

## **ACTION TRANSMITTAL 2016-04**

**DATE:** January 11, 2016

**TO:** Transportation Advisory Board

**FROM:** Technical Advisory Committee

**PREPARED BY:** Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)  
Steve Peterson, Planning Analyst (651-602-1819)  
Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator (651-602-1717)

**SUBJECT:** 2016 Regional Solicitation: Weighting of Criteria and Measures

**REQUESTED ACTION:** Recommend the weighting of the criteria and measures for the 2016 Regional Solicitation as shown in Attachments 1 through 5.

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** That TAB approve the weighting of the criteria and measures for the 2016 Regional Solicitation as shown in Attachments 1 through 5.

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF ACTION:** The Regional Solicitation for federal transportation project funding is part of the Metropolitan Council's federally-required continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning process for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. Attachment 1 shows the criteria and the proposed weighting for the criteria for each of the application categories. Attachments 2 through 5 show the proposed changes to the distribution of points within criteria that have more than one measure for each application category.

### **PROPOSED CRITERIA WEIGHTING CHANGES:**

For the most part, the recommended criteria weightings remain the same as within the 2014 Regional Solicitation. Proposed criteria weighting changes are shown on Attachment 1 and the explanation for each recommended change is provided below.

- Addition of Cost Effectiveness as a new criterion will require a change in the scoring for all application categories. TAC recommends that each application category include 100 points for the Cost Effectiveness criterion to be added to the existing points for a new total of 1,100 points for each application category.
- In 2014 the Bridge application category was the only application category that contained a stand-alone criterion and measure for cost effectiveness. If the Cost Effectiveness criterion is approved to be scored above the 1,000 point application total, the points previously allocated to this Bridge criterion need to be redistributed to other criteria and measures. Based on general feedback from TAC F&P and TAC on the importance of a bridge's Role in the Regional Transportation System as measured by its distance to other parallel bridges (i.e., the further the distance, the more important the bridge to the regional transportation system) and the importance of bridges for freight movements (Usage criterion), TAC recommends reallocating the 75 points among these two criteria as shown on Attachment 1.
- Under the Pedestrian Facility application category, TAC recommends equalizing the distribution of the points between the criteria Role in the Regional System and

Usage. The Role in the Regional System criterion is measured by connections to jobs while the Usage criterion is measured by existing population within a half mile of the project. The suggested change would make these two criteria (jobs and population) equal at 150 points each.

- Under the Safe Routes to School application category, TAC recommends eliminating the Multimodal Connections criterion and redistributing the 50 points to the Usage criterion. This is recommended because Safe Routes to School projects are typically focused on providing sidewalk connections and are not focused on providing other multimodal connections.

## **DISTRIBUTION OF POINTS WITHIN CRITERIA WITH MORE THAN ONE MEASURE:**

Attachments 2 through 5 show proposed changes to the distribution of points among criteria that have more than one measure.

### Attachment 2 Roadway Applications Measures

#### Roadway Expansion

- Based on the sensitivity analysis conducted after the 2014 Regional Solicitation, TAC recommends increasing the points from 20 to 30 under measure C in Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy criterion to increase its potential impact in the next solicitation. This recommendation applies to all four Roadway applications.
- With the removal of measures A and B in the Multimodal Facilities criterion (recommended under AT 2016-03), all points are now included in new measure A (former measure C). This recommendation applies to all four Roadway applications.

#### Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization

- TAC recommends redistribution of points for measures A and B under Congestion Reduction/Air Quality (i.e., increase the emissions reduced measure from 25 to 30 points and decrease the vehicle delay reduced measure from 50 to 45 points) to increase the potential impact of the emissions reduced measure in the next solicitation.

#### Bridges

- TAC recommends reallocating points from the eliminated Cost Effectiveness criterion to two Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy measures and one Usage measure based on feedback at TAC F&P and TAC related to bridges.

#### Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization

- Under several criteria (Usage, Emissions Reduction, and Multimodal Connections), TAC recommends consolidating measures to one measure and allocating the points to the remaining measure.

