DISCUSSION TOPICS TO ADDRESS FOR THE 2016 REGIONAL SOLICITATION

Based on survey responses, meeting discussions, and user feedback, staff has complied below questions that should be addressed.

1. Should interchange projects be required to complete the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request process prior to applying to the Regional Solicitation?
2. Should the scoring be modified to equalize the competition for projects on all roadway classifications, i.e., expander, collector, reliever, augmenter, and non-freeway principal arterial?
3. Should the scoring be modified to make railroad grade-separation projects more competitive for funding?
4. How and where should cost-effectiveness be measured?
5. Should “new roadways” be a separate application category or can the expansion scoring criteria be adjusted to so that new roadways can be more easily compared to expansions of existing roadways?
6. Should B-minor bridges be eligible for funding in the bridge category?
7. Should bundling be allowed and how wide of a geographic area can projects cover?
8. Should trail usage be based on actual counts rather than number of residents or employees within one mile of the trail facility?
9. Should the scoring for transit expansion projects further favor new riders more than existing riders?

1: INTERCHANGE APPROVALS
Should interchange projects be required to complete the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request process prior to applying to the Regional Solicitation?

Staff's preference would be to require interchange approval prior to applying for the Regional Solicitation. However, staff wishes to hear from localities whether this is feasible for the 2016 Regional Solicitation (applications are due 7/15/16).

If local agencies do not believe that there is adequate time to go through the process before the application deadline for the 2016 Regional Solicitation, then staff could add this to the Risk Assessment measure.

Funding & Programming Committee Feedback: General consensus favored including completion of the interchange process as points to be earned in the Risk Assessment measure. There was discussion that projects would be required to go through the interchange process prior to submitting in application for the 2018 Regional Solicitation, if the process is not too time-consuming for applicants at this early stage of the project development process.

TAC Feedback: General consensus favored including completion of the interchange process as points to be earned in the Risk Assessment measure. Additionally, TAC suggested alerting applicants to this development early so they are aware of the need to go through this process.

2: EQUALIZING ROADWAY CLASSIFICATIONS

Should the scoring be modified to equalize the competition for projects on all roadway functional classifications (i.e., expander, connector, reliever, augmenter, and non-freeway principal arterial)?

Four of the five roadway functional classifications were funded as part of the 2014 Regional Solicitation. No Connector projects were funded. Five Connector projects were applied for in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization category. Out of 21 applications in that category, the five projects were ranked 14th, 18th, 19th, 20th, and 21st.

TAB could take several approaches to address this question. Given that TAB has decided not to fund projects based on roadway functional classification, eliminating the splitting of classifications in measure 1A (Role in the Regional Transportation System) is an option. TAB could also choose not to adjust measure 1A. TAB could guarantee a minimum of one funded project per functional classification sub-category (which would have entailed funding the 14th ranked Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization project, "leap-frogging" five projects with higher scores). The projects could be grouped by functional classification with both the Expansion and Reconstruction/Modernization categories to reduce the issue with "leap-frogging." Finally TAB could adjust the scoring so that each functional classification is scored separately, allowing for maximum score to be given to each functional classification in multiple categories (as is done in measure 1A).

Funding & Programming Committee Feedback: General consensus was to further explore scoring changes to make all four sub-classifications competitive for funds, as recommended in the A-Minor Arterial System Evaluation (2012).

TAC Feedback: TAC members expressed concern that A-Minor Connector projects cannot be competitive under the current system and some counties may not apply for them in the future if nothing is changed.

3: ABILITY OF RAILROAD CROSSING SAFETY PROJECTS TO RECEIVE FUNDING
Should the scoring be modified to make railroad grade-separation projects more competitive for funding?

This question stems from the increase in train traffic being experienced in the Twin Cities and the impacts on highway safety and mobility at these at-grade crossings. Rail-highway grade separation projects are eligible for STP funds, but do not score well in the current scoring system when compared to other roadway projects.

As currently constructed, the safety category (worth 150 points) will not likely provide a lot of points to railroad grade-separation projects because the measure is based on the number of crashes experienced. Railroad crossings do not tend to see enough crashes to compete with intersection projects in this category.

Some options include:

1. Create a separate "railroad crossing safety" category. Staff cautions that this would create an expectation of a project from the category being funded, despite a history of very few such applications.
2. Do not adjust the scoring.
3. Adjust the safety category to allow for proactive safety elements:
    a. Allow for a portion of the safety points to be for railroad safety
    b. Allow for a "proactive" score that incorporates points for railroad crossing safety

Funding & Programming Committee Feedback: General consensus was that railroad crossing projects are important to the region and should continue to be eligible for funding. However, due to the already high demand for Regional Solicitation funds and the desire to simplify the process, the group did not want to change the scoring measures.

TAC Feedback: One member expressed disagreement with the Funding & Programming consensus to leaving scoring alone. The rational is that this is a key issue for first responders that are stuck waiting for a train. The member suggested that if there is any way to quantify delay, it should be done.

4: COST-EFFECTIVNESS AND THE IMPACT ON SCOPE CHANGES
How and where should cost-effectiveness be measured?

Concern has been raised regarding cost effectiveness criteria measurements. Some of this concern is related to the rating of scope change requests. When Council staff attempts to determine whether a modified project would have scored enough to be funded, the cost effectiveness criteria become problematic. Two scope change issues have surfaced: a) the project costs increases for the project being considered versus the other projects selected in the same solicitation; while there may be good cost data on the project requesting the change, costs of the other projects are not consistently available for comparisons and b) the potential for a scope change to be denied based on the addition of locally-funded ancillary elements, such as utility work, which are included and affect the cost effectiveness score. For these reasons staff is bringing some options and considerations forward that might be used to modify the solicitation and/or the scope change process.

1. Eliminate cost effectiveness sub-criteria.
   A number of the criteria have accompanying sub-criteria to assess cost effectiveness. For example, for safety, the reduction in collisions is divided by the project cost to determine the cost effectiveness of the safety investments. Cost effectiveness has been used for many years, but has probably become more important recently due to the limited transportation funds available and the policy emphasis on lower-cost/higher-benefit projects. Using a cost effectiveness measure helps to allow a comparison of the big, high-cost project to the smaller, low-cost project. From this perspective, some form of cost effective measure seems important/appropriate for the solicitation.
2. Measure cost effectiveness only on the level of federal funds requested.
   The solicitation projects include eligible and non-eligible elements. The cost effectiveness calculation uses the total project cost, which may include significant non-eligible costs. In some cases, scope change requests involve non-eligible elements such as water or sewer lines in the right-of-way that are not necessarily part of the transportation scope of work.

   If only the eligible elements of the project and the associated federal funds and requested match were the basis of the cost effectiveness measure, changes to the non-eligible and, therefore, non-funded project elements could be made and not have to be analyzed from the cost effectiveness perspective. The rationale for using only federal eligible elements and cost also benefit smaller agencies that are not as able to propose larger projects with large local contributions for non-eligible elements.
3. Measure cost effectiveness based on the total score of the project.
   Today there are cost effectiveness sub-criteria measures for safety, air quality, etc. A method used for bridge projects is to calculate the cost-effectiveness given the total points the project received on all criteria. These points are then divided by the total project costs. This may be more in line with the lower-cost/high-benefit policy in that it measures all aspects of the project against all costs.
4. Eliminate cost effectiveness measures from the scope change analysis.
   A simple solution is to eliminate cost-effectiveness when considering a scope change. As noted above, cost effectiveness is a measure in a number of criteria. Measures like crash reduction or air quality improvements would still be used to measure benefits and changes that occur with a modified project, but the cost effectiveness measure of the same would not be considered.
5. During scope changes, conduct analysis with original project cost assumed constant.
   Inflation and changes in material costs can move the cost of a project a great deal over a short time. Basing the cost effectiveness score for any air quality or collision reduction change on the original cost should reflect the true impact of the proposed changes. If the modified project changed the number of crashes reduced, the cost effectiveness calculation would be based on the original project cost.

Funding & Programming Committee Feedback: General consensus was to measure cost effectiveness only on federally-eligible project elements and to eliminate criteria-specific cost effectiveness measures and measure cost-effectiveness on the total score of the project.

TAC Feedback: General consensus was agreement with the Funding & Programming Committee, though there was question about how to monitor project cost.

5: NEW ALIGNMENTS

Should "new roadways" be a separate application category or can the expansion scoring criteria be adjusted to so that new roadways can be more easily compared to expansions of existing roadways?

In the 2014 Regional Solicitation, applications for four new roadways were submitted. These were extensions of existing highways. Several criteria were not good fits for a new highway versus the expansion or modernization of an existing highway. A number of people responding to the survey or critiquing the process suggested these problems would go away if there was a separate category for new highways.

While a new category would resolve confusion about specific criteria, there are ramifications of creating another category of highway projects. These include:

1. Creating a separate category creates the expectation that at least one, and maybe more, new highways will be funded. Having a separate category will therefore likely allocate funds for the sub-category. Historically, there are only one or two new alignment project applications in any one solicitation.
2. Creating a new category with needed criteria and scoring guidelines is time-consuming for staff and policy-makers as the solicitation package moves through the review and approval process. It also increases the number of scorers needed.

Staff recognizes the confusion in trying to fit the existing criteria to a new highway. Staff believes the criteria could be modified so that while the answers for a new highway proposal would be different than for an existing highway proposal, they will be comparable and allow a fair distribution of scores. An alternative process will be needed for each of these six measures: Current daily person throughput, heavy commercial traffic, infrastructure age, congestion reduction, emissions reduction, and safety.

