

**GCLMPO MTP  
APPENDIX C**

**PAGE LEFT  
INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

# APPENDIX C: GCLMPO 2050 MTP PROJECT SOLICITATION AND RANKING PROCESS



## Gaston-Cleveland-Lincoln MPO 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Project Solicitation and Ranking Process

**Adoption Date: January 28, 2021**

The **Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)** for the GCLMPO is the locally-adopted, fiscally-constrained, long-range transportation plan for Cleveland, Gaston, and Lincoln counties. The MTP is also a comprehensive plan that defines the multi-modal transportation network that will serve both present and projected volumes of vehicular traffic, public transportation use, bicycle, pedestrian, aviation and freight travel in and around the urban area. The MTP is based on the most accurate and complete information available including, but not limited to, population and economic development growth and land development patterns in and around the urban area.

### SCHEDULE

**Development of Project Lists:** GCLMPO staff has assembled 2050 MTP project lists for each mode through the following method: In December 2020, MPO staff reviewed the 2045 MTP, in order to retain prior identified needs that have not been initiated or else not completed (this also captures projects in the MPO's 10-year Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program [MTIP]); then staff added any other projects, not already captured, that had been submitted 2020 during the most recent prioritization process ("P6.0"), under the NCDOT Strategic Transportation Investments (STI) law.

**Project Ranking Timeline:** Upon approval of the ranking methodology set forth in this document, MPO staff will evaluate candidate projects for the three counties and will present a prioritized project list to the TCC and MPO Board at their March 2021 meetings. From that list, a fiscally-constrained project list will be developed for consideration of endorsement/approval by the TCC and MPO Board at subsequent meetings, contingent upon the alignment of the MTP schedule with the air quality conformity modeling process for the Metrolina region.

### PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

**Project Solicitation:** GCLMPO assesses transportation needs in a continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive manner. As the draft projects lists for the 2050 MTP are a result of multiple prior initiatives, public participation has occurred for the development of the lists at several different stages, and future opportunities will be provided before the 2050 MTP is adopted.

Legacy projects from the 2045 MTP have been subject to public review and comment, in accord with the MPO's Public Participation Plan, before the 2045 MTP was adopted in 2018 and during amendments thereafter. During the subsequent development of project lists for all of the transportation modes in the "P6.0" Strategic Transportation Investments process, GCLMPO again solicited project needs from member governments, area agencies, and members of the public. In 2020, the MPO committees reviewed the draft project lists and released them to a 30-day public comment period, including public meetings and an online map that allowed comments to be geographically marked.

During the 2050 MTP planning process, public review and comment will occur on a prioritized project list in 2021 and on the draft 2050 MTP document, including the fiscally constrained project list, in the winter of 2021-2022. The Participation Plan will guide the public involvement process.

**RANKING PROCESS**

**Regional Level Highway Projects:** All NC routes, US 29, and US 74 east of I-85 in Gaston County are found on the Regional Level. These highway projects will be evaluated by the criteria as detailed in the following table:

<b>Regional Level Highway Projects (Max Total Score: 105 points)</b>					
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>0 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>	<b>10 points</b>	<b>15 points</b>	<b>20 points</b>
<b>Existing Congestion (20 max)</b>	Volume to capacity less than 0.6	Volume to capacity btw 0.6 and 0.85	Volume to capacity btw 0.86 and 1.0	Volume to capacity btw 1.01 and 1.1	Volume to capacity over 1.1
<b>Existing Safety (20 max)</b>	SPOT safety points less than 30	SPOT safety points btw 31-50	SPOT safety points btw 51-65	SPOT safety points btw 66-80	SPOT safety points over 80
<b>Cost-Effectiveness (15 max)</b>	Cost per vehicle/equivalent greater than \$1,500 per mile	Cost per vehicle/equivalent btw \$1,000-\$1,500 per mile	Cost per vehicle/equivalent btw \$500-\$999 per mile	Cost per vehicle/equivalent less than \$499 per mile	-----
<b>Cost (10 max)</b>	Cost over \$50 million	Cost \$25-49 million	Cost less than \$25 million	-----	-----
<b>Freight Volume (10 max)</b>	Less than 500 trucks/equivalent per day	Btw 500-1,000 trucks/equivalent per day	More than 1,000 trucks/equivalent per day	-----	-----
<b>Plan Consistency (10 max)</b>	Project is not in an adopted land use, transportation, transit or other plan	Project type, such as intersections, not considered in plans	Project supports an adopted land use, transportation, transit or other plan	-----	-----
<b>Multimodal Accommodation (5 max)</b>	Project does not include bike/ped/transit/ rail facilities	Project includes bike/ped/transit/ rail facilities	-----		
<b>Supports Environmental Justice (EJ) (5 max)</b>	Project adds capacity or accessibility where growth is not encouraged	Project adds new capacity or accessibility in support of EJ	-----	-----	-----
<b>Supports Economic Development (5 max)</b>	Project does not support economic development	Project supports economic development	-----	-----	-----
<b>Local Funding Contribution (5 max)</b>	No local funding	At least 5% local funding of total project cost (or 25% for locally-administered projects)	-----	-----	-----

