

## **ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT POLICY COMMITTEE**

**November 1, 2018 – 9:00 am – 12:00 pm**

Lake Michigan Room, NIRPC Office  
6100 Southport Rd. Portage, IN 46368

**1.0 Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance**

**2.0 Introductions**

**3.0 Approval of Minutes – October 4, 2018 and October 10, 2018**

*ACTION REQUESTED – Approval*

**4.0 2020-2024 TIP Programmatic Approach & Scoring Criteria – Mitch Barloga**

**4.1** NIRPC staff will present the final project type scoring based on all committee input.

**4.2** Draft project evaluation criteria and scoring for discussion.

*ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion*

**5.0 Announcements**

**6.0 Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the EMPC committee is scheduled for December 3, 2018 at 9 am.

**7.0 Adjournment**

The Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission (NIRPC) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, national origin, age, disability, marital status, familial status, parental status, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program.

## ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT POLICY COMMITTEE

NIRPC - Lake Michigan Room

October 4, 2018

Minutes

**Members/Guests:** Bill Emerson, Jr., Geof Benson, Maggie Byrne, Kathryn Vallis, Sarah Nimetz, George Topoll, Jan Bapst, Michael Spinar, Sherryl Doerr, Tim Kingsland, Susan MiHalo, Lauri Keagle, Sylvia Collins, Susan Adams, Deb Backus, Lynda Lancaster, Jennifer Gadzala, Jess Huseman, Greg Towler, Stuart Carlton, Milo Milatovic, Carolyn Saxton, Katherine Moore Powell, Joe Grazalski, Elizabeth McCloskey, Kay Nelson, Jennifer Birchfield, Namissa Taylor, Kris Krouse, Daniel Goldfarb, Carol Ropski, Peg Donnelly and Cherie Fisher.

**NIRPC Staff:** Kathy Luther, Mitch Barloga, Dominique Edwards and Candice Eklund.

### **Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance**

Bill Emerson, Jr. called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance and self-introductions.

### **NIRPC Business:**

#### **Approval of Minutes**

On motion by Tim Kingsland and second by Sara Nimetz, the September 6, 2018 EMPC meeting minutes were approved as presented.

#### **Presentation: 2050 Plan + Tip Programmatic Approach and Project Scoring**

Mitch Barloga presented on the draft 2050 Plan and TIP Programmatic Approach and Program Scoring revisions based on committee input. Program scoring was reviewed by the Committee and points were changed live as needed, based on consensus of the group. Ten sets of project criteria were scheduled to be examined, however due to the Urban Waters Federal Partnership and the U.S. EPA's Sub-Area Response Plan presentation, time only allowed for three of the criteria's to be examined. The Committee agreed to schedule an additional session on October 10, 2018 to discuss the seven remaining project criteria's for EMPC and Air Quality. At the November meeting, project sizes and funding mechanisms will be examined. The Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) will be out in late November. Submissions are due in January.

#### **Urban Waters Federal Partnership Updates, Presented by Jennifer Birchfield**

Jennifer Birchfield conveyed her gratitude on the mix of the agencies partnerships and how they all work together on projects related to urban waters and revitalizing communities. Northwest Indiana was one of the original seven pilot locations and today there are 21 locations and 60 partner organizations throughout Indiana.

The next Urban Waters meeting will be held on January 25, 2019, 9:30 am at NIRPC. Additional sessions and workshops offered will be included in the announcements that are emailed to the group.

#### **U.S. EPA NW Indiana Sub-Area / Geographical Response Plan Discussion**

Peg Donnelly, with the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), discussed the need for enhancing the emergency planning in Northwest Indiana (NWI) and effectively communicating with the communities. Dan Haag, also with the US EPA, stated there were two reasons for enhancing the emergency plan. There have been some recent incidents in NWI where some people felt left out of the early stages of the emergency and the need for improved planning was also recognized. As a result, Peg Donnelly and Carol Ropski were assigned to form a regional task force group, referred to as Region 5 or RRT5, which covers the great lakes. Additional information on the Region 5 Sub-Area Plans can be found on the [rrt5.org](http://rrt5.org) website.

The primary goal for NWI within the Sub-Area plan is to effectively manage the response within the first 24-48 hours. The initial task will be to develop an Incident Accident Plan (IAP) for all responders needing to respond to a discharge of oil into a water way in NWI. An automatic communication tool was discussed because it can automatically email, text or phone a contact list in an emergency.

The US EPA completed response drills with 12 facilities in August 2018, will schedule additional drills with more test facilities and ensure the facilities implement their plans. Quarterly meetings will be held and a kickoff Sub-Area planning meeting is scheduled for November to establish goals.

There is currently an area contingency plan and the Sub-Area plan be will an addendum to that plan, specific to Lake, Porter and LaPorte Counties. Since they are in the beginning stages with the Sub-Area plan, US EPA will be attending another EMPC meeting in 2019 to provide progress updates and identify additional areas in the plan.

Bill Emerson thanked the presenters for taking the corrective steps and addressing the gap in response procedures because it has been a concern with the environmental committee.

#### **Announcements**

The event announcements submitted will be distributed in an email to the committee.

#### **Adjournment**

Hearing no other business, Bill Emerson adjourned the meeting at 10:53 a.m.

