OLD COLONY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO)

OLD COLONY TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

DRAFT TRANSPORTATION EVALUATION CRITERIA (TEC)

DECEMBER 2023

PREPARED BY: OLD COLONY PLANNING COUNCIL
70 SCHOOL STREET BROCKTON, MASSACHUSETTS
UNDER MASSDOT CONTRACT 123116

Introduction

Effective with the development of the Old Colony FFY 2025 – 2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Old Colony Planning Council has developed an updated set of Transportation Evaluation Criteria (TEC), and scoring system to be used in the process of developing the Old Colony Metropolitan Planning Organization's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

During TIP development, all projects that have been approved by the MassDOT Project Review Committee (PRC) are evaluated using these Transportation Evaluation Criteria. The MPO staff uses the Transportation Evaluation Criteria results, along with project readiness information, available funding, and other pertinent information to develop a Draft TIP. The Old Colony MPO releases the Draft TIP for a 21-Day Public Review and Comment Period. Following the 21-Day Public Review and Comment Period, the Old Colony MPO considers the comments received, and then endorses the TIP if there are no significant changes.

The proposed updated Transportation Evaluation Criteria replaces an 18-point system used by Old Colony Planning Council in recent years with a 100-point system that scores projects by specific defined criteria in the following categories:

- System Preservation – 30 Points
- Safety – 30 Points
- Mobility – 10 Points
- Economic Impact – 10 Points
- Environmental and Health Impact – 10 Points
- Community Support and Consistency with Policy – 10 Points

The updated Transportation Evaluation Criteria is designed to be clearly designed and fully transparent, considering all modes of transportation and users in transportation projects. They also take into consideration recent initiatives and policies, such as Complete Streets and MPO adopted Performance Targets.

Old Colony TIP Transportation Evaluation Criteria (TC)

Table 1 outlines how PRC approved projects are scored in six categories.

Table 1: Outline of Old Colony TIP Transportation Evaluation Criteria Scoring Categories and Potential Points

Category	Evaluation Criterion	Total Potential Points
System Preservation / State of Good Repair	Primary Asset Condition Enhancements to Secondary Assets Use of Modern Technology to Improve Efficiency Incorporates Transit Elements into Design	30
Safety	Motorist crash history and anticipated improvement Non-Motorist crash history and anticipated improvement Proven Safety Measures	30
Mobility	Existing Motorist Congestion Effect on Mobility and Accommodation for Non-Motorists Effect on System Connectivity and Access	10
Economic Impact	Access to or within a regionally designated economic development area Access to or within a business district Connectivity between housing, employment, and commerce Effect on freight network	10
Environmental Effect	Effect on Wetlands, Wildlife or Other Natural Resources Protects or Enhances Water Quality by Improving Stormwater Management Effect on air quality and GHG emissions Improves Coastal Resiliency Enhances local open space Incorporates Healthy Transportation Options	10
Community Support and Consistency with Policy	Project has Community Support, Identified in Local Plans, and an Active Design Project Identified in Regional Plan and/or Consistent with Regional Policy Consistent with PM1, PM2, PM3, and/or TAM Project Supports Federal and State Policy Equity	10
	Total Possible Score	**100**

System preservation and Modernization Scoring

Table 2 outlines how projects are scored based on system preservation and modernization criteria.

Table 2: System Preservation and Modernization Criteria and Potential Scoring

System Preservation Criterion	Factor	Points
Primary asset condition / effect on condition	Poor or failing / substantial improvement	12
	Fair / moderate improvement	8
	Good / minor improvement	4
	Excellent / no improvement	0
	Potential Primary Asset Points	12
Enhancements to Secondary Assets (Sidewalks, etc.)	Poor or failing / substantial improvement	8
	Fair / moderate improvement	5
	Good / minor improvement	2
	Excellent / no improvement	0
	Potential Secondary Asset Points	**8**
Use of modern technology to improve efficiency	Use of innovative technology and/or incorporation of traffic counting technology	5
	Improvement in technology to current best practices	2
	Maintain/repair existing technology	1
	Not applicable	0
	Potential Modern Technology Points	**5**
Incorporates transit elements into design	Incorporates significant improvements to transit infrastructure, accessibility and/or operational	5
	Incorporates minor transit improvements	3
	Improves operations on a transit route	1
	No related improvements to transit access/operations are expected	0
	Potential Transit Elements Points	**5**
	Total Potential System Preservation and Modernization Scoring	**30**

Safety Scoring

Table 3 outlines how projects are scored based on safety criteria.