#### TDM

- Under two criteria (Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy and Innovation), TAC recommends consolidating measures into one measure and allocating the points to the remaining measure.
- Under the Risk Assessment criterion, TAC recommends eliminating one measure and reallocating the points to the remaining two measures.

#### Multiuse Trails/Bike and Pedestrian Facilities

- With the removal of measure A/B in Multimodal Facilities, TAC recommends all points are included in new measure A (former measure C).

#### Safe Routes to Schools

- TAC recommends points from the Facilities and Connections criterion be reallocated to the Potential Usage criterion. With the concepts previously under Multimodal (i.e., transit usage to the school) reallocated to the Potential Usage criterion, it is recommended that the 50 points also be reallocated to Potential Usage, under the average share of the student population that bikes, walks, or uses transit measure.

**RELATIONSHIP TO REGIONAL POLICY:** TAB develops and issues a Regional Solicitation for federal funding.

**COMMITTEE COMMENTS AND ACTION:** The following comments and unanimous actions took place at the December 17, 2015, Funding & Programming Committee meeting and the January 6, 2016, TAC meeting:

- Both committees recommended adding points for the Cost Effectiveness criterion that would be in addition to the existing 1,000-point total. They recommend adding 100 points for the Cost Effectiveness criterion across all 10 application categories, so the total points possible would now increase from 1,000 to 1,100.
- Both committees recommended increasing the Risk Assessment criterion for all four roadway applications from 75 to 100 points and reducing the Multimodal criterion for the same applications categories from 100 to 75 points. The rationale is to elevate the importance of Risk Assessment in an attempt to reduce the number of scope change requests (there has already been one request from the solicitation approved last May). In addition, this change may increase the likelihood that applicants will be able to deliver the projects in their program years, thereby reducing the tension on the region to reallocate those federal funds.
- As part of Action Transmittal 2016-03, both committees recommended deletion of the second measure under the Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy criterion for the Transit Expansion and Transit System Modernization application categories. Due to this recommended change, both committees recommend reallocating the 33 points from this deleted measure to the two other measures in the criterion. Therefore, measure A would increase from 33 to 50 points and measure C would increase from 34 to 50 points.

### ROUTING

<b>TO</b>	<b>ACTION REQUESTED</b>	<b>DATE COMPLETED</b>
TAC Funding & Programming	Review & Recommend	December 17, 2015
Technical Advisory Committee	Review & Recommend	January 6, 2016
Transportation Advisory Board	Review & Approve	

ATTACHMENT 1: DRAFT CRITERIA WEIGHTING

Criteria	Roadway Exp.	Roadway Reconst/ Modern.	Roadway System Man.	Roadway Bridges	Transit Exp.	Transit Modern.	TDM	Multi-Use Trails & Bike Facility	Ped. Facility	Safe Routes to School
Role in the Regional System	17.5%	17.5%	12.5%	<del>12.5</del> 19.5%	10%	10%	10%	20%	<del>10</del> 15%	--
Usage	17.5%	17.5%	12.5%	<del>12.5</del> 13%	35%	30%	10%	20%	<del>20</del> 15%	<del>20</del> 25%
Safety	15%	15%	20%	--	--	--	--	25%	30%	25%
Congestion /Air Quality	15%	7.5%	20%	--	20%	10%	40%	--	--	--
Infrastructure Age	7.5%	15%	7.5%	40%	--	--	--	--	--	--
Equity and Housing Performance	10%	10%	10%	10%	20%	15%	15%	12%	12%	12%
Multimodal Facilities	<del>10</del> 7.5%	<del>10</del> 7.5%	<del>10</del> 7.5%	<del>10</del> 7.5%	10%	10%	--	10%	15%	<del>5</del> 5%
Risk Assessment	<del>7.5</del> 10%	<del>7.5</del> 10%	<del>7.5</del> 10%	<del>7.5</del> 10%	5%	10%	5%	13%	13%	13%
<del>Total Bridge Cost Effect.</del>	--	--	--	7.5%	--	--	--	--	--	--
Relationship Between SRTS Elements	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	25%
Transit Improvements	--	--	--	--	--	15%	--	--	--	--
TDM Innovation	--	--	--	--	--	--	20%	--	--	--
<b>Total (1,000 Points)</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Cost Effectiveness (Points)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>