*A Digital MP3 of this meeting is filed. Contact Candice Eklund at 219-763-6060 Ext 142 or ceklund@nirpc.org should you wish to receive a copy of it.*

## ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT POLICY COMMITTEE

### Continued Project Scoring Session

NIRPC - Lake Michigan Room

October 10, 2018

Minutes

**Members/Guests:** Jan Bapst, Lauri Keagle, Kay Nelson, Lynda Lancaster, George Malis, Mary Jane Thomas, Deb Backhus, Geof Benson and Jennifer Gadzala

**NIRPC Staff:** Kathy Luther, Mitch Barloga, Dominique Edwards and Candice Eklund.

Jan Bapst called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.

#### **Presentation: 2050 Plan Futures**

Dominique Edwards presented on the 2050 Plan drivers and influences of Northwest Indiana's future. The Plan will also aid in aligning project scoring planning when discussing futures scenarios. Summer pop-up events concluded September 1. Feedback was received from over 900 people ranging in age from 5 to 75. The fall series of pop-up events begins this week and goes through October 20. Visit [www.nirpc.org](http://www.nirpc.org) for more information.

#### **Presentation: 2050 Plan + Tip Programmatic Approach and Project Scoring**

Mitch Barloga recapped the draft 2050 Plan and TIP Programmatic Approach and Program Scoring revision documents from the EMPC meeting held on October 4, 2018. A total of ten sets of project criteria were scheduled to be examined. Three sets were examined on October 4th and the remaining seven were examined and completed during today's meeting. As the program scoring was reviewed, points were changed live as needed, based on consensus of the group. The Project Planning category for the development of regional environment protection plans was examined and points were changed live as well.

Mitch Barloga discussed the proposed project evaluation criteria and weights programs. The overall criteria will be used for every program category. The program category for Cost Effectiveness may be included as one metric in another area. Mitch will send out the revised scoring and project evaluation criteria and weights spreadsheets and has requested feedback within two weeks of receiving the updates. The group discussed each of the Air Quality and Environment criteria for each program to obtain a full understanding and make appropriate changes. Kathy Luther and Joe Exl will update each of the criteria's discussed and assign numerical values to each of the programs. These updates will be discussed in full detail during the EMPC Committee meeting in November, before a final vote is taken.

#### **Adjournment**

Hearing no other business, Jan Bapst adjourned the meeting at 1:21 pm.

The next EMPC meeting will be held on November 1, 2018 beginning at 9:00 am and concluding at 12:00 pm, or when the project scoring and proposed project evaluation criteria and weights have been reviewed and voted on by the Committee.

*A Digital MP3 of this meeting is filed. Contact Candice Eklund at 219-763-6060 Ext 142 or [ceklund@nirpc.org](mailto:ceklund@nirpc.org) should you wish to receive a copy of it.*





# Program Evaluation Criteria



# STC Programs

Program	Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Policy & Plan Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Regional Priority	Safety	Social Equity
<b>New Roadways</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All purpose average trip times for households within one mile of proposed corridor</li> <li>Percent of population within 1/4-mile of a sidewalk, trail, or bicycle facility for population within one mile of proposed corridor</li> <li>Percent of population within transit service areas for population within one mile of proposed corridor</li> <li>Modeled improvement of reductions in Vehicle Hours of Travel within two miles of proposed corridor</li> <li>Emergency Access based on proximity from hospital and medical care purpose average trip time for households within one mile of proposed corridor</li> </ol> <p><b>20 points</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employment density within one mile of proposed corridor</li> <li>Economic productivity of facilities within one mile of proposed Corridor</li> </ol> <p><b>15 points</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emissions Reductions</li> <li>Green Infrastructure Components</li> </ol> <p><b>5 points</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Master Plan or Thoroughfare Plan</li> <li>Capital Improvements Program (CIP)</li> <li>Traffic Impact Fee Plan</li> <li>Related Studies</li> </ol> <p><b>15 points</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>INDOT</li> <li>Railroads</li> <li>Public Private Partnership (P3)</li> <li>Foundations</li> </ol> <p><b>5 points</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overmatch</li> <li>Right of Way owned</li> <li>Locally funded PE/ROW</li> </ol> <p><b>5 points</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Corridors Study (RCS)</li> <li>Creative Livable Communities</li> <li>Congestion Management Program (CMP)</li> </ol> <p><b>20 points</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Universal Design Criteria</li> <li>Complete Streets</li> </ol> <p><b>10 points</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location in EJ Area</li> </ol> <p><b>5 points</b></p>
<b>Roadway Improvement</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All purpose average trip times for households within one mile of proposed corridor</li> <li>Percent of population within 1/4-mile of a sidewalk, trail, or bicycle facility for population within one mile of proposed corridor</li> <li>Percent of population within transit service areas for population within one mile of proposed corridor</li> <li>Modeled improvement of reductions in Vehicle Hours of Travel within two miles of proposed corridor</li> <li>Emergency Access based on proximity from hospital and medical care purpose average trip time for households within one mile of proposed corridor</li> </ol> <p><b>20 Points</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employment density within one mile of proposed corridor</li> <li>Economic productivity of facilities within one mile of proposed Corridor</li> </ol> <p><b>15 points</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emissions Reductions</li> <li>Green Infrastructure Components</li> </ol> <p><b>5 points</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Master Plan or Thoroughfare Plan</li> <li>Capital Improvements Program (CIP)</li> <li>Related Studies</li> </ol> <p><b>15 points</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major employers</li> <li>TDM</li> <li>Transit Agencies</li> <li>INDOT</li> <li>Universities</li> <li>Parking operators</li> <li>Railroads</li> <li>Emergency Medical Services</li> <li>Freight Carriers</li> <li>Law Enforcement</li> <li>Public Private Partnership (P3)</li> </ol> <p><b>5 points</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overmatch</li> <li>Right of Way owned</li> <li>Locally funded PE/ROW</li> </ol> <p><b>5 points</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2040 Plan</li> <li>Regional Corridors Study (RCS)</li> <li>Creating Livable Communities</li> <li>Congestion Management Program (CMP)</li> <li>ITS Regional Architecture</li> </ol> <p><b>20 points</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Crashes per 100 million VMT</li> <li>Number of non-motor crashes</li> <li>Number railroad crashes</li> <li>Universal Design Criteria</li> <li>Complete Streets</li> </ol> <p><b>10 points</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location in EJ Area</li> </ol> <p><b>5 points</b></p>



