



# Public Priorities to CRP Project Selection Criteria

Prepared by Alexandria-Pineville MPO | February 2026

803 Johnston Street, Alexandria, LA 71301  
318-487-5401 | [www.rapc.info/transportation](http://www.rapc.info/transportation)

# MPO CRP Project Selection Criteria Public Feedback Report



## Background

The Alexandria-Pineville Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) invited residents, stakeholders, and community partners to share their transportation priorities as part of the development of the local Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) through the Modern Mobility Study. The goal was to understand which transportation issues most affect daily travel and how CRP funding could best support projects that reduce transportation-related emissions while improving safety, access, and reliability of the transportation system inside the metropolitan planning area.

## How to Read This Report

This report explains how public and stakeholder input informed the development of the Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) project selection criteria used by the Alexandria-Pineville Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).

The purpose of this document is to show, in a clear and transparent way, how community feedback helped shape how projects are evaluated, not which specific projects are selected. Public input was used to identify key transportation priorities and to ensure that the CRP scoring framework reflects local needs while remaining consistent with federal program requirements.

### This report:

- Summarizes what the MPO heard through public engagement;
- Describes how those priorities influenced the CRP selection criteria and weighting; and
- Demonstrates the relationship between community priorities and the project scoring framework.

This report does not rank or select individual projects. Project evaluation and selection will occur through a separate, formal process using the criteria described here.

# MPO CRP Project Selection Criteria

## Public Feedback Report



### What We Heard from the Community

Public and stakeholder engagement activities were designed to identify transportation issues affecting daily travel and to understand how residents perceive opportunities to reduce transportation-related emissions. Across all engagement activities, several consistent themes emerged and featured in Table 1.

TABLE 1 | IDENTIFIED TOP PUBLIC PRIORITIES

**Improved pedestrian safety and connectivity**, including sidewalks, crossings, lighting, and traffic calming in areas with high walking activity

**Safer and more comfortable bicycling conditions**, particularly on corridors with high vehicle speeds or limited separation

**Improved access to public transit**, including safer access to stops, shelters, and first-/last-mile connections

**Enhanced transit reliability and usability**, including clearer routing, more consistent service, and improved rider information

**Targeted congestion and operational improvements** at intersections and corridors experiencing recurring delay and vehicle idling

**Projects serving daily destinations**, such as employment centers, schools, healthcare facilities, and neighborhood commercial areas

**Transportation investments that deliver multiple benefits**, including safety, mobility, accessibility, and emissions reduction

### How Public Feedback Was Used

Public engagement activities were designed to identify transportation issues that affect daily travel and to understand how residents perceive opportunities to reduce transportation-related emissions. Rather than using public input to score or rank individual project proposals, the MPO used engagement results to inform the:

- Structure of the CRP project selection criteria;
- Relative weighting of evaluation categories; and
- Interpretation of how projects demonstrate carbon reduction benefits.

This approach ensures that public input meaningfully influences funding decisions while maintaining consistency, fairness, and alignment with federal CRP guidance.



# MPO CRP Project Selection Criteria Public Feedback Report



## Use of Public Feedback in Developing CRP Project Selection Criteria & Weighting

The MPO synthesized feedback to inform how projects are evaluated and prioritized rather than using public input to rank individual projects. Community input consistently emphasized pedestrian and bicyclist safety, safe and comfortable access to transit, improved transit reliability and usability, and targeted traffic operations improvements to address recurring delay and vehicle idling. These themes directly informed the weighting and structure of the CRP scoring framework presented in Table 3 particularly the criteria addressing Mode Shift Enablement, Safety Outcomes Supporting Low-Carbon Travel, Transit Reliability, Access, and Usability, and Traffic Operations and System Efficiency.