In most applications for new highways or alignments, existing highways serve the current trips. The applicant will be asked to identify the highways that serve these trips today (which may or may not be "A" Minors) and provide data similar to that needed for project applications on existing alignments. Of course, if the Council staff is providing this data, the applicant would only have to identify the highways that provide the function today. As an example, the Commercial Vehicle Traffic criteria require counts. The applicant would identify points on the existing highways that provide for this traffic today.

If more than one highway serves the trips, then counts could be summed, though only a percentage of the trips from each roadway would divert to the new roadway.

In the case of Daily Person Throughput, which includes the current average annual daily traffic volume x 1.3 (persons per vehicle) plus the average annual transit ridership, this calculation is made by Metropolitan Council staff. Again, data from the existing highway(s) that are serving this trip as noted above would be used.

In the case of infrastructure age, use of existing highways is not as straight forward. The condition of the existing highways will not be improved, but their condition can still be used as a surrogate for a problem. Parallel routes may be able to be used since traffic will be diverted from these existing roadways, thereby extending the useful life of these facilities.

Staff believes the Solicitation process can be made fair to new highway projects without creating a new category. All criteria for the highway expansion category will be reviewed and modifications of the appropriate criteria for a new highway will be developed. These modifications will be brought to the F&PC as the Solicitation is revised for 2016.

Funding & Programming Committee Feedback: General consensus was not to create a new category for new roadways. Staff will bring adjusted roadway measures to a future meeting that account for new alignments.

TAC Feedback: TAC provided no additional feedback.

6: BRIDGE ELIGIBILITY
Should B-minor bridges be eligible for funding in the bridge category?

Eligibility for bridges has been restricted to "A" minor arterials for a number of years. Staff is not certain when this started, but records back to 2003 show that only "A" bridges were eligible.

Over the five solicitations dating back to 2003, a total of 42 bridge projects were submitted and 23 projects were funded. In those solicitations, $10 million in federal funds was designated for bridges in each solicitation. The level of funding was based on a federal designation that a specific level of the STP funds would go to bridges. This changed with MAP-21. The designated categories of bridges and other Federal Aid roads were consolidated into the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP). This Act also reduced the total federal funds coming to the region from $161.4 million every two years to $150 million.

In the 2014 Regional Solicitation Evaluation, an early proposal was to eliminate the bridge category completely. Bridges would not compete in their own category but would be eligible if they were part of a highway expansion or modernization project. Due to significant support from the regional partners, the TAB maintained bridges as a roadway sub-category but only allowed "A" minor arterials to qualify.

In the 2014 Solicitation, six bridge projects were submitted with a combined federal funding request of $24.7 million. This was about 9% of the total $280 million requested. One bridge was selected in 2014 to receive $7 million in federal funds. The estimated total cost of the project was over $60 million. This bridge funding represented about 5% of the federal funds allotted in the 2014 Solicitation. Over the 2003 to 2011 period, 6.4% of the federal funds were allocated to bridges. On average from 2003 to 2011, eight bridges were submitted for each solicitation.

Staff recommends continuing to limit the Bridge category to "A" minor arterials.

Funding & Programming Committee Feedback: While there were members that expressed a desire for expanding bridge eligibility, general consensus was to leave the A-minor requirement as is. There are plenty of unfunded A-Minor bridges as exhibited by the fact that TAB only funded 1 of 6 A-Minor bridges in the last solicitation.

TAC Feedback: TAC provided no additional feedback.

7: BUNDLING AND GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE
Should bundling be allowed and how wide of a geographic area can projects cover?

The 2014 Regional Solicitation provided for "bundling" of similar projects:

> "Project applicants can also 'bundle' two or more projects together to meet the funding minimum. Bundled projects must fall into one of three types:
> 1. Projects located along the same corridor (e.g., filling multiple trail gaps along a trail corridor)
> 2. Systemwide improvements (e.g., retiming traffic signals across a defined jurisdiction)
> 3. Similar improvements within a concentrated geographic area (e.g., adding benches along the sidewalks in a downtown area)
>
> Communities may want to consider using joint powers agreements for implementing bundled projects in two or more jurisdictions. Bundling of independent projects that can each meet the project minimum and are not related to one another as described above is not allowed."

No bundled projects that meet the guidelines above have been submitted in any Regional Solicitation. Two projects were submitted in 2014, but, due to the size of the individual elements, they did not meet this definition and were disqualified.

Another project also raised issues about scoring; a Roadway System Management project that would allow retiming of signals on an unknown number of corridors and cities throughout the region.

The concern with both the bundling projects and systemwide improvements is how they would score given location-specific criteria. In the Bicycle/Pedestrian category, which may draw interest for bundling, four of the six criteria are tied closely to location. In the Roadway System Management category, six of the eight criteria are tied closely to location. In some cases the data could be averaged to give a score, but for the connections to job concentrations and equity they would be inconsistent with the intent of the criteria.

Given that there has never been a qualified bundling project submitted in the Regional Solicitation, staff believes eliminating this would simplify the solicitation and reduce the complexity of scoring.

In projects that provide similar systemwide improvements, staff would like to explore a different solution. The definition of the "defined jurisdiction" or the "concentrated geographic area" would be restricted so the various criteria could be scored reflective of the intent of the adopted criteria. As examples of a "defined area", a downtown area, defined area, or length along a singular trail corridor could be used.

The System Management application submitted in 2014 and disqualified could not be addressed in this manner. The application would have provided funds to hire consultants to undertake signal retiming and upgrading on various county-owned A-Minors in all seven counties. Specific locations were not identified since this was intended to provide the assistance needed for smaller traffic system management projects, but under one umbrella contract that MnDOT would administer. Staff believes this is a unique project that may need to be considered for funding as such by the TAB.

Funding & Programming Committee Feedback: General consensus was to continue to allow bundling and to make sure that geographic areas are defined with census tracts.

TAC Feedback: TAC provided no additional feedback.

8: TRAIL USAGE

Should trail usage be based on actual counts rather than number of residents or employees within one mile of the trail facility?

As part of the Regional Solicitation Redesign in 2014, some bicycle and pedestrian technical workgroup members requested that project usage should be measured by doing actual trail counts. However, the group noted that the collection equipment, techniques, and methodologies were not ready to be deployed on a regional level for the Regional Solicitation. Instead, the group recommended that people and jobs within one mile of the proposed trail be used as a proxy to measure potential usage. As part of the recent online survey, people asked for a better way to measure usage.

The 2016 Regional Solicitation could respond to this concern in several ways:

1. Leave the measure as is based on the idea that population and employment are the best available indicators of potential trail usage.
2. Use ridership counts. While automated counting may be a possibility in the future, staff would recommend that manual counts be taken on each proposed trail. If the project is an improvement to an existing trail, then counts should be taken on the actual trail. If the proposed project is a new segment, then a count should be completed at the highest-volume connecting trail facility (i.e., likely an end point of the proposed trail). Manual counts should be taken from 4 PM to 6 PM on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday during the application period. The number of users counted during the two-hour window would then be inserted into the application (i.e., the number would not be adjusted to a daily count). This same methodology can be used for any Pedestrian Facilities projects.
3. Design a qualitative method for determining a score for potential usage.

Funding & Programming Committee Feedback: General consensus was to leave the measure as is.

TAC Feedback: TAC provided no additional feedback.

9: EXISTING VS. NEW TRANSIT RIDERS
Should the scoring for transit expansion projects further favor new riders more than existing riders?

In the survey, concern was expressed that awarding a lot of points to existing transit riders under-values expansion of the transit system; expansion is not meant to "capture" riders that already ride, but to create new ridership. This concern was in part based on the survey response that rewarding existing ridership "seems inconsistent with Federal guidelines for CMAQ funds, which are intended to help start up viable, new transit services."

Interim Program Guidance Under MAP-21 states: "In using CMAQ funds for *operating assistance*, the intent is to help start up viable new transportation services that can demonstrate air quality benefits and eventually cover costs as much as possible." Operating assistance is not eligible to maintain existing service and the Regional Solicitation does not provide operating assistance to existing routes.

Staff believes, therefore, that adding new riders to existing routes is as viable as adding riders via new routes when it comes to CMAQ funding. The question still remains, however, whether existing riders are weighted more than they should be. For CMAQ, the key objective is to reduce congestion and air pollution.

This issue relates to the "Usage" criterion. The three measures are:

A. Cost effectiveness per rider. This includes new and existing riders. 105 points
B. Operating cost effectiveness, which is found by dividing new annual operation cost by new annual ridership. 70 points
C. Project cost effectiveness per new rider. 175 points.

New riders go further toward achieving CMAQ goals of reducing congestion and improving air quality than do existing riders. At present, 245 of the 350 points awarded in Usage are directed entirely toward new ridership. The other 105 points are awarded for each existing and new rider (i.e., total ridership). Therefore, as shown in the below table, only 30% of the usage criterion is dedicated to total ridership; a portion of which is existing riders.

	2014
A: Cost Effectiveness per **New/Existing** Rider	105 **(30%)**
B:Operating Cost Effectiveness per **New** Rider	70 (20%)
C: Project Cost Effectiveness per **New** Rider	175 (50%)
Total **New**-Only Measures	245 **(70%)**

Staff recommends continued inclusion of this weight for existing riders because there is value in providing improved service to existing riders.

Funding & Programming Committee Feedback: General consensus was not reached. The 2014 transit Scoring Committee members will be invited to participate in a one-time work group to try to come to consensus and address other transit/TDM issues.

TAC Feedback: TAC provided no additional feedback.

Regional Solicitation for Transportation Projects Application

October 16, 2015

Complete and submit the following online application **by 4:00 PM on July 15, 2016**.