Program		Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Policy & Plan Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Regional Priority	Safety	Social Equity
Asset Management	Descript	- Use of Universal Design Standards	N/A	- Use of alternative fuels vehicles	- Demonstrated need for type of capital purchase	- Other transit operators - Medical providers - Non-profits - Municipalities - Counties - Businesses (Local match, fare partnerships, service links, consolidated services)	- Overmatch - Dedicated local match - Service precedent	- Coordinated Transit Plan - Long Range Plan - Transit Asset Management Plan - Capital projects on State QPA	- Safety Plan Compliance - Performance of on-time preventative maintenance - Meeting required performance targets for maintenance	- Improve efficiency of service or overall quality of assets within EJ areas
	Scoring	- Will the new vehicle or capital asset utilize universal design standards for ADA accessibility?	N/A	- More alternative fuel vehicles than previously utilized?	- Does the proposed asset match intended need? - Documentation provided justifying purchase if the asset is different than previously purchased capital items	- What partnerships are being leveraged? - What advantages are available b/c of partnerships?	- Can this project be overmatched? - Is there a dedicated source of local match? - Is this a vehicle, other capital replacement, or ongoing preventative maintenance?	- Is this project computable with the CTP? - Is this project compatible with the LRP? - Is this project compatible with the TAMP?	- Is the operator in compliance with their safety plan? - Has the operator been meeting their preventative maintenance milestones?	- Does the proposed vehicle replacement, capital asset, or new vehicle improve efficiency or service or overall quality of assets within EJ areas? - (Percentage of vehicles that have met the ULB operating within EJ areas)
	Weight	- 10 Points	- 0 Points	- 5 Points	- 5 Points	- 10 Points	- 25 Points	- 25 Points	- 10 Points	- 10 Points
Customer Experience	Descript	- Use of Universal Design Standards	- Connection to job centers	- LEED building standards - Green Infrastructure	- Feasibility study for new passenger facilities - Compatibility with the ADA Transition Plan	- Other transit operators - Medical providers - Non-profits - Municipalities - Counties - Businesses (Local match, fare partnerships, service links, consolidated services)	- Overmatch - Dedicated local match - Service precedent	- Coordinated Transit Plan - Long Range Plan - CLC Locations - G+B 2020 Plan - 30 & I-65 Plan - Capital projects on State QPA	- Safety Plan Compliance - Performance of on-time preventative maintenance - Meeting required performance targets for maintenance	- Improve efficiency of service or overall quality of assets within EJ areas
	Scoring	- Will the new vehicle or capital asset utilize universal design standards for ADA accessibility?	- Does the proposed facility, system, program, or training increase access to job centers?	- Will the proposed asset utilize green infrastructure building methods or LEED design standards?	- Is the proposed facility compatible with the local ADA Transition Plans? - Are considerations for the new facility well-documented? - Are the needs for improving an existing facility well-documented?	- What partnerships are being leveraged? - What advantages are available b/c of partnerships?	- Can this project be overmatched? - Is there a dedicated source of local match? - Is this a facility, system, training, or service that was utilized previously?	- Is this project computable with the CTP, LRP, G+B 2020 Plan, & 30 & I-65 Plan? - Is this project compatible with identified CLC locations?	- Is the operator in compliance with their safety plan? - Has the operator been meeting their preventative maintenance milestones?	- Does the proposed vehicle replacement, capital asset, or new vehicle improve efficiency or service or overall quality of assets within EJ areas?
	Weight	- 10 Points	- 5 Points	- 5 Points	- 5 Points	- 10 Points	- 45 Points	- 5 Points	- 5 Points	- 10 Points

