



REPORT

# GETTING TRANSPORTATION RIGHT: RANKING THE STATES IN LIGHT OF NEW FEDERAL FUNDING



**AUTHORS:**

John Bailey, Senior Advocate, Federal and State Transportation, NRDC

Dave Grossman, Principal, Green Light Consulting (and Senior Consultant, David Gardiner and Associates)

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was made possible by the support of NRDC's funders and donors. The authors are especially grateful to Deron Lovaas, formerly with NRDC and currently with the State of Maryland, for his leadership on transportation policy and insight into the direction of this report. Sarah Kline of SK Solutions LLC and Sabreen Ahmed with DGA (now with EDF) provided invaluable assistance throughout. Thanks too to Celia Lane (formerly with DGA, now with Deloitte) for her contributions. The authors are also grateful for the review and thoughtful comments from the following individuals:

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Rabi Abonour, NRDC                         | David Hawkins, NRDC                      | David Pettit, NRDC   |
| Zak Accuardi, NRDC                         | Samantha Henningson, NRDC                | Craig Segall, Evergreen Action   |
| Justin Backal Balik, Evergreen Action      | Patrick King, NRDC                       | Sasha Stashwick, (former) NRDC   |
| Kevin DeGood, Center for American Progress | Sarah Medeiros, NRDC                     | Leah Stecher, NRDC   |
| David Doniger, NRDC                        | Alana Miller, NRDC                       | Christina Theodoridi, NRDC   |
| Mark Drajem, NRDC                          | Chantelle Mendonsa, NRDC                 | Shruti Vaidyanathan, NRDC<br>(reviewed while employed at the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy) |
| Jenn Fox, Vision Zero Network              | Beth Osborne, Transportation for America | Mende Yangden, NRDC  |
| David Gardiner, DGA                        | Muhammed Patel, NRDC                     |  |
| Kathy Harris, NRDC                         | Benito Pérez, Transportation for America |  |

### About David Gardiner and Associates

David Gardiner and Associates is a strategic advisory firm with a mission to accelerate clean energy solutions and policy to achieve transformational decarbonization. We help our business and non-profit clients by delivering practical, innovative, and tailored solutions through research and analysis, strategic advice and planning, policy advocacy, and alliance building. Our extensive and practical energy and sustainability knowledge, deep involvement in federal and state policy, and laser focus on our clients' objectives provide the solutions necessary for our clients to advance their goals. Visit us at [www.dgardiner.com](http://www.dgardiner.com).

### About NRDC

NRDC ([Natural Resources Defense Council](http://www.nrdc.org)) is an international nonprofit environmental organization with more than 3 million members and online activists. Established in 1970, NRDC uses science, policy, law, and people power to confront the climate crisis, protect public health, and safeguard nature. NRDC has offices in New York City, Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Bozeman, MT, Beijing and Delhi (an office of NRDC India Pvt. Ltd). Visit us at [www.nrdc.org](http://www.nrdc.org) and follow us on Twitter [@NRDC](https://twitter.com/NRDC).

*NRDC Chief Communications Officer:* Kristin Wilson-Palmer

*NRDC Managing Directors of Communications:* Lisa Goffredi, Jenny Powers, Rosa Del Angel

*NRDC Senior Policy Publications Editor:* Leah Stecher

*NRDC Director of Peer Review, Science Office:* Laurie Geller

*Cover image:* © Vitaliy Borushko/Alamy

*Design and Production:* [www.suerossi.com](http://www.suerossi.com)

© Natural Resources Defense Council 2023



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Executive Summary</b> .....   | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Introduction</b> .....  | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Scorecard Overview</b> .....  | <b>7</b>  |
| Metrics Overview .....   | 7         |
| State Rankings .....   | 9         |
| <b>Detailed Discussion of Metrics</b> .....                                | <b>12</b> |
| State Planning For Climate and Equity .....                                | 12        |
| Transportation-Specific GHG Reduction Targets .....                        | 12        |
| Equity in Project Scoring Criteria .....                                   | 12        |
| Compensation for Community Participation .....                             | 13        |
| Vehicle Electrification .....  | 13        |
| Charging Ports.....  | 13        |
| Higher Rebates or Grants for Low-Income Buyers .....                       | 13        |
| Grants and Rebates for Used EVs .....                                      | 14        |
| Adoption of Advanced Clean Cars Rules .....                                | 14        |
| Adoption of Advanced Clean Trucks Rule .....                               | 14        |
| Reducing VMT Through Expanded Transportation Choices .....                 | 15        |
| State Spending on Public Transit per Capita.....                           | 15        |
| Federal Funding Flexed to Transit and Bicycle/Pedestrian Spending .....    | 15        |
| Targets for Reducing Vehicle-Miles Traveled.....                           | 15        |
| Smart Growth Policies .....  | 16        |
| Encouraging Affordable Housing Near Transit .....                          | 16        |
| Pedestrian/Bicyclist Safety.....   | 17        |
| System Maintenance.....  | 17        |
| Spending for Road Repair and Maintenance .....                             | 17        |
| Procurement .....  | 18        |
| Buy Clean: Environmental Product Declarations .....                        | 18        |
| Buy Clean: Carbon Intensity of Construction Materials .....                | 18        |
| Achievement of Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Goal.....                 | 18        |
| Minority-Owned/Women-Owned Business Targets .....                          | 19        |
| <b>The Need for Improved Data Availability and Transparency</b> .....      | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Conclusion</b> .....  | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Appendix A: Detailed Methodology</b> .....                              | <b>22</b> |
| <b>Appendix B: List of Policies for which States Received Credit</b> ..... | <b>25</b> |
| <b>Endnotes</b> .....  | <b>33</b> |

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the wake of the passage of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) in 2021 and the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) in 2022, historic amounts of federal funding will be flowing to states to invest in a range of infrastructure projects. The BIL in particular includes the largest federal investment in transportation ever. States will be at the forefront of deciding how these funds will be spent, and the decisions states make regarding that funding will shape the nature of the transportation system in the United States for decades to come, with enormous implications for equity, climate change, and public health. While it is too early to assess the spending of these new federal funds, NRDC (Natural Resources Defense Council) has evaluated all 50 states to gauge the general policy and spending context that will influence and direct this federal funding, aiming to identify the degree to which states have adopted policies and directed dollars to improve equity, public health, and climate outcomes.

The stakes are high. Transportation is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States, and analyses show that the infrastructure law could either help or hinder the shift to a climate-friendly system. With the information provided in this report, states have the ability to chart a new course over the coming years.

In this scorecard report, NRDC and David Gardiner and Associates (DGA) assess states across a range of metrics related to state planning for climate and equity, vehicle electrification, expansion of transportation choices, system maintenance, and procurement.

According to the metrics used in this analysis, the 10 states doing the most to improve equity and climate outcomes from the transportation sector are:

- |                  |                |
|------------------|----------------|
| 1. California    | 6. New York    |
| 2. Massachusetts | 7. Colorado    |
| 3. Vermont       | 8. New Jersey  |
| 4. Oregon        | 9. Connecticut |
| 5. Washington    | 10. Minnesota  |

The 10 states doing the least to improve equity and climate outcomes from the transportation sector are:

- |                    |                 |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| 50. Kentucky       | 45. Arizona     |
| 48. Louisiana      | 44. Idaho       |
| 48. Nebraska       | 43. Alaska      |
| 47. Alabama        | 42. Montana     |
| 46. South Carolina | 41. Mississippi |



© Jacob Pritchard for NRDC

NRDC and DGA drew data from various databases and from state websites to assemble this robust scorecard. As money from the BIL and the IRA continues flowing into states, it is imperative for states to enhance transparency and consistency in their data collection and sharing so that all Americans can easily find and track how each state is spending this critical funding.

As the federal dollars flow, there will be tremendous opportunities for all states to shape transportation investments, systems, and policies in ways that accelerate progress on equity and climate goals. Even those states that are leading in this scorecard can do more to reduce the number of vehicles on the road, accelerate the deployment of zero-emission vehicles, focus investments on fixing and maintaining rather than expanding roadway infrastructure, procure lower-carbon construction materials, ensure that planning helps achieve better equity and climate outcomes, and much more.



# INTRODUCTION



© Dennis Schroeder/NREL, 4/9/28

On November 15, 2021, President Biden signed into law the most comprehensive infrastructure bill Congress has passed in decades: the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), also referred to as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL).<sup>1</sup> The BIL, which will expire in 2026, dedicates more than \$1.2 trillion to infrastructure, most of which is allocated to transportation. In fact, the BIL represents the largest infusion of federal transportation spending in states and local communities in years, committing nearly twice as much federal spending as the previous transportation law. The Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 also contains important provisions and programs that will affect transportation, equity, and climate change.

This extraordinary surge in federal transportation funding represents an opportunity to use infrastructure investments to meet a range of goals, including on climate and equity. The recipients of the funding, however, will allocate it according to their own policies and funding needs. Government

spending does not happen in a vacuum. It is controlled and authorized by a policy context that sets out rules for how and where money is to be spent. In general, the grooves of transportation spending are well worn, and historically states have overemphasized spending on highway expansion. The result is a transportation network that is the largest contributor of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the United States and that leaves too many Americans, particularly those in low-income or minority communities, without safe and affordable mobility options. Absent changes to state policies, the influx of federal funds will flow along the paths laid out by current state policies and priorities. Examining those current policies and priorities—as done in this report—allows states to see where they could better advance key climate and equity goals.

Most federal transportation funding is distributed through formula grant programs—pots of funding that are distributed to states or other entities on the basis of formulas laid

out in the law. Recipients are usually state departments of transportation (DOTs), tribal governments, and transit agencies. Congress has also reauthorized and created a number of competitive programs in the BIL that states, cities, and other governmental entities can apply for.

State DOTs have particularly critical roles to play in deciding how the influx of federal funding will be put to use and in charting each state's transportation future, though other entities also play key roles. State DOTs lead the state planning processes from which most transportation projects emerge, and they are charged with navigating federal administrative processes and delivering outcomes on a range of federal policy requirements (such as safety and bridge conditions) and federal and state political commitments (such as particular equity goals).<sup>2</sup> Many other government decision makers—such as governors, legislatures, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), and local governments—have a say in the decision-making process as well. In some states, legislatures have the final say on which projects get funded, reducing the discretion of state DOTs and MPOs. Additionally, some state legislatures have passed laws that constrain the types of projects state DOTs are allowed to select, requiring DOTs to spend funds on highways and prohibiting them from selecting transit or projects that support biking or walking, among other low-carbon alternatives to driving.

The path of federal funding will be determined by the policy and spending context in each state. In December 2021, the Georgetown Climate Center found that if governments direct a substantial portion of the BIL funding into highway expansion projects, the law could actually increase surface transportation GHG emissions. In contrast, if policymakers prioritize more climate-beneficial strategies such as public transit and increased mobility options, they could significantly accelerate reductions in transportation emissions, compared with what would otherwise be expected.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, communities that offer people more transportation choices are better positioned to have lower transportation costs, less exclusionary zoning, more housing types, and increased neighborhood investment; these communities are therefore investing in a more equitable future.

As it is too soon to assess the spending of BIL funds, this scorecard evaluates every state to gauge the general policy and spending context that will influence and direct the influx of federal funding.<sup>4</sup> There has never been a more important time for states to take transportation spending off autopilot and instead adopt policies and target spending to ensure that the billions of dollars from the BIL help achieve greater equity and sustainability.

# SCORECARD OVERVIEW

In recent years the transportation sector has surpassed the electric power sector to become the largest contributor to U.S. GHG emissions.<sup>5</sup> Climate change goals cannot be met without making significant progress on reducing emissions from the transportation sector. Additionally, where and how state DOTs make transportation investments have enormous consequences for the ability of people to access employment, education, health care, and other basic needs. Transportation decisions also have direct impacts on public health; for instance, living close to major roadways has been associated with increased risks of coronary mortality, respiratory disease, and neurological impacts.<sup>6</sup> The history of highway construction dividing low-income communities provides further motivation for ensuring that equity is embedded in all state transportation policy and spending.<sup>7</sup>

The influx of federal dollars from the BIL and the IRA represents a powerful opportunity to change the trajectory of the transportation sector's impacts on both equity and climate change. This scorecard evaluates the general policy and spending context in each state that will influence and direct this influx of funding.

## METRICS OVERVIEW

This scorecard assesses a wide variety of state-level actions on transportation, including policies, planning, and investment decisions. Activities that are typically analyzed separately, such as procurement practices, emissions reduction goals, and road maintenance, have been compiled here into a single scorecard to encourage states to take a comprehensive look at their delivery of sustainable and equitable transportation across multiple programs and agencies.

The metrics in this scorecard and their associated point values are shown in Table 1. Each metric is described more fully in the next section of this report, including the considerations involved in granting a state full or partial credit.

