

Carbon Reduction Program Evaluation Manual

for the Quad Cities, Iowa/
Illinois Metropolitan
Planning Area

April 2026



Carbon Reduction Program Evaluation Manual

For The Quad Cities, Iowa/Illinois Metropolitan Planning Area

April 2026

This report was prepared in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration; the Illinois Department of Transportation; and the Iowa Department of Transportation. The contents of this report reflect the views of the author who is responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the Illinois Department of Transportation, the Iowa Department of Transportation, or the Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.



1504 Third Avenue, Third Floor
Rock Island, IL 61201
Phone: (309) 793-6300 • Fax: (309) 793-6305
Website: <http://www.bistateonline.org>

Table of Contents

- Introduction 1**

- Participation by Transportation Technical and Policy Committees 4**

- Project Requirements 5**
 - Transportation Alternatives Options..... 5
 - Congestion Management 6
 - Fuel and Energy Alternatives..... 6
 - Construction Approaches..... 6
 - Planning and Project Development Activities 6

- Carbon Reduction Program Technical Evaluation 6**
 - Awarded Projects 7
 - Technical Evaluation Criteria..... 8

- Evaluation Scoring Procedure..... 10**

- Figure 1 Project Applicant and Application Type 11**

Bi-State Regional Commission

Brad Bark, Chair

David Adams	Jerry Lack
Mike Bartels	Michael Limberg
Kippy Breeden	John Maxwell
Maria Bribriesco	Dan McNeil
Richard "Quijas" Brunk	Marcy Mendenhall
Kimberly Callaway-Thompson	Drue Mielke
Danny Chick, Jr.	Gary Moore
Michael Davis	Scott Naumann
Jean Dickson	Jazmin Newton
Rick Dunn	Dylan Parker
Reggie Freeman	Sangeetha Rayapati
Robert Gallagher	Sally Rodriguez*
Jason Gordon	Eileen Roethler
Ashley Harris	Rick Schloemer
Ralph H. Heninger	Jeff Sorensen
Marshall Jones	William Stoermer
Kurt Kirchner	Rich Volkert

Colonel William Parker, Rock Island Arsenal Garrison – Ex-Officio Member

* *Alternate for Small Town Representatives*

Bi-State Regional Commission Staff

Denise Bulat, Executive Director

Community/Economic Development

Lisa Ahern, Community/Economic
Development Director

Natalie Murphy, Planner

Ricky Newcomb, Senior Planner

Administration/Finance

Jill Henderson, Administrative/Finance
Director

Kim Ellis, Accounting Technician

Sarah Grabowski, Desktop Publisher

Becky Grems, Accounting Technician

Justine VanBlair, Accounting Technician

GIS/Mapping/Graphics

Kassie Keeney-McGurk, GIS/Graphics
Coordinator

Maia Edmondson, GIS Analyst

Jim Schmedding, Interactive Media Designer

Planning/Programming

Gena McCullough, Deputy Director

Sarah Bambas, Planner

Nithin Kalakuntla, Transportation Engineer

Bryan Schmid, Principal Planner

Zachary Sutton, Planner

Municipal Code Enforcement System (MUNICES)

Rich Keehner, MUNICES Project Manager

Transportation Policy Committee¹

Bob Gallagher, Mayor
City of Bettendorf, Iowa

Jason Gordon, Mayor
City of Davenport, Iowa

Jazmin Newton, Alderman
City of Davenport, Iowa

Rick Dunn, Alderman
City of Davenport, Iowa

Reggie Freeman, Mayor
City of East Moline, Illinois

Sangeetha Rayapati, Mayor
City of Moline, Illinois

Dennis Gerard, Mayor^{3,4}
City of LeClaire, Iowa
(Alternate: Scott Campbell, City of Eldridge)

Ashley Harris, Mayor
City of Rock Island, Illinois

Michael Bartels, Mayor⁴
Village of Coal Valley, Illinois
(Alternate: Bruce Stickell, Village of Milan)

Richard "Quijas" Brunk, Chair²
Rock Island County Board

Ross Paustian
Scott County Board of Supervisors

Trisha Thompson
Region 2, District 2 and 3 Engineer
Illinois Department of Transportation
(Alternate: Faith Duncan)

Dave Krouth, Chair
Rock Island County Metropolitan
Mass Transit District

Carrie Butler (ex-officio, non-voting)
Administrator, Federal Transit
Administration – Region VII
(Alternate: Jeremiah Shuler)

Vershun Tolliver (ex-officio, non-voting)
Interim Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration – Illinois
(Alternate: Anna Musial)

Vershun Tolliver (ex-officio, non-voting)
Interim Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administrator – Iowa
(Alternate: Sean Litteral)

Stuart Anderson, Director
Transportation Development Division
Iowa Department of Transportation
(Alternate: Hector Torres-Cacho,
District Transportation Planner)

¹ The Policy Committee voting is restricted to one vote for each voting member. Voting members may authorize an alternate, with the stipulation that alternates of elected officials also be an elected representative of the appropriate jurisdiction.