For questions contact (Elaine Koutsoukos) at (elaine.koutsoukos@metc.state.mn)

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. APPLICANT:
2. UNIT OF GOVERNMENT: (Select from drop down list)
3. PRIMARY COUNTY WHERE THE PROJECT IS LOCATED: (Select from drop down list)
4. JURISDICTIONAL AGENCY (IF DIFFERENT THAN THE APPLICANT):
5. APPLICANT MAILING ADDRESS STREET: CITY: STATE: ZIP CODE:
6. PROJECT CONTACT PERSON: TITLE: PHONE NO. ( ) E-MAIL ADDRESS:

II. PROJECT INFORMATION

7. PROJECT NAME:
8. EVALUATION CATEGORIES – Check only one project category in which you wish your project to be considered. **Roadways Including Multimodal Elements** ☐ Roadway Expansion ☐ Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization ☐ Roadway System Management ☐ ~~Bridges~~ Bridge Rehabilitation/Reconstruction **Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities** ☐ Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities ☐ Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA) ☐ Safe Routes to School Infrastructure **Transit and Travel Demand Management (TDM) Projects** ☐ Transit Expansion ☐ TDM ☐ Transit System Modernization
9. BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION (Include location, road name/functional class, type of improvement, etc. – limit to 400 words):
10. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) DESCRIPTION – will be used in TIP if the project is selected for funding (link to TIP description guidance):
11. PROJECT LENGTH (to the nearest one-tenth of a mile):

III. PROJECT FUNDING

12. Are you applying for funds from another source(s) to implement this project? Yes☐ No☐ If yes, please identify the source(s):
12. FEDERAL AMOUNT: $
13. MATCH AMOUNT: $ (Minimum of 20% of the project total)
14. PROJECT TOTAL: $
15. MATCH PERCENTAGE (Minimum of 20%): (Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total)
16. SOURCE OF MATCH FUNDS (A minimum of 20% of the total project cost must come from non-federal sources; additional match funds over the 20% minimum can come from other federal sources):
17. PROGRAM YEARS (Check all years that are feasible): ☐ 2018 (TDM Only) ☐ 2019 (TDM Only) ☐ 2020 ☐ 2021
18. ADDITIONAL PROGRAM YEARS (Check all years that are feasible if funding in an earlier year becomes available): ☐ 2017 ☐ 2018 ☐ 2019

IV. REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS

19. MAPS:

- A map or concept drawing of the proposed improvements that clearly labels the beginning and end of the project, all roadways in the project area, roadway geometry, and any bicycle, pedestrian, and transit components upon completion of the project.

- **For Roadway Expansion, Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization, and Roadway System Management projects only:** The Synchro/Highway Capacity Manual emission reduction reports including the Timing Page Report that displays input and output information. *This report must be attached within the web-based application form for Measure 5A (Congestion Reduction/Air Quality).*

- **For Safe Routes to School Projects only:** The completed travel tally and parent survey results from the SRTS planning process. The travel tally form can be found on the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) SRTS website: http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/sites/default/files/resources/SRTS_Two_Day_Tally.pdf. *The travel tally and parent survey results must be attached within the web-based application form for Measure 2A (Usage).*

- ~~**For Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities, Pedestrian Facilities, and Safe Routes to School Projects only:** The documentation of any labor hours (soft match) used to meet the 20 percent local match requirement.~~

- All project information maps generated through the Metropolitan Council Make-A-Map web-based application completed at the beginning of the application process. Attachment/upload locations are placed throughout all appropriate web-based application forms.

20. COORDINATION

- The applicant must include a letter from the agency with jurisdiction over the facility (if different than the applicant) indicating that it is aware of and understands the project being submitted, and that it commits to operate and maintain the facility for its design life.

- If the applicant expects any other agency to provide part of the local match, the applicant must include a letter or resolution from the other agency agreeing to financially participate.

- **For Transit Expansion projects that include service expansion only:** Applicants must provide a letter of support for the project from the transit provider that will commit to providing the service or manage the contract for the service provider.

21. OTHER

- **For Transit and TDM Projects that include public/private joint-use parking facilities only**: The applicant must upload a plan for and make a commitment to the long-term management and enforcement of ensuring exclusive availability of parking to public transit users during commuting times. Federal rules require that parking spaces funded be available exclusively to transit users during the hours of transit service. In the plan, the applicant must indicate how commuter and transit parking will coexist with parking needs for joint use tenants. The entity charged with ensuring exclusive parking for transit commuters after the facility opens must be designated in the plan.

- **TDM Projects only:** Upload Project Budget (budget should include applicable costs, such as, salary, fringe benefits, overhead expenses, marketing, materials, etc.). If using a sub-vendor as part of the project, proper procurement procedures must be used after the project is awarded to select the vendor.

Project Information Form – Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

(To be used to assign State Project Number after project is selected)

Please fill in the following information as it pertains to your proposed project. Items that do not apply to your project, please label N/A.

COUNTY, CITY, OR LEAD AGENCY _____

ZIP CODE WHERE MAJORITY OF WORK IS BEING PERFORMED _____

APPROXIMATE BEGIN CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

APPROXIMATE END CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

NAME OF TRAIL/PED FACILITY: _____ (i.e., CEDAR LAKE TRAIL)

TERMINI: (Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work)

From:_____

To: _____
(DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION; INCLUDE NAME OF ROADWAY IF MAJORITY OF FACILITY RUNS ADJACENT TO A SINGLE CORRIDOR)

OR At: _____

PRIMARY TYPES OF WORK _____
_____

Examples: GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT BASE, BIT SURF, SIDEWALK, SIGNALS, LIGHTING, GUARDRAIL, BIKE PATH, PED RAMPS, BRIDGE, PARK AND RIDE, ETC.

BRIDGE/CULVERT PROJECTS (IF APPLICABLE)

OLD BRIDGE/CULVERT NO.: _____ _____
NEW BRIDGE/CULVERT NO.: _____
STRUCTURE IS OVER/UNDER: _____

Project Information Form – Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

(To be used to assign State Project Number after project is selected)

Please fill in the following information as it pertains to your proposed project. Items that do not apply to your project, please label N/A.

COUNTY, CITY, OR LEAD AGENCY _____

FUNCTIONAL CLASS OF ROAD _____

ROAD SYSTEM_____ (TH, CSAH, MSAS, CO. RD., TWP. RD., CITY STREET)

ROAD/ROUTE NO. _____ (i.e., 53 FOR CSAH 53)

NAME OF ROAD_____(Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE)

ZIP CODE WHERE MAJORITY OF WORK IS BEING PERFORMED _____

APPROXIMATE BEGIN CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

APPROXIMATE END CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

TERMINI: (Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work)

From:_____

To: _____
(DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION)

OR At: _____

PRIMARY TYPES OF WORK _____

_____

Examples: GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT BASE, BIT SURF, SIDEWALK, CURB AND GUTTER,STORM SEWER, SIGNALS, LIGHTING, GUARDRAIL, BIKE PATH, PED RAMPS, BRIDGE, PARK AND RIDE, ETC.

BRIDGE/CULVERT PROJECTS (IF APPLICABLE)

OLD BRIDGE/CULVERT NO.: _____

NEW BRIDGE/CULVERT NO.: _____

STRUCTURE IS OVER/UNDER: _____

Project Information Form – Transit and TDM (for Park-and-Ride and Transit Station Projects Only)

(To be used to assign State Project Number after project is selected)

Please fill in the following information as it pertains to your proposed project. Items that do not apply to your project, please label N/A.

COUNTY, CITY, OR LEAD AGENCY _____

ZIP CODE WHERE MAJORITY OF WORK IS BEING PERFORMED _____

APPROXIMATE BEGIN CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

APPROXIMATE END CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

NAME OF PARK AND RIDE OR TRANSIT STATION: _____
(i.e., MAPLE GROVE TRANSIT STATION)

TERMINI: (Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work)

From:_____

To: _____
(DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION)

OR At: _____

PRIMARY TYPES OF WORK _____
_____

Examples: GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT BASE, BIT SURF, SIDEWALK, CURB AND GUTTER,STORM SEWER, SIGNALS, LIGHTING, GUARDRAIL, BIKE PATH, PED RAMPS, PARK AND RIDE, ETC.

Estimate of TAB-Eligible Project Costs

Fill out the scoping sheet below and provide the estimate of TAB- eligible costs for the project. Applicants are not required to fill out each row of the cost estimate. The list of project elements is meant to provide a framework to think about the types of costs that may be incurred from the project. The total cost should match the total cost reported for the project on the first page of this application. Costs for specific elements are solely used to help applicants come up with a more accurate total cost; adjustments to these specific costs are expected as the project is more fully developed. Per TAB direction, the project must exclude costs for studies, preliminary engineering, design, or construction engineering. Right-of-way costs are only eligible as part of bicycle/pedestrian projects, transit stations/stops, transit terminals, park-and-ride facilities, or pool-and-ride lots. Noise barriers, drainage projects, fences, landscaping, etc., are not eligible for funding as a standalone project, but can be included as part of the larger submitted project, which is otherwise eligible.

Please use 2016 cost estimates for all project elements including transit vehicle and operating costs. The TAB may apply an inflation factor to awarded projects. If TAB includes an inflation factor, then all project elements will be inflated, unlike past years, when only certain project elements were inflated.

It is important that applicants accurately break out costs for the project's various multimodal elements. These costs will be used, in part, to help determine the score for the Multimodal Facilities scoring criterion. If no dollar amount is placed in the cost estimate form below, than it will be assumed that no multimodal elements are included with the project.