Table 3: Safety Criteria and Potential Scoring

Safety Criterion	Factor	Points
Motorist crash history and anticipated safety impact	HSIP Eligible Location	10
	Location is Reginal Top 100 High Crash Location or engaged in a safety plan and project will improve motorist safety	7
	Demonstrated safety problem and safety improvement is anticipated with project	4
	No demonstrated safety problem, but safety improvement is anticipated with project	3
	No Safety Improvement Anticipated	0
	Project may adversely effect safety	-1
	Potential Motorist Safety Points	10
Non-Motorist crash history and anticipated safety impact	HSIP Bicycle or Pedestrian Cluster	10
	Location is Reginal Top 100 High Crash Location or engaged in a safety plan and project will improve non-motorist safety	7
	Demonstrated safety problem and non-motorist safety improvement is anticipated with	4
	No demonstrated crash problem, but project is anticipated to improve non-motorist safety	3
	No safety improvement anticipated	0
	The project many adversely affect non-motorist safety	-1
	Potential Non-Motorist Safety Points	**10**
Systematic Safety Improvements/Proven Safety Countermeasures	Characteristics of the location make it a primary risk location and the project will implement a proven safety countermeasure Characteristics of the location make it a secondary risk location and the project will implement a proven safety countermeasure	10
	While not a primary or secondary risk location, the location provides access to vulnerable roadway users, such as schools, transit stops and senior destinations and the project will implement a proven safety countermeasure No safety improvement anticipated	7
	While not a primary or secondary risk location, the location provides access to vulnerable roadway users, such as schools, transit stops and senior destinations and the project will implement a proven safety countermeasure	4
	No safety improvement anticipated	0
	Potential Systematic Safety Improvement Points	**10**
	Total Potential Safety Scoring	**30**

Mobility Scoring

Table 4 outlines how projects are scored based on mobility criteria.

Table 4: Mobility Criteria and Potential Scoring

Mobility Criterion	Factor	Points
Existing motorist congestion / effect on motorist congestion	Location identified in the CMP network/ substantial improvement	4
	Significant existing / substantial improvement	3
	Significant existing / moderate or minor improvement	2
	Minimal existing / minor improvement	1
	No Change	0
	Negative effect	-1
	Potential Motorist Congestion Points	4
Effect on mobility / accommodation of non-motorists	Substantial improvement	3
	Moderate improvement	2
	Minimal improvement	1
	No effect for non-motorists	0
	Negative effect on mobility / accommodation	-1
	Potential Non-Motorist Mobility Points	**3**
Effect on connectivity / access (emphasis placed on key emergency and evacuation reoutes)	Substantial improvement to connectivity through the corridor	3
	Moderate improvement to connectivity	2
	W Minimal effect on connectivity	1
	No effect on connectivity	0
	Negative effect on connectivity	-1
	Potential Connectivity and Access Points	**3**
	Total Potential Mobility Scoring	**10**

Economic Development Scoring

Table 5 outlines how projects are scored based on economic impact criteria.

Table 5: Economic Impact Criteria and Potential Scoring

Economic Criterion	Factor	Points
Effect on access to or within a regionally-designated economic development area	Substantial improvement	3
	Moderate improvement	2
	Minor improvement	1
	No effect	0
	Negative effect	-1
	Potential Points	3
Effect on access to or within a locally-designated business district	Substantial or moderate improvement	2
	Minor improvement	1
	No effect	0
	Negative effect	-1
	Potential Points	2
Effect on connections between housing, job, cultural centers, and essential services within and beyond the region	Substantial improvement	3
	Moderate improvement	2
	Minor improvement	1
	No effect	0
	Negative effect	-1
	Potential Points	3
Effect on the ability of the region's freight network to handle current and future freight needs	Substantial or moderate improvement	2
	Minor improvement	1
	No effect	0
	Negative effect	-1
	Potential Points	2
	Total Potential Economic Impact Scoring	**10**

Environmental and Health Scoring

Table 6 outlines how projects are scored based on environmental and community health impact criteria.