## METHODOLOGY OVERVIEW

NRDC and DGA developed draft metrics for assessing state transportation policy and spending, and then reviewed individual state policies, initiatives, and spending levels related to those draft metrics. The process of selecting and refining metrics was iterative, with adjustments made on the basis of research findings, data availability, and ongoing analysis. The aim was to identify a set of metrics that provided a useful, illustrative snapshot of state transportation actions relevant to equity and climate change. Some of these metrics focus on whether states have adopted particular policies, while other metrics focus on actual state performance, spending, and outcomes.

Data were gathered on these metrics between December 2022 and February 2023. *Any state actions taken after the research was conducted are not reflected in this report.*

Since the public deserves to know what states are doing to promote transportation-related climate solutions and equitable outcomes, the data-gathering process focused on information that was publicly available. While some of the quantitative metrics could be found in centralized repositories, the vast majority of the research involved digging through state websites to identify whether relevant policies or practices were in place. For some metrics, the research was limited to state DOTs; for others, the research stretched across state agencies.

Given the nature of this research, it is certainly possible that during the data-gathering process some state actions, policies, provisions, programs, or initiatives that should have received credit failed to come to light. (The need for states to improve transparency and provide easier access to information is discussed later.) NRDC and DGA welcome feedback from states on actions that might not be represented in this report.

Once the metrics were finalized and the research completed, the metrics were assigned different point values based on an assessment of their relative impact on climate and equity outcomes. States were then ranked according to their total scores.

The research and ranking methodologies are explained in much greater detail in Appendix A.



| TABLE 1: METRICS IN THIS SCORECARD AND THEIR ASSOCIATED POINT VALUES  |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| METRIC  | MAXIMUM POINTS AVAILABLE  |
| State Planning for Climate and Equity   | 17                        |
| Near-term (2035 or earlier) quantified GHG reduction target or projection for the transportation sector   | 6                         |
| Equity as part of publicly available state transportation project scoring criteria  | 6                         |
| Encouragement in the state DOT's public participation plan or community participation plan for compensation of community-based organizations or community members for participation in planning processes | 5                         |
| <b>Vehicle Electrification</b>  | <b>31</b>                 |
| Electric vehicle (EV) charging ports per 1,000 residents  | 10                        |
|   | <i>Fast charging</i> 5    |
|   | <i>Level 2 charging</i> 5 |
| Higher EV rebate or grant for low-income buyers   | 5                         |
| Rebate or grant for used EVs  | 4                         |
| Advanced Clean Cars Rules   | 6                         |
| Advanced Clean Trucks Rule  | 6                         |
| <b>Reducing VMT Through Expanded Transportation Choices</b>   | <b>34</b>                 |
| State dollars spent on transit per capita (three-year average)  | 5                         |
| Dollars flexed to transit and bicycle/pedestrian spending compared with spending of federal funds on highways (three-year average)  | 10                        |
| Quantified goal or projection for reducing vehicle-miles traveled (VMT)   | 5                         |
| State smart growth policy that identifies particular areas or districts for growth and provides incentives for focusing development there   | 4                         |
| Points for Low-Income Housing Tax Credit applications that develop affordable housing near transit  | 4                         |
| Nonmotorized serious injuries/fatalities on roadways per 100,000 population (five-year average)   | 6                         |
| <b>System Maintenance</b>   | <b>7</b>                  |
| Spending of federal highway dollars on maintenance, repairs, and operations, compared with total state spending of federal funds on highways (three-year average)   | 7                         |
| <b>Procurement</b>  | <b>11</b>                 |
| Requirement for or encouragement of environmental product declarations (EPDs) for commonly used construction materials in transportation projects   | 3                         |
| Carbon intensity ceiling for commonly used construction materials in public transportation projects   | 3                         |
| Achievement of disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE) goals for federally funded transportation projects   | 3                         |
| Minority-owned or women-owned small business targets or bid preferences for state-funded transportation projects  | 2                         |
| <b>TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS</b>  | <b>100</b>                |

Reducing GHG emissions from the transportation sector will require progress on a variety of strategies evaluated in this report. As Table 1 makes clear, expanding transportation choices and vehicle electrification are the most heavily weighted categories in this scorecard. The electrification of transportation receives a huge amount of attention from policymakers and the public, but it is also imperative to reduce vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) and the number of vehicles on the road by expanding transportation choices—including by funding alternatives to driving (e.g., biking, walking, transit) and making it easier and safer for people to access and utilize those options. Respected think tank RMI analyzed what it would take to cut U.S. transportation emissions by 45 percent below 2005 levels by 2030 and found that in addition to substantial vehicle electrification,

passenger vehicle miles of travel per capita must be reduced by 20 percent below 2019 levels.<sup>8</sup> Reducing VMT by expanding transportation choices is of vital importance not only because there will still be fossil-fuel vehicles on the road for years, but also because fewer vehicles to electrify reduces electricity demand, further reducing emissions.<sup>9</sup>

The metrics used in this report include both “traditional” transportation and climate metrics, such as highway maintenance and transit investment, and metrics explicitly focused on equity, such as compensation for community-based organizations, equity criteria in project scoring, and achievement of disadvantaged business goals. It should also be recognized that many of the “traditional” metrics have impacts on equity, such as pedestrian/bicyclist safety and policies to promote clean trucks (since injuries/fatalities



and truck pollution tend to be concentrated in low-income or minority communities). The influx of federal funding provides an opportunity for states to not only reduce GHG emissions, but also avoid perpetuating the harms from previous transportation investments.

The metrics in this scorecard are merely a snapshot of state actions and thus do not present a complete or dynamic picture. The absence of other metrics from this scorecard—reflecting countless other policy, spending, and implementation decisions—is not meant to suggest that these other state actions are not important.

One should also keep in mind that some of the data gathered reflect investments and outcomes that occurred during the heart of the COVID-19 pandemic. It is entirely possible that the unique circumstances of that time frame affected these metrics.

## STATE RANKINGS

The full state scores and rankings are provided in Table 2.

According to the metrics used in this analysis, the 10 states doing the most to improve equity and climate outcomes from the transportation sector are:

- |                  |                |
|------------------|----------------|
| 1. California    | 6. New York    |
| 2. Massachusetts | 7. Colorado    |
| 3. Vermont       | 8. New Jersey  |
| 4. Oregon        | 9. Connecticut |
| 5. Washington    | 10. Minnesota  |

In contrast, the 10 states doing the least to improve equity and climate outcomes from the transportation sector are:

- |                    |                 |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| 50. Kentucky       | 45. Arizona     |
| 48. Louisiana      | 44. Idaho       |
| 48. Nebraska       | 43. Alaska      |
| 47. Alabama        | 42. Montana     |
| 46. South Carolina | 41. Mississippi |

**TABLE 2: STATE SCORES AND RANKINGS**

|      |                | State Planning<br>(17 points possible) |   |   | Vehicle Electrification<br>(31 points possible) |                         |                               |                      |                           |                            | Reducing VMT Through Expanded Transportation Choices<br>(34 points possible) |  |                                       |                     |   |                           | System Maintenance<br>(7 points possible) | Procurement<br>(11 points possible)           |  |   |   |       |
|------|----------------|--|---|---|---|-------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---|---------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|-------|
| RANK | STATE          | Transportation GHG reduction targets   | Equity criteria in transportation project scoring | Compensation for community participation in transportation planning process | Charging Ports                                  |                         | Rebates for low-income buyers | Rebates for used EVs | Advanced Clean Cars Rules | Advanced Clean Trucks Rule | State funding for transit  | Federal funds used for transit and bicycle/pedestrian projects | Vehicle-miles traveled reduction goal | Smart growth policy | Incentive to locate affordable housing near transit | Bicycle/pedestrian safety | Funding for road repair and maintenance   | Buy Clean: environmental product declarations | Buy Clean: carbon intensity ceiling for construction materials | Achievement of Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal | Minority-owned/women-owned business targets for state-funded projects | Total |
|      |                |  |   |   | Number of fast-charging ports                   | Number of level 2 ports |                               |                      |                           |                            |  |  |                                       |                     |   |                           |   |   |  |   |   |       |
| 1    | California     | 6                                      | 6   | 5   | 5.0   | 3.6                     | 5                             | 4                    | 6                         | 6                          | 1.0  | 10.0   | 5                                     | 4                   | 4   | 1.8                       | 6.5                                       | 3   | 3  | 0   | 2   | 86.9  |
| 2    | Massachusetts  | 6                                      | 6   | 5   | 1.9   | 3.2                     | 0                             | 0                    | 6                         | 6                          | 3.4  | 3.7  | 5                                     | 4                   | 4   | 2.8                       | 6.9                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 2   | 68.9  |
| 3    | Vermont        | 6                                      | 0   | 0   | 4.2   | 5.0                     | 5                             | 4                    | 6                         | 6                          | 0.3  | 8.2  | 5                                     | 4                   | 4   | 3.4                       | 6.9                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 68.0  |
| 4    | Oregon         | 6                                      | 3   | 0   | 2.7   | 1.9                     | 2.5                           | 2                    | 6                         | 6                          | 0.2  | 5.1  | 5                                     | 4                   | 4   | 3.2                       | 5.9                                       | 3   | 0  | 3   | 0   | 63.5  |
| 5    | Washington     | 6                                      | 3   | 5   | 2.7   | 2.0                     | 0                             | 4                    | 6                         | 6                          | 0.7  | 4.4  | 5                                     | 4                   | 4   | 2.6                       | 5.1                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 2   | 62.5  |
| 6    | New York       | 6                                      | 0   | 0   | 1.3   | 1.8                     | 0                             | 0                    | 6                         | 6                          | 5.0  | 5.9  | 5                                     | 4                   | 4   | 1.5                       | 6.8                                       | 3   | 3  | 0   | 2   | 61.3  |
| 7    | Colorado       | 6                                      | 3   | 5   | 3.3   | 2.7                     | 0                             | 0                    | 3                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 1.2  | 5                                     | 4                   | 4   | 2.1                       | 6.6                                       | 3   | 3  | 3   | 2   | 56.9  |
| 8    | New Jersey     | 6                                      | 0   | 0   | 1.7   | 0.9                     | 0                             | 0                    | 3                         | 6                          | 2.4  | 2.1  | 5                                     | 4                   | 4   | 3.0                       | 6.1                                       | 3   | 3  | 3   | 0   | 53.2  |
| 9    | Connecticut    | 6                                      | 0   | 5   | 2.3   | 1.4                     | 5                             | 4                    | 3                         | 0                          | 1.3  | 1.2  | 5                                     | 4                   | 4   | 2.2                       | 6.7                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 2   | 53.1  |
| 10   | Minnesota      | 6                                      | 6   | 5   | 1.0   | 0.9                     | 0                             | 0                    | 3                         | 0                          | 1.4  | 4.6  | 5                                     | 4                   | 4   | 3.8                       | 5.9                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 2   | 52.6  |
| 11   | Rhode Island   | 6                                      | 0   | 5   | 1.7   | 2.5                     | 2.5                           | 2                    | 3                         | 0                          | 0.2  | 4.6  | 5                                     | 4                   | 4   | 2.7                       | 7.0                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 2   | 52.2  |
| 12   | Maine          | 6                                      | 3   | 0   | 3.1   | 2.0                     | 5                             | 4                    | 3                         | 0                          | 0.1  | 0.7  | 5                                     | 4                   | 4   | 3.3                       | 7.0                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 50.2  |
| 13   | Maryland       | 6                                      | 6   | 0   | 2.9   | 2.2                     | 0                             | 0                    | 3                         | 0                          | 2.9  | 4.2  | 5                                     | 4                   | 4   | 1.9                       | 5.4                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 2   | 49.5  |
| 14   | Hawaii*        | 6                                      | 6   | 0   | 1.5   | 2.4                     | 0                             | 0                    | x                         | x                          | 4.2  | 3.4  | 0                                     | 4                   | 4   | 2.1                       | 4.7                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 43.6* |
| 15   | New Mexico     | 6                                      | 3   | 5   | 1.7   | 0.7                     | 0                             | 0                    | 3                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 4.1  | 5                                     | 0                   | 4   | 2.1                       | 5.8                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 0   | 43.4  |
| 16   | Pennsylvania   | 6                                      | 3   | 0   | 1.2   | 0.8                     | 2.5                           | 2                    | 0                         | 0                          | 2.1  | 1.8  | 5                                     | 0                   | 4   | 3.4                       | 6.3                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 2   | 40.1  |
| 17   | Delaware       | 6                                      | 6   | 0   | 2.3   | 1.1                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 2.1  | 1.1  | 5                                     | 4                   | 4   | 2.1                       | 6.1                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 39.8  |
| 18   | Virginia       | 0                                      | 6   | 0   | 2.5   | 1.3                     | 0                             | 0                    | 6                         | 0                          | 0.3  | 2.8  | 0                                     | 4                   | 4   | 2.4                       | 4.5                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 2   | 38.8  |
| 19   | Nevada         | 6                                      | 6   | 0   | 3.1   | 1.7                     | 0                             | 0                    | 3                         | 0                          | 0.1  | 4.1  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 2.1                       | 3.7                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 33.8  |
| 20   | Wisconsin      | 6                                      | 3   | 5   | 1.0   | 0.6                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.4  | 0.4  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 3.2                       | 4.5                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 2   | 33.1  |
| 21   | Illinois       | 0                                      | 6   | 0   | 1.2   | 0.8                     | 2.5                           | 2                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.7  | 2.5  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 1.7                       | 6.4                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 2   | 29.8  |
| 22   | North Dakota*  | 0                                      | 3   | 0   | 1.9   | 0.6                     | 0                             | 0                    | x                         | x                          | 0.1  | 0.7  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 4.9                       | 6.7                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 0   | 28.3* |
| 23   | North Carolina | 0                                      | 6   | 0   | 1.5   | 1.0                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.2  | 1.2  | 5                                     | 0                   | 4   | 3.5                       | 2.6                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 2   | 27.0  |
| 24   | Florida        | 0                                      | 6   | 0   | 1.9   | 1.2                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.3  | 1.8  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 1.3                       | 5.0                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 2   | 26.5  |
| 25   | Ohio           | 0                                      | 6   | 0   | 1.0   | 0.8                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 3.1  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 2.8                       | 6.3                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 2   | 26.0  |

\* State is ineligible to adopt Advanced Clean Cars and Clean Trucks Rules under the Clean Air Act. Since those categories are excluded from consideration, state's score has been adjusted, as described in Appendix A.