Public concern regarding safety—particularly related to lighting, visibility, crossings, and traffic calming—reinforced the treatment of safety as a prerequisite to walking, bicycling, and transit use. As reflected in Table 2, safety outcomes supporting low-carbon travel are evaluated as a distinct criterion and assigned meaningful weight to recognize their role in enabling emissions-reducing travel behavior. Similarly, repeated feedback regarding transit service reliability, route clarity, and access to key destinations informed the inclusion and definition of the Transit Reliability, Access, and Usability criterion in Table 2, ensuring that service- and operations-focused transit improvements are appropriately recognized during project evaluation.

Community input also highlighted localized congestion and operational issues that contribute to vehicle delay and idling. In response, the Traffic Operations and System Efficiency criterion in Table 2 explicitly recognizes targeted operational improvements—such as signal timing, corridor management, and related strategies—when they demonstrate emissions-reduction benefits. Feedback related to access to education, employment, healthcare, and neighborhood services further reinforced the importance of evaluating projects based on their ability to improve access to daily destinations, which is reflected in the Equity and Access to Daily Destinations criterion in Table 2.

Feedback indicated strong public support for practical, near-term transportation improvements that deliver multiple benefits informed the overall balance of the scoring framework. As summarized in Table 2, the weighting structure prioritizes projects that achieve meaningful or well-supported carbon reductions while also advancing safety, accessibility, equity, and system performance objectives identified by the community. Through this approach, the CRP project selection criteria and weights documented in Table 2 reflect both technical requirements and locally identified priorities, ensuring that CRP investments are transparent, well-supported, and responsive to public input.

Table 2 summarizes the proposed CRP project selection criteria, weights, scoring guidance, and recommended evidence developed in response to public feedback and aligned with the Carbon Reduction Strategy Framework.

# MPO CRP Project Selection Criteria Public Feedback Report



## How Public Priorities Shaped the CRP Selection Criteria

Public feedback directly informed how the MPO evaluates CRP-eligible projects. Community input reinforced that people are more likely to walk, bike, or use transit when they feel safe and when transportation options are practical, connected, and reliable. As a result, safety, multimodal connectivity, transit access, and operational efficiency are treated as critical enablers of carbon reduction rather than secondary considerations.

### CRP Scoring Framework Project Priorities:

- Demonstrate meaningful or well-supported reductions in transportation-related emissions.
- Enable shifts away from single-occupant vehicle travel.
- Improve safety conditions that support walking, bicycling, and transit use.
- Enhance transit reliability, clarity, and user experience.
- Reduce congestion and vehicle idling through targeted operational improvements.
- Improve access to daily destinations, particularly for underserved populations.
- Deliver multiple benefits across safety, access, mobility, equity, and emissions outcomes.