Program		Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Policy & Plan Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Regional Priority	Safety	Social Equity
Expansion	Descript	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connections to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hospitals &amp; medical facilities</li> <li>Other transit networks</li> <li>Across city boundaries</li> <li>Across county boundaries</li> <li>Decreased trip time/wait time</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connections to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Job centers</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of alternative fuel vehicles</li> <li>Increased service efficiencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feasibility study for new services</li> <li>Compatibility with the ADA Transition Plan</li> <li>Rider qualification policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other transit operators</li> <li>Local medical providers</li> <li>Non-profits</li> <li>Municipalities</li> <li>Counties</li> <li>Businesses (local match, fare partnerships, service links, consolidated services)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overmatch</li> <li>Dedicated local match</li> <li>Service precedent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinated Transit Plan</li> <li>Long Range Plan</li> <li>Capital projects on State QPA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety Plan Compliance</li> <li>Performance of on-time preventative maintenance</li> <li>Meeting required performance targets for maintenance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service to and from EJ areas</li> <li>Increase access for individuals with disabilities and the elderly</li> </ul>
	Scoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More connections available than previous service?</li> <li>Trip time/wait time more efficient?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More job center connections than previous service?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More job center connections than previous service?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is this an expansion of service? If so is there a feasibility study?</li> <li>Is the proposed service compatible with local ADA transition plans?</li> <li>Are the rider qualification policies compatible with other paratransit systems?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What partnerships are being leveraged?</li> <li>What advantages are available because of these partnerships?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can this project be overmatched?</li> <li>Is there a dedicated source of local match for this project?</li> <li>Has this project been in successful operation for more than 2 years?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is this project computable with the CTP?</li> <li>Is this project compatible with the LRP?</li> <li>Are all capital purchases on the QPA?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the operator in compliance with their Safety Plan?</li> <li>Has the operator been meeting their preventative maintenance milestones?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does this service increase access of people living in EJ areas?</li> <li>Does this service increase access of people with disabilities and elderly?</li> </ul>
	Weight									
			- 10 Points	- 5 Points	- 5 Points	- 5 Points	- 5 Points	- 45 Points	- 5 Points	- 5 Points
Safety	Descript	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety and security for persons with disabilities</li> </ul>	- N/A	- N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service/staff coordination</li> <li>Robust Safety Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other transit operators</li> <li>Medical providers</li> <li>Non-profits</li> <li>Municipalities</li> <li>Counties</li> <li>Businesses (local match, fare partnerships, service links, consolidated services)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overmatch</li> <li>Dedicated local match</li> <li>Robust feasibility study</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinated Transit Plan</li> <li>Long Range Plan</li> <li>Transit Asset Management Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety Plan Compliance</li> <li>Performance of on-time preventative maintenance</li> <li>Meeting required performance targets for maintenance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety and security of EJ passenger facilities</li> </ul>
	Scoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does this project increase the safety and security for persons with disabilities?</li> </ul>	- N/A	- N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What resources have been shared with other operators and partners?</li> <li>Does operator have a robust safety plan?</li> <li>Is this project in compliance with the needs identified in the safety plan?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What partnerships are being leveraged?</li> <li>What advantages are available because of these partnerships?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can this project be overmatched?</li> <li>Is there a dedicated source of local match for this project?</li> <li>Is there a well-documented need for proposed service expans.?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is this project computable with the CTP?</li> <li>Is this project compatible with the LRP?</li> <li>Is this project compatible with the TAMP?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the operator in compliance with their Safety Plan?</li> <li>Has the operator been meeting their preventative maintenance milestones?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does this project increase the safety and security of passenger facilities in EJ areas?</li> </ul>
	Weight									
			- 20 Points	- 0 Points	- 0 Points	- 5 Points	- 5 Points	- 30 Points	- 5 Points	- 5 Points

Program		Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Policy & Plan Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Regional Priority	Safety	Social Equity
Operating	Describe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connections to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hospitals &amp; medical facilities</li> <li>Other transit networks</li> <li>Across city boundaries</li> <li>Across county boundaries</li> <li>Decreased trip time/wait time</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connections to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Job centers</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of alternative fuel vehicles</li> <li>Increased service efficiencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feasibility study for new services</li> <li>Compatibility with the ADA Transition Plan</li> <li>Rider qualification policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other transit operators</li> <li>Local medical providers</li> <li>Non-profits</li> <li>Municipalities</li> <li>Counties</li> <li>Businesses (local match, fare partnerships, service links, consolidated services)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overmatch</li> <li>Dedicated local match</li> <li>Service precedent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinated Transit Plan</li> <li>Long Range Plan</li> <li>Capital projects on State QPA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety Plan Compliance</li> <li>Performance of on-time preventative maintenance</li> <li>Meeting required performance targets for maintenance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service to and from EJ areas</li> <li>Increase access for individuals with disabilities and the elderly</li> </ul>
	Scoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More connections available than previous service?</li> <li>Trip time/wait time more efficient?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More job center connections than previous service?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More job center connections than previous service?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is this an expansion of service? If so is there a feasibility study?</li> <li>Is the proposed service compatible with local ADA transition plans?</li> <li>Are the rider qualification policies compatible with other paratransit systems?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What partnerships are being leveraged?</li> <li>What advantages are available because of these partnerships?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can this project be overmatched?</li> <li>Is there a dedicated source of local match for this project?</li> <li>Has this project been in successful operation for more than 2 years?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is this project computable with the CTP?</li> <li>Is this project compatible with the LRP?</li> <li>Are all capital purchases on the QPA?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the operator in compliance with their Safety Plan?</li> <li>Has the operator been meeting their preventative maintenance milestones?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does this service increase access of people living in EJ areas?</li> <li>Does this service increase access of people with disabilities and elderly?</li> </ul>
	Weight	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10 Points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>45 Points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 Points</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10 Points</li> </ul>