**Division Level Highway Projects:** All highway projects on SR roads and local roads will be evaluated by the criteria and scoring as detailed in the following table:

<b>Division Level Highway Projects (Max Total Score: 100 points)</b>					
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>0 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>	<b>10 points</b>	<b>15 points</b>	<b>20 points</b>
<b>Existing Lack of Capacity (20 max)</b>	Volume to capacity less than 0.5 (roads and rail), existing facilities available (other modes)	-----	Volume to capacity btw 0.51 and 0.75 (roads and rail), intermittent or incomplete facilities/transit available (other modes)	-----	Volume to capacity over 0.75 (roads and rail), no facilities/transit available (other modes)
<b>Cost-Effectiveness (20 max)</b>	Cost per daily user greater than \$4,000 per user per mile	Cost per daily user btw \$2,000-\$4,000 per user per mile	Cost per daily user btw \$1,500-\$1,999 per user per mile	Cost per daily user btw \$1,000-\$1,499 per user per mile	Cost per daily user less than \$999 per user per mile
<b>Total Cost (10 max)</b>	Cost over \$10 million	Cost \$5-10 million	Cost less than \$5 million	-----	-----
<b>Plan Consistency (10 max)</b>	Project is not in an adopted land use, transportation, transit or other plan	Intersections not improving recommended corridors	Project supports an adopted land use, transportation, transit or other plan	-----	-----
<b>Project Readiness (10 max)</b>	Significant ROW, EJ or environmental impacts	Moderate ROW, EJ or environmental impacts	No ROW, EJ or environmental impacts	-----	-----
<b>Multimodal Accommodation (10 max)</b>	Project does not include bike/ped/transit/ rail facilities	-----	Project includes bike/ped/transit/ rail facilities	-----	-----
<b>Supports Environmental Justice (EJ) (5 max)</b>	Project adds capacity or accessibility where growth is not encouraged	Project adds new capacity or accessibility in support of EJ	-----	-----	-----
<b>Supports Economic Development (5 max)</b>	Project does not support economic development	Project supports economic development	-----	-----	-----
<b>Local Funding Contribution (10 max)</b>	No local funding	At least 5% local funding of total project cost (or 25% for locally-administered projects)	At least 10% local funding of total project cost (or 30% for locally administered projects)	-----	-----

**Division Level Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects:** The ranking criteria for bicycle/pedestrian projects for the 2050 MTP are illustrated in the table below.

<b>Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects (Max Total Score: 100 points)</b>					
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>0 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>	<b>10 points</b>	<b>15 points</b>	<b>20 points</b>
<b>Safety: Motor Traffic Volume (10 max)</b>	AADT ≤ 2,000 or >40,000	AADT 2,001-15,000	AADT 15,001-40,000	-----	-----
<b>Safety: Motor Traffic Speed (10 max)</b>	Posted speed ≤ 25 mph or ≥ 60 mph	Posted speed 30 – 40 mph	Posted speed 45 – 55 mph	-----	-----
<b>Network Connectivity (20 max)</b>	No connections to existing infrastructure	1-3 connections	4-6 connections	7-10 connections	More than 10 connections
<b>Tourism and Economic Development (10 max)</b>	Not on or connecting to a state or regional bicycle and/or pedestrian route	Connects to a state or regional bicycle and/or pedestrian route	On a state or regional bicycle and/or pedestrian route	-----	-----
<b>Transportation-challenged Populations (20 max)</b>	Project touches block group having: ≤ 10% of HH under poverty line	Project touches block group having: >10% but ≤ 20% of HH under poverty line	Project touches block group having: >20% but ≤ 30% of HH under poverty line	Project touches block group having: >30% but ≤ 40% of HH under poverty line	Project touches block group having: >40% of HH under poverty line
<b>Density: Population (10 max)</b>	Project touches block group having ≤ 500 pop/sq mi	Project touches block group having >500 but ≤ 1000 pop/sq mi	Project touches block group having >100 but ≤ 2500 pop/sq mi	Project touches block group having >2500 but ≤ 5000 pop/sq mi	Project touches block group having >5000 pop/sq mi
<b>Density: Employment (10 max)</b>	Project touches thermal area in lowest stratification of jobs/sq mile	Project touches thermal area in the moderately low stratification of jobs/sq mile	Project touches thermal area in the middle stratification of jobs/sq mile	Project touches thermal area in the moderately high stratification of jobs/sq mile	Project touches thermal area in highest stratification of jobs/sq mile
<b>Cost Effectiveness (10 max)</b>	For each project, the sum of the scores above is divided by the cost of the remaining phases per \$100,000. Then the scores are indexed to a 0-10 scale, with the highest scoring project receiving 10 points.				