Table 6: Environmental and Community Health Impact Criteria and Potential Scoring

Environmental and Health Criterion	Factor	Points
Effect on wetlands, wildlife, or other resource protection	Anticipated improvement	2
	Minor contribution to preservation	1
	No anticipated impact or negative impacts adequately mitigated	0
	Negative impact	-1
	Potential Effect on Natural Resources Points	2
Effect on water quality through stormwater management and treatment with an emphasis on for nitrogen	Anticipated improvement in stormwater management and treatment	2
	Anticipated improvement in stormwater management	1
	No anticipated impact or negative impacts adequately mitigated	0
	Negative impact	-1
	Potential Effect on Water Quality Points	2
Effect on air quality / GHG emission	Significant, quantifiable decrease in GHG anticipated	2
	Minor, quantifiable or qualitative decrease in GHG anticipated	1
	No effect on GHG anticipated	0
	Anticipated increase in GHG	-1
	Potential Effect on Air Quality Points	2
Coastal Resiliency / Sea Level Rise Vulnerability / Low Lying Roads	Project vulnerable area with resilient design	2
	Project is not in a vulnerable area but includes with resilient design elements	1
	Project not in vulnerable area and not special consideration given to resilient design	0
	Project in a vulnerable area and is not a resilient design	-1
	Potential Effect on Coastal Resiliency Points	2
Effect on cultural resources or open space	Anticipated improvement	1
	No anticipated impact or negative impacts adequately mitigated	0
	Negative impact	-1
	Potential Effect on Open Space Points	1
Healthy Transportation Options	Increase in healthy transportation options	1
	No anticipated impact or negative impacts adequately mitigated	0
	Negative impact	-1
	Potential Effect on Healthy Transportation Options Points	1
	Total Potential Environmental and Health Scoring	**10**

Policy and Support Scoring

Table 7 outlines how projects are scored based on policy and support criteria.

Table 7: Policy and Support Criteria and Potential Scoring

Policy and Support Criterion	Factor	Points
Local Plans / Community Support	Stated Support for Project by Officials and Project Has Active Design	3
	Stated Support but No Active Design	2
	Project identified in existing local plan	1
	Neutral	0
	Project has community opposition	-1
	Potential Local Sand Community Support Points	3
Project identified in Regional Plan and/or Consistent with Regional Policy	Project specifically identified in Regional Plan	2
	Project Supports Regional Plan Policies, including PM1, PM2, PM3, an	1
	Neutral	0
	Inconsistent with Regional Plan and Policies	-1
	Potential Regional Support and Consistency Points	2
Project supports Federal or State (including MassDOT) policies and goals not accounted for in other criteria	Project specifically identified in a existing Federal or State Plan	2
	Consistent with Federal or State Policies or Principles	1
	Neutral	0
	Inconsistent with Federal or State Policies or Principles	-1
	Potential State and Federal Consistency Points	2
Equity	Project is located within an Environmental Justice area and will have a positive impact on population	3
	Project is of a regional significance that will serve individuals and improve access for Environmental Justice populations	1
	Project is isolated and not located within or adjacent to an Environmental Justice area	0
	Project in a vulnerable area and is not a resilient design	-1
	Potential Equity and Environmental Justice Points	3
	Total Potential Policy and Support Scoring	**10**

Project Evaluation Schedule

Table 8 outlines the schedule for evaluating and scoring projects. All projects are initially scored in the project initiation process following approval by MassDOT's Project Review Committee (PRC). However, as project design and other factors affecting project evaluation may change from the time a project is initiated, projects are subject to re-evaluation and updated scoring and circumstance necessitates.

Table 8: Project Evaluation Schedule

Initial Evaluation	Following PRC Approval
When Projects May Be Re-Evaluated	• New Project Details Known (Functional Design Report / Pre-25% Design)
	• Significant Change in Scope / Design has Occurred
	• Significant Change in Community Support / Active Design has Occurred
	• Significant Change in Existing conditions has Occurred
	• Project Has Been Inactive for 3 TIP Development Cycles