# MPO CRP Project Selection Criteria

## Public Feedback Report



TABLE 2 | PROPOSED CRP PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA

Scoring Category	Max Points	What This Measures	Scoring guidance	Recommended Evidence
<b>Carbon Reduction Impact &amp; Cost Effectiveness</b>	<b>30</b>	Degree to which the project reduces transportation-related carbon emissions relative to cost, including through mode shift, transit reliability, reduced congestion/idling, or operational improvements	30 = strong quantified or strong proxy + high carbon impact per dollar; 20 = moderate; 10 = low/uncertain; 0 = no carbon pathway/evidence.	Emissions estimates (if available); proxy measures (VMT reduction, delay/idling reduction); traffic or transit performance data; project cost estimate
<b>Mode Shift Enablement (Walking, Biking, Transit)</b>	<b>20</b>	Ability to reduce automobile reliance by enabling safe, usable, and connected low-carbon travel	20 = closes major gap/creates continuous facility to key destinations; 10 = incremental improvement; 0 = no mode shift pathway.	Project maps; sidewalk/bike network connectivity; proximity to destinations; transit access improvements; first/last-mile connections
<b>Safety Outcomes Supporting Low-Carbon Travel</b>	<b>15</b>	Extent to which safety improvements remove barriers to low-carbon travel, including lighting and visibility	15 = addresses high-risk location/corridor with strong countermeasures; 8 = moderate; 0 = not safety-relevant or not demonstrated.	Crash data; safety studies; lighting plans; crossing improvements; speed management measures; photos or design concepts
<b>Transit Reliability, Access, and Usability</b>	<b>10</b>	Improvements to transit reliability, consistency, clarity, and user experience	10 = measurable reliability/speed improvement or major access gain; 5 = incremental; 0 = not applicable.	Transit performance data; stop access; maps; shelter or lighting plans; routing or service reliability information; rider information improvements
<b>Traffic Operations &amp; System Efficiency</b>	<b>10</b>	Reduction of congestion, delay, and vehicle idling through operational or corridor-level improvements	10 = targets known congestion or operational problem locations, measurably reduces delay, stops, or vehicle idling; 5 = limited operations improvement or with uncertain emissions benefit; 0 = no meaningful operational or efficiency benefit.	Signal timing plans; corridor studies; congestion or delay data; operational analyses; lighting tied to traffic flow
<b>Equity &amp; Access to Daily Destinations</b>	<b>10</b>	Improvement in access to jobs, schools, healthcare, and services, particularly for underserved populations	10 = primarily benefits transportation disadvantaged/priority areas; 5 = mixed; 0 = not demonstrated.	Demographic/needs mapping, zero-vehicle households, access to essential services, ADA accessibility improvements.
<b>Implementation Readiness, Plan Consistency &amp; Community Support</b>	<b>5</b>	Readiness for delivery and consistency with adopted plans and public priorities	5 = clear scope, reasonable cost estimate, feasible schedule; consistent with MPO plans and documented public input; 3 = conceptual readiness, general plan consistency; 0 = significant delivery uncertainties or inconsistent with adopted plans.	Project scope and schedule; cost estimates; MTP/TIP consistency, local plan references, public engagement summary, letters of support.



# MPO CRP Project Selection Criteria Public Feedback Report



## Linking Public Priorities to Project Scoring

Table 3 illustrates how transportation priorities identified through public and stakeholder engagement were systematically translated into the Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) project evaluation framework. It demonstrates the direct relationship between community-identified concerns and the CRP scoring categories and weights summarized in Table 2.

Rather than using public input to rank individual projects, the MPO used engagement results to inform the structure, weighting, and interpretation of the CRP scoring criteria. Public priorities –such as pedestrian and bicyclist safety, transit access and reliability, lighting and visibility, congestion reduction, and access to daily destinations—are reflected across multiple scoring categories, including Mode Shift Enablement, Safety Outcomes Supporting Low-Carbon Travel, Transit Reliability and Access, and Traffic Operations and System Efficiency.

Many public priorities align with more than one scoring category, reinforcing the MPO’s emphasis on projects that deliver multiple benefits. This multi-category alignment supports evaluation of projects that simultaneously advance emissions reduction, safety, accessibility, equity, and overall system performance.

By explicitly linking public feedback to the CRP scoring framework and weighting, the MPO ensures that funding decisions are transparent, defensible, consistent with federal program requirements, and responsive to community needs.

TABLE 3 | PUBLIC PRIORITY TO CRP SCORING CRITERIA CROSSWALK

Public Priority Identified Through Engagement	CRP Strategy Category	Primary CRP Scoring Criterion Addressed
Improved pedestrian safety and sidewalk connectivity	<b>Mode Shift Enablement / Safety Supporting Low-Carbon Travel</b>	Mode Shift Enablement; Safety Outcomes
Safer and more comfortable bicycling conditions	<b>Mode Shift Enablement</b>	Mode Shift Enablement; Safety Outcomes
Improved access to public transit stops and routes	<b>Transit Reliability and Access</b>	Transit Reliability & Access; Equity & Access
More reliable and usable transit service	<b>Transit Reliability and Access</b>	Transit Reliability & Access; Carbon Reduction
Reduced congestion and delay at problem locations	<b>Traffic Operations and System Efficiency</b>	Carbon Reduction & Cost Effectiveness
Better access to jobs, schools, healthcare, and services	<b>Mode Shift Enablement / Transit Access</b>	Equity & Access; Mode Shift Enablement
Projects delivering multiple benefits (safety, access, emissions)	<b>All Strategy Categories</b>	Carbon Reduction; Safety Outcomes; Plan Consistency



