



MID-OHIO REGIONAL
MORPC
PLANNING COMMISSION

111 Liberty St., Suite 100
Columbus, Ohio 43215
www.morpc.org

NOTICE OF A MEETING

MPO FUNDING COMMITTEE MEETING
MID-OHIO REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
111 LIBERTY STREET, SUITE 100
COLUMBUS, OH 43215

Wednesday, November 5, 2025
10:00 a.m.

Note: Due to changes in Ohio Revised Code 121.221 regarding public bodies and virtual meetings, the meeting will be aired via live stream. We will note who views the meeting via live stream as information is available.

Live Stream Option

[View MPO Funding Committee Meeting via Live Stream](#)

Meeting ID: 211 108 101 719 2

Passcode: BN33bX6z

To listen by phone, use the conference call information below:

(888) 595-9475 United States (Toll-free)

Phone conference ID: 364 894 784#

AGENDA

1. Welcome & Introductions
2. Approval of October 1, 2025, Minutes
3. Policy Revisions
 - a. Criteria Changes
 - b. Goal Weighting
 - c. Funding Target Ranges
 - d. Program Management Policies

William Murdock, AICP
Executive Director

Chris Amorose Groomes
Chair

Ben Kessler
Vice Chair

Laurie Jadwin
Secretary

- 
4. SFY 2026 Carryforward Reduction Strategy
 5. Other Business
 6. Adjourn

PLEASE NOTIFY EVA REDA AT 614-233-4167 OR ereda@morpc.org TO CONFIRM YOUR ATTENDANCE FOR THIS MEETING OR IF YOU REQUIRE SPECIAL ASSISTANCE.

The next MPO Funding Committee Meeting is
Wednesday, December 3, 2025, at 10 a.m.
111 Liberty Street, Suite 100
Columbus, Ohio 43215

PARKING AND TRANSIT: When parking in MORPC's parking lot, please be sure to park in a MORPC visitor space or in a space marked with a yellow "M". Accessible parking is available at the side of MORPC's building. Electric vehicle charging stations are available for MORPC guests.

Indoor bike parking is available for MORPC guests.

MORPC is accessible by COTA BUS. The closest bus stop to MORPC is E. Fulton St./S. High St. Bus lines that accommodate this stop are Numbers 1, 4, 8, and 51.



Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission

MPO Funding Committee Meeting Minutes



MID-OHIO REGIONAL
MORPC
PLANNING COMMISSION

Date: **October 1, 2025**
Time: **10:00 a.m.**
Location: **MORPC**

Members Present

Cox, Barbara
Hamons, Shannon
Moorehead, John
Owen, Jonathan
Tornes, Ginger

Crosier, Fritz
Jenkins, Tiffany
Moran, Alan
Pajk, Jim
Wilfong, Gary

Girves, Catherine
Komlac, Tom
Nittle, Tim
Risko, Michele

MORPC Staff

Agrawal, Parag
Reda, Eva
Silveira, Juliana
Webb, Liz

Graham, Thomas
Ruscin, Hannah
Smith, Sam

Petrov, Jordan
Schaper, Maria
Vonstein, Melinda

I. Welcome & Introductions

- Chair Crosier called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. There was a quorum present.

II. Approval of October 1, 2025, Meeting Minutes

- Chair Crosier asked for a motion to approve October 1, 2025, meeting minutes. Mr. Pajk moved; Mr. Moorehead seconded; and the motion passed.

III. Activity Categories

- Mr. Graham presented recommendations to retain the current definitions for roadway and transit categories while modifying the system preservation and bike/pedestrian categories. The committee agreed to move forward with these changes.

IV. Evaluation Process

- Mr. Graham led a discussion on the current subjective scoring process, proposed increased transparency and consistency, and received committee consensus to base average scores around 5, with future rubrics to be developed as capacity allows.

V. Criteria Changes

- Mr. Graham reviewed and discussed proposed changes to criteria for economic opportunity, natural resources, energy, collaboration and funding,

health, safety and welfare, and sustainable neighborhoods, incorporating committee feedback and outlining next steps for further refinement.

