ACTION TRANSMITTAL No. 2017-29

DATE:	November 6, 2017
TO:	Transportation Advisory Board
FROM:	Technical Advisory Committee
PREPARED BY:	Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)
SUBJECT:	2018 Regional Solicitation Application Categories
REQUESTED ACTION:	Recommend the attached measures and scoring guidance for each application category for the 2018 Regional Solicitation
RECOMMENDED MOTION:	That TAB approve the attached measures and scoring guidance for each application category for the 2018 Regional Solicitation.

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. TAB selects projects for funding from two federal programs: the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program. The attached materials include the 10 application categories, criteria for each category, proposed measures within the criteria, and proposed scoring guidance for the 2018 Regional Solicitation.

Key Changes Proposed:
Proposed Changes to Universal Measures

A. Reduction in the number of sub-measures in the Risk Assessment form to fewer, more significant sub-measures (shown in the individual application categories). (Pages 26, 50, 71, 83, 98, 116, 148, 162, and 175)
B. Adjustment of the Equity measure to incorporate community engagement and to better address negative externalities (measure 3A in each category). (Pages 13, 38, 61, 80, 95, 111, 128, 141, 155, and 169)

Proposed Changes to Roadway Measures

C. Changes to the "Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy" criterion:
    - Incorporation of the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study into scoring (Expansion and Reconstruction/Modernization). (Measure 1A; pages 6 and 33)
    - Incorporation of the Congestion Management and Safety Plan (CMSP) into scoring (Reconstruction/Modernization). (Measure 1A; page 34)
    - Incorporation of the Regional Truck Corridor Study into scoring instead of the Freight Projects Elements measure (Expansion and Reconstruction/Modernization). (Measure 1C; pages 8 and 33)
    - Addition of Integration Within Existing Traffic Management Systems and Coordination with Other Agencies measures (Roadway System Management). (Measures 1C and 1D; pages 57 and 58)
D. Clarification that traffic projections should be based on the average weekday, disallowing peak holiday traffic or other events (Expansion and Reconstruction/Modernization). (Measure 5A; pages 18 and 44)
E. Incorporation of the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network into the Multimodal Elements and Existing Conditions criterion. (Measure 7/5; pages 25, 49, 70, and 85)

F. Roadway System Management:
    - Shifting from Date of Equipment Installation to Obsolete Equipment to gauge infrastructure needs. (Measure 4; page 65)
    - Change in the Vehicle Delay Reduced and Kg of Emissions Reduced measures from quantitative measures to qualitative measures. (Measures 5A and 5B; pages 66 and 67)
    - Addition of a qualitative safety measure scoring project characteristics and inclusion in local safety plans. (Measure 6B; page 69)

Proposed Changes to Transit Measures:

G. Incorporate the ability to deduct points from emissions reductions if no methodology is provided for Usage (Expansion only). (Measure 4; page 99)
H. Change Emissions Reduction from a quantitative to qualitative measure (Modernization only). (Measure 4; page 115)
I. Merger of Service and Customer Improvements criterion into one measure by eliminating the operating and maintenance cost saving measure and moving travel time savings into rider improvements measure. (Modernization only). (Measure 5; page 116)

Proposed Changes to Travel Demand Management (TDM) Measures:

J. Scoring of usage, in part, on the project's focus on target populations or groups. (Measure 2; page 127)
K. Definition of a "trip" as a journey from origin to destination. (Measure 4B; page 132)
L. Introduction of points for replicating a successful project in another region and ability to reduce points for redundant projects in the "Innovation" criterion. (Measure 5; page 134)

Proposed Changes to Bicycle/Pedestrian Measures:

M. Addition of a new measure, providing points to applicants that remove snow from trails (Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities). (Measure 2B; removed from page 143)

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

COMMITTEE COMMENTS AND ACTION: At its October 19, 2017 meeting, the Funding & Programming Committee voted unanimously to recommend the attached measures and scoring guidance for each application category for the 2018 Regional Solicitation, with the following changes:

- (Item A, above): Returning to the Risk Assessment work group's recommended distinction, within "Review of Section 106 Historic Resources," between "no historic properties affected" or "'no adverse effect' anticipated." MnDOT Metro District State Aid commented that "no historic properties affected" is worthy of no point deduction while "'no adverse effect' anticipated" may include a 30-day review from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), which could add further time, expense, and conditions. The attached measure reflects a return of that designation to an 80% awarding of points.
- (Item B, above): Adjusting the Equity measure to reflect Title VI and NEPA timing, broaden the definition of engagement, and require scorers to document negatives not acknowledged in the application. These changes are reflected with yellow highlight in the attached measure.
- (Item C (first two sub-bullets), above): Clarifying that "parallel route" is "adjacent parallel route" and providing clarity that the "congestion on adjacent parallel routes" part of the measure does not relieve congestion. Also, while this was not in the motion, staff has suggested eliminating reference to scorers having discretion to select a different parallel route. (Pages 7 and 34)
- (Item I, above): At the request of the Committee, staff added language to promote the importance of travel time savings and to provide further guidance to scorers. (Page 116)
- (Item M, above): Eliminating the 50-point snow plowing award, returning those points to the now-lone measure under Usage, and adding the phrase "year-round" to the winter-maintenance-related qualifying criterion (since adjusted by TAC; see below).
- Allowing maintenance and support facilities and garages in the Transit Modernization application.

At its November 1, 2017 meeting, the Transportation Advisory Committee voted unanimously to recommend the attached measures and scoring guidance for each application category for the 2018 Regional Solicitation, as recommended by the Funding & Programming Committee with the following change:

- Inclusion of a measure to award 50 points to applicants that have a maintenance plan that includes snow and ice control on bicycle and pedestrian trails.

ROUTING

TO	ACTION REQUESTED	COMPLETION DATE
TAC Funding & Programming Committee	Review & Recommend	10-19-2017
Technical Advisory Committee	Review & Recommend	11-1-2017
Transportation Advisory Board	Review & Adopt	-
Transportation Committee	Review & Recommend	-
Metropolitan Council	Concurrence	-

Roadway Expansion – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

September 20, 2017

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 new thru-lane capacity with these federal funds per regional policy and must apply in the Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility application category.

Examples of Roadway Expansion Projects:

- New roadways
- Two-lane to four-lane expansions
- ~~Two-lane to three~~Other thru-lane expansions (excludes additions of a continuous center turn lane)
- 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, overpasses and underpasses

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures		Points	% of Total Points
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy		**~~175~~210**	**1~~97.5~~%**
	Measure A - ~~Average distance to nearest~~Level of Congestion and Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study Priorities ~~parallel roadways~~	80	
	Measure B - Connection to Total Jobs, ~~and~~ Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs, and Students	~~30~~50	
	Measure C - ~~Current daily heavy commercial traffic~~Regional Truck Corridor Study Tiers	~~50~~80	
~~-~~	~~Measure D - Freight project elements~~	~~15~~	
2. Usage		**175**	**1~~67.5~~%**
	Measure A - Current daily person throughput	110	
	Measure B - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume	65	
3. Equity and Housing Performance		**100**	**~~10~~9%**
	Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation	30	
	Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Infrastructure Age		**~~75~~40**	**~~7.5~~4%**
	Measure A - Date of construction	~~75~~40	
5. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality		**150**	**~~15~~14%**
	Measure A - Vehicle delay reduced	100	
	Measure B - Kg of emissions reduced	50	
6. Safety		**150**	**~~15~~14%**
	Measure A - Crashes reduced	150	
7. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections		**100**	**~~10~~9%**
	Measure A - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements & connections	100	
8. Risk Assessment		**75**	**7%**
	Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	75	
9. Cost Effectiveness		**100**	9%

	Measure A - Cost effectiveness (~~total project cost/~~total points awarded/total project cost)	100
Total		**1,100**

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (~~175~~ 210 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,~~ congestion levels along the regional transportation system near the project, how it aligns with the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study, ~~;serves heavy commercial traffic, and~~ how itconnects to employment, manufacturing/distribution-related employment, and students, and how it aligns with ~~i.e.,~~ the Regional Truck Corridor Study).

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.~~ Identify the level of congestion on a parallel route ~~may provide relief for congested, parallel routes~~ and how the project area is prioritized in the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study. Respond to each of the two sub-sections below. Projects will get the highest score of the two sub-section sections.

Congestion on adjacent Parallel Routes:

The measure will analyze the level of congestion on ~~the~~ an adjacent parallel A-minor arterial or principal arterial to determine the importance of the ~~Reliever~~roadway in managing congestion on the Regional Highway System. Council staff will use Streetlight travel speed data on an applicant-selected adjacent parallel route that is adjacent to the proposed project. The analysis will compare the peak hour travel speed on an adjacent parallel route to free-flow conditions on this same route to understand congestion levels in the area of the project, which correlates to the role that the project plays in the regional transportation system and economy. The applicant must identify the adjacent parallel corridor as part of the response. The end points of this adjacent parallel corridor must align as closely as possible to the project end points.

RESPONSE (Calculation):

- Adjacent Parallel Corridor: _____
- Adjacent Parallel Corridor Start and End Points: _____
- Free-Flow Travel Speed (Council Staff): _____
- Peak Hour Travel Speed (Council Staff): _____
- Percentage Decrease in Travel Speed in Peak Hour Compared to Free-Flow (Council Staff): _____

Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study:

The measure relies on the results on the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study, which prioritized non-freeway principal arterial intersections. In addition to interchange projects, other lane expansion projects that make improvements to a low-, medium-, or high-priority intersection can also earn points in this measure.

Use the final study report for this measure: metrocouncil.org/PAICS

RESPONSE (Select one for your project, based on the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study):

- Proposed interchange or at-grade project that reduces delay at a High Priority Intersection: ☐ (80 Points)

- Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a Medium Priority Intersection: ☐ (60 Points)
- Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a Low Priority Intersection: ☐ (50 Points)
- Proposed interchange that reduces delay at a Medium Priority Intersection: ☐ (40 Points)
- Proposed interchange project that reduces delay at a Low Priority Intersection: ☐ (0 Points)
- Not listed as a priority in the study: ☐ (0 Points)

SCORING GUIDANCE (80 Points)

~~Expanders, Augmentors, and Non-Freeway Principal Arterials: The applicant with the furthest average distance from the closest parallel~~ Due to the two scoring methods, more than one project can score the maximum points. ~~A-Minor~~ minor Arterials ~~arterials~~ or ~~Principal~~ principal Arterials ~~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~~. In order to be awarded points for this measure the proposed project itself must show some delay reduction in measure 5A. If the project does not reduce delay, then it will score 0 points for this measure.

~~Relievers:~~ Congestion on adjacent Parallel Routes: The applicant with the with the most congestion on an adjacent parallel route (measured by the largest percentage decrease in peak hour travel speeds relative to free-flow conditions)~~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 proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored showed a 5% decrease of travel speeds in the peak hour on the adjacent parallel route relative to free flow conditions and the top project had a 10% reduction, this applicant would receive (5/10)*80 points, or 40 points. ~~In order to be awarded points as an A-minor arterial the proposed project must show some delay reduction in measure 5A. If the project does not reduce delay, then it cannot reduce systemwide congestion and will score 0 points for this measure.~~

~~The scorer will have discretion in determining whether the applicant selected the correct parallel A-minor arterial or principal arterial (and location on that segment).~~

Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study: Projects will be scored based on their Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study priorities.

The scorer will assess if the applicant would score highest with congestion on the adjacent parallel routes part of the measure or the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study part of the measure and give the applicant the highest of the ~~three~~two scores out of a maximum of ~~65~~80 points. However, all interchange projects must only use the scoring output from the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study.

Note: Due to the use of multiple sub-sections, two applicants may receive the full ~~65~~80 points.

~~Four projects (one each for Augmentor, Expander, Reliever, and Non-Freeway Principal Arterial) may receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points (awarded to the top score in the appropriate functional classification). For example, if the Expander being scored had a distance of 8 miles and the top Expander project had an average distance of 10 miles, this applicant would receive (8/10)*80 points or 64 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.~~

B. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Regional Economy" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing employment, manufacturing/distribution-related employment, and post-secondary students enrolled within one mile, as depicted on the "Regional Economy" map.

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

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

- Existing Employment within 1 Mile:_____(Maximum of ~~30~~ 50 points)
- Existing Manufacturing/Distribution-Related Employment within 1 Mile:_____ (Maximum of ~~30~~ 50 points)
- Existing Post-Secondary Students: _____(Maximum of ~~18~~ 30 points)

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~3~~50 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)*~~30~~ 50 points or ~~20~~ 33 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. 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)*~~30~~ 50 points or ~~20~~ 33 points.

The applicant with the highest number of post-secondary students will receive 18 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the 18 points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 students within one mile and the top project had 1,500 students, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*~~18~~ 30 points or ~~12~~ 20 points.

The scorer will assess if the applicant would score highest with the total employment part of the measure, the manufacturing/distribution employment part of the measure, or the education part of the measure and give the applicant the highest of the three scores out of a maximum of ~~30~~ 50 points.

Note: Due to the use of multiple sub-measures, two applicants ~~will~~ can receive the full ~~30~~ 50 points.

C. *MEASURE:* This criterion relies on the results on the Truck Highway Corridor Study, which prioritized all principal and minor arterials based on truck volume, truck percentage of total traffic, proximity to freight industry clusters, and proximity to regional freight terminals. (80 points)

Use the final study report for this measure: https://metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Planning-2/Transit-Plans,-Studies-Reports/Highways-Roads/Truck-Freight-Corridor-Study.aspx

RESPONSE Select one for your project, based on the Regional Truck Corridor Study*):*

- Along Tier 1: ☐ (80 Points)

- Along Tier 2: ☐ (60 Points)
- Along Tier 3: ☐ (40 Points)
- The project provides a direct and immediate connection (i.e., intersects) with either a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor: ☐ (10 Points)
- None of the tiers: ☐ (0 Points)

C. 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 count is collected, or that 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.

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

RESPONSE:

- Location:_____
- Current daily heavy commercial traffic volume:_____
- Date heavy commercial count taken: _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)
The applicant with the highest daily heavy commercial traffic at a location along the project length will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. 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)*50 points, or 38 points.

D. *MEASURE:* Discuss any freight elements that are included as part of the project and how they improve efficiency, security, or safety. (15 points)
Address how the proposed project safely integrates freight. Freight elements could be project elements such as upgrading a non-ten-ton roadway to a ten-ton roadway, adding paved shoulders, wider shoulders, acceleration lanes, or longer turning lanes added specifically to accommodate freight movements.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (15 Points)
The project with the most comprehensive freight elements included as part of the project will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.

2. Usage (175 Points) – This criterion quantifies the project's potential 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:* The applicant must identify the location along the project length and provide the current AADT volume from the MnDOT 50-series maps and existing transit routes that travel on the road (reference Transit Connections Map). Ridership data will be provided by the Metropolitan Council staff, if public transit is currently provided on the project length. 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.

- Current Daily Person Throughput = (current average annual daily traffic volume x 1.30 vehicle occupancy) + average annual daily transit ridership (~~2015~~2017)
- For new roadways, identify the estimated existing daily traffic volume based on traffic modeling.

RESPONSE:

- Location:_____
- Current AADT volume:_____
- Existing Transit Routes on the Project:_____
- Transit routes that will likely be diverted to ~~a~~ the new proposed roadway (if applicable):_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (110 Points)
The applicant with highest current daily person throughput will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had a daily person throughput of 1,000 vehicles and the top project within the same functional classification 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 modeled 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☐
- If checked, METC Staff will provide Forecast (2040) ADT volume ☐

OR

RESPONSE:

- Identify the 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. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate 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) – This criterion addresses the Council's role in advancing equity by examining the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. 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 equitable distribution of~~the~~ benefits, mitigation of negative impacts, and community engagement ~~impacts, and mitigation~~ for the populations selected. (30 Points)

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

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

- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50): ☐ (up to 100% of maximum score~~0 to 30 Points~~)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐ (up to 80% of maximum score ~~0 to 24 Points~~)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (up to 60% of maximum score ~~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: ☐ (up to 40% of maximum score ~~0 to 12 Points~~)

1. (0 to 3 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project has encouraged or will engage the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Identify the communities to be engaged and where in the project development process engagement has occurred or will occur. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project; and surveys, study recommendations, or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If relevant, describe how NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities.

(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

2. (0 to 7 points) Describe the project's benefits to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Benefits could relate to safety; public health; access to destinations; travel time; gap closure; leveraging of other beneficial

projects and investments; and/or community cohesion. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

3. (-3 to 0 points) Describe any negative externalities created by the project along with measures that will be taken to mitigate them. Negative externalities can result in a reduction in points, but mitigation of externalities can offset reductions.

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

Below is a list of negative impacts. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

- Increased difficulty in street crossing caused by increased roadway width, increased traffic speed, wider turning radii, or other elements that negatively impact pedestrian access.
- Increased noise.
- Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
- Project elements that are detrimental to location-based air quality by increasing stop/start activity at intersections, creating vehicle idling areas, directing an increased number of vehicles to a particular point, etc.
- Increased speed and/or "cut-through" traffic.
- Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
- Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.
- Displacement of residents and businesses.
- Construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings. These tend to be temporary.
- Other

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~30~~ 30 Points)

Each application will be scored on a 10-point scale as described below.

1. (3 points): The project(s) with the most impactful and meaningful community engagement will receive the full three points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
2. (7 points) The project(s) with the most positive benefits will receive the full seven points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
3. (-3 to 0 points) The scorer will reduce the score by one point (up to three total) for each negative externality. Note that the scorer can deduct points for negatives not acknowledged in the application; the scorer will document any negatives not acknowledged in the application and the reasons for any associated point reductions. The scorer can add one to three points for successful mitigation of negative project elements based on the degree to which they are mitigated. Note that this score cannot provide more points than are deducted.

Each score from the above 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography.

~~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 proportionate 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. Note also that it is possible to score negative points on this measure.

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the ~~2015~~ 2017 Housing Performance Score 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.

For stand-alone intersection, bridge, underpass, and interchange projects, a one-mile radius-buffer will be drawn around the project. If the radius-buffer enters more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on the proportionate population of the Census blocks in each jurisdiction that are all or partially located in the area within the one-mile radius-buffer.

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.

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

- City/Township: _____
- Length of Segment (Population for stand-alone projects from Regional Economy map) within City/Township: _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)

The applicant with the highest ~~2015~~ 2017 Housing Performance Score will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate 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. For stand-alone

intersection, bridge, underpass, and interchange projects, a one-mile radius-buffer will be drawn around the project. If the radius-buffer enters more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on the proportionate population of the Census blocks in each jurisdiction that are all or partially located in the area within the one-mile radius-buffer.

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 (~~75~~ 40 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 an 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 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 reconstruction: _____
- Segment length: _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~75~~ 40 Points)

The applicant with the oldest roadway will receive full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate 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~~ 40 points or ~~64~~ 34 points.

Note: Because of the reporting of year of construction, it is possible for multiple projects to receive the full allotment of ~~75~~ 40 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. In addition, it will address its ability to improve congested intersections operating at unacceptable levels of service during peak hour conditions.

A. *MEASURE:* Conduct a capacity analysis at one or more of the intersections (or rail crossings) being improved by the roadway project using existing turning movement counts (collected within the last three years) in the weekday 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 (or rail crossings) and the reduction in total peak hour intersection delay at these intersections (or rail crossings) in seconds, due to the project. If more than one intersection is examined, then the delay reduced by each intersection (or rail crossing) can be can added together to determine the total delay reduced by the project. If expanding thru lanes or building a new interchange on an existing signalized corridor, signal retiming must be completed in the five-year time period before the project was submitted for funding (i.e., completed a signal retiming between 2013 and 2018), consistent with regional policy in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan.

   - 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 applicant should conduct fieldwork during either the a.m. or p.m. peak hour to determine the total peak hour delay reduced by the project. Applicants can also add together intersection delay reduced and railroad delay reduced, if they both will be improved by the project.

   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
   - Roadway lengths for intersection approaches must be the same length for before and after scenarios
   - An average weekday should be used for the existing conditions instead of a weekend, peak holiday, or special event time period that is not representative of the corridor for most of the year

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

   RESPONSE (Calculation):

   - Total Peak Hour Delay/Vehicle without the Project (Seconds/Vehicle):_____
   - Total Peak Hour Delay/Vehicle with the Project (Seconds/Vehicle):_____
   - Total Peak Hour Delay/Vehicle Reduced by the Project (Seconds/Vehicle):_____

- Volume (Vehicles Per Hour): _____
- Total Peak Hour Delay Reduced by the Project (Seconds): _____
- *EXPLANATION of methodology used to calculate railroad crossing delay, if applicable, or date of last signal retiming for signalized corridors (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):*

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 proportionate share of the points. 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. If expanding thru lanes or building a new interchange on an existing signalized corridor, signal retiming must be completed in the five-year time period before the project was submitted for funding (i.e., completed a signal retiming between 2013 and 2018), consistent with regional policy in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan. If the date of the signal retiming is more than five years past, then the project will be disqualified as part of the qualifications review of the projects. Applicants will provide that date as part of the explanation for this measure.

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 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.