TAB-ELIGIBLE CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES		
Check all that apply	**ITEM**	**COST**
Specific Roadway Elements		
☐	**Mobilization (approx. 5% of total cost)**	**$**
☐	**Removals (approx. 5% of total cost)**	**$**
☐	**Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.)**	**$**
☐	**Roadway (aggregates and paving)**	**$**
☐	**Subgrade Correction (muck)**	**$**
☐	**Storm Sewer**	**$**
☐	**Ponds**	**$**
☐	**Concrete Items (curb & gutter, sidewalks, median barriers)**	**$**
☐	**Traffic Control**	**$**
☐	**Striping**	**$**
☐	**Signing**	**$**
☐	**Lighting**	**$**
☐	**Turf - Erosion & Landscaping**	**$**
☐	**Bridge**	**$**
☐	**Retaining Walls**	**$**
☐	**Noise Wall (do not include in cost-benefit measure)**	**$**

☐	**Traffic Signals**	**$**
☐	**Wetland Mitigation**	**$**
☐	**Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection**	**$**
☐	**Railroad Crossing**	**$**
☐	**Roadway Contingencies**	**$**
☐	**Other Roadway Elements**	**$**
Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements		
☐	**Path/Trail Construction**	**$**
☐	**Sidewalk Construction**	**$**
☐	**On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction**	**$**
☐	**Right-of-Way**	**$**
☐	**Pedestrian Curb Ramps (ADA)**	**$**
☐	**Crossing Aids (e.g., Audible Pedestrian Signals, HAWK)**	**$**
☐	**Pedestrian-Scale Lighting**	**$**
☐	**Streetscaping**	**$**
☐	**Wayfinding**	**$**
☐	**Bicycle and Pedestrian Contingencies**	**$**
☐	**Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements**	**$**
Specific Transit and TDM Elements		
☐	**Fixed Guideway Elements**	**$**
☐	**Stations, Stops, and Terminals**	**$**
☐	**Support Facilities**	**$**
☐	**Transit Systems (e.g. communications, signals, controls, fare collection, etc.)**	**$**
☐	**Vehicles**	**$**
☐	**Contingencies**	**$**
☐	**Right-of-Way**	**$**
☐	**Other Transit and TDM Elements**	**$**
TOTAL TAB-ELIGIBLE CONSTRUCTION COSTS		**$**
Transit Operating Costs		
☐	**Transit Operating Costs**	**$**
☐	**TDM Operating Costs**	**$**
TOTAL TAB-ELIGIBLE TRANSIT AND TDM OPERATING COSTS		**$**
TOTAL TAB-ELIGIBLE COSTS		**$**

Risk Assessment

Please check those that apply and fill in anticipated completion dates for all projects, except for new/expanded transit service projects, transit vehicle purchases, or travel demand management (TDM) projects.

1) Project Scope (5 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurred
40% ☐ Stakeholders have been identified
0% ☐ Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted

2) Layout or Preliminary Plan (5 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ Layout or Preliminary Plan completed
50% ☐ Layout or Preliminary Plan started
0% ☐ Layout or Preliminary Plan has not been started

Anticipated date or date of completion: _____

3) Environmental Documentation (~~10~~ 5 Percent of Points)

☐EIS ☐EA ☐PM

Document Status:
100% ☐ Document approved (include copy of signed cover sheet)
75% ☐ Document submitted to State Aid for review (date submitted:_____)
50% ☐ Document in progress; environmental impacts identified; review request letters sent
0% ☐ Document not started

Anticipated date or date of completion/approval: _____

4) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (~~15~~ 10 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ No known historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places are located in the project area, and project is not located on an identified historic bridge
80% ☐ Historic/archeological review under way; determination of "no historic properties affected" or "no adverse effect" anticipated
40% ☐ Historic/archeological review under way; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated
0% ☐ Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological resources in the project area.

Anticipated date or date of completion of historic/archeological review: _____
Project is located on an identified historic bridge: ☐

5) Review of Section 4f/6f Resources (1~~5~~0 Percent of Points)

4(f) – Does the project impacts any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild & scenic rivers or public private historic properties?

6(f) – Does the project impact any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild & scenic rivers or historic property that was purchased or improved with federal funds?

100% ☐ No Section 4f/6f resources located in or adjacent to the project
100% ☐ Impact to 4(f) property. The project is an Independent Bikeway/Walkway project covered by the bikeway/walkway Negative Declaration statement. Letter of support received (potential option for bicycle and pedestrian facility applications only)
80% ☐ Section 4f resources present within the project area, but no adverse effects
50% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely – coordination/documentation has begun
30% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely – coordination/documentation has not begun
0% ☐ Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area

6) Right-of-Way (15 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements not required
100% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements has/have been acquired
75% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, offers made
50% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, appraisals made
25% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels identified
0% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels not identified
0% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed

Anticipated date or date of acquisition _____

7) Railroad Involvement (25 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ No railroad involvement on project
100% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement is executed (include signature page)
60% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated
40% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun
0% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations not begun

Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement _____

8) Interchange Approval (15 Percent of Points)*

100% ☐ Project does not involve construction of a new/expanded interchange or new interchange ramps
100% ☐ Interchange project has been approved by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee
0% ☐ Interchange project has not been approved by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee

*Please contact Karen Scheffing at MnDOT (Karen.Scheffing@state.mn.us or 651-234-7784) to determine if your project needs to go through the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee.

9) Construction Documents/Plan (10 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ Construction plans completed/approved (include signed title sheet)
75% ☐ Construction plans submitted to State Aid for review

50% ☐ Construction plans in progress; at least 30% completion
0% ☐ Construction plans have not been started

Anticipated date or date of completion: _____

10) Letting

Anticipated Letting Date: _____

Qualifying Requirements (Draft)

October 8, 2015

The applicant must show that the project meets all of the qualifying requirements to be eligible to be scored and ranked against other projects. All qualifying requirements must be met before completing an application. Applicants whose projects are disqualified may appeal and participate in the review and determination of eligibility at the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Funding & Programming Committee meeting.

By selecting each checkbox, the applicant confirms compliance with the following project requirements:

All Projects

1. The project must be consistent with the goals and policies in these adopted regional plans: Thrive MSP 2040 (2014), the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan, the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan (2015), and the 2040 Water Resources Policy Plan (2015).

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

2. The project must be consistent with the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan. Reference the 2040 Transportation Plan objectives and strategies that relate to the project. List the goals, objectives, strategies, and associated pages):

3. The project or the transportation problem/need that the project addresses must be in a local planning or programming document. Reference the name of the appropriate comprehensive plan, regional/statewide plan, capital improvement program, corridor study document [studies on trunk highway must be approved by the Minnesota Department of Transportation and the Metropolitan Council], or other official plan or program of the applicant agency [includes Safe Routes to School Plans] that the project is included in and/or a transportation problem/need that the project addresses. List the applicable documents and pages):

4. The project must exclude costs for studies, preliminary engineering, design, or construction engineering. Right-of-way costs are only eligible as part of bicycle/pedestrian projects, transit stations/stops, transit terminals, park-and-ride facilities, or pool-and-ride lots. Noise barriers, drainage projects, fences, landscaping, etc., are not eligible for funding as a standalone project, but can be included as part of the larger submitted project, which is otherwise eligible.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

5. Applicants that are not cities or counties in the seven-county metro area with populations over 5,000 must contact the MnDOT Metro State Aid Office prior to submitting their application to determine if a public agency sponsor is required.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

6. Applicants must not submit an application for the same project elements in more than one funding sub-category.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

5. The requested funding amount must be more than or equal to the minimum award and less than or equal to the maximum award. The cost of preparing a project for funding authorization can be substantial. For that reason, minimum federal amounts apply. Other federal funds may be combined with the requested funds for projects exceeding the maximum award, but the source(s) must be identified in the application. Funding amounts by application category are listed below in Table 1.

Table 1: 2016 Regional Solicitation Funding Award Minimums and Maximums

Modal Categories	2016 Regional Solicitation		
	Sub-Categories	Minimum Federal Award	Maximum Federal Award
Roadways Including Multimodal Elements	Roadway Expansion	$1,000,000	$7,000,000
	Roadway Reconstruction/ Modernization	$1,000,000	$7,000,000
	Roadway System Management	$250,000	$7,000,000
	Bridges Rehabilitation/ Replacement	$1,000,000	$7,000,000
Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities	Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities	$~~125~~250,000	$~~5~~3,500,000
	Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA)	$~~125~~250,000	$1,000,000
	Safe Routes to School	$~~125~~150,000	$1,000,000
Transit and TDM Projects	Transit Expansion	$500,000	$7,000,000
	Travel Demand Management (TDM)	$75,000	$300,000
	Transit System Modernization	$100,000	$7,000,000

☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement

6. The project must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

7. The project must be accessible and open to the general public.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

8. The owner/operator of the facility must operate and maintain the project for the useful life of the improvement.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

9. The project must represent a permanent improvement with independent utility. The term "independent utility" means the project provides benefits described in the application by itself and does not depend on any construction elements of the project being funded from other sources outside the regional solicitation, excluding the required non-federal match. Projects that include traffic management or transit operating funds as part of a construction project are exempt from this policy.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

10. The project must not be a temporary construction project. A temporary construction project is defined as work that must be replaced within five years and is ineligible for funding. The project must also not be staged construction where the project will be replaced as part of future stages. Staged construction is eligible for funding as long as future stages build on, rather than replace, previous work.

    ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

11. The project applicant must send written notification regarding the proposed project to all affected state and local units of government prior to submitting the application.

    ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

1. All roadway and bridge projects must be identified as a Principal Arterial (Non-Freeway facilities only) or A-Minor Arterial as shown on the latest TAB approved roadway functional classification map.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

2. **Roadway Expansion and Reconstruction/Modernization projects only:** The project must be designed to meet 10-ton load limit standards.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

4. **Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only:** Projects requiring a grade-separated crossing of a Principal Arterial freeway must be limited to the federal share of those project costs identified as local (non-MnDOT) cost responsibility using MnDOT's "Cost Participation for Cooperative Construction Projects and Maintenance Responsibilities" manual. In the case of a federally funded trunk highway project, the policy guidelines should be read as if the funded trunk highway route is under local jurisdiction.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

5. **Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only:** The bridge must carry vehicular traffic. Bridges can carry traffic from multiple modes. However, bridges that are exclusively for bicycle or pedestrian traffic must apply under one of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities sub-categories. Rail-only bridges are ineligible for funding.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

6. **Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only:** The length of the bridge must equal or exceed 20 feet.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

7. **Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only**: The bridge must have a sufficiency rating less than 80 for rehabilitation projects and less than 50 for replacement projects. Additionally, the bridge must also be classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

   Please note: In this 2016 solicitation, points will be awarded as part of the Risk Assessment for applicable projects that have completed this interchange approval process. In the next Regional Solicitation, applicable interchange projects will need to go through the approval prior to submitting an application (i.e., it will become a qualifying requirement). Please contact Karen Scheffing at MnDOT (Karen.Scheffing@state.mn.us or 651-234-7784) to determine if your project needs to go through the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Projects Only

1. All projects must relate to surface transportation. As an example, for multiuse trail and bicycle facilities, surface transportation is defined as primarily serving a commuting purpose and/or that connect two destination points. A facility may serve both a transportation purpose and a recreational purpose; a facility that connects people to recreational destinations may be considered to have a transportation purpose.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

~~2. Seventy percent of the project cost must fall under one or a combination of the following eligible activities:~~

- ~~Construction of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized forms of transportation, including sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian and bicycle signals, traffic calming techniques, lighting and other safety-related infrastructure, and transportation projects to achieve compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).~~
- ~~Construction of infrastructure-related projects and systems that will provide safe routes for non-drivers, including children, older adults, and individuals with disabilities, to access daily needs.~~
- ~~Conversion and use of abandoned railroad corridors for trails for pedestrians, bicyclists, or other non-motorized transportation users.~~
- ~~Safe Routes to School Infrastructure-related projects.~~

~~☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.~~

2. **Multiuse Trails on Active Railroad Right-of-Way:** All multiuse trail projects that are located within right-of-way occupied by an active railroad must attach an agreement with the railroad that this right-of-way will be used for trail purposes.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

3. **Safe Routes to School projects only:** All projects must be located within a two-mile radius of the associated primary, middle, or high school site.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

4. **Safe Routes to School projects only:** All schools benefitting from the SRTS program must conduct after-implementation surveys. These include the student travel tally form and the parent survey available on the National Center for SRTS website. The school(s) must submit the after-evaluation data to the National Center for SRTS within a year of the project completion date. Additional guidance regarding evaluation can be found at the MnDOT SRTS website.

☐ Check the box to indicate that the applicant understands this requirement and will submit data to the National Center for SRTS within one year of project completion.

5. **Safe Routes to School projects only:** The applicant must have a Safe Routes to School plan established to be eligible for funding. MnDOT staff will notify Metropolitan Council staff of all agencies eligible for funding. If an applicant has a new Safe Routes to School plan and has not previously notified MnDOT Safe Routes to School staff of the plan, the applicant should contact Mao Yang (Mao.Yang@state.mn.us; 651-366-3827) prior to beginning an application to discuss the plan and confirm eligibility. MnDOT staff will send updated applicant eligibility information to Metropolitan Council staff, if necessary.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the applicant understands this requirement and will contact MnDOT Safe Routes to School staff, if necessary, to confirm funding eligibility.

Transit and Travel Demand Management (TDM) Projects Only

1. **Transit Expansion projects only:** The project must provide a new or expanded transit facility or service (includes peak, off-peak, express, limited stop service, or dial-a-ride).

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

2. **Transit Expansion projects only:** The applicant must have the capital and operating funds necessary to implement the entire project and commit to continuing the service or facility project beyond the initial three-year funding period for transit operating funds.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

3. **Transit Expansion projects only:** The project is not eligible for either capital or operating funds if the corresponding capital or operating costs have been funded in a previous solicitation. However, Transit Modernization projects are eligible to apply in multiple solicitations if new project elements are being added with each application.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

Roadway Expansion – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

Definition: A roadway project that adds thru-lane capacity. Projects must be located on a non-Freeway Principal Arterial or A-Minor Arterial functionally-classified roadway, consistent with the latest TAB approved functional classification map. However, A-Minor Connectors cannot be expanded with these federal funds per regional policy and must apply in the Reconstruction/Modernization sub-category.

Examples of Roadway Expansion Projects:

- New roadways
- Two-lane to four-lane, two-lane to three-lane, and four-lane to six-lane expansions
- New interchanges with or without associated frontage roads
- Expanded interchanges with either new ramp movements or added thru lanes
- New bridges and overpasses

Minimum Federal Award: $1,000,000
Maximum Federal Award: $7,000,000

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	**175**	**17.5%**
Measure A - Role in Regional Transportation System	~~90~~80	
Measure B - Current daily heavy commercial traffic	65	
Measure C - Connection to Total Jobs and Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs~~, and Educational Institutions and local activity Centers~~	~~20~~30	
2. Usage	**175**	**17.5%**
Measure A - Current daily person throughput	110	
Measure 2 - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume	65	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**100**	**10%**
Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and benefits, impacts, mitigation	30	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Infrastructure Age	**75**	**7.5%**
Measure A - Date of construction~~ and remaining useful life~~	75	
5. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	**150**	**1%**
Measure A - ~~Cost effectiveness (project cost/v~~Vehicle delay reduced)	100	
Measure B - ~~Cost effectiveness (project cost/~~Kg ~~per day~~of emissions reduced~~)~~	50	
6. Safety	**150**	**15%**
Measure A ~~– Cost effectiveness of~~ Crashes reduced	150	
7. Multimodal Facilities ~~and Connections~~	**100**	**10%**
~~Measure A – Ridership of transit routes directly/indirectly connected to project~~	~~25~~	
~~Measure B – Bicycle and pedestrian connections~~	~~25~~	
Measure ~~C~~ A - Transit, bicycle~~, or~~ pedestrian, or freight elements of the project	~~50~~100	
8. Risk Assessment	**75**	**7.5%**
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	75	
Sub-Total	**1,000**	**100.0%**
9. Cost-Benefit Ratio	**TBD**	
Measure A - Cost-benefit ratio (total project cost/total points awarded)	TBD	
Total	**TBD**	

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (175 Points) – Tying regional policy (Thrive MSP2040) to the Regional Solicitation, this criterion measures the project's ability to serve a transportation purpose within the regional transportation system and economy based on how well it fulfills its functional classification role, serves heavy commercial traffic, and connects to employment and manufacturing/distribution-related employment~~, as well as existing local activity centers~~.

A. *MEASURE:* Address how the project route fulfills its role in the regional transportation system as identified by its current functional classification. Respond as appropriate to one type of functional classification. (90 Points)

Expander/Augmentor/Non-Freeway Principal Arterial:

- Use the "Roadway Area Definition" map generated at the beginning of the application process. To ensure consistency of methodology between applicants, Metropolitan Council staff will calculate the average distance between the project and the closest parallel A-Minor Arterials or Principal Arterials on both sides of the project given the project description included by the applicant.

RESPONSE (Calculation):

- *Metropolitan Council staff will calculate the response*

Reliever: For A-Minor Arterial Relievers, the measure will analyze the level of congestion on the parallel Principal Arterial to determine the importance of the Reliever. Identify the hours per day the current volume exceeds the design capacity on the Principal Arterial being relieved by the Reliever.

- If the Reliever is relieving a Principal Arterial that is a freeway facility, the applicant should obtain data from the current MnDOT Metro Freeway Congestion Report.
- If the Reliever is relieving a Principal Arterial that is a non-freeway facility, the applicant should obtain intersection turning movement or hourly volume data (within the last three years) directly from the MnDOT Metro Intersection Warrant Information website. If data is unavailable on the website, the applicant should collect or use their own intersection turning movement or hourly volume data (within the last three years) for the non-freeway facility. The volume used for the Principal Arterial being relieved should be located within the parallel length of the project. To calculate existing conditions, the applicant must obtain the hourly directional traffic volumes on a weekday, and the current lane configurations.

For the design capacity calculations, the applicant must use Metropolitan Council definition below:

Design Capacity
The assumed maximum number of vehicles per lane which pass any given point in an hour on an average day during normal operating conditions. For the purposes of responding to criteria in this solicitation packet, the following capacities shall be used:

- Expressway through lane - 800 vehicles per hour;
- Arterial through lane - 600 vehicles per hour;
- Left-turn lane - 300 vehicles per hour;
- Right-turn lane - 200 vehicles per hour;
- Dedicated bike lane or multi use trail - 60 vehicles per hour.

RESPONSE (Calculation):

SCORING GUIDANCE (90 Points)

Expanders, Augmentors, and Non-Freeway Principal Arterials: The applicant with the furthest average distance from the closest parallel A-Minor Arterials or Principal Arterials on both sides will receive the full points. The furthest average distance will be considered separately for Expanders, Augmentors, and Non-Freeway Principal Arterials. Four projects (one each for Augmentor, Expander, Reliever, and Non-Freeway Principal Arterial) may receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points (awarded to the top score in its functional classification). For example, if the Expander being scored had a distance of 8 miles and the top Expander project was had an average distance of 10 miles, this applicant would receive (8/10)*90 points or 72 points. Metropolitan Council staff will provide average distance data for all Augmentor, Expander, and Non-Freeway Principal Arterial projects to ensure consistency of methodology between applications.