# EMPC Programs

Program		Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Policy & Plan Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Regional Priority	Safety	Social Equity
Air Quality- Vehicle Replacement or Retrofit	Descript	Impact of the vehicle(s) to enhances access and connections for people:	Potential benefits of vehicle operation and maintenance costs, potential employment, and generalized economic benefit of emission reduction	Total Emission Reduction over list of vehicle federal useful life of vehicle, weighted for cost effectiveness	Applicant's commitment to improving air quality in their community demonstrated by one or more of following: air quality education, idle reduction, green fleets, green building, renewable energy, and urban forestry.	Participation in regional air quality initiatives	Useful Life of vehicle to be replaced or modified		LPA or Transit Operator demonstrates training of first responders to alt-fuel spills or fires.	If Emission or idle reduction, location in EJ census tract with higher than region average PM 2.5 or Ozone concentrations per CDC 2011-2014 data set.
	Scoring	Transit Vehicle – High School Bus- Medium Non-Transportation vehicle- Low	Calculable public cost savings in vehicle operation and maintenance costs over useful life of vehicle + increased mechanics jobs/demand generated = High  Calculable public cost savings in vehicle operation and maintenance costs over useful life of vehicle - Medium  Non-calculable general economic value of health benefits from emission reductions	Total cumulative tons of VOC/NOX/CO/PM + GHG over life of project – upper quartile cost effectiveness for CMAQ specified pollutants  Total cumulative tons of VOC/NOX/CO/PM + GHG over life of project – 2 <sup>nd</sup> quartile cost effectiveness For CMAQ specified pollutants  Total cumulative tons of VOC/NOX/CO/PM + GHG over life of project – 3 <sup>rd</sup> quartile cost effectiveness For CMAQ specified pollutants  Total cumulative tons of VOC/NOX/CO/PM + GHG over life of project – bottom quartile cost effectiveness For CMAQ specified pollutants	Planning, policies, and programs <b>incentivize</b> and encourage residents and businesses to do the same. The project implements an adopted green fleet plan. - HIGH  Planning, policies, and programs <b>allow</b> residents and businesses to undertake air quality improvement activities by right.  Municipality actively engages in education and implements municipal activities to improve air  Project implements an adopted green fleet plan.	LPA or Transit Operator participates in Green Fleets as a member and attends training events  LPA or Transit Operator participates in Partners for Clean Air at minimum Green level = 1 point Bronze level= 3 points	Vehicle replacement or repower, vehicle to be replaced must have met Useful Life  Vehicle must be on an existing state Quantity Purchase Agreement.			
	Weight	Points – 15	Points- 10	Points- 40	Points- 15	Points - 5	Points – 5	Points - 5	Points - 5	Points - 5

Program		Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Policy & Plan Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Regional Priority	Safety	Social Equity
Air Quality-  Alt Fuel Infrastructure or Truck Stop Electrification	Descript	Impact of the infrastructure to close a gap or between existing alt infrastructure and increases access to alt infrastructure in the region.	Projected fuel cost saving during the useful life of the Alt-Fuel infrastructure + jobs+ local revenue gen	Total Emission Reduction over list of vehicle federal useful life of vehicle, weighted for cost effectiveness	Applicant's commitment to improving air quality in their community demonstrated by one or more: air quality education, idle reduction, green fleets, green building, renewable energy, and urban forestry.	Shared use agreements or partnerships for fueling infrastructure between or among neighboring communities, multiple departments, public entities (municipalities, school districts, townships, or NGOs	If P3, the Private Partner has been competitively procured by the LPA and Private Partner documents understanding of requirements for use of federal funds.	If Alt Fuel Infrastructure proximity and ease of access to designated Alt Fuel Corridor	LPA/TO vehicle facilities designed for safety of alt fuel infrastructure	Location reduces fuel or idling emissions in an environmental justice area.
	Scoring	<p>&gt; X distance from other infrastructure or TSE with public or commercial access</p> <p>&lt;X distance from other infrastructure with public or commercial access</p> <p>&lt;X distance from other infrastructure with no public access</p>	<p>Total cost reduction for public entity and construction jobs and increased revenue generated if commercial/public availability</p> <p>Fuel cost reduction for public entity and construction jobs</p> <p>No fuel cost reduction for public entity but some construction jobs and or revenue enhancement predicted and general economic benefit from reduced health costs</p>	<p>Total cumulative tons of VOC/NOX/CO/PM + GHG over life of project – upper quartile cost effectiveness for CMAQ specified pollutants</p> <p>Total cumulative tons of VOC/NOX/CO/PM + GHG over life of project – 2<sup>nd</sup> quartile cost effectiveness For CMAQ specified pollutants</p> <p>Total cumulative tons of VOC/NOX/CO/PM + GHG over life of project – 3<sup>rd</sup> quartile cost effectiveness For CMAQ specified pollutants</p> <p>Total cumulative tons of VOC/NOX/CO/PM + GHG over life of project – bottom quartile cost effectiveness For CMAQ specified pollutants</p>	<p>Planning, policies, and programs <b>incentivize</b> and encourage residents and businesses to do the same</p> <p>Planning, policies, and programs <b>allow</b> residents and businesses to undertake air quality improvement activities by right.</p> <p>Municipality <b>actively engages</b> in education and implements municipal activities to improve air</p> <p>Project <b>implements</b> an adopted green fleet plan.</p>	<p>LPA or Transit Operator participates in Green Fleets as a member and attends training events</p> <p>LPA or Transit Operator participates in Partners for Clean Air at minimum Green level = 1 point Bronze level= 3 points</p>			<p>LPA/TO has no IDEM violations for past 5 years.</p> <p>Within the EJ Census Block</p> <p>Adjacent to an EJ Census Block</p> <p>&lt; 1 mile from an EJ Census Block</p>	
	Weight	Points- 15	Points-10	Points – 40	Points- 15	Points = 10	Points = 5	Points = 5	Points = 5	Points = 5

