

Regional Solicitation and Discussion on Criteria Weighting

June 21, 2017

TAB Meeting



Top 20 Discussion Topics

- Top 20 list discussed at TAC F&P and TAC
 - Committee comments included in the attachment
 - Most issues are technical in nature
 - Several technical sub-committees formed
- TAB will see TAC recommendations to each of these issues as they are included in specific topic areas discussions over the next several months (July-December)

Today's Discussion and Input

- High-level discussion on criteria weights
- Are the most important criteria in each application category given the most points?
- Does any shifting need to occur?
- Technical experts may have other recommendations that add, move, or eliminate measures that will come back to the TAB in future months

Prioritization Criteria and Weights

- Based on 2014 Regional Solicitation Evaluation and Redesign Effort
- Recommendation from Steering Committee
 - Technical Experts/Modal Committee Chairs, TAB members, Councilmembers
- Approved by TAB and the Council

Application Categories



MODAL CATEGORIES

Roadways Including Multimodal Elements
**48% - 68% of Funds

Transit and Travel Demand Management (TDM) Projects
**22% - 32% of Funds

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
**10% - 20% of Funds

APPLICATION CATEGORIES

Expansion

Reconstruction / Modernization

Roadway System Management

Bridges

Transit Expansion

Transit System Modernization

Travel Demand Management

- Base Level
- Innovative

Multise Trails and Bicycle Facilities

Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA)

Safe Routes to School (Infrastructure Projects)

Roadway Expansion

Criteria	Expansion	Mod.	RSM	Bridge
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distance to parallel roadways Connection to jobs Heavy commercial traffic Freight elements 	16%	16%	11%	18%
Usage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Person throughput 2040 ADT 	16%	16%	11%	12%
Safety (Crashes reduced)	14%	14%	18%	--
Congestion /Air Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Congestion reduction Emissions reduction 	14%	7%	18%	--
Equity and Housing Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socio-economic elements Housing performance score 	9%	9%	9%	9%
Cost Effectiveness	9%	9%	9%	9%
Multimodal	9%	9%	9%	9%
Infrastructure Age	7%	14%	7%	36%
Risk Assessment	7%	7%	7%	7%

Roadway Recon/Modernization

Criteria	Recon/Mod	Exp.	RSM	Bridge
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distance to parallel roadways Connection to jobs Heavy commercial traffic Freight elements 	16%	16%	11%	18%
Usage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Person throughput 2040 ADT 	16%	16%	11%	12%
Safety (Crashes reduced)	14%	14%	18%	--
Infrastructure Age/Condition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction date Roadway deficiencies 	14%	7%	7%	36%
Equity and Housing Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socio-economic elements Housing performance score 	9%	9%	9%	9%
Cost Effectiveness	9%	9%	9%	9%
Multimodal	9%	9%	9%	9%
Risk Assessment	7%	7%	7%	7%
Congestion /Air Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Congestion reduction Emissions reduction 	7%	14%	18%	--

Roadway System Management

Criteria	RSM	Exp.	Mod.	Bridge
Safety (Crashes reduced)	18%	14%	14%	--
Congestion /Air Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Congestion reduction Emissions reduction 	18%	14%	7%	--
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distance to parallel roadways Connection to jobs Heavy commercial traffic Freight elements 	11%	16%	16%	18%
Usage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Person throughput 2040 ADT 	11%	16%	16%	12%
Equity and Housing Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socio-economic elements Housing performance score 	9%	9%	9%	9%
Cost Effectiveness	9%	9%	9%	9%
Multimodal	9%	9%	9%	9%
Infrastructure Age/Condition	7%	7%	14%	36%
Risk Assessment	7%	7%	7%	7%

Bridge Rehab and Replacement

Criteria	Bridge	Exp.	Mod.	RSM
Infrastructure Age/Condition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridge sufficiency • Load-posting 	36%	7%	14%	7%
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distance to parallel roadways • Connection to jobs • Heavy commercial traffic • Freight elements 	18%	16%	16%	11%
Usage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Person throughput • 2040 ADT 	12%	16%	16%	11%
Equity and Housing Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socio-economic elements • Housing performance score 	9%	9%	9%	9%
Cost Effectiveness	9%	9%	9%	9%
Multimodal	9%	9%	9%	9%
Risk Assessment	7%	7%	7%	7%
Safety	--	14%	14%	18%
Congestion /Air Quality	--	14%	7%	18%

Transit Expansion

Criteria	Transit Expansion	Transit Modernization
Usage (New Riders)	32%	27%
Equity and Housing Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socio-economic elements Housing performance score 	18%	14%
Emissions Reduction	18%	9%
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connection to jobs and educational institutions Transit connections 	9%	9%
Multimodal	9%	9%
Cost Effectiveness	9%	9%
Risk Assessment	5%	9%
Transit Improvements	--	14%

Transit System Modernization

Criteria	Transit Modernization	Transit Expansion
Usage (Existing Riders)	27%	32%
Equity and Housing Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socio-economic elements Housing performance score 	14%	18%
Transit Improvements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Travel time reduction Reduced operating/maintenance cost improvements. 	14%	--
Emissions Reduction	9%	18%
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connection to jobs and educational institutions Transit connections 	9%	9%
Multimodal	9%	9%
Cost Effectiveness	9%	9%
Risk Assessment	9%	5%

Innovative Travel Demand Mangmt.

Criteria	TDM
Congestion /Air Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Congestion• VMT reduction	36%
TDM Innovation	18%
Equity and Housing Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Socio-economic elements• Housing performance score	14%
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	9%
Usage	9%
Cost Effectiveness	9%
Risk Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Technical capacity of applicant• Continuation of project beyond funding	5%

Multiuuse Trails & Bicycle Facilities

Criteria	Trails/Bike	Ped.	SRTS.
Deficiencies and Safety <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaps/Barriers • Deficiencies 	23%	27%	23%
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (RBTN)	18%	14%	--
Potential Usage	18%	14%	23%
Risk Assessment	12%	12%	12%
Equity and Housing Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socio-economic elements • Housing performance score 	11%	11%	11%
Multimodal	9%	14%	--
Cost Effectiveness	9%	9%	9%
Safe Route to School Program Elements	--	--	23%

Pedestrian Facilities

Criteria	Pedestrian	Trails/Bike	SRTS.
Deficiencies and Safety <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gaps/Barriers Deficiencies 	27%	23%	23%
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	14%	18%	--
Potential Usage	14%	18%	23%
Multimodal	14%	9%	--
Risk Assessment	12%	12%	12%
Equity and Housing Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socio-economic elements Housing performance score 	11%	11%	11%
Cost Effectiveness	9%	9%	9%
Safe Route to School Program Elements	--	--	23%

Safe Routes to School

Criteria	SRTS	Trails/Bike	Ped.
Safe Route to School Program Elements	23%	--	--
Deficiencies and Safety <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gaps/Barriers Deficiencies 	23%	27%	23%
Potential Usage	23%	14%	18%
Risk Assessment (and Public Engagement)	12%	12%	12%
Equity and Housing Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socio-economic elements Housing performance score 	11%	11%	11%
Cost Effectiveness	9%	9%	9%
Multimodal	--	14%	9%
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	--	14%	18%

Questions

Steve Peterson, Manager of Highway Planning and
TAB/TAC Process

651-602-1819

Steven.Peterson@metc.state.mn.us

Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner

651-602-1705

joseph.barbeau@metc.state.mn.us