² Chair, Transportation Policy Committee

³ Vice-Chair, Transportation Policy Committee

⁴ The mayors of the cities of Buffalo, Eldridge, LeClaire, Princeton, and Riverdale in the Iowa portion and the cities and villages of Andalusia, Carbon Cliff, Coal Valley, Colona, Hampton, Milan, Oak Grove, Port Byron, Rapids City, and Silvis in the Illinois portion select a representative from their jurisdictions (Iowa and Illinois separately) to represent them on the Policy and Technical Committees.

Transportation Technical Committee¹

Brent Morlok, City Engineer²
City of Bettendorf, Iowa

Jeff Reiter, Economic Development Director
City of Bettendorf, Iowa

Brian Schadt, City Engineer
City of Davenport, Iowa

Gary Statz, Engineer
City of Davenport, Iowa

Bruce Berger, Community Planning & Economic
Development Director
City of Davenport, Iowa

Tim Kammler, City Engineer³
City of East Moline, Illinois

Mark Rothert, City Administrator
City of East Moline, Illinois

Nevada Lemke, City Administrator⁴
City of Eldridge, Iowa
(Alternate: Dennis Bockenstedt, LeClaire, Iowa)

Jerry Lebovitz, City Administrator⁴
City of Silvis, Illinois
(Alternate: Nick Gottwalt, Carbon Cliff, Illinois)

K.J. Whitley, Community Development Program
Manager
City of Moline, Illinois

Laura Klauer, City Engineer
City of Moline, Illinois

Tanner Osing, Planning and Zoning Manager
City of Rock Island, Illinois

Mike Kane, City Engineer
City of Rock Island, Illinois

Scott Stephenson, County Engineer
Henry County, Illinois

Matt Miller, Public Works Engineer
Rock Island County, Illinois

Greg Thorpe, Director of Building & Zoning
Rock Island County, Illinois

Jeff Nelson, General Manager
Rock Island County Metropolitan
Mass Transit District

Greg Schaapveld, Planning & Development
Director
Scott County, Iowa

Angie Kersten, County Engineer
Scott County, Iowa

Anna Musial
Federal Highway Administration
Illinois Division

Sean Litteral
Federal Highway Administration
Iowa Division

Jeremiah Shuler
Federal Transit Administration

Katie Smith
Illinois Department of Transportation

Hector Torres-Cacho
Iowa Department of Transportation

¹ The Technical Committee system allows one vote per agency with delegated representative voting permitted in the absence of an agency's listed member. The City of Davenport has three votes. Transit managers for Bettendorf Transit and Davenport CitiBus are invited.

² Chair, Transportation Technical Committee.

³ Vice-Chair, Transportation Technical Committee.

⁴ The mayors of the cities of Buffalo, Eldridge, LeClaire, Princeton, and Riverdale in the Iowa portion and the cities and villages of Andalusia, Carbon Cliff, Coal Valley, Colona, Hampton, Milan, Oak Grove, Port Byron, Rapids City, and Silvis in the Illinois portion select a representative from their jurisdictions (Iowa and Illinois separately) to represent them on the Policy and Technical Committees.

NOTE: Additional membership may include advisory representatives from the Illinois and Iowa Departments of Transportation, planning and research engineers from the Illinois and Iowa Federal Highway Administration, and a community planning representative from the Federal Transit Administration Region VII.