Relievers: The applicant with the highest number of hours per day in which current capacity exceeds the design capacity on the Principal Arterial will receive the full points. Remaining Reliever projects will receive a proportional share of the full points, calculated as described above.

B. *MEASURE:* Provide the current daily heavy commercial traffic at one location along the A-Minor Arterial or Non-Freeway Principal Arterial's project length. It is required that an actual daily count is collected or available data from within the last three years is used (from the city, county or MnDOT). Heavy commercial traffic is defined as all trucks with at least two axles and six tires. (65 Points)

- For new roadways, using a traffic model, identify the current daily heavy commercial traffic volume.

RESPONSE:

- Location:_____
- Current daily heavy commercial traffic volume:_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (65 Points)

The applicant with the highest daily heavy commercial traffic at a location along the project length will receive the full points. The highest daily heavy commercial traffic will be considered separately for Augmentors, Expanders, Relievers, and Non-Freeway Principal Arterials.

As a result, four projects (Augmentors, Expanders, Relievers, and Non-Freeway Principal Arterials) may receive the full points. Remaining projects in each of the four categories will receive a proportional share of the full points (awarded to the top score in its functional classification). For example, if the

application being scored had a heavy commercial volume of 750 vehicles and the top project had a heavy commercial volume of 1,000 vehicles, this applicant would receive (750/1,000)*65 points, or 48 points.

C. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Regional Economy" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing total employment and manufacturing/distribution-related employment within one mile, as depicted on the "Regional Economy" map. ~~Reference the "Regional Economy" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Identify the project's connections to the Job Concentrations, Manufacturing/ Distribution Locations, and Educational Institutions as defined in ThriveMSP 2040, and depicted in the "Regional Economy" map. If the project does not provide a connection to a Job Concentration, Manufacturing/Distribution Location, or Educational Institution, but provides a connection to a local activity center, reference the adopted county or city plan identifying this area. (20 Points)~~

Upload the "Regional Economy" map used for this measure.

~~*RESPONSE (Select all that apply, based on the "Regional Economy" map):*~~

- ~~Direct connection to or within a mile of a Job Concentration: ☐ (20 Points)~~
- ~~Direct connection to or within a mile of a Manufacturing/Distribution Location:☐ (20 Points)~~
- ~~Direct connection to or within a mile of an Educational Institution:☐ (12 Points)~~
- ~~Project provides a direct connection to or within a mile of an existing local activity center identified in an adopted county or city plan:☐ (12 & Points)~~

RESPONSE (Data from the "Regional Population" map):

- Existing Total Employment within 1 Mile: _____
- Existing Manufacturing/Distribution-Related Employment within 1 Mile: _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (20 Points)

All Census block groups that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project will be included.

The applicant with the highest existing total employment will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 workers within one mile and the top project had 1,500 workers, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*20 points or 13 points.

The applicant with the highest existing manufacturing/distribution-related employment will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points equal to the existing manufacturing/distribution-related employment within one mile of the project being scored divided by the project with the highest manufacturing/distribution-related employment within one mile multiplied by the maximum points available for the measure (20). For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 manufacturing/distribution-related workers within one mile and the top project had

1,500 manufacturing/distribution-related workers, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*20 points or 13 points.

The scorer will assess if the applicant would score higher with the total employment part of the measure or the manufacturing/distribution employment part of the measure, and give the applicant the higher of the two scores out of a maximum of 20 points.

Note: Due to the use of two sub-measures, two applicants will receive the full 20 points.

2. Usage (175 Points) – This criterion quantifies the project's potential mobility impact by measuring the current daily person throughput and future vehicular traffic that will be served by the project. These roadway users directly benefit from the project improvements on the A-Minor Arterial or Non-Freeway Principal Arterial.

A. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will calculate the current daily person throughput at one location along the A-Minor Arterial or Non-Freeway Principal Arterial project length using the current average annual daily traffic (AADT) volume and average annual ridership. The applicant must identify the location along the project length and provide the current AADT volume from the last published MnDOT 50-series maps and existing transit routes. Ridership data will be provided by the Metropolitan Council staff, if public transit is currently provided on the project length. (110 Points)

- Current Daily Person Throughput = (current average annual daily traffic volume x 1.30 vehicle occupancy) + average annual daily transit ridership (2015)

- For new roadways, identify the existing daily traffic volume based on traffic modeling.

RESPONSE:

- Location:_____
- Current AADT volume:_____
- Existing Transit Routes on the Project:_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (110 Points)
The applicant with highest current daily person throughput will receive the full points for the measure. This measure will be considered separately for Augmentors, Expanders, Relievers, and Non-Freeway Principal Arterials.

As a result, four projects (Augmentors, Expanders, Relievers, and Non-Freeway Principal Arterials) may receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points (awarded to the top score in its functional classification). For example, if the application being scored had a daily person throughput of 1,000 vehicles and the top project had a daily person throughput of 1,500 vehicles, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*110 points or 73 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Provide the forecast (2040) average daily traffic volume at the same location along the A-Minor Arterial or Non-Freeway Principal Arterial project length, as identified in the previous measure. The applicant may choose to use a county or city travel demand model based on the Metropolitan Council model to identify the forecast (2040) average daily traffic volume or have Metropolitan Council staff determine the forecast volume using the Metropolitan Council model and project location. Respond as appropriate to the use of one type of forecast model. (65 Points)

- For new roadways, identify the forecast daily traffic volume if this information is available. If not available, then identify the forecast volumes that will be relocated from any parallel roadway(s) to the new roadway.

RESPONSE:

- Use Metropolitan Council model to determine forecast (2040) ADT volume☐

OR

RESPONSE:

- Approved county or city travel demand model to determine forecast (2040) ADT volume ☐
- Forecast (2040) ADT volume : _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (65 Points)

The applicant with the highest forecast (2040) ADT volume will receive the full points for the measure. This measure will be considered separately for Augmentors, Expanders, Relievers, and Non-Freeway Principal Arterials.

As a result, four projects (Augmentors, Expanders, Relievers, and Non-Freeway Principal Arterials) may receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had a daily forecast of 28,000 vehicles and the top project had a daily forecast of 32,000 vehicles, this applicant would receive (28,000/32,000)*65 points or 57 points.

3. Equity and Housing Performance (100 Points) – **The language for this criterion has not yet been updated.** This criterion addresses the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. The criterion also evaluates a community's efforts to promote affordable housing.

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Socio-Econ" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Identify the project's location from the list below, as depicted on the map. Describe the project's positive benefits, and negative impacts, and mitigation for low-income populations; people of color; children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive the full points listed below. In order to receive the maximum points, the response should address the benefits, impacts, and mitigation for the populations listed above. (30 Points)

Upload the "Socio-Econ" map used for this measure.

RESPONSE (Select one, based on the "Socio-Econ" map):

- Project located in Racially Concentrated Area of Poverty: ☐ (0 to 30 Points)
- Project located in Concentrated Area of Poverty: ☐ (0 to 24 Points)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (0 to 18 Points)
- Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color, or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly: ☐ (0 to 12 Points)

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (30 Points)
Based on the "Socio-Econ" map's output, the applicant will select the appropriate option from the above bullets. However, geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive full points. The applicant must fully describe the positive benefits and negative impacts (with mitigation to address the issue) for those identified groups. Each project will first be graded on a 10-point scale, not accounting for geography. Each score from the 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography. The project with the most positive benefits and appropriate mitigation for negative impacts will receive the full points relative to its maximum geographic sub-area defined above. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. This response is intended to be qualitative. Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

Note: Due to the geographic adjustment to scores, it is possible that the above process will result in no project receiving the maximum allotment of 30 points. In this case, the highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 30 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 10 points and the top project had 20 points, this applicant would receive (10/20)*30 points or 15 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the 2015 Housing Performance Score (add hyperlink) for the city or township in which the project is located. The score includes consideration of affordability and diversification, local initiatives

to facilitate affordable workforce housing development or preservation, and density of residential development. If the project is in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on a weighted average using the length of the project in each jurisdiction. If a project is located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), then the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project's total score will be adjusted as a result. (70 Points)

RESPONSE (Affordable Housing Score completed by Metropolitan Council staff):

- City/Township: _____
- Length of Segment within City/Township: _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)

The applicant with the highest 2015 Housing Performance Score will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had a Housing Performance Score of 55 and the top project had a Housing Performance Score of 90, this applicant would receive (55/90)*70 points or 43 points.

Note: Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

Projects will use the city Housing Performance Score based on the project location. If a project is located in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on a weighted average of the city or township scores for the project location based on the length of the project in each jurisdiction. If a project is located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), then the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project's total score will be adjusted as a result.

If this is the case, then the total points possible in the application will be 930 instead of 1,000. The total points awarded through the rest of the application (900 as a hypothetical example) will be divided by 930, then multiplied by 1,000. Therefore, a project scoring 900 out of 930, will equate to 968 points on a 1,000-point scale.

If a portion of the project is located in a city with an affordable housing allocation and the other portion is located in a township with no affordable housing allocation, then a combination of the weighted average and no affordable housing methodologies should be used. This will result in a total score that will be somewhere between 930 and 1,000; then the score will need to be adjusted to fit a 1,000-point scale.

4. Infrastructure Age/Condition (75 Points) – This criterion will assess the age of the roadway facility being improved. Roadway improvement investments should focus on the higher needs of an aging facility, whereas, improvements to a recently reconstructed roadway does not display as efficient use of funds.

A. *MEASURE:* Identify the year of the roadway's original construction or most recent reconstruction. If the reconstruction date is used for the roadway, a full reconstruction must have been completed during the indicated year. Routine maintenance, such as an overlay or a sealcoating project does not constitute a reconstruction and should not be used to determine the infrastructure age.

- For new roadways, identify the average age of the parallel roadways from which traffic will be diverted to the new roadway.

