MM)]	MPO
8	Safety	TxDOT
9 (TAP)	Transportation Alternatives Program & TA Set Aside Program	TxDOT/MPO
10	Supplemental Transportation Projects	TxDOT
11/11P1	District Discretionary	TxDOT
12/12CL	Strategic Priority	TxDOT
12(425)	Strategic Priority 425 Plan	TxDOT/MPO
SBPE	TxDOT Preliminary Engineering	TxDOT
S102	TxDOT Right-of-Way	TxDOT

EXHIBIT III-2**Transit Section Program Selection Responsibility**

TRANSIT CATEGORY	SELECTED BY:
Section 5307 - Urbanized Area Formula Program	MPO
Section 5309 - Fixed Guideway Capital Investment Grant Program	Congress
Section 5310 - Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program	MPO/TxDOT Districts
Section 5311 - Nonurbanized Area Formula Program	TxDOT
Section 5337 - State of Good Repair Program	MPO
Section 5339 - Bus and Bus Facilities Program	MPO/TxDOT

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING PROGRAMS

The following summaries (Exhibits III-3 and III-4) provide a brief description of transportation funding program categories included in the 2019-2022 TIP and the specific types of projects funded in the various categories. Chapter VII contains complete project listings for each of these programs in the FY 2019-2022 timeframe.

EXHIBIT III-3**State and Federal Roadway Section Funding Categories**

CATEGORY NUMBER	CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION
1	Preventive Maintenance and Rehabilitation	Preventive maintenance and rehabilitation on the existing state highway system, including: (A) Preventive maintenance - minor roadway modifications to improve operations and safety; and (B) Rehabilitation - installation, rehabilitation, replacement, and maintenance of pavement, bridges, traffic control devices, traffic management systems, and ancillary traffic devices. Funds are formula allocated.
1P1	Proposition 1- Preventive Maintenance and Rehabilitation	The Proposition 1 (Prop 1) amendment authorizes a portion oil and gas tax revenues that typically go into the Economic Stabilization Fund to be deposited to the State Highway Fund. Funds may be spent to engineer, acquire right-of-way, move utilities, construct, and maintain public highways (transit, bicycle/pedestrian, and toll roads are ineligible). Projects must be on the Interstate Highway System or on the State Highway System. This category includes Prop 1 projects selected using the Category 1 maintenance formula and criteria. Selected by the MPO in consultation with TxDOT.

CATEGORY NUMBER	CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION
2M/U	Metropolitan and Urban Corridor Projects	<p>Mobility and added capacity projects along a corridor that decrease travel time and the level or duration of traffic congestion and increase the safe and efficient movement of people and freight in metropolitan and urbanized areas.</p> <p>This category is split into two types of funding. Metropolitan Corridor (2M) projects are within the boundaries of a Transportation Management Area (TMA) like Dallas-Fort Worth. Urban Corridor Projects (2U) are in areas without a Transportation Management Area (non-TMA) like Sherman-Denison. Funds are formula allocated. These funds are generally approved through the Unified Transportation Program (UTP) or 10-Year Planning process.</p>
2MP1	Proposition 1- Metropolitan Corridor Projects	<p>The Proposition 1 (Prop 1) amendment authorizes a portion oil and gas tax revenues that typically go into the Economic Stabilization Fund to be deposited to the State Highway Fund. Funds may be spent to engineer, acquire right-of-way, move utilities, construct, and maintain public highways (transit, bicycle/pedestrian, and toll roads are ineligible). Projects must be on the Interstate Highway System or on the State Highway System. This category includes Prop 1 projects selected using the Category 2 metropolitan corridor formula and criteria.</p>
3	Non-Traditionally Funded Transportation Projects	<p>Transportation related projects that qualify for funding from sources not traditionally part of the state highway fund, including state bond financing under programs such as Proposition 12 (General Obligation Bonds), Proposition 14, pass-through toll financing, unique federal funding (like TIGER discretionary funds), regional toll revenue, Regional Transportation Council/Local funds (RTC/Local), and local participation funding.</p> <p>Below is additional information about several of these sub-categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Toll Revenue (RTR) funds include toll proceeds from toll project agreements. RTR funds may include up-front payments by tolling entity, excess revenue payment by tolling entity, or interest accrued on these funds. RTR funds can be spent on state highway system, public transit, or air quality projects. They are selected by the RTC with strong participation levels from local agencies (cities, counties, etc.). The Texas Transportation Commission has final approval via minute order. • RTC/Local funds are local funds created by and available to the RTC. The funds are general created through federal/local funding swaps. Projects are selected by the RTC, and primarily consist of for air quality, sustainable development, and study-type projects. • Proposition 14 funds are revenue bonds backed by future dollars in the State Highway Fund (Fund 6). The funds may be spent to acquire right-of-way, build, maintain and police public roadways, and to enforce traffic and safety laws. • Proposition 12 are revenue bonds backed by the State’s general fund. The funds may be spent to acquire right-of-way, build, maintain and police public roadways, and to enforce traffic and safety laws.
3TDC (MPO)	Transportation Development Credits (Metropolitan Planning Organization)	<p>A financial accounting tool approved by the Federal Highway Administration that allows states to use federal funding to offset a local match. These credits are non-cash credits allocated to states (and later to regions) as a representative value to account for toll road and tolled managed lanes that benefit the federal system. This category of TDCs are selected by the MPO.</p>

CATEGORY NUMBER	CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION
3TDC (TTC)	Transportation Development Credits (Texas Transportation Commission)	A financial accounting tool approved by the Federal Highway Administration that allows states to use federal funding to offset a State match. These credits are non-cash credits allocated to states (and later to regions) as a representative value to account for toll road and tolled managed lanes that benefit the federal system. This category of TDCs are selected by the TTC.
4	Statewide Connectivity Corridor Projects	Mobility and added capacity projects on major state highway system corridors, which provide statewide connectivity between urban areas and corridors, to create a highway connectivity network composed of the Texas Highway Trunk System, National Highway System, and connections from those two systems to major ports of entry on international borders and Texas water ports. Generally used in rural (non-urban) areas.
4P1	Proposition 1- Statewide Connectivity Corridor Projects	The Prop 1 amendment authorized a portion of oil and gas tax revenues that typically go into the Economic Stabilization Fund to be deposited to the State Highway Fund. Funds may be spent to engineer, acquire right-of-way, move utilities, construct, and maintain public highways (transit, bicycle/pedestrian, and toll roads are ineligible). Projects must be on the Interstate Highway System or on the State Highway System. This category includes Prop 1 projects selected using the Category 4 statewide connectivity corridor formula and criteria.
4-3C	Category 4 Congestion, Connectivity, Corridor (3C) Projects	The Congestion Connectivity Corridor (3C) program is designed to provide connectivity for interstates and major freight/trade corridors, and enables the use of Category 4 funds in urban areas. Projects should be prioritized and selected based on criteria consistent with House Bill 20. Funds are formula allocated using the Category 2 formula. Projects are selected by the TxDOT District in consultation with the MPO.
5	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program	Designed for air quality or transit projects that address attainment of national ambient air quality standards in the nonattainment areas (currently Dallas-Fort Worth, Houston, and El Paso). Funds cannot be used to add capacity for single-occupancy vehicles. Projects selected by the MPO in consultation with TxDOT. Funds are formula allocated.
6	Bridges	Replacement or rehabilitation of eligible bridges on and off the State Highway System (functionally obsolete or structurally deficient). Replacement of existing highway-railroad grade crossings, and the rehabilitation or replacement of deficient railroad underpasses on the State Highway System. Specific locations evaluated by a cost-benefit derived index.
7	Surface Transportation Block Group Program (STBG) [Previously called Surface Transportation Program-Metropolitan Mobility (STP-MM)]	Designed for mobility (roadway or transit) and air quality projects that address transportation needs within Metropolitan Area boundaries with populations of 200,000 or greater. Projects are selected by the MPO in consultation with TxDOT. Funds are formula allocated.
8	Safety	Safety related projects both on and off the state highway system including the federal Highway Safety Improvement Program, Railway-Highway Crossing Program, Safety Bond Program, and High Risk Rural Roads Program. Safe Routes To School projects previously authorized remain in Category 8, but new Safe Routes to School projects are managed under the Transportation Alternatives Program in Category 9.

CATEGORY NUMBER	CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION
9 (TAP)	Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), and Transportation Alternative – Set Aside Program	<p>Federal aid program for the construction of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrian, bicycle, and other non-motorized forms of transportation, including sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian and bicycle signals, traffic calming techniques, lighting and other safety-related infrastructure, and transportation projects to achieve compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.</p> <p>This program also includes the Safe Routes to Schools Program. Projects are selected through competitive calls for projects at the regional and state levels.</p> <p>Funds are formula allocated. Under the FAST Act, the State/MPO 50/50 Allocation continues. The RTC selects a portion of TA funds and TxDOT selects another portion.</p>
10	Supplemental Transportation Projects	<p>Transportation related projects that do not qualify for funding in other categories, including landscape and aesthetic improvement, erosion control and environmental mitigation, construction and rehabilitation of roadways within or adjacent to state parks, fish hatcheries, and similar facilities, replacement of railroad crossing surfaces, maintenance of railroad signals, construction or replacement of curb ramps for accessibility to pedestrians with disabilities, and miscellaneous federal programs. Previous federal earmarks often appear in this funding category. Green Ribbon funds would also appear under Category 10.</p>
11	District Discretionary	<p>Miscellaneous projects on the State Highway System selected at the TxDOT district’s discretion.</p>
11P1	Proposition 1- District Discretionary	<p>The Proposition 1 (Prop 1) amendment authorized a portion of oil and gas tax revenues that typically go into the Economic Stabilization Fund to be deposited to the State Highway Fund. Funds may be spent to engineer, acquire right-of-way, move utilities, construct, and maintain public highways (transit, bicycle/pedestrian, and toll roads are ineligible). Projects must be on the Interstate Highway System or on the State Highway System. This category includes Prop 1 projects selected using the Category 11 district discretionary formula and criteria.</p>
12	Strategic Priority	<p>Projects with specific importance to the State including those that generally promote economic opportunity, increase efficiency on military deployment routes or retain military assets in response to the federal military base realignment and closure reports, maintain the ability to respond to both manmade and natural emergencies, and provide pass-through toll financing for local communities.</p>
12 Clear Lanes	Strategic Priority – Clear Lanes	<p>Provides funding for congestion relief projects in metropolitan areas with over 1 million in population, which includes Austin, Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston, and San Antonio. Projects in this category should be listed on the Top 100 Most Congested Roadways list. These funds are formula allocated, but selected by the Texas Transportation Commission.</p>
12 (425)	Strategic Priority – 425 Plan	<p>Additional funds awarded to the region from TxDOT to advance “ready to let” projects. No additional funds are available in this category, but projects are still under construction using these funds.</p>
SBPE	TxDOT PE Funds	<p>Funds TxDOT uses for engineering/design services for projects on the state highway system.</p>
S102	TxDOT ROW Funds	<p>Funds TxDOT uses for right-of-way acquisition or utility relocation for projects on the state highway system.</p>

EXHIBIT III-4

Federal Transit Section Funding Categories

TRANSIT CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION
Section 5307 - Urbanized Area Formula Program	Provides for the distribution of capital assistance and operating assistance (under specific guidelines) to transit operators in Urbanized Areas.
Section 5309 - Fixed Guideway Capital Investment Grant Program	Provides Congressional discretionary funds for new transit start-ups, rail modernization, bus fleet, and other major transit projects (including Small Starts and New Starts Program).
Section 5310 - Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program	Provides transportation services for seniors and individuals with disabilities that increases mobility options through capital and limited operating assistance funds.
Section 5311 - Nonurbanized Area Formula Program	Provides for the distribution of capital assistance and operating assistance to state agencies, local public bodies, nonprofit organizations, and operators of public transportation services outside Urbanized Areas.
Section 5337 – State of Good Repair Program	Provides funding for the maintenance, rehabilitation, and replacement of capital assets used for rail transit and high intensity motor bus systems to ensure that public transit operates safely, efficiently, reliably, and sustainably.
Section 5339 – Bus and Bus Facilities Program	Provides capital funding to replace, rehabilitate, and purchase buses and related equipment and to construct bus-related facilities.



School buses retrofitted to run on propane.
Source: NCTCOG photo archives

PROJECT SELECTION RESPONSIBILITY

The MPO has project selection responsibility for the following funding programs:

- 1) Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG), formerly known as Surface Transportation Program-Metropolitan Mobility (STP-MM) funds, in the Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington Urbanized Area and the Denton-Lewisville Urbanized Area
- 2) Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds in the Dallas-Fort Worth ozone nonattainment area
- 3) Transit Section 5307--Urbanized Area Formula Program (UAFP) funds in the Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington Urbanized Area, the Denton-Lewisville Urbanized Area, and the McKinney Urbanized Area

- 4) Transit Section 5310 – Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities funds in the Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington Urbanized Area and the Denton-Lewisville Urbanized Area
- 5) Transit Section 5337 – State of Good Repair (SGR) funds in the Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington Urbanized Area and the Denton-Lewisville Urbanized Area
- 6) Transit Section 5339 – Bus and Bus Facilities (BBF) funds in the Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington Urbanized Area and the Denton-Lewisville Urbanized Area
- 7) Texas Mobility Funds (TMF) & Metropolitan Corridor funds (in conjunction with the TxDOT Dallas, Fort Worth, and Paris Districts). In addition, certain projects selected by TxDOT, as part of the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP), are selected in cooperation with the MPO prior to inclusion in the TIP
- 8) RTC/Local funds
- 9) Regional Toll Revenue funds--projects are selected in consultation with TxDOT, local governments, and local transportation agencies.

Project selection for the STBG and CMAQ programs occur periodically by the MPO through funding initiatives. Local governments and transportation agencies are invited to submit projects for consideration through calls for projects or strategic programming initiatives. More attention is given to project selection criteria and evaluation methods used by the MPO later in this chapter.

TxDOT is responsible for selecting projects for all other funding programs with the exception of

PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA AND EVALUATION

Prior to ISTEA, federal funds were allocated differently for both roadway and transit projects. Roadway projects were selected by TxDOT based on

Federal Demonstration, Congressional Earmarks, and Capital Program funds when they are available. Three TxDOT Districts encompass the Dallas-Fort Worth Metropolitan Area: the Dallas District, the Fort Worth District, and the Paris District. As shown in Exhibits III-1 and III-2 in Chapter III, the TxDOT Districts are responsible for selecting projects for various funding categories in their local areas. Funding categories in which TxDOT Austin has project selection responsibility are those that are selected on a statewide basis and approved by the Texas Transportation Commission. Other funding programs, such as the Strategic Priority Program, are selected directly by the Texas Transportation Commission.

Transit Section 5309--Capital Program projects listed in Chapter VII do not necessarily represent approved funding, but rather an intent to pursue funding from Congress.

The 2019-2022 TIP represents the culmination of a continuing process to refine and prioritize the projects selected for implementation since ISTEA was passed. The 1993 TIP was the first metropolitan TIP in North Central Texas prepared under ISTEA. It, like the 2019-2022 TIP, was developed through the cooperative efforts of NCTCOG, local governments, transportation authorities, and TxDOT with input by the public and agencies involved in tourism and natural disaster mitigation. The project selection process utilized by the Dallas-Fort Worth MPO has evolved since that time and is explained in more detail in the following section. TxDOT's project selection responsibility is shared by the local District offices, Austin Division offices, and the Texas Transportation Commission.

a cost-effectiveness index as reported in the State Project Development Plan. Transit projects were selected by transit operators and funded based on

the federal allocation formula, which was based on demographic and service criteria for each transit service area. After the passage of ISTEA in 1991, transportation projects had to compete with each other for limited federal funds. For example, roadway projects, transit projects, and other transportation-related projects were evaluated with a single set of criteria to determine which would receive federal funding through the STP-MM Program (now the STBG). In addition, project selection had to comply with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (CAAA) and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1991 (ADA). Beginning in 1999, specific project selection criteria were developed for each funding initiative.

Metropolitan Planning Organization

Federal legislation authorizes MPOs to coordinate the selection and funding of transportation projects in urbanized areas. Through the MPO process, local governments and cities have the opportunity to participate in identifying and solving transportation-related problems in their respective areas. Projects submitted for evaluation are not limited to new roadways, roadway widenings, or transit services. Projects can include intersection and signal improvements, grade separations, incident management systems, sustainable development, and other types of transportation improvements or enhancements.