- Committee members had concerns about making all four categories in the housing goal a “B” level criteria.
- A committee member posed the question of whether support should be given to the development of new housing, regardless of how close it is to people’s regular destinations, or if some component that looks at destinations should be weighed.
- Three different criteria were removed from the Natural Resources goal, as discussed last month, leaving one criteria / one response that must be made.
- Two Energy criteria were combined, as discussed last month.
- No revision recommendations have been made regarding the Collaboration and Funding goal. This goal outlines funding provided local match, and how much funding is requested.
- A committee member suggested removing letters of support from funding partners.
- The system life criteria was removed from Health, Safety, and Welfare as it wasn’t valuable in differentiating projects.
- A committee member suggested adding long term operation maintenance to Other criteria within Health, Safety and Welfare.
- Mr. Graham proposed to remove the Displacements goal in Sustainable Neighborhoods and add language to encourage minimal displacements in the Other category.

VI. Other Business

- Mr. Graham previewed next month’s agenda, which will include goal weighting, program management policies, funding target ranges, and proposals to address state fiscal year 2026 carryforward balances, with the committee expected to review and consider these items.

VII. Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 11:01 a.m.





MID-OHIO REGIONAL
MORPC
PLANNING COMMISSION

111 Liberty St., Suite 100
Columbus, Ohio 43215
www.morpc.org

Memorandum

TO: Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission
MPO Funding Committee

FROM: Tom Graham
Associate Director of Transportation Planning

DATE: 10/28/2025

SUBJECT: Revising the Policies for Managing MORPC MPO Funds – Housing Criteria

Changes to Criteria

The MPO Funding Committee discussed the potential addition of housing criterion during the October meeting. Suggestions were made to include a buffer for determining eligible housing developments which could receive credit. Additionally, the priority ranking of the criteria was discussed. In response to these suggestions staff are recommending the following changes to the proposed criteria:

- Housing: If applicable, applicants should describe how the project will support future or newly constructed housing within 1 mile of the project. Newly constructed housing must be no older than 3 years old to be eligible. Projects claiming to support future housing will score higher as long as they are able to demonstrate proof of commitment – this may include contracts, in-principle commitments, zoning changes which would support housing construction, or any proof of ongoing housing construction. Projects which support more units will score higher, as will projects which support higher-density or infill housing.
 - This criterion is proposed for the Economic Opportunity Goal with a priority of A in the Roadway Capacity & Operational Changes category and B across all other activity categories

The MPO Funding Committee will have the opportunity to further discuss this criterion outlined above, as well as any additional changes, during the 11/5 meeting. Any changes to criteria currently being recommended are outlined alongside the existing evaluation criteria on the following pages.

William Murdock, AICP
Executive Director

Chris Amorose Groomes
Chair

Ben Kessler
Vice Chair

Laurie Jadwin
Secretary

Economic Opportunity Goal Criteria

The evaluation for the economic opportunity goal criteria is based on information provided in the Final Application and MORPC-derived data from the regional travel demand model or GIS.

Data Source	Economic Opportunity Goal Evaluation Criteria & Description	Priority Level by Category				
		Capacity & Operational Changes	Preservation	Bike & Ped	Transit	Other
MORPC Derived***	Congestion Relief: Applicant is to provide information on how congestion is hampering economic development in the area. Applications which do not clearly demonstrate how congestion is hampering economic development in the area will not benefit from this criterion. How will improvements to the transportation system because of this project improve economic development? MORPC will estimate the ability of the project to improve travel within a corridor so congested components of the transportation system are relieved. Measured using the regional model by the percentage reduction in existing and 2050 VMT that experiences LOS F or worse within 1 mile of the project.	B			B	
MORPC Derived****	Job Retention & Creation: The number of existing jobs of each type (manufacturing, office, warehousing, retail, institutional) within 1 mile of the project. The Applicant will provide the number of permanent jobs of each type that will be <u>created in the region</u> because of the project. Provide a map showing the locations in relationship to the project. Provide documentation showing that these jobs are committed to being created in this area with the improvements to the area.	A	B	B	B	
	Housing: <u>If applicable, applicants should describe how the project will support future or newly constructed housing within 1 mile of the project. Newly constructed housing must be no older than 3 years old to be eligible. Projects claiming to support future housing will score higher as long as they are able to demonstrate proof of commitment – this may include contracts, in-principle commitments, zoning changes which would support housing construction, or any proof of ongoing housing construction. Projects which support more units will score higher, as will projects which support higher-density or infill housing.</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>B</u>	
	Development Readiness: <u>Describe the presence and timing of all necessary economic development components in the project area, such as infrastructure (e.g., utilities, water and sewer, broadband), access to appropriately trained labor (skilled/unskilled), and other transportation options (e.g., rail, airports, transit or bicycle/pedestrian). This can include how much new private/public capital investment has been made in the project area or will be because of the project. This investment can be within the past 3 years or commitments between now and 5 years after completion of the transportation project. Provide a map showing the past and committed investments. Specify the type of investment and the timeline for this investment.</u>	B			B	