Introduction

On November 15, 2021, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) (Public Law 117-58) was enacted, also known as the “Bipartisan Infrastructure Law” (BIL). With the newly created program under IIJA, Iowa and Illinois are designated to receive a portion of the Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) funds, which are available through the States of Illinois and Iowa for eligible projects that reduce transportation emissions of carbon dioxide from on-road sources. CRP funds may be spent on traffic monitoring/control, advanced truck stop electrification, pedestrian/bicycle/non-motorized transportation facilities, congestion management, Intelligent Transportation System, energy efficient street and traffic lights, deployment of alternative fuels vehicles/infrastructure, diesel engine retrofits, public transit, and reduction of freight impacts on the environment/communities. Selected projects should align with each respective state’s Carbon Reduction Strategy. The deadline for state submissions of a Carbon Reduction Strategy is November 2023.

Legislative Basis The BIL established the CRP to provide funds for projects designed to reduce transportation emissions, defined as carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from on-road highway sources. By November 15, 2023, states were required to develop a Carbon Reduction Strategy in consultation with any MPO designated within the state (23 U.S.C. 175(d)(1)). The State Carbon Reduction Strategy shall support efforts to reduce transportation emissions and identify projects and strategies to reduce these emissions. The Carbon Reduction Strategy must be updated at least once

every four years (23 U.S.C. 175(d)(3) and (4)). Each Carbon Reduction Strategy shall (See 23 U.S.C. 175(d)(2)):

- Support efforts to reduce transportation emissions
- Identify projects and strategies to reduce transportation emissions, which may include projects and strategies for safe, reliable, and cost-effective options such as:
 - To reduce traffic congestion by facilitating the use of alternatives to single occupant vehicle (SOV) trips, including public transportation facilities, pedestrian facilities, bicycle facilities, and shared or pooled vehicle trips within the state or an area served by the applicable MPO, if any
 - To facilitate the use of vehicles or modes of travel that result in lower transportation emissions per person-mile traveled as compared to existing vehicles and modes
 - To facilitate approaches to the construction of transportation assets that result in lower transportation emissions as compared to existing approaches
- Support the reduction of transportation emissions of the state
- At the discretion of the state, quantify the total carbon emissions

from the production, transport, and use of materials used in the construction of transportation facilities within the state

- Be appropriate to the population density and context of the state, including any metropolitan planning organization designated within the state

States and MPOs are encouraged to obligate CRP funding for projects that support implementation of the State’s Carbon Reduction Strategy. Examples of eligible activities under CRP are project proposals that improve motor vehicle traffic flow, public transit service and intermodal freight movement; reduce traffic congestion and single-occupant vehicle travel; and help finance the purchase of publicly owned alternative fuel

vehicles and bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs.

Both Illinois and Iowa sides of the Quad Cities are entitled to CRP funds as shown in Table 1. For the Illinois side, funding will become available in 2025. Funds for 2023 and 2024 were merged with STBG funds in consultation with FHWA. Table 1 indicates the amount of funds available for programming by FFY2030 is \$986,073. On the Iowa side, funds were available in 2024. The amount available through 2030 will be \$2,024,966. One caveat is IJJA/BIL is authorized through September 30, 2026. There is a possibility the program could be eliminated, renewed, or continued through a continuing resolution. It will be important to initiate projects quickly in the short-term, and understand the uncertainty of the program as projects are programmed moving forward.

Table 1

MPO IL QC Federal Aid – Carbon Reduction Program					
Federal Fiscal Year	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
CRP Target*		\$318,408	\$318,408	\$318,408	\$318,408
Total Available for Programming		\$773,981	\$349,257	\$667,665	\$986,073
Total CRP Programmed		\$743,132	\$0	\$0	\$0
CRP Balance	\$455,473	\$30,849	\$349,257	\$667,665	\$986,073

MPO IA QC Federal Aid – Carbon Reduction Program					
Federal Fiscal Year	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
CRP Target		\$457,192	\$457,000	\$457,000	\$457,000
Total Available for Programming		\$653,966	\$1,110,966	\$1,567,966	\$2,024,966
Total CRP Programmed		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
CRP Balance	\$196,774	\$653,966	\$1,110,966	\$1,567,966	\$2,024,966

Programming Responsibility

Programming of these funds is the responsibility of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), which is the Bi-State Regional Commission. The Commission has, in turn, delegated the authority for programming these CRP funds to the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC). The Policy Committee has directed the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) to develop and implement a process through which candidate projects for CRP funding are submitted as needed, then evaluated and ranked in relation to each other and to assign them to three levels of priority. The resulting advisory prioritization assists the Policy Committee in determining which projects should be selected to receive CRP funding. However, the Policy Committee reserves the right to select projects to receive CRP funding as deemed necessary for the transportation system at any time, as long as the Public Participation Process is followed for public notification. There may be circumstances where the CRP evaluations may not apply.