Since ISTEA was signed into law, the Dallas-Fort Worth MPO has conducted several funding initiatives (i.e., project selection events). Over time, NCTCOG and the RTC have employed different criteria and screening processes for different project funding and selection initiatives. NCTCOG first developed project selection and evaluation criteria for the 1992 Call for Projects. Similar evaluation methods were used in the 1994 and 1999 Calls for Projects. The selection criteria in these calls for

projects generally addressed cost-effectiveness (both current and future), air quality benefits, local commitment, congestion reduction, and the level of multi-modal and social mobility benefits afforded by a project. This approach involved a comprehensive project rating system with diverse rating criteria, linked to the type of funding being requested.

In 2002, NCTCOG began selecting projects more strategically. Through this type of initiative, NCTCOG staff works cooperatively with the Surface Transportation Technical Committee (STTC), RTC, and regional partners to select projects that support regional priorities. Projects are evaluated based on their individual merits and their impact on the regional transportation system. Then, the set of recommended projects is evaluated to ensure an equitable distribution of selected projects throughout the region. The RTC has issued several such funding initiatives, including the 2002 Strategic Programming Initiative, the 2003-2005 RTC Partnership Programs, and the 2017-2018 CMAQ/STBG Funding Program.

Of course, the RTC has led other types of funding initiatives that lie in the middle of the project selection spectrum (e.g., from technical to strategic). Examples of these funding programs include the 2001 Park-and-Ride Call for Projects, the 2001 Land Use/Transportation Joint Venture Program Call for Projects, and the 2005 RTC Partnership Program 3. These three funding initiatives were similar to the "calls for projects" outlined above, in that they involved evaluation criteria; however, the evaluation methodology they employed was more rational than technical. In both cases, a set of evaluation criteria was created, followed by screening or filtering through the criteria. The projects that met all the criteria or screens were recommended for funding.

As the MPO has evolved and matured, the funding initiatives used to evaluate project applications have

changed as well. Moreover, different types of funding initiatives are used for different programs and federal funding categories, as appropriate. As regional needs change, so do the project selection and funding methodologies employed by the RTC. As transportation funding dollars have decreased within the region, regional impact has also become another critical piece used to evaluate project applications, which was evident in the Regional Toll Revenue Funding Initiative, Sustainable Development Call for Projects, the 2012-2013 Transportation Enhancement Program Call for Projects, Transportation Development Credits (TDCs) Type 2 Call for Projects, 2014 Transportation Alternative Program Call for Projects, SH 161 Funding Initiative, and 2017 TA-Set Aside Call for Projects.

In any event, projects are selected based on a competitive process, with an emphasis on public and local elected official involvement. Project selection criteria generally considered in the Dallas-Fort Worth area, regardless of the type of funding initiative being employed, include: air quality, mobility, financial commitment, safety, intermodalism, regional innovation, and cost-effectiveness.

The selection criteria for the 1992 and 1994 Calls for Projects included cost effectiveness (current and future), air quality/energy conservation, local cost participation, and intermodal/multimodal/social mobility. Specific criteria and weighting values apply to each funding program, as shown in Exhibit III-5. In addition, an example of the evaluation methodology for the 1992 and 1994 Calls for Projects is included in Exhibit III-6.

Exhibit III-7 includes the evaluation criteria used in the 1999 Call for Projects, which is similar to the criteria employed in the 1992 and 1994 Calls for Projects. Exhibit III-8 includes the 2001 Park-and-

Ride project screening criteria used in this call for projects. Exhibit III-9 includes information about the selection process employed for the 2001 Land Use/Transportation Joint Venture Program. Exhibit III-10 shows evaluation methodology and emphasis area scoring strategies for the 2005 RTC Partnership Program 3. Exhibit III-11 contains the RTR (2009) Sustainable Development Call for Projects and Exhibit III-12 explains the selection criteria and methodology used in the RTR Funding Initiative. Exhibit III-13 includes information about the SH 161 Funding Initiative's project selection process. Exhibit III-14 shows the criteria used in the 2014 Transportation Alternatives Program Call for Projects. Exhibit III-15 explains the selection criteria for Transportation Development Credits (TDCs) Type 2 Call for Projects. Exhibit III-16 details the criteria used in the 2017 Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Call for Projects. Exhibit III-17 shows the criteria considered for both parts of the Regional Traffic Signal Retiming Program and Minor Improvement Program. Exhibit III-18 outlines the selection criteria for the programs that comprise the 2017-2018 CMAQ/STBG Funding Program. There are certain projects from the older calls for projects that are still being implemented in the Dallas-Fort Worth region, so those selection processes are included in these exhibits for reference.

Proposition 1, a constitutional amendment approved by Texas voters in 2014, resulted in an initial infusion of over \$500 million in the first two years to Dallas-Fort Worth. Proposition 1 allows a portion of the oil and gas severance taxes previously directed exclusively to the state's Rainy Day Fund to be used for non-tolled highway projects. Selection of Proposition 1 funded projects was based on project readiness, consistency with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, sensitivity to existing projects with funding shortfalls, regional east-west equity, and continued focus on capacity, rather than

maintenance. The TxDOT Congestion Relief Program was intended to improve traffic flow through the state's major metropolitan areas and expedite several major DFW projects. The funding became available when the Texas Legislature ended gas-tax diversions to other non-transportation programs. Projects selected for the Congestion Relief Program to date have been based on project readiness and priority in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

During the 84th Texas Legislature, House Bill (HB) 20 became law. Among other items, this legislation requires that MPOs develop 10-Year Plans for funding allocated to the region and that MPOs incorporate a variety of performance metrics into the project selection process. When developing the Dallas-Fort Worth region's 10-Year Plan, projects were divided into three paths. Path "A" consisted of projects with previous funding commitments that needed additional funding or multi-phased projects that were under construction and required funding for the next phase of construction. Projects funded with Proposition 1 revenue that failed to materialize due to decreased oil and gas severance tax receipts fell under this category as well. Path "B" was made up of new freeway projects. The selection process for this path included considering performance measures pertaining to congestion, environmental justice, vehicle crash rates, and the percentage of trucks that travel on the facility. Finally, Path "C" was made up of on-system arterial facilities with high traffic volumes. The congestion and non-congestion criteria utilized for Path "B" were also used to select these projects. Exhibits III-19 and III-20 show the results of the analysis done to determine which freeways and tollways facilities met the congestion and non-congestion criteria. Exhibit III-21 shows the facilities that drivers would choose to travel on assuming there were no constraints on their decisions.

Performance Measures in Project Selection

Performance-based planning and project programming have increasingly been employed by NCTCOG staff in recent years. The two most recent federal transportation funding bills, MAP-21 and the FAST Act, require that performance-based planning and programming be incorporated into the development of Metropolitan Transportation Plans (MTP) and Transportation Improvement Programs. Since the development and approval of the last TIP, a series of final rules pertaining to performance-based planning and programming were released by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA). To date, two performance measures rules, the Highway Safety Improvement Program (PM1) and Transit Asset Management (PM4), are required to have targets set for them. Two others, Pavement and Bridge Condition and System Performance/Freight/CMAQ, will be required to have targets set and updated in the TIP. More information on the performance measure rules and the targets can be found in Chapter 9 of this document.

When working to select and program projects, MPO staff factor in a variety of performance measures. Given that projects and programs in a MPO's TIP must be included in and consistent with its MTP, the MTP and the performance measures that support it are critical to the development of the TIP. The projects that are recommended in the MTP and eventually programmed in the TIP go through a rigorous review to determine whether they are warranted.

Addressing Performance Targets

One of the funding programs recently approved by the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) was dedicated to funding projects and programs that sought to address safety issues and/or system resilience, or include benefits for incident management and first responders. The program includes funding for projects that address flooding issues in the region, improvements that aim to reduce crashes, and funding for a region-wide program that will focus on mitigating safety issues (i.e., wrong-way driving, dangerous intersections). This program specifically addresses PM1 as defined in Chapter 9. Two other recently approved funding programs invested in transit projects and projects that emphasize non-vehicular modes of transportation and context-sensitive design. These programs were the Sustainable Development Phase 4 (which included Turnbacks, Context Sensitive & Transit-Oriented Development projects) and the Transit Program – both were part of the larger 2017-2018 CMAQ/STBG Funding Program. Both of these programs address parts of PM3 and the Transit Asset Management (TAM) performance measures.

Performance targets related to transit projects approved by the RTC are addressed through the annual transit funding process. While many transit projects relate to maintaining existing operations of public transportation services, other transit projects directly relate to the maintenance, repair, and replacement of capital assets. These projects are evaluated against the TAM regional performance targets and individual transit provider's TAM plans to ensure consistency. Regional performance targets for TAM were established and coordinated with each transit provider. Additionally, each transit provider is federally required to develop and implement a TAM plan, individually or through a group-sponsor such as the MPO or TxDOT. Each TAM plan addresses capital assets used in the provision of public transportation

and requires prioritization of investments for repair, maintenance, and replacement. This requirement allows transit providers to strategically plan for funding of capital assets and allows the MPO to make effective funding decisions for projects included in the TIP.

Performance targets are also being addressed via larger funding initiatives that do not necessarily specify achieving progress toward a certain target as the reason for the initiative. One of the RTC's most recent project selection initiatives discussed earlier, the Regional 10-Year Plan required by Texas House Bill (HB) 20, includes many projects that address congestion reduction, connectivity, and safety issues, in addition to other criteria like pavement and bridge condition. A notable example is the proposed reconstruction of IH 635 East in Dallas County. In addition to being one of the most congested roadways in Texas, this roadway has an average annual crash rate that is 60 percent higher than similar urban interstates in Texas. Part of the proposed project involves bringing IH 635 up to current design standards that will mitigate the contributing factors in crashes on the facility. As a major roadway reconstruction project, it will improve pavement and bridge conditions along the 11-mile corridor. And, it will reduce congestion by adding roadway capacity. Ultimately, the project will address multiple performance measures, which is what made it a regional priority.

This emphasis on projects that have multi-faceted benefits also applies to the other performance measures and targets that will be utilized in the coming years. Many projects that have been selected by the RTC fall into this category where the improvements do not strictly address one issue. An interchange project may be selected primarily for its expected congestion relief, but it can address a structurally deficient bridge at the same time. A project that increases capacity will often also

address a pavement deficiency through the reconstruction of all existing lanes in addition to constructing the new ones.

In addition to the measures and targets described above, other focus areas are being considered when determining whether a project is selected and programmed. These include environmental justice, improved air quality, added active transportation options, increased freight movement, geographic dispersion, and many more. The region has also made a concerted effort to provide funding for active transportation improvements as part of roadway projects. When vetting projects, NCTCOG and the RTC consider a variety of measures pertaining to each of these areas when applicable.

Going forward, NCTCOG staff will continue to work to devote funding to projects and programs that will serve to achieve performance targets, required or otherwise

Texas Department of Transportation

The Unified Transportation Program (UTP) process is used to prioritize projects in certain funding categories for projects that TxDOT selects (either solely, or in coordination with MPOs). The UTP is a 10-year project planning document that guides project development and authorizes various levels of project development or implementation activity. The UTP establishes levels of development authority to allow projects to progress through the various stages of development actions included in each level. Transportation investments, particularly new facilities, typically take several years of planning before construction can begin. Projects often require feasibility studies, route studies, public hearings, environmental and social impact assessments, and the purchase of right-of-way prior to construction.

TxDOT uses various ranking indices or allocation formulas to prioritize the many projects in the UTP. Projects selected by TxDOT Austin are evaluated on a statewide basis, while projects selected by the Districts are evaluated against other projects within that District. The UTP identifies funding levels available to program projects against in the TIP.

Project Monitoring, Refinement, and Revision

The 2019-2022 TIP project listing is balanced to available resources. In addition, all projects in Year 1 are of high priority. Since the program is balanced to available resources, cost overruns can result in the potential of high priority projects being delayed into Year 2. Several other types of actions result in the need for a dynamic TIP monitoring program.

Examples of potential changes that could occur during the TIP implementation process include: cost overruns/underruns, environmental concerns, local governments' inability to meet local match requirements, lawsuits, delays in right-of-way acquisition or utility clearances, local governments wishing to pursue projects with local funds, etc.

The current RTC policy is that reprioritization of projects from later years will occur if earlier construction is feasible and financial constraint requirements can still be met. Therefore, the types of changes listed above could lead to projects being expedited or delayed, depending on the circumstances. Diligent monitoring with regular briefings to the RTC is essential. The TIP is intended to be a current and accurate listing of transportation projects proposed for federal or State funding.

RTC TIP Modification Policy and Process

NCTCOG staff may modify a project in the TIP at any time; however, project modifications are generally handled on a quarterly cycle in coordination with the STIP revision process unless TxDOT has approved an out-of-cycle revision period. Timely modifications to the TIP are important in order to avoid

funding/construction delays. The TIP modification policy consists of four sections – general policy provisions, project changes not requiring TIP modification, administrative amendment policy, and revision policy. TIP revisions require approval by the RTC, while the RTC delegates that authority to the Director of Transportation for administrative amendments. There are certain project changes that do not require a TIP modification such as, changes that do not impact the overall purpose of the project (i.e., CSJ change), increases in local funds, cost/funding decreases, funding year changes, etc. The specific criteria used to determine whether a modification will require a revision or administrative amendment, or if the project change does not require a TIP modification, are outlined in the TIP Modification Policy, Exhibit III-22.

After determining that

a modification requires RTC action, proposed revisions are submitted to STTC for review. STTC recommends a position on proposed revisions to the RTC. Then, the RTC takes action on STTC recommendations. If rapid turnaround is important, a modification can be submitted directly to the RTC and preclude the normal review processing sequence. In that case, the modification will go back to STTC for concurrence. All modifications are reviewed for consistency with the MTP and air quality conformity. After MTP and air quality review, the revisions and administrative amendments are made available online for public review and comment in accordance with the NCTCOG Public Participation Plan. All modifications that require a revision to the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) are submitted to

TxDOT on a quarterly basis.



EXHIBIT III-5
1992 and 1994 Call For Projects Selection Criteria

CRITERIA	POINTS
STP-MM	
Current cost-effectiveness	24
Future cost-effectiveness	18
Air quality/energy conservation	18
Local cost participation	24
Intermodal/multimodal/social mobility	16
Total	100
CMAQ	
Current cost-effectiveness	20
Air quality/energy conservation	20
Local cost participation	20
Intermodal/multimodal/social mobility	20
Congestion Management System Strategy/Transportation Control Measure	20
Total	100

EXHIBIT III-6

**Example of Project Evaluation Methodologies -
1992 & 1994 Calls for Projects
ADDITION OF LANES**

Criteria - Benefit/Cost Based Upon Travel Time Savings

Benefit/Cost Ratio	=	Annualized Travel Time Savings (\$)
		Annualized Total Project Costs
Annualized Total Project Costs	=	Total Project Costs * Capital Recovery Factor (6% for 40 years)
Annualized Travel Time Savings	=	Daily Travel Time Savings (Person Hours) * Value of Time * Number of Days per Year
Daily Travel Time Savings	=	Directional Design Hourly Volume (DDHV) * Auto Occupancy * Reduction in Delay Due to Road Widening * Hours of Congestion per Day
DDHV	=	Equivalent Peak-Hour Volume Factor * Peak-Hour Directional Split * Truck Factor * 24-Hour Traffic Volume

Benefit/Cost Assumptions

Cost of Congestion per Person Hour:	\$8.92	Average Auto Occupancy:	1.20
Number of Days per Year:	260	Truck Factor:	1.0
Hours of Congestion per Day:	8.33	Peak-Hour Directional Split:	60%
Delay per Mile (in minutes):	0.015 * Exp. (4.0 * V/C)		
Equivalent Peak-Hour Volume Factor:	10% (DDHV Factor = 0.06)		
Free Speeds:	90% of Speed Limits		
Capital Recovery Factor for 40 years at 6 Percent:	0.06646		

Criteria - Dollars per Pound of VOC Emissions Reductions

- Calculate Existing Daily Hydrocarbon (HC) Emissions:

$$E_B = EF_B * Volume * Distance$$
 Where: E_B = Emissions before improvement (grams)
 EF_B = Emission factor (grams per mile) based on existing average speed
- Determine Average Speed After Improvement:
 Increased Capacity → Improved Level of Service → Higher Speed
- Calculate Daily HC Emissions After Improvement:

$$E_A = EF_A * Volume * Distance$$
 Where: E_A = Emissions after improvement (grams)
 EF_A = Emission factor (grams per mile) based on new average speed and improved level of service
- Calculate Annual HC Emissions Reductions (E_R):

$$E_R = (E_B - E_A) * 300 \text{ days per year}$$
- Determine Cost per Pound of HC Reduction:

$$\text{Cost per Pound} = (\text{Annual Project Cost} * C_1) / E_R$$
 Where: C_1 = 454 grams per pound

Criteria – Local Cost Participation

Calculated as a ratio of local funds available to total project cost. Received the higher score of either local cost participation or project commitment. When this criteria was revised for the 1995 TIP, the number of points became proportional to local cost as a percent of the total project cost.