Roadway projects that do not include new roadway segments or railroad grade-separation elements:

- Total Peak Hour Emissions Reduced (Kilograms)= Total Peak Hour Emissions without the project – Total Peak Hour Emissions with the Project ~~Reduced Per Vehicle x Vehicles Per Hour~~

RESPONSE (Calculation):

- Total (CO, NO_X, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions~~/Vehicle~~ without the Project (Kilograms):_____
- Total (CO, NO_X, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions~~/Vehicle~~ with the Project (Kilograms):_____
- Total (CO, NO_X, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced~~/Vehicle~~ by the Project (Kilograms):_____
- ~~Volume (Vehicles Per Hour): _____~~
- ~~Total (CO, NO_X, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms): _____~~

If more than one intersection is examined, the response ~~in~~ should include a total of all emissions reduced.

Roadway projects that are constructing new roadway segments, but do not include railroad grade-separation elements:

- 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 (using Synchro). If more than one intersection is examined, then the emissions reduced by each intersection can be can added together.

  However, new roadways will also generate new emissions compared to existing conditions as traffic diverts from the parallel roadways. The applicant needs to estimate four variables to determine the new emissions generated once the project is completed on any major intersections. Those variables include: speed, vehicle mile traveled, delay, and total vehicle stops. The applicant needs to detail any assumptions used for conditions after the project is built. The variables will be used in the exact same equation used Synchro required of the other project types.

The equation below should only be used to estimate the new emissions generated by new roadways.

Parallel Roadways

Enter data for Parallel Roadways.

- Total Peak Hour Emissions Reduced (Kilograms) = Total Peak Hour ~~Emissions Reduced Per Vehicle x Vehicles Per Hour~~without the project – Total Peak Hour Emissions with the Project

RESPONSE (Data Input and Calculation):

- Total (CO, NO_X, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions ~~Per Vehicle~~ without the Project (Kilograms):_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Total (CO, NO_X, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions ~~Per Vehicle~~ with the Project (Kilograms):_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Total (CO, NO_X, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced ~~Per Vehicle~~ by the Project (Kilograms):_____ (Online Calculation)
- ~~Volume (Vehicles Per Hour): _____ (Applicant inputs number)~~
- ~~Total (CO, NO_X, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms): _____ (Online Calculation)~~

If more than one intersection is examined, the response is a total of all emissions reduced.

Emissions Reduced on Parallel Roadways _____ (Online Calculation)

New Roadway Portion

- Cruise speed in miles per hour with the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Vehicle miles traveled with the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Total delay in hours with the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Total stops in vehicles per hour with the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Fuel consumption in gallons: _____
- Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced or Produced on New Roadway (Kilograms):_____
- EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used:(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
- Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms):

Speed = cruise speed in miles per hour
Total Travel = vehicle miles traveled
Total Delay = total delay in hours
Stops = total stops in vehicles per hour
$K4 = 0.075283-0.0015892 * Speed + 0.000015066 * Speed^2$
K2 = 0.7329
$K5 = 0.0000061411 * Speed^2$

F2 = Fuel consumption in gallons

*CO = F2 * 0.0699 kg/gallon*
$NO_X = F2 * 0.0136$ kg/gallon
*VOC = F2 * 0.0162 kg/gallon*

Total = Total Peak Hour Emissions reduced on Parallel Roadways – (CO + NOx + VOC)

Roadway projects that include railroad grade-separation elements:

- For roadway projects that include a railroad crossing, the applicant needs to input four variables before and after the project to determine the change in emissions. Those variables include: speed, vehicle mile traveled, delay, and total vehicle stops. The applicant needs to conduct fieldwork during either the a.m. or p.m. peak hour to determine the existing conditions and then detail any assumptions used for conditions after the project is built. The variables will be used in the exact same equation used within the software program (i.e., Synchro) required of the other project types. Therefore, the approach to calculate the kilograms emissions reduced for railroad grade-separation projects will be comparable to intersection improvement projects.

RESPONSE (Calculation):

- Cruise speed in miles per hour without the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Vehicle miles traveled without the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Total delay in hours without the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Total stops in vehicles per hour without the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)

- Cruise speed in miles per hour with the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Vehicle miles traveled with the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)

- Total delay in hours with the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Total stops in vehicles per hour with the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Fuel consumption in gallons (F1)
- Fuel consumption in gallons (F2)
- Fuel consumption in gallons (F3)
- Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms):
- EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used:(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)

Speed = cruise speed in miles per hour
Total Travel = vehicle miles traveled
Total Delay = total delay in hours
Stops = total stops in vehicles per hour

$K1 = 0.075283\text{-}0.0015892 * Speed + 0.000015066 * Speed^2$
$K2 = 0.7329$
$K3 = 0.0000061411 * Speed^2$

F1 (or F2 – without the project) = Fuel consumption in gallons

*F1 = Total Travel * k1 + Total Delay * k2 + Stops * k3*
*F2 = Total Travel * k1 + Total Delay * k2 + Stops * k3*

F3 = F1 – F2

*CO = F3 * 0.0699 kg/gallon*
NO_X *= F3 * 0.0136 kg/gallon*
*VOC = F3 * 0.0162 kg/gallon*

Equation Automatically Provides Emissions Reduced:

- Total (CO, NO_X, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms): _____ (Online Calculation)
- *EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):*

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 proportionate 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 monetized safety benefits.

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

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 latest Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) application. 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~~ 2015 through ~~2015~~2017. 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 and attach the crash modification factor(s) used from FHWA's Crash Modification Factors Clearinghouse: http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/. This measure requests the monetized safety benefit of the project. The cost of the project is scored in the Cost Effectiveness criterion.

New Roadways:

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 Factor Used (*Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)*: _____
- Rationale for Crash Modifications Selected (*Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)*: _____
- Project Benefit ($) from B/C ratio: _____
- Explanation of Methodology: _____

Roadway projects that include railroad grade-separation elements:

Since the number of observed crashes at an existing at-grade railroad crossing is minor 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 proportionate 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 crash risk exposure eliminated due to the project will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored reduced 11,000 exposures and the top project reduced 16,000 exposures this applicant would receive (11,000 /16,000)*150 points or 103 points.

7. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections (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.

A. *MEASURE:* Describe how the project positively affects the multimodal system.

- Discuss any bicycle, pedestrian, or transit 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. 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).
- Describe ~~to reference~~ how the proposed multimodal improvements positively affect identified alignments in the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) or along a regional trail, if applicable.
- ~~Also, describe~~Discuss the existing bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections and how the project enhances these connections.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The project ~~with the~~that most positively affects the ~~comprehensive~~ multimodal ~~elements included as part of the project~~system will 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. Points can be earned for incorporating multimodal project elements, positively affecting identified alignments in the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) or regional trail, or for making connections with existing multimodal systems.

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 successfully building the project. High-risk applications increase the likelihood that projects will withdraw at a later date. If this happens, the region is forced to reallocate the federal funds in a short amount of time or return them to the US Department of Transportation. ~~and the steps already completed in the project development process~~. These ~~steps~~ risks 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.).

~~If the applicant is completing a transit or TDM application that is operations only, check the box and do not complete the remainder of the form. These projects will receive full points for the Risk Assessment.~~

Park-and-Ride and other transit construction projects require completion of the Risk Assessment below.

RESPONSE (Complete Risk Assessment):

~~**1) Project ScopeFunding (5 20 Percent of Points)**~~

~~100% ☐ Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurred~~All funding sources are identified and/or are local sources ~~(the Regional Solicitation award is the gap funding/remaining funding needed to implement the project); applicants may still pursue other funding sources after the project award to reduce the local contribution.~~

~~40% ☐ Stakeholders have been identified~~

~~0% ☐ The applicant is promising to cover the entire local match, but it is necessary for them to seek other sources (e.g., state bonding or various state/federal competitive grants) or funding partners to be able to successfully deliver the project (i.e., the local agency does not have the entire local match committed at this time) Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted~~

~~2)~~1) **Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ (30 ~~5~~ Percent of Points)**

Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries

100% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)~~completed~~). **A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.**

50% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan started~~completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. **A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.**

0% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ has not been started

Anticipated date or date of completion: _____

~~**3) Environmental Documentation (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)~~2) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (~~10~~ 20 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

100% ☐ There are historical/archeological properties present but determination of "no historic properties affected" is anticipated.

80% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of ~~"no historic properties affected" or~~ "no adverse effect" anticipated

40% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated

0% ☐ Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological ~~resources~~ properties 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 (10 20 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 property 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)~~

~~8070% ☐ Section 4f resources present within the project area, but no adverse effects~~impacts are minor and they do not adversely affect the activities, features, or ~~attributes of the 4(f) property.~~

~~50% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. – C~~coordination/documentation has begun

~~30% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. Coordination/documentation has not begun resources likely – coordination/documentation has not begun~~

~~0% ☐ Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area~~

~~6)~~3) Right-of-Way (~~15 2~~30 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired

50% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

~~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 all identified
~~0%~~ ☐ ~~Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed~~

Anticipated date or date of acquisition _____

~~7)~~4) **Railroad Involvement (~~25~~ 20 Percent of Points)**

100% ☐ No railroad involvement on project or r
~~100%~~ ☐ ~~R~~ailroad Right-of-Way ~~Agreement~~ agreement is executed (**include signature page, if applicable**)
~~60%~~ ☐ ~~Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated~~
~~40~~50% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun
~~20%~~ ☐ ~~Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; railroad has been contacted~~
0% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun~~railroad has not been contacted~~.

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: _____~~

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 proportionate 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 Effectiveness (100 Points) – This criterion will assess the project's cost effectiveness based on the total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls) and total points awarded in the previous 8 criteria.

A. *MEASURE:* This measure will calculate the cost effectiveness of the project. Metropolitan Council staff will divide the number of points awarded in the previous criteria by the TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls) ~~by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria~~.

- Cost effectiveness = ~~total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls)/~~total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls)

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 most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the top project received .0005 points per dollar and the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, this applicant would receive (.00025/.0005)*100 points or 50 points.

The scorer for this measure will also complete a reasonableness check of the total project cost that is used for this measure. The scorer may follow up with the applicant to clarify any questions. Up to 50 percent of points awarded for this measure can be deducted if the scorer does not believe that the cost estimate is reasonable.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS

Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility– Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

September 20, 2017

Definition: A roadway project that does not add thru-lane capacity, but reconstructs, reclaims, ~~or~~ modernizes, or adds new spot mobility elements (e.g., new turn lanes, traffic signal, or roundabout)~~the facility~~. Routine maintenance including mill and overlay projects are not eligible. 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.

Examples of Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility Projects:

- Intersection improvements or alternative intersections such as unsignalized or signalized reduced conflict intersections.
- Interchange reconstructions that do not involve new ramp movements or added thru lanes
- Turn lanes ~~(not continuous)~~
- Two-lane to three-lane conversions (with a continuous center turn lane)
- Four-lane to three-lane conversions
- Roundabouts
- Addition or replacement of traffic signals
- Shoulder improvements
- Strengthening a non-10-ton roadway
- Raised medians, frontage roads, access modifications, or other access management
- Roadway improvements that add multimodal elements
- New alignments that replace an existing alignment and do not expand the number of lanes

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	**~~175~~170**	**15%**
Measure A - Level of Congestion, Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study Priorities, and Congestion Management and Safety Plan Opportunity Areas ~~Average distance to nearest parallel roadways~~	~~80~~65	
Measure B - Connection to Total Jobs and Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs	~~30~~40	
Measure C - Regional Truck Corridor Study Tiers~~Current daily heavy commercial traffic~~	~~50~~65	
~~Measure D - Freight project elements~~	~~15~~	
2. Usage	**175**	**16%**
Measure A - Current daily person throughput	110	
Measure B - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume	65	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**100**	**~~10~~9%**
Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits	30	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Infrastructure Age/Condition	**150**	**~~15~~14%**
Measure A - Date of construction	50	
Measure B - Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies	100	
5. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	**~~75~~80**	**~~7.5~~7%**
Measure A - Vehicle delay reduced	~~45~~50	
Measure B - Kg of emissions reduced	30	
6. Safety	**150**	**~~15~~14%**
Measure A - Crashes reduced	150	
7. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	**100**	**~~10~~9%**
Measure A - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections	100	
8. Risk Assessment	**75**	**~~7.58~~7%**

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	75	
9. Cost Effectiveness	**100**	9%
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (~~total project cost/~~total points awarded/total project cost)	100	
Total	**1,100**	

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (~~175~~ 170 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~~ congestion levels along the regional transportation system near the project; how it aligns with the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study and Congestion Management and Safety Plan IV; ~~fulfills its functional classification role, serves heavy commercial traffic, and~~ how it connects to employment, ~~and~~ manufacturing/distribution-related employment, and post-secondary students; and how it aligns with the Regional Truck Corridor Study.

A. *MEASURE:* Identify the level of congestion on a parallel route ~~Address how the project, route fulfills its role in the regional transportation system and~~ and how the project area is prioritized in the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study and the latest Congestion Management and Safety Plan. Respond ~~as appropriate to one type of functional classification~~ to each of the three sub-sections below. Projects will get the highest score of the three sub-section sections.

Congestion on Adjacent Parallel Routes:

The measure will analyze the level of congestion on an adjacent parallel A-minor arterial or principal arterial to determine the importance of the roadway in managing congestion on the Regional Highway System. Council staff will use Streetlight travel speed data on an applicant-selected parallel route that is adjacent to the proposed project. The analysis will compare the peak hour travel speed on an adjacent parallel route to free-flow conditions on this same route to understand congestion levels in the area of the project, which correlates to the role that the project plays in the regional transportation system and economy. The applicant must identify the adjacent parallel corridor as part of the response. The end points of this adjacent parallel corridor must align as closely as possible to the project end points.

RESPONSE (Calculation):

- Adjacent Parallel Corridor: _____
- Adjacent Parallel Corridor Start and End Points: _____
- Free-Flow Travel Speed (Council Staff): _____
- Peak Hour Travel Speed (Council Staff): _____
- Percentage Decrease in Travel Speed in Peak Hour Compared to Free-Flow (Council Staff): _____

Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study:

The measure relies on the results on the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study, which prioritized non-freeway principal arterial intersections.

Use the final study report for this measure: metrocouncil.org/PAICS

RESPONSE (Select one for your project):

- Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a High Priority Intersection: ☐ (65 Points)
- Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a Medium Priority Intersection: ☐ (55 Points)
- Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a Low Priority Intersection: ☐ (45 Points)
- Not listed as a priority in the study: ☐ (0 Points)

Congestion Management and Safety Plan IV:

The measure relies on the results on MnDOT's Congestion Management and Safety Plan IV (CMSP IV), which prioritized lower cost/high benefit, spot mobility projects on MnDOT-owned roadways. For the Regional Solicitation, only the CMSP opportunity areas on the A-minor arterial or non-freeway principal arterial systems are eligible. Principal arterial projects on the freeway system are not eligible for funding per TAB-adopted rules.

Use the final list of CMSP IV opportunity area locations as depicted in the draft 2040 Transportation Policy Plan (2018).

RESPONSE (Select one for your project):

- Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a CMSP opportunity area: ☐ (65 Points)
- Not listed as a CMSP priority location: ☐ (0 Points)

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~80~~ 65 Points)

~~Expanders, Augmentors, Connectors, 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, Connectors, and Non-Freeway Principal Arterials.~~ Due to the three scoring methods, more than one project can score the maximum points. ~~mapa~~ In order to be awarded points for this measure the proposed project itself must show some delay reduction in measure 5A. If the project does not reduce delay, then it will score 0 points for this measure.

Congestion on Adjacent Parallel Routes: The applicant with the with the most congestion on an adjacent parallel route (measured by the largest percentage decrease in peak hour travel speeds relative to free-flow conditions) will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored showed a 5% decrease of travel speeds in the peak hour on the adjacent parallel route relative to free flow conditions and the top project had a 10% reduction, this applicant would receive (5/10)*65 points, or 33 points.~~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 proportionate share of the full points, calculated as described above.~~

~~The scorer will have discretion in determining whether the applicant selected the correct parallel A-minor arterial or principal arterial (and location on that segment).~~

Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study: Projects will be scored based on their Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study priorities.

Congestion Management and Safety Plan IV: Projects will be scored based on whether their project location is in a Congestion Management and Safety Plan opportunity area.

The scorer will assess if the applicant would score highest with congestion on adjacent parallel routes part of the measure, the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study part of the measure, or the CMSP IV part of the measure and give the applicant the highest of the three scores out of a maximum of 65 points.

Note: Due to the use of multiple sub-sections, three applicants may receive the full 65 points.

~~A.~~*B. MEASURE:* Reference the "Regional Economy" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing employment and manufacturing/distribution-related employment, and post-secondary students enrolled within one mile, as depicted on the "Regional Economy" map.

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

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

- Existing Employment within 1 Mile:_____(Maximum of ~~30~~ 40 points)
- Existing Manufacturing/Distribution-Related Employment within 1 Mile:_____ (Maximum of ~~30~~ 40 points)
- Existing Post-Secondary Students: _____(Maximum of ~~18~~ 24 points)

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~30~~ 40 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)*~~30~~ 40 points or ~~20~~ 27 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 (30). 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)*~~30~~ 40 points or ~~20~~ 27 points.

The applicant with the highest number of post-secondary students will receive 18 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the 18 points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 students within one mile and the top project had 1,500 students, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*~~18~~ 24 points or ~~12~~ 16 points.

The scorer will assess if the applicant would score highest with the total employment part of the measure, the manufacturing/distribution employment part of the measure, or the education part of the measure and give the applicant the highest of the three scores out of a maximum of ~~30~~ 40 points.

Note: Due to the use of multiple sub-measures, two applicants will receive the full ~~30~~ 40 points.

C. *MEASURE:* This criterion relies on the results on the Regional Truck Corridor Study, which prioritized all principal and minor arterials based on truck volume, truck percentage of total traffic, proximity to freight industry clusters, and proximity to regional freight terminals. (65 points)

Use the final study report for this measure:

https://metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Planning-2/Transit-Plans,-Studies-Reports/Highways-Roads/Truck-Freight-Corridor-Study.aspx

RESPONSE (Select one for your project, based on the Regional Truck Corridor Study*):*

- Along Tier 1: ☐ (65 Points)
- Along Tier 2: ☐ (45 Points)
- Along Tier 3: ☐ (25 Points)

- The project provides a direct and immediate connection (i.e., intersects) with either a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor: ☐ (10 Points)
- None of the tiers: ☐ (0 Points)

~~Provide the current daily heavy commercial traffic at one location along the A- Minor Arterial or Non-Freeway Principal Arterial project length. It is required that an actual count is collected, or that 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. (50 Points)~~

~~*RESPONSE:*~~

- ~~Location:_____~~
- ~~Current daily heavy commercial traffic volume:_____~~
- ~~Date heavy commercial count taken: _____~~

SCORING GUIDANCE ~~(50 Points)~~
~~The applicant with the highest daily heavy commercial traffic at a location along the project length will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. 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)*50 points, or 38 points.~~

~~B. *MEASURE:* Discuss any freight elements that are included as part of the project and how they improve efficiency, security, or safety.~~
~~Address how the proposed project safely integrates freight. Freight elements could be project elements such as upgrading a non-ten-ton roadway to a ten-ton roadway, adding paved shoulders, wider shoulders, acceleration lanes, or longer turning lanes added specifically to accommodate freight movements.~~

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

~~SCORING GUIDANCE (15 Points)~~
~~The project with the most comprehensive freight elements included as part of the project will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.~~

2. Usage (175 Points) – This criterion quantifies the project's potential 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:* The applicant must identify the location along the project length and provide the current AADT volume from the MnDOT 50-series maps and existing transit routes that travel on the road (reference Transit Connections Map). Ridership data will be provided by the Metropolitan Council staff, if public transit is currently provided on the project length. 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.

- Current Daily Person Throughput = (current average annual daily traffic volume x 1.30 vehicle occupancy) + average annual daily transit ridership (~~2015~~2017)

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. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had a daily person throughput of 1,000 vehicles and the top project within the same functional classification 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.

RESPONSE:

- Use Metropolitan Council model to determine forecast (2040) ADT volume☐
- If checked, METC Staff will provide Forecast (2040) ADT volume ☐

OR

RESPONSE:

- Identify the 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. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate 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) – This criterion addresses the Council's role in advancing equity by examining the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. 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 equitable distribution of~~the~~ benefits, mitigation of negative impacts, and community engagement ~~impacts, and mitigation~~ for the populations selected. (30 Points)

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

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

- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50): ☐ (up to 100% of maximum score~~0 to 30 Points~~)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐ (up to 80% of maximum score ~~0 to 24 Points~~)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (up to 60% of maximum score ~~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: ☐ (up to 40% of maximum score ~~0 to 12 Points~~)

1. (0 to 3 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project has encouraged or will engage the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Identify the communities to be engaged and where in the project development process engagement has occurred or will occur. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project; and surveys, study recommendations, or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If relevant, describe how NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities.

(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

2. (0 to 7 points) Describe the project's benefits to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Benefits could relate to safety; public health; access to destinations; travel time; gap closure; leveraging of other beneficial

projects and investments; and/or community cohesion. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

3. (-3 to 0 points) Describe any negative externalities created by the project along with measures that will be taken to mitigate them. Negative externalities can result in a reduction in points, but mitigation of externalities can offset reductions.