RESPONSE:

- Year of original roadway construction or most recent full reconstruction: _____
- Explanation (if needed): _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (75 Points)

The applicant with the oldest roadway will receive full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored was constructed 41 years ago and the oldest project was constructed 48 years ago, this applicant would receive (41/48)*75 points or 64 points.

Note: Because of the reporting of year of construction, it is possible for multiple projects to receive the full allotment of 75 points.

5. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality (150 Points) – This criterion measures the project's ability to reduce intersection delay and emissions during peak hour conditions.

A. *MEASURE:* Conduct a capacity analysis at one or more of the intersections being improved by the roadway project using existing turning movement counts (collected within the last three years) in the a.m. or p.m. peak hour and Synchro or HCM software. The analysis must include build and no build conditions (with and without the project improvements). The applicant must show the current total peak hour delay at one or more intersections and the reduction in total peak hour intersection delay at these intersections in seconds due to the project. If more than one intersection is examined, then the delay reduced by each intersection can be can added together to determine the total delay reduced by the project (100 Points)

- For new roadways, identify the key intersection(s) on any parallel roadway(s) that will experience reduced delay as a result of traffic diverting to the new roadway. If more than one intersection is examined, then the delay reduced by each intersection can be can added together.
- For roadway projects that include a railroad crossing, the Synchro analysis should be adapted to account for the delay caused by the railroad tracks being blocked.

The applicant should include the appropriate Synchro or HCM full reports (including the Timing Page Report) that support the improvement in total peak hour delay and should conduct the analysis using the following:

- Under the network settings, all defaults should be used for lanes, volumes, phases and simulation
- Use Synchro's automatic optimization to determine cycle, offset and splits (for traffic signals)
- Project improvements assumed in the build condition should be reflected in the total project cost, such as additional through or turn lanes and protective left-turn phasing

- Total Peak Hour Delay Reduced (Seconds) = Total Peak Hour Delay/Vehicle x Vehicles Per Hour

RESPONSE (Calculation):

- Total Peak Hour Delay/Vehicle Reduced by the Project (Seconds/Vehicle):_____
- Volume (Vehicles Per Hour): _____
- Total Peak Hour Delay Reduced by the Project (Seconds): _____
- ~~Cost Effectiveness:_____~~

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)
The applicant with the most peak hour vehicle delay reduced by the project improvement will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the. For example, if the application being scored reduced delay by 5,000 seconds and the top project reduced delay by 25,000 seconds, this applicant would receive (5,000/25,000)*100 points, or 20 points.

~~A.~~B. *MEASURE:* Using the Synchro or HCM analysis completed in the previous measure, identify the total peak hour emissions reduction in kilograms (CO, NO_X, VOC) due to the project. The applicant should include the appropriate Synchro or full HCM reports (including the Timing Page Report) that support the improvement in total peak hour emissions. If more than one intersection is examined, then the emissions reduced by each intersection can be can added together to determine the total emissions reduced by the project (50 Points)

- For new roadways, identify the key intersection(s) on any parallel roadway(s) that will experience reduced emissions as a result of traffic diverting to the new roadway. If more than one intersection is examined, then the emissions reduced by each intersection can be can added together.

- Total Peak Hour Emissions Reduced (Kilograms)= Total Peak Hour Emissions Reduced/Vehicle x Vehicles Per Hour

RESPONSE (Calculation):

- Peak Hour CO Emissions Reduced/Vehicle by the Project (Kilograms): _____
- Peak Hour NO_X Emissions Reduced/Vehicle by the Project (Kilograms): _____
- Peak Hour VOC Emissions Reduced/Vehicle by the Project (Kilograms): _____
- Total Peak Hour Emissions Reduced/Vehicle by the Project (Kilograms):_____
- Volume (Vehicles Per Hour): _____
- Total Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms): _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

The applicant with the most kilograms reduced by the project improvement will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full. For example, if the application being scored reduced emissions by 3 kilograms and the top project reduced emissions by 5 kilograms, this applicant would receive (3/5)*50 points or 30 points.

6. Safety (150 Points) – This criterion addresses the project's ability to correct deficiencies and improve the overall safety of an existing or future roadway facility. It will assess the project's ~~Benefit/Cost ratio~~monetized safety benefits.

A. *MEASURE:* Respond as appropriate to one of the two project types below. (150 Points)

Roadway projects that do not include railroad grade-separation elements:

Calculate the reduction in the total number of crashes due to improvements on the A-Minor Arterial or Non-Freeway Principal Arterial made by the project. The applicant must base the estimate of crash reduction on the methodology consistent with the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). Applicants should focus on the crash analysis for reactive projects starting on page 7 through page 11, in addition to Appendix A, E, and F.

Crash data must be obtained for the project length using the MnDOT TIS system average for calendar years 2013 through 2015. Crash data should include all crash types and severity, including pedestrian and bicycle crashes.

Applicants should request crash data from MnDOT as early as possible. The applicant must then attach a listing of the crashes reduced and the HSIP Benefit/Cost (B/C) worksheet that identifies the resulting benefit associated with the project. As part of the response, please detail the crash modification factor(s) used from FHWA's Crash Modification Factors Clearinghouse: http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/

1. For new roadways, identify the parallel roadway(s) from which traffic will be diverted to the new roadway.
2. Using the crash data for 2013-2015, calculate the existing crash rate for the parallel roadway(s) identified in Step 1.
3. Identify the daily traffic volume that will be relocated from the parallel roadway(s) to the new roadway.
4. Calculate the number of crashes on the parallel roadway(s) using the existing crash rate from Step 2 and the relocated traffic volume to determine the change in number of crashes due to the relocated traffic volume. For instance, if 5,000 vehicles are expected to relocate from the existing parallel roadway to the new roadway, calculate the number of crashes related to the 5,000 vehicles.
5. Identify the average crash rate for the new roadway using MnDOT's average crash rates by roadway type. Using the average crash rate for the new roadway, calculate the number of crashes related to the relocated traffic (i.e., the 5,000 vehicles).
6. Calculate the crash reduction factor using the existing number of crashes on the existing parallel roadway (Step 4) compared to the estimated crashes calculated for the new roadway (Step 5), due to the relocated traffic volume (i.e., the 5,000 vehicles).
7. The calculated crash reduction factor should be used in the HSIP B/C worksheet.
8. Upload additional documentation materials into the "Other Attachments" Form in the online application.

RESPONSE (Calculation):

- Crash Modification Factors Used: _____
- Rationale for Crash Modifications Selected (*Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)*: _____
- Project Benefit ($) from B/C ratio ~~/Cost ratio~~ : _____

Roadway projects that include railroad grade-separation elements:

Since the number of observed crashes at an existing at-grade railroad crossing is small compared to an intersection, this measure will assess crash risk exposure that exists in order to compare projects. As a proactive safety measure, railroad grade-separation projects eliminate the crash risk exposure.

- Crash Risk Exposure Eliminated = current average annual daily traffic volume x average number of daily trains at the at-grade crossing

RESPONSE (Calculation):

- Current AADT volume: _____
- Average daily trains: _____
- Crash Risk Exposure eliminated: _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)

This measure will be considered separately for projects that do and do not include a railroad grade-separation project. As a result, two projects (one project without a railroad grade-separation project and one with a railroad grade-separation project) may receive the full points.

For projects that do not include a grade-separation project, the applicant with the highest dollar value of benefits will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had safety benefits of $11,000,000 and the top project had safety benefits of $16,000,000, this applicant would receive (11,000,000/16,000,000)*150 points or 103 points.

For railroad grade-separation projects, the applicant with the highest dollar value of benefits will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had safety benefits of $11,000,000 and the top project had safety benefits of $16,000,000, this applicant would receive (11,000,000/16,000,000)*150 points or 103 points.

Note: Due to the use of two sub-measures, two applicants will receive the full 150 points.

7. Multimodal Facilities (100 Points) – This criterion measures how the project improves the travel experience, safety, and security for other modes of transportation and addresses the safe integration of these modes. The *Transportation Policy Plan* requires that explicit consideration of all users of the transportation system be considered in the planning and scoping phase of roadway projects.

~~Multimodal Connections (50 Points)~~

~~**Transit Connections**~~

~~A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Transit Connectivity" map generated at the beginning of the application process. List the transit routes directly connected to the project to help determine the annual transit ridership of these connecting routes, as depicted on the "Transit Connectivity" map. Potential connections include transitway stations (existing transitways or planned transitways with a mode and alignment determined in the 2030 TPP), high-frequency express and local stations/stops, and other non-high-frequency fixed-route stations/stops. Metropolitan Council staff will provide annual ridership for each connecting route.~~

~~Upload the "Transit Connectivity" map used for this measure.~~

~~**Note:** Transitways offer travel time advantages for transit vehicles, improve transit service reliability, and increase the convenience and attractiveness of transit service. Transitways are defined in the Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail, light rail, highway and arterial bus rapid transit, and express bus with transit advantages. Eligible transitway projects are those that have a mode and alignment identified in the Transportation Policy Plan.~~

~~*RESPONSE (Data from the "Transit Connectivity" map):*~~

- ~~Existing routes directly connected to the project:_____~~
- ~~Planned transitways directly connected to the project (alignment and mode determined and identified in the 2030 TPP):_____~~

~~SCORING GUIDANCE~~
~~NOTE: 7A IS SCORED BELOW, ALONG WITH 7B.~~

~~**Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections**~~

~~B. *MEASURE:* Identify the pedestrian and bikeway connections to the project and describe these existing facilities. As part of the required response, discuss how the project provides a direct connection to an existing high pedestrian-traffic area (e.g., commercial, mixed-use, or entertainment nodes/districts; town or village centers) identified in an adopted county or city plan or study. Applicants should also discuss any bicycle or pedestrian connections that will be constructed before the completion of the proposed project, or planned future connections. If the pedestrian or bicycle connection is planned, also describe the timing of the project and the adopted county or city plan or study that identifies this facility.~~