Criteria – Intermodal/Multimodal/Social Mobility

Assumed to support mainly single-occupancy vehicle travel, score = 0

EXHIBIT III-7

Project Evaluation Criteria – 1999 Call for Projects

Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Improvement Program

Criteria	POINTS
Current Cost-Effectiveness (1995)	20
Air Quality/Energy Conservation (1995)	20
Local Cost Participation	20
Intermodal/Multimodal/Social Mobility	20
Congestion Management System Strategy/ Transportation Control Measure	20
TOTAL	100

Current Cost-Effectiveness Rating

Benefit/Cost Ratio	Score
0.00 – 0.49	0
0.50 – 0.99	3
1.00 – 1.49	5
1.50 – 1.99	8
2.00 – 2.99	10
3.00 – 4.99	15
>4.99	20

Local Cost Participation Rating

Percent Commitment	Score
0 – 20	0
21 – 25	3
26 – 30	7
31 – 35	10
36 – 40	13
41 – 45	17
>45	20

Air Quality/Energy Conservation Rating

Dollars Per Pound of Volatile Organic Compound Emission Reductions	Score
>99.99	0
50.0 – 99.99	5
10.0 – 49.99	10
5.0 – 9.99	15
<5.0	20

Intermodal/Multi-Modal/Soc

Mode Occupancy	Score
Automobile (Occupancy = 1)	0
Goods Movement, Pedestrian, Bicycle, TDM, Bus Transit, Light Rail, Commuter Rail, HOV, Elderly & Disabled, Intermodal	20

Congestion Management System Strategy/Transportation Control Measure Rating

Criteria	Score	
Is proposed project in the Congestion Management System or State Implementation Plan?	No	0
	Yes	20

Exhibit III-7 (Cont'd)

Project Evaluation Criteria – 1999 Call for Projects

Surface Transportation Program – Metropolitan Mobility (STP-MM)
and Urbanized Area Formula Program (UAFP)

Criteria	Score
Current cost Effectiveness (1995)	24
Future Cost Effectiveness (2020)	18
Air Quality/Energy Conservation (1995)	18
Local Cost Participation	24
Intermodal/Multimodal/Social Mobility	16
TOTAL	100

Current Cost-Effectiveness Rating

Benefit/Cost Ratio	Score
0.00 – 0.49	0
0.50 – 0.99	3
1.00 – 1.49	6
1.50 – 1.99	9
2.00 – 2.99	12
3.00 – 4.99	18
>4.99	24

Future Cost Effectiveness Rating

Percent Commitment	Score
0.00 – 0.49	0
0.50 – 0.99	3
1.00 – 1.49	6
1.50 – 1.99	9
2.00 – 2.99	12
3.00 – 4.99	18
>4.99	24

Air Quality/Energy Conservation Rating

Dollars Per Pound of Volatile Organic Compound Emission Reductions	Score
>99.99	0
50.0 – 99.99	5
10.0 – 49.99	9
5.0 – 9.99	14
<5.0	18

Local Cost Participation Rating

Percent Commitment	Score
0 – 20	0
21 – 25	3
26 – 30	7
31 – 35	10
36 – 40	13
41 – 45	17
>45	20

Intermodal/Multi-Modal/Social Mobility

Mode Occupancy	Score
Automobile (Occupancy = 1)	0
Goods Movement, Bicycle & Pedestrian, TDM, Bus Transit, Light Rail, Commuter Rail, High Occupancy Vehicle Facilities, Elderly & Disabled, Intermodal	16

Exhibit III-8
2001 Park-and-Ride Call for Projects
PROJECT SCREENING CRITERIA

Projects selected for funding as a result of the 2001 Park-and-Ride Call for Projects must meet each of the criteria outlined below.

1. Service to Alternative Modes

Proposed facility should serve high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, bus transit, rail transit, vanpools, and/or carpools.

2. Serves Long Commute Trips

Proposed facility should be located to serve long commute trips in the Dallas-Fort Worth nonattainment area.

3. Proximity to Existing or Funded Transportation Infrastructure

Proposed facilities should be located in close proximity to existing passenger rail lines, freeway corridors, or principal arterials.

4. State Implementation Plan Commitments

Because the park-and-ride projects included in the 2001 Park-and-Ride Call for Projects are also State Implementation Plan commitments, they must be operational by 2007.

5. Convenient Access

Patrons should be able to access the proposed facility conveniently.

Exhibit III-9
2001 Land Use/Transportation Joint Venture Program
PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

Screen 1 Project Readiness	• Implementation Studies; Active Developers
Screen 2 RTC Objectives	• Rail or Mixed Use or Access
Screen 3 Private Sector	• Private Sector Match or Private Sector In-kind
Screen 4 Timing Issues	• Block Structure, Concurrency, Eligibility
Screen 5 Project Objectives	• Rail or Mixed Use or Access
Screen 6 System Continuity	• Project Access; Work Trips
Screen 7 Facility Review	• Eligible; Strategic; Cost Effective; Funding
Staff Recommendations	• Programs; Plans; Projects

EXHIBIT III-10
Strategic Funding Program
Arterial Streets Program
Emphasis Areas and Proposal Content

Emphasis Areas:

- Projects that widen or extend existing arterial roadways and projects that construct new arterial roadways
- Projects that improve mobility and safety
- Projects that target resources to most congested areas
- Projects that are currently identified in the metropolitan transportation plan and transportation conformity
- Projects that involve multiple transportation modes (i.e., include sidewalks or other pedestrian amenities)
- Projects that create permanent improvements,
- Projects that are ready for construction,
- Agencies submitting projects under this funding initiative must be willing and able to sign TxDOT's standard right-of-way participation and local project advance funding agreements to receive funding.

Proposal Content:

- Project Location - include project limits (to/from)
- Map of Project
- Scope of Work - detailed description of improvements to be made (i.e., widen Main Street from point A to point B, 2 to 4 lanes, divided/undivided roadway)
- Project Type (i.e., addition of lanes, new roadway)
- Project Length
- Project Phases to be Funded - indicate the phases for which funds are being requested (engineering, right-of-way, and/or construction). Please note that engineering initiated before final State/federal approval of the project funding is received must be paid with 100 percent local/private funds (and cannot be counted toward local match commitment).
- Cost Estimate - provide an estimated cost (in 2005 dollars) that details the roadway and non-roadway items included in the project cost. The cost should take into account (and delineate) each of the phases for which you wish to request funding. It should also include Engineering and Contingency (E&C) charges, which is a fee that TxDOT charges to cover engineering, contingencies, project inspection, etc. This fee is a percentage of the total project cost (rate schedule: \$0 to \$1 million total cost - 16 percent E&C; \$1 million to \$5 million - 11.5 percent E&C; \$5 million to \$25 million - 11 percent E&C; over \$25 million - 7.5 percent E&C). Please note that landscaping and amenities that cost more than one (1) percent of the total construction cost will be 100 percent locally funded, unless otherwise noted.
- Local Match - document who is paying the local match and whether or not funds are already available
- Estimated Let/Start Date (for each phase)
- Estimated Completion Date (for each phase)
- Project Contact - include name of project contact, their contact information, and the name of the office or department serving as the primary contact
- Partnership Program Workshop Certification - include printed name and signature of individual that attended the NCTCOG/TxDOT Partnership Program Workshop for this agency/project

EXHIBIT III-10 (Cont'd)

**Strategic Funding Program
Arterial Streets Program
Emphasis Areas and Proposal Content**

Eligibility Determination

Widen/Extend Existing or Construct New Roadway?	Creates Permanent Improvements?	Can Sign TxDOT Agreements?	Within MPO Boundary?	Are Additional Lanes Warranted (SOV Analysis)?	On FFCS?
Yes = 1	Yes = 1	Yes = 1	Yes = 1	Yes = 1	Yes = 1
No = 0 (reconstruction only)	No = 0	No = 0	No = 0	No = 0	No = 0

Evaluation of Eligible Projects

Improves Safety?	Provides Multiple Transportation Modes?	Volume Ranges	Levels of Service and Volume Capacity Ratio	Listed in MTP?	Ready for Construction?	Local Priority	Regional Facility	Interjurisdictional Project
Yes = 1	Yes = 1	80,000+ = 4	F = 4	Listed Correctly = 2	If ROW, PE, and Env are Completed and Const is Scheduled to Begin by Dec 2007 = 1	Priority 1 = 4	Listed in Regional Arterials in the Plan = 1	Yes = 1
No = 0	No = 0	40,000 - 79,999 = 3	E = 3	Listed Incorrectly, but Lets After May 2007 = 1	If Const is Scheduled to Begin Later than Dec 2007 = 0	Priority 2 = 3	Not Listed in the Plan = 0	No = 0
		20,000 - 39,999 = 2	D = 2	Listed Incorrectly, but Lets Before May 2007 = 0		Priority 3 = 2		
		19,999 or less = 1	C = 1	Not Listed at All = 0		Priority 4+ = 1		
			B = 0					

Notes:
 SOV = Single Occupant Vehicle
 FFCS = Federal Functional Classification System
 MTP = Mobility Plan
 ROW = Right of Way
 PE = Preliminary Engineering
 Env = Environmental Phase

EXHIBIT III-10 (Cont'd)
Strategic Funding Program
Arterial-Intersection and Bottleneck Program
Emphasis Areas and Proposal Content

Emphasis Areas:

- Projects that reduce travel time, delay, and/or accidents due to implementation of low-cost improvements
- Projects that improve mobility, safety, and air quality at arterial intersections or along arterial streets
- Projects that are currently identified in the metropolitan transportation plan, transportation conformity, and/or major investment studies
- Projects that target resources to most congested areas,
- Projects that involve multiple transportation modes (i.e., include sidewalks or other pedestrian amenities)
- Projects that create permanent improvements
- Projects that are ready for construction
- Agencies submitting projects under this funding initiative must be willing and able to sign TxDOT's standard right-of-way participation and local project advance funding agreements to receive funding.

Proposal Content:

- Project Location - include project limits and/or individual locations to be improved
- Map of Project
- Scope of Work - detailed description of improvements to be made (i.e., add left and right turn lanes on Street A at Street B, add grade separation on Street X at Street)
- Project Type (i.e., safety, grade separation, intersection improvement)
- Project Length
- Project Phases to be Funded - indicate the phases for which funds are being requested (engineering, right-of-way, and/or construction). Please note that engineering initiated before final State/federal approval of the project funding is received must be paid with 100 percent local/private funds (and cannot be counted toward local match commitment).
- Cost Estimate - provide an estimated cost (in 2005 dollars) that details the roadway and non-roadway items included in the project cost. The cost should take into account (and delineate) each of the phases for which you wish to request funding. It should also include E&C charges, which is a fee that TxDOT charges to cover engineering, contingencies, project inspection, etc. This fee is a percentage of the total project cost (rate schedule: \$0 to \$1 million total cost – 16 percent E&C; \$1 million to \$5 million - 11.5 percent E&C; \$5 million to \$25 million – 11 percent E&C; over \$25 million - 7.5 percent E&C). Please note that landscaping and amenities that cost more than one (1) percent of the total construction cost will be 100 percent locally funded, unless otherwise noted.
- Local Match - document who is paying the local match and whether or not funds are already available
- Estimated Let/Start Date (for each phase)
- Estimated Completion Date (for each phase)
- Project Contact - include name of project contact, their contact information, and the name of the office or department serving as the primary contact
- Partnership Program Workshop Certification - include printed name and signature of individual that attended the NCTCOG/TxDOT Partnership Program Workshop for this agency/project

EXHIBIT III-10 (Cont'd)
Strategic Funding Program
Arterial-Intersection and Bottleneck Program
Emphasis Areas and Proposal Content

Eligibility Determination

Creates Permanent Improvements?	Can Sign TxDOT Agreements?	Is it an intersection improvement?
Yes = 1	Yes = 1	Yes = 1
No = 0	No = 0	No = 0

Evaluation of Eligible Projects

Reduces NOx/Air Quality Benefits (in lbs/day)?	Is Cost Effective (~cost/tons of emissions reduced)?	Volume Ranges	Levels of Service/Volume Capacity Ratio	Improves Safety?	Provides Multiple Transportation Modes?	Ready for Construction?	Local Priority	Regional Facility	Interjurisdictional Project
≥ 3.0 = 3	\$99,999 or less = 5	80,000+ = 4	F = 4	Yes = 1	Yes = 1	If ROW, PE, and Env are Completed and Const is Scheduled to Begin by Dec 2007 = 1	Priority 1 = 4	Listed in Regional Arterials in the Plan = 1	Yes = 1
1.5 < 3.0 = 2	\$100,000 - 499,000 = 4	40,000 - 79,999 = 3	E = 3	No = 0	No = 0	If Const is Scheduled to Begin Later than Dec 2007 = 0	Priority 2 = 3	Not Listed in the Plan = 0	No = 0
0.01 < 1.5 = 1	\$500,000 - \$999,999 = 3	20,000 - 39,999 = 2	D = 2				Priority 3 = 2		
0 = 0	\$1 million+ = 2	19,999 or less = 1	C = 1				Priority 4+ = 1		
			B=0						

Notes:

NOx = Nitrogen Oxides
 ROW = Right of Way
 PE = Preliminary Engineering
 Env = Environmental Phase

EXHIBIT III-10 (Cont'd)
Strategic Funding Program
Intelligent-Transportation System Projects
Emphasis Areas and Proposal Content

Emphasis Areas:

- Projects that fill in gaps in the existing Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) infrastructure by completing critical systems
- Projects that enhance interagency cooperation
- Projects that increase the reliability of the existing transportation system
- Projects that promote multimodal usage

Eligible and Ineligible Projects:

- Programs, projects, corridors and/or systems identified in the regional ITS plans are eligible.
- Projects consistent with priority services identified in the North Texas Regional ITS Architecture are eligible.
- Project sponsorship must include a commitment to provide at least 20 percent of the total project cost from a local source, in order to qualify for federal funding.
- Agencies submitting projects under this funding initiative must be willing and able to sign TxDOT's standard local project advance funding agreement to receive funding.
- Traffic signal communication projects which provide or enhance communication between signals and the central control are eligible under the ITS program.
- Traditional traffic signal improvement projects (signal optimization, controller replacement, signal upgrade, and signal coordination) are not eligible under the ITS program.
- Purchase of right-of-way is not an eligible expense.
- Cost overruns for currently selected or future ITS projects will not be funded with federal funds.

Proposal Content:

- Project Location - include project limits and/or individual locations to be improved
- Map of Project
- Scope of Work - description of improvements to be implemented as part this project
- Project Length
- Project Phases to be Funded - indicate the phases for which funds are being requested (engineering and/or construction). Please note that engineering initiated before final State/federal approval of the project funding is received must be paid with 100 percent local/private funds (and cannot be counted toward local match commitment).
- Prioritization number of the project, as ranked by your agency (optional)
- Cost Estimate - provide an estimated cost in 2005 dollars that details items included in the project cost. The cost should indicate each of the phases for which you wish to request funding. It should also include engineering and contingency (E&C) charges, which is a fee that TxDOT charges to cover engineering, contingencies, project inspection, etc. This fee is a percentage of the total project cost (rate schedule: \$0

to \$1 million total cost – 16 percent E&C; \$1 million to \$5 million - 11.5 percent E&C; \$5 million to \$25 million – 11 percent E&C).

- Local Match - indicate the agency responsible for paying the local match and whether or not funds are already available. If not available, please specify when the funds will be available.
- Estimated Let/Start Date (for each phase)
- Estimated Completion Date (for each phase)
- Project Contact - include name of project contact, their contact information, and the name of the office or department serving as the primary contact
- Partnership Program Workshop Certification - include printed name and signature of individual who attended the NCTCOG/TxDOT Partnership Program Workshop for this agency/project

EXHIBIT III-10 (Cont'd)
Strategic Funding Program
Intelligent-Transportation System Projects
Emphasis Areas and Proposal Content

Column Title: Fill Gaps

Column Description: Projects that fill in gaps in the existing Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) infrastructure by completing critical systems.

Projects that fill in the gaps on freeway systems received a '2'.

Projects that fill in the gaps on arterials systems received a '1'.

Projects that did not fill in the gaps received a '0'.

Column Title: Enhance Interagency Cooperation

Column Description: Projects that enhance interagency cooperation.