## ATTACHMENT 2: ROADWAY MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	System			
	Expansion	Recon/Mod	Mgmt	Bridge
<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>125</b>	<b><del>125</del>195</b>
Measure A - Average distance to nearest parallel roadways/bridges	<del>90</del> 80	<del>90</del> 80	<del>65</del> 55	<del>65</del> 115
Measure B – Current daily heavy commercial traffic	65	65	40	<del>40</del> 50
Measure C – Connection to Total Jobs, Manu/Dist Jobs, <u>and Educational Inst.</u>	<del>20</del> 30	<del>20</del> 30	<del>20</del> 30	<del>20</del> 30
<b>Usage</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>125</b>	<b><del>125</del>130</b>
Measure A – Current daily person throughput	110	110	85	<del>95</del> 100
Measure B – Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume	65	65	40	30
<b>Equity and Housing Performance</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Measure A – Connection to disadvantageded pop and benefits, impacts, mitigation	30	30	30	30
Measure B – Housing Performance Score	70	70	70	70
<b>Infrastructure Age/Condition</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>400</b>
Measure A – Date of construction	75	50	<b>75</b>	
Measure B - Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies	75	100		
Measure A – Bridge Sufficiency Rating				300
Measure B – Load-Posting				100
<b>Congestion Reduction/Air Quality</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>200</b>	
Measure A – Vehicle delay reduced	100	<del>50</del> 45	150	
Measure B – Kg of emissions reduced	50	<del>25</del> 30	50	
<b>Safety</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>200</b>	
Measure A – Crashes reduced	150	150	200	
<b>Multimodal <del>Facilities</del> Elements and Existing Connections</b>	<b><del>100</del>75</b>	<b><del>100</del>75</b>	<b><del>100</del>75</b>	<b><del>100</del>75</b>
<del>Measure A/B – Transit and bike/ped connections</del>	<del>50</del>	<del>50</del>	<del>50</del>	<del>50</del>
Measure A - Transit, bicycle, pedestrian, <u>freight project</u> elements and connections	<del>50</del> 10075	<del>50</del> 10075	<del>50</del> 10075	<del>50</del> 10075
<b>Risk Assessment</b>	<b><del>75</del>100</b>	<b><del>75</del>100</b>	<b><del>75</del>100</b>	<b><del>75</del>100</b>
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	<del>75</del> 100	<del>75</del> 100	<del>75</del> 100	<del>75</del> 100
<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>				<b>75</b>
<del>Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)</del>				<del>75</del>
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>
<b><u>9. Cost Effectiveness</u></b>	<b><u>100</u></b>	<b><u>100</u></b>	<b><u>100</u></b>	<b><u>100</u></b>
<u>Measure A - Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>1,100</u></b>	<b><u>1,100</u></b>	<b><u>1,100</u></b>	<b><u>1,100</u></b>

### ATTACHMENT 3: TRANSIT MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Transit Expansion	Transit Modernization
<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Measure A - Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	<del>33</del> 50	<del>33</del> 50
- Measure B – Existing population within 0.25 mile (bus stop), 0.5 mile (transitway), and/or 2.5 miles (park & ride lot)	33	33
Measure C – Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project	<del>34</del> 50	<del>34</del> 50
<b>Usage</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>300</b>
Measure A – <del>Cost effectiveness per</del> Existing riders	<del>105</del>	<del>210</del> 300
Measure B – Operating cost effectiveness	70	90
Measure C – <del>Cost effectiveness per new</del> New riders	<del>175</del> 350	
<b>Equity and Housing Performance</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>150</b>
Measure A - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project’s benefits, impacts, and mitigation	130	80
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	70
<b>Emissions Reduction</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
Measure A - Total emissions reduced	<del>133</del> 200	100
Measure B – Cost effectiveness of emissions reduced	67	
<b>Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Measure A – Bike/Ped Connections	50	50
Measure A - Multimodal elements of the project and existing connections	<del>50</del> 100	<del>50</del> 100
<b>Risk Assessment</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	50	100
<b>Service and Customer Improvements</b>		<b>150</b>
Measure A – Travel Time Reduction		75
Measure B – Cost Reduction		38
Measure C – Service Improvement		37
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>
<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)	100	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>