**TABLE 2: STATE SCORES AND RANKINGS**

|      |                | State Planning<br>(17 points possible) |   |   | Vehicle Electrification<br>(31 points possible) |                         |                               |                      |                           |                            | Reducing VMT Through Expanded Transportation Choices<br>(34 points possible) |  |                                       |                     |   |                           | System Maintenance<br>(7 points possible) | Procurement<br>(11 points possible)           |  |   |   |       |
|------|----------------|--|---|---|---|-------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---|---------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|-------|
| RANK | STATE          | Transportation GHG reduction targets   | Equity criteria in transportation project scoring | Compensation for community participation in transportation planning process | Charging Ports                                  |                         | Rebates for low-income buyers | Rebates for used EVs | Advanced Clean Cars Rules | Advanced Clean Trucks Rule | State funding for transit  | Federal funds used for transit and bicycle/pedestrian projects | Vehicle-miles traveled reduction goal | Smart growth policy | Incentive to locate affordable housing near transit | Bicycle/pedestrian safety | Funding for road repair and maintenance   | Buy Clean: environmental product declarations | Buy Clean: carbon intensity ceiling for construction materials | Achievement of Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal | Minority-owned/women-owned business targets for state-funded projects | Total |
|      |                |  |   |   | Number of fast-charging ports                   | Number of level 2 ports |                               |                      |                           |                            |  |  |                                       |                     |   |                           |   |   |  |   |   |       |
| 26   | Oklahoma       | 0                                      | 3   | 0   | 4.4   | 0.5                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 0.5  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 2.8                       | 6.0                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 0   | 24.2  |
| 27   | Michigan       | 0                                      | 0   | 5   | 1.3   | 0.9                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.4  | 1.4  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 2.6                       | 6.8                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 22.4  |
| 28   | Utah           | 0                                      | 3   | 0   | 2.1   | 2.2                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 1.1  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 2.9                       | 2.9                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 0   | 21.2  |
| 29   | South Dakota   | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 1.7   | 0.4                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 0.9  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 4.2                       | 6.0                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 0   | 20.2  |
| 29   | West Virginia  | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 1.2   | 0.6                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 0.3  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 3.9                       | 5.2                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 2   | 20.2  |
| 29   | Iowa           | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 1.9   | 0.6                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.1  | 1.8  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 4.8                       | 5.0                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 2   | 20.2  |
| 32   | Tennessee      | 0                                      | 3   | 0   | 1.0   | 0.8                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.1  | 2.7  | 0                                     | 4                   | 0   | 2.6                       | 3.9                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 2   | 20.1  |
| 33   | New Hampshire  | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 2.1   | 1.0                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 1.5  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 6.0                       | 5.4                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 20.0  |
| 34   | Missouri       | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 1.2   | 1.3                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 1.8  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 2.5                       | 6.5                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 2   | 19.3  |
| 35   | Georgia        | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 1.7   | 1.3                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 2.3  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 3.1                       | 4.8                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 2   | 19.2  |
| 35   | Kansas         | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 1.2   | 1.2                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.1  | 1.9  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 3.8                       | 4.0                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 0   | 19.2  |
| 37   | Texas          | 0                                      | 3   | 0   | 1.0   | 0.7                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.1  | 1.4  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 2.6                       | 4.3                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 2   | 19.1  |
| 38   | Indiana        | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 1.0   | 0.5                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.2  | 2.2  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 3.5                       | 5.3                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 2   | 18.7  |
| 39   | Arkansas       | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 0.6   | 0.7                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 1.2  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 2.9                       | 4.2                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 2   | 18.6  |
| 40   | Wyoming        | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 3.5   | 0.8                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 0.3  | 0                                     | 0                   | 0   | 4.0                       | 6.4                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 0   | 18.0  |
| 41   | Mississippi    | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 0.6   | 0.3                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 1.1  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 3.3                       | 5.3                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 0   | 17.6  |
| 42   | Montana        | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 2.3   | 0.5                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 1.5  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 3.1                       | 6.0                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 17.4  |
| 43   | Alaska         | 0                                      | 3   | 0   | 1.2   | 0.4                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.1  | 1.1  | 0                                     | 0                   | 0   | 2.3                       | 5.9                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 0   | 17.0  |
| 44   | Idaho          | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 1.2   | 0.7                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 1.0  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 2.9                       | 6.7                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 16.5  |
| 45   | Arizona        | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 1.7   | 1.2                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 4.1  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 1.8                       | 2.5                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 15.3  |
| 46   | South Carolina | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 1.2   | 0.6                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 0.6  | 0                                     | 0                   | 0   | 2.3                       | 5.1                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 2   | 14.8  |
| 47   | Alabama        | 0                                      | 3   | 0   | 1.2   | 0.5                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 1.4  | 0                                     | 0                   | 0   | 2.7                       | 5.9                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 14.7  |
| 48   | Nebraska       | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 1.5   | 0.7                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 1.1  | 0                                     | 0                   | 0   | 3.0                       | 6.8                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 13.1  |
| 48   | Louisiana      | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 0.6   | 0.3                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 1.0  | 0                                     | 0                   | 4   | 2.5                       | 4.7                                       | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0   | 13.1  |
| 50   | Kentucky       | 0                                      | 0   | 0   | 0.6   | 0.4                     | 0                             | 0                    | 0                         | 0                          | 0.0  | 1.4  | 0                                     | 0                   | 0   | 3.0                       | 4.3                                       | 0   | 0  | 3   | 0   | 12.7  |



# DETAILED DISCUSSION OF METRICS

The metrics used to score and rank states are each described in more detail below. All data sources for quantitative metrics can be found in Appendix A. All policies and practices for which states received credit under each qualitative metric can be found in Appendix B. (Links for all policies and practices highlighted in the sections below can likewise be found in the appendices.)

In general, states were given credit for policies they have in place. This report does not assess how rigorously those policies are implemented.

## STATE PLANNING FOR CLIMATE AND EQUITY

### Transportation-Specific GHG Reduction Targets

The BIL makes billions of dollars in federal funding available to states and MPOs, through a range of programs, to help reduce carbon dioxide emissions from the transportation sector. To bring more focus and transparency to those efforts, in June 2022 the U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) proposed a rule that would require states and MPOs to establish their own declining targets for GHG emissions from roadway travel.<sup>10</sup> This proposed rule must be finalized so that transportation planning and investments help solve rather than exacerbate climate change.

Fortunately, many states have already taken this step. Accordingly, this scorecard gives states credit either *for establishing statewide, near-term (2035 or earlier), transportation-specific GHG reduction targets or for providing near-term emissions reduction projections for the transportation sector* based on state climate policies. Both of these approaches provide states with a transportation-specific emissions reduction yardstick they can measure against in evaluating policy, program, and spending decisions. For example:

- California has established interim milestones on the pathway to its long-term target of reducing transportation-related GHG emissions 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Additionally, California has a low-carbon fuel standard, which aims to achieve a 20 percent reduction in transportation fuel carbon intensity by 2030.
- Colorado's Greenhouse Gas Pollution Reduction Roadmap calls for 12.7 million tons of reduction in annual transportation emissions by 2030.
- Maine's 2020 Climate Action Plan, *Maine Won't Wait*, models the plan's impacts on GHG emissions, including sectoral breakdowns, to meet the state's overall 2030 and 2050 goals.
- Minnesota's Department of Transportation set the following targets for GHG reductions from the transportation sector, expressed as percentage reductions

from 2005 levels: 30 percent by 2025, 50 percent by 2030, 65 percent by 2035, and 80 percent by 2040.

Since this metric focuses on states that have put in place a transportation-specific emissions reduction yardstick, states with economy-wide (but not transportation-specific) emissions reduction targets did not receive credit. Neither did states with emissions projections based solely on historical emissions data, without consideration of future scenarios or state actions for reducing emissions. For instance, Iowa's statewide GHG inventory report includes sectoral projections for emissions in key years.<sup>11</sup> However, the projection tool simply forecasts trends based on historical data, rather than projecting the impacts of policies to reduce emissions, so Iowa did not receive credit.

### Equity in Project Scoring Criteria

In recent years, the U.S. DOT formally established equity as an agency-wide goal, to redress historic inequities caused by the transportation sector and work toward more inclusive practices and benefits for the public.<sup>12</sup> As part of this objective, and in conjunction with Executive Order 13985, *Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government*, the department has committed to integrating equity considerations into the planning, development, and implementation of all transportation investments.

There are also opportunities to address inequity through state-level transportation planning processes. For example, some states include equity in the scoring criteria used to evaluate and prioritize proposed transportation projects. In this report, states with *publicly available transportation project scoring criteria that include equity as a criterion* received credit. Full credit was given if equity was considered within a comprehensive, overarching set of project scoring criteria, applicable to all transportation projects. Because states spend most of their transportation dollars on highways and roads, full credit was also given if equity was included only in scoring criteria applicable to highway and road projects. Twelve states received full credit. If a state considered equity only in the project evaluation criteria for non-highway projects (e.g., transit, biking), it received partial credit. Fourteen states received partial credit. Examples of equity in scoring criteria include the following:

- Delaware DOT's project prioritization criteria include weighing the impact on the public, social disruption, and the social and health impacts on low-income and/or minority populations.
- Maryland's Transportation Project-Based Scoring Model includes "Equitable Access to Transportation" as one of nine required goals for project evaluation.

- Virginia utilizes the SMART SCALE tool as a method of scoring planned projects included in VTrans (Virginia’s long-range transportation plan). Accessibility is one of the six factors in the project evaluation process, and “access to jobs for disadvantaged persons” accounts for 20 percent of the accessibility score.

### Compensation for Community Participation

To receive federal funding, state DOTs are required to develop public (or community) participation plans. Meaningful public involvement, engagement, and consultation from the beginning and throughout a project’s life cycle help projects better meet the needs of the community. Focus groups, surveys, pop-up events, and public meetings are a few ways community members have traditionally participated in the planning process. With online tools growing in popularity over the last decade, virtual engagement has also become more common.

Though current practices allow many more people to engage in the transportation planning process, these approaches may still fail to reach some groups, particularly those in underserved communities who may lack the time or resources to participate. One promising approach, recommended by the U.S. DOT, is to provide compensation to community members and representatives from community-based organizations for their participation in the planning process.<sup>13</sup> While compensation is just one element of effective engagement, it is an emerging practice explicitly focused on inclusivity and is incorporated in this scorecard as an indicator of which states are taking meaningful steps to improve equity in their engagement efforts. For the purposes of this scorecard, compensation was defined as any provisions—such as child care, travel reimbursements, cash, or meals—guaranteed to help cover the costs and/or time for participating. Offerings that are not guaranteed for participants, such as raffles or giveaways, did not count as compensation. Only 10 states explicitly *encourage compensation for community participation* within their transportation agency’s official public involvement plan: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Washington, and Wisconsin. For example:

- Minnesota DOT’s Public Engagement Guidance suggests providing food and refreshments and offering incentives or reimbursements to reduce barriers to participation for community organizations and people.
- Michigan DOT’s Environmental Justice Guidance notes that providing transportation, on-site child care, and food and refreshments can enable participation by low-income populations.
- Wisconsin DOT’s public involvement guidelines suggest providing special public transportation and child care services to better enable participation by minority and low-income populations.