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

Below is a list of negative impacts. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

- Increased difficulty in street crossing caused by increased roadway width, increased traffic speed, wider turning radii, or other elements that negatively impact pedestrian access.
- Increased noise.
- Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
- Project elements that are detrimental to location-based air quality by increasing stop/start activity at intersections, creating vehicle idling areas, directing an increased number of vehicles to a particular point, etc.
- Increased speed and/or "cut-through" traffic.
- Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
- Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.
- Displacement of residents and businesses.
- Construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings. These tend to be temporary.
- Other

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~30~~ 30 Points)

Each application will be scored on a 10-point scale as described below.

1. (3 points): The project(s) with the most impactful and meaningful community engagement will receive the full three points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
2. (7 points) The project(s) with the most positive benefits will receive the full seven points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
3. (-3 to 0 points) The scorer will reduce the score by one point (up to three total) for each negative externality. Note that the scorer can deduct points for negatives not acknowledged in the application; the scorer will document any negatives not acknowledged in the application and the reasons for any associated point reductions. The scorer can add one to three points for successful mitigation of negative project elements based on the degree to which they are mitigated. Note that this score cannot provide more points than are deducted.

Each score from the above 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography.

~~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 proportionate 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. Note also that it is possible to score negative points on this measure.

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the ~~2015~~ 2017 Housing Performance Score 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.

For stand-alone intersection, bridge, underpass, and interchange projects, a one-mile radius-buffer will be drawn around the project. If the radius-buffer enters more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on the proportionate population of the Census blocks in each jurisdiction that are all or partially located in the area within the one-mile radius-buffer.

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.

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

- City/Township: _____
- Length of Segment (Population for stand-alone projects from Regional Economy map) within City/Township: _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)

The applicant with the highest ~~2015~~ 2017 Housing Performance Score will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate 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. For stand-alone

intersection, bridge, underpass, and interchange projects, a one-mile radius-buffer will be drawn around the project. If the radius-buffer enters more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on the proportionate population of the Census blocks in each jurisdiction that are all or partially located in the area within the one-mile radius-buffer.

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 (150 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 an 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 sealcoating project does not constitute a reconstruction and should not be used to determine the infrastructure age.

RESPONSE:

- Year of original roadway construction or most recent reconstruction: _____
- Location(s) used: _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)
The applicant with the oldest roadway will receive full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate 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)*50 points or 43 points.

Note: Because of the reporting of year of construction, it is possible for multiple projects to receive the full allotment of 50 points.

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. Please identify the proposed improvement):

- Improving ~~a non-10 ton~~ roadway to better accommodate freight movements~~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)*
- Signals/lighting upgrades: ☐ 0-10 pts
  - *RESPONSE (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)*
- *Other Improvements*: ☐ 0-10 pts
  - *RESPONSE (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words)*

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)
Within each improvement sub-measure, the answer most responsive to the need 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 proportionate 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.

5. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality (~~75~~ 80 Points) – This criterion measures the project's ability to reduce congestion. In addition, it will address its ability to improve congested intersections operating at unacceptable levels of service during peak hour conditions. The project will also be measured based on its ability to reduce emissions.

A. *MEASURE:* Conduct a capacity analysis at one or more of the intersections (or rail crossings) 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 the Synchro or HCM software. The applicant must show the current total peak hour delay at one or more intersections (or rail crossings) and the reduction in total peak hour intersection delay at these intersections (or rail crossings) in seconds due to the project. If more than one intersection (or rail crossing) is examined, then the delay reduced by each intersection can be can added together to determine the total delay reduced by the project.

- For roadway projects that include a railroad crossing, the applicant should conduct fieldwork during either the a.m. or p.m. peak hour to determine the total peak hour delay reduced by the project. Applicants can also add together intersection delay reduced and railroad delay reduced, if they both will be improved by the project.

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
- Roadway lengths for intersection approaches must be the same length for before and after scenarios
- An average weekday should be used for the existing conditions instead of a weekend, peak holiday, or special event time period that is not representative of the corridor for most of the year

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

RESPONSE (Calculation):

- Total Peak Hour Delay/Vehicle without the Project (Seconds/Vehicle):_____
- Total Peak Hour Delay/Vehicle with the Project (Seconds/Vehicle):_____
- Total Peak Hour Delay/Vehicle Reduced by the Project (Seconds/Vehicle):_____
- Volume (Vehicles Per Hour): _____
- Total Peak Hour Delay Reduced by the Project (Seconds): _____
- *EXPLANATION of methodology used to calculate railroad crossing delay, if applicable (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):*

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 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 proportionate share of the points. 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)*50 points, or 10 points.

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.

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

- Total Peak Hour Emissions Reduced (Kilograms)= Total Peak Hour Emissions without the project – Total Peak Hour Emissions with the Project ~~Reduced Per Vehicle x Vehicles Per Hour~~

RESPONSE (Calculation):

- Total (CO, NO_X, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions~~/Vehicle~~ without the Project (Kilograms):_____
- Total (CO, NO_X, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions~~/Vehicle~~ with the Project (Kilograms):_____
- Total (CO, NO_X, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced~~/Vehicle~~ by the Project (Kilograms):_____
- ~~Volume (Vehicles Per Hour): _____~~
- ~~Total (CO, NO_X, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms): _____~~

If more than one intersection is examined, the response ~~in~~ should include a total of all emissions reduced.

Roadway projects that include railroad grade-separation elements:

- For roadway projects that include a railroad crossing, the applicant needs to input four variables before and after the project to determine the change in emissions. Those variables include: speed, vehicle mile traveled, delay, and total vehicle stops. The applicant needs to conduct fieldwork during either the a.m. or p.m. peak hour to determine the existing conditions and then detail any assumptions used for conditions after the project is built. The variables will be used in the exact same equation used within the software program (i.e., Synchro) required of the other project types. Therefore, the approach to calculate the kilograms emissions reduced for railroad grade-separation projects will be comparable to intersection improvement projects.

RESPONSE (Calculation):

- Cruise speed in miles per hour without the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Vehicle miles traveled without the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)

- Total delay in hours without the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Total stops in vehicles per hour without the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Cruise speed in miles per hour with the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Vehicle miles traveled with the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Total delay in hours with the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Total stops in vehicles per hour with the project:_____ (Applicant inputs number)
- Fuel consumption in gallons (F1)
- Fuel consumption in gallons (F2)
- Fuel consumption in gallons (F3)
- Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms):
- EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used:(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)

Speed = cruise speed in miles per hour
Total Travel = vehicle miles traveled
Total Delay = total delay in hours
Stops = total stops in vehicles per hour

*K1 = 0.075283-0.0015892 * Speed + 0.000015066 * Speed^2*
K2 = 0.7329
*K3 = 0.0000061411 * Speed^2*

F1 (or F2 – without the project) = Fuel consumption in gallons

*F1 = Total Travel * k1 + Total Delay * k2 + Stops * k3*
*F2 = Total Travel * k1 + Total Delay * k2 + Stops * k3*

F3 = F1 – F2

*CO = F3 * 0.0699 kg/gallon*
NO_X *= F3 * 0.0136 kg/gallon*
*VOC = F3 * 0.0162 kg/gallon*

Equation Automatically Provides Emissions Reduced:

- Total (CO, NO_X, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms): _____ (Online Calculation)
- *EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):*

SCORING GUIDANCE (30 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 proportionate 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)*30 points or 18 points.

6. Safety (150 Points) – This criterion addresses the project's ability to correct deficiencies and improve the overall safety of a roadway facility. It will assess the project's 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~~"~~-m~~M~~inor a~~A~~rterial or n~~N~~on-f~~F~~reeway p~~P~~rincipal a~~A~~rterial made by the project. The applicant must base the estimate of crash reduction on the methodology consistent with the latest Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) application. 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~~ 2015 through ~~2015~~2017. 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 and attach the crash modification factor(s) used from FHWA's Crash Modification Factors Clearinghouse: http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/. This measure requests the monetized safety benefit of the project. The cost of the project is scored in the Cost Effectiveness criterion.

RESPONSE (Calculation):

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

Roadway projects that include railroad grade-separation elements:

Since the number of observed crashes at an existing at-grade railroad crossing is minor 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 without a railroad grade-separation project and one with a railroad grade-separation) 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 proportionate 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 crash risk exposure eliminated due to the project will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored reduced 11,000 exposures and the top project reduced 16,000, this applicant would receive (11,000 /16,000)*150 points or 103 points.

7. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections (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.

A. ***MEASURE:*** Describe how the project positively affects the multimodal system.

- Discuss any bicycle, pedestrian, or transit 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. 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).
- Describe how the proposed multimodal improvements positively affect identified alignments in the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) or along a regional trail, if applicable.
- ~~Also, describe~~Discuss the existing bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections and how the project enhances these connections.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The project ~~with the~~that most positively affects the ~~comprehensive~~ multimodal elements ~~included as part of the project~~system will 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. Points can be earned for incorporating multimodal project elements, positively affecting identified alignments in the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) or regional trail, or for making connections with existing multimodal systems.

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 successfully building the project. High-risk applications increase the likelihood that projects will withdraw at a later date. If this happens, the region is forced to reallocate the federal funds in a short amount of time or return them to the US Department of Transportation. ~~and the steps already completed in the project development process~~. These risks 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):

~~**1) Project ScopeFunding (5 20 Percent of Points)**~~

~~100% ☐ Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurred~~All funding sources are identified and/or are local sources ~~(the Regional Solicitation award is the gap funding/remaining funding needed to implement the project); applicants may still pursue other funding sources after the project award to reduce the local contribution.~~

~~40% ☐ Stakeholders have been identified~~

~~0% ☐ The applicant is promising to cover the entire local match, but it is necessary for them to seek other sources (e.g., state bonding or various state/federal competitive grants) or funding partners to be able to successfully deliver the project (i.e., the local agency does not have the entire local match committed at this time) Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted~~

~~2)~~1) **Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ (30 ~~5~~ Percent of Points)**

Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries

100% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)~~completed~~). **A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.**

50% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan started~~completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. **A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.**

0% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ has not been started

Anticipated date or date of completion: _____

~~**3) Environmental Documentation (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)~~2) **Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (~~10~~ 20 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

100% ☐ There are historical/archeological properties present but determination of "no historic properties affected" is anticipated.

80% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of ~~"no historic properties affected"~~ or "no adverse effect" anticipated

40% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated

0% ☐ Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological ~~resources~~ properties 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 (10 20 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 property 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)~~

~~8070% ☐ Section 4f resources present within the project area, but no adverse effectsimpacts are minor and they do not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the 4(f) property.~~

~~50% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. – Ccoordination/documentation has begun~~

~~30% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. Coordination/documentation has not begun resources likely – coordination/documentation has not begun~~

~~0% ☐ Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area~~

~~6)~~3) **Right-of-Way (~~15 2~~30 Percent of Points)**

100% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired

50% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

~~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 all identified

~~0%~~ ☐ ~~Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed~~

Anticipated date or date of acquisition _____

~~7)~~4) Railroad Involvement (~~25~~ 20 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ No railroad involvement on project or r

~~100%~~ ☐ ~~R~~ailroad Right-of-Way ~~Agreement~~ agreement is executed (**include signature page, if applicable**)

~~60%~~ ☐ ~~Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated~~

~~40~~50% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

~~20%~~ ☐ ~~Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; railroad has been contacted~~

0% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun~~railroad has not been contacted~~.

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: ___~~

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 proportionate 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 Effectiveness (100 Points) –** This criterion will assess the project's cost effectiveness based on the total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls) and total points awarded in the previous criteria.

   A. *MEASURE: This measure will calculate the cost* effectiveness *of the project.* Metropolitan Council staff will divide the number of points awarded in the previous criteria by the TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls) ~~by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria~~.

      - Cost- effectiveness = ~~total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls)/~~total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible project cost

      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 most points (i.e., the benefits) per~~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 proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the top project ~~had 35,000~~received .0005 points per dollar and the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, ~~had 70,000,~~ this applicant would receive (.0005~~35,000~~/.00025~~70,000~~) *100 points for 50 points.

The scorer for this measure will also complete a reasonableness check of the total project cost that is used for this measure. The scorer may follow up with the applicant to clarify any questions. Up to 50 percent of points awarded for this measure can be deducted if the scorer does not believe that the cost estimate is reasonable.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS

~~Roadway System~~Traffic Management Technologies – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

September 20, 2017

Definition: An Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) or similar project~~s~~ that primarily benefits roadway users. ~~Roadway System~~Traffic Management Technology projects can include project elements along a single corridor, ~~a continuous route (could be more than one~~multiple ~~roadway~~corridors,~~)~~ or within a ~~defined~~ specific geographic area such as a downtown area. ~~The~~ To be eligible, ~~system management~~ projects must make improvements to at least one A-minor arterial or non-freeway principal arterial ~~as part of the project~~. Projects that are more transit-focused must apply in the Transit System Modernization application category.

Examples of ~~Roadway System~~Traffic Management Technology Projects:

- Flashing yellow arrow traffic signals
- Traffic signal retiming projects
- Integrated corridor signal coordination
- Traffic signal control system upgrades
- New/replacement detectors
- Passive detectors for bicyclists and pedestrians
- New/replacement traffic mgmt. centers
- New/replacement ~~fiber optic cables used for~~ traffic ~~control, etc.~~communication
- New/replacement CCTV cameras
- New/replacement variable message signs & other info improvements
- Incident management coordination

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	**~~125~~175**	**~~12.5~~16%**
Measure A - ~~Average distance to nearest parallel roadways~~Functional classification of project	~~55~~50	
Measure B - ~~Connection to Total Jobs and Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs~~ Regional Truck Corridor Study Tiers	~~30~~50	
Measure C - Integration within existing traffic management systems	~~70~~50	
Measure D - ~~Freight project elements~~ Coordination with other agencies	25	
2. Usage	**125**	**11%**
Measure A - Current daily person throughput	85	
Measure B - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume	40	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**100**	**~~10~~9%**
Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits	30	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Infrastructure Age	**75**	**~~7.5~~7%**
Measure A - ~~Date of construction~~ Upgrades to obsolete equipment	75	
5. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	**200**	**18~~20~~%**
Measure A - ~~Vehicle delay reduced~~Congested roadway	150	
Measure B - ~~Kg of emissions reduced~~Emissions and congestion benefits of project	50	
6. Safety	**200**	**~~20~~18%**
Measure A - Crashes reduced	~~200~~50	
Measure B - Safety issues in project area	~~50~~150	
7. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	**~~100~~50**	**~~10~~5%**
Measure A - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections	~~100~~50	

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
~~8~~8. **Risk Assessment**	**75**	**~~7.5~~7%**
Measure A- Risk Assessment Form	75	
~~Sub-Total~~	~~1,000~~	~~100%~~
~~9~~9. **Cost Effectiveness**	**100**	**9%**
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (~~total project cost/~~total points awarded/ total project cost)	100	
Total	**1,100**	

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (~~125~~ 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~~aligns with the Regional~~Highway~~ Truck Corridor Study, and ~~connects to employment, students, and manufacturing/distribution related employment~~integrates with existing traffic management systems, and provides coordination across agencies.~~.~~ The project must be located on at least one non-freeway principal arterial or A~~-~~-minor arterial.

A. *MEASURE:* ~~Address how the project route fulfills its role in the regional transportation system. The project must be located on at least one Non-Freeway Principal Arterial or "A" Minor Arterial.~~ Reference the functional classification(s) that the project would serve. Investment in a higher functionally-classified roadway (i.e., the principal arterial system) serves a more regional purpose and will result in more points.

~~Upload the "Roadway Area Definition" map used for this measure.~~

RESPONSE (~~Calculation~~Select one):

- The majority of the project funds will be invested on the principal arterial system: ☐ (4~~0~~50 points)
- The majority of the project funds will be invested on the A-minor arterial system: ☐ (2~~0~~5 points)
- The majority of the project funds will be invested on the collector or local system with some investment either on the principal arterial or A-minor arterial system: ☐ (0 points)

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)
The scorer will assign points based on which of the above scores applies. Note that multiple applicants are able to score the maximum point allotment. If no applicant scores 50 points, the 25-point projects will be adjusted to 50 points, while the zero-point projects will remain at zero.~~SCORING GUIDANCE (55 Points)~~
~~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. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the project being scored had a distance of 8 miles and the top project was had an average distance of 10 miles, this applicant would receive (8/10)*55 points or 44 points. Metropolitan Council staff will provide average distance data for all projects to ensure consistency of methodology between applications.~~

A. *B. MEASURE:* ~~Reference "Regional Economy" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the employment and manufacturing/distribution related employment, and post-secondary students enrolled within one mile, as depicted on the "Regional Economy" map. (30 Points)~~ This criterion relies on the results on the ~~Highway~~Regional Truck Corridor Study, which prioritized all ~~roadways~~principal and minor arterials based on truck volume, truck percentage of total traffic, proximity to freight industry clusters, and proximity to regional freight terminals. (50 points)
Use the final study report for this measure:

https://metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Planning-2/Transit-Plans,-Studies-Reports/Highways-Roads/Truck-Freight-Corridor-Study.aspx

RESPONSE (Select one for your project, based on the ~~Highway~~Regional Truck Corridor Study):

- The majority of the project funds will be invested on either a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor: ☐ (50 Points)
- A majority of the project funds will NOT be invested on a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor, but at least 10 percent of the funds will be invested on these corridors: ☐ (25 Points)
- No project funds will be invested on a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor: ☐ (0 Points)

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)
The scorer will assign points based on which of the above scores applies. Note that multiple applicants can score the maximum point allotment. If no applicant scores ~~65~~ 50 points, the ~~30~~25-point projects will be adjusted to 65 points, while the zero-point projects will remain at zero.~~SCORING GUIDANCE (30 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)*30 points or 20 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. 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)*30 points or 20 points.~~

~~The applicant with the highest number of students will receive 18 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the 18 points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 students within one mile and the top project had 1,500 students, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*18 points or 12 points.~~

~~The scorer will assess if the applicant would score highest with the total employment part of the measure, the manufacturing/distribution employment part of the measure, or the education part of the measure and give the applicant the highest of the three scores out of a maximum of 30 points.~~

~~Note: Due to the use of multiple sub-measures, two applicants will receive the full 30 points.~~

C. MEASURE: ~~Provide the current daily heavy commercial traffic at one location along the A-Minor Arterial or Non-Freeway Principal Arterial project length. It is required that an actual count is collected or that 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.~~Discuss how the proposed project integrates and/or builds on existing traffic -management infrastructure (examples of systems include traffic signal systems, freeway management systems, and incident management systems). (50 Points)

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

~~*RESPONSE:*~~

- ~~Location:_____~~

- ~~Current daily heavy commercial traffic volume:_____~~
- ~~Date(s) heavy commercial count taken: _____~~

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~30~~ 50 Points)
~~The applicant with the highest daily heavy commercial traffic at a location along the project length will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. 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)*30 points, or 23 points.~~The applicant will describe how the project would build on other infrastructure and management systems. Prioritizing projects that complement existing infrastructure and management methods, the scorer will award the full share of points to the project that best builds on other infrastructure and management systems. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. This response is intended to be qualitative.

D. MEASURE: ~~Discuss any freight elements that are included as part of the project and how they improve efficiency, security, or safety. (10 points)Address how the proposed project safely integrates freight. Freight elements could be project elements such as upgrading a non-ten-ton roadway to a ten-ton roadway, adding paved shoulders, wider shoulders, acceleration lanes, or longer turning lanes added specifically to accommodate freight movements.~~Demonstrate how the project provides or enhances coordination among operational and management systems and/or jurisdictions. (25 points)

RESPONSE (Limit ~~2~~1,~~8~~400 characters; approximately ~~4~~200 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~10~~ 425 Points)
The project that best provides or enhances coordination among operational and management systems and/or jurisdictions ~~with the most comprehensive freight elements included as part of the project~~ will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.

2. Usage (~~125~~ 1205 Points) – This criterion quantifies the project's potential 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.

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~~ daily transit ridership. If more than one corridor or location is included in the project, then the applicant should select the corridor where the most investment is being made with the project. The applicant must identify the location along the project length and provide the current AADT volume from the MnDOT 50-series maps ~~and existing transit routes that travel on the road~~. Reference the Transit Map for transit routes along the project. Ridership data will be provided by the Metropolitan Council staff, if public transit is currently provided on the project length. (80~~0~~5 points)

- Current Daily Person Throughput = (current average annual daily traffic volume x 1.30 vehicle occupancy) + average annual daily transit ridership (~~2015~~2017)

RESPONSE:

- Location:_____
- Current AADT volume:_____
- Existing ~~Transit~~ transit ~~Routes~~ routes ~~on the Project~~at the location noted above:_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~85~~80~~0~~5 Points)
The project with highest current daily person throughput will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. 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)*~~85~~80~~0~~5 points or 5~~4~~6 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. (40 points)

RESPONSE:

- Use Metropolitan Council model to determine forecast (2040) ADT volume☐
- If checked, METC Staff will provide 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 (40 Points)
The applicant with the highest forecast (2040) ADT volume will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate 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)*40 points or 35 points.