~~*RESPONSE (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):*_____~~

~~SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)~~
~~NOTE: THIS SCORING SECTION IS FOR 7A and 7B, COMBINED~~

~~The applicant should provide a response to measures A and B. The project with the most extensive connections to other modes will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.~~

~~The scorer will weigh the project's connections to transit (as measured through annual transit ridership), bikeways, high-traffic pedestrian areas (e.g., commercial, mixed use, or entertainment nodes/districts; town or village centers), and other pedestrian facilities, as detailed in the required response (200 words or less). A higher value will be placed on existing transit ridership and infrastructure connections present at the time of project construction over future transit ridership and planned infrastructure connections.~~

~~Multimodal Facilities (50 Points)~~

~~C.~~*A.* *MEASURE:* Discuss any bicycle, pedestrian, transit, or freight elements that are included as part of the project and how they improve the travel experience, safety, and security for users of these modes. Applicants should make sure that new multimodal elements described in the response are accounted for as part of the cost estimate form earlier in the application. Also, describe the existing bicycle, pedestrian, transit, or freight connections. Furthermore, address how the proposed project safely integrates all modes of transportation (i.e., vehicles, trucks, bicyclists, transit, and pedestrians) and, if applicable, supports planned transitway stations. Applicants should note if there is no transit service in the project area and identify supporting studies or plans that address why a mode may not be incorporated in the project (e.g., a bicycle system plan that locates bikeway facilities on a lower-volume parallel route).

RESPONSE (Limit 2, 800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The project with the most comprehensive multimodal elements included as part of the project will receive the full points. This measure will be considered separately for Augmentors, Expanders, Relievers, and Non-Freeway Principal Arterials. As a result, four projects (Augmentors, Expanders, Relievers, and Non-Freeway Principal Arterials) may receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. The project score will be based on the quality of the improvements, as opposed to being based solely on the number of modes addressed.

Scorers should make sure that new multimodal elements described in the response are accounted for on the cost estimate form earlier in the application.

8. Risk Assessment (75 Points) – This criterion measures the number of risks associated with the project and the steps already completed in the project development process. These steps are outlined in the checklist in the required Risk Assessment.

A. *MEASURE:* Applications involving construction must complete the Risk Assessment. This checklist includes activities completed to-date, as well as an assessment of risks (e.g., right-of-way acquisition, proximity to historic properties, etc.).

RESPONSE (Complete Risk Assessment):

SCORING GUIDANCE (75 Points)
The applicant with the most points on the Risk Assessment (more points equate to less project risk) will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 40 points and the top project had 70 points, this applicant would receive (40/70)*75 points or 43 points.

9. –Cost-Benefit Ratio (100 Points) – This criterion will assess the project's cost-benefit based on the total TAB-eligible project cost and total points awarded in the previous 8 criteria. Calculations must be based on the total project cost of TAB-eligible expenses. Any eligible dollars allocated to noise walls should be excluded from this measure because of the uncertainty of needing them at this stage of the project development cycle.

A. *MEASURE: Calculate the cost-benefit ratio of the project.* The Scoring Committee will divide the total project cost by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria (1-8).

- Cost-Benefit Ratio= total TAB-eligible project cost/total number of points awarded in previous criteria (1-8)

RESPONSE (This measure will be calculated after the scores for the other measures are tabulated by the Scoring Committee):

- Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form):_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)
The applicant with the lowest dollar value per point earned in the application (i.e., the benefits) will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the top project had 35,000 and the application being scored had 70,000, this applicant would receive (35,000/70,000)*100 points or 50 points.

TOTAL: 1,1,100 POINTS

Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

November 4, 2015

4. Infrastructure Age/Condition

B. *MEASURE:* Select the geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies listed below that will be improved as part of this project, as reflected in the project cost estimate. (100 Points)

RESPONSE (Select all that apply):

- Improving a non-10-ton roadway to a 10-ton roadway: ☐ 0-15 pts
  - *RESPONSE (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words):*
- Improved clear zones or sight lines: ☐ 0-10 pts
  - *RESPONSE (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)*
- Improved roadway geometrics: ☐ 0-15 pts
  - *RESPONSE (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)*
- Access management enhancements: ☐ 0-20 pts
  - *RESPONSE (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)*
- Vertical/horizontal alignments improvements: ☐ 0-10 pts
  - *RESPONSE (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)*
- Improved stormwater mitigation: ☐ 0-10 pts
  - *RESPONSE (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)*
- Improved roadway materials: ☐ 0-10 pts
  - *RESPONSE (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)*
- Signals/lighting upgrades: ☐ 0-10 pts
  - *RESPONSE (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)*

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

Within each above improvement sub-measure, the best-response will receive full (e.g., the top project that improves clear zones or sight lines will receive 10 points), with each remaining project receiving a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. It is possible for more than one project to receive maximum points for a sub-measure.

The highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 100 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points equal to the points for the project being scored divided by the points assigned to the highest-scoring project multiplied by the maximum points available for the measure (100). For example, if the application being scored had 25 points and the top project had 50 points, this applicant would receive (25/50)*100 points or 50 points.

Bridges – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

October 8, 2015

4. Infrastructure Condition (400 Points) – This criterion will assess condition of the bridge facility being improved. Bridge improvement investments should focus on the higher needs of unsafe facilities. If there are two separate spans, then the applicant should take the average bridge sufficiency rating of the two spans.

A. *MEASURE:* Identify the bridge sufficiency rating. (300 Points)

RESPONSE:

- Bridge Sufficiency Rating: ____ (Ratings are from 0 to 100)

SCORING GUIDANCE (300 Points)
The applicant with the lowest bridge sufficiency rating will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points equal to the rating for the project with the lowest bridge sufficiency rating divided by the project being scored multiplied by the maximum points available for the measure (300). For example, if the top project had a bridge sufficiency rating of 35 and the application being scored had a score of 55, this applicant would receive (35/55)*300 points or 191 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Select if the bridge is posted for load restrictions~~Describe the design and safety deficiencies improved by the proposed project~~. (100 Points)

RESPONSE (Select if the bridge is load-posted):

- Load-Posted: ☐ (100 points)

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)
Applicants will receive the points shown depending on if the bridge is load-posted. The applicant can only score 0 or 100 points for this measure.

~~Note: Due to tiered scoring, it is possible that no project will receive the maximum allotment of 100 points.~~

2014 REGIONAL SOLICITATION FUNDING RESULTS
ROADWAY RECONSTRUCTION/MODERNIZATION PROJECTS BY FUNCTIONAL CLASS

Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization: Non-Freeway Principal Arterials

Rank	ID	Applicant	Project Name	Funct Class	Year	Fed. Request	Total Scores
5	2006	Scott County	CSAH 42 and TH 13 Intersection Reconstruction	NFPA	2018	$5,600,000	**671**
9	2105	Champlin	US 169 in Champlin	NFPA	2019	$6,473,147	**647**

Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization: Expanders

Rank	ID	Applicant	Project Name	Funct Class	Year	Fed. Request	Total Scores
10	2007	Scott County	CSAH 21 and TH 13 Intersection Reconstruction	Expander	2019	$6,000,000	**629**
11	2296	Anoka County	CSAH 11 Reconstruction from CSAH 1 to CSAH 3	Expander	2019	$7,000,000	**551**

Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization: Relievers

Rank	ID	Applicant	Project Name	Funct Class	Year	Fed. Request	Total Scores
2	2186	Minneapolis	8th Street South Reconstruction	Reliever	2019	$6,445,000	**724**
4	2187	Minneapolis	Broadway Street NE Reconstruction	Reliever	2018	$3,265,600	**684**
6	2217	Dakota County	CSAH 26 (Lone Oak Road) and CSAH 43	Reliever	2018	$2,000,000	**668**
7	2134	Brooklyn Ctr EDA	Brooklyn Boulevard Reconstruction/Modernization	Reliever	2018	$7,000,000	**667**
12	2011	Hennepin County	CSAH 3 (Excelsior Boulevard) Reconstruction	Reliever	2019	$5,520,000	**551**

Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization: Connectors

Rank	ID	Applicant	Project Name	Funct Class	Year	Fed. Request	Total Scores
14	2005	Scott County	CSAH 8 Reconstruction	Connector	2019	$4,400,000	**511**
18	2290	Washington County	CSAH 21/Stagecoach Trail	Connector	2019	$4,800,000	**396**
19	2156	Dakota County	CSAH 86 from CSAH 23 to TH 3 in Dakota County	Connector	2019	$3,200,000	**389**
20	2157	Dakota County	CSAH 86 from TH 3 to CSAH 47 in Dakota County MN	Connector	2018	$5,500,000	**380**
21	2241	Dakota County	Reconstruction of CSAH 23	Connector	2018	$7,000,000	**336**

Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization: Augmentors

Rank	ID	Applicant	Project Name	Funct Class	Year	Fed. Request	Total Scores
1	1952	Hennepin County	CSAH 3 (Lake Street) Reconstruction	Augmentor	2018	$2,844,000	**826**
3	2020	Ramsey County	I-94/Dale St Interchange Reconstruction	Augmentor	2019	$5,565,626	**688**
8	2171	Ramsey County	White Bear Ave Reconstruction- I-94 to Beech	Augmentor	2017	$3,130,210	**659**
16	2192	Ramsey County	Ramsey Co Rd C/Hennepin CSAH 94 Reconstruction	Augmentor	2019	$4,496,848	**492**