© EYgo Network, CC BY-NC-SA 4.0

## VEHICLE ELECTRIFICATION

### Charging Ports

Electric vehicles (EVs) substantially reduce the life cycle GHG emissions associated with vehicles, and they eliminate other kinds of tailpipe emissions that can have significant impacts on public health, particularly in underserved communities. The BIL includes a range of programs to advance vehicle electrification, including the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) Formula Program, which will create a system of charging stations throughout the country.<sup>14</sup> This will make long-distance EV trips easier and increase driver confidence that they will be able to get to their destinations without running out of battery charge.

There are different types of charging stations, including alternating current (AC) Level 2 chargers, which can take hours to charge an EV (and are generally found at homes or in locations where vehicles will be parked for a long period), and direct current (DC) fast chargers, which can provide significant charge to an EV in under an hour (and are most commonly found near highways to help drivers refuel on longer trips). Both kinds of chargers benefit the expansion of EVs, so each received equal weighting in this scorecard. States received credit based on *the number of fast charging ports and the number of Level 2 ports per 1,000 residents*, with states receiving credit relative to the number of ports in the highest state (which received full credit). California had the most fast charging ports per 1,000 residents (0.26). Vermont had the most Level 2 ports per 1,000 residents (1.25).

### Higher Rebates or Grants for Low-Income Buyers

While EVs are cheaper to own and operate and provide life cycle savings for drivers, the up-front costs of an EV are, on average, currently higher than those of a comparable conventional internal combustion vehicle. The federal government has provided a tax credit for EVs (which was recently expanded and retooled in the Inflation Reduction Act) to reduce the up-front costs, and states, too, can promote EV adoption by providing their own rebates or grants for

buyers. To ensure that EV adoption occurs equitably and is not limited to wealthy buyers, some states have adopted *higher rebates or grants for low-income buyers*. In this scorecard, states received full credit if they had a higher rebate or grant for low-income buyers *and* the rebate was available at the point of sale. Point-of-sale rebates have been shown to be more effective in driving EV sales than rebates after a sale, which may not be accessible to low-income buyers who lack sufficient up-front funds.<sup>15</sup> States with a higher rebate for low-income buyers that was available only after purchase (e.g., a mail-in rebate) received half credit. Examples of programs receiving credit include the following:

- California has two relevant programs—the Clean Cars 4 All program and the Clean Vehicle Assistance Program (CVAP). Clean Cars 4 All currently provides up to \$9,500 in grants for the purchase of new or used EVs, with the highest incentive amount reserved for the lowest-income participants. CVAP provides grants and affordable financing to help income-qualified residents purchase or lease a new or used hybrid or EV at the point of sale.
- Vermont’s Drive Electric Program offers point-of-sale rebates for the purchase of new EVs, with greater incentives for buyers with an adjusted gross income of \$50,000 or less.
- The Illinois Electric Vehicle Rebate Program offers rebates for the purchase of all-electric vehicles. Although rebates are not higher for low-income buyers, low-income applicants are prioritized when the limited pot of rebate funding is disbursed, which was deemed to be similar in impact. Illinois received partial credit as the program did not appear to be point-of-sale.

### Grants and Rebates for Used EVs

Another way that states can ensure that EV expansion is accessible and equitable is by supporting adoption of used EVs, which are more affordable than new vehicles. Accordingly, some states offer *grant and rebate programs for used EVs*. As noted above, studies show that point-of-sale rebates are most effective, so states received full credit under this metric if their used EV rebates are available at the point of sale, and half credit if they are available only after purchase. For example:

- Connecticut offers incentives of up to \$3,000 to residents who purchase or lease eligible used EVs through the Connecticut Hydrogen and Electric Automobile Rebate (CHEAPR) program. Incentive amounts vary according to income qualifications and are offered at the point of sale at participating dealerships.
- Vermont’s MileageSmart program offers an incentive of 25 percent of the initial price of pre-owned hybrids, plug-in hybrids, or EVs, up to \$5,000 for buyers that are at or below 80 percent of the state’s median income. Buyers must apply and be approved before purchasing a vehicle, and the incentive is applied at the time of purchase.

- Washington offers a sales and use tax exemption for alternative fuel and plug-in hybrid vehicles, including used EVs. At the dealer, the transaction is processed without collecting those taxes, which effectively lowers the price at the point of sale.
- Pennsylvania offers an Alternative Fuel Vehicle (AFV) Rebate, which includes the purchase of used EVs. However, this rebate is provided after the transaction, so the state received only half of the total points available.

### Adoption of Advanced Clean Cars Rules

While rebates and grants can be very effective “carrots” for increasing EV adoption, regulatory requirements and standards provide important “sticks” to ensure progress toward the same goal. Under Section 177 of the federal Clean Air Act, most states can either operate under federal vehicle pollution standards or adopt California’s, which tend to be more stringent. California has adopted a series of regulations over the years to promote zero-emission vehicles (ZEVs), including impactful regulations such as Advanced Clean Cars I (ACC I) and Advanced Clean Cars II (ACC II). ACC I, adopted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) in 2012, set statewide low- and zero-emission vehicle standards for model years 2015 through 2025. This included a requirement that automakers produce for sale an increasing number of new ZEVs each year, culminating in about 7–8 percent ZEV sales by model year 2025. ACC II, adopted by CARB in 2022, builds on ACC I by ramping up the required sales percentage from 35 percent in model year 2026 to 100 percent by model year 2035.

States received scorecard credit if they have *adopted the Advanced Clean Cars rules*. States that have adopted ACC II received full credit, while states adopting only ACC I received half credit. Seven states have adopted ACC II and received full credit (California, Massachusetts, New York, Oregon, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington), and nine others received half credit (Colorado, Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, and Rhode Island). Hawaii and North Dakota appear to be ineligible to adopt California’s vehicle standards under Section 177, so this metric was not considered in determining the overall ranking for those states. (See Appendix A for more details on methodology.)

### Adoption of Advanced Clean Trucks Rule

Medium- and heavy-duty vehicles make up a small percentage of the vehicles on the road, but they produce a disproportionate share of vehicle-related GHG emissions and other air pollutants, causing concentrated public health harms in communities located near routes and facilities (e.g., ports) that have significant truck traffic. In particular, communities of color and low-income communities are most likely to be disproportionately impacted by this air pollution. As with the Advanced Clean Cars rules, most states have the option under the Clean Air Act of operating under federal vehicle pollution standards or adopting California’s more



stringent standards for medium- and heavy-duty vehicles. The Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT) rule, adopted by CARB in 2020, has both an increasing manufacturer ZEV sales requirement and a reporting requirement. Each class of heavy-duty vehicle has its own goals and requirements, increasing to between 40 percent and 75 percent by 2035.

Only seven states—California, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Vermont, and Washington—have *adopted the ACT rule*, though more states were in the process of doing so when research for this scorecard was completed. Again, Hawaii and North Dakota appear to be ineligible to adopt California’s standards under Section 177, so this metric was not considered in determining the overall ranking for those states (as explained in Appendix A).

## REDUCING VMT THROUGH EXPANDED TRANSPORTATION CHOICES

### State Spending on Public Transit per Capita

Among the most important public investments federal, state, and local governments can make are investments in public transportation, including transit infrastructure and vehicles. Such expenditures can be directed to:

- Buses, including bus rapid-transit lines with dedicated lanes and other design characteristics differentiating their routes from traditional bus routes.
- Rail, including on-street light rail or trolleys, heavy rail systems often traveling underground, and commuter rail.
- Van pools and shuttle services.
- Ferries.

These transportation options deliver varying levels of GHG emission reductions compared with driving a car, averaging about 55 percent less for a typical transit trip.<sup>16</sup> Emissions- and energy-saving benefits increase with ridership of transit vehicles, underscoring the importance of providing frequent and reliable transit service to attract and retain riders.

In addition, increasing public transportation can help advance equity goals. As the foundation TransitCenter put it: “When transit works well, it’s a great equalizer, providing affordable access to jobs, education, and other daily destinations without barriers linked to race, class, gender and equity.”<sup>17</sup> States have a chance to help local municipalities and transit agencies deliver on this promise.

For this metric, states received points based on their *spending from state revenue sources on public transit per person (three-year average)*, which is an indicator of state-level commitment to transit. New York spent the most from state sources per capita (approximately \$280), followed by Hawaii (\$235) and Massachusetts (\$192). In contrast, states such as Alabama, Arizona, Idaho, Kentucky, Mississippi, and New Hampshire devoted less than \$1 per capita of state spending to transit.



© Marc A. Heermann/MITA

### Federal Funding Flexed to Transit and Bicycle/Pedestrian Spending

Some federal transportation dollars are dedicated to public transit and nonmotorized transportation (e.g., bicycle and pedestrian projects). States can also opt to “flex” some of their highway funding received by formula and transfer the funding to these more climate-friendly, equity-boosting purposes.<sup>18</sup> There is substantial variation in state flexing practices, but Congress has been adding more and more flexibility in use of these dollars over the decades, and advocates have been pressing states to exercise this flexibility.<sup>19</sup>

Therefore, this scorecard assesses states according to the share of their overall federal allocation redirected to transit or spent on nonmotorized transportation projects. States received credit based on *dollars flexed to transit and bicycle/pedestrian spending compared with spending of federal funds on highways (three-year average)*. California had the highest ratio of flexed federal dollars, redirecting more than 10 cents out of every federal highway dollar to transit, bike, or pedestrian spending, followed by Vermont at about 8.5 cents out of every dollar.

### Targets for Reducing Vehicle-Miles Traveled

In addition to a transportation-specific GHG reduction target (referred to earlier), states can set reduction targets for vehicle-miles traveled. VMT targets (or projections of VMT reductions) provide a clearer focus on—and support planning for—reducing overall vehicle traffic and travel demand. VMT reductions can be achieved with an array of strategies, including improved public transportation, safer and more plentiful bicycle lanes and sidewalks, smarter land use that better mixes places to shop, live, and work, and continued teleworking (which spiked during the COVID pandemic).

To be clear, adopting a VMT reduction target is important but is not sufficient by itself. States must complement targets with serious strategies, policies, and investments to actually deliver the energy savings and emissions reductions that

come with reduced VMT. Still, planning for reductions in VMT is a key first step. Accordingly, the 17 states with a *quantified goal or projection for reducing VMT* received credit. For example:

- Maine’s climate action plan sets out the goal of a 10 percent reduction in light-duty VMT by 2025, a 20 percent reduction by 2030, and a 4 percent reduction for heavy-duty VMT by 2030.
- Maryland’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Act (GGRA) Plan sets a goal of reducing statewide GHG emissions by 40 percent from 2006 levels by 2030 and includes projections for reduced VMT stemming from the plan’s strategies. (Maryland’s Climate Solutions Act of 2022 updated the GGRA by establishing a goal of reducing statewide GHG emissions 60 percent by 2031.)
- New Mexico DOT’s 2045 long-range transportation plan references the New Mexico Climate Strategy’s recommendation for reducing VMT per capita to 15 percent below 2015 levels by 2027.
- North Carolina DOT conducted a VMT reduction study that identified strategies to reduce VMT and modeled the effects of these strategies in key metro areas. North Carolina’s Deep Decarbonization Pathway Analysis also includes VMT reductions (1.2 percent below 2018 levels by 2040) in its modeling scenarios.

## Smart Growth Policies

The Smart Growth Network—a national coalition of groups (including NRDC) founded in 1996 in part by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency—defines smart growth as underpinned by 10 principles, most of which are about directing development so that it is relatively compact, walkable, adjacent to or within existing communities, and protective of open spaces and natural resources.<sup>20</sup> Smart growth policies protect natural resources from sprawling development and yield communities with characteristics that numerous studies show to be associated with lower VMT per capita.<sup>21</sup> To address important equity needs, these principles can be paired with effective policies that reduce displacement.

Building on these principles, this scorecard gives credit to states that strive to avoid sprawling development with a *policy that identifies particular areas or districts for growth and provides incentives for focusing development there*.

Many states have other policies that could promote smart growth, including local comprehensive planning statutes and support for infill development. States also have some useful tools that could be used to support smart growth; North Dakota, for instance, has a New Development Calculator that allows elected officials, other decision makers, or interested residents to gauge the fiscal impact of potential new development.<sup>22</sup> Only 17 states, however, received credit in this scorecard for identifying specific areas for growth and providing incentives to focus development there. For example:

- Connecticut updates its statewide conservation and development plan every 5 years and requires its municipal and regional governments to update their plans every 10 years. These plans are encouraged by statute to promote compact, transit-accessible, pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use development patterns and land reuse, and the state plan must incorporate statutorily defined Principles of Smart Growth. Additionally, the plan (as required by statute) designates growth boundaries for “priority funding areas” and prohibits all state agencies, departments, and institutions from providing funding for development outside these priority areas.
- Rhode Island has made efforts to limit urban sprawl, most notably with its State Land Use Policies and Plan from 2006. One of the key strategies in the plan is to contain sprawl by limiting growth outside the urban services boundary or approved growth centers. The plan incorporates a number of recommendations and policies to discourage urban sprawl and is based on the premise that the rate of land consumption in the state was not sustainable. The plan complements Rhode Island’s Comprehensive Planning and Land Use Act. In addition, the Division of Statewide Planning’s Land Use Unit provides grants and technical assistance on issues affecting transportation and land use planning, including the establishment of growth centers.
- Minnesota has statutory provisions focused on constraining urban sprawl and investing in “livable” communities. For example, the Livable Communities Act provides incentives for “compact and efficient development” in the Twin Cities area.