**Division Level Aviation Projects:** All aviation projects will be evaluated by the criteria and scoring as detailed in the following table:

<b>Aviation Projects (Max Total Score: 100 points)</b>					
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>0 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>	<b>10 points</b>	<b>15 points</b>	<b>20 points</b>
<b>Economic Development (20 max)</b>	Does not improve aircraft size capacity or space availability for based aircraft	-----	-----	Increases capacity for heavier aircraft and/or increases space available for new based aircraft	Creates capacity for larger aircraft and/or creates employment
<b>Safety (20 max)</b>	No safety improvements	-----	Improves safety requirements outside of the runway and taxiway areas	Improves taxiway/taxilane safety area grades and obstacle free zones	Improves required runway safety area grades and runway approach obstruction clearing
<b>Cost of Project (20 max)</b>	Total Project Cost is greater than \$500,000	-----	Total Project Cost is between \$250,000 and \$499,999	-----	Total Project Cost is less than \$250,000
<b>Local Funding Contribution (10 max)</b>	No local match above the required 10%	Local match exceeds the minimum requirement of 10% and is between 11-19%	Local match exceeds the minimum requirement by at least 20% of project cost	-----	-----
<b>Plan Consistency (20 max)</b>	Project is not in an adopted plan	-----	Project is included in the adopted MTP OR local aviation plan	-----	Project is included in the adopted MTP AND local aviation plan
<b>Project Readiness (10 max)</b>	Significant ROW, EJ and/or environmental impacts	Moderate ROW, EJ and/or environmental impacts	No ROW, EJ or environmental impacts	-----	-----



**Division Level Public Transportation Projects:** Public transportation projects will be evaluated by the criteria and scoring as detailed in the following table. The following public transportation projects will be scored:

- **Operations** – includes funding for administration of a system, as well as maintenance and operation of a transit system.
- **Expansion Vehicles** – project types are focused on increasing efficiency. Example projects include:
  - New bus routes and/or services (demand response, headway reductions)
  - Purchase of new buses or vans
- **Facilities** – project types are focused on replacing, improving, or constructing new transit-related facilities. Examples of projects include:
  - Transit-related facilities
  - Park and Ride Lots
  - Bus Shelters

<b>Public Transportation Projects (Max Total Score: 100 points)</b>					
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>0 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>	<b>10 points</b>	<b>15 points</b>	<b>20 points</b>
<b>Interagency Coordination (10 max)</b>	Project involves only one transit/municipal agency	-----	Project involves two or more transit/municipal agencies	-----	-----
<b>Ridership Impact (15 max)</b>	Project does not increase or has no impact on ridership	Project increases ridership by 0-5%	Project increases ridership by 5.1-10%	Project increases ridership by more than 10%	-----
<b>Capacity Impact (15 max)</b>	Project does not decrease headway or increase frequency on an existing transit route that is near or at capacity	-----	-----	Project decreases headway or increases frequency on an existing transit route that is near or at capacity	-----
<b>Serves Activity Center(s) (10 max)</b>	Project does not serve an activity center	-----	Project does serve activity center(s)	-----	-----
<b>Multimodal Accommodation (10 max)</b>	Project does not include bike/ped facilities	-----	Project includes bike/ped facilities	-----	-----
<b>Plan Consistency (20 max)</b>	Project is not in an adopted plan	-----	Project is included in an adopted plan	-----	Project is included in an adopted plan
<b>Local Support (5 max)</b>	Project does not have local support as evidenced by public input or elected Board support	Project does have local support as evidenced by public input or elected Board support	-----	-----	-----
<b>Local Funding Contribution (15 max)</b>	No local match above the required 10%	Local match exceeds the minimum requirement of 10% but is <20%	-----	Local match equals or exceeds 20%	-----