Evaluation Criteria The TTC periodically reviews the procedures for the technical evaluation and advisory ranking. This

document shall define the methodology that reflects the nomenclature and essence of the current transportation act.

Ranking Process After a point value is assigned to each item considered in the evaluation, the points for each project are totaled. The final advisory ranking is then determined by graphing the projects by their individual total number of points to identify natural breaks or clusters of projects. As these breaks occur, projects can be classified in three priority groups, "A," "B," and "C." Candidate projects that are characterized as "A" are the highest priority, while "C" projects are the lowest priority. These groupings of projects (A, B, C) will be the final advisory ranking given to the Policy Committee with an individual ranked score. The Technical Committee may make recommendations based on funding availability in relation to the ranking. The Policy Committee will consider the priority of the project and recommendation of the Technical Committee, but may choose a lower priority project based on funding availability, economic development, regional significance or impact, eminent safety concerns, or other non-quantitative factors.

Participation by Transportation Technical and Policy Committees

Candidate projects for CRP funds are solicited as needed from jurisdictions through the evaluation process. Bi-State Regional Commission facilitates the call for projects using the most recent estimate on CRP funds available, and following the Public Participation Plan notification process. The notice is sent to the MPO Technical Committee and eligible small communities within the metropolitan planning area boundary.

Submittal Form-Description and Match

A submittal form, as shown in Figure 1, must be completed in every submission period for each project that is to be evaluated. The application should include a detailed project description for roads, bridges, trails/sidewalks, or other constructed features with project termini; a location map; other capital cost, such as buses or engine retrofits; a description for all projects total cost in the estimated year of expenditure dollars and anticipated CRP share request (up to 80% share of the total cost), as well as other supporting documentation to aid the evaluation process. Data provided on the submittal form will be used by the Bi-State staff in conducting the CRP evaluation.

Response Form

Following the completion of the project's evaluation, the CRP Candidate Project Response Form (Figure 1) is returned to the respective jurisdiction for review. Bi-State staff should be notified of any revisions to the project's evaluation desired by the jurisdiction. Calculation errors may be

corrected by Bi-State staff; however, any significant revisions to the submittal form that are requested will to be presented to the TTC for their consideration. Changes to the submittal form must occur prior to scoring.

Special Considerations

The TTC will review the special consideration categories at the first TTC meeting following the completion of the initial evaluation of projects. At this time, the ranking of projects shall not be released to the committee. A list of those projects that are eligible for special consideration "bonus" points shall be presented to the TTC members prior to the special consideration review. Any other evaluation revisions that are presented to the Technical Committee will also be considered at this meeting.

Ranking and Priority Clusters

Final ranking of the CRP Candidate Projects will be conducted following the Committee's review of special considerations. After awarding "bonus" points, the final ranking will be presented to the Technical Committee without identification of the project. Scores will be shown graphically to identify clusters of projects from highest to lowest score. Clusters of projects scores will be logically grouped by the Technical Committee into priorities "A," "B," and "C" – "A" being the highest priority projects. The projects in their priority groupings will be forwarded to the Transportation Policy Committee for consideration. The Policy Committee shall consider the results of the CRP Evaluation

and the amount of anticipated funds in determining what project(s) to program. The Policy Committee will consider the priority of project(s) and recommendation of the Technical Committee, but may

Project Requirements

Each CRP project proposal must have a **minimum total project cost of \$125,000** to be eligible for funding assistance. Applications for CRP funding assistance must demonstrate that proposals will reduce vehicle emissions (CO₂) and, if applicable, reduce traffic congestion or increase transit ridership.

Eligibility

Both states' Department of Transportation can implement additional restrictions for how the funds can be spent. As of 2024, Illinois DOT follows federal guidelines, and has not implemented any state-specific funding restrictions. Iowa DOT has implemented restrictions on the funding. These restrictions prohibit CRP funding to be used on preliminary engineering, constructing engineering, or Electric vehicle charging infrastructure.

Final determination of funding eligibility for individual projects is made by the Bi-State Regional Commission based on program guidelines, and DOT feedback.

In order to be eligible for approval, applications must be submitted or sponsored by a city, county, or local public transit agency.