# MPO CRP Project Selection Criteria

## Public Feedback Report



### How Public Priorities Are Reflected in Project Scoring

Public priorities were translated into specific scoring categories and weights used to evaluate CRP project proposals. This relationship is documented through the CRP Project Selection Criteria (Table 2), and Public Priority to CRP Scoring Criteria Crosswalk (Table 3) which shows how community priorities align with scoring categories. Projects that best address the priorities identified by the community—and demonstrate clear carbon reduction benefits—score higher and are more likely to be included in the MPO’s Priority CRP Project Listing.

**Based on what we heard, the MPO developed a project scoring framework that prioritizes:**

#### **Safety as a Foundation for Carbon Reduction**

*Public concerns about lighting, visibility, crossings, and traffic speeds reinforced that people are more likely to walk, bike, or use transit when they feel safe. As a result, safety improvements that support low-carbon travel are explicitly recognized and weighted in the scoring process.*

#### **Transit Access & Reliability**

*Feedback about transit reliability, route clarity, and access to key destinations informed the creation of scoring criteria that reward projects improving transit usability, consistency, and access to stops and shelters.*

#### **Mode Shift & Multimodal Connectivity**

*Community support for walking, biking, and transit investments led to increased emphasis on projects that reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles by enabling practical, connected, and usable low-carbon travel options.*

#### **Traffic Operations & Congestion Reduction**

*Concerns about recurring congestion and delay influenced scoring criteria that recognize targeted operational improvements—such as signal timing and corridor management—when they reduce vehicle idling and emissions.*

#### **Access to Daily Destinations**

*Public input emphasized the importance of reaching everyday destinations. Projects that improve access to jobs, education, healthcare, and services—particularly for people with limited transportation options—are prioritized in the scoring framework.*

#### **Projects with Multiple Benefits**

*Many community priorities overlap. The scoring framework rewards projects that address more than one goal at the same time, such as improving safety, access, and emissions outcomes together.*

# MPO CRP Project Selection Criteria Public Feedback Report



## What This Process Does & Does Not Do

What This Process Does		What This Process Does Not Do	
✓	Public feedback does not directly rank or select individual projects.	✗	Public feedback does not directly rank or select individual projects.
✓	Ensures CRP investments reflect community priorities.	✗	Projects cannot be funded unless they meet federal CRP eligibility requirements.
✓	Integrates safety, access, mobility, and equity into scoring because they support lower-carbon travel behavior.	✗	Community preference alone cannot override technical analysis or federal program rules.
✓	Maintains carbon reduction effectiveness as a primary evaluation factor.		
✓	Promotes transparent and fair funding decisions.		

### Why This Matters

The MPO’s approach balances community values, technical analysis, and federal program requirements. By using public input to guide *how* projects are evaluated — rather than selecting projects directly — the MPO ensures that:

- Funding decisions are transparent and accountable;
- Investments respond to real-world community needs;
- Selected projects deliver measurable benefits; and
- Carbon reduction goals are pursued in ways that also improve safety, access, and daily mobility.

### How the CRP Scoring Framework Will Be Used

The CRP project selection criteria described in this report will be used to evaluate eligible project proposals submitted for CRP funding consideration. Projects that best address community-identified priorities and demonstrate clear carbon reduction benefits will score higher and be more competitive for inclusion in the MPO’s Priority CRP Project Listing. Project evaluation will follow a standardized process to ensure fairness, consistency, and alignment with adopted MPO plans and policies.

### Stay Involved

The MPO will continue to share information about CRP funding decisions and future opportunities for public input. Community feedback remains an important part of how transportation investments are planned and prioritized.