Data Source	Economic Opportunity Goal Evaluation Criteria & Description	Priority Level by Category				
		Capacity & Operational Changes	Preservation	Bike & Ped	Transit	Other
MORPC Derived*	Travel Time Uncertainty: Using existing travel time data, the existing travel time uncertainty index will be calculated for the area within 1 mile of the project. Projects in areas with higher uncertainty will score better.	B			C	
MORPC Derived*	Traffic Composition: Current and future Average Daily Traffic and percentage of truck traffic. Higher volume facilities and facilities serving a higher percentage of truck traffic will score higher.	B	A			
	Other Economic Considerations: Describe the type and amount of acreage of site(s) that will primarily benefit from the project's improvements (e.g., greenfields, developed, redeveloped, infill, brownfields, intermodal facilities). Provide information regarding the project's impact on economic development in the area. Is there anything unique about this project that has not been captured by the criteria? This could include how the project will impact a specific industry cluster, innovative business, or industry target as identified by One Columbus.	A	B	A	A	A

*Data relative to the travel time index and delay will be available prior to application submission.

***MORPC will estimate change in congested VMT. Applicant is to provide statement on how congestion is hampering economic development.

****The number of existing jobs is available prior to application submission. Applicant is to provide the number of new jobs.

Natural Resources Goal Criteria

The scores for the natural resources goal criteria are mostly based on information provided in the Final Application. The emission reductions are estimated using the regional travel demand model.

Data Source	Natural Resources Goal Evaluation Criteria & Description	Priority Level by Category				
		Capacity & Operational Changes	Preservation	Bike & Ped	Transit	Other
MORPC Derived	Emission Reduction: The vehicle emissions of PM2.5 (fine particulates), VOC (volatile organic compounds), and NOx (oxides of nitrogen) contribute to the region being recently in non-attainment of the ozone and PM 2.5 national air quality standards. The regional model will estimate the change in emissions resulting from the project, reported in kilograms per day. Projects with more emission reductions will score better.	A		A	A	A
MORPC Provided*	Addressing Sensitive Land Issues: Based on project location information provided in the Screening Application, a listing of sensitive lands in the project vicinity will be provided to the applicant. In the Final Application, the applicant is to provide information addressing how the project impacts each of these. Projects that do not impact sensitive lands or will go beyond NEPA requirements* will score better.	B	B	B	B	
	Water Runoff Quality & Quantity: Describe a current significant water runoff quality or quantity problem in the project area that will be resolved as a result of the project and complying with NEPA requirements. If there is no current significant water runoff quality or quantity problem, describe aspects of the project that will improve water runoff quality or quantity that will go above and beyond NEPA requirements.* Projects which address problems or go beyond NEPA requirements will score better.	B	B	B	B	B
	Vegetation and Habitat Restoration: Describe a current significant vegetation or habitat problem in the project area that will be resolved as a result of the project and complying with NEPA requirements. If there is no current significant vegetation or habitat problem, describe aspects of the project that will improve vegetation or habitat restoration above and beyond NEPA requirements.* Projects that address problems or go beyond NEPA requirements will score better.	B	B	B	B	B
	Other Extraordinary Aspects Related to Natural Resources: A statement by the sponsor about any extra-ordinary aspects of the project's impact on the natural habitat. <u>This can include but is not limited to significant improvements to water runoff quality and quantity, vegetation and habitat restoration, or extraordinary efforts to address sensitive land issues.</u>	B	B	B	B	B

*Available prior to application submission.