## ATTACHMENT 4: TDM MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Points
<b>1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>	<b>100</b>
Measure A – Ability to capitalize on existing regional transportation facilities and resources	<del>50</del> <u>100</u>
<del>Measure B – Identify the existing regional transportation facilities and resources on which the project will capitalize (transit stations, bikeways, etc.).</del>	<del>50</del>
<b>2. Usage</b>	<b>100</b>
Measure A – <del>Cost effectiveness of</del> Users	100
<b>3. Equity and Housing Performance</b>	<b>150</b>
Measure A - Project’s benefits, impacts, and mitigation to disadvantaged populations	80
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70
<b>4. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality</b>	<b>400</b>
Measure A - Congested roadways in project area	200
Measure B - Emissions reduced	200
<b>5. Innovation</b>	<b>200</b>
Measure A - Project innovations or <u>new geographic area</u>	<del>100</del> <u>200</u>
<del>Measure B – New Geographic Area</del>	<del>100</del>
<b>6. Risk Assessment</b>	<b>50</b>
<del>Measure A – Risk Assessment Form</del>	<del>15</del>
Measure A - Technical capacity of applicant's organization	<del>20</del> <u>25</u>
Measure B - Continuation of project after initial federal funds are expended	<del>15</del> <u>25</u>
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1,000</b>
<b><u>7. Cost Effectiveness</u></b>	<b><u>100</u></b>
<u>Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)</u>	<u>100</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>1,100</u></b>



## ATTACHMENT 5: BIKE / PEDESTRIAN MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Multiuse Trails / Bike	Pedestrian	SRTS
<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>	<b>200</b>	<del>100</del> <b>150</b>	<b>250</b>
Measure A - Identify location of project relative to Regional Bicycle Transportation Network	200		
Measure A – Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions		<del>100</del> <b>150</b>	
Measure A – “5 Es”			250
<b>Potential Usage</b>	<b>200</b>	<del>200</del> <b>150</b>	<del>200</del> <b>250</b>
Measure A – <del>Cost effectiveness of</del> Existing population and employment	200		
Measure A – <del>Cost effectiveness of</del> Existing population <del>and employment</del>		<del>200</del> <b>150</b>	
Measure A - Average share of student population that bikes, walks, <u>or uses public transit</u>			<del>120</del> <b>170</b>
Measure B - Student population within school's walkshed			80
<b>Equity and Housing Performance</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>120</b>
Measure A - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project’s benefits, impacts, and mitigation	50	50	50
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	70	70
<b>Deficiencies and Safety</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>250</b>
Measure A – Gaps closed/barriers removed, and/or continuity between jurisdictions improved by the project	100	120	100
Measure B - Deficiencies corrected or safety problem addressed	150	180	150
<b>Multimodal Facilities and <u>Existing</u> Connections</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>150</b>	<del>50</del>
<del>Measure A/B – Transit or pedestrian connections</del>	<del>50</del>	<del>75</del>	<del>50</del>
Measure C - Transit or pedestrian elements of the project; and <u>existing connections</u>	<del>50</del> <b>100</b>	<del>75</del> <b>150</b>	
<b>Risk Assessment/Public Engagement</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	130	130	85
Measure A – Public Engagement			45
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>
<b><u>Cost Effectiveness</u></b>	<b><u>100</u></b>	<b><u>100</u></b>	<b><u>100</u></b>
<u>Measure A-Cost effectiveness (Total project cost/total points awarded)</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>1,100</u></b>	<b><u>1,100</u></b>	<b><u>1,100</u></b>