## Encouraging Affordable Housing Near Transit

The federal Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program requires each state agency that allocates tax credits (usually a housing finance agency) to have a Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP). The QAP sets out the state’s eligibility priorities and specifies the criteria it will use to select projects competing for federal tax credits. For the purposes of this scorecard, NRDC focused on how each state used its QAP to encourage development of affordable housing in proximity to public transportation.



© Tony Anderson/Getty Images





States received full credit if their QAP provided *points for LIHTC applications that develop affordable housing near transit*. Almost all states received full credit, the exceptions being Alabama, Alaska, Kentucky, Nebraska, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Wyoming.

### Pedestrian/Bicyclist Safety

For decades most American roads have been designed to prioritize the fastest possible movement of vehicles, leaving road users both inside and outside of vehicles at risk. The number of pedestrian injuries and fatalities in the United States is currently the highest it has been in more than a decade, and Black and Native American pedestrians have been disproportionately impacted.<sup>23</sup> It has never been more important to emphasize the safety of everyone on the roads. If people do not feel safe when walking or biking, they are less likely to pursue those transportation options.

U.S. DOT has adopted a Safe System Approach as the guiding paradigm to address roadway safety and promotes this approach for states and regions.<sup>24</sup> This holistic and comprehensive approach has been embraced by the transportation community as an effective way to address and mitigate the risks inherent in an enormous and complex transportation system. It works by building and reinforcing multiple layers of protection to both prevent collisions from happening and minimize the harm caused when they do occur. The BIL offers billions of dollars to improve safety on America's roads, through both formula programs like

the Highway Safety Improvement Program and competitive programs like Safe Streets and Roads for All. For some of these programs, U.S. DOT is encouraging projects that will contribute to a Safe System Approach.

It is important to understand what the safety situation currently looks like in states as the BIL funding starts to flow. States are required to report to U.S. DOT on a range of highway safety metrics, including five-year averages of nonmotorized fatalities and serious injuries. In this scorecard, states received credit based on their *nonmotorized serious injuries/fatalities per 100,000 population (five-year average)*. The state with the lowest ratio (i.e., the safest) was New Hampshire (3.32), while the state with the highest ratio was Florida (15.06).

### SYSTEM MAINTENANCE

#### Spending for Road Repair and Maintenance

America has millions of miles of roadways that must be maintained and upgraded to remain in usable condition, and there is currently a backlog of repair needs totaling more than half a trillion dollars.<sup>25</sup> There are many environmental, economic, and equity benefits to limiting roadway expansion and investing in better maintenance, repair, and operations of current roads. Improving the quality of the roads that vehicles drive on reduces the wear and tear on vehicles, as well as the amount of emissions they create.<sup>26</sup> By contrast, the expansion of roadways allows more vehicles on the roads



and causes a significant increase in emissions. In addition, states have historically built and expanded highways in ways that have displaced minority communities and led to harmful health impacts on environmental justice communities through increased air pollution.

In this scorecard, states were evaluated on the basis of their *spending of federal highway dollars on maintenance, repairs, and operations, compared with total state spending of federal funds on highways (three-year average)*. Spending ratios, of course, show only so much, and there are states with high ratios that still spend huge sums of money on roadway expansion. Still, the states with the highest ratios received the most points, and those with lower ratios received proportionally fewer points. With the highest non-expansion spending ratio (99.3 percent), Rhode Island received full points. Other states directing more than 90 percent of federal highway dollars to non-expansion work were California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, and Vermont. Arizona and North Carolina had the lowest ratios (36.1 percent and 36.8 percent, respectively) and received the fewest points.

## PROCUREMENT

### Buy Clean: Environmental Product Declarations

Greenhouse gas emissions attributable to the transportation sector do not come only from vehicles combusting fuels. Significant emissions also occur across the life cycle of materials used in transportation projects. For construction materials such as cement and steel, these emissions—referred to as embodied emissions—occur mainly during their production. The most common way of reporting data on a product’s embodied emissions is through an environmental product declaration (EPD), which provides quantified information on environmental impacts and use of resources. EPDs can help buyers identify materials that have lower carbon footprints.

State governments are among the largest buyers of materials such as cement and steel and thus can play a major role in reducing the substantial emissions associated with the cement and other materials that go into the transportation projects they fund and build. States have only recently begun to use their procurement power to accelerate the deployment of lower-carbon materials through clean public procurement (“Buy Clean”) policies.

Some states, such as Arizona, Maryland, and Washington, are considering or beginning the process of evaluating, studying, or piloting the use of EPDs.<sup>27</sup> A few others, such as Massachusetts and Minnesota, have executive orders or plans that generally encourage evaluating strategies and opportunities to reduce embodied carbon in building materials.<sup>28</sup> However, only a handful of states—California, Colorado, New Jersey, New York, and Oregon—*require or encourage EPDs for commonly used construction materials*

*in transportation projects*, and those are the states that received credit in this scorecard. (Oregon’s EPD requirement may not kick in until the end of 2025, but the requirement is in statute, so the state was given credit.)

### Buy Clean: Carbon Intensity of Construction Materials

Beyond requiring or encouraging disclosure of embodied emissions data, states can use that sort of data to set embodied emissions limits on the concrete, steel, or other materials they procure. This is a relatively nascent area of procurement policy, and only a few states have adopted a *carbon intensity ceiling for commonly used construction materials in transportation projects*. California, Colorado, and New Jersey have either set or required the setting of maximum carbon intensity limits for certain materials. New York’s specifications for lower-carbon concrete do not specify a limit per se but do set a sort of carbon intensity ceiling by reducing the amount of cement in concrete, including by setting concrete content limits and by requiring a minimum percentage of supplementary cementitious materials. These four states are the only ones receiving credit in the scorecard for instituting a carbon intensity ceiling.

It can be difficult to assess which state approaches should be considered equivalent to a carbon intensity ceiling. Many states have made decisions about using particular types of materials—such as warm-mix asphalt, Portland limestone cement, and materials with recycled or reclaimed content—and Hawaii has decided to use carbon-injected concrete.<sup>29</sup> All of these have the effect of lowering embodied emissions compared with conventional materials. While these alternative materials may be beneficial, in NRDC’s judgment, only New York’s approach was sufficiently analogous to a meaningful carbon intensity ceiling to receive credit in this scorecard.

### Achievement of Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Goal

To help ensure that federal transportation investments advance equity goals during project construction and delivery, states are required to establish goals for contracting with disadvantaged business enterprises (DBEs) on federally funded transportation projects. DBEs are defined as small businesses owned and operated by members of certain racial minority groups or women.<sup>30</sup> States establish goals based on the source of funding (i.e., whether it comes from the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, or the Federal Aviation Administration), the number of qualified DBEs in the state compared with the total number of qualified firms, and expected levels of DBE participation absent any discrimination.<sup>31</sup> States report annually to the U.S. DOT on their progress in meeting their goals. This scorecard gives credit to the 20 states that *met their goals for DBE contracting with regard to FHWA funding* (the largest portion of federal transportation funding states receive) in federal fiscal year 2022.



## Minority-Owned/Women-Owned Business Targets

DBE requirements apply only to federally supported projects, so some states have adopted similar equity-focused contracting requirements for state-funded projects. This scorecard gives credit to states that have *either contracting targets or bid preferences for minority- or women-owned businesses on state-funded transportation projects*. In most cases, these policies apply broadly to all state-funded projects and are not limited to transportation. While a number of states offer education, training, or other support to minority- and women-owned small businesses to assist them in bidding on state contracts, only states with requirements specific to the procurement process itself (i.e., contracting targets and bid preferences) received credit. For example:

- Illinois law sets a goal for at least 30 percent of the total dollar amount of state contracts to be awarded to businesses owned by minorities, women, and persons with

disabilities. That goal is further broken down to aim for at least 16 percent of contracts to be awarded to businesses owned by minorities, at least 10 percent to be awarded to women-owned businesses, and at least 4 percent to be awarded to businesses owned by persons with disabilities.

- Maryland has a Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) program for state-funded contracts. Under the program, state agencies must structure their procurements so that at least 29 percent of the total dollar value of procurement contracts are given to MBE contractors.
- Missouri requires all state agencies to aim to procure 10 percent of goods and services from MBEs and 10 percent from women-owned business enterprises (WBEs). Additionally, vendors certified as MBEs or WBEs may receive additional points toward their bid score if bidding on state contracts.



© Adrian Verdugo/Seattle DOT



# THE NEED FOR IMPROVED DATA AVAILABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

---

Members of the public deserve to know what their states are doing to promote climate solutions and equitable outcomes in the transportation sector. States should endeavor to make this information available in a user-friendly, timely fashion.

As previously noted, and as described in more detail in Appendix A and Appendix B, the data for this scorecard were derived from federal and other databases and from information available on state websites. While these sources allowed NRDC and DGA to assemble a robust scorecard of states' transportation-related activities relevant to equity and climate, it is worth noting some of the specific data challenges and ways they could be addressed.

On the quantitative side, challenges exist with regard to timeliness, consistency, and availability of data. At the time research began in the fall of 2022, several of the quantitative databases included information only through 2020, making it difficult to track more recent spending and other trends. The National Transit Database is in many ways an exemplary database, given the comprehensive nature of the information it tracks, but more timely updates of its annual data sets would enable researchers to better understand and analyze current conditions. The same holds true for the Highway Statistics database maintained by FHWA and data sets of other federal agencies.

In some cases, clearer guidance from U.S. DOT would be helpful in ensuring that data are reported consistently across states. For example, states are not required to use a common methodology in reporting the amount they spend on bicycle and pedestrian projects, thus making it difficult to understand relative spending in different states. Greater consistency, spurred by additional guidance from U.S. DOT, could help researchers and the public make cross-state comparisons with greater confidence.

U.S. DOT should also make more of the transportation data it collects available to the public. The agency has made strides in this regard in recent years, such as with the Performance Dashboard that summarizes and tracks state performance on national performance metrics.<sup>32</sup> More could be done, however, to help the public better understand the outcomes achieved with federal funding.

As for the qualitative metrics, data-gathering for this report required extensive review of state websites to determine the existence of state policies, programs, and goals. While a great deal of useful information was contained on the websites of the various agencies in each state, relevant information was not always easy to locate. In some cases, web pages did not appear to have been updated in several years. Statewide targets, goals, and programs involving state DOTs sometimes did not appear on the state DOT websites. Documents and plans that should be publicly available were sometimes missing from state websites, even when referred to by other state documents. Documents that could serve as useful repositories of information related to state transportation spending and priorities, such as State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) plans, were sometimes complex and opaque—and every state does its STIP in its own way, with its own timing, and with different structures, categories, and information.

The BIL will provide a historic level of federal transportation funding to states. Although the law was enacted in November 2021 and hundreds of billions have already been allocated to states and localities, detailed data about the use of most of those funds were not yet available when the research for this report was being conducted. In part, this stems from the fact that the bulk of the transportation dollars flow to states through formula programs, which states then apply to projects they choose over several years. In other words, there is a certain amount of lag time between the award of BIL funds and their ultimate use. This challenge is often exacerbated by delays in updating federal databases that track these expenditures. Still, given the scale of the funding and the opportunities for progress on climate, equity, and other goals, enhanced transparency by states and the federal government is imperative. NRDC intends to report in future scorecards on states' use of BIL funding.



# CONCLUSION

---

States, and in particular state DOTs, will be the primary decision makers on how to spend the hundreds of billions of dollars in transportation funding provided by the BIL. As this scorecard has demonstrated, the landscape into which these funds will be invested is decidedly mixed. While some states have already adopted policies and programs conducive to meeting equity and climate goals, other states must rapidly realign their priorities in order to achieve these outcomes. Even the states currently leading the pack, while they are to be commended for their actions thus far, have areas in need of improvement.

Fortunately, the federal dollars now available can be directed toward these areas. Both the BIL and the IRA contain funding for redressing past inequities in transportation and providing cleaner, more sustainable options going forward. Even the grant programs not specifically directed toward these purposes are typically flexible enough that states can choose to use them for these types of activities. All states, whether they placed high or low on this scorecard, can reshape their transportation landscapes with smart choices about allocating new federal funds.

NRDC and DGA encourage all states to use this scorecard to help inform future policy and investment decisions.

# APPENDIX A: DETAILED METHODOLOGY

---

This appendix describes the sources used for the quantitative metrics in the scorecard, as well as a description of the points system.