Emission Reduction Calculations

Sponsors of CRP funding applications must calculate emission reduction estimates for each proposal using professional

choose a lower priority project(s) based on funding availability, economic development, regional significance or impact, eminent safety concerns, or other non-quantitative factors.

methodology and must document the estimates and methodology in the applications. Estimates of reductions in vehicle miles of travel (VMT) and travel delays; increases in vehicle speeds; and changes in travel time, time of day, mode choice, trip length, trip frequency, and other relevant factors should also be documented in the applications.

To be eligible for CRP funding, the proposed projects and programs should fit into one or more of the following categories:

Transportation Alternatives Options

These projects work towards providing safe and convenient transportation options that people are likely to use. Examples include developing complete streets models; increasing access to trails and nonmotorized transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; the inclusion of other modes of transportation, like ridesharing services, within existing right of way; and public transportation development. However, rehabilitation, reconstruction, or maintenance of existing facilities are not eligible. Operating assistance to support the start-up of discrete, newly added transit services is limited to three years of operating costs, which must be easily identified; however, payments may be spread over a five-year period under certain conditions. Separate applications

must be submitted for each year operating assistance funding is requested.

Congestion Management

Projects in this category improve traffic flow, reduce road congestion, and cut down on vehicle idling. Examples of possible projects include traffic monitoring, management, and control programs; deployment of Intelligent Traffic Systems (ITS); congestion pricing and travel demand management strategies; establishment of auto-free zones; construction of roundabouts; truck parking projects; and traffic improvements without adding new general use lanes. Projects to add general-purpose lane capacity for SOV use will not be eligible funding without analyses demonstrating emissions reductions over the project's lifecycle.

Fuel and Energy Alternatives

These projects or efforts provide options for alternative fuels and energy sources used throughout the transportation system. Examples include port and truck stop electrification, efforts that reduce environmental and community impacts of freight, replacement of street lighting and traffic control devices with energy efficient alternatives, deployment of alternative fuel

infrastructure, diesel engine retrofits, and renewable energy within existing right of way.

Construction Approaches

Activities in this category lower transportation emissions by utilizing alternative approaches to the construction of transportation facilities. Examples include purchase or lease of zero-emission construction equipment and use of sustainable pavements and construction materials.

Planning and Project Development Activities

This relates to project development activities that lead to construction of facilities or new services and programs with air quality benefits. Preliminary engineering or project planning studies are eligible. This includes studies for the preparation of environmental or National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents, but only if they directly support projects that improve air quality. (General planning activities such as economic, demographic, or similar studies that do not propose or support transportation air quality projects are not eligible.)

Carbon Reduction Program Technical Evaluation

TTC will assign the highest priorities to eligible and proven CO2 reduction strategies that cost-effectively maximize reductions in vehicle emissions (CO2), are sustainable in the long-term, and are supported by the community. The types of projects or programs that are the highest priorities for CRP funding are those that:

- Demonstrate a direct benefit in reducing or eliminating CO2 air pollution
- Reduce SOV trips or VMT
- Reduce vehicle congestion and improve traffic flow on highways and streets

- Implement the TCMs or other transportation-related projects identified in an approved State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality (if needed)
- Assist in developing management systems for traffic congestion, public transportation, or intermodal facilities

CRP proposals should result from a strong participatory planning process involving close coordination among the state DOTs, the MPO, and state and local air quality agencies. CRP proposals also should be reflected as high priorities in congestion management system programs or long-range transportation plans.

Awarded projects must be added to approved the MPO transportation improvement program (TIP) and to the respective state's – Illinois and Iowa – Statewide Transportation Improvement Programs (STIP).

Awarded Projects

Awarded projects will be required to proceed through the federal-aid project development process beginning with contact with the respective Department of Transportation, and will be subject to certain federal and applicable state laws and regulations related to public involvement, real estate, environmental regulations, conforming to ADA, DBE, wage, competitive bidding and permitting requirements, to name a few.

An award letter will be used to notify the local jurisdiction of the award amounts and expectations in working with the Departments of Transportation to proceed

through the federal-aid project development process. The letter will be sent to the Chief Elected Official or Board Representative and to the appropriate Technical Committee representative, and a copy will be provided to the respective District Planner and/or other appropriate DOT staff. Awarded projects are expected to be included in the Quad Cities MPO Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and may require an amendment through the MPO Policy Committee depending on the timing of the programming process.

The availability of funds is subject to the type of budget authority authorized for federal CRP funds. The time period established in legislation determines when funds must be obligated. It will be important for projects to be timely in carrying out the project development process to prevent lapsing of these funds if the respective State Department of Transportation cannot carry balances of the CRP program as a whole.