Energy Goal Criteria

Two criteria for the energy goal are scored based on information provided in the Final Application, and one is scored using results from the regional travel demand model and GIS analysis.

Data Source	Energy Goal Evaluation Criteria & Description	Priority Level by Category				
		Capacity & Operational Changes	Preservation	Bike & Ped	Transit	Other
MORPC Derived	Vehicle Miles of Travel: Projects that would reduce regional Vehicle Miles of Travel will score better.	A		A	A	A
	Components that Save Energy: An assessment provided by the sponsor as to the potential project level technology components that save energy.	B	B	B	B	B
	Other Extraordinary Aspects: A statement by the sponsor about any extraordinary aspects of the project's impact on energy. This could include renewable energy production <u>or components that save energy</u> as part of the project.	B	B	B	B	B

Collaboration and Funding Goal Criteria

The evaluation for the collaboration and funding goal criteria is exclusively based on information provided in the Final Application. A first consideration in the score for this goal will be inclusion in the MTP. **If the activity is not in the MTP, the maximum score for the goal is reduced to five (5).**

Data Source	Collaboration and Funding Goal Evaluation Criteria & Description	Priority Level by Category				
		Capacity & Operational Changes	Preservation	Bike & Ped	Transit	Other
MORPC Provided*	Percent of MORPC Funding Requested: The percentage will only be based on the total right-of-way and construction cost. If it is not a traditional construction project, the percent of the total program/activity will be used. Applications that provide non-federal match to MORPC funding of 30% or more will score better.	A	A	A	A	A
MORPC Provided*	Amount of MORPC Funding Requested: Applications that request amounts greater than \$8 million for the Roadway Capacity & Operational Changes and Transit categories or request amounts greater than \$4 million for the remaining categories, will not benefit in this criterion. Applications that request amounts less than \$2 million for the Roadway Capacity & Operational Changes and Transit categories or request amounts less than \$1 million for the remaining categories, will receive maximum benefit in this criterion.	A	A	A	A	A
	Documentation of Support and Collaboration: The applicant is to provide letters of support from neighboring government jurisdictions, community associations, business associations, or others. Additional funding partners are also a sign of support. The focus of this support is to be for the right-of-way and construction phases. Projects that have more support will score better. Additionally, the more private sector funding, the better the score.	A	A	A	A	A
	Origin of Project/Project Readiness: The applicant is to provide the origin of the project including all planning studies recommending the project or activity and which ODOT Project Development Process (PDP) steps have been completed at time of final application submittal. Projects that that are further through the planning and PDP process will score better. The sponsor is also to provide documentation on interagency and community collaboration (e.g., identification in MORPC's Competitive Advantage Projects initiative, utilized MORPC's Technical Assistance Program) that has occurred to date to advance the project.	B	B	B	B	B
	Applicant Priority Ranking: Applicants that submit more than one project must also submit a priority ranking of their projects. The applicant's top project within each category, will benefit under this criterion.	C	C	C	C	C
	Small Agency Funding Capacity: For an agency with a small transportation budget, such that the local funding they are contributing to the project phases for which they are requesting assistance is approximately equal to or greater than the usual size	C	C	C	C	C

Data Source	Collaboration and Funding Goal Evaluation Criteria & Description	Priority Level by Category				
		Capacity & Operational Changes	Preservation	Bike & Ped	Transit	Other
	of its annual transportation infrastructure expenditures, will benefit under this criterion.					

*Available prior to application submission.

Health, Safety & Welfare Goal Criteria

Some of the health, safety and welfare goal criteria are evaluated based on information provided in the Final Application, and others are evaluated based on MORPC-derived data using GIS analysis.