3. Equity and Housing Performance (100 Points) – This criterion addresses the Council's role in advancing equity by examining the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. 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 equitable distribution of~~the~~ benefits, mitigation of negative impacts, and community engagement ~~impacts, and mitigation~~ for the populations selected. (30 Points)

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

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

- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50): ☐ (up to 100% of maximum score~~0 to 30 Points~~)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐ (up to 80% of maximum score ~~0 to 24 Points~~)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (up to 60% of maximum score ~~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: ☐ (up to 40% of maximum score ~~0 to 12 Points~~)

1. (0 to 3 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project has encouraged or will engage the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Identify the communities to be engaged and where in the project development process engagement has occurred or will occur. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project; and surveys, study recommendations, or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If relevant, describe how NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities.

(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

2. (0 to 7 points) Describe the project's benefits to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Benefits could relate to safety; public

health; access to destinations; travel time; gap closure; leveraging of other beneficial projects and investments; and/or community cohesion. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

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

3. (-3 to 0 points) Describe any negative externalities created by the project along with measures that will be taken to mitigate them. Negative externalities can result in a reduction in points, but mitigation of externalities can offset reductions.

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

Below is a list of negative impacts. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

- Increased difficulty in street crossing caused by increased roadway width, increased traffic speed, wider turning radii, or other elements that negatively impact pedestrian access.
- Increased noise.
- Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
- Project elements that are detrimental to location-based air quality by increasing stop/start activity at intersections, creating vehicle idling areas, directing an increased number of vehicles to a particular point, etc.
- Increased speed and/or "cut-through" traffic.
- Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
- Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.
- Displacement of residents and businesses.
- Construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings. These tend to be temporary.
- Other

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (30 Points)

Each application will be scored on a 10-point scale as described below.

1. 3 points): The project(s) with the most impactful and meaningful community engagement will receive the full three points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
2. (7 points) The project(s) with the most positive benefits will receive the full seven points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
3. (-3 to 0 points) The scorer will reduce the score by one point (up to three total) for each negative externality. Note that the scorer can deduct points for negatives not acknowledged in the application; the scorer will document any negatives not acknowledged in the application

and the reasons for any associated point reductions. The scorer can add one to three points for successful mitigation of negative project elements based on the degree to which they are mitigated. Note that this score cannot provide more points than are deducted.

Each score from the above 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography.
~~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 proportionate 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. Note also that it is possible to score negative points on this measure.

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the ~~2015~~ 2017 Housing Performance Score 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~~percent of total funds to be spent in each jurisdiction.
For stand-alone intersection, bridge, underpass, and interchange projects, a one-mile-radius buffer will be drawn around the project. If the radius-buffer enters more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on the proportionate population of the Census blocks in each jurisdiction that are all or partially located in the area within the one-mile-radius buffer. 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.

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

- City/Township: _____
- ~~Length of Segment~~Percent of total funds to be spend within City/Township:_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)
The applicant with the highest ~~2015~~ 2017 Housing Performance Score will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate 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. For stand-alone roadway (intersection, bridge, underpass, and interchange) projects, a one-mile radius-buffer will be drawn around the project. If the radius-buffer enters more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on the proportionate population of the Census blocks in each jurisdiction that are all or partially located in the area within the one-mile radius-buffer.

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 (75 Points) – This criterion will assess the ~~age of the infrastructure elements being improved. Roadway system management investments should focus on improving and replacing existing equipment that is beyond its useful life~~ degree to which functionally obsolete infrastructure elements are being replaced and improved.

A. *MEASURE:* ~~Identify~~ Describe how various ~~type(s) and age(s) of ITS, signal/control, and/or communication~~ equipment will be improved or replaced as part of this project relative to its age and whether it is functionally obsolete~~, as reflected in the project cost estimate~~.
~~*RESPONSE:*~~

- ~~Equipment to be improved: _____~~
- ~~Date of equipment installation (year): _____~~

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (75 Points)

The project that best provides for stewardship of public funds and resource by replacing functionally obsolete equipment and finding cost-effective solutions to upgrade viable equipment will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.~~All applicants replacing equipment past the total useful life, as listed below, will receive full points. Projects replacing more than one type or age of equipment should be scored based on the average remaining useful life. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points equal to the total useful life minus the remaining useful life for the project being scored divided by the total useful life.~~

~~If there are no projects at or past the useful life of the equipment, the applicant with shortest remaining useful life will receive full points, and remaining projects will receive a proportionate share. For example, if the oldest project was installed 18 years ago (traffic signal) and the application being scored was installed 14 years ago, this applicant would receive (14/18)*75 points, or 58 points.~~

~~Equipment Useful Life Values~~

- ~~ITS Equipment: 10 years~~
- ~~Traffic Signals/Control Equipment: 20 years~~
- ~~Communication Equipment: 10 years~~

5. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality (200 Points) – This criterion measures the project's ability to ~~reduce congestion. In addition, it will address its ability to improve congested intersections operating at unacceptable levels of service during peak hour conditions.~~make improvements in congested corridors. The project will also be measured based on its ability to reduce emissions.

A. *MEASURE:* Council staff will use Streetlight travel speed data to compare the peak hour travel speed in the project area to free flow conditions.~~Conduct a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio analysis at one or more of the intersections being located~~ If more than one corridor or location is included in the project, then the applicant should select the corridor on which the most investment is being made with the project. The applicant must identify the corridor as part of the response. (150 Points)

~~using existing turning movement counts (collected within the last three years) in the a.m. or p.m. peak hour and the Synchro or HCM software. The applicant must show the current total peak hour V/C ratio delay at one or more intersections (or rail crossings) and the reduction in total peak hour intersection delayV/C ratio at these intersections (or rail crossings), in seconds, due to the project. If more than one intersection (or rail crossing) is examined, then the V/C ratio delay reduced by each intersection can be added together to determine the project's total reductiontotal .~~

- ~~For roadway projects that include a railroad crossing, the applicant should conduct fieldwork during either the a.m. or p.m. peak hour to determine the total peak hour delay reduced by the projectreduction resulting from the project. Applicants can also add together intersection delay reduced and railroad delay reduced, if they both will be improved by the project.~~

~~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~~
- ~~Roadway lengths for intersection approaches must be the same length for before and after scenarios~~

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

RESPONSE ~~(Calculation)~~:

- Corridor:_____
- Corridor Start and End Points:_____
- Free-Flow Travel Speed (Council Staff):_____
- Peak Hour Travel Speed (Council Staff):_____
- Percentage Decrease in Travel Speed in Peak Hour Compared to Free-Flow (Council Staff):_____

- ~~Total Peak Hour Delay/Vehicle without the Project (Seconds/Vehicle):_____~~

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)

The applicant with the most congestion (measured by the largest percentage decrease in peak hour travel speeds relative to free flow conditions)~~most peak hour vehicle delay reduced by the project improvement~~ will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the points. For example, if the application being scored showed a 5% decrease of travel speeds in the peak hour relative to free flow conditions ~~reduced delay by 5,000.8 seconds~~ and the top project ~~reduced delay by 25,0001.01 seconds~~had a 10% reduction, this applicant would receive (5/10)*150 points, or 75 points.

A. ~~*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.~~

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

~~If more than one intersection is examined, the response is a total of all emissions reduced.~~

~~Respond to one of the following sections, depending on project type:~~

1. ~~Roadway projects that do not include new roadway segments or railroad grade-separation elements~~
2. ~~Roadway projects that are constructing new roadway segments, but do not include railroad grade-separation elements (for Roadway Expansion applications only)~~
3. ~~Roadway projects that include railroad grade-separation elements~~

~~*RESPONSE (Calculation):*~~

- ~~Total (CO, NO_x, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions/Vehicle without the Project (Kilograms):_____~~
- ~~Total (CO, NO_x, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions/Vehicle with the Project (Kilograms):_____~~
- ~~Total (CO, NO_x, and VOC)Peak Hour Emissions Reduced/Vehicle by the Project (Kilograms):_____~~
- ~~Volume (Vehicles Per Hour): _____~~

B. ~~Total (CO, NO_x, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms): _____~~Discuss how the project will reduce emissions and congestion. The applicant should focus on any reduction in CO, NO_x, and VOC. Projects on roadways that provide relief to congested, parallel principal arterial roadways should reference the current MnDOT Metro Freeway Congestion Report and discuss the systemwide emissions and congestion impact of the proposed improvements.

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

The project that is most likely to reduce emissions and congestion will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.~~The applicant with the most kilograms reduced by the project improvement will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate 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 (200 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 monetized safety benefits.

A. *MEASURE:* 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 latest MnDOT Metro District Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) application. 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~~ 2015 through ~~2015~~2017. 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 and attach the crash modification factor(s) used from FHWA's Crash Modification Factors Clearinghouse: http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/. This measure requests the monetized safety benefit of the project. The cost of the project is scored in the Cost Effectiveness criterion.

RESPONSE (Calculation):

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~1~~50 Points)
The applicant with the highest dollar value of benefits will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate 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)*~~1~~50 points or ~~103~~ 34 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Discuss how the project will improve safety issues in the project area. As part of the response, the applicant may want to reference the project relative to County Highway Safety Plan or similar planning documents and what the project will specifically do to improve the safety issue.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)
The project that will provide the most safety benefits and alleviate identified safety concerns will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.

7. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections (~~100~~ 50 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.

A. *MEASURE:* Describe how the project positively affects the multimodal system.

- Discuss any bicycle, pedestrian, or transit 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. 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).
- Describe how the proposed multimodal improvements positively affect identified alignments in the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) or along a regional trail, if applicable.
- ~~Describe~~ Discuss the existing bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections and how the project enhances these connections.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~100~~ 50 Points)

The project ~~with the~~that most positively affects ~~comprehensive~~ the multimodal ~~elements included as part of the project~~ system will 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. Points can be earned for incorporating multimodal project elements, positively affecting identified alignments in the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) or regional trail, or for making connections with existing multimodal systems.

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 successfully building the project. High-risk applications increase the likelihood that projects will withdraw at a later date. If this happens, the region is forced to reallocate the federal funds in a short amount of time or return them to the US Department of Transportation. ~~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):

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 ScopeFunding (5 20 Percent of Points)**~~

~~100% ☐ Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurredAll funding sources are identified and/or are local sources (the Regional Solicitation award is the gap funding/remaining funding needed to implement the project); applicants may still pursue other funding sources after the project award to reduce the local contribution.~~

~~40% ☐ Stakeholders have been identified~~

~~0% ☐ The applicant is promising to cover the entire local match, but it is necessary for them to seek other sources (e.g., state bonding or various state/federal competitive grants) or funding partners to be able to successfully deliver the project (i.e., the local agency does not have the entire local match committed at this time) Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted~~

~~2)~~1) **Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ (30 ~~5~~ Percent of Points)**

Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries

100% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)~~completed~~). **A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.**

50% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan started~~completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. **A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.**

0% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ has not been started

Anticipated date or date of completion: _____

~~**3) Environmental Documentation (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)~~2) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (~~10~~ 20 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

100% ☐ There are historical/archeological properties present but determination of "no historic properties affected" is anticipated.

80% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of ~~"no historic properties affected" or~~ "no adverse effect" anticipated

40% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated

0% ☐ Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological ~~resources~~ properties 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 (10 20 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 property 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)~~

~~8070% ☐ Section 4f resources present within the project area, but no adverse effectsimpacts are minor and they do not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the 4(f) property.~~

~~50% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. – Ccoordination/documentation has begun~~

~~30% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. Coordination/documentation has not begun resources likely – coordination/documentation has not begun~~

~~0% ☐ Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area~~

~~6)~~3) Right-of-Way (~~15 2~~30 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired

50% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

~~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 all identified

~~0% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed~~

Anticipated date or date of acquisition _____

~~7)~~4) Railroad Involvement (~~25~~ 20 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ No railroad involvement on project or r

~~100% ☐ R~~ailroad Right-of-Way ~~Agreement~~ agreement is executed (**include signature page, if applicable**)

~~60% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated~~

~~40~~50% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

~~20% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; railroad has been contacted~~

0% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun~~railroad has not been contacted~~.

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: _____~~

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 proportionate 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 Effectiveness (100 Points) – This criterion will assess the project's cost effectiveness based on the total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls) and total points awarded in the previous 8 criteria.

A. *MEASURE: Calculate the cost effectiveness of the project.* Metropolitan Council staff will divide the number of points awarded in the previous criteria by the TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls) ~~by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria~~.

- Cost effectiveness = ~~total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls)/~~total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls)

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 proportionate 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 for 50 points.~~The applicant with the most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the top project received .0005 points per dollar and the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, this applicant would receive (.00025/.0005)*100 points or 50 points.

The scorer for this measure will also complete a reasonableness check of the total project cost that is used for this measure. The scorer may follow up with the applicant to clarify any questions. Up to 50 percent of points awarded for this measure can be deducted if the scorer does not believe that the cost estimate is reasonable.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS

Bridges – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

September 20, 2017

Definition: A bridge rehabilitation or replacement project located on a non-f~~F~~reeway p~~P~~rincipal ~~A~~arterial or A-~~M~~minor a~~A~~rterial functionally-classified roadway, consistent with the latest TAB-approved functional classification map. Bridge structures that have a separate span for each direction of travel can apply for both spans as part of one application.

The bridge must carry vehicular traffic, but may also include accommodations for other modes. Bridges that are exclusively for bicycle or pedestrian traffic must apply under one of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities application categories. Rail-only bridges are not eligible for funding. Completely new bridges, interchanges, or overpasses should apply in the Roadway Expansion application category.

Examples of Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement Projects:

- Bridge rehabilitation of 20 or more feet with a sufficiency rating less than 80 and classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.
- Bridge replacement of 20 or more feet with a sufficiency rating less than 50 and classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	**195**	**19.58%**
Measure A - ~~Average d~~Distance to the nearest parallel bridge~~s~~	~~115~~100	
Measure B - Connection to Total Jobs, ~~and~~ Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs, and Post-Secondary Students	30	
Measure C - ~~Current daily heavy commercial traffic~~Regional Truck Corridor Tiers	~~35~~65	
~~Measure D - Freight project elements~~	~~15~~	
2. Usage	**130**	**1312%**
Measure A - Current daily person throughput	100	
Measure B - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume	30	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**100**	**109%**
Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation	30	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Infrastructure Condition	**400**	**4036%**
Measure A – Bridge Sufficiency Rating	300	
Measure B – Load-Posting	100	
5. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	**100**	**109%**
Measure A - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections	100	
6. Risk Assessment	**75**	**7.57%**
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	75	
~~Sub-Total~~	~~1,000~~	~~100%~~
7. Cost Effectiveness	**100**	9%
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (~~total project cost/~~total points awarded/ total project cost)	100	
Total	**1,100**	

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (195 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, post-secondary students, and manufacturing/distribution-related employment, and aligns with the ~~Highway~~Regional Truck Corridor Study tiers.

A. *MEASURE:* Address how the project route fulfills its role in the regional transportation system by measuring the diversion to the nearest parallel crossing (must be an A-minor arterial or principal arterial) if the proposed project is closed. (100 points) The project must be located on a non-freeway principal arterial or an A-minor arterial.

RESPONSE:

- Distance from one end of proposed project to nearest parallel crossing (that is an A-minor arterial or principal arterial) and then back to the other side of the proposed project: _____
- Location of nearest parallel crossing: _____
- Explanation (*Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words*): _____

- ~~Reference the "Roadway Area Definition" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the total area and project length, as depicted on the "Roadway Area Definition" map, to calculate the average distance between the project and the closest parallel "A" Minor Arterials or Principal Arterials on both sides of the project.~~

~~Upload the "Roadway Area Definition" map used for this measure.~~

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~115~~ 100 Points)

The applicant with the furthest ~~average~~ distance from the closest parallel A-minor arterial or principal arterial bridge on ~~both sides~~ will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the project being scored had a distance of 8 miles and the top project was had ~~an average~~a distance of 10 miles, this applicant would receive (8/10)*~~115~~ 100 points or ~~92~~ 80 points. ~~Metropolitan Council staff will provide average distance data for all projects to ensure consistency of methodology between applications.~~

B. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Regional Economy" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the employment, manufacturing/distribution-related employment, and post-secondary students enrolled within one mile, as depicted on the "Regional Economy" map.

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

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

- Existing Employment within 1 Mile:_____(Maximum of 30 points)
- Existing Manufacturing/Distribution-Related Employment within 1 Mile:_____ (Maximum of 30 points)
- Existing Post-Secondary Students: _____(Maximum of 18 points)

SCORING GUIDANCE (30 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)*30 points or 20 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)*30 points or 20 points.

The applicant with the highest number of post-secondary students will receive 18 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the 18 points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 students within one mile and the top project had 1,500 students, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*18 points or 12 points.

The scorer will assess if the applicant would score highest with the total employment part of the measure, the manufacturing/distribution employment part of the measure, or the education part of the measure and give the applicant the highest of the three scores out of a maximum of 30 points.

Note: Due to the use of multiple sub-measures, two applicants will receive the full 30 points.

C. *MEASURE:* ~~Provide the current daily heavy commercial traffic at one location on the A-Minor Arterial or Non-Freeway Principal Arterial 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.~~ This ~~criterion~~measure relies on the results ~~on~~in the ~~Highway~~Regional Truck Corridor Study, which prioritized all ~~roadways~~principal and minor arterials based on truck volume, truck percentage of total traffic, proximity to freight industry clusters, and proximity to regional freight terminals. (65 points)

Use the final study report for this measure:
https://metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Planning-2/Transit-Plans,-Studies-Reports/Highways-Roads/Truck-Freight-Corridor-Study.aspx

RESPONSE (Select one for your project, based on the Regional Truck Corridor Study*):*

- The project is located on either a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor: ☐ (65 Points)
- The project provides a direct and immediate connection~~s~~ (i.e., intersects) with either a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor: ☐ (10 Points)
- The project is not located on a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor: ☐ (0 Points)

~~*RESPONSE:*~~

- ~~Location:_____~~

- Current daily heavy commercial traffic volume:_____
- Date heavy commercial count taken:_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~3~~65 Points)

The scorer will assign points based on which of the above scores applies. Note that multiple applicants can score the maximum point allotment. ~~The applicant with the highest daily heavy commercial traffic at a location along the bridge will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. 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)*35 points, or 26 points.~~

~~C. *MEASURE:* Discuss any freight elements that are included as part of the project and how they improve efficiency, security, or safety. (15 points)~~

~~Address how the proposed project safely integrates freight. Freight elements could be project elements such as upgrading a non ten-ton roadway to a ten-ton roadway, adding paved shoulders, wider shoulders, acceleration lanes, or longer turning lanes added specifically to accommodate freight movements.~~

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

~~SCORING GUIDANCE (15 Points)~~

~~The project with the most comprehensive freight elements included as part of the project will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.~~

2. Usage (130 Points) – This criterion quantifies the project's potential 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 on the A-minor arterial or non-freeway principal arterial bridge 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 MnDOT 50-series maps ~~and existing transit routes that travel on the road~~. Reference the Transit Map for transit routes along the project. Ridership data will be provided by the Metropolitan Council staff, if public transit is currently provided on the project length.

- Current Daily Person Throughput = (current average annual daily traffic volume x 1.30 vehicle occupancy) + average annual daily transit ridership (~~2015~~2017)

RESPONSE:

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)
The applicant with highest current daily person throughput will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full. 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)*100 points or 67 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Provide the forecast (2040) average daily traffic volume at the same location on the A-minor arterial or non-freeway principal arterial bridge, 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. (30 points)

RESPONSE:

- Use Metropolitan Council model to determine forecast (2040) ADT volume ☐
- METC Staff-Forecast (2040) ADT volute ☐

OR

RESPONSE:

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (30 Points)
The applicant with the highest forecast (2040) ADT volume will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate 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)*30 points or 26 points.

3. Equity and Housing Performance (100 Points) – This criterion addresses the Council's role in advancing equity by examining the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. 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 equitable distribution of~~the~~ benefits, mitigation of negative impacts, and community engagement ~~impacts, and mitigation~~ for the populations selected. (30 Points)

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

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

- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50): ☐ (up to 100% of maximum score~~0 to 30 Points~~)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐ (up to 80% of maximum score ~~0 to 24 Points~~)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (up to 60% of maximum score ~~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: ☐ (up to 40% of maximum score ~~0 to 12 Points~~)

1. (0 to 3 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project has encouraged or will engage the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Identify the communities to be engaged and where in the project development process engagement has occurred or will occur. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project; and surveys, study recommendations, or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If relevant, describe how NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities.

(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

2. (0 to 7 points) Describe the project's benefits to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Benefits could relate to safety; public health; access to destinations; travel time; gap closure; leveraging of other beneficial

projects and investments; and/or community cohesion. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

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

3. (-3 to 0 points) Describe any negative externalities created by the project along with measures that will be taken to mitigate them. Negative externalities can result in a reduction in points, but mitigation of externalities can offset reductions.