## EV Charging Ports

The data for publicly available Level 2 and DC Fast Chargers (DCFC) per 1,000 residents were derived from the following sources:

- Atlas EV Hub, State Summary and Passenger EV Metrics  
<https://www.atlasevhub.com/materials/state-policy-dashboard/>
  - The Atlas State Policy Dashboard calculated charging per 1,000 residents on the basis of charging location information from the [U.S. Department of Energy](#)'s Alternative Fuels Data Center and population demographics from the [U.S. Census Bureau](#).

Based on their ratios for Level 2 charging ports per 1,000 residents and DCFC ports per 1,000 residents, the highest-scoring state for each type of charger received full points, and other states' scores were divided by the highest score to determine the percentage of points they received.

## State Spending on Transit Per Capita

The data for this metric were derived from the following sources:

- National Transit Database (NTD), Funding Sources Table (2020, 2019, and 2018)  
<https://www.transit.dot.gov/ntd/data-product/2020-funding-sources>  
<https://www.transit.dot.gov/ntd/data-product/2019-funding-sources>  
<https://www.transit.dot.gov/ntd/data-product/2018-funding-sources>
- U.S. Census Bureau, Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for the Nation and States  
<https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/technical-documentation/research/evaluation-estimates/2020-evaluation-estimates/2010s-state-total.html>

The NTD provides data on state contributions to transit agencies within their state for both operational and capital purposes. These were combined to produce a total for state spending on transit in each year. Yearly totals were then added together and divided by 3 to produce a three-year average. A three-year average was also produced for the state population estimates using demographics data for the same years. Finally, the averages for state spending were divided by the state's total population average to create the final ratio for ranking. The state with the highest spending on transit per capita received full points, and other states' spending levels per capita were divided by the highest state's to determine the percentage of points they received.

## Federal Funding Flexed to Transit and Bicycle/Pedestrian Spending

This metric evaluated state spending of federal dollars on transit and bike/pedestrian projects relative to its spending on highways. The data were derived from the following sources:

- U.S. DOT's FHWA, Table FMISL18A-1 Transactions by Date. *Provided by U.S. DOT's Federal Management Information System. Includes state-by-state records of all flexible funding transfers, recipients, and amounts.*
- U.S. DOT's FHWA, Bike/Ped Obligations by State Table  
[https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/funding/bipedfund.cfm](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/funding/bipedfund.cfm)
- U.S. DOT's FHWA, Highway Statistics Tables SF-12A (2020, 2019, 2018)  
<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/statistics/2020/sf12a.cfm>  
<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/statistics/2019/sf12a.cfm>  
<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/statistics/2018/sf12a.cfm>

For all three data sources, three-year averages for the years 2018–2020 were produced for each state. Then the average amount of money flexed to transit and the average bike/pedestrian obligations for each state were combined to produce the numerator for this ratio. This was divided by the states' average highway spending to produce the final ratio for comparison. The state with the highest ratio received full points, and other states' spending ratios were divided by the highest state's to determine the percentage of points they received.

## Pedestrian/Bicyclist Safety

The data for the nonmotorized serious injuries/fatalities per 100,000 population were based on the following sources:

- U.S. DOT's FHWA, Performance Dashboard and Reports  
<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/reporting/state/index.cfm>
- U.S. Census Bureau, Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for the Nation and States  
<https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/technical-documentation/research/evaluation-estimates/2020-evaluation-estimates/2010s-state-total.html>

States received points based on a five-year average of nonmotorized serious injuries/fatalities per 100,000 residents. The state with the best ratio (lowest) received full points, and all other states received a proportion of the total points available based on how their ratios compared to the best state's ratio.

## Spending for Road Repair and Maintenance

The data for the metric related to spending for road repair, maintenance, and other needs apart from roadway expansion were based on the following sources:

- U.S. DOT's FHWA, Highway Statistics Tables SF-12A (2020, 2019, 2018)  
<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/statistics/2020/sf12a.cfm>  
<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/statistics/2019/sf12a.cfm>  
<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/statistics/2018/sf12a.cfm>

Three-year averages for state-by-state spending on road repair and preservation and road expansion were calculated for 2018–2020. FHWA reports these expenditures under the category of highway capital spending and maintenance, a subset of total state spending on highways. The data do not include expenditures for roads functionally classified as local.

State highway spending was classified as either roadway expansion, roadway repair, or other capital expenditures, as follows:

- Roadway expansion: spending in FHWA-defined categories including Right of Way, New Construction, Reconstruction—Added Capacity, Major Widening, and New Bridge;
- Roadway repair: spending in FHWA-defined categories including Reconstruction—No Added Capacity, Minor Widening, Restoration and Rehabilitation, and Resurfacing; and
- Other capital expenditures: including spending on safety, engineering, traffic operations, and environmental enhancements.

To produce the ratios for state rankings, the non-roadway-expansion spending (roadway repair and other capital expenditures) was compared with the total spending amount. The state with the highest ratio for non-roadway-expansion spending received full points. Other states received a proportion of the total points available based on how their ratios compared to the highest state's ratio.

## Achievement of DBE Goals

The data on state DBE performance were based on the following source:

U.S. DOT's FHWA, 2022 *National Uniform Report*, provided directly to NRDC by FHWA's Office of Public Affairs

The *National Uniform Report* calculates whether a state has met its DBE performance goal for each fiscal year. States that met their DBE goals in FY22 received full points, and states that did not meet their goal in FY22 received no points.

## Scoring for Other Metrics

All other metrics in the scorecard were qualitative and received one of the following point allocations based on an assessment of their relevant programs and policies:

- **Full credit:** The state clearly and completely meets the evaluation criteria for the metric and receives full points available.
- **Half credit:** The state meets only a portion of the criteria for the metric and receives half of the available points.
- **No credit:** The state does not meet any portion of the criteria and receives zero points.

The descriptions of each metric in the body of the report provide details on the associated evaluation criteria. Appendix B provides a full list of the policies and programs in each state that formed the basis for receiving credit for each qualitative metric.

## Ranking of States

States were ranked according to the total number of points they received out of 100 possible points. As noted in the body of the report, two states, Hawaii and North Dakota, are ineligible under the Clean Air Act to adopt the Advanced Clean Cars rules and the Advanced Clean Trucks rule, as their State Implementation Plans do not have provisions adopted under Part D of Title I of the Clean Air Act. Accordingly, these metrics (and their 12 combined possible points) were removed from consideration in determining the rankings for these states. Rather than ranking these states on the basis of 100 possible points, these states were ranked according to the percentage of the remaining 88 points that they received.



# APPENDIX B: LIST OF POLICIES FOR WHICH STATES RECEIVED CREDIT

The table below lists the policies and programs for which states received credit in the scorecard’s qualitative metrics.

| STATE      | POLICIES  |
|------------|---|
| Alabama    | <b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">State Management Plan: Federal Transit Administration Programs</a> ; <a href="#">FY 2022 Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program Guidelines</a>  |
| Alaska     | <b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Alaska State Transportation Planning Regulations, 17 Alaska Administrative Code 05.175(d)</a>  |
| Arizona    | <b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2022 and 2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a>   |
| Arkansas   | <b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a><br><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">Arkansas Code § 15-4-302</a>  |
| California | <b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Executive Order B-16-2012</a> ;<br><a href="#">Low Carbon Fuel Standard</a> ; <a href="#">CARB SB 375 Regional Targets</a><br><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan 2021</a><br><b>Compensation for Community Participation:</b> <a href="#">Public Participation Plan</a><br><b>EV Rebate for Low-Income Buyers:</b> <a href="#">Clean Cars for All</a> ;<br><a href="#">Clean Vehicle Assistance Program</a><br><b>Used EV Rebate:</b> <a href="#">Clean Cars for All</a> ;<br><a href="#">Clean Vehicle Assistance Program</a><br><b>Advanced Clean Cars Rules:</b> <a href="#">13 California Code of Regulations §§1962.4; 1962.2</a><br><b>Advanced Clean Trucks Rule:</b> <a href="#">Advanced Clean Trucks Regulation</a><br><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">2022 Scoping Plan</a><br><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">SB375 (2008)</a> ; <a href="#">California Government Code § 65041.1</a> ;<br><a href="#">California Government Code §§ 66200 et seq</a> ;<br><a href="#">Infill Infrastructure Grant Program</a><br><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">4 California Code of Regulations §§ 10300 et seq.</a><br><b>Environmental Product Declarations:</b> <a href="#">California Public Contract Code § 3503</a><br><b>Carbon Intensity Ceiling:</b> <a href="#">California Public Contract Code § 3502</a> ;<br><a href="#">Buy Clean California Act: GWP Limits</a><br><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">California Public Contract Code § 10115 et seq.</a> ;<br><a href="#">Office of Small Business and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise Services (OSDS) website</a> ;<br><a href="#">California Government Code § 14110</a> |

| STATE       | POLICIES   |
|-------------|--|
| Colorado    | <p><b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Greenhouse Gas Pollution Reduction Roadmap</a>;<br/><a href="#">2 Code of Colorado Regulations 60I-22-8.00</a></p> <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan</a>;<br/><a href="#">Strategic Transit Project Selection Process</a></p> <p><b>Compensation for Community Participation:</b> <a href="#">A Guide to the Transportation Planning and Programming Public Involvement Process</a></p> <p><b>Advanced Clean Cars Rules:</b> <a href="#">Regulation Number 20 Colorado Low Emission Automobile Regulation (5 Code of Colorado Regulations 100I-24)</a></p> <p><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">FY2022-2023 Performance Plan</a>;<br/><a href="#">FY2021 Performance Plan</a></p> <p><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">HB 22-1304 (2022)</a><br/><a href="#">(Infrastructure &amp; Strong Communities program)</a>;<br/><a href="#">Colorado Revised Statutes §§ 24-32-3201 et seq.</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">Qualified Allocation Plan 2023 to 2024</a></p> <p><b>Environmental Product Declarations:</b> <a href="#">Colorado Revised Statutes §§ 24-92-117, 24-92-118</a>;<br/><a href="#">CDOT Environmental Product Declarations (EPD) website</a></p> <p><b>Carbon Intensity Ceiling:</b> <a href="#">Colorado Revised Statutes §§ 24-92-117, 24-92-118</a>;<br/><a href="#">CDOT Field Materials Manual 2023, Appendix O</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">2 Code of Colorado Regulations 604-I-1.2, 4.4</a>;<br/><a href="#">CDOT Emerging Small Business program</a></p> |
| Connecticut | <p><b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">2018 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory</a>;<br/><a href="#">Governor’s Council on Climate Change 2018 Recommendations report</a></p> <p><b>Compensation for Community Participation:</b> <a href="#">Public Involvement Procedures 2020</a></p> <p><b>EV Rebate for Low-Income Buyers:</b> <a href="#">Connecticut Hydrogen and Electric Automobile Purchase Rebate (CHEAPR)</a></p> <p><b>Used EV Rebate:</b> <a href="#">Connecticut Hydrogen and Electric Automobile Purchase Rebate (CHEAPR)</a></p> <p><b>Advanced Clean Cars Rules:</b> <a href="#">Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies §22a-174-36c</a></p> <p><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">2030 VMT Goal and Strategies</a></p> <p><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">Connecticut General Statutes §§ 8-23, 8-35a, 16a-27, 16a-35c, 16a-35d</a>;<br/><a href="#">Public Act 09-230 (2009)</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2022 and 2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">Connecticut General Statutes § 4a-60g</a></p>  |
| Delaware    | <p><b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Delaware’s Climate Action Plan</a></p> <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">DeIDOT Project Prioritization Criteria</a></p> <p><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Delaware’s Climate Action Plan</a></p> <p><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">Executive Order 42 (2020)</a>;<br/><a href="#">2020 Delaware Strategies for State Policies and Spending</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">Qualified Allocation Plan 2023–2024</a></p>   |
| Florida     | <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Strategic Intermodal System Policy Plan</a>;<br/><a href="#">Strategic Intermodal System Handbook</a>;<br/><a href="#">Strategic Investment Tool Highway Component</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2022 Qualified Allocation Plan</a>;<br/><a href="#">RFA 2022-20I Housing Credit Financing for Affordable Housing Developments Located in Medium and Small Counties</a>;<br/><a href="#">RFA 2022-30I Housing Credit Financing for Affordable Housing Developments Located in Duval County</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">Florida Statutes § 339.0805</a></p>   |