Data Source	Health, Safety & Welfare Goal Evaluation Criteria & Description	Priority Level by Category				
		Capacity & Operational Changes	Preservation	Bike & Ped	Transit	Other
MORPC Derived*	Crash Reduction (Motor Vehicles): Using the ODOT crash data and tools, crash measures for the project will be calculated, including overall frequency, fatal and serious injury crash frequency, and fatal and serious injury crash rate. Additionally, using Crash Modification Factors (CMF) and Highway Safety Manual (HSM) based analyses, project improvement(s) will be evaluated with respect to their estimated impact on expected crashes impacting motor vehicle users. Projects that show more projected improvements to safety motor vehicle users will score higher, with additional consideration given to projects reducing fatal and serious injury crashes.	A	A	A	A	
MORPC Derived*	Crash Reduction (Vulnerable Users): Using the same methodology as the previous criterion, overall bike/ped frequency and fatal and serious injury bike/ped frequency for the project will be calculated and projects will be evaluated with respect to their estimated impact on expected crashes impacting vulnerable roadway users. Projects that show more projected improvements to the safety of vulnerable roadway users will score higher, with additional consideration given to projects reducing fatal and serious injury crashes.	A	A	A	A	
	Enhance Systemic Safety: The applicant describes how the project will improve or maintain safety. Projects which address existing safety issues will score higher, but projects which include systemic safety improvements to maintain safety can benefit in this criterion. Additionally, projects which are identified in local or regional plans as priority safety projects will score higher.	A	A	A	A	
MORPC Derived*	Facility Condition: The average PCR of the existing roadway that would be improved as part of the project based on the most recent ODOT data will be calculated. The worst existing bridge component rating based on ODOT data that would be improved as part of the project. The sponsor should review the ODOT data and may provide supplemental data if desired. Projects that are on facilities with lower PCRs and/or bridge ratings will score higher.	A	A			
	New Transit Ridership: The applicant provides an estimate of the increase in transit ridership. This is to include both the ridership on the specific project or activity as well as overall system ridership. Projects that have higher ridership will score better.				A	
	Regional Transportation System Equity: Measure of how the project addressing unmet needs of a particular population group or groups within their community. With a focus on minority, low income, elderly, disabled or other historically underrepresented population group, the applicant is to provide a description of how the unmet need(s) of the population group(s) is being addressed by the project. Data (census or other) to support the project is serving the specified population(s) should be provided.	A	A	A	A	
	System Life: The applicant is to provide information on the age and condition of the components being replaced. Also provide a statement, if applicable, as to the potential of the project to maximize life of transportation system. This is any extraordinary aspect that is likely to be part of the project.	C	C	C	A	
	Other Health, Safety & Welfare Considerations: Statement by the sponsor with rationale on how the project would further this goal. Reference should be	C	C	C	C	A

Data Source	Health, Safety & Welfare Goal Evaluation Criteria & Description	Priority Level by Category				
		Capacity & Operational Changes	Preservation	Bike & Ped	Transit	Other
	made to as many of the above criteria as applicable in justifying the benefits of the program/activity/project relative to this goal.					

*Available prior to application submission.

**Available prior to application submission ONLY for Bike and Pedestrian projects.

Sustainable Neighborhoods and Quality of Life Goal Criteria

Some of the criteria for the sustainable neighborhoods goal are based on information provided in the Final Application. A few criteria are based on MORPC-derived data that uses GIS analysis and the travel demand model.

Data Source	Sustainable Neighborhoods and Quality of Life Evaluation Criteria & Description	Priority Level by Category				
		Capacity & Operational Changes	Preservation	Bike & Ped	Transit	Other
MORPC Derived**	Origin/Destination Density: The average density (population + jobs) of the project users' origins and destinations will be estimated based on existing densities & 2040 projections. The average densities will be calculated for both higher density ends of the trip and lower density ends of the trip. For the Bike and Pedestrian category, the density within 1 mile of the project will be used. Projects that serve travelers going to and from more dense areas will score higher.	A	A	B	A	
	Pedestrian System: The applicant will provide information on the relationship of the project to the existing pedestrian transportation system and/or how the project will include improvements to enhance or connect to the pedestrian system. Projects that facilitate the construction of pedestrian facilities along a regionally significant active transportation corridor will score higher. Projects that provide pedestrian facilities where none currently exist and/or provide connections among existing facilities will score higher. <u>Projects will also score higher if they demonstrate that they remove, bypass, or otherwise ameliorate barriers to pedestrians, including highways, railroads, and waterways.</u>	B	B	A	A	
	Bikeway System: The applicant will provide information on the relationship of the project to the existing bikeway transportation system and/or how the project will include improvements to enhance or connect to the bikeway system. Projects that facilitate the construction of facilities along a regional active transportation corridor will score higher. Projects that provide bike facilities where none currently exist will score higher. Projects that improve the level of stress, per MORPC's Level of Stress map will score higher. <u>Projects will also score higher if they demonstrate that they remove, bypass, or otherwise ameliorate barriers to bikes, including highways, railroads, and waterways.</u>	B	B	A	A	
	Displacements: The applicant will provide an estimate of the number of displacements (business and residential) as a result of the project. The information can be provided in terms of a range of likely displacements. Projects with less or no displacement of residents or businesses will score higher.	B	C	C	C	
	Transit System: A statement by the applicant as to how the project enhances transit service. Projects along existing transit routes will need to provide appropriate transit related facilities and will score higher. Beyond what transit related facilities may be part of the project if on existing transit line, projects that make additional improvements, improve first and last mile connections to existing service, or that could enhance future transit service while not on a current transit line will score higher.	B	B	A	B	
	Other Sustainable Neighborhoods Considerations: Statement by the applicant with rationale on how the project would further quality of life and relationship of this project to furthering the community's quality of life goals. <u>Applicants can highlight efforts the project will take to minimize displacements in this criterion.</u> For projects in the Other Activity Category, also provide additional information especially in regard to any of criteria above criteria as	C	C	C	C	A