# EMPC Programs

Program		Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Policy & Plan Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Regional Priority	Safety	Social Equity
Air Quality- Public Education	Descript	Impact the project has on region understanding of air quality impact of modes or transportation connection		Total cumulative tons of VOC/NOX/CO/PM + GHG over life of project – upper quartile cost effectiveness for CMAQ specified pollutants	Community zoning ordinance allows for alt-fuel infrastructure stations on parity with standard gasoline stations		If Infrastructure, LPA can demonstrate vehicles for which the fuel will be used	If Emission Reduction: VOC reductions bonus points due to tight region transportation emission budget.		
	Scoring			Total cumulative tons of VOC/NOX/CO/PM + GHG over life of project – 2 <sup>nd</sup> quartile cost effectiveness For CMAQ specified pollutants						
	Weight			Total cumulative tons of VOC/NOX/CO/PM + GHG over life of project – 3 <sup>rd</sup> quartile cost effectiveness For CMAQ specified pollutants						
				Total cumulative tons of VOC/NOX/CO/PM + GHG over life of project – bottom quartile cost effectiveness For CMAQ specified pollutants						
				Points - 40						

# EMPC Programs

Program		Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Policy & Plan Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Regional Priority	Safety	Social Equity
Wildlife Mortality	Describe	<p>Potential of the project to increase habitat connectivity and decrease mortality in a prioritized range of natural areas.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce ETR wildlife mortality associated with transportation infrastructure or vehicular collision</li> <li>Reduce non-ETR wildlife mortality associated with transportation infrastructure or vehicular collision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature preserve management plan</li> <li>Natural area (i.e. not state dedicated nature preserve or national park) management plan</li> <li>Open space or park plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three (3) or more natural resource agencies/ natural area land managers</li> <li>One to Two (1-2) natural resource agencies/ natural area land managers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ROW or property ownership</li> <li>Wildlife species impacted identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project location within LMCP or CLCP Focus Area or Grand Cal AOC</li> <li>Project location corresponds with habitats highlighted in G+B</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project reduces probability of wildlife collisions</li> <li>Project improves sightline safety</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location in EJ zone</li> </ul>
	Scoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjacent to managed land (managed as natural area) with ETR species at risk</li> <li>Adjacent to managed land (managed as natural area) without ETR species at risk</li> <li>Adjacent to G&amp;B core/patch natural habitat</li> </ul>								
	Weight									
Habitat	Describe	<p>Location of the project with respect to a prioritized range of natural areas and public access.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buffers or connects to existing managed lands (managed as natural area) or restores fish and other aquatic life passage by removing physical or hydrologic barriers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature preserve management plan</li> <li>Natural area (i.e. not state dedicated nature preserve or national park) management plan</li> <li>Open space or park plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three (3) or more natural resource agencies/ natural area land managers</li> <li>One to Two (1-2) natural resource agencies/ natural area land managers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ROW or property ownership</li> <li>Restoration targets and functions identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project location within LMCP or CLCP Focus Area or Grand Cal AOC or project is located within a "critical" or "priority" area as identified in state approved WMP</li> <li>Project location corresponds with habitats highlighted in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood prone transportation infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location in EJ zone</li> </ul>
	Scoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjacent to managed land (managed as natural area) with Natural Heritage Data Center "Element Occurrences" or located on tributary listed by IDEM for Impaired Biotic Communities (IBC)</li> <li>Adjacent to managed land (managed as natural area) without</li> </ul>								



# EMPC Programs

Program		Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Policy & Plan Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Regional Priority	Safety	Social Equity
Wildlife Mortality	Descript	Potential of the project to increase habitat connectivity and decrease mortality in a prioritized range of natural areas.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce ETR wildlife mortality associated with transportation infrastructure or vehicular collision</li> <li>Reduce non-ETR wildlife mortality associated with transportation infrastructure or vehicular collision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature preserve management plan</li> <li>Natural area (i.e. not state dedicated nature preserve or national park) management plan</li> <li>Open space or park plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three (3) or more natural resource agencies/ natural area land managers</li> <li>One to Two (1-2) natural resource agencies/ natural area land managers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ROW or property ownership</li> <li>Wildlife species impacted identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project location within LMCP or CLCP Focus Area or Grand Cal AOC</li> <li>Project location corresponds with habitats highlighted in G+B</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project reduces probability of wildlife collisions</li> <li>Project improves sightline safety</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location in EJ zone</li> </ul>
	Scoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjacent to managed land (managed as natural area) with ETR species at risk</li> <li>Adjacent to managed land (managed as natural area) without ETR species at risk</li> <li>Adjacent to G&amp;B core/patch natural habitat</li> </ul>								
	Weight									
Habitat	Descript	Location of the project with respect to a prioritized range of natural areas and public access.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buffers or connects to existing managed lands (managed as natural area) or restores fish and other aquatic life passage by removing physical or hydrologic barriers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature preserve management plan</li> <li>Natural area (i.e. not state dedicated nature preserve or national park) management plan</li> <li>Open space or park plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three (3) or more natural resource agencies/ natural area land managers</li> <li>One to Two (1-2) natural resource agencies/ natural area land managers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ROW or property ownership</li> <li>Restoration targets and functions identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project location within LMCP or CLCP Focus Area or Grand Cal AOC or project is located within a "critical" or "priority" area as identified in state approved WMP</li> <li>Project location corresponds with habitats highlighted in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood prone transportation infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location in EJ zone</li> </ul>
	Scoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjacent to managed land (managed as natural area) with Natural Heritage Data Center "Element Occurrences" or located on tributary listed by IDEM for Impaired Biotic Communities (IBC)</li> <li>Adjacent to managed land (managed as natural area) without</li> </ul>								