| STATE     | POLICIES   |
|-----------|--|
| Georgia   | <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">GDOT State Supported Funding Program (SSFP) Capital Projects Small/Veteran/Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (SVDBE) Goal website</a></p>   |
| Hawaii    | <p><b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Hawaii Greenhouse Gas Emissions Report for 2017</a></p> <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Hawaii Transportation System GHG Reduction: Challenges and Opportunities</a> (describing SmartTRAC)</p> <p><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">Hawaii Revised Statutes §§ 226-104, 226-62; Act 132 (2016) (HB 2305)</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2022/2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a></p>  |
| Idaho     | <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">Qualified Allocation Plan (2022)</a></p>  |
| Illinois  | <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Data Driven Decisions Tool</a></p> <p><b>EV Rebate for Low-Income Buyers:</b> <a href="#">Electric Vehicle Rebate Program (415 Illinois Compiled Statutes I20/)</a></p> <p><b>Used EV Rebate:</b> <a href="#">Electric Vehicle Rebate Program (415 Illinois Compiled Statute I20/)</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2022-2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">30 Illinois Compiled Statutes 575/</a></p>  |
| Indiana   | <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2023–2024 Qualified Allocation Plan</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">25 Indiana Administrative Code 5-7-3; Indiana Code 4-13-16.5-2; Report of the Governor’s Commission on Supplier Diversity to the Governor (2022); Minority and Women Business Enterprises (MBE/WBE) Program</a></p>  |
| Iowa      | <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2023—9% Qualified Allocation Plan</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">Iowa Code 73.16; Fiscal Year 2020 Targeted Small Business Legislative Services Agencies Report</a></p>   |
| Kansas    | <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a></p>  |
| Kentucky  |  |
| Louisiana | <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2022–2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a></p>   |
| Maine     | <p><b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Maine Won’t Wait climate action plan</a></p> <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Maine DOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Program</a></p> <p><b>EV Rebate for Low-Income Buyers:</b> <a href="#">Electric Vehicle Rebate</a></p> <p><b>Used EV Rebate:</b> <a href="#">Electric Vehicle Rebate</a></p> <p><b>Advanced Clean Cars Rules:</b> <a href="#">06-096 Code of Maine Regulations Ch. 127</a></p> <p><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Maine Won’t Wait climate action plan</a></p> <p><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">30-A Maine Revised Statutes Ch. 187, especially §§4326, 4349-A</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2023-2024 Qualified Allocation Plan</a></p> |



| STATE         | POLICIES   |
|---------------|--|
| Maryland      | <p><b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">2022 Annual Attainment Report on Transportation System Performance</a></p> <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Chapter 30 Transportation Project-Based Scoring Model</a></p> <p><b>Advanced Clean Cars Rules:</b> <a href="#">Code of Maryland Regulations §§26.11.34.02, 26.11.34.09</a></p> <p><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">2030 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Act Plan</a></p> <p><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">Maryland Code, State Finance and Procurement, §§ 5-7B-03, 5-7B-04</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">Qualified Allocation Plan (2022)</a>;<br/><a href="#">Multifamily Rental Financing Program Guide (2022)</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">Code of Maryland Regulations § 21.11.03.01</a>;<br/><a href="#">Maryland State Finance &amp; Procurement Code § 14-302</a>;<br/><a href="#">MDOT Small, Minority &amp; Disadvantaged Business website</a></p>  |
| Massachusetts | <p><b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Determination of Statewide Greenhouse Gas Emissions Limits and Sector-Specific Sublimits for 2025 and 2030</a> (pursuant to <a href="#">Acts (2021), Chapter 8</a>)</p> <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Recommendations for MassDOT Project Selection Criteria; 2023–2027 Capital Investment Plan, Appendix B (Expansion: Highway Division)</a></p> <p><b>Compensation for Community Participation:</b> <a href="#">Public Participation Plan</a></p> <p><b>Advanced Clean Cars Rules:</b> <a href="#">310 Code of Massachusetts Regulations 7.40</a></p> <p><b>Advanced Clean Trucks Rule:</b> <a href="#">310 Code of Massachusetts Regulations 7.40</a></p> <p><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Massachusetts Clean Energy and Climate Plan for 2020</a></p> <p><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 40R, Chapter 10 Section 35AA</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2022–2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">Commonwealth of Massachusetts Diverse and Small Business Program Policies for Goods and Services Procurements (2021)</a>;<br/><a href="#">Supplier Diversity Office (SDO) website</a>;<br/><a href="#">Supplier Diversity Office Comprehensive Annual Report Fiscal Year 2021</a></p> |
| Michigan      | <p><b>Compensation for Community Participation:</b> <a href="#">Environmental Justice Guidance for Michigan Transportation Plans, Programs and Activities</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2022–2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a>;<br/><a href="#">2022–2023 LIHTC Scoring Criteria</a></p>   |
| Minnesota     | <p><b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan</a></p> <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Guide to MnDOT Highway Project Selection</a>; <a href="#">Guide to MnDOT Capital Project Selection</a></p> <p><b>Compensation for Community Participation:</b> <a href="#">Public Engagement Guidance</a></p> <p><b>Advanced Clean Cars Rules:</b> <a href="#">Minnesota Administrative Rules §§7023.0150, 7023.0300</a></p> <p><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan</a></p> <p><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">Minnesota Statutes §§ 473.25 et seq.</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2022–2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a>;<br/><a href="#">2022–2023 Self-Scoring Worksheet</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">Minnesota Statutes §§ 16C.16, 16I.32</a>;<br/><a href="#">MnDOT Small business program information website</a>;<br/><a href="#">Office of Equity in Procurement, Diverse Spend website</a></p>  |
| Mississippi   | <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">Qualified Allocation Plan (2023)</a></p>  |
| Missouri      | <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">Qualified Allocation Plan (2022)</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">Missouri Code of State Regulations 10-17.050</a>;<br/><a href="#">Executive Order 15-06</a></p>   |

| STATE         | POLICIES   |
|---------------|--|
| Montana       | <b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a>   |
| Nebraska      |  |
| Nevada        | <b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Nevada Statewide Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Projections, 1990–2041</a><br><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Implementing Transportation Projects (One Nevada Process)</a><br><b>Advanced Clean Cars Rules:</b> <a href="#">Nevada Administrative Code §§445B.780 et seq.</a><br><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">Qualified Allocation Plan (2023)</a>  |
| New Hampshire | <b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">Qualified Allocation Plan (2023–2024)</a>  |
| New Jersey    | <b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">New Jersey’s Global Warming Response Act 80x50 Report</a><br><b>Advanced Clean Cars Rules:</b> <a href="#">New Jersey Administrative Code 7:27-29</a><br><b>Advanced Clean Truck Rule:</b> <a href="#">New Jersey Administrative Code 7:27-31 and 33</a><br><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">New Jersey’s Global Warming Response Act 80x50 Report</a><br><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">New Jersey Statutes §§ 27:1E-1 and 27:1E-2;</a><br><a href="#">Transit Village Initiative</a><br><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">Qualified Allocation Plan (2019–2020)</a><br><b>Environmental Product Declarations:</b> <a href="#">P.L. 2023, Chapter 4;</a><br><a href="#">P.L. 2021, Chapter 278</a><br><b>Carbon Intensity Ceiling:</b> <a href="#">P.L. 2023, Chapter 4;</a><br><a href="#">P.L. 2021, Chapter 278</a>  |
| New Mexico    | <b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">New Mexico Interagency Climate Change Task Force 2021 Progress &amp; Recommendations report</a><br><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">New Mexico Prioritized Statewide Bicycle Network Plan;</a><br><a href="#">Transportation Alternatives and Recreational Trails—Motorized Program Guide</a><br><b>Compensation for Community Participation:</b> <a href="#">Public Involvement Plan</a><br><b>Advanced Clean Cars Rules:</b> <a href="#">New Mexico Administrative Code §20.2.91.108</a><br><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">New Mexico 2045 Plan;</a><br><a href="#">New Mexico Climate Strategy</a><br><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">Qualified Allocation Plan (2021)</a>   |
| New York      | <b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Pathways to Deep Decarbonization in New York State</a><br><b>Advanced Clean Cars Rules:</b> <a href="#">6 New York Codes, Rules and Regulations Part 218 and Section 200.9</a><br><b>Advanced Clean Trucks Rule:</b> <a href="#">6 New York Codes, Rules and Regulations Part 218 and Section 200.9</a><br><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Climate Action Council Scoping Plan (and Appendix G);</a><br><a href="#">Pathways to Deep Decarbonization in New York State</a><br><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">Consolidated Laws of New York Chapter 43-B Article 6</a><br><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">Qualified Allocation Plan (2021)</a><br><b>Environmental Product Declarations:</b> <a href="#">Executive Order 22 (2022);</a><br><a href="#">GreenNY Specification: Lower Carbon Concrete;</a><br><a href="#">S542A (2021)</a><br><b>Carbon Intensity Ceiling:</b> <a href="#">GreenNY Specification: Lower Carbon Concrete</a><br><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">Setting Minority and Women Owned Business Enterprise (M/WBE) Goals on Non-Federal-Aid Construction Contracts;</a><br><a href="#">NYSDOT Minority and Women Owned Business Enterprises Program website</a> |

| STATE          | POLICIES  |
|----------------|---|
| North Carolina | <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Prioritization Resources</a>;<br/> <a href="#">Prioritization 6.0 Scoring Criteria, Weights, and Normalization for All Modes</a></p> <p><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">VMT Reduction Study</a>;<br/> <a href="#">North Carolina Deep Decarbonization Pathways Analysis</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">NCDOT Utilization Goals for Disadvantaged Minority &amp; Woman-Owned Programs website</a></p>  |
| North Dakota   | <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Transportation Alternatives (TA) Project Selection Criteria</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2022 Allocation Plan</a>;<br/> <a href="#">Multifamily Housing Programs Application, Exhibit E (Green Communities Criteria)</a></p>  |
| Ohio           | <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">HSIP Formal Safety Application</a>;<br/> <a href="#">HSIP Systemic Safety Funding Application Process</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2022–2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">ODOT Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) website</a>;<br/> <a href="#">ODOT Encouraging Diversity, Growth &amp; Equity (EDGE) website</a></p>  |
| Oklahoma       | <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Transportation Alternatives Program Guidance &amp; Application Packet</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a></p>   |
| Oregon         | <p><b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Oregon Administrative Rules 340-253-0000 (Oregon Clean Fuels Program)</a></p> <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund Program Guidebook</a>;<br/> <a href="#">Factors and Evaluation Criteria: Oregon State Rail Plan</a></p> <p><b>EV Rebate for Low-Income Buyers:</b> <a href="#">Oregon Clean Vehicle Rebate Program</a></p> <p><b>Used EV Rebate:</b> <a href="#">Oregon Clean Vehicle Rebate Program</a></p> <p><b>Advanced Clean Cars Rules:</b> <a href="#">Oregon Administrative Rules 340-257-0010 et seq.</a></p> <p><b>Advanced Clean Trucks Rule:</b> <a href="#">Oregon Administrative Rules 340-257-0010 et seq.</a></p> <p><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">U.S. Climate Alliance High-Impact Actions</a></p> <p><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">Oregon Administrative Rules 660-015-0000 et seq. (Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines)</a>,<br/> <a href="#">660-024-0000 et seq.</a>;<br/> <a href="#">Transportation and Growth Management Program</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">Qualified Allocation Plan (2022)</a></p> <p><b>Environmental Product Declarations:</b> <a href="#">HB 4139 (Chapter 74, 2022 Laws)</a></p> |
| Pennsylvania   | <p><b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Pennsylvania Climate Action Plan 2021</a></p> <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program: Guidance and Procedures</a></p> <p><b>EV Rebate for Low-Income Buyers:</b> <a href="#">Alternative Fuel Vehicle Rebate Program</a></p> <p><b>Used EV Rebate:</b> <a href="#">Alternative Fuel Vehicle Rebate Program</a></p> <p><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Pennsylvania Climate Action Plan 2021</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">Allocation Plan for 2022</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">Increasing Opportunities for Small, Diverse, and Veteran-Owned Businesses (2019)</a></p>   |