Data Source	Sustainable Neighborhoods and Quality of Life Evaluation Criteria & Description	Priority Level by Category				
		Capacity & Operational Changes	Preservation	Bike & Ped	Transit	Other
	applicable in justifying the benefits of the program/activity/project relative to this goal.					

*Available prior to application submission.

**Available prior to application submission ONLY for Bike and Pedestrian projects.



MID-OHIO REGIONAL
MORPC
PLANNING COMMISSION

111 Liberty St., Suite 100
Columbus, Ohio 43215
www.morpc.org

Memorandum

TO: Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission
MPO Funding Committee

FROM: Tom Graham
Associate Director of Transportation Planning

DATE: 10/28/2025

SUBJECT: **Revising the Policies for Managing MORPC MPO Funds – Program Management Policies**

The committee discussed multiple potential changes related to program management policies during the August meeting. This discussion included potential limits on funding requests per project and additional funding support for project development. This memo outlines potential changes to the policies which address these items and will be considered by the MPO Funding Committee during the November meeting.

Limits on Funding Requests per Project

MORPC does not currently place a cap on the amount of funding which can be requested for a single project. The Percent and Amount of MORPC Funding Requested criterion within the Collaboration goal does incentivize smaller funding requests, though requests of any amount are still eligible to be submitted. Discussions with the committee during the August meeting indicated a desire to maintain program flexibility by not introducing a hard cap on the amount of funding requested but also indicated an interest in capping the amount of funding which can be requested for a project which would be utilizing MORPC MPO Funding as “seed money” to leverage larger funding opportunities. Staff have developed the following potential additional policy to address this concern from the committee, which would be added as a new subsection under Section 4.4 of the policies:

4.4.5 Maximum Funding Requested for Projects Seeking Large Funding Opportunities

Projects which have a total project cost in excess of \$50 million, and which will be pursuing funding commitments through federal discretionary opportunities or ODOT’s TRAC program, can request up to \$5 million in MORPC MPO Funding. This policy is intended to ensure MORPC MPO Funds can still be utilized to leverage other funding opportunities while also maximizing the number of projects which can receive this benefit. Exceptions to this policy

William Murdock, AICP
Executive Director

Chris Amorose Groomes
Chair

Ben Kessler
Vice Chair

Laurie Jadwin
Secretary

can be granted by the MPO Funding Committee if the applicant demonstrates a clear need for additional MPO Funds to be allocated to the project, such as when federal discretionary funds or ODOT TRAC funds are not able to be secured to advance the project.

The additional policy outlined above provides a draft for the committee to discuss. Staff is specifically interested in the thresholds for defining which projects this policy applies to, as well as the maximum request allowed for such projects.

Additional Support for Project Development

The committee expressed a desire to further support project development during the August meeting, and the idea of expanding the Technical Assistance program to meet this need was discussed. MORPC staff is recommending increasing the funding for the technical assistance program to allow for expanded services, including consultant services for feasibility studies and preliminary engineering, to be funded through the program. Additional details on this proposed expansion will be presented during the November and December committee meetings.