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

Below is a list of negative impacts. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

- Increased difficulty in street crossing caused by increased roadway width, increased traffic speed, wider turning radii, or other elements that negatively impact pedestrian access.
- Increased noise.
- Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
- Project elements that are detrimental to location-based air quality by increasing stop/start activity at intersections, creating vehicle idling areas, directing an increased number of vehicles to a particular point, etc.
- Increased speed and/or "cut-through" traffic.
- Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
- Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.
- Displacement of residents and businesses.
- Construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings. These tend to be temporary.
- Other

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (30 Points)

Each application will be scored on a 10-point scale as described below.

1. (3 points): The project(s) with the most impactful and meaningful community engagement will receive the full three points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
2. (7 points) The project(s) with the most positive benefits will receive the full seven points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
3. (-3 to 0 points) The scorer will reduce the score by one point (up to three total) for each negative externality. Note that the scorer can deduct points for negatives not acknowledged in the application; the scorer will document any negatives not acknowledged in the application and the reasons for any associated point reductions. The scorer can add one to three points for successful mitigation of negative project elements based on the degree to which they are mitigated. Note that this score cannot provide more points than are deducted.

Each score from the above 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography.

~~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 proportionate 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. Note also that it is possible to score negative points on this measure.

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the ~~2015~~ 2017 Housing Performance Score 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. A one-mile radius-buffer will be drawn around the project. If the radius-buffer enters more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on the proportionate population of the Census blocks in each jurisdiction that are all or partially located in the area within the one-mile radius-buffer. 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: _____
- Population from the Regional Economy map within City/Township:

SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)

The applicant with the highest ~~2015~~ 2017 Housing Performance Score will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate 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. A one-mile radius-buffer will be drawn around the project. If the radius-buffer enters more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on the proportionate population of the Census blocks in each jurisdiction that are all or partially located in the area within the one-mile radius-buffer.

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 Condition (400 Points) – This criterion will assess the age and 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, from the most recent market structure inventory report. Attach the report to the application.

RESPONSE:

- Bridge Sufficiency Rating: ____

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 proportionate 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:* Identify whether the bridge is posted for load restrictions.

RESPONSE (Check box if the bridge is load-posted):

- Load-Posted (Check box if the bride is load-posted): ☐

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

5. Multimodal Elements and Connections (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.

MEASURE: Describe how the project positively affects the multimodal system.

- Discuss any bicycle, pedestrian, or transit 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. 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).
- Describe how the proposed multimodal improvements positively affect identified alignments in the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) or along a regional trail, if applicable.
- ~~Also, describe~~Discuss the existing bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections and how the project enhances these connections. ~~Furthermore, address how the proposed project safely integrates all modes of transportation (i.e., vehicles, bicyclists, transit, and pedestrians) and, if applicable, supports planned transitway stations.~~

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The project ~~with the~~that most positively affects ~~comprehensive~~ the multimodal ~~elements included as part of the project~~ will 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. Points can be earned for incorporating multimodal project elements, positively affecting identified alignments in the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) or regional trail, or for making connections with existing multimodal systems.

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

6. Risk Assessment (75 Points) – This criterion measures the number of risks associated with successfully building the project. High-risk applications increase the likelihood that projects will withdraw at a later date. If this happens, the region is forced to reallocate the federal funds in a short amount of time or return them to the US Department of Transportation. ~~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):

~~1) Project Scope~~Funding ~~(5~~ 20 ~~Percent of Points)~~

~~100%~~ ☐ ~~Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurred~~All funding sources are ~~identified and/or are local sources (the Regional Solicitation award is the gap funding/remaining funding needed to implement the project); applicants may still pursue other funding sources after the project award to reduce the local contribution.~~

~~40%~~ ☐ ~~Stakeholders have been identified~~

~~0%~~ ☐ ~~The applicant is promising to cover the entire local match, but it is necessary for them to seek other sources (e.g., state bonding or various state/federal competitive grants) or funding partners to be able to successfully deliver the project (i.e., the local agency does not have the entire local match committed at this time) Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted~~

~~2)~~1) Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan (~~30 ~~5~~ Percent of Points)

Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries

100% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)~~completed~~). **A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.**

50% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan started~~completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. **A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.**

0% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ has not been started

Anticipated date or date of completion: _____

~~3) Environmental Documentation (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)~~2) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (~~10~~ 20 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

100% ☐ There are historical/archeological properties present but determination of "no historic properties affected" is anticipated.

~~80~~100% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of ~~"no historic properties affected" or~~ "no adverse effect" anticipated

40% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated

0% ☐ Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological ~~resources~~ properties 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 (10 20 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 property 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)~~

~~8070%~~ ☐ ~~Section 4f resources present within the project area, but no adverse effects~~impacts are minor and they do not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the 4(f) property.

~~50% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. – Ccoordination/documentation has begun~~

~~30% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. Coordination/documentation has not begun resources likely – coordination/documentation has not begun~~

~~0% ☐ Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area~~

~~6)~~3) **Right-of-Way (~~15 2~~30 Percent of Points)**

100% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired

50% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

~~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 all identified

~~0% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed~~

Anticipated date or date of acquisition _____

~~7)~~4) **Railroad Involvement (~~25~~ 20 Percent of Points)**

100% ☐ No railroad involvement on project or r

~~100% ☐ R~~ailroad Right-of-Way ~~Agreement~~ agreement is executed (**include signature page, if applicable**)

~~60% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated~~

~~40~~50% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

~~20% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; railroad has been contacted~~

0% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun~~railroad has not been contacted~~.

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: ___~~

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 proportionate 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.

7. Cost Effectiveness (100 Points) – This criterion will assess the project's cost effectiveness based on the TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls) and total points awarded in the previous six criteria.

A. *MEASURE:* This measure will calculate the cost effectiveness of the project. Metropolitan Council staff will divide the number of points awarded in the previous criteria by the TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls) ~~by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria~~.

- Cost Effectiveness ~~= total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls)/~~total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls)

RESPONSE (Points Awarded and Cost Effectiveness will be Automatically Calculated):

- 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 proportionate 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 for 50 points.~~The applicant with the most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the top project received .0005 points per dollar and the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, this applicant would receive (.00025/.0005)*100 points or 50 points.

The scorer for this measure will also complete a reasonableness check of the total project cost that is used for this measure. The scorer may follow up with the applicant to clarify any questions. Up to 50 percent of points awarded for this measure can be deducted if the scorer does not believe that the cost estimate is reasonable.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS

Transit Expansion – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

~~May 18, 2016~~October 6, 2017

Definition: A transit project that provides new or expanded transit service/facilities~~.~~ with the intent of attracting new transit riders to the system. Expansion projects may also benefit existing or future riders, but the projects will be scored primarily on the ability to attract new riders. Routine facility maintenance and upkeep is not eligible. If a project includes both expansion and modernization elements, it is the applicant's discretion to choose which application category the project would best fit. However, an application can be disqualified if it is submitted to the wrong category. It is suggested that applicants contact Council staff for consultation before the application deadline to determine eligibility. ~~If a project has both transit expansion and transit system modernization elements, then the project should apply in the application category that requires the majority of the project costs.~~

Examples of Transit Expansion Projects:

- Operating funds for new or expanded transit service
- Transit vehicles for new or expanded service
- ~~Transit shelters, centers, stations, and platforms~~Customer facilities for new or expanded service, new transit centers or stations, along a route
- Park-and-ride facilities or expansions

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	**100**	**~~10~~9%**
Measure A - Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	50	
Measure B – Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project	50	
2. Usage	**350**	**~~35~~32%**
Measure A - New Annual Riders	350	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**200**	**~~20~~18%**
Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and projects benefits	130	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Emissions Reduction	**200**	**~~20~~18%**
Measure A - Total emissions reduced	200	
5. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	**100**	**~~10~~9%**
Measure A - Bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project and connections	100	
6. Risk Assessment	**50**	**~~5~~5%**
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	50	
~~**Sub-Total**~~	~~**1,000**~~	~~**100%**~~
7. Cost Effectiveness	100	9%
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (~~total annual project cost/~~total points awarded/total annual project cost)	100	
Total	**1,100**	

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (100 Points) - This criterion measures the regional significance of the project, including the project's connections to jobs and post-secondary educational institutions (as defined in Thrive MSP 2040) and the project's ability to provide regional transit system connections (measured through the number of connecting, weekday transit trips).

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Population/Employment" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing employment and educational institution enrollment within 1/4 mile of the project's bus stops or within 1/2 mile of the project's transitway stations. Existing employment will be measured by summing the employment located in the census blocks that intersect the 1/4-mile or 1/2-mile buffers. Enrollment at public and private post-secondary institutions will also be measured. Applications for projects that include "last mile" service provided by employers or educational institutions can get credit for the employment and enrollment, respectively, if a commitment letter is provided guaranteeing service for three years. (50 Points)

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

RESPONSE (Data from the "Population/Employment" and map):

- Existing Employment within ¼ (bus stop) or ½ mile (transitway station) buffer:_____
- Existing Post-Secondary Enrollment within ¼ (bus stop) or ½ mile transitway station) buffer:_____
- Existing Employment outside of the ¼- or ½ mile buffer to be served by shuttle service (Letter of commitment required):_____
- Existing Post-Secondary Enrollment outside of the ¼- or ½ mile buffer to be served by shuttle service (Letter of commitment required):_____

EXPLANATION of last-mile service, if necessary (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)
The applicant with the highest combined total employment and post-secondary education enrollment will receive the full points for this measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 workers/students within 1/4 mile and the top project had 1,500 workers/students, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*50 points or 33 points. Using the Metropolitan Council model, all Census blocks that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project will be included in the analysis.

B. *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 average weekday transit trips these connecting routes provide, as depicted on the "Transit Connectivity" map. Metropolitan Council staff will provide the average number of weekday trips for each connecting transit route.

Connections to planned transitway stations should be separately cited. Any transitway connection is worth 15 points.

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

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

- Existing transit routes directly connected to the project: _____ (35 Points)

- Planned transitways directly connect to the project (mode and alignment determined and identified in the 2040 TPP): (15 Points)

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 2040 Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail, light rail, highway and arterial bus rapid transit. Eligible transitway projects are those that have a mode and alignment identified in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan.

If the project includes construction of a park-and-ride facility, employment and eligible educational institutions only include those directly connected by the transit routes exiting the facility.

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

The applicant with route connections having the highest number of weekday trips will receive the full points (as shown above). Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had connecting ridership of 100 trips and the top project had 150 trips, this applicant would receive (100/150)*35 points or 23 points.

Any project with a connection to a planned transitway station should be awarded 15 points.

After each of the above scores are tabulated the top total score will be adjusted to 50 with all other projects adjusted proportionately. For example, if the top application scored 28 points, it would be adjusted to 50. A project that scored 19 points would be awarded (19/28)*50, or 34 points.

2. Usage (350 Points) – This criterion quantifies the project's impact by estimating the annual new transit ridership of the project.

A. *MEASURE:* This measure will calculate the project's new riders. Based on the service type, estimate and provide the new annual transit ridership that is produced by the new project in the third year of service. (350 points)

~~For~~ Park-and-Rides and Express Route~~s~~ Projects to Minneapolis and St. Paul Only:

- Use ~~the~~ a 2020 forecast (or similar equivalent to the third year of ridership) from the latest park-and-ride demand estimation model ~~in the 2030 Regional Park-and-Ride Plan (Appendix B)~~ to develop a ridership estimate. The potential demand market area should be defined using the site location criteria associated with the model and demand should be determined by the Census block groups in the market area.~~The market will be defined using the prescribed site location criteria in the plan and demand estimates determined by the census block groups in the express bus route market area~~. If possible, the applicant should use the ridership figures provided for an existing or planned facility.

  The 2030 Regional Park-and-Ride Plan forecasts 2020 and 2030 demand to downtown Minneapolis and downtown St. Paul based o~~ff~~ 2008 usage data. However, the park-and-ride demand estimation model allows for calculating more up-to-date demand estimation. The applicant can use data from the 2030 Plan if no other accurate data is available. Regardless, the applicant must clearly describe the methodology and assumptions used to estimate annual ridership.~~If the applicant wants to use more up-to-date data than 2008, then they must follow the methodology and equations from the Park-and-Ride Plan and clearly describe the methodology and assumptions used to estimate annual ridership.~~

  Note: Any Express routes not going to these downtown areas should follow the peer route methodology described in the "For Urban and Suburban Local Routes and Suburb-to-Suburb Express Routes Only" section.

~~For~~ Transitways Projects Only:

- Use most recent forecast data (current or opening year and 2040) to estimate ridership for the third year of service. Forecast data for the transitway must be derived from a study or plan that uses data approved by Metropolitan Council staff. This includes the most up-to-date estimates from plans that have been already adopted. Describe the study or plan where the ridership is derived from and where the documentation can be found (provide weblinks, if available).~~methodology and assumptions used to estimate annual ridership.~~

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 2040 Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail; light rail; and highway, dedicated, and arterial bus rapid transit. Eligible transitway projects are those included in either funding scenarios in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan and that have a mode and alignment identified through a local process.~~in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan.~~

~~For~~ Urban and Suburban Local Routes and Suburb-to-Suburb Express Routes Only:

- Use peer routes that are currently in service to develop a ridership estimate for the third year of service. Applicants must use the most recent annual ridership figures that are available. To select the peer routes, the applicant should identify routes in the same transit market area (as defined in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan), or routes that

serve locations with similar development patterns. Applicants must use the average passengers per service hour of at least three peer routes to apply a rate of ridership for the proposed service project. Additionally, describe how a peer route was selected in the response and any assumptions used.

RESPONSE (Cost effectiveness will be automatically calculated):

- Service Type:____
- New Annual Ridership (Integer Only):_____
- Assumptions Used (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):_____
- Describe Methodology: How Park-and-Ride and Express Route Projections were calculated, ~~and~~ which Urban and Suburban Local Route(s) were selected, and how the third year of service was estimated (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):_____

Up until two weeks prior to the application due date, applicants will be able to submit their projections to Council staff, who will advise whether the projections need to be corrected. This optional review, or lack thereof, will be made available to the scorer of this criterion. Applicants who plan to use an alternative ridership estimation methodology are strongly encouraged to do this to avoid risking a deduction for their score.

SCORING GUIDANCE (350 Points)

The applicant with the highest new annual ridership will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had ridership of 1,000,000 riders and the top project had a ridership of 1,500,000 riders, this applicant would receive (1,000,000/1,500,000)*350 points or 233 points.

For urban and suburban local bus service and suburb-to-suburb express service, applicants should use peer routes from the same Transportation Policy Plan market area or peer routes that serve locations with similar development patterns. Points are scored based on sound methodology and clear relationship to the peer routes.

For all service types, up to ~~50~~ 100 percent of points can be deducted if the applicant provides no methodology. If a methodology is provided, then points should only be deducted if the estimation methodology is not sound.

3. Equity and Housing Performance (200 Points) -- This criterion addresses the Council's role in advancing equity by examining the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. 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 equitable distribution of~~the~~ benefits, mitigation of negative impacts, and community engagement ~~impacts, and mitigation~~ for the populations selected. (130 Points)

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

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

- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50): ☐ (up to 100% of maximum score~~0 to 30 Points~~)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐ (up to 80% of maximum score ~~0 to 24 Points~~)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (up to 60% of maximum score ~~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: ☐ (up to 40% of maximum score ~~0 to 12 Points~~)

1. (0 to 3 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project has encouraged or will engage the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Identify the communities to be engaged and where in the project development process engagement has occurred or will occur. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project; and surveys, study recommendations, or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If relevant, describe how NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities.

(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

2. (0 to 7 points) Describe the project's benefits to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Benefits could relate to safety; public health; access to destinations; travel time; gap closure; leveraging of other beneficial projects and investments; and/or community cohesion. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

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

1. (-3 to 0 points) Describe any negative externalities created by the project along with measures that will be taken to mitigate them. Negative externalities can result in a reduction in points, but mitigation of externalities can offset reductions.

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

Below is a list of negative impacts. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

- Increased difficulty in street crossing caused by increased roadway width, increased traffic speed, wider turning radii, or other elements that negatively impact pedestrian access.
- Increased noise.
- Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
- Project elements that are detrimental to location-based air quality by increasing stop/start activity at intersections, creating vehicle idling areas, directing an increased number of vehicles to a particular point, etc.
- Increased speed and/or "cut-through" traffic.
- Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
- Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.

- Displacement of residents and businesses.
- Construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings. These tend to be temporary.
- Other

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (130 Points)

Each application will be scored on a 10-point scale as described below.

1. (3 points): The project(s) with the most impactful and meaningful community engagement will receive the full three points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
2. (7 points) The project(s) with the most positive benefits will receive the full seven points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
3. (-3 to 0 points) The scorer will reduce the score by one point (up to three total) for each negative externality. Note that the scorer can deduct points for negatives not acknowledged in the application; the scorer will document any negatives not acknowledged in the application and the reasons for any associated point reductions. The scorer can add one to three points for successful mitigation of negative project elements based on the degree to which they are mitigated. Note that this score cannot provide more points than are deducted.

Each score from the above 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography.

~~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 proportionate 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)*130 points or 65 points. Note also that it is possible to score negative points on this measure.

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the 2015 Housing Performance Score for the city or township in which the project's stops are 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 includes express service with no reverse commute trips, the applicant should only report the number of stops and corresponding jurisdictions in which the inbound service originates. If the project has stops 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's stops are 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.

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

- City/Township: _____
- Number of Stops 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. 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. Emissions Reduction (200 Points) – This criterion measures the impact that the project's implementation will have on air quality as measured by reductions in CO, NO_x, CO_{2e}, $PM_{2.5}$, and VOC emissions. Applications for transit operating, vehicle or capital funds must calculate the benefit for the third year of service.

A. *MEASURE:* The applicant must show that the project will reduce CO, NOx, CO2e, PM2.5, and/or VOC due to the reduction in VMT. Calculate and provide the number of new daily transit riders and the distance from terminal to terminal in miles to calculate VMT reduction. The emissions factors will be automatically applied to the VMT reduction to calculate the total reduced emissions.

Daily VMT Reduction = New Daily Transit Riders multiplied by Distance from Terminal to Terminal

Emissions Factors

- CO reduced = VMT reduced * 2.39
- NO_X reduced = VMT reduced * 0.16
- CO_{2e} reduced = VMT reduced * 366.60
- $PM_{2.5}$ reduced = VMT reduced * 0.005
- VOCs reduced = VMT reduced * 0.03

RESPONSE (Total reduced emissions will automatically calculate):

- New Daily Transit Riders: _____
- Distance from Terminal to Terminal (Miles)_____

VMT Reduction	
CO Reduced	
NOx Reduced	
CO2e Reduced	
PM2.5 Reduced	
VOCs Reduced	
Total Emissions Reduced	

SCORING GUIDANCE (200 Points)

The applicant with the greatest daily reduction in emissions due to VMT reduction will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. 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)*200 points or 120 points.

For all service types, up to 100 percent of points can be deducted if the applicant provides no methodology for Usage (criteria #2). The deduction percent for Emissions Reduction will be equivalent to any methodology deduction for Usage.

5. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections (100 Points) – This criterion measures how the project improves the travel experience, safety, and security for other modes of transportation, provides strong connections, and addresses the safe integration of these modes.

A. *MEASURE:* Discuss any bicycle or pedestrian elements that are included as part of the total project and how they improve the travel experience, safety, and security for users of these modes. Also, describe the existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities and accommodations or bicycle and pedestrian connections. Furthermore, address how the proposed project safely integrates all modes of transportation (i.e., transit, vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians). Applicants should also identify supporting studies or plans that address why a mode may not be incorporated into the project.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The project that results in the most comprehensive connectivity to non-motorized modes (via existing or added elements), as addressed in the required response will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. Example improvements are listed below:

- Improves the safety and security of the pedestrian or bicyclist (e.g., pedestrian-scale lighting, removing obstructions to create safe gathering spaces, leading pedestrian signal phasing, traffic calming, bike facilities separated from pedestrians)
- Improves the quality of the travel experience (e.g., pavement improvements, public art, benches, wayfinding)
- Improves the pedestrian network near the transit stop/station
- Improves the bicycle network near the transit stop/station
- Uses roadway shoulders or MnPASS lanes for faster service
- Connects to transit stops accessible via bike
- Connects to transit tops with safe / comfortable areas for pedestrians to walk or wait

6. Risk Assessment (50 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.

Facility Projects:

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.)

If the applicant is completing a transit or TDM application that is operations only, check the box and do not complete the remainder of the form. These projects will receive full points for the Risk Assessment.

Park-and-Ride and other transit construction projects require completion of the Risk Assessment below.

RESPONSE (Complete 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 ScopeFunding (5 20 Percent of Points)**~~

~~100% ☐ Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurredAll funding sources are identified and/or are local sources (the Regional Solicitation award is the gap funding/remaining funding needed to implement the project); applicants may still pursue other funding sources after the project award to reduce the local contribution.~~

~~40% ☐ Stakeholders have been identified~~

~~0% ☐ The applicant is promising to cover the entire local match, but it is necessary for them to seek other sources (e.g., state bonding or various state/federal competitive grants) or funding partners to be able to successfully deliver the project (i.e., the local agency does not have the entire local match committed at this time) Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted~~

~~2)~~1) **Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ (30 ~~5~~ Percent of Points)**

Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries

100% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)~~completed~~). **A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.**

50% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan started~~completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. **A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.**

0% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ has not been started

Anticipated date or date of completion: _____

~~**3) Environmental Documentation (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)~~2) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (~~10~~ 20 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

100% ☐ There are historical/archeological properties present but determination of "no historic properties affected" is anticipated.

80% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of ~~"no historic properties affected" or~~ "no adverse effect" anticipated

40% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated

0% ☐ Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological ~~resources~~ properties 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 (10 20 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 property 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)~~

~~8070% ☐ Section 4f resources present within the project area, but no adverse effectsimpacts are minor and they do not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the 4(f) property.~~

~~50% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. – Ccoordination/documentation has begun~~

~~30% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. Coordination/documentation has not begun resources likely – coordination/documentation has not begun~~

~~0% ☐ Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area~~

~~6)~~3) Right-of-Way (~~15 2~~30 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired

50% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

~~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 all identified
~~0%~~ ☐ ~~Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed~~

Anticipated date or date of acquisition _____

~~7)~~4) Railroad Involvement (~~25~~ 20 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ No railroad involvement on project or r
~~100%~~ ☐ ~~R~~ailroad Right-of-Way ~~Agreement~~ agreement is executed (**include signature page, if applicable**)
~~60%~~ ☐ ~~Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated~~
~~40~~50% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun
~~20%~~ ☐ ~~Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; railroad has been contacted~~
0% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun~~railroad has not been contacted~~.

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: ___~~

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 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 proportionate 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)*50 points or 29 points.

7. Cost Effectiveness (100 Points) – This criterion will assess the project's cost effectiveness based on the total annual TAB-eligible project cost and total points awarded.

A. *MEASURE: This measure~~s~~ will calculate the cost effectiveness of the project.* Metropolitan Council staff will divide the~~-~~ total number of points awarded in the previous criteria by the total annual TAB-eligible project cost ~~by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria~~.

Estimate and provide the annualized capital cost of the project and the annual operating cost of the project; the sum of these cost components equals the total annual project cost. The annualized project cost is derived from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidelines on useful life.

Total annual project cost is the lump sum total project cost divided by the FTA "years of useful life" as listed here. As noted in the useful life table, operating costs should also be annualized. If the project has two or more components with differing years of useful life, annualize each component. If the project type is not listed in the document, use most similar project type or provide supporting documentation on useful life value used.

Applicants should include all operating and capital costs associated with implementing the entire project, even though the applicant may only be applying for part of these costs as part of the solicitation.

Project Type	Years of Useful Life
Operating funds	3
Passenger Automobile/Sedan/Minivan	4
Medium Duty Transit Buses	5
Heavy Duty Transit Buses	12
Over-the-Road Coach Buses	14
Park & Ride – Surface Lot	20
Park & Ride – Structured	50
Transit Center/Station/Platform	70
Transit Shelter	20
Light Rail Vehicles	25
Commuter Rail Vehicles	25
Land Purchase	100

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

- Total Annual Operating Cost: _____
- Total Annual Capital Cost of Project:_____
- Total Annual Project Cost:_____
- Assumptions Used (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):_____

- Cost effectiveness = ~~total TAB-eligible annual project cost/~~total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible annual project cost

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The applicant with the most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar~~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 proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the top project received .0005 points per dollar and the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, this applicant would receive (.00025/.0005)~~had 35,000 and the application being scored had 70,000, this applicant would receive (35,000/70,000)~~ *100 points or 50 points.

The scorer for this measure will also complete a reasonableness check of the total project cost that is used for this measure. The scorer may follow up with the applicant to clarify any questions. Up to 50 percent of points awarded for this measure can be deducted if the scorer does not believe that the cost estimate is reasonable.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS

Transit ~~System~~ Modernization – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

May 18, 2016

Definition: A transit project that makes ~~existing~~ transit more attractive to existing ~~and future~~ riders by offering faster travel times between destinations or~~,~~ improving the customer experience~~, or reducing operating costs for the transit provider. The project must be able to reduce emissions through a reduction in single-occupant vehicle trips, vehicle-miles traveled, emissions from capital improvements, idling time, an increase in speeds, or other means.~~ Modernization projects may also benefit new or future riders, but the projects will be scored primarily on the benefit to existing riders. Routine facility maintenance and upkeep is not eligible. Projects associated wholly or in part with new ~~or expanded~~ service/facilities intended to attract new transit riders, such as the purchase of new buses or expansion of an existing park-and-ride, should apply in the Transit Expansion application category. If a project includes both expansion and modernization elements, it is the applicant's discretion to choose which application category the project would best fit. However, an application can be disqualified if it is submitted to the wrong category. It is suggested that applicants contact Council staff for consultation before the application deadline to determine eligibility. ~~If a project has both transit expansion and transit system modernization elements, then the project should apply in the application category that requires the majority of the project costs~~.

Examples of Transit ~~System~~ Modernization Projects:

- Improved boarding areas, lighting, or safety and security equipment, real-time signage;
- Passenger waiting facilities, heated facilities or weather protection
- New transit maintenance and support facilities/garages or upgrades to existing facilities
- ITS measures that improve reliability and the customer experience on a specific transit route or in a specific area
- Improved fare collection systems
- Multiple eligible improvements along a route

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	**100**	**~~10~~9%**
Measure A - Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	50	
Measure B – Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project	50	
2. Usage	**~~300~~325**	**30%**
Measure A - Total existing annual riders	~~300~~325	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**~~150~~175**	**~~15~~16%**
Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits	~~80~~105	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Emissions Reduction	**~~100~~50**	**5~~10~~%**
Measure A – Description of emissions reduced	~~100~~50	
5. Service and Customer Improvements	**~~150~~200**	**~~15~~18%**
~~- Measure A - Percent reduction in passenger travel time~~	~~75~~	
~~- Measure B - Percent reduction in operating & maintenance costs~~	~~38~~	
Measure ~~C~~A - Project improvements for transit users	~~37~~200	

6. Multimodal Facilities and Connections	**100**	**~~10~~9%**
Measure A - Bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project and connections	100	
7. Risk Assessment	**~~100~~50**	**~~10~~5%**
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	~~100~~50	
~~Sub-Total~~	**~~1,000~~**	**~~100%~~**
8. Cost Effectiveness	**100**	**9%**
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (~~total annual project cost/~~total points awarded/total annual project cost)	100	
Total	**1,100**	

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (100 Points) - This criterion measures the regional significance of the project, including the project's connections to jobs and post-secondary educational institutions (as defined in Thrive MSP 2040) and the project's ability to provide regional transit system connections (measured through the number of connecting, weekday transit trips).

   A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Population/Employment" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing employment and educational institution enrollment within 1/4 mile of the project's bus stops or within 1/2 mile of the project's transitway stations. Existing employment will be measured by summing the employment located in the census block groups that intersect the 1/4-mile or 1/2-mile buffers. Enrollment at public and private post-secondary institutions will also be measured. Applications for projects that include "last mile" service provided by employers or educational institutions can get credit for the employment and enrollment, respectively, if a commitment letter is provided guaranteeing service for three years. (50 Points)

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

   RESPONSE (Data from the "Population/Employment" map):

   - Existing Employment within ¼ (bus stop) or ½ mile (transitway station) buffer:_____
   - Existing Post-Secondary Enrollment within ¼ (bus stop) or ½ mile (transitway station) buffer:_____
   - Existing Employment outside ¼- or ½ mile buffer to be served by shuttle service (Letter of commitment required):_____
   - Existing Post-Secondary Enrollment outside ¼- or ½ mile buffer to be served by shuttle service (Letter of commitment required):_____
   - *EXPLANATION of last-mile service, if necessary (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):*

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

The applicant with the highest combined total employment and post-secondary education enrollment will receive the full points for this measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 workers/students within 1/4 mile and the top project had 1,500 workers/students, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*50 points or 33 points. Using the Metropolitan Council model, all Census block groups that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project will be included in the analysis.

B. *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 average weekday transit trips ~~annual transit ridership of~~ these connecting routes provide, as depicted on the "Transit Connectivity" map. Metropolitan Council staff will provide the average number of weekday trips for each connecting transit route.

Connections to planned transitway stations should be separately cited. Any transitway connection is worth 15 points.

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

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

- Existing transit routes directly connected to the project: _____ (35 Points).
- Planned transitways directly connect to the project (mode and alignment determined and identified in the 2040 TPP): _____(15 Points)

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 2040 Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail, light rail, highway and arterial bus rapid transit. Eligible transitway projects are those that have a mode and alignment identified in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan.

If the project includes construction of a park-and-ride facility, employment and eligible educational institutions only include those directly connected by the transit routes exiting the facility.

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

The applicant with route connections having the highest number of weekday trips will receive the full points (as shown above). Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had connecting ridership of 100 trips and the top project had 150 trips, this applicant would receive (100/150)*35 points or 23 points.

Any project with a connection to a planned transitway station should be awarded 15 points.

After each of the above scores are tabulated the top total score will be adjusted to 50 with all other projects adjusted proportionately. For example, if the top application scored 28 points, it would be adjusted to 50. A project that scored 19 points would be awarded (19/28)*50, or 34 points.

2. Usage (~~300~~ ~~350~~ 325 points) - This criterion quantifies the project's impact based on how many riders the improvement(s) will impact, i.e., existing riders.

MEASURE: This measure will display the existing riders that will benefit from the project. This would entail, for example, riders on a bus route with buses fitted for Wi-Fi or users boarding or alighting at a park-and-ride being improved. Ridership data will be provided by the Metropolitan Council staff.

RESPONSE:

- Existing Transit Routes on the Project:_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~300~~ 325 Points)

The applicant with the highest existing annual ridership will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points equal to the existing ridership of the project being scored divided by the project with the highest existing ridership multiplied by the maximum points available for the measure (300). For example, if the application being scored had ridership of 1,000 riders and the top project had a ridership of 1,500 riders, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*~~300~~ 325 points or ~~200~~ 217 points.

3. Equity and Housing Performance (~~150~~ ~~200~~ 175 Points) -- This criterion addresses the Council's role in advancing equity by examining the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. 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 equitable distribution of~~the~~ benefits, mitigation of negative impacts, and community engagement ~~impacts, and mitigation~~ for the populations selected. (~~30~~ 105 Points)

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

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

- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50): ☐ (up to 100% of maximum score~~0 to 30 Points~~)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐ (up to 80% of maximum score ~~0 to 24 Points~~)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (up to 60% of maximum score ~~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: ☐ (up to 40% of maximum score ~~0 to 12 Points~~)

1. (0 to 3 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project has encouraged or will engage the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Identify the communities to be engaged and where in the project development process engagement has occurred or will occur. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project; and surveys, study recommendations, or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If relevant, describe how NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities.

(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

2. (0 to 7 points) Describe the project's benefits to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Benefits could relate to safety; public

health; access to destinations; travel time; gap closure; leveraging of other beneficial projects and investments; and/or community cohesion. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

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

3. (-3 to 0 points) Describe any negative externalities created by the project along with measures that will be taken to mitigate them. Negative externalities can result in a reduction in points, but mitigation of externalities can offset reductions.

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

Below is a list of negative impacts. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

- Increased difficulty in street crossing caused by increased roadway width, increased traffic speed, wider turning radii, or other elements that negatively impact pedestrian access.
- Increased noise.
- Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
- Project elements that are detrimental to location-based air quality by increasing stop/start activity at intersections, creating vehicle idling areas, directing an increased number of vehicles to a particular point, etc.
- Increased speed and/or "cut-through" traffic.
- Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
- Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.
- Displacement of residents and businesses.
- Construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings. These tend to be temporary.
- Other

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~30~~ 105 Points)

Each application will be scored on a 10-point scale as described below.

1. (3 points): The project(s) with the most impactful and meaningful community engagement will receive the full three points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
2. (7 points) The project(s) with the most positive benefits will receive the full seven points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
3. (-3 to 0 points) The scorer will reduce the score by one point (up to three total) for each negative externality. Note that the scorer can deduct points for negatives not acknowledged in the application; the scorer will document any negatives not acknowledged in the application and the reasons for any associated point reductions. The scorer can add one to three points for

successful mitigation of negative project elements based on the degree to which they are mitigated. Note that this score cannot provide more points than are deducted.

Each score from the above 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography.

~~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 proportionate 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~~ 105 points or ~~15~~ 53 points. Note also that it is possible to score negative points on this measure.

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the 2015 Housing Performance Score for the city or township in which the project's stops are 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 includes express service with no reverse commute trips, the applicant should only report the number of stops and corresponding jurisdictions in which the inbound service originates. If the project has stops 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's stops are 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.

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

- City/Township: _____
- Number of Stops 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 proportionate share of the full 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. Emissions Reduction (~~100~~ 50 Points) - This criterion measures the impact that the project's implementation may have on air quality by rating the potential that project's elements have to contribute to reductions~~will have on air quality as measured by reductions~~ in CO, NO_x, CO_{2e}, $PM_{2.5}$, and VOC emissions. Projects can include improvements to rolling stock~~,~~; increases in travel speed and reductions in idling~~,~~; and facility ~~modernization~~improvements~~, and systemwide upgrades~~ that reduce ~~congestion~~ emissions, reduce exposure, reduce congestion, and/or improve energy efficiency and use of renewable energy.

~~A. *MEASURE:* Describe how the project will reduce CO, NOx, CO_{2e}, $PM_{2.5}$, and/or VOC due to the reduction in SOV trips, reduction in VMT, and/or an increase of speeds. The applicant should also describe capital improvements that will reduce emissions and energy consumption.~~

~~Most projects will reduce CO, NOx, CO2e, PM2.5, and/or VOC due to the reduction in VMT that comes about from adding new daily transit riders (computed in the third year of service). As part of the response, applicants may want to indicate the daily emissions reductions by using the formula and emissions factors below.~~

~~Daily VMT Reduction = New Daily Transit Riders multiplied by Distance from Terminal to Terminal~~

~~**Emissions Factors**~~

- ~~CO reduced = VMT reduced * 2.39~~
- ~~NO_x reduced = VMT reduced * 0.16~~
- ~~CO_{2e} reduced = VMT reduced * 366.60~~
- ~~$PM_{2.5}$ reduced = VMT reduced * 0.005~~
- ~~VOCs reduced = VMT reduced * 0.03~~

~~*RESPONSE: (Limit 2,100 characters; approximately 300 words)*~~

~~SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)~~
~~The applicant should describe improvements to rolling stock, increases in travel speed, facility improvements, and systemwide upgrades that will reduce congestion and/or improve energy efficiency. The application will be scored based on the improvements that are being made. Projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. (200 words or less).~~

A. Discuss how the project will reduce emissions. Examples of project elements that can reduce emissions include (note that this is not an exhaustive list):

- Improved fuel efficiency and reduced tailpipe emissions through vehicle upgrades
- Improved ability for riders to access transit via non-motorized transportation
- Improved accommodation of transit-oriented development walkable from transit stop(s) and/or station(s)
- Reduced vehicle acceleration/deceleration cycles, "dead head" time, or idling time
- Electric vehicle charging stations
- Sustainable facility features such as energy efficient equipment, "green infrastructure" for storm water management, and use of renewable energy

Applicants are recommended to provide any data to support their argument.

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)
The project that has the most benefits for reduced emissions, reduced exposures, reduced congestion, ~~reduce emissions,~~ and/or improved energy efficiency will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.

5. Service and Customer Improvements (~~150~~ 200 Points) - Measures under this criterion assess how the overall quality of transit service is improved, and how the regional transit system will ~~operate more efficiently~~ provide a better customer experience ~~–~~as a result of this project. ~~An improvement that makes transit more attractive to future and existing riders is offering faster travel times between destinations. Additionally, the modernization of a transit facility should present a savings in operating costs for the transit provider. Projects can also offer improvements to facilities that offer a better customer experience, and attract riders to transit facilities.~~ Service and customer improvements include but are not limited to providing faster travel times, providing new or improved amenities or customer facilities, and improving customer interface with transit. This criterion will place particularly emphasis on travel time and reliability improvements.

~~*A. MEASURE:* Provide the existing and proposed travel times to calculate the percent reduction in transit passenger travel time due to the project. The applicant should provide the existing passenger travel time from the project site to the transit route's terminal. If the project benefits multiple routes, the applicant can take an average of the passenger travel times. Applicants must also provide the proposed travel time from the project site to the terminal. The percent reduction in travel time that will result from the project's implementation will be calculated automatically.~~

~~*RESPONSE (Percent reduction will be automatically calculated)*~~

- ~~Current Passenger Travel Time (Minutes):_____~~
- ~~Proposed Passenger Travel Time (Minutes):_____~~

~~SCORING GUIDANCE (75 Points)~~
~~The applicant with the greatest reduction in travel time will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points.~~

~~*B. MEASURE:* Identify the current annual transit operating costs and proposed annual transit operating costs that will result from this project. Operating and maintenance costs are external to the project, and do not include costs associated with the construction or procurement of facilities, vehicles, or equipment. The percent reduction in operating and maintenance costs will be calculated automatically. The applicant should also provide its methodology for calculating cost change.~~

~~*RESPONSE (Percent reduction will be automatically calculated):*~~

- ~~Current Annual Transit Operating Costs:_____~~
- ~~Proposed Annual Transit Operating Costs:_____~~
  - ~~*Description of how the proposed cost change was determined (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):*~~

~~SCORING GUIDANCE (38 Points)~~
~~The applicant with the greatest reduction in operating and maintenance costs will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points.~~

~~C.~~A. *MEASURE:* Discuss how the project will improve transit service to the users. Proposed improvements and amenities can include, but are not limited to the following (~~37~~ 200 Points):

- Travel time or reliability improvements
- Improved boarding area
- Improved customer waiting facilities
- Real-time signage

- Heated facilities or weather protection
- Safety and security equipment
- Improved lighting
- ITS measures that improve reliability and the customer experience
- Transit advantages
- ~~Travel time or reliability improvements~~

When providing a description of improvements and amenities, provide quantitative information, as applicable. This could include number of improved customer facilities by the type of amenity, number of routes impacted, or number of riders impacted. Of particular importance is quantifying travel time and reliability improvement. Examples include time saved per route, the portion of the route along which time is saved, and ridership or frequency on this route(s).

RESPONSE (Limit ~~2,800~~5,600 characters; approximately ~~400~~ 800 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~37~~ 200 Points)

The applicant should describe improvements included in the project that will make transit service more attractive and improve the user experience. The project will be scored based on the quality of the responses. When possible, quantitative information on service and customer improvements will be considered in the quality of the responses. A particular emphasis will be placed on travel time or reliability improvements. Projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.

6. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections (100 Points) – This criterion measures how the project improves the travel experience, safety, and security for other modes of transportation, provides strong connections, and addresses the safe integration of these modes.

A. *MEASURE:* Discuss any bicycle or pedestrian elements that are included as part of the total project and how they improve the travel experience, safety, and security for users of these modes. Also, describe the existing bicycle, and pedestrian facilities and accommodations or bicycle and pedestrian connections. Furthermore, address how the proposed project safely integrates all modes of transportation (i.e., transit, vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians). Applicants should also identify supporting studies or plans that address why a mode may not be incorporated into the project.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The project that results in the most comprehensive connectivity to non-motorized modes (via existing or added elements), as addressed in the required response (2,800 or fewer characters), will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. Example improvements are listed below:

- Improves the safety and security of the pedestrian or bicyclist (e.g., pedestrian-scale lighting, removing obstructions to create safe gathering spaces, leading pedestrian signal phasing, traffic calming, bike facilities separated from pedestrians)
- Improves the quality of the travel experience (e.g., pavement improvements, public art, benches, wayfinding)
- Improves the pedestrian network near the transit stop/station
- Improves the bicycle network near the transit stop/station
- Uses roadway shoulders or MnPASS lanes for faster service
- Connects to transit stops accessible via bike
- Connects to transit tops with safe / comfortable areas for pedestrians to walk or wait

7. Risk Assessment (~~100~~ 50 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 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.)

If the applicant is completing a transit or TDM application that is operations only, check the box and do not complete the remainder of the form. These projects will receive full points for the Risk Assessment.

Park-and-Ride and other transit construction projects require completion of the Risk Assessment below.

RESPONSE (Complete 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 ScopeFunding (5 20 Percent of Points)**~~

~~100% ☐ Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurred~~All funding sources are identified and/or are local sources ~~(the Regional Solicitation award is the gap funding/remaining funding needed to implement the project); applicants may still pursue other funding sources after the project award to reduce the local contribution.~~

~~40% ☐ Stakeholders have been identified~~

~~0% ☐ The applicant is promising to cover the entire local match, but it is necessary for them to seek other sources (e.g., state bonding or various state/federal competitive grants) or funding partners to be able to successfully deliver the project (i.e., the local agency does not have the entire local match committed at this time) Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted~~

~~2)~~1) **Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ (30 ~~5~~ Percent of Points)**

Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries

100% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)~~completed~~). **A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.**

50% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan started~~completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. **A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.**

0% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ has not been started

Anticipated date or date of completion: _____

~~**3) Environmental Documentation (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)~~2) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (~~10~~ 20 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

100% ☐ There are historical/archeological properties present but determination of "no historic properties affected" is anticipated.

80% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted but~~;~~ determination of ~~"no historic properties affected" or~~ "no adverse effect" anticipated

40% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated

0% ☐ Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological ~~resources~~ properties 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 (10 20 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 property 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~~70% ☐ ~~Section 4f resources present within the project area, but no adverse effects~~impacts are minor and they do not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the 4(f) property.

~~50% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. – C~~coordination/documentation has begun

~~30% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. Coordination/documentation has not begun resources likely – coordination/documentation has not begun~~

~~0% ☐ Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area~~

~~6)~~3) Right-of-Way (~~15 2~~30 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired

50% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

~~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 all identified
~~0% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed~~

Anticipated date or date of acquisition _____

~~7)~~4) **Railroad Involvement (~~25~~ 20 Percent of Points)**

100% ☐ No railroad involvement on project or r
~~100% ☐ R~~ailroad Right-of-Way ~~Agreement~~ agreement is executed (**include signature page, if applicable**)
~~60% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated~~
~~40~~50% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun
~~20% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; railroad has been contacted~~
0% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun~~railroad has not been contacted~~.

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: ___~~

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~100~~ 50Points)

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 proportionate 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)*~~100~~ 50 points or ~~57~~ 29 points.

8. Cost Effectiveness (100 Points) – This criterion will assess the project's cost effectiveness based on the total annual TAB-eligible project cost and total points awarded.

A. *MEASURE: This measure will calculate the cost effectiveness of the project.* Metropolitan Council staff will divide the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria by the total annual TAB-eligible project cost ~~by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria~~.

Estimate and provide the annualized capital cost of the project and the annual operating cost of the project; the sum of these cost components equals the total annual project cost. The annualized project cost is derived from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidelines on useful life.

Total annual project cost is the lump sum total project cost divided by the FTA "years of useful life" as listed here. As noted in the useful life table, operating costs should also be annualized. If the project has two or more components with differing years of useful life, annualize each component. If the project type is not listed in the document, use most similar project type or provide supporting documentation on useful life value used.

Applicants should include all operating and capital costs associated with implementing the entire project, even though the applicant may only be applying for part of these costs as part of the solicitation.

Project Type	Years of Useful Life
Operating funds	3
Passenger Automobile/Sedan/Minivan	4
Medium Duty Transit Buses	5
Heavy Duty Transit Buses	12
Over-the-Road Coach Buses	14
Park & Ride – Surface Lot	20
Park & Ride – Structured	50
Transit Center/Station/Platform	70
Transit Shelter	20
Light Rail Vehicles	25
Commuter Rail Vehicles	25
Land Purchase	100

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

- Total Annual Operating Cost: _____
- Total Annual Capital Cost of Project:_____
- Total Annual Project Cost:_____
- Assumptions Used (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):_____

- Cost effectiveness = ~~total TAB-eligible annual project cost/~~total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible annual project cost

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 proportionate 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.~~The applicant with the most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the top project received .0005 points per dollar and the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, this applicant would receive (.00025/.0005)*100 points or 50 points.

The scorer for this measure will also complete a reasonableness check of the total project cost that is used for this measure. The scorer may follow up with the applicant to clarify any questions. Up to 50 percent of points awarded for this measure can be deducted if the scorer does not believe that the cost estimate is reasonable.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS

Travel Demand Management (TDM) – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

~~May 18, 2016~~October 5, 2016

Definition:

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) provides residents/commuters of the Twin Cities Metro Area with greater choices and options regarding how to travel in and throughout the region. Projects should reduce the congestion and emissions during the peak period. Similar to past Regional Solicitations, base-level TDM funding for the Transportation Management Organizations (TMOs) and Metro Transit will be not part of the competitive process. ~~.~~

Examples of TDM Projects:

- Bikesharing
- Carsharing
- Telework strategies
- Carpooling
- Parking management
- Managed lane components

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	**~~100~~200**	**~~10~~18%**
Measure A - Ability to capitalize on existing regional transportation facilities and resources	~~100~~200	
2. Usage	**100**	**~~10~~9%**
Measure A - Users	100	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**150**	**~~15~~14%**
Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation	80	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	**~~400~~300**	**~~40~~18~~27~~%**
Measure A - Congested roadways in project area	~~200~~150	
Measure B - VMT reduced	~~200~~150	
5. Innovation	**200**	**~~20~~18%**
Measure A - Project innovations and geographic expansion	200	
6. Risk Assessment	**50**	**5%**
Measure A - Technical capacity of applicant's organization	25	
Measure B - Continuation of project after initial federal funds are expended	25	
~~**Sub-Total**~~	~~**1,000**~~	~~**100%**~~
7. Cost Effectiveness	**100**	**9%**
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (~~total project cost/~~total points awarded/total project cost)	**100**	
Total	**1,100**	

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (~~100~~ 200 Points) - This criterion measures the existing regional transportation resources that can be capitalized on as part of this project.

A. *MEASURE:* Identify the existing regional transportation facilities and resources on which the project will capitalize.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~100~~ 200 Points)
The applicant will receive points based on the quality of the response. Projects that effectively use existing organization and regional infrastructure and manage congestion and use on key facilities will receive the most points. The applicant with the top score will receive full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points.

2. Usage (100 Points) – This criterion quantifies the project's impact by estimating the number of direct users of the TDM by identifying the strength of its connection to target groups.

A. *MEASURE:* Calculate and provide the average weekday users of the project. A direct project user is someone who will participate in the TDM program or project, and not one who receives an indirect benefit from the project. For example, if the project involves teleworking, a user would be the individual that is teleworking, not the roadway users that benefit from reduced congestion. Applicants must describe their methodology for determining the number of project users. Also, provide a description of the people/groups that will receive either direct or indirect benefits from the project.

Benefits may include:

- Access to jobs
- Reduced congestion
- Reverse commute assistance
- Ability to live car-free
- Overcoming barriers to non-traditional commuting (e.g., ~~.~~ shift times not adhering to transit schedules; long transit trips due to transfers/timing)
- Major employers or employment areas
- Reduced transportation costs through subsidizing/incentivizing alternative modes

~~.~~(100 Points)

RESPONSE:

- Average Weekday Users:_____

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The applicant will receive points based on the quality of the response and the number of average weekday users. The project that most effectively defines a targeted population and the ability to reach that population, along with the most effective benefits ~~The applicant with the most users~~ will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a ~~proportional~~ share of the full points. ~~For example, if the top project had 90 users and the application being scored had 50, this applicant would receive (50/90)*100 points or 56 points.~~

One hundred percent of points can be deducted if the applicant provides an unclear or unreasonable methodology.~~ If a methodology is provided, then points should only be deducted if the estimation methodology is not sound.~~

3. Equity and Housing Performance (150 Points) -- This criterion addresses the Council's role in advancing equity by examining the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. The criterion also evaluates a community's efforts to promote affordable housing.

A. *MEASURE:* Describe the project's positive benefits, and negative impacts, and mitigation(s) to minimize harm and promote equity for low-income populations; people of color; children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with a description on how the impacted communities have been engaged.~~. In order to receive the maximum points, the response should address the benefits, impacts, and mitigation for the populations listed above (low-income populations; people of color; children, people with disabilities, and the elderly). As part of the response, reference the "Socio-Econ" map generated at the beginning of the application process to identify if the project is located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color, Concentrated Area of Poverty, or census tracts above the regional average in poverty or populations of color. (80 Points)~~

Responses

1. (20 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project has encouraged or will engage the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Identify the communities to be engaged and where in the project development process engagement has occurred or will occur. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project; and surveys, study recommendations, or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If relevant, describe how NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities.

(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

2. (60 points) Describe the project's positive benefits to the identified communities. Benefits could relate to safety; public health; access to destinations; travel time; gap closure; leveraging of other beneficial projects and investments; and/or community cohesion. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

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

3. (-10 to 0 points) Describe any negative externalities created by the project and measures that will be taken to mitigate them. Negative externalities can result in a reduction in points, but mitigation of externalities can offset reductions.

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

Below is a list of negative impacts. (Negative impacts can occur during construction/implementation) Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

- Increased difficulty in street crossing caused by increased roadway width, increased traffic speed, wider turning radii, or other elements that negatively impact pedestrian access.
- Increased noise.
- Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
- Project elements that are detrimental to location-based air quality by increasing stop/start activity at intersections, creating vehicle idling areas, directing an increased number of vehicles to a particular point, etc.
- Increased speed and/or "cut-through" traffic.
- Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
- Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.
- Displacement of residents and businesses.
- Construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings. These tend to be temporary.
- Other

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (80 Points)

Each application will be scored as described below.

1. (60 points): The project with the most impactful and meaningful community engagement will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.

2. (20 points) The project with the most positive benefits will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
3. (up to 0 points) The scorer will reduce the score by one point for each negative externality. Note that the scorer can deduct points for negatives not acknowledged in the application; the scorer will document any negatives not acknowledged in the application and the reasons for any associated point reductions. The scorer can add one to three points for successful mitigation of negative project elements based on the degree to which they are mitigated. Note that this score cannot provide more points than deducted.

Following the scoring of the two above elements, each project's combined score will be determined. The top-scoring project will be adjusted to 80 points with all other projects adjusted proportionately. ~~The project with the most positive benefits and appropriate mitigation for negative impacts will receive the full points. 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.~~

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the 2015 Housing Performance Score 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 an average score of the jurisdictions. 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.

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

- City/Township: _____ *(Cities and Townships entered by applicant)*
- Housing Score: _____

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. 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. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality (~~400~~ 300 Points) – This criterion measures the project's ability to reduce congestion during the peak period in an area or corridor. This criterion also measures the impact that the project's implementation will have on air quality as measured by reductions in CO, NO_x, CO_{2e}, $PM_{2.5}$, and VOC emissions.

A. *MEASURE:* Describe the congested roadways in the geographic area of the project and how this project will address or alleviate those issues by reducing congestion and/or single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips. (~~200~~ 150 Points)

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~200~~ 150 Points)
The applicant with best response will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
- The project is located in an area of traffic congestion served by one or more principal arterials or A-minor arterials: Up to ~~60~~ 50 Points, plus
- The project will reduce congestion and/or SOV trips in the project area: Up to ~~140~~ 100 Points

B. *MEASURE:* The applicant must show that the project will reduce CO, NOx, CO2e, PM2.5, and/or VOC due to the reduction in VMT. Calculate and provide the number of one-way commute trips reduced and the average commute trip length to calculate VMT reduction. The emissions factors will be automatically applied to the VMT reduction to calculate the total reduced emissions Applicants must describe their methodology for determining the number of one-way trips reduced. (200 Points)

NOTE: A "trip" is defined as the journey from origin to destination. Round trip travel is considered two trips. Using multiple modes or multiple transit routes between an origin and destination does not constitute multiple trips.

- VMT reduced = Number of one-way commute trips reduced * 12.1

(12.1 is the regional average commute trip length in miles as determined by the 2011 Travel Behavior Inventory, conducted by Metropolitan Transportation Services. You may use a number other than 12.1 if you know the commute length of your targeted market area).

Emissions Factors

- CO reduced = VMT reduced * 2.39
- NO_X reduced = VMT reduced * 0.16
- CO_{2e} reduced = VMT reduced * 366.60
- $PM_{2.5}$ reduced = VMT reduced * 0.005
- VOCs reduced = VMT reduced * 0.03

RESPONSE (Emissions reduction will be automatically calculated):

- Number of One-Way Commute Trips Reduced:_____
- Average Commute Trip Length (Default 12.1):_____
- *RESPONSE: (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):*

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~200~~ 150 Points)
The applicant with the greatest reduction in emissions will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the top project reduced 5 kg and the

application being scored reduced 4 kg, this applicant would receive (4/5)*~~200~~ 150 points or ~~160~~ 120 points.

~~Fifty~~ One hundred percent of points can be deducted if the applicant provides no methodology. If a methodology is provided, then points should only be deducted if the estimation methodology is not sound.

5. Innovation (~~200~~ 300 Points) – This prioritizing criterion measures how well the project introduces new concepts to the region or expands to a new geographic region. Innovative TDM projects may involve the deployment of new creative strategies for the region, expand the geographic scope of a project to a new geographic area, serve populations that were previously unserved, or incorporate enhancements to an existing program.

   A. *MEASURE:* Describe how the project is innovative or expands the geographic area of an existing project. (200 Points)

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (200 Points)

The applicant will receive the full points shown for each of innovation categories based on the quality of the response. The applicant with the top score will receive full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points.

- Project introduces a new policy, program, or creative strategy: Up to 200 Points, ~~or~~
- Project replicates another project done in another region or applies research from another organization: Up to 125 Points,
- Project expands the geographic scope of an existing successful project, serves or engages a new group of people, or significantly enhances an existing program: Up to ~~100~~ 75 Points

A project that duplicates efforts already occurring within the same geography can be subjected to a reduced score, at the scorer's discretion, if the scorer feels it is redundant and therefore not good stewardship of public funds.

6. Risk Assessment (50 Points) - This criterion measures technical capacity of the applicant and their long-term strategy to sustain their proposed projects beyond the initial funding period.

A. *MEASURE:* Describe the technical capacity of the applicant's organization and what makes them well suited to deliver the project. (25 Points)

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (25 Points)
The applicant will receive a maximum of the points listed below, based on the quality of their response (200 words or less). Highest scoring projects will be led by agencies with staff expertise in TDM, experience in the field, and adequate resources to deliver the project in a timely manner. The applicant with the top score will receive full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the top project had 15 points and the application being scored had 10, this applicant would receive (10/15)*25 points or 17 points.

- Organization has experience implementing similar projects: Up to 10 Points, plus
- Organization has adequate resources to implement the project in a timely manner: Up to 15 Points

B. *MEASURE:* Describe if the project will continue after the initial federal funds are expended. Identify potential future sources of funding, if needed, to continue the project. (25 Points)

RESPONSE (Check one):

- Project funding sources are identified and secured to continue the project past the initial funding period, and/or carry on the project to a future phase: ☐ (25 Points)
- Applicant has identified potential funding sources that could support the project beyond the initial funding period: ☐ (15 Points)
- Applicant has not identified funding sources to carry the project beyond the initial funding period: ☐ (0 Points)

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (25 Points)
The applicant will receive a maximum of the points shown below based on the quality of their response. Applicants that receive the highest scores will have a financial plan in place to continue the project after the initial funding period. The applicant with the top score will receive full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the top project had 15 and the application being scored had 0, this applicant would receive (0/15)*25 points or 0 points.

7. **Cost Effectiveness (100 Points)** –This criterion will assess the project's cost effectiveness based on the total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls) and total points awarded in the previous 6 criteria.

   A. *MEASURE:* This measure will calculate the cost effectiveness of the project. Metropolitan Council staff will divide the number of points awarded in the previous criteria by the TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls) ~~by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria~~.

      - Cost effectiveness = ~~total TAB-eligible project cost/~~total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible project cost/

      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 most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar ~~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 received .0005 points per dollar ~~had 35,000~~ and the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, ~~had 70,000,~~ this applicant would receive (.00025~~35,000~~/.0005~~70,000~~)*100 points or 50 points.

The scorer for this measure will also complete a reasonableness check of the total project cost that is used for this measure. The scorer may follow up with the applicant to clarify any questions. Up to 50 percent of points awarded for this measure can be deducted if the scorer does not believe that the cost estimate is reasonable.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS

Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

September 21, 2017

Definition: A project that benefits bicyclists (or bicyclists and other non-motorized users). All projects must have a transportation purpose (i.e., connecting people to destinations). A facility may serve both a transportation purpose and a recreational purpose. Multiuse trail bridges or underpasses should apply in this application category instead of the Pedestrian Facilities application category given the nature of the users and the higher maximum award amount.

Examples of Multiuse Trail and Bicycle Facility Projects:

- Multiuse trails
- Trail bridges/underpasses
- On-street bike lanes
- Filling multiple gaps, improving multiple crossings, or making other similar improvements along a trail corridor

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	**200**	**~~20~~18%**
Measure A - Identify location of project relative to Regional Bicycle Transportation Network	200	
2. Potential Usage	**200**	**~~20~~18%**
Measure A - Existing population and employment within 1 mile (potential usage)	~~200~~150	
Measure B – Snow and ice control	50	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**120**	**~~12~~11%**
Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation	50	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Deficiencies and Safety	**250**	**~~25~~23%**
Measure A – Gaps closed/barriers removed and/or continuity between jurisdictions improved by the project	100	
Measure B - Deficiencies corrected or safety problems addressed	150	
5. Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections	**100**	**~~10~~9%**
Measure A - Transit or pedestrian elements of the project and connections	100	
6. Risk Assessment~~/Public Engagement~~	**130**	**~~13~~12%**
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	130	
~~**Sub-Total**~~	~~**1,000**~~	~~**100%**~~
7. Cost Effectiveness	**100**	**9%**
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total ~~project cost~~points awarded/total project cost~~points awarded~~)	100	
Total	**1,100**	

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (200 Points) - This criterion measures the project's ability to serve a transportation purpose within the regional transportation system and economy through its inclusion within or direct connection to the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN), which is based on the Twin Cities Regional Bicycle System Study (2015).

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "RBTN Evaluation" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Draw the proposed trail on the map.

Upload the "RBTN Evaluation" map used for this measure.

RESPONSE (Select one, based on the "RBTN Evaluation and Major Barriers" map):

- Tier 1, Priority RBTN Corridor (200 Points)
- Tier 1 RBTN Alignment (200 points)
- Tier 2, RBTN Corridor (175 Points)
- Tier 2, RBTN Alignment (175 Points)
- Direct connection to an RBTN Tier 1 corridor or alignment: (150 Points)
- Direct connection to an RBTN Tier 2 Corridor or Alignment (125 Points)
  OR
- Project is not located on or directly connected to the RBTN, but is part of a local system and identified within an adopted county city, or regional parks implementing agency plan. (50 Points)

SCORING GUIDANCE (200 Points)
The applicant will receive the points shown in the above bullets based on the location of the project relative to the RBTN.

RBTN Projects (Tier 1/Tier 2 corridors and alignments)
To receive the available points associated with Tier 1 and Tier 2 corridors and alignments, a project must accomplish one of the following:

- Improve a segment of an existing Tier 1 or Tier 2 alignment beyond a simple resurfacing of the facility;
- Implement a currently non-existing segment of a Tier 1 or Tier 2 alignment within and along a Tier 1 or Tier 2 corridor; OR
- Connect directly to a specific Tier 1 or Tier 2 corridor or alignment of the RBTN.
  * Note: if connecting to a RBTN ***corridor***, the project must connect to a roadway or to the planned terminus of a trail in a way that makes possible a future connection to a potential RBTN alignment for the corridor.

Projects that include both on-RBTN and off-RBTN improvements
Projects will be scored based on the proportion of the project that is within and along a RBTN corridor or along a designated RBTN alignment as shown on the RBTN map. Specifically:

- Tier 1 projects with 50% or more of the project's length within and along a Tier 1 corridor or alignment will receive 200 points.
- Tier 2 projects with 50% or more of the project's length within and along a Tier 2 corridor or alignment will receive 175 points.
- A project with less than 50% of its length within and along a Tier 1 corridor or alignment will be considered a Tier 1 direct connection and will receive 150 points for providing the direct connection.
- A project with less than 50% of its length within and along a Tier 2 corridor or alignment will be considered a Tier 2 direct connection and will receive 125 points for providing the direct connection.
- A project with less than 50% of its length within and along a Tier 1 or Tier 2 corridor or along a Tier 1 or Tier 2 alignment, but with 50% or more of its length within and along a combined Tier 1/Tier 2 corridor or alignment will receive the number of points corresponding to the Tier level with the higher proportion of project length.

Note: If no projects meet the above criterion for 200 points, the top scoring project(s) will be adjusted to 200 points and all other project scores will be adjusted proportionately. Due to tiered scoring, it is possible that ~~no, or~~ multiple~~,~~ projects will receive the maximum allotment of 200 points.

2. Potential Usage (200 Points) - This criterion quantifies the project's potential usage based on the existing population and employment adjacent to the project. Metropolitan Council staff will calculate the potential usage of the project using the Metropolitan Council model.

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Population Summary" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing population and employment within one mile, as depicted on the "Population Summary" map.

Upload the "Population Summary" map used for this measure.

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

- Existing Population within 1 Mile (Integer Only, ~~100~~ 75 Points): _____
- Existing Employment within 1 Mile (Integer Only, ~~100~~ 75 points):_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~200~~ 150 Points)
The applicant with highest population will receive the full ~~100~~ 75 points, as will the applicant with the highest number of jobs. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points for population and jobs, respectively. As an example for population, projects will score equal to the existing population within 1 mile of the project being scored divided by the project with the highest population within 1 mile multiplied by the maximum points available for the measure (~~100~~75). For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 people within 1 mile and the top project had 1,500 people, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*~~100~~ 75 points or ~~67~~ 50 points.

- Existing population: ~~100~~ 75 Points
- Existing employment: ~~100~~ 75 Points

Using the Metropolitan Council model, all Census block groups that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project will be included in the analysis.

The highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 200 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 80 points and the top project had ~~190~~ 140 points, this applicant would receive (80/~~190~~140)*~~200~~ 150 points or ~~84~~ 86 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Confirm that the applicant and/or controlling jurisdiction has a maintenance plan or other policy that mandates snow and ice control to promote year-round usage.

RESPONSE:

Include a link to and/or description of maintenance plan language.

- Maintenance plan or policy for snow-removal for year-round use (50 Points): _____
- No maintenance plan or policy for snow-removal for year-round use (0 Points): _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)
Applicants that have policy language that commits to year-round usage by controlling snow and ice on from trails will receive 50 points. Those who do not will receive zero points.

3. Equity and Housing Performance (120 Points) – This criterion addresses the Council's role in advancing equity by examining the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. 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 equitable distribution of~~the~~ benefits, mitigation of negative impacts, and community engagement ~~impacts, and mitigation~~ for the populations selected. (50 Points)

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

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

- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50): ☐ (up to 100% of maximum score~~0 to 30 Points~~)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐ (up to 80% of maximum score ~~0 to 24 Points~~)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (up to 60% of maximum score ~~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: ☐ (up to 40% of maximum score ~~0 to 12 Points~~)

1. (0 to 3 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project has encouraged or will engage the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Identify the communities to be engaged and where in the project development process engagement has occurred or will occur. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project; and surveys, study recommendations, or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If relevant, describe how NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities.

(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

2. (0 to 7 points) Describe the project's benefits to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Benefits could relate to safety; public health; access to destinations; travel time; gap closure; leveraging of other beneficial

projects and investments; and/or community cohesion. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

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

3. (-3 to 0 points) Describe any negative externalities created by the project along with measures that will be taken to mitigate them. Negative externalities can result in a reduction in points, but mitigation of externalities can offset reductions.

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

Below is a list of negative impacts. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

- Increased difficulty in street crossing caused by increased roadway width, increased traffic speed, wider turning radii, or other elements that negatively impact pedestrian access.
- Increased noise.
- Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
- Project elements that are detrimental to location-based air quality by increasing stop/start activity at intersections, creating vehicle idling areas, directing an increased number of vehicles to a particular point, etc.
- Increased speed and/or "cut-through" traffic.
- Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
- Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.
- Displacement of residents and businesses.
- Construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings. These tend to be temporary.
- Other

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~30~~ 50 Points)

Each application will be scored on a 10-point scale as described below.

1. (3 points): The project(s) with the most impactful and meaningful community engagement will receive the full three points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
2. (7 points) The project(s) with the most positive benefits will receive the full seven points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
3. (-3 to 0 points) The scorer will reduce the score by one point (up to three total) for each negative externality. Note that the scorer can deduct points for negatives not acknowledged in the application; the scorer will document any negatives not acknowledged in the application and the reasons for any associated point reductions. The scorer can add one to three points for successful mitigation of negative project elements based on the degree to which they are mitigated. Note that this score cannot provide more points than are deducted.

Each score from the above 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography.

~~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 proportionate 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~~ 50 points or ~~15~~ 25 points. Note also that it is possible to score negative points on this measure.

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the 2015 Housing Performance Score 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 an average score of the jurisdictions. 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.

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

- City/Township: _____ *(Cities and Townships entered by applicant)*
- Housing Score: _____

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. 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. Deficiencies and Safety (250 Points) – This criterion addresses the project's ability to overcome barriers or system gaps through completion of a Critical Bicycle Transportation Link, as defined in the 2040 TPP. **Critical Bicycle Transportation Links** encompass several types of barriers that can disrupt the connectivity of the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) and isolate communities and key destinations. In addition to providing critical links, projects will be scored on their ability to correct deficiencies and improve the overall safety/security of an existing facility, or expand safe biking opportunities with a future multiuse trail or bicycle facility.

Note: Routine maintenance activities on a multiuse trail or bicycle facility are not eligible for funding. As defined by the FHWA, examples of routine maintenance activities include shrub and brush removal or minor drainage improvements. In order to be eligible for funding, reconstruction projects must be replacing a facility at the end of its useful life or include improvements to the facility (e.g., ADA, safety, other deficiencies). Resurfacing of a facility is eligible only if other improvements to the facility are also included in the proposed project.

A. *MEASURE:* Discuss how the project will close a gap and/or improve continuity or connections between jurisdictions. The applicant should include a description of gap improvements for the project. (100 Points)

RESPONSE (Check all that apply):

- **Closes a transportation network gap and/or provides a facility that crosses or circumvents a physical barrier** ☐ (0-90 Points)**:**
  Gap improvements can be on or off the RBTN and may include the following:
  - Providing a missing link between existing or improved segments of a regional (i.e., RBTN) or local transportation network;
  - Improving bikeability to better serve all ability and experience levels by:
    - Providing a safer, more protected on-street facility;
    - Improving crossings at busy intersections (signals, signage, pavement markings); OR
    - Improving a bike route or providing a trail parallel to a highway or arterial roadway along a lower-volume neighborhood collector or local street.

  Barrier crossing improvements (on or off the RBTN) can include crossings (over or under) of rivers or streams, railroad corridors, freeways, or multi-lane highways, or enhanced routes to circumvent the barrier by channeling bicyclists to existing safe crossings or grade separations. (For new barrier crossing projects, data about the nearest parallel crossing (as described above) must be included in the application to be considered for the full allotment of points under this criterion).
- **Improves continuity and/or connections between jurisdictions** (on or off the RBTN) (e.g., extending a specific bikeway facility treatment across jurisdictions to improve consistency and inherent bikeability): ☐ (10 Points)

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The applicant will receive up to 90 points if the response shows that the project closes a gap and/or crosses or circumvents a physical barrier and up to 10 points if it improves continuity and/or connections between jurisdictions. The project that the most meets the intent of each the criteria will receive the maximum points (e.g., 90 points for the project that best overcomes a gap or barrier). Remaining projects will receive a portion of the maximum points based on the response. Projects that do not check the box or whose description does not fulfill the intent of the criteria, will receive 0 points.

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. For example, if the application being scored had 80 points and the top project had 90 points, this applicant would receive (80/90)*100 points or 89 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Discuss how the project will correct existing deficiencies or address an identified safety or security problem on the facility. The applicant should also include any available project site-related safety data (e.g. crash data, number of conflict points to be eliminated by the project by type of conflict (bicyclist/pedestrian, bicyclist/vehicle, pedestrian/vehicle, and vehicle/vehicle)) to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem. Where available, use of local crash data for the project length is highly encouraged. Crashes involving bicyclists and pedestrians should be reported for 2011-2015. As part of the response, demonstrate that the project improvements will reduce the crash potential and provide a safer environment (by referencing crash reduction factors or safety studies) and/or correct a deficiency. (150 Points)

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)

The applicant will receive the points shown below, based on the magnitude of the deficiencies or safety issues and the quality of the improvements, as addressed in the response. The scorer will first place each project into one of the two categories below based on ~~if~~ whether crash data is cited as part of the response. The project with the most extensive improvements will receive the full points for each category. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points as listed below.

- For applicants that provide actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem only. Project also demonstrates that the project will reduce the crash potential and provide a safer environment and/or correct a deficiency. The project that will reduce the most crashes will receive 150 points. The other projects in this category will receive a proportional share between ~~101~~ 76 and 150 points (i.e., a project that reduces one-half of the crashes of the top project would receive 125 points): ~~101~~ 76 to 150 Points
- For applicants that do not provide actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data. However, the applicant demonstrates the project's ability to reduce the risk for bicycle and pedestrian crashes with the reduction of modal conflict points (bike/pedestrian, bike/vehicle, pedestrian/vehicle, and vehicle/vehicle), safety improvements that address these modal conflicts, or the project's ability to correct deficiencies. The top project will receive 100 points while other projects will receive a portion of the 100 points based on the quality of the project and response: 0 to 100 Points

5. Multimodal Elements and Connections (100 Points) - This criterion measures how the project improves the travel experience, safety, and security for other modes of transportation, provides strong connections, and addresses the safe integration of these modes.

A. *MEASURE:* Discuss any transit or pedestrian 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 transit and pedestrian connections. Furthermore, address how the proposed bikeway project safely integrates all modes of transportation (i.e., bicyclists, transit, pedestrians, and vehicles). 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.

RESPONSE (200 words or less):

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The project with the most comprehensive enhancements to the travel experience and safe integration of other modes, as addressed in the required response, will 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. Projects that include the transit or pedestrian elements as part of the project should receive slightly more points than existing or planned multimodal facilities on parallel routes, consistent with the supporting plans and studies.

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

6. Risk Assessment (130 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.

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):

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~~Funding ~~(5~~ 20 ~~Percent of Points)~~

~~100%~~ ☐ ~~Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurred~~All funding sources are ~~identified and/or are local sources~~ ~~(the Regional Solicitation award is the gap funding/remaining funding needed to implement the project); applicants may still pursue other funding sources after the project award to reduce the local contribution.~~

~~40%~~ ☐ ~~Stakeholders have been identified~~

~~0%~~ ☐ ~~The applicant is promising to cover the entire local match, but it is necessary for them to seek other sources (e.g., state bonding or various state/federal competitive grants) or funding partners to be able to successfully deliver the project (i.e., the local agency does not have the entire local match committed at this time) Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted~~

~~2)~~1) Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan (~~30 ~~5~~ Percent of Points)

Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries

100% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)~~completed~~). **A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.**

50% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan started~~completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. **A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.**

0% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ has not been started

Anticipated date or date of completion: _____

~~3) Environmental Documentation (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)~~2) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (~~10~~ 20 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

100% ☐ There are historical/archeological properties present but determination of "no historic properties affected" is anticipated.

80% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of ~~"no historic properties affected" or~~ "no adverse effect" anticipated

40% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated

0% ☐ Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological ~~resources~~ properties 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 (10 20 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 property 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~~70% ☐ ~~Section 4f resources present within the project area, but no adverse effects~~impacts are minor and they do not adversely affect the activities, features, or ~~attributes of the 4(f) property.~~

~~50% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. – C~~coordination/documentation has begun

~~30% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. Coordination/documentation has not begun resources likely – coordination/documentation has not begun~~

~~0% ☐ Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area~~

~~6)~~3) Right-of-Way (~~15 2~~30 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired

50% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

~~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 all identified

~~0% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed~~

Anticipated date or date of acquisition _____

~~7)~~4) **Railroad Involvement (~~25~~ 20 Percent of Points)**

100% ☐ No railroad involvement on project or r

~~100% ☐ R~~ailroad Right-of-Way ~~Agreement~~ agreement is executed (**include signature page, if applicable**)

~~60% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated~~

~~40~~50% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

~~20% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; railroad has been contacted~~

0% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun~~railroad has not been contacted~~.

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: ___~~

SCORING GUIDANCE (130 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)*130 points or 74 points.

7. Cost Effectiveness (100 Points) – This criterion will assess the project's cost effectiveness based on the total TAB-eligible project cost and total points awarded in the previous 6 criteria.

A. *MEASURE:* This measure will calculate the cost effectiveness of the project. Metropolitan Council staff will divide the number of points awarded in the previous criteria by the TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls) ~~by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria~~.

- Cost Effectiveness = ~~total TAB-eligible project cost/~~total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible project cost

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 most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar ~~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~~ proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the top project received .0005 points per dollar and ~~had 35,000 and~~ the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, ~~had 70,000,~~ this applicant would receive (.00025~~35,000~~/.0005~~70,000~~)*100 points or 50 points.

The scorer for this measure will also complete a reasonableness check of the total project cost that is used for this measure. The scorer may follow up with the applicant to clarify any questions. Up to 50 percent of points awarded for this measure can be deducted if the scorer does not believe that the cost estimate is reasonable.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS

Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA) – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

July 12, 2017

Definition: A project that primarily benefits pedestrians as opposed to multiple types of non-motorized users. Most non-motorized projects should apply in the Multiuse Trail and Bicycle Facilities application category. All projects must relate to surface transportation. 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. Multiuse trail bridges or underpasses should apply in the Multiuse Trail and Bicycle Facilities application category instead of this application category given the nature of the users and the higher maximum awards.

Examples of Pedestrian Facility Projects:

- Sidewalks
- Streetscaping
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) improvements
- Making similar improvements in a concentrated geographic area, such as sidewalk gap closure throughout a defined neighborhood or downtown area

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	**150**	**~~15~~14%**
Measure A - Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	150	
2. Potential Usage	**150**	**~~15~~14%**
Measure A - Existing population within 1/2 mile	150	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**120**	**~~12~~11%**
Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation	50	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Deficiencies and Safety	**300**	**~~30~~27%**
Measure A - Barriers overcome or gaps filled	120	
Measure B - Deficiencies corrected or safety problems addressed	180	
5. Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections	**150**	**~~15~~14%**
Measure A - Transit or bicycle elements of the project and connections	150	
6. Risk Assessment	**130**	**~~13~~12%**
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	130	
~~Sub-Total~~	**~~1,000~~**	**~~100%~~**
7. Cost Effectiveness	**100**	**9%**
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (~~total project cost/~~total points awarded/total project cost)	100	
Total	**1,100**	

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (~~150~~ ~~300~~ 150 Points) -

This criterion measures the regional significance of the project, including the project's connections to jobs, ~~and~~ Educational Institutions, ~~as defined in ThriveMSP 2040~~and people.

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Regional Economy" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing employment and educational institution enrollment within 1/2 mile of the project. Existing employment will be measured by summing the employment located in the Census block groups that intersect the 1/2-mile buffer. Enrollment at public and private post-secondary institutions will also be measured.

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

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

- Existing Employment Within One-Half Mile:_____
- Existing Post-Secondary Enrollment Within One-Half Mile:_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)

The applicant with the highest combined total employment and post-secondary education enrollment will receive the full points for this measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 workers/students within 1/2 mile and the top project had 1,500 workers/students, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*150 points or 100 points. Using the Metropolitan Council model, all census block groups that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project.

Using the Metropolitan Council model, all Census block groups that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project will be included in the analysis.

2. Potential Usage (150 Points) - This criterion quantifies the project's potential usage based on the existing population adjacent to the project.

B. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Population Summary" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing population within 1/2-mile, as depicted on the "Population Summary" map.

Upload the "Population Summary" map used for this measure.

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

- Existing Population Within One-Half Mile: _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)

The applicant with the highest population will receive the full 150 points, as will the applicant with the highest number of jobs. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 people within 1/2 mile and the top project had 1,500 people, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*150 points or 100 points.

Using the Metropolitan Council model, all Census block groups that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project will be included in the analysis.

3. Equity and Housing Performance (120 Points) – This criterion addresses the Council's role in advancing equity by examining the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. 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 equitable distribution of~~the~~ benefits, mitigation of negative impacts, and community engagement ~~impacts, and mitigation~~ for the populations selected. (50 Points)

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

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

- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50): ☐ (up to 100% of maximum score~~0 to 30 Points~~)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐ (up to 80% of maximum score ~~0 to 24 Points~~)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (up to 60% of maximum score ~~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: ☐ (up to 40% of maximum score ~~0 to 12 Points~~)

1. (0 to 3 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project has encouraged or will engage the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Identify the communities to be engaged and where in the project development process engagement has occurred or will occur. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project; and surveys, study recommendations, or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If relevant, describe how NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities.

(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

2. (0 to 7 points) Describe the project's benefits to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Benefits could relate to safety; public

health; access to destinations; travel time; gap closure; leveraging of other beneficial projects and investments; and/or community cohesion. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

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

3. (-3 to 0 points) Describe any negative externalities created by the project along with measures that will be taken to mitigate them. Negative externalities can result in a reduction in points, but mitigation of externalities can offset reductions.

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

Below is a list of negative impacts. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

- Increased difficulty in street crossing caused by increased roadway width, increased traffic speed, wider turning radii, or other elements that negatively impact pedestrian access.
- Increased noise.
- Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
- Project elements that are detrimental to location-based air quality by increasing stop/start activity at intersections, creating vehicle idling areas, directing an increased number of vehicles to a particular point, etc.
- Increased speed and/or "cut-through" traffic.
- Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
- Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.
- Displacement of residents and businesses.
- Construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings. These tend to be temporary.
- Other

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

Each application will be scored on a 10-point scale as described below.

1. (3 points): The project(s) with the most impactful and meaningful community engagement will receive the full three points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
2. (7 points) The project(s) with the most positive benefits will receive the full seven points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
3. (-3 to 0 points) The scorer will reduce the score by one point (up to three total) for each negative externality. Note that the scorer can deduct points for negatives not acknowledged in the application; the scorer will document any negatives not acknowledged in the application and the reasons for any associated point reductions. The scorer can add one to three points for

successful mitigation of negative project elements based on the degree to which they are mitigated. Note that this score cannot provide more points than are deducted.

Each score from the above 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography.

~~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 proportionate 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)*50 points or 25 points. Note also that it is possible to score negative points on this measure.

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the 2015 Housing Performance Score 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.

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. Deficiencies and Safety (300 Points) – This criterion addresses the project's ability to improve the overall safety of an existing or future pedestrian facility. This includes how the project will overcome physical barriers or system gaps, correct deficiencies, and/or fix a safety problem.

Note: Routine maintenance activities on a pedestrian facility are not eligible for funding. As defined by the FHWA, examples of routine maintenance activities include shrub and brush removal or minor drainage improvements. In order to be eligible for funding, reconstruction projects must be replacing a facility at the end of its useful life or include improvements to the facility (e.g., ADA, safety, other deficiencies). Resurfacing of a facility is eligible only if other improvements to the facility are also included in the proposed project.

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "RBTN Evaluation and Major Barriers" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Discuss how the project will overcome barriers (i.e., bridge or tunnel), fill gaps, or connects system segments in the pedestrian network. The applicant should include a description of barriers and gap improvements for the project. If the project is crossing or circumventing a barrier (e.g., river, stream, railroad corridor, freeway, or multi-lane highway), the applicant should describe the magnitude of the barrier (number of lanes, average daily traffic, posted speed, etc.) and how the proposed project will improve travel across or around that barrier. The description should include distance to and condition of the nearest parallel crossing of the barrier, including the presence or absence of pedestrian facilities, number of lanes, average daily traffic, and posted speed limit. The description should also include details of any project elements that advance needs prioritized in an ADA Transition Plan. (120 Points)

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (120 Points)
The applicant will receive up to 120 points if the response shows that the project overcomes a physical barrier or system gap. The project that most meets the intent will receive the maximum points. Remaining projects will receive a portion of the maximum points based on the response. Projects that do not fulfill the intent of the measure will receive 0 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Discuss how the project will correct existing deficiencies or address an identified safety or security problem on the facility. The applicant should also include any available project site-related safety data (e.g. crash data, number of conflict points to be eliminated by the project by type of conflict (bicyclist/pedestrian, bicyclist/vehicle, pedestrian/vehicle, and vehicle/vehicle)) to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem. Where available, use of local crash data for the project length is highly encouraged. Crashes involving bicyclists and pedestrians should be reported for 2011-2015. As part of the response, demonstrate that the project improvements will reduce the crash potential and provide a safer environment (by referencing crash reduction factors or safety studies) and/or correct a deficiency.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (180 Points)

The applicant will receive the points shown below, based on the magnitude of the deficiencies or safety issues and the quality of the improvements, as addressed in the response. The scorer will first place each project into one of the two categories below based on if crash data is cited as part of the response. The project with the most extensive improvements will receive the full points for each category. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points as listed below.

- For applicants that provide actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem only. Project also demonstrates that the project will reduce the crash potential and provide a safer environment and/or correct a deficiency. The project that will reduce the most crashes will receive 180 points. The other projects in this category will receive a proportional share between 121 and 180 points (i.e., a project that reduces one-half of the crashes of the top project would receive 150 points): ~~121~~ 101 to 180 Points
- For applicants that do not provide actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data. However, the applicant demonstrates the project's ability to reduce the risk for bicycle and pedestrian crashes with the reduction of modal conflict points (bike/pedestrian, bike/vehicle, pedestrian/vehicle, and vehicle/vehicle), safety improvements that address these modal conflicts, or the project's ability to correct deficiencies. The top project will receive 120 points based on the quality of the project and response: 0 to 120 Points

5. Multimodal Elements and Connections (150 Points Points) - This criterion measures how the project improves the travel experience, safety, and security for other modes of transportation, provides strong connections, and addresses the safe integration of these modes.

A. *MEASURE:* Discuss any transit or bicycle 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 transit and bicycle connections. Furthermore, address how the proposed pedestrian facility project safely integrates all modes of transportation (i.e., pedestrians, transit, bicyclists, and vehicles). Applicants should note if there is no transit service in the project area and identify supporting studies or plans that address why mode may not be incorporated into the project.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)

The project with the most comprehensive enhancements to the travel experience and safe integration of other modes, as addressed in the required response, will 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. Projects that include the transit or bicycle elements as part of the project should receive slightly more points than existing or planned multimodal facilities on parallel routes, consistent with the supporting plans and studies.

6. Risk Assessment (130 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.

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):

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~~Funding ~~(5~~ 20 ~~Percent of Points)~~

~~100% ☐ Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurred~~All funding sources are ~~identified