Projects that enhance interagency cooperation between more than two agencies received a '2'.

Projects that enhance interagency cooperation between two agencies received a '1'.

Projects that did not enhance interagency cooperation received a '0'.

Column Title: Increase Reliability

Column Description: Projects that increase the reliability of the existing transportation system.

Projects that increase reliability on freeway systems received a '2'.

Projects that increase reliability on arterials systems received a '1'.

Projects that did not increase reliability received a '0'.

Column Title: Multimodal

Column Description: Projects that promote multimodal usage

Projects that promote multimodal usage, roadway and transit directly received a '2'.

Projects that promote multimodal usage, roadway and transit indirectly, received a '1' (i.e., projects located within a transit service area).

Projects that do not promote multimodal usage directly or indirectly received a '0'.

EXHIBIT III-10 (Cont'd)

Joint TxDOT/RTC Freeway Interchange/Bottleneck Partnership Program

Eligibility and Selection Priority

Eligible

Interchange Improvements

Bottleneck Removal Projects

Locations

Highway to highway interchanges

Highway to arterial crossings

Highway bottlenecks

Funding Requirements

1/3 local (can include city, county, and private funds)

1/3 TxDOT

1/3 RTC

Selection Priority

- Leveraging of federal and State funds with local funding sources
- Bottleneck and interchange locations identified in the Mobility Plan – Amended April 2005 or in the 2003 DFW Commuter Traffic Study available online at <http://www.nctcog.org/trans/photo-survey/2003/index.html>
- Corridors that did not receive funding through RTC Partnership Program 1 (October 2004)
- Projects that create permanent improvements
- Projects are ready for construction
- Agencies submitting projects under this funding initiative must be willing and able to sign TxDOT's standard right-of-way participation and local project advance funding agreements to receive funding

Other Considerations

TxDOT and NCTCOG staff will coordinate in drafting a list of project funding recommendations for STTC and RTC consideration.

EXHIBIT III-10 (Cont'd)
Local Air Quality Program
Bicycle/Pedestrian Regional Connections
Eligibility, Emphasis Areas, and Proposal Content

Eligible Project Types:

- Construction of a new trail
- Construction of sidewalks

Emphasis Areas:

- Projects that provide regional connections
- Projects that yield air quality benefits
- Projects that are consistent with the Mobility Plan
- Projects that are consistent with the Rail Station Access Study (available online at http://www.nctcog.org/trans/sustdev/bikeped/access_to_rail/index.html)
- Projects that are consistent with local bicycle/pedestrian area plans
- Projects that adhere to current regional, state, or federal design guidelines
- Projects that are located within a bicycle/pedestrian transportation district (available online at http://www.nctcog.org/trans/sustdev/bikeped/2005_update/Exhibit XIII-20 Bike & Ped Facilities Revised May05.pdf)
- Projects that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT)

Proposal Content:

- Prioritization or Ranking of Project (if submitting multiple projects)
- Name of Facility
- Facility Location – Include city name, and beginning and end point of project
- Project Description – Detailed description of improvements to be made (i.e., construction of a new trail, sidewalks, bicyclist/pedestrian amenities, lighting, landscaping).
- Type of Facility – Indicate if facility is on-street, off-street, or sidewalk
- Length of Facility (in miles)
- Project Justification – Why is this project needed? How will this project meet the emphasis areas listed above? Describe any other relevant information that will assist in the evaluation of this project.
- Describe the nearby land uses and expected users of the facility
- Right-of-Way Availability – Is right-of-way already in hand? If not, will it be purchased or donated? And, has purchase or donation process been initiated? What is the estimated completion for right-of-way acquisition?

- Phases to be Funded – indicate the phases for which funds are being requested (engineering, right-of-way, and/or construction).
- Cost Estimate – Provide an itemized cost estimate (in 2006 dollars). The cost should take into account (and delineate) each of the phases for which funding is requested.
- Map of project location
- MAPSCO Page Number – Indicate the MAPSCO page number(s) in which the project is located
- Local Match – Indicate who is paying the local match and whether or not funds are already available
- Estimated Let/Start Date (month and year for each phase)
- Estimated Completion Date (month and year for each phase)
- Project Contact – Include name of project contact, their contact information, and the name of the office or department serving as the primary contact
- Partnership Program Workshop Certification – Include printed name and signature of individual that attended the NCTCOG/TxDOT Partnership Program Workshop for this agency/project

EXHIBIT III-10 (Cont'd)
Local Air Quality Program
Bicycle/Pedestrian Regional Connections
Evaluation Methodology

Eligibility Screen		
Adheres to Rules/Design Standards	Provides Regional Connection ¹	Pass Eligibility Screen?
Yes?	Yes?	2 "Yes" = Pass
No?	No?	Less than 2 "Yes" = Fail

Regional Connectivity Table		
Mobility (Project serves at least 500 users)	No viable alternative currently exists for bike/ped traffic	Provides transportation benefit without construction of other major bike/ped facility to function
Y/N	Y/N	Y/N

Safety Table		
Does the facility run along a major arterial?	Grade-separated crossing over a major roadway?	New or improved facility connecting to a school?
Y/N	Y/N	Y/N

Evaluation of Eligible Projects

Bike/Pedestrian Criteria = 100 points max					Air Quality Criteria = 100 points max			Other Criteria = 100 points max		
Transit Connectivity (25)	Veloweb Connectivity (25)	Annualized capital cost per average weekday user (10)	Targets Low-Income Bike/Ped User Accessibility (25)	Safety Score ² (15)	Emission Reduction [2009 NOx Reduction in Pounds/Day] (45)	Completion Timeframe (25)	Cost Benefit [Cost/Ton Over Project Lifetime] (30)	Environmental Justice Distribution ³ (10)	Local Priority (20)	Interjurisdictional Projects (20)
Upon construction, project will provide direct access to transit = 25	Project connects to existing veloweb section = 25	Less than \$50 = 10	Project is located in an area with >15%poverty = 25	Project meets at least 2 safety criteria = 15	Greater than 100 = 45	Present - June 2007 = 25	< \$2,000 = 30	7-8 = 10	Priority 1 = 20	Joint Local Match Participation = 20
Subsequent phases necessary for project to reach a existing transit station or needs station construction = 15	Project connects to programmed veloweb section = 20	Between \$50 and \$100 = 5	Project is located in an area with >11% and <15% poverty = 15	Project meets 1 safety criteria = 10	.01 - 100 = y	July 2007 - June 2008 = 20	,001 - \$125,000 =	5-6 = 8	Priority 2 = 12	Project Crosses City Limit = 10
Project has no connection to transit = 0	Project connects to a non-existing veloweb section = 15	Greater than \$100 = 0	Project is located in an area with <11% poverty = 0	Project meets 0 safety criteria = 0	0 = 0	July 2008 - June 2009 = 15	25,001 or more =	3-4 = 5	Priority 3 = 5	All Other Cases = 0
	Project has no connection to the veloweb = 0					July 2009 - June 2010 = 10		0-2 = 2	Priority 4+ = 0	
					$y = 0.45x$	After June 2010 = 5	$y = (-30/123,000)x + 30.49$			

Notes:

¹ See Regional Connectivity Criteria table

² See Safety Criteria table

³ Based on number of disadvantaged classes satisfied

NOx = Nitrogen Oxides

VMT = Vehicle Miles of Travel

EXHIBIT III-10 (Cont'd)

Local Air Quality Program

Regional/Innovative Projects and Programs to improve Air Quality

Eligibility, Emphasis Areas, and Proposal Content

Eligible Project Types:

- Employer trip reduction programs
- Air quality outreach and marketing programs
- Vanpool programs
- Special studies
- Other air quality control strategies

Other Considerations:

- Projects may be funded with local or federal funds
- If funding permits, RTC/local projects may be funded 100% (no local match required)
- Federally funded projects will require a minimum of 20 percent local match. However, if funding permits, the local match may be programmed with RTC/local funds.
- Project ideas/proposals may be expanded and implemented at the regional (versus local) level
- Ongoing projects will be funded through 2009. If funding permits, ongoing projects may be funded through 2010.

Emphasis Areas:

- Projects that yield air quality benefits
- Projects that lead to mobility and safety improvements
- Projects that reduce vehicle miles of travel
- Projects that encourage the use of alternative transportation modes
- Projects that reduce indirect impacts of transportation
- Projects that aid in the evaluation or implementation of air quality initiatives
- Projects supported in the Mobility Plan or State Implementation Plan

Proposal Content:

- Project Location – Identify whether this project is a city, county, or regional project
- Project Description – Include a detailed description of project proposal. The description should explain the goals, objectives, and expected outcomes/products of the project. Is the proposal for a new program or is it an enhancement of an existing program. If it is an enhancement, please specify the existing program.
- Project Justification – Why is this project needed? How will this project meet the emphasis areas listed above? Describe any other relevant information that will assist in the evaluation of this project.
- Project Phases to be Funded – Indicate the phases for which funds are being requested (engineering, implementation, staff time)
- Cost Estimate by Fiscal Year – Provide an itemized cost estimate in 2006 dollars. The cost should delineate each of the years in which funding is requested.
- Local Match – Document who is paying the local match or if the local match is being requested through this program. Please indicate when the matching funds will be available

- Estimated Start Date (month and year for each phase)
- Estimated Completion Date (month and year for each phase)
- Project Contact – Include name of project contact, their contact information, and the name of the office or department serving as the primary contact
- Partnership Program Workshop Certification – Include printed name and signature of individual that attended the NCTCOG/TxDOT Partnership Program Workshop for this agency/project

EXHIBIT III-10 (Cont'd)

Local Air Quality Program

Regional/Innovative Projects and Programs to Improve Air Quality

Screening Process

1. Does the proposal duplicate an existing or recently funded project?
2. Is the project better funded under another funding source (i.e., Unified Planning Work Program, Clean Vehicle Call for Projects)?
3. Can this project be combined with other proposals or can existing projects/programs be expanded in funding and size to incorporate beneficial elements of project?
4. Does the project provide a direct air quality benefit or does it involve management or operations of a project that provides air quality benefits?
5. Is the project an existing 1-Hour Ozone State Implementation Plan (SIP) Commitment?
6. Can the project be used in the pending 8-Hour Ozone SIP?
7. Should an education, engineering, or enforcement solution be implemented?
8. Does this proposal serve as a continuation of an existing regional air quality program?
9. If so, should that project/program be continued?
10. Is the project needed or desired by the region?
11. If so, and the project is not funded under this program, is there another funding source available (i.e., do we lose a good program if we do not fund it)?
12. Is the private sector meeting this need?
13. Is this project a strategic regional commitment?

EXHIBIT III-10 (Cont'd)

Local Air Quality Program

Park-and-Ride Facilities

Eligibility, Emphasis Areas and Proposal Content

Eligible Project Types:

- Construction of dedicated facilities only
- construction of parking garages are not eligible
- Joint-use facilities are not eligible (i.e., share parking lot with athletic stadium or church)

Emphasis Areas:

- Projects that yield air quality benefits
- Facilities that serve alternative modes of transportation, such as high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, bus transit, rail transit, vanpools and/or carpools
- Facilities that serve long commute trips to, from, or within the Dallas-Fort Worth nonattainment area
- Facilities that are located in close proximity to existing or funded passenger rail lines, freeway corridors, or principal arterials
- Facilities must be operational by 2009
- Patrons should be able to access the proposed facility conveniently
- Facilities that have been identified in a major investment study, environmental document, transit study, or other relevant sub-area study
- Facilities that are anticipated to provide high utilization rates

Proposal Content:

- Project Location – Include city name and closest major intersection (i.e., I.H. 30 at Ballpark Way)
- Map of Location – Map project location, along with any nearby transit stations, other park-and-ride lots, and the major transportation facility that the park-and-ride lot will serve
- MAPSCO Page Number – Indicate the MAPSCO page number(s) for the project location
- Project Description – Include a detailed description of project components (i.e., construction of spaces, access and egress, passenger shelters, lighting, and landscaping)
- Number of Spaces
- Project Justification – Why is this project needed? How will this project meet the emphasis areas listed above? Describe any other relevant information that will assist in the evaluation of this project
- Project Phases to be Funded - Indicate the phases for which funds are being requested (engineering, right-of-way, and/or construction)
- Cost Estimate – Provide an itemized cost estimate in 2006 dollars. The cost should take into account (and delineate) each of the phases for which funding is requested.
- Local Match – Indicate who is paying the local match and whether or not funds are already available
- Estimated Let/Start Date (month and year for each phase)
- Estimated Completion Date (month and year for each phase)
- Project Contact – Include name of project contact, their contact information, and the name of the office or department serving as the primary contact
- Partnership Program Workshop Certification - include printed name and signature of individual that attended the NCTCOG/TxDOT Partnership Program Workshop for this agency/project

EXHIBIT III-10 (Cont'd)

Local Air Quality Program
Park-and-Ride Facilities
Evaluation Methodology

Eligibility Determination

Construction of a Dedicated PNR Facility?	Within Nonattainment Area?	Passes Eligibility Screen?
Yes?	Yes?	2 "Yes" = Pass
No?	No?	Less than 2 "Yes" = Fail

Evaluation of Eligible Projects

Congestion Management Criteria = 100 points max					Air Quality Criteria = 100 points max			Local Priority (20)
Serves Alternative Modes of Transportation (30)	Identified in MIS, EIS/EA, Transit, or Sub-Area Study (20)	Provides Convenient Access for Users (15)	Current Cost Effectiveness (Mobility Benefit/Cost Ratio) ¹ (20)	Listed in Mobility Plan (15)	Emission Reduction [2009 NOx Reduction in Pounds/Day] (45)	Completion Timeframe (25)	Cost Benefit [Cost/Ton Over Project Lifetime] (30)	
Three or More Modes = 30	Yes = 20	Freeway, Rail, Managed/HOV Lane Access = 15	1 - 0.5 = 20	Yes = 15	Greater than 100 = 45	Present - June 2007 = 25	< \$2,000 = 30	Priority 1 = 20
Two Modes = 20	No = 0	Major Arterial Access = 10	0.20 - 0.5 = 15	No = 0	.01 - 100 = y	July 2007 - June 2008 = 20	\$2,001 - \$125,000 = y	Priority 2 = 12
One Mode = 10		Other = 0	0.10 - 0.20 = 10		0 = 0	July 2008 - June 2009 = 15	\$125,001 or more = 0	Priority 3 = 5
			>0.00 - .10 = 5			July 2009 - June 2010 = 10		Priority 4+ = 0
			0.00 = 0		y = 0.45x	After June 2010 = 5	y = (-30/123,000)x + 30.49	

Notes:

¹Mobility Benefit/Cost Ratio = (Value of Time * (Avg. Commute Distance / Avg. Freeway Speed) * New PNR Spaces * Utilization Factor * Days Per Year) / Total Cost

²Based on number of disadvantaged classes satisfied

PNR = Park-and-Ride Facility

NOx = Nitrogen Oxides

MIS = Major Investment Study

EIS/EA = Environmental Documents

HOV = High Occupant Vehicle

EXHIBIT III-10 (Cont'd)
Local Air Quality Program
Traffic Signal Projects
Eligibility, Emphasis Areas and Proposal Content

Eligible Project Types: Traffic signal retiming, which can include the following eligible costs:

- Installation of new traffic signal controllers
- Replacement of existing traffic signal controllers
- Replacement of vehicle detectors (loop, video, etc.)
- Installation of communication equipment
- Installation of communication software

Emphasis Areas:

- Projects that yield air quality benefits
- Projects that improve mobility and safety
- Projects that reduce travel time, delay, and/or accidents due to implementation of low-cost improvements
- Projects that target resources to most congested areas
- Projects that involve coordination with neighboring jurisdictions
- Projects that are not included in the Thoroughfare Assessment Program (TAP)
- Signal locations that were retimed before 2004

Proposal Content:

- Prioritization or Ranking of Project (if submitting multiple projects)
- Project Location/Corridor – City name, street name and project limits (beginning and ending point)
- Map of Project Location
- MAPSCO Page Number – Indicate the MAPSCO page number(s) for the signal locations
- Project Identification – An interactive query/mapping feature will be made available at <http://www.nctcog.org/trans/tip/signals>. Project locations must be selected from the GIS layer/table provided online. Proposals must include corresponding Signal ID(s) for those locations being submitted.
- Project Description – General description of requested improvements (please use terminology listed in eligible project costs above)
- Number of Locations – How many locations will be improved through project?
- Individual Locations – Provide itemized list of individual locations to be improved along that corridor. Include Signal ID (see above), street name and cross street (i.e., Beltline at Josey), the requested improvement at each location (please use terminology listed in eligible project costs above), and indicate any individual locations thought to be on the State Highway System
- Project Justification – Why is this project needed? How will this project meet the emphasis areas listed above? Describe any other relevant information that will assist in the evaluation of this project.