# EMPC Programs

Program		Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Policy & Plan Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Regional Priority	Safety	Social Equity
Wildlife Mortality	Describe	<p>Potential of the project to increase habitat connectivity and decrease mortality in a prioritized range of natural areas.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce ETR wildlife mortality associated with transportation infrastructure or vehicular collision</li> <li>Reduce non-ETR wildlife mortality associated with transportation infrastructure or vehicular collision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature preserve management plan</li> <li>Natural area (i.e. not state dedicated nature preserve or national park) management plan</li> <li>Open space or park plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three (3) or more natural resource agencies/ natural area land managers</li> <li>One to Two (1-2) natural resource agencies/ natural area land managers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ROW or property ownership</li> <li>Wildlife species impacted identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project location within LMCP or CLCP Focus Area or Grand Cal AOC</li> <li>Project location corresponds with habitats highlighted in G+B</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project reduces probability of wildlife collisions</li> <li>Project improves sightline safety</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location in EJ zone</li> </ul>
	Scoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjacent to managed land (managed as natural area) with ETR species at risk</li> <li>Adjacent to managed land (managed as natural area) without ETR species at risk</li> <li>Adjacent to G&amp;B core/patch natural habitat</li> </ul>								
	Weight									
Habitat	Describe	<p>Location of the project with respect to a prioritized range of natural areas and public access.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buffers or connects to existing managed lands (managed as natural area) or restores fish and other aquatic life passage by removing physical or hydrologic barriers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature preserve management plan</li> <li>Natural area (i.e. not state dedicated nature preserve or national park) management plan</li> <li>Open space or park plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three (3) or more natural resource agencies/ natural area land managers</li> <li>One to Two (1-2) natural resource agencies/ natural area land managers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ROW or property ownership</li> <li>Restoration targets and functions identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project location within LMCP or CLCP Focus Area or Grand Cal AOC or project is located within a "critical" or "priority" area as identified in state approved WMP</li> <li>Project location corresponds with habitats highlighted in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood prone transportation infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location in EJ zone</li> </ul>
	Scoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjacent to managed land (managed as natural area) with Natural Heritage Data Center "Element Occurrences" or located on tributary listed by IDEM for Impaired Biotic Communities (IBC)</li> <li>Adjacent to managed land (managed as natural area) without</li> </ul>								

# LUC Programs

Program	Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Policy & Plan Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Regional Priority	Safety	Social Equity
<b>Quality of Place</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Walk score of project area</li> <li>- Improve connectivity to main centers &amp; major roads</li> <li>- Transit Availability</li> <li>- SOV reduction</li> <li>- Ease of Mobility</li> <li>- Highly accessible area</li> <li>- Congestion mitigation</li> </ul> <p>Points: 25</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Attract business to come to area</li> <li>- Amenities</li> <li>- Jobs &amp; housing increase</li> <li>- TOD</li> <li>- Expansion of Existing Business</li> </ul> <p>Points: 10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Green infrastructure standards</li> <li>- Emission reduction &amp; air quality</li> <li>- Stormwater management</li> <li>- Promote scenic area</li> </ul> <p>Points: 10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Citation in comprehensive plan</li> <li>- Local CLC/TOD plan</li> <li>- Redevelopment plan</li> <li>- Traffic studies</li> </ul> <p>Points: 10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Businesses</li> <li>- Foundations</li> <li>- INDOT</li> <li>- FTA/FHWA</li> <li>- Municipalities</li> <li>- Schools</li> <li>- Homeowner Associations</li> </ul> <p>Points: 5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overmatch</li> <li>- Precedent with project</li> <li>- Shovel ready</li> </ul> <p>Points: 10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CLC</li> <li>- 2040</li> <li>- G+B Plan</li> <li>- Wayfinding Guide</li> <li>- RDA Plan</li> <li>- INDOT</li> </ul> <p>Points: 10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Crashes for all types</li> <li>- Safe access for all vehicles</li> <li>- Universal Design</li> </ul> <p>Points: 10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Location within EJ area</li> <li>- Mixed income %</li> <li>- Mixed housing %</li> </ul> <p>Points: 10</p>