| STATE          | POLICIES  |
|----------------|---|
| Rhode Island   | <p><b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Energy 2035: Rhode Island State Energy Plan</a></p> <p><b>Compensation for Community Participation:</b> <a href="#">Public Participation Plan</a></p> <p><b>EV Rebate for Low-Income Buyers:</b> <a href="#">DRIVE+</a></p> <p><b>Used EV Rebate:</b> <a href="#">DRIVE+</a></p> <p><b>Advanced Clean Cars Rules:</b> <a href="#">250 Rhode Island Code of Regulations I20-05-37</a></p> <p><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Energy 2035: Rhode Island State Energy Plan</a>;<br/><a href="#">Rhode Island Moving Forward: Long-Range Transportation Plan</a></p> <p><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">Land Use 2025: Rhode Island State Land Use Policies and Plan (2006)</a>;<br/><a href="#">Rhode Island General Laws §§ 45-22.2-1 et seq.</a>;<br/><a href="#">Division of Statewide Planning website on Growth Centers</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">Rhode Island General Laws § 37-14.1-6</a>;<br/><a href="#">220 Rhode Island Code of Regulations 80-10-2</a></p> |
| South Carolina | <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">South Carolina Code of Laws § 11-35-5240</a>;<br/><a href="#">SCDOT MBE Utilization Plan (2021-2022)</a></p>   |
| South Dakota   | <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2022–2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a></p>  |
| Tennessee      | <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">FY2021 Transportation Alternatives Program Instruction Booklet</a>;<br/><a href="#">Multimodal Access Grant</a></p> <p><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">Tennessee Code §§ 6-58-101 et seq. (Public Chapter 1101)</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">Governor’s Office of Diversity Business Enterprise Annual Report (2022)</a></p>  |
| Texas          | <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program: 2023 Call for Projects Program Guide</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2023 Qualified Allocation Plan</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">Texas Administrative Code §20.284</a>;<br/><a href="#">Texas Transportation Code §201.702</a>;<br/><a href="#">TxDOT 2023-2027 Strategic Plan</a></p>  |
| Utah           | <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">New Transportation Capacity Project Prioritization Process</a>;<br/><a href="#">UDOT Project Prioritization</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2022–2023 Allocation Plan</a></p>  |
| Vermont        | <p><b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">2022 Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan</a></p> <p><b>EV Rebate for Low-Income Buyers:</b> <a href="#">Incentives for New Electric Vehicles</a></p> <p><b>Used EV Rebate:</b> <a href="#">MileageSmart Used Electric Vehicle Incentive Program</a></p> <p><b>Advanced Clean Cars Rules:</b> <a href="#">Code of Vermont Rules I2-030-09</a></p> <p><b>Advanced Clean Trucks Rule:</b> <a href="#">Code of Vermont Rules I2-030-09</a></p> <p><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">2016 Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan</a>;<br/><a href="#">2022 Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan</a></p> <p><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">Act 183 (2006)</a>;<br/><a href="#">Act 200 (24 Vermont Statutes Annotated § 4302)</a>;<br/><a href="#">Act 250 (10 Vermont Statutes Annotated Chapter 151)</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">Qualified Allocation Plan (2022)</a></p>  |

| STATE         | POLICIES   |
|---------------|--|
| Virginia      | <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">SMART SCALE</a></p> <p><b>Advanced Clean Cars Rules:</b> <a href="#">9 Virginia Administrative Code 5-95; Code of Virginia §10.1-1307.04</a></p> <p><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">Code of Virginia §§ 15.2-2223 et seq., §33.2-353</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">Allocation Plan (2022)</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">Executive Order No. 35 (2019); Small, Women-Owned, and Minority-Owned Business website</a> (and <a href="#">FAQ</a>)</p>   |
| Washington    | <p><b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Revised Code of Washington 70A.535 (Clean Fuels Program)</a></p> <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> <a href="#">Project Scoring Criteria for NHFP Program; Pedestrian and Bicyclist Program and Safe Routes to Schools Program 2021–2023 Prioritized Project List and Program Update Document; State Buses and Bus Facilities</a></p> <p><b>Compensation for Community Participation:</b> <a href="#">Community Engagement Plan</a></p> <p><b>Used EV Rebate:</b> <a href="#">Sales and Use Tax Exemption</a></p> <p><b>Advanced Clean Cars Rules:</b> <a href="#">Washington Administrative Code §173-423-075</a></p> <p><b>Advanced Clean Trucks Rule:</b> <a href="#">Washington Administrative Code §173-423-081</a></p> <p><b>VMT Reduction Goal/Projection:</b> <a href="#">Revised Code of Washington 47.01.440</a></p> <p><b>Smart Growth Policy:</b> <a href="#">Revised Code of Washington 36.70A (Growth Management)</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">9% Competitive Housing Tax Credit Policies (2022)</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">WSDOT State Funded Contract Participation Plan Drafting Guidelines; Revised Code of Washington 39.19.030</a></p> |
| West Virginia | <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">2021 and 2022 Allocation Plan</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">West Virginia Code § 5A-3-37; West Virginia Code of State Rules § 148-22-9</a></p>   |
| Wisconsin     | <p><b>GHG Reduction Target/Projection:</b> <a href="#">State of Wisconsin Clean Energy Plan</a></p> <p><b>Project Scoring Criteria:</b> 2022–2026 Transportation Alternatives Program Guidelines (no longer available, but see, as examples, applications from the <a href="#">Town of Spring Green</a> and the <a href="#">City of Lodi</a>)</p> <p><b>Compensation for Community Participation:</b> <a href="#">Facilities Development Manual</a></p> <p><b>Qualified Allocation Plan:</b> <a href="#">Qualified Allocation Plan 2023–2024; 2023 Multifamily Application (Tab 26, Energy Efficiency &amp; Sustainability)</a></p> <p><b>State MBE Target/Preference:</b> <a href="#">Wisconsin Supplier Diversity Program website; WisDOT Supplier Diversity Program website</a></p>   |
| Wyoming       |  |

## ENDNOTES

- 1 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, Pub. L. No. 117-58, 135 Stat. 429 (2021), <https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/3684/text>.
- 2 See, e.g., White House, Executive Order on Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government, January 20, 2021, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/01/20/executive-order-advancing-racial-equity-and-support-for-underserved-communities-through-the-federal-government/>.
- 3 Georgetown Climate Center, “Issue Brief: Estimating the Greenhouse Gas Impact of Federal Infrastructure Investments in the IJJA,” December 16, 2021, <https://www.georgetownclimate.org/articles/federal-infrastructure-investment-analysis.html>.
- 4 This scorecard updates and expands on a previous set of annual scorecards that NRDC and DGA researched and published from 2008 to 2012. Those scorecards ranked states based on, among other things, their adoption of smart solutions to reduce their dependence on oil in the transportation sector, thus bolstering America’s energy security. See Deron Lovaas, “Fighting Oil Addiction,” NRDC, November 30, 2012, <https://www.nrdc.org/resources/fighting-oil-addiction>.
- 5 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Fast Facts on Transportation Greenhouse Gas Emissions,” last modified August 28, 2023, <https://www.epa.gov/greenvehicles/fast-facts-transportation-greenhouse-gas-emissions>.
- 6 Wen Qi Gan et al., “Changes in Residential Proximity to Road Traffic and the Risk of Death from Coronary Heart Disease,” *Epidemiology* 21, no. 5 (September 2010): 642-649, <https://doi.org/10.1097/ede.0b013e3181e89f19>.
- 7 Noel King, “A Brief History of How Racism Shaped Interstate Highways,” NPR, April 7, 2021, <https://www.npr.org/2021/04/07/984784455/a-brief-history-of-how-racism-shaped-interstate-highways>.
- 8 Charles Teplin et al., *The United States’ Role in Limiting Warming to 1.5°C*, RMI, April 2021, <https://rmi.org/insight/scaling-us-climate-ambitions>.
- 9 NRDC et al., “Comments in Support of FHWA’s Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to Establish a National Performance Management Measure for Assessing Performance of the National Highway System, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Measure (Docket No. FHWA-2021-004),” Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, October 13, 2022, <https://www.regulations.gov/comment/FHWA-2021-0004-39133>.
- 10 Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, “National Performance Management Measures; Assessing Performance of the National Highway System, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Measure,” 87 Fed. Reg. 42401 (July 15, 2022), <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/07/15/2022-14679/national-performance-management-measures-assessing-performance-of-the-national-highway-system>.
- 11 Iowa Department of Natural Resources, *2021 Iowa Statewide Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory Report*, 2022, <https://www.iowadnr.gov/Portals/idnr/uploads/air/ghgemissions/2021%20GHG%20REPORT.pdf>.
- 12 U.S. Department of Transportation, *FY 2022-2026 Strategic Plan*, 2022, [https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/2022-04/US\\_DOT\\_FY2022-26\\_Strategic\\_Plan.pdf](https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/2022-04/US_DOT_FY2022-26_Strategic_Plan.pdf).
- 13 U.S. Department of Transportation, *Promising Practices for Meaningful Public Involvement in Transportation Decision-Making*, October 2022, <https://www.transportation.gov/priorities/equity/promising-practices-meaningful-public-involvement-transportation-decision-making>.
- 14 Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, “National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program,” fact sheet, last modified February 10, 2022, [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/nevi\\_formula\\_program.cfm](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/nevi_formula_program.cfm).
- 15 Laura Roberson and John Paul Helveston, “Not All Subsidies Are Equal: Measuring Preferences for Electric Vehicle Financial Incentives,” *Environmental Research Letters* 17, no. 8 (2022), <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/ac7df3>.
- 16 Jen McGraw et al., *An Update on Public Transportation’s Impacts on Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, Transit Cooperative Research Program research report 226 (Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2021), <https://www.trb.org/Main/Blurbs/181941.aspx>.
- 17 TransitCenter, “How Transit Agencies Can Change Their Practices to Deliver More Equitable Service,” September 22, 2021, <https://transitcenter.org/how-transit-agencies-can-change-their-practices-to-deliver-more-equitable-service/>. This also explains how transit agencies can overcome systemic racism to become more equitable in practice and reality.
- 18 Georgetown Climate Center, “Issue Brief: Flexible Federal Funding Opportunities for State and Local Clean Transportation Investments,” February 23, 2023, <https://www.georgetownclimate.org/blog/federal-transportation-funding-flexibility.html>.
- 19 TransitCenter, “Want to Use Highway Dollars for Transit? These Places Already Do,” November 29, 2022, <https://transitcenter.org/want-to-use-highway-dollars-for-transit-these-places-already-do/>.
- 20 Smart Growth Network, “What Is Smart Growth?,” Maryland Department of Planning, March 16, 2015, <https://smartgrowth.org/what-is-smart-growth/>.
- 21 Guang Tian, “Chapter Two: Smart Growth and Travel Behavior – A Synthesis With a Focus on the United States,” *Advances in Transport Policy and Planning* 9 (2022): 9-27, <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.atpp.2021.02.005>.
- 22 State of North Dakota, “Smart Efficient Infrastructure,” accessed January 20, 2023, <https://www.nd.gov/living-nd/main-street-nd/smart-efficient-infrastructure>.
- 23 U.S. Department of Transportation, *National Roadway Safety Strategy*, January 2022, 7, 10, <https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/2022-02/USDOT-National-Roadway-Safety-Strategy.pdf>.
- 24 U.S. Department of Transportation, “What Is a Safe System Approach?,” last modified October 13, 2022, <https://www.transportation.gov/NRSS/SafeSystem>.
- 25 U.S. Department of Transportation, *Status of the Nation’s Highways, Bridges, and Transit: Conditions and Performance*, 24th ed., 2021, <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/24cpr/pdf/24cpr-Standalone.pdf>.
- 26 “Keeping Roads in Good Shape Reduces Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Rutgers-Led Study Finds,” *Rutgers Today*, January 14, 2019, <https://www.rutgers.edu/news/keeping-roads-good-shape-reduces-greenhouse-gas-emissions-rutgers-led-study-finds>.
- 27 Arizona Department of Transportation, *Implementing FHWA’s INVEST Round 3 Project and 3rd Annual Arizona Department of Transportation Sustainable Transportation Program Final Report*, June 2020, <https://azdot.gov/sites/default/files/media/2020/10/Final-Report-June20-V6.pdf>; Maryland Climate Solutions Now Act of 2022, S.B. 0528, sec. 13 (2022), <https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Legislation/Details/sb0528?ys=2022RS>; State of Washington, Substitute House Bill 1080, sec. 1050 (2021), <https://lawfilesexternal.wa.gov/biennium/2021-22/Pdf/Bills/House%20Passed%20Legislature/1080-S.PL.pdf?q=20210428150650#page=19>.
- 28 Massachusetts Exec. Order No. 594 (2021), <https://www.mass.gov/executive-orders/no-594-leading-by-example-decarbonizing-and-minimizing-environmental-impacts-of-state-government>; Minnesota H.F. 6, at. 8, sec. 31 (2021), [https://www.revisor.mn.gov/bills/text.php?number=HF6&type=bill&version=1&session=ls92&session\\_year=2021&session\\_number=1](https://www.revisor.mn.gov/bills/text.php?number=HF6&type=bill&version=1&session=ls92&session_year=2021&session_number=1); Minnesota Go, *Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan*, Minnesota Department of Transportation, December 2022, 126, <https://minnesotago.org/final-plans/sntp-final-plan-2022>.



- 29 Sebastien Malo, “U.S. Lawmakers Take a Concrete Step to Battle Emissions,” Reuters, July 2, 2019, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-climate-change-usa-carboncapture/u-s-lawmakers-take-a-concrete-step-to-battle-emissions-idUSKCN1TX1KB>; Jason Plautz, “Hawaii to Combat Climate Change with Carbon-Injected Concrete,” *Smart Cities Dive*, July 8, 2019, <https://www.smartcitiesdive.com/news/hawaii-to-combat-climate-change-with-carbon-injected-concrete/558200/>.
- 30 Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Transportation, “Definition of a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise,” last modified May 3, 2022, <https://www.transportation.gov/civil-rights/disadvantaged-business-enterprise/definition-disadvantaged-business-enterprise>.
- 31 49 CFR 26, subpart C, last modified October 5, 2023, <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-49/subtitle-A/part-26/subpart-C>.
- 32 Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, “State Performance Dashboard and Reports,” last modified April 14, 2023, <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/reporting/state/>.