- Date of Last Signal Retiming – When was the last time this signal was retimed (mm/yy)?
- Length of Corridor (in miles)
- Traffic Count – Provide a 24-hour traffic count for each individual location. Also indicate the date (mm/dd/yy) that the count was taken.
- Phases to be Funded – Indicate the phases for which funds are being requested (engineering and/or construction)
- Cost Estimate – Provide an itemized cost estimate (in 2006 dollars). The cost should take into account (and delineate) each of the phases for which funding is requested.
- Local Match – Document who is paying the local match and whether or not funds are already available
- Estimated Let/Start Date (month and year for each phase)
- Estimated Completion Date (month and year for each phase)
- Project Contact – Include name of project contact, their contact information, and the name of the office or department serving as the primary contact
- Partnership Program Workshop Certification – Include printed name and signature of individual that attended the NCTCOG/TxDOT Partnership Program Workshop for this agency/project

EXHIBIT III-10 (Cont'd)
Local Air Quality Program
Traffic Signal Projects
Evaluation Methodology

Eligibility Determination

Involves Signal Retiming	Requested Equipment Upgrades are Eligible	Within Nonattainment Area	Signals Last Retimed Prior to December 2003	Passes Eligibility Screen?
Yes?	Yes?	Yes?	Yes?	4 "Yes" = Pass
No?	No?	No?	No?	3 or Less "Yes" = Fail

Evaluation of Eligible Projects

Congestion Management Criteria = 100 points max			Air Quality Criteria = 100 points max			Other Criteria = 100 points max		
Mobility Benefit/Cost Ratio [Based on Time Saved] ¹ (50)	Environmental Justice Distribution ² (30)	Interjurisdictional Project (20)	Emission Reduction [2009 NOx Reduction in Pounds/Day] (45)	Completion Timeframe (25)	Cost Benefit [Cost/Ton Over Project Lifetime] (30)	Regional Facility (30)	Not Included In TAP (20)	Local Priority (20)
> 4.99 = 50	7-9 = 30	Joint Local Match Participation = 20	Greater than 100 = 45	Present - June 2007 = 25	< \$2,000 = 30	Listed as Regional Arterial in MTP = 30	Not Included In TAP = 20	Priority 1 = 20
3.00 - 4.99 = 40	5-6 = 20	Project Crosses City Limit = 10	.01 - 100 = y	July 2007 - June 2008 = 20	\$2,001 - \$125,000 = y	Not Listed as Regional Arterial in MTP = 0	Retiming Funded, but Equipment Not Funded Through TAP = 10	Priority 2 = 12
2.00 - 2.99 = 30	3-4 = 10	All Other Cases = 0	0 = 0	July 2008 - June 2009 = 15	\$125,001 or more = 0			Priority 3 = 5
1.50 - 1.99 = 20	0-2 = 5			July 2009 - June 2010 = 10				Priority 4+ = 0
1.00 - 1.49 = 15			y = 0.45x	After June 2010 = 5	y = (-30/123,000)x + 30.49			
0.50 - .99 = 10								
0.00 - 0.49 = 5								

Notes:

¹ Mobility Benefit Cost Ratio = Total benefit in present dollars (time saved*value of time(\$9.7)*daily occupancy (1.14)) / Total Project Cost

²Based on number of disadvantaged classes satisfied

NOx = Nitrogen Oxides

MTP = Metropolitan Transportation Plan

TAP = Thoroughfare Assessment Program

EXHIBIT III-10 (Cont'd)
Sustainable Development Program
Planning Project Screening Process




EXHIBIT III-10 (Cont'd)
Sustainable Development Program
Land Banking Interview Questions

1. Does the project aim to assemble multiple parcels under separate ownership or is it focused on a single major parcel? If separate ownership, how many property owners will be involved?
2. Is there a general intent to immediately transfer the land to an identified or likely private sector developer?
3. Are there any existing private sector parcel assembly efforts underway?
4. Is the project part of or coordinated with a H.U.D. or Housing Authority project?
5. Will the long-term use of the land be for a private sector land use development, housing or a governmental use (park, education, transit, et cetera)?
6. As the local sponsor, what is your estimate of the time lag between grant and acquisition and between acquisition and use of the land?
7. Is there a current TIF/PID or other special district in place?
8. Is the project located in a Transit Authority area and is it directly adjacent to a current rail station or a station planned to be in place by 2010? By 2025?
9. If the project is successful, how many acres would be in the land bank and what ultimate land use is supported by city staff?
10. Does the project provide for a redevelopment opportunity on existing developed land?
11. Is there anything else you would like to add about the project?

EXHIBIT III-11

Regional Toll Revenue (RTR) Sustainable Development Call for Projects

Sustainable Development Call for Projects Implementation with RTR Funding

A total of \$41 million is available for sustainable infrastructure and planning projects. RTR funds were specifically set aside for the 2009 Sustainable Development Call for Projects, which seeks to:

- Reduce ozone-forming pollution from vehicles by promoting mixed-use developments through public/private partnerships.
- Support sustainable, walkable communities.
- Foster growth and development around historic downtowns, main streets, infill areas and passenger rail lines and stations.

Of the \$41 million available to the region, \$27.6 million is RTR funds available for infrastructure projects in the Eastern Subregion. An additional \$1 million local dollars is set aside for planning projects.

Types of Projects Considered in Sustainable Development Funding

Infrastructure

An infrastructure project is a construction project that provides public infrastructure in the public right-of-way and can be used to support private vertical development. Examples include pedestrian amenities, landscaping, intersection improvements, lighting, street construction, traffic signalization, etc.

Planning

Planning projects include market, housing, and economic analyses, transit station planning, Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Planning, General Planning (subdivision regulations, creation of new code/zoning regulations, master planning, updates to pedestrian and/or bicycle plans, etc.), and others.

How Much Funding is Available for Sustainable Development

Infrastructure: \$40M (80% Awarded)

Planning: \$1M (80% Awarded) \$10M (20% Match) \$250K (20% Match)

Eastern Subregion award: \$40M

Who Can Apply for Sustainable Development Funding

Infrastructure

Primary sponsors include cities and counties. Secondary sponsors include private for profit developers or cities constructing vertical development, "acting as the developer" (required). Additional sponsors are allowed.

Planning

A city, county, special district, or a transit agency must be the primary sponsor for each application. Additional secondary sponsors are allowed.

EXHIBIT III-12

**Regional Toll Revenue (RTR)
Evaluation Methodology and Definitions
ON- AND OFF-SYSTEM PROJECTS**

	Column Name	Definition
Eligibility Screen	Eligible County	Dallas, Tarrant, Denton, & Collin County are the only counties eligible to participate in this funding initiative
	Eligible Project Type	Project variations that can be funded under each category (requirements vary by project type)
	Eligible Match = 20%	Is the Eligible State/Local Match of the Total Cost greater than or equal to 20% of the Total Cost?
	Must include Construction Phase	Does the project involve the construction or implementation of a transportation improvement?
	Does Project have Added Capacity? (i.e. widen, extend, construct new roadway)	Will the project widen or extend an existing roadway or construct a new roadway? Reconstruction projects are not eligible.
	Warranted In 2007 (SOV Analysis)	Will the addition of general-purpose lane(s) significantly reduce congestion if the roadway is constructed by 2007? (Measured using daily volume to capacity ratio)
	Warranted In 2015 (SOV Analysis)	Will the addition of general-purpose lane(s) significantly reduce congestion if the roadway is constructed by 2015? (Measured using daily volume to capacity ratio)
	Warranted in 2030 (SOV Analysis)	Will the addition of general-purpose lane(s) significantly reduce congestion if the roadway is constructed by 2030? (Measured using daily volume to capacity ratio)
	Are Additional Lanes Warranted (SOV Analysis)?	Will the addition of general-purpose lane(s) significantly reduce congestion if the roadway is constructed in 2007, 2015, or 2030?
	Adopted Clean Fleet Policy	Has implementing agency adopted RTC Clean Fleet Vehicle Model Ordinance? *Applies as an eligibility requirement only to Dallas & Tarrant County. In Collin & Denton County, this criteria applies to the Technical Screen.
	Pass Eligibility Screen	Does project meet minimum eligibility requirements?
Strategic Screen	Initial Assessment of RTC Interest	Given existing RTC policies & priorities, would the RTC be interested in funding this project?
	Is Project Warranted in Near Term? (i.e., 2007 or 2015)	Is the roadway expansion (i.e. number of lanes) warranted in the short term (i.e. 2007 or 2015) rather than in the future (2030)?
	Creates Permanent or Long Term Improvement	Does the project create a permanent or long term improvement? The RTC prefers not to invest in temporary or "throw-away" improvements.
	Pass Strategic Screen	Does the project meet minimum strategic requirements?
Technical Screen	Federal Functional Classification System (FFCS) of Collector or Greater	Are the project improvements located on an arterial that is designated as an Urban Collector or greater as defined by the FFCS?
	Supports Transportation System vs. Stand Alone	Does the construction of the project support the existing/future transportation system as opposed to being a stand-alone project?
	Project Consistent with Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)	Is the project correctly documented/referenced in the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan?
	MTP Comments	Comments provided by the Metropolitan Transportation Plan team regarding Plan consistency (as needed)
	Interjurisdictional Project (Crosses Jurisdictional Lines or Funded by More Than One City)	Does the project traverse city limit lines and/or is the project's local match funded by more than one city?
	% Local Match	Percent of Local/State Match committed by project sponsor(s)
	% of Other Leveraging	Percent of Other Funding Sources above and beyond the required 20% match
	Sum of all Leveraging	Sum of all Local Match funding and Other Leveraging committed by submitting agency
	Is Local Match and Other Leveraging >=50%	Is the sum of the Local Match and Other Leveraging greater than or equal to 50% of the Total Cost?
	Intermodal/ Multiple Transportation Modes	Does the project involve the use of multiple modes of transportation (i.e. pedestrian, transit, roadway, intermodal)?
	Congestion Management Process (CMP) Strategy	Does the project utilize one or more of the congestion management strategies identified in the currently approved CMP?
	Environmental Justice Score	Measures positive impacts on protected populations, such as minority and low income populations (1=Communities of Lowest Concern will have a lower population of protected classes and a low to moderate density), (2=Communities of Moderate Concern will have a moderate percent of protected classes and a moderate to high density), and (3=Communities of Highest Concern will have a high percent of protected classes and a moderate to high density).
	Meets Environmental Justice Threshold	Staff proposes scores of 2 or higher for projects located in Denton and Collin Counties and scores of 3 for projects located in Tarrant and Dallas Counties in order to meet threshold.
	Regional Facility	Is this project defined as a regional arterial in the MTP?
Final 2015 Volumes	Projected daily vehicular volumes generated by the Regional Travel Model for year 2015	
2015 Level of Service (E-F=Yes/A-D=No)	Is the vehicular traffic flow on the roadway seriously impeded or congested beyond normal daily traffic flow in year 2015? Rated like grades in school: A = good traffic flow ---> F = highly congested roadway)	
2015 Cost Benefit of Congestion	Cost benefit of congestion shows the costs incurred for congestion reduced. Calculation provides cents per mile output for year 2015.	

EXHIBIT III-12 (Cont'd)
Regional Toll Revenue (RTR)
Evaluation Methodology and Definitions
ON- AND OFF-SYSTEM PROJECTS (Cont'd)

	Column Name	Definition
Technical Screen	2015 Cost Benefit of Congestion (Threshold)	Staff proposes using a 15 cents/mile threshold for year 2015.
	Air Quality Benefit NOx 2015	Amount of NOx emissions reduced in tons per day in year 2015
	Meets Air Quality Threshold	Staff proposes using a 2.31 tons per day threshold for year 2015, which is the average tons per day reduction of NOx for submitted On- and Off-System projects.
	Air Quality Cost Effectiveness	Air Quality Cost Effectiveness provides the cost per ton of emissions reduced over lifetime of project
	Meets Air Quality Cost Effectiveness Threshold	Staff proposes using a \$17,349,458 per ton threshold and a \$5,723,089 per ton threshold, which are the average cost per ton of emissions reduced over lifetime for submitted On- and Off-System projects, respectively.
	Safety (# of Incidents)	Number of vehicular traffic accidents reported along the roadway between 2003 and 2007
	Meets Safety Threshold	Staff proposes that a minimum of one incident be reported to meet threshold
	Safety Severe (# of Incidents)	Number of severe vehicular traffic accidents (i.e. incidents with an injury or fatality) reported along the roadway between 2003 and 2007
	Meets Severity Threshold	Staff proposes that a minimum of one severe incident be reported to meet threshold
	Adopted Clean Fleet Policy	Has implementing agency adopted RTC Clean Fleet Vehicle Model Ordinance? *Applies as an eligibility requirement only to Dallas & Tarrant County. In Collin & Denton County, this criteria applies to the Technical Screen.
	Technical Screen Count	Sum of all 'Yes' responses found in Technical Screen
	Recommend	Does staff recommend project for RTC approval?
	Final Comments	Comments relevant to approval or understanding of project

EXHIBIT III-12 (Cont'd)
Regional Toll Revenue (RTR)
Evaluation Methodology and Definitions (Cont'd)
BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

	Column Name	Definition
Eligibility Screen	Eligible County	Dallas, Tarrant, Denton, & Collin County are the only counties eligible to participate in this funding initiative
	Eligible Project Type	Project variations that can be funded under each category (requirements vary by project type)
	Eligible Match = 20%	Is the Eligible State/Local Match of the Total Cost greater than or equal to 20% of the Total Cost?
	Must include Construction Phase	Does the project involve the construction or implementation of a transportation improvement?
	Adopted Clean Fleet Policy	Has implementing agency adopted RTC Clean Fleet Vehicle Model Ordinance? *Applies as an eligibility requirement only to Dallas & Tarrant County. In Collin & Denton County, this criteria applies to the Technical Screen.
	Pass Eligibility Screen	Does project meet minimum eligibility requirements?
Strategic Screen	Initial Assessment of RTC Interest	Given existing RTC policies & priorities, would the RTC be interested in funding this type of project?
	Supports Transportation System vs. Stand Alone	Does the construction of the project support the existing/future transportation system as opposed to being a stand-alone project?
	Creates Permanent or Long Term Improvement	Does the project create a permanent or long term improvement? The RTC prefers not to invest in temporary or "throw-away" improvements.
	Pass Strategic Screen	Does the project meet minimum strategic requirements?
Technical Screen	Project Consistent with Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)	Is the project correctly documented/referenced in the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan?
	MTP Comments	Comments provided by the Metropolitan Transportation Plan team regarding Plan consistency (as needed)
	Interjurisdictional Project (Crosses Jurisdictional Lines or Funded by More Than One City)	Does the project traverse city limit lines and/or is the project's local match funded by more than one city?
	% Local Match	Percent of Local/State Match committed by project sponsor(s)
	% of Other Leveraging	Percent of Other Funding Sources above and beyond the required 20% match
	Sum of all Leveraging	Sum of all Local Match funding and Other Leveraging committed by submitting agency
	Is Local Match and Other Leveraging >=50%	Is the sum of the Local Match and Other Leveraging greater than or equal to 50% of the Total Cost?
	Intermodal/ Multiple Transportation Modes	Does the project involve the use of multiple modes of transportation (i.e. pedestrian, transit, roadway, intermodal)?
	Congestion Management Process (CMP) Strategy	Does the project utilize one or more of the congestion management strategies identified in the currently approved CMP?
	Environmental Justice Score	Measures positive impacts on protected populations, such as minority and low income populations (1=Communities of Lowest Concern will have a lower population of protected classes and a low to moderate density), (2=Communities of Moderate Concern will have a moderate percent of protected classes and a moderate to high density), and (3=Communities of Highest Concern will have a high percent of protected classes and a moderate to high density).
	Meets Environmental Justice Threshold	Staff proposes scores of 2 or higher for projects located in Denton and Collin Counties and scores of 3 for projects located in Tarrant and Dallas Counties in order to meet threshold.
	Air Quality Benefit NOx 2015	Amount of NOx emissions reduced in tons per day in year 2015
	Meets Air Quality Threshold	Staff proposes using a 1.518 tons per day threshold for year 2015, which is the average tons per day reduction of NOx for submitted Bicycle/Pedestrian projects.
	Air Quality Cost Effectiveness	Air Quality Cost Effectiveness provides the cost per ton of emissions reduced over lifetime of project
	Meets Air Quality Cost Effectiveness Threshold	Staff proposes using a \$1,726,147 per ton threshold, which is the average cost per ton of emissions reduced over lifetime for submitted Bicycle/Pedestrian projects.
	# of Users Served	Amount of daily users modeled to use proposed facility
	Mobility (Serves 1500 or more)	Is the amount of daily users modeled to use proposed facility over 1500?
	Provides Transit Connectivity	Does project contain a comprehensive strategy for easing passengers' movement from one transit system to another by providing more reliable connections, making it easier to pay fares, improving way-finding signage and reducing overall travel times?
	Veloweb Connectivity	Does project connect to Regional Veloweb (a 644 mile, designated off-street trail network that has been planned to provide bicycle and pedestrian connections in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex)?
	Indicate Special Generator	Does project contain special generators (eg. airports, shopping centers, hospitals, schools, sporting events, etc.) that produce trips on a regular, periodic, or special basis?
	Special Generator	Staff proposes at least one special generator to meet threshold
	Includes Safety Elements	Does project contain safety elements including marked crosswalks, accessible pedestrian signals, left/right turn prohibitions, etc.?
	Adopted Clean Fleet Policy	Has implementing agency adopted RTC Clean Fleet Vehicle Model Ordinance? *Applies as an eligibility requirement only to Dallas & Tarrant County. In Collin & Denton County, this criteria applies to the Technical Screen.
Sum Technical Screen	Sum of all 'Yes' responses found in Technical Screen	
Recommend	Does staff recommend project for RTC approval?	
Final Comments	Comments relevant to approval or understanding of project	