CRP funds are contract authority. CRP obligations are reimbursed from the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund. The availability of funds is subject to the type of budget authority authorized for CRP funds. The time period established in legislation determines when funds must be obligated. It will be important for projects to be timely in carrying out the project development process to prevent lapsing of these funds. Jurisdictions that are awarded projects must be able to implement the project within five (5) years from the fiscal year the project is awarded.

For example, a project being awarded funds from Fiscal Year 2026, would be expected to be authorized or let no later than 2031. Awarded projects not

proceeding to implementation within the five (5) years must request an extension by the Policy Committee or return the funds to the MPO pool for reprogramming. Changes in scope of work from the original awarded application will be required to be approved by the Policy Committee.

All projects funded under the program are treated as if they were located on a federal-aid highway. This requires the use of Davis-Bacon wage and Build America, Buy America Act requirements. FHWA has updated guidance around the Build America, Buy America Act to incorporate construction materials due to new provisions in the BIL. Understanding Build America, Buy America Act considerations will be important during the project identification process. Projects considering the purchase of manufactured products and construction materials, such as components for charging stations, alternative fuels, new vehicle purchases, and the construction of facilities, should be aware that Build America, Buy America Act requirements may apply and coordinate with their respective DOT district office to determine affected components.

Technical Evaluation Criteria

The TTC will determine the eligibility of all proposed CRP projects or programs in consultation with the DOTs and evaluate and rank them on a competitive basis, using a range of points associated with the criteria listed below. As both states receive funds, projects will be reviewed and scored by members from the same state, so Illinois communities will rate Illinois-based projects, and Iowa communities will rate Iowa-based projects. For each criterion, the applicant must show quantitative analysis

of the estimated traffic congestion reduction or air quality improvement benefits that will result from the proposed project or program within the study area. The applicants also must document in the application, the methodology, assumptions, and sources of data used in the analysis.

For the air quality improvement analysis, applicants should use the latest available VOC (HC), CO₂ emission factors provided on the FHWA website (https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmaq/toolkit/). Alternative emission estimates prepared with EPA approved factors suitable for the Bi-State Region may be substituted for those supplied by the FHWA as long as they are documented. The TTC may refine the criteria prior to scoring to assist in the project ranking process. The rank of each project, based on total points, will be used to determine Bi-State's staff funding recommendations to the Transportation Technical Commission. The project ranking criteria are as follows for all CRP projects.

(0-50 points): Effective vehicle emission reduction estimates in the project area.

The applicant must document how many kilograms per day of CO₂ vehicle emissions will be reduced. Projects that show a more direct or have a higher probability of reduction (as opposed to the potential of reducing emissions) will receive more points. Will reductions occur quickly after the project, or over a longer time frame?

(0-25 points): Project cost-effectiveness relative to associated air quality benefits.

Project applicant must calculate the cost-effectiveness of the proposed project by dividing the average annual total cost of the project (total project cost divided by expected project life in years) by

the total annual vehicle emissions reduction in kilograms per year for each target pollutant. [Average annual total project cost (dollars)] divided by [emissions reduction (kilograms per year)].

(0-10 points): Degree of transportation-related air pollution or traffic congestion in the project area. An area with a higher degree of transportation-related air pollution or traffic congestion will receive higher priority for assistance. Proposed projects in areas with a larger amount of emissions, such as high traffic corridors or areas with sustained traffic idling, would receive more points. Traffic congestion will be based on available annual average daily traffic (AADT) and broken up into three (3) tiers. They are as follows:

- 0-3750
- 3750.01 – 13900
- 13900.01 and up

(0-10 points): Community Engagement. Does the proposed project have the backing of the community it will be working in? Projects that have demonstrated a commitment to acquiring community feedback, such as having a strategy included in the proposal, will receive more points. This can be documented within a

Capital Improvement Program, other local, regional, or statewide planning document, or documented public meeting process.

(0-10 points): Equity. Does the proposed project mitigate emission impact or provide increased benefit to historically disadvantaged communities? How will this project provide benefits to these historically disadvantaged communities? A location map of the candidate project will be provided, or a project will be acknowledged as areawide benefit if appropriate. TTC will compare the candidate projects to that provide air quality improvements to these populations, such as low-income, households without vehicles, and racial/ethnicity or other disadvantaged population criteria as part of the decision-making process.