# 3PC Programs

Program	Access & Connections	Cost Effectiveness	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Policy & Plan Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Regional Priority	Safety	Social Equity
<b>Complete Streets</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Walk score in project area</li> <li>- Trip generators in project area</li> <li>- Number of destinations accessed by project</li> <li>- Universal design adherence</li> <li>- Transit access within project area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Comparison with project without measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Accommodate job commuters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Emissions reduction compared to project without measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local CS policy</li> <li>- Citation in comprehensive or thoroughfare plan</li> <li>- Bicycle parking ordinance</li> <li>- Flexible zoning &amp; subdivision codes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- INDOT</li> <li>- Other jurisdictions</li> <li>- Advocacy groups</li> <li>- Foundations</li> <li>- Businesses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overmatch</li> <li>- ROW or property ownership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- G+B 2020 Plan</li> <li>- 2040 Plan</li> <li>- NIRPC CS Ordinance &amp; Guidelines adherence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Crashes in project area – all types</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Location of project in EJ area</li> <li>- Proximity of senior centers</li> <li>- Proximity of centers for disabled</li> </ul>
<b>Multi-Use Path</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of communities connected</li> <li>- Residential density in project area</li> <li>- Destinations in project area</li> <li>- Connections to existing on-road bicycle routes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction material used</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Connections to job centers</li> <li>- Number of employed in project area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Connections to Conservation Corridors</li> <li>- Adherence to naturalized corridors (no-mow)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Citation in comprehensive or trails-related plan</li> <li>- Set-asides in subdivision codes</li> <li>- Enacted trails maintenance plan</li> <li>- Railroad agreements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Other jurisdictions</li> <li>- Hospitals</li> <li>- Foundations</li> <li>- Businesses</li> <li>- Land trusts</li> <li>- Advocacy groups</li> <li>- Railroads</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overmatch</li> <li>- ROW or property ownership</li> <li>- Corridor ownership by NIPSCO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- G+B 2020 Plan</li> <li>- 2040 Plan</li> <li>- Priority Trails adherence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Law enforcement strategy - patrols</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Location of project in EJ area</li> <li>- Proximity of senior centers</li> <li>- Proximity of centers for disabled</li> </ul>
<b>SRTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Residential density in project area</li> <li>- Current % of children walking and biking to school</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduction of automobiles accessing school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- School district SRTS plan</li> <li>- School PTA approval</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Municipalities</li> <li>- Foundations</li> <li>- Advocacy groups</li> <li>- Businesses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overmatch</li> <li>- ROW or property ownership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- G+B 2020 Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Crashes in project area – all types</li> <li>- Police reports of injuries to children accessing school in project area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Location of project in EJ area</li> </ul>

*Contact name*

Mitch Barloga

*Email*

[mbarloga@nirpc.org](mailto:mbarloga@nirpc.org)

*Website*

*Facebook*

<https://www.facebook.com/nirpcmpo/>

*Twitter*

<https://twitter.com/NIRPC>

*Phone*

(219) 763-6060

*Address*

6100 Southport Rd Portage, IN 46368

# 3PC Programs

Program	Access & Connections	Economic Generation	Environmental Benefits	Local Policy & Plan Support	Partnerships	Project Readiness	Regional Priority	Safety	Social Equity	MAX SCORE
<b>Complete Streets</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Walk score in project area</li> <li>- Trip generators in project area</li> <li>- Number of destinations accessed by project</li> <li>- Universal design adherence</li> <li>- Transit access within project area</li> <li>- Residential density in project area</li> <li>- Current % of children walking and biking to school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Accommodate job commuters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Emissions reduction compared to project without measures</li> <li>- Reduction of automobiles accessing school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local CS policy</li> <li>- Citation in comprehensive or thoroughfare plan</li> <li>- Bicycle parking ordinance</li> <li>- Flexible zoning &amp; subdivision codes</li> <li>- School district SRTS plan</li> <li>- School PTA approval</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- INDOT</li> <li>- Other jurisdictions</li> <li>- Advocacy groups</li> <li>- Foundations</li> <li>- Businesses</li> <li>- School Districts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overmatch</li> <li>- ROW or property ownership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- G+B 2020 Plan</li> <li>- 2040 Plan</li> <li>- NIRPC CS Ordinance &amp; Guidelines adherence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Crashes in project area – all types</li> <li>- Police reports of injuries to children accessing school in project area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Location of project in EJ area</li> <li>- Proximity of senior centers</li> <li>- Proximity of centers for disabled</li> </ul>	<b>100 Points</b>
<b>Multi-Use Path</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of communities connected</li> <li>- Residential density in project area</li> <li>- Destinations in project area</li> <li>- Connections to existing on-road bicycle routes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Connections to job centers</li> <li>- Number of employed in project area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Connections to Conservation Corridors</li> <li>- Adherence to naturalized corridors (no-mow)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Citation in comprehensive or trails-related plan</li> <li>- Set-asides in subdivision codes</li> <li>- Enacted trails maintenance plan</li> <li>- Railroad agreements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Other jurisdictions</li> <li>- Hospitals</li> <li>- Foundations</li> <li>- Businesses</li> <li>- Land trusts</li> <li>- Advocacy groups</li> <li>- Railroads</li> <li>- Developers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overmatch</li> <li>- ROW or property ownership</li> <li>- Corridor ownership by NIPSCO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- G+B 2020 Plan</li> <li>- 2040 Plan</li> <li>- Priority Trails adherence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Law enforcement strategy - patrols</li> <li>- EMS Patrols</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Location of project in EJ area</li> <li>- Proximity of senior centers</li> <li>- Proximity of centers for disabled</li> </ul>	<b>100 Points</b>