EXHIBIT III-12 (Cont'd)

Regional Toll Revenue (RTR)

Evaluation Methodology and Definitions (Cont'd)

INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

	Column Name	Definition
Eligibility Screen	Eligible County	Dallas, Tarrant, Denton, & Collin County are the only counties eligible to participate in this funding initiative
	Eligible Project Type	Project variations that can be funded under each category (requirements vary by project type)
	Must include Construction Phase	Does the project involve the construction or implementation of a transportation improvement?
	Eligible Match = 20%	Is the Eligible State/Local Match of the Total Cost greater than or equal to 20% of the Total Cost?
	Adopted Clean Fleet Policy	Has implementing agency adopted RTC Clean Fleet Vehicle Model Ordinance? *Applies as an eligibility requirement only to Dallas & Tarrant County. In Collin & Denton County, this criteria applies to the Technical Screen.
	Pass Eligibility Screen	Does project meet minimum eligibility requirements?
Strategic Screen	Initial Assessment of RTC Interest	Given existing RTC policies & priorities, would the RTC be interested in funding this type of project?
	Creates Permanent or Long Term Improvement	Does the project create a permanent or long term improvement? The RTC prefers not to invest in temporary or "throw-away" improvements.
	Pass Strategic Screen	Does the project meet minimum strategic requirements?
Technical Screen	Supports Transportation System vs. Stand Alone	Does the construction of the project support the existing/future transportation system as opposed to being a stand-alone project?
	Project Consistent with Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)	Is the project correctly documented/referenced in the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan?
	Interjurisdictional Project (Crosses Jurisdictional Lines or Funded by More Than One City)	Does the project traverse city limit lines and/or is the project's local match funded by more than one city?
	% Local Match	Percent of Local/State Match committed by project sponsor(s)
	% of Other Leveraging	Percent of Other Funding Sources above and beyond the required 20% match
	Sum of all Leveraging	Sum of all Local Match funding and Other Leveraging committed by submitting agency
	Is Local Match and Other Leveraging >=50%	Is the sum of the Local Match and Other Leveraging greater than or equal to 50% of the Total Cost?
	Intermodal/ Multiple Transportation Modes	Does the project involve the use of multiple modes of transportation (i.e. pedestrian, transit, roadway, intermodal)?
	Congestion Management Process (CMP) Strategy	Does the project utilize one or more of the congestion management strategies identified in the currently approved CMP?
	Environmental Justice Score	Measures positive impacts on protected populations, such as minority and low income populations (1=Communities of Lowest Concern will have a lower population of protected classes and a low to moderate density), (2=Communities of Moderate Concern will have a moderate percent of protected classes and a moderate to high density), and (3=Communities of Highest Concern will have a high percent of protected classes and a moderate to high density).
	Meets Environmental Justice Threshold	Staff proposes scores of 2 or higher for projects located in Denton and Collin Counties and scores of 3 for projects located in Tarrant and Dallas Counties in order to meet threshold.
	Regional Facility	Is this project defined as a regional arterial in the MTP?
	Final 2015 Volumes	Projected daily vehicular volumes generated by the Regional Travel Model for year 2015
	2015 Level of Service (E-F=Yes/A-D=No)	Is the vehicular traffic flow on the roadway seriously impeded or congested beyond normal daily traffic flow in year 2015? Rated like grades in school: A = good traffic flow → F = highly congested roadway)
	Air Quality Benefit NOx 2015	Amount of NOx emissions reduced in tons per day in year 2015
	Meets Air Quality Threshold	Staff proposes using a 0.458 tons per day threshold for year 2015, which is the average tons per day reduction of NOx for submitted Intersection Improvement projects.
	Air Quality Cost Effectiveness	Air Quality Cost Effectiveness provides the cost per ton of emissions reduced over lifetime of project
	Meets Air Quality Cost Effectiveness Threshold	Staff proposes using a \$3,484,524 per ton threshold, which is the average cost per ton of emissions reduced over lifetime for submitted Intersection Improvement projects.
	Safety (# of Incidents)	Number of vehicular traffic accidents reported along the roadway between 2003 and 2007
	Meets Safety Threshold	Staff proposes that a minimum of one incident be reported to meet threshold
	Safety Severe (# of Incidents)	Number of severe vehicular traffic accidents (i.e. incidents with an injury or fatality) reported along the roadway between 2003 and 2007
	Meets Severity Threshold	Staff proposes that a minimum of one severe incident be reported to meet threshold
	Adopted Clean Fleet Policy	Has implementing agency adopted RTC Clean Fleet Vehicle Model Ordinance? *Applies as an eligibility requirement only to Dallas & Tarrant County. In Collin & Denton County, this criteria applies to the Technical Screen.
Technical Screen Count	Sum of all 'Yes' responses found in Technical Screen	
Recommend	Does staff recommend project for RTC approval?	
Final Comments	Comments relevant to approval or understanding of project	

EXHIBIT III-12 (Cont'd)

Regional Toll Revenue (RTR)

Evaluation Methodology and Definitions (Cont'd)

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PROJECTS

	Column Name	Definition
Eligibility Screen	Eligible County	Dallas, Tarrant, Denton, & Collin County are the only counties eligible to participate in this funding initiative
	Eligible Match = 20%	Is the Eligible State/Local Match of the Total Cost greater than or equal to 20% of the Total Cost?
	Must include Construction Phase	Does the project involve the construction or implementation of a transportation improvement?
	Adopted Clean Fleet Policy	Has implementing agency adopted RTC Clean Fleet Vehicle Model Ordinance? *Applies as an eligibility requirement only to Dallas & Tarrant County. In Collin & Denton County, this criteria applies to the Technical Screen.
	Pass Eligibility Screen	Does project meet minimum eligibility requirements?
Strategic Screen	Initial Assessment of RTC Interest	Given existing RTC policies & priorities, would the RTC be interested in funding this type of project?
	Creates Permanent or Long Term Improvement	Does the project create a permanent or long term improvement? The RTC prefers not to invest in temporary or "throw-away" improvements.
	No Duplication of Service	The proposed project shall not duplicate other existing ITS project(s).
	Pass Strategic Screen	Does the project meet minimum strategic requirements?
Technical Screen	Project Consistent with Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)	Is the project correctly documented/referenced in the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan?
	Interjurisdictional Project (Crosses Jurisdictional Lines or Funded by More Than One City)	Does the project traverse city limit lines and/or is the project's local match funded by more than one city/agency?
	% Local Match	Percent of Local/State Match committed by project sponsor(s)
	% of Other Leveraging	Percent of Other Funding Sources above and beyond the required 20% match
	Sum of all Leveraging	Sum of all Local Match funding and Other Leveraging committed by submitting agency
	Is Local Match and Other Leveraging >=50%	Is the sum of the Local Match and Other Leveraging greater than or equal to 50% of the Total Cost?
	Intermodal/ Multiple Transportation Modes	Does the project involve the use of multiple modes of transportation (i.e. pedestrian, transit, roadway, intermodal)?
	Final 2015 Volumes	Projected daily vehicular volumes generated by the Regional Travel Model for year 2015
	2015 Volume Threshold	Is the project's 2015 daily volume greater than or equal to the average 2015 daily volume among all ITS projects?
	Congestion Management Process (CMP) Strategy	Does the project utilize one or more of the congestion management strategies identified in the currently approved CMP?
	Environmental Justice Score	Measures positive impacts on protected populations, such as minority and low income populations (1=Communities of Lowest Concern will have a lower population of protected classes and a low to moderate density), (2=Communities of Moderate Concern will have a moderate percent of protected classes and a moderate to high density), and (3=Communities of Highest Concern will have a high percent of protected classes and a moderate to high density).
	Meets Environmental Justice Threshold	Staff proposes scores of 2 or higher for projects located in Denton and Collin Counties and scores of 3 for projects located in Tarrant and Dallas Counties in order to meet threshold.
	Safety (# of Incidents)	Number of vehicular traffic accidents reported along the roadway between 2003 and 2007
	Meets Safety Threshold	Staff proposes that a minimum of one incident be reported to meet threshold
	Safety Severe (# of Incidents)	Number of severe vehicular traffic accidents (i.e. incidents with an injury or fatality) reported along the roadway between 2003 and 2007
	Meets Severity Threshold	Staff proposes that a minimum of one severe incident be reported to meet threshold
	Fills Gaps in Existing System	Does project fill gaps in existing system leading to more seamless/uninterrupted ITS coverage?
	Enhance Interagency Cooperation/Coordination	Does project enhance information sharing among organizations?
	Innovative Partnership	Does project contain unique financing or partnerships that can be used to provide a means to quickly and cost effectively fund the project?
	Air Quality Benefit NOx 2015	Amount of NOx emissions reduced in tons per day in year 2015
	Meets Air Quality Threshold	Staff proposes using a 0.069 tons per day threshold for year 2015, which is the average tons per day reduction of NOx for submitted Intelligent Transportation System projects.
	Air Quality Cost Effectiveness	Air Quality Cost Effectiveness provides the cost per ton of emissions reduced over lifetime of project
	Meets Air Quality Cost Effectiveness Threshold	Staff proposes using a \$242,566 per ton threshold, which is the average cost per ton of emissions reduced over lifetime for submitted Intelligent Transportation System projects.
Adopted Clean Fleet Policy	Has implementing agency adopted RTC Clean Fleet Vehicle Model Ordinance? *Applies as an eligibility requirement only to Dallas & Tarrant County. In Collin & Denton County, this criteria applies to the Technical Screen.	
Technical Screen Count	Sum of all 'Yes' responses found in Technical Screen	
Recommend	Does staff recommend project for RTC approval?	
Comments	Comments relevant to approval or understanding of project	

EXHIBIT III-12 (Cont'd)
Regional Toll Revenue (RTR)
Evaluation Methodology and Definitions (Cont'd)
PARK AND RIDE PROJECTS

	Column Name	Definition
Eligibility Screen	Eligible County	Dallas, Tarrant, Denton, & Collin County are the only counties eligible to participate in this funding initiative
	Eligible Project Type	Project variations that can be funded under each category (requirements vary by project type)
	Eligible Match = 20%	Is the Eligible State/Local Match of the Total Cost greater than or equal to 20% of the Total Cost?
	Must include Construction Phase	Does the project involve the construction or implementation of a transportation improvement?
	Adopted Clean Fleet Policy	Has implementing agency adopted RTC Clean Fleet Vehicle Model Ordinance? *Applies as an eligibility requirement only to Dallas & Tarrant County. In Collin & Denton County, this criteria applies to the Technical Screen.
	Pass Eligibility Screen	Does project meet minimum eligibility requirements?
Strategic Screen	Initial Assessment of RTC Interest	Given existing RTC policies & priorities, would the RTC be interested in funding this type of project?
	At Least 200 Users/Day 2015	Is the number of daily users estimated to use proposed facility greater than 200?
	Creates Permanent or Long Term Improvement	Does the project create a permanent or long term improvement? The RTC prefers not to invest in temporary or "throw-away" improvements.
	Pass Strategic Screen	Does the project meet minimum strategic requirements?
Technical Screen	Supports Transportation System vs. Stand Alone	Does the construction of the project support the existing/future transportation system as opposed to being a stand-alone project?
	Project Consistent with Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)	Is the project correctly documented/referenced in the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan?
	Interjurisdictional Project (Crosses Jurisdictional Lines or Funded by More Than One City)	Does the project traverse city limit lines and/or is the project's local match funded by more than one city?
	Sum of all Leveraging	Sum of all Local Match funding and Other Leveraging committed by submitting agency
	Is Local Match and Other Leveraging >=50%	Is the sum of the Local Match and Other Leveraging greater than or equal to 50% of the Total Cost?
	Congestion Management Process (CMP) Strategy	Does the project utilize one or more of the congestion management strategies identified in the currently approved CMP?
	Environmental Justice Score	Measures positive impacts on protected populations, such as minority and low income populations (1=Communities of Lowest Concern will have a lower population of protected classes and a low to moderate density), (2=Communities of Moderate Concern will have a moderate percent of protected classes and a moderate to high density), and (3=Communities of Highest Concern will have a high percent of protected classes and a moderate to high density).
	Meets Environmental Justice Threshold	Staff proposes scores of 2 or higher for projects located in Denton and Collin Counties and scores of 3 for projects located in Tarrant and Dallas Counties in order to meet threshold.
	Regional Facility	Is this project defined as a regional arterial in the MTP?
	Number of Spaces Requested	Number of new parking spaces requested
	Air Quality Benefit NOx 2015	Amount of NOx emissions reduced in tons per day in year 2015
	Air Quality Benefit VOC 2015	Amount of VOC emissions reduced by tons per day in year 2015
	Meets Air Quality Threshold	Staff proposes using a 0.681 tons per day threshold for year 2015, which is the average tons per day reduction of NOx for submitted Park-and-Ride projects.
	Air Quality Cost Effectiveness	Air Quality Cost Effectiveness provides the cost per ton of emissions reduced over lifetime of project
	Meets Air Quality Cost Effectiveness Threshold	Staff proposes using a \$1,523,292 per ton threshold, which is the average cost per ton of emissions reduced over lifetime for submitted Park-and-Ride projects.
	Serves Alternative Mode of Transportation?	Does project serve carpools/vanpools, rail transit, bus transit, or other modes?
	Identified in MIS, EIS/EA, Transit, or Area Study?	Is project identified in current or previous MIS, EIS/EA, Transit, or Area Study?
	Provides Convenient Access for users?	Does project provide convenient access for patrons?
	Construction of a Dedicated PNR Facility?	Does project involve the construction of a dedicated Park and Ride Facility vs a joint use parking lot?
	Adopted Clean Fleet Policy	Has implementing agency adopted RTC Clean Fleet Vehicle Model Ordinance? *Applies as an eligibility requirement only to Dallas & Tarrant County. In Collin & Denton County, this criteria applies to the Technical Screen.
	Technical Screen Count	Sum of all "Yes" responses found in Technical Screen
	Comments	Comments relevant to approval or understanding of project
	Recommend	Does staff recommend project for RTC approval?