Note: The total cost of an CRP proposal includes all costs necessary to complete the project or program, consistent with the estimated benefits related to the proposal. A proposal’s annualized cost should be determined by using the “useful life” of individual cost items as in the economic evaluation of highway and transit projects.

Points	Criteria
0-50	Vehicle emission reduction estimates
0-25	Project cost effectiveness relative to air quality benefits
0-10	Degree of transportation-related air pollution or traffic congestion
0-10	Community Engagement
0-10	Equity
0-105	Total possible points.

Evaluation Scoring Procedure

Data values determined through the candidate project evaluations will be assigned scores by voting members of the TTC who will submit their evaluations individually to Bi-State staff. Scores will be given in 5-point increments. For example, when looking at Community Engagement, a project would receive 10 points when it demonstrates that it has fully engaged with the community, 5 points when it partially engages with the community, and no points if there is no engagement with the community. The scores are summed for each project by Bi-State staff, and candidate projects are then ranked in descending order by total summed scores.

The final advisory ranking is then determined by graphing the projects by

their individual total number of points to identify natural breaks or clusters of projects. As these breaks occur, projects can be classified in three priority groups: "A," "B," and "C." "A" candidate projects are characterized as the highest priority, while "C" projects are the lowest priority. These groupings of projects (A, B, C) will be the final advisory ranking given to the TPC with an individual ranked score.

Based on the TTC recommendations and spatial equity data, the Policy Committee may choose another or lower priority project based on funding availability, regional significance or impact, eminent safety concerns, or other non-quantitative factors.

**Figure 1
Project Applicant and Application Type**

Name, Location of Public Sponsor and Sponsor Type:

Sponsor Name: _____

Sponsor Type: _____

Project Title: _____

Estimated Total Cost of Project: _____

Funds Requested in Proposal: _____

Describe location, boundaries, and length of the project:

County: _____

Street Address of Project (if located on a highway or road):

Project Representative Contact Person(s) Information:

Primary Public Sponsor Agency Contact Information:

Name: _____ Title: _____

Street Address: _____ Phone: (____) ____ - ____

Municipality: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

E-mail: _____

Secondary Public Sponsor Agency or Private Organization Contact Information:

Organization/Agency Name: _____

Name: _____ Title: _____

Street Address: _____ Phone: (____) ____ - ____

Municipality: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

E-mail: _____

Head of Government Contact Information:

Name: _____ Title: _____

Street Address: _____ Phone: (____) ____ - ____

Municipality: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

E-mail: _____

Eligible Project Activities

Indicate the appropriate project improvement type(s) by checking all of the boxes which apply to the proposed project:

- Transportation Options
- Congestion Management
- Fuel and Energy Alternatives
- Construction Approaches
- Planning and Project Development Activities

Note: Not all federally eligible project activities are eligible for CRP

Existing Facilities & Projects

Rail Facilities:

Does a railroad facility exist within 1,000 feet of the project limits? Yes No

If yes, specify: _____

If yes, does the project physically cross a rail facility? Yes No

Owner of Rail Facility: _____

Is the proposed project location in an area with known safety issues? Yes No

If yes, specify: _____

Is this project on or parallel to a local road or street? Yes No

If Yes, provide the name of the road or street: _____

Does this project cross a state or federal highway? Yes No

Does this project run parallel to a state or federal highway? Yes No

Is any part of this project on the National Highway System? Yes No

Will this project be constructed as part of another planned road project? Yes No

If Yes, specify if this is a state, county, or local project and when the road project is scheduled for construction:

Will any exceptions to standards be requested? Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description of the exceptions that may be requested:

Environmental/Cultural Issues

Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Investigated
Comments _____			
Archaeological sites	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Investigated
Comments _____			
Historical sites	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Investigated
Comments _____			
Designated Main Street area	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Investigated
Comments _____			
Lakes, waterways, floodplains	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Investigated
Comments _____			
Stormwater management	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Investigated
Comments _____			
Hazardous materials sites	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Investigated
Comments _____			
Hazardous materials on existing structure	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Investigated
Comments _____			
Upland habitat	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Investigated
Comments _____			
Endangered/threatened/migratory species	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Investigated
Comments _____			
Section 4(f)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Investigated
Comments _____			
Section 6(f)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Investigated
Comments _____			
Through/adjacent to tribal land	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Investigated
Comments _____			