EXHIBIT III-12 (Cont'd)

Regional Toll Revenue (RTR)

Evaluation Methodology and Definitions (Cont'd)

TRAFFIC SIGNAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

	Column Name	Definition
Eligibility Screen	Eligible County	Dallas, Tarrant, Denton, & Collin County are the only counties eligible to participate in this funding initiative
	Eligible Project Type	Project variations that can be funded under each category (requirements vary by project type)
	Eligible Match = 20%	Is the Eligible State/Local Match of the Total Cost greater than or equal to 20% of the Total Cost?
	Must include Construction Phase	Does the project involve the construction or implementation of a transportation improvement?
	Involves Signal Retiming?	Does project involve retiming of existing traffic signals?
	Signals Never Retimed or Last Retimed Prior to December 2003	Does project include signals that have either never been retimed or were last retimed prior to December 2003? Signal retiming improvements generally last 4 years before retiming is needed again.
	Adopted Clean Fleet Policy	Has implementing agency adopted RTC Clean Fleet Vehicle Model Ordinance? *Applies as an eligibility requirement only to Dallas & Tarrant County. In Collin & Denton County, this criteria applies to the Technical Screen.
Pass Eligibility Screen	Does project meet minimum eligibility requirements?	
Strategic Screen	Initial Assessment of RTC Interest	Given existing RTC policies & priorities, would the RTC be interested in funding this type of project?
	Creates Permanent or Long Term Improvement	Does the project create a permanent or long term improvement? The RTC prefers not to invest in temporary or "throw-away" improvements.
	Pass Strategic Screen	Does the project meet minimum strategic requirements?
Technical Screen	Project Consistent with Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)	Is the project correctly documented/referenced in the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan?
	Interjurisdictional Project (Crosses Jurisdictional Lines or Funded by More Than One City)	Does the project traverse city limit lines and/or is the project's local match funded by more than one city?
	% Local Match	Percent of Local/State Match committed by project sponsor(s)
	% of Other Leveraging	Percent of Other Funding Sources above and beyond the required 20% match
	Sum of all Leveraging	Sum of all Local Match funding and Other Leveraging committed by submitting agency
	Is Local Match and Other Leveraging >=50%	Is the sum of the Local Match and Other Leveraging greater than or equal to 50% of the Total Cost?
	Intermodal/ Multiple Transportation Modes	Does the project involve the use of multiple modes of transportation (i.e. pedestrian, transit, roadway, intermodal)?
	Congestion Management Process (CMP) Strategy	Does the project utilize one or more of the congestion management strategies identified in the currently approved CMP?
	Which CMP Strategy?	Lists the CMP Strategy that applies to project.
	Environmental Justice Score	Measures positive impacts on protected populations, such as minority and low income populations (1=Communities of Lowest Concern will have a lower population of protected classes and a low to moderate density), (2=Communities of Moderate Concern will have a moderate percent of protected classes and a moderate to high density), and (3=Communities of Highest Concern will have a high percent of protected classes and a moderate to high density).
	Meets Environmental Justice Threshold	Staff proposes scores of 2 or higher for projects located in Denton and Collin Counties and scores of 3 for projects located in Tarrant and Dallas Counties in order to meet threshold.
	Final 2015 Volumes	Projected daily vehicular volumes generated by the Regional Travel Model for year 2015
	Final 2015 Threshold (>=40000)	Staff proposes 40,000 vehicles/day as a minimum threshold.
	Agency Has Not Received RTC Funding Support for Traffic Signals in Last 5 Years	Gives credit to implementing agencies that have not received RTC funding support for traffic signals in the past 5 years.
	Safety (# of Incidents)	Number of vehicular traffic accidents reported along the roadway between 2003 and 2007
	Meets Safety Threshold	Staff proposes that a minimum of one incident be reported to meet threshold
	Safety Severe (# of Incidents)	Number of severe vehicular traffic accidents (i.e. incidents with an injury or fatality) reported along the roadway between 2003 and 2007
	Meets Severe Threshold	Staff proposes that a minimum of one severe incident be reported to meet threshold
	Air Quality Benefit NOx 2015	Amount of NOx emissions reduced in tons per day in year 2015
	Meets Air Quality Threshold	Staff proposes using a 22.681 tons per day threshold for year 2015, which is the average tons per day reduction of NOx for submitted Traffic Signal Improvement projects.
	Air Quality Cost Effectiveness	Air Quality Cost Effectiveness provides the cost per ton of emissions reduced over lifetime of project
	Meets Air Quality Cost Effectiveness Threshold	Staff proposes using a \$1,099,796 per ton threshold, which is the average cost per ton of emissions reduced over lifetime for submitted Traffic Signal Improvement projects.
	Adopted Clean Fleet Policy	Has implementing agency adopted RTC Clean Fleet Vehicle Model Ordinance? *Applies as an eligibility requirement only to Dallas & Tarrant County. In Collin & Denton County, this criteria applies to the Technical Screen.
Technical Screen Count	Sum of all 'Yes' responses found in Technical Screen	
Recommend	Does staff recommend project for RTC approval?	
Comments	Comments relevant to approval or understanding of project	

EXHIBIT III-12 (Cont'd)
Regional Toll Revenue (RTR)
Evaluation Methodology and Definitions (Cont'd)
TRANSIT PROJECTS

	Column Name	Definition
Eligibility Screen	Eligible County	Dallas, Tarrant, Denton, & Collin County are the only counties eligible to participate in this funding initiative
	New or Expanded Service?	Is this project establishing new or expanded service?
	Eligible Project Type	Project variations that can be funded under each category (requirements vary by project type)
	Must include Construction Phase	Does the project involve the construction or implementation of a transportation improvement?
	Eligible Match = 20%	Is the Eligible State/Local Match of the Total Cost greater than or equal to 20% of the Total Cost?
	Adopted Clean Fleet Policy	Has implementing agency adopted RTC Clean Fleet Vehicle Model Ordinance? *Applies as an eligibility requirement only to Dallas & Tarrant County. In Collin & Denton County, this criteria applies to the Technical Screen.
Strategic Screen	Pass Eligibility Screen	Does project meet minimum eligibility requirements?
	Initial Assessment of RTC Interest	Given existing RTC policies & priorities, would the RTC be interested in funding this type of project?
	Creates Permanent or Long Term Improvement	Does the project create a permanent or long term improvement? The RTC prefers not to invest in temporary or "throw-away" improvements.
Strategic Screen	Pass Strategic Screen	Does the project meet minimum strategic requirements?
	Supports Transportation System vs. Stand Alone	Does the construction of the project support the existing/future transportation system as opposed to being a stand-alone project?
	Project Consistent with Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)	Is the project correctly documented/referenced in the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan?
Technical Screen	Interjurisdictional Project (Crosses Jurisdictional Lines or Funded by More Than One City)	Does the project traverse city limit lines and/or is the project's local match funded by more than one city?
	% Local Match	Percent of Local/State Match committed by project sponsor(s)
	% of Other Leveraging	Percent of Other Funding Sources above and beyond the required 20% match
	Sum of all Leveraging	Sum of all Local Match funding and Other Leveraging committed by submitting agency
	Is Local Match and Other Leveraging >=50%	Is the sum of the Local Match and Other Leveraging greater than or equal to 50% of the Total Cost?
	Intermodal/ Multiple Transportation Modes	Does the project involve the use of multiple modes of transportation (i.e. pedestrian, transit, roadway, intermodal)?
	Congestion Management Process (CMP) Strategy	Does the project utilize one or more of the congestion management strategies identified in the currently approved CMP?
	Which CMP Strategy?	Lists the CMP Strategy that applies to project.
	Environmental Justice Score	Measures positive impacts on protected populations, such as minority and low income populations (1=Communities of Lowest Concern will have a lower population of protected classes and a low to moderate density) , (2=Communities of Moderate Concern will have a moderate percent of protected classes and a moderate to high density), and (3=Communities of Highest Concern will have a high percent of protected classes and a moderate to high density).
	Meets Environmental Justice Threshold	Staff proposes scores of 2 or higher for projects located in Denton and Collin Counties and scores of 3 for projects located in Tarrant and Dallas Counties in order to meet threshold.
	Regional Facility	Is this project defined as a regional arterial in the MTP?
	2030 Expected Ridership (Daily)	Number of daily riders estimated to use proposed facility in the regional travel model for transit.
	Meets Ridership Threshold (>=3000)	Is the number of daily users over 3000?
	Air Quality Benefit NOx 2030	Amount of NOx emissions reduced in tons per day in year 2030
	Air Quality Benefit VOC 2030	Amount of VOC emissions reduced by tons per day in year 2030
	Meets Air Quality Threshold	Staff proposes using a 6.764 tons per day threshold for year 2030, which is the average tons per day reduction of NOx for submitted Transit projects.
	Air Quality Cost Effectiveness	Air Quality Cost Effectiveness provides the cost per ton of emissions reduced over lifetime of project
	Meets Air Quality Cost Effectiveness Threshold	Staff proposes using a \$2,369,090 per ton threshold, which is the average cost per ton of emissions reduced over lifetime for submitted Transit projects.
	Safety (# of Incidents)	Number of vehicular traffic accidents reported along the roadway between 2003 and 2007
	Meets Safety Threshold	Staff proposes that a minimum of one incident be reported to meet threshold
	Safety Severe (# of Incidents)	Number of severe vehicular traffic accidents (i.e. incidents with an injury or fatality) reported along the roadway between 2003 and 2007
	Meets Severity Threshold	Staff proposes that a minimum of one severe incident be reported to meet threshold
	Improves Seamless Connections	Does project allow transit patrons to travel from origin to destination without transferring to another mode or transit carrier?
	Increases Reliability of System	Does project increase reliability of existing transit system?
	Adopted Clean Fleet Policy	Has implementing agency adopted RTC Clean Fleet Vehicle Model Ordinance? *Applies as an eligibility requirement only to Dallas & Tarrant County. In Collin & Denton County, this criteria applies to the Technical Screen.
	Technical Screen Count	Sum of all 'Yes' responses found in Technical Screen
	Recommend	Does staff recommend project for RTC approval?
Comments	Comments relevant to approval or understanding of project	

EXHIBIT III-13
SH 161 Funding Initiative
RTC Approved the Selection Process on December 9, 2010
PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS




EXHIBIT III-14
2014 Transportation Alternatives Program – MPO Ranking Process
RTC Approved on February 13, 2014

Before consideration, project applications will be screened for the following attributes:
 1. Does the project meet the RTC policy of a "preferred" project type?
 2. Is the right-of-way acquired?
 3. Does the project have a resolution of funding commitment?

	Making Regional Linkages and Connections	Implementing Active Transportation and Mobility Plans	Improving Safety	Reducing Barriers	Connecting to Employment, Residents, and Activity Centers	Providing Environmental Benefits	Serving Disadvantaged (Environmental Justice) Areas	Creating Economic Development Opportunities	Other Factors
Description	Improves regional connections between neighborhoods, cities, and counties.	Improving ability to use walking and bicycling facilities for everyday activities including travel to work, school, and shopping.	Provides safer and less intimidating facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-drivers.	Improves access and/or provides safe crossings for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-drivers at an existing obstacle to travel.	Provides access to major destinations and large number of residents or employees.	Helps reduce congestion and improves air quality.	Provides access in underserved communities.	Results in benefits exceeding costs.	Project readiness / ability to initiate construction quickly and geographic distribution.
Points	25	20	15	10	10	10	5	5	15
High Criteria / Scoring Range	Project connects or is in close proximity to transit. Project connects with multiple transit stations. Project is part of a regionally significant corridor, extending an existing facility and/or links multiple jurisdictions. Project completes a gap in a regionally significant corridor or connects multiple jurisdictions. (21-25 points)	Project implements an adopted Safe Routes To School (SRTS) plan. Project constructs a segment of the Regional Veloweb. (14-20 points)	Project is located within or in close proximity to a high crash density area. Project area has a documented history of crashes reported in application and project will have a direct impact on improving safety. (11-15 points)	Project features grade separation from a regionally significant barrier, such as a river, highway and/or railroad, or a combination of multiple moderately significant barriers. (8-10 points)	Project located in an area featuring a high number of special trip generators, schools, and population. (8-10 points)	Project would provide a major federally eligible, quantifiable air quality improvement. (8-10 points)	Project area features an Environmental Justice Index score more than 51. (5 points)	Project is constructed parallel to development featuring large employers. (4-5)	Design and engineering is complete. Project has no environmental approval or easement issues. Local entity is contributing more than the minimum match. Strong project support by the public or stakeholders.
Medium Criteria / Scoring Range	Project is within one mile away from rail transit. Project provides a cross-town linkage within a jurisdiction. Project closes a gap of a regionally significant corridor to a regionally significant destination. (11-20 points)	Project implements a locally adopted Trails / Bicycle Master Plan facility that is not part of the Regional Veloweb. (8-13 points)	Project is located within a medium or low crash density area. Project area has a documented history of safety issues and the project may provide some benefit to the safety in the area. (6-10 points)	Project features grade separation from a moderately significant barrier, such as a principal arterial, minor local arterial, moderate size streams/creeks or a combination of multiple minor barrier crossings. (4-7 points)	Project located in an area featuring a moderate amount of special trip generators, schools, and population. (4-7 points)	Project provides some air quality improvement benefit. (4-7 points)	Project area features an Environmental Justice Index score between 11-50. (2 points)	Project intersects an area of development. (2-3)	Local entity has made some progress in preconstruction (engineering and design). There is evidence of general project support by the public or stakeholders. Local entity is contributing slightly more than the minimum match.
Low Criteria / Scoring Range	Project is within two miles from transit stations. Project is not a regionally significant corridor, but provides multi-neighborhood access to a school or regionally significant destination. Project completes a local sidewalk gap to a school or a regionally significant destination. (0-10 points)	Project is a sidewalk in a locally adopted plan or neighborhood / district plan. Projects not in an adopted plan received no points. (0-7 points)	Project is located in a low crash density area or in an area with no crash density. Project by its nature will improve safety, such as an off-street path. (0-5 points)	Project features a crossing of minor barriers, such as signalization at a roadway, crosswalk or crossing of a culvert/ditch. (1-3 points)	Project located in an area featuring a small amount of special trip generators, schools, and population. (1-3 points)	Project is not related to air quality and provides little or no additional environmental benefit. (1-3 points)	Project area features an Environmental Justice Index score less than 10. (0 points)	Project extends an existing facility already connected to development. (1). Projects with no economic impact are awarded no points.	Project does not have the adequate easements necessary for construction. Project is located in an area commonly awarded bicycle/pedestrian projects. There is no evidence of project support by the public.

EXHIBIT III-15
Transportation Development Credits
“Type 2- Local Agency has Federal and Local Revenue”

BACKGROUND

- Projects evaluated on best use of local funds freed by use of TDC’s
- Seeking projects that meet the needs of the local community or region
- Agencies must already have federal funds for submitted project or program
- TDCs replace the cash 20% local match as a “soft” match
- Local match must be redirected to another transportation project or program
- Approximately 50 million credits are available for “Type 2” Call

PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA

- Demonstrates significant partnership
- Advances local/regional goals and/or provides local/regional benefits
- Leverages resources
- Strategic importance
- Innovation

Exhibit III-16 2017 Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Call for Projects Criteria

Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside - Active Transportation Project Category 2017 Call for Projects for the North Central Texas Region ¹											
Category	Regional Network Connectivity	Mobility	Safety	Reducing Barriers	Congestion Reduction	Destination Density	Air Quality Benefits	Equity	Local Network Connectivity	Project Readiness and Other Factors	Project Innovation
Description	Improves connectivity of Mobility 2040 regional paths and bikeways between cities and counties.	Improves connections and access to transit.	Improves safety and provides facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists with a high level of comfort and suitable for users of all ages and abilities.	Provides safe crossing of existing travel obstacles such as major roadways, interchanges, railroads, and bodies of water.	Provides alternative travel options in lieu of motor vehicle trips in areas with greater opportunity for walking and bicycling.	Provides access to areas with a high density of major employers and destinations.	Improves air quality by supporting non-motorized facility usage.	Improves access to disadvantaged populations and underserved communities.	Implements locally planned priorities.	Project readiness / ability to obligate funds and initiate construction quickly. Other factors related to project impact upon the community.	Project implements innovative or new treatments and technology that can serve as a model for the region.
Points	25	20	15	10	10	5	5	5	5	20	5
High Criteria / Scoring Range	Project is on the Regional Veloweb. Project closes a gap or extends an existing Regional Veloweb facility, resulting in long continuous network mileage. Project's length is long. Project is identified along a regionally significant bikeway corridor. (20-25 Points)	Project connects to a rail station or closes a network gap significantly improving access with a low stress/high comfort facility. ² (16-20 Points)	Project is a safety countermeasure identified in a safety report or audit. Project design addresses a documented safety issue and includes a low stress/high comfort facility. ² Project is in a high bicycle and/or pedestrian crash density area. (11-15 Points)	Project features grade separation from a regionally significant barrier, such as a river, highway and/or railroad, or a combination of multiple moderately significant barriers. (8-10 points)	Project is located in an area of severe congestion per Mobility 2040. Project is located in an area with a high density of short car trips. (7-10)	Project is located in an area with a high number of destinations and the project provides seamless connections to the destinations with a low stress/high comfort facility. ² (4-5 Points)	Project is forecasted to have high traffic volumes and would provide a high quantifiable air quality improvement. (4-5 Points)	Project is located in an area with Environmental Justice Index score more than 50 or the project is located in an area above the regional average for zero-car households. (4-5 Points)	Project is clearly identified in an adopted local plan. (5 Points)	Considerable design and engineering is complete. Project is feasible with realistic cost estimates. Project's benefits justify the cost. Project has strong evidence of public support. Entity will contribute more than the minimum 20% local match. (15-20 Points)	Project includes elements of innovative design that will result in a low stress/high comfort facility. ² (3-5 Points)
Medium Criteria / Scoring Range	Project is on the Regional Veloweb. Project closes a gap or extends an existing Regional Veloweb facility, resulting in moderate to short continuous network mileage. Project's length is moderate to short. Pedestrian connections are to major destinations per Mobility 2040. (13-19 Points)	Project extends an existing facility moderately improving access to a rail station or the project connects to one or more bus stops or closes a network gap significantly improving access with a low stress/high comfort facility. ² (11-15 Points)	No safety report or audit has been developed. Project includes a low stress/high comfort facility in a medium to low bicycle and/or pedestrian crash density area. ² (6-10 Points)	Project features grade separation from a moderately significant barrier, such as a principal arterial, minor local arterial, moderate size streams/creeks or an at-grade signalized crossing. (4-7 points)	Project is located in an area of moderate congestion per Mobility 2040. Project is located in an area with a moderate density of short car trips. (4-6)	Project is located in an area with a moderate number of destinations. Project provides a seamless connection to a significant destination or closes a gap improving access to destinations. (2-3 Points)	Project is forecasted to have moderate traffic volumes and provides some air quality improvement benefits. (2-3 Points)	Project is located in an area with Environmental Justice Index score between 10.01-50. (1-3 Points)	Project is identified in a plan or study under development. (1-4 Points)	Project has some progress in preconstruction (engineering and design). Project's benefits justify the cost. Project has moderate evidence of public support. (6-14 Points)	Project includes elements of innovative design that will moderately improve the level of comfort for users. (1-2 Points)
Low Criteria / Scoring Range	Project is not on the Regional Veloweb, but connects to an existing Veloweb facility. Project is designated as a local community path or on-street bikeway in Mobility 2040. Pedestrian facilities are consistent with the recommendations of Mobility 2040. (1-12 Points)	Project does not connect to a rail station or closes a network gap improving access. Project closes a network gap moderately improving access to a bus stop. (5-10 Points) Project does not improve access to transit. (0 Points)	Project area has no documented safety issues. Project does not include a low stress/high comfort facility. ² Project is not in a bicycle and/or pedestrian crash density area. Project provides an inherent benefit to safety. (1-5 Points)	Project features grade separation from a minor barrier, such as a culvert/ditch or unsignalized crossing of a roadway. (1-3 points) Project does not cross a barrier. (0 Points)	Project is located in an area outside of severe or moderate congestion per Mobility 2040. Project is located in an area with no or low density of short car trips, but may provide direct access to local destinations. (0-3 Points)	Project is located in an area with a limited number of destinations and the project has limited impact to improve access to destinations. (0-1 Points)	Project is forecasted to have low traffic volumes and limited air quality benefits. (0-1 Points)	Project is located in an area with Environmental Justice Index score of 10 or lower. (0 Points)	Project is not identified in a plan or study. (0 Points)	No schematic design or engineering has been completed for project. Project may not be feasible and benefits do not justify the costs. Project timeline is not realistic. Project has no evidence of public support. (0-5 Points)	Project does not include elements of innovative design. (0 Points)

¹Before evaluating projects, all applications submitted were screened for the following: Is the right-of-way acquired? Does the project have a resolution of funding commitment? If on-system, has TxDOT approved the project? Was the environmental checklist submitted? Was a budget worksheet submitted?

²A low stress / high comfort facility is considered a wide sidewalk (minimum 5 feet in width) for pedestrians or a minimum 10-14 foot wide off-street shared-use path for both pedestrians and bicyclists, or separated/protected bike lanes or on-street bike lanes with a suitable design for users of all ages and abilities based on the context of the project location (e.g. projected traffic volumes, speeds, adjoining land uses, etc.). Such project design must be consistent with relevant Design Guidelines and resources including AASHTO, NACTO, ITE, FHWA, and TxDOT.

Exhibit III-17
Evaluation and Scoring Criteria for Regional Traffic Signal Retiming Program

Category	Scoring (pts)	Description
Mobility Benefit/Cost Ratio	35	Project benefit/cost ratio will be calculated based on the improvements associated with basic traffic signal program input
NOx & VOC Cost Per Pound	35	Air quality benefits will be calculated based on the improvements associated with basic traffic signal retiming improvements.
Communication	10	Communication technology that keeps traffic signals in sync.
Environmental Justice Distribution	5	Environmental justice methodology used to map concentrations of EJ populations using demographic data.
Multi-Modal Operations	5	Projects supporting multimodal operations including high truck volume corridors (four percent or greater) and/or located at or near transit facilities/routes.
Multi-Jurisdictional Corridor	5	Corridors passing through more than one agency's jurisdictional boundary.
Data Cloud	5	Provide traffic signal data to the cloud

EXHIBIT III-17 (Cont'd)
Evaluation and Scoring Criteria for Minor Improvement Projects

Category	Scoring (pts)	Description
Mobility Benefit/Cost Ratio	35	Project benefit/cost ratio will be calculated based on improvements associated with basic traffic signal program input.
NOx & VOC Cost Per Pound	35	Air quality benefits will be calculated based on the improvements associated with basic traffic signal retiming improvements.
Recommended Improvements	20	Recommended improvements from previous RTSRP phases by consultants.
Additional Local Match	5	Agency willing to contribute more than twenty percent local match.
Environmental Justice Distribution	5	Environmental justice methodology used to map concentrations of EJ populations using demographic data.

EXHIBIT III-18
2017-2018 CMAQ/STBG Funding Program Selection Criteria

Program	Selection Criteria Considered
Strategic Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local partners are contributing more than the standard 20% match (overmatching the federal funds or paying for design, right-of-way, etc.) • Project has multiple non-RTC stakeholders/contributors • Project is of strategic importance within/to the region
Automated Vehicles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project advances the deployment of automated vehicles or implementation of automated vehicle infrastructure within the region
Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project improves/expands transit service within the region • Project improves multimodal access to transit services (i.e., roadway or veloweb connections to transit stations/stops)
Planning and Other Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses a need for additional study of a corridor or route being considered for future construction funding
10-Year Plan/Proposition 1 Adjustments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is a previous Proposition 1 commitment with a funding shortfall that needs to be eliminated • Project requires additional funding to ensure that year-of-expenditure cost increases are covered and the project remains fully funded
Local Bond Program Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local partner has a recently passed or soon-to-be passed bond program (funds are contingent upon passage of the program)
Federal/Local Exchanges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTC goals met by the projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increasing capacity of the transportation system ○ Improving safety ○ Reducing emissions ○ Project is multimodal • Return on investment (i.e., the amount of local funds to be collected over time and the timeframe in which those funds are received)
Sustainable Development: Phase 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership in TxDOT's Turnback Program • Opportunities for redevelopment • Payback mechanisms if applicable (Tax Increment Finance Districts, Public Improvement Districts, etc.) • Inclusion of context-sensitive design elements • Inclusion of transit-oriented development elements • Inclusion of pedestrian-friendly streetscape elements
Safety, Innovative Construction, and Emergency Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project addresses a safety issue (pedestrian safety at risk, history of vehicle crashes, etc.) • Project involves an innovative construction element (e.g., modular bridges) • Project addresses an emergency situation (flooding issues that affect system resilience) • Project includes incident management/first responder safety benefits • Projects that implement recommendations from the regional safety plan

EXHIBIT III-19 10-Year Plan Congestion Criteria




EXHIBIT III-20

10-Year Plan Non-Congestion Criteria




EXHIBIT III-7

2040 All-or-Nothing Weekday Demand




EXHIBIT III-22
Transportation Improvement Program Modification Policy
RTC Approved on March 14, 2013

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a staged, multi-year program of projects approved for funding with federal, State, and local funds within the Dallas-Fort Worth area. A new TIP is approved every two to three years by the Regional Transportation Council (RTC), which serves as the policy board for the Dallas-Fort Worth Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). Due to the changing nature of projects as they move through the implementation process, the TIP must be modified on a regular basis.

Please note certain project changes require collaboration with our State and federal review partners. This collaboration occurs through the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) revision process. Therefore, modification of the Dallas-Fort Worth TIP will follow the quarterly schedule established for revisions to the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

This policy consists of four sections:

General Policy Provisions: Overall policies guiding changes to project implementation

Project Changes Not Requiring TIP Modification: Changes related to administration or interpretation of Regional Transportation Council Policy

Administrative Amendment Policy: Authority granted to the MPO Director to expedite project delivery and maximize the time the RTC has to consider policy level (vs. administrative) issues

Revision Policy: Changes only the Regional Transportation Council can approve or recommend for State and federal concurrence

General Policy Provisions

1. All projects inventoried in the Transportation Improvement Program fall under this modification policy, regardless of funding source or funding category.
2. Air quality conformity, Mobility Plan consistency, congestion management process compliance, and financial constraint requirements must be met for all TIP modifications.
3. Project modifications will only be made with the consent of the implementing/impacted agency.
4. The Dallas-Fort Worth MPO will maintain a cost overrun funding pool. Program funds must be available through the cost overrun pool or from other sources in order to process modifications involving project cost increases.
5. All funding from deleted projects will be returned to the regional program for future cost overruns or new funding initiatives, unless the deleted funds are needed to cover cost overruns in other currently selected projects. However, it is important to note that funds are awarded to projects, not to implementing agencies. Therefore, funds from potentially infeasible projects cannot be saved for use in future projects by implementing agencies. MPO staff will manage timely resolution of these projects/funds. In addition, if a project was selected through a particular "program," such as the Sustainable Development or Regional ITS Funding Program, funds from deleted projects may be returned to those programs for future "calls for projects" in those areas.

6. For projects selected using project scoring methodologies, projects will no longer be rescored before a cost increase is considered.
7. Cost increases for strategically-selected projects fall under the same modification policy provisions.
8. As a general policy, new projects are proposed through periodic regional funding initiatives. However, the RTC may elect to add new projects to the TIP, outside of a scheduled funding initiative under emergency or critical situations. Projects approved under this provision must be an immediate need.
9. Local match commitments (i.e., percentages) will be maintained as originally approved. Cost overruns on construction, right-of-way, and engineering costs will be funded according to original participation shares.
10. Additional restrictions may apply to projects selected under certain funding initiatives. For example, projects selected through the Land Use/Transportation Joint Venture (i.e., Sustainable Development) program are not eligible for cost increases from RTC-selected funding categories.
11. Cost overruns are based on the total estimated cost of the project, including all phases combined, and are evaluated once total project cost is determined to exceed original funding authorization.
12. Cost indicators may be evaluated on cost overruns to alert project reviewers of potential unreasonable cost estimates (examples include cost per lane-mile, cost per turn lane). The cost indicators are developed by the MPO, in consultation with TxDOT, using experience from the last several years. If a project falls out of this range, the MPO may either: (a) require a more detailed estimate and explanation, (b) require value engineering, (c) suggest a reduced project scope, or (d) determine that a cost increase will come from local funds, not RTC funds.
13. For a project change to be considered, implementing agencies must submit modification requests for their TIP projects through the online TIP modification system. Project change requests must include complete information by the deadline. Incomplete requests will be sent back to agency for re-submittal in a future cycle.
14. Implementing agencies must identify one or two official points of contact for TIP project modifications. The point of contact is responsible for entering *complete* project modification requests into the online TIP modification system *on time*. The point of contact must be capable of collecting and entering accurate project information. Points of contact will be sent reminders leading up to submittal deadlines.

Project Changes Not Requiring TIP Modification

In certain circumstances, changes may be made to TIP projects without triggering a TIP modification. These circumstances are outlined below:

1. **Changes that do not impact the overall purpose of a project:** Changes to MTP reference, CSJ's, or other clerical edits do not require a TIP modification.
2. **Changes to TxDOT's Design and Construction Information System (DCIS):** The DCIS is a project tracking system, therefore, simply updating the DCIS to match previously approved TIP projects or project elements does not require TIP modification. MPO staff maintains the official list of projects and funding levels approved by the RTC.
3. **Carryover Funds:** At the end of each fiscal year, unobligated funds are moved to the new fiscal year as carryover funds. For example, if a project receives funding in a specific fiscal year, but the project is not implemented by the end of the fiscal year, staff will automatically move the funds for that project into the next fiscal year. These changes do not require a TIP modification.

4. **Cost/Funding Increases:** Staff will update cost increases in the information system for changes of less than \$400,000.
5. **Increases in Local Funds:** Staff will adjust with concurrence of local agency.
6. **Changes in RTC Funding Categories:** Staff adjustments permitted.
7. **Emergency:** This provision includes emergency changes that need approval quickly, but timing is not aligned with the RTC Meeting schedule. These changes would come to the RTC for ratification at the next scheduled meeting.
8. **Cost/Funding Decreases:** Staff will update the information system with cost decreases.
9. **Funding Year Changes:** Staff will update the information system for changes that advance project implementation. Once projects are ready for construction (i.e., all federal and State requirements and procedures have been met), staff will advance the project to construction if funds are available.
10. **Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Revisions Consistent with Previous RTC Action** (e.g., Staff will place a project or changes previously approved by the RTC in the appropriate information system and documents.)
11. **Addition of Noncapacity, Conformity-Exempt Projects:** Staff will place projects in the appropriate information system/document.

Examples include, but are not limited to:

Sign refurbishing	Intersection Improvements
Landscaping	Intelligent Transportation System
Preventive maintenance	Traffic Signal Improvements
Bridge rehabilitation/replacement	
Safety/Maintenance	

12. **Changes to Implementing Agency:** Staff will process after receiving a written request/approval from the current implementing agency and the newly proposed implementing agency.
13. **Increased Flexibility for Traffic Signal, Intersection Improvement, ITS, and “Grouped” Projects:** Staff will use best practices to advance this category of projects.
14. **Addition and Adjustment of Phases:** Includes engineering, right-of-way, construction, etc.
15. **Administrative Scope Changes:** Minor clarifications to the type of work being performed, physical length of project, and project termini/limits. For example, changing the limits of a project from “.25 miles west of” to “west of,” or changing the limits from “point A” to “.5 miles east of point A,” or clarifying limits due to a change to the name of a roadway when there is no physical change to the limits (the name of the roadway just changed from one name to another, etc.
16. **Funding Year Changes:** Can be moved by staff if project is being moved less than one year.

Please note that a STIP revision may be required to make these changes in the statewide funding document. In all cases, MPO information systems will be updated and changes will be noted in project tracking systems.

Administrative Amendment Policy

Administrative Amendments are TIP modifications that do not require action of the RTC for approval. Under the Administrative Amendment Policy, the RTC has authorized the Director of Transportation, or his designee, for the Dallas-Fort Worth MPO to approve TIP modifications that meet the following conditions. After they are approved,

administrative amendments are provided to STTC and the RTC for informational purposes, unless they are merely processed to support previous RTC project approval.

1. **Changes in Federal/State Funding Categories that Do Not Impact RTC-Selected Funding Programs:** RTC-Selected funding programs include: CMAQ, STP-MM, RTR, Category 2M - Metro Corridor (in coordination with TxDOT), Texas Mobility Funds, Urbanized Area Formula Program - Transit Section 5307.
2. **Potentially Controversial Projects:** The administrative amendment policy does not restrict the Transportation Director from requesting Regional Transportation Council (RTC) action on potentially controversial project changes.
3. **Change in funding share due to adding funding from one program to another:** For instance, if adding Thoroughfare Assessment Program funds (80% federal and 20% state/local) to a project that is 56% federal and 44% local, an administrative amendment is permitted. The revision policy applies to all other instances.

Revision Policy

Revisions are modifications that require approval of the Regional Transportation Council. A revision is required for any project modification that meets the following criteria or that does not fall under the Administrative Amendment Policy.

1. **Adding or Deleting Projects from the TIP:** This provision includes all projects not covered previously in this Policy. All new projects regardless of funding source need to be approved under this Revision Policy.
2. **Cost/Funding Increases:** A revision is required on any cost/funding increase over \$400,000.
3. **Substantive Scope Changes:** This provision includes major or substantive changes that may have citizen interest or policy implications. For example, limits change to a brand new location, limits are extended or shortened substantially, the number of lanes changes, etc.
4. **Funding Year Changes:** A revision is required to move a project more than one year into a fiscal year that would delay project implementation.
5. **Changes in the Funding/Cost Shares:** A change to the percentage of the total project cost paid by each funding partner requires a revision (with the one exception noted in the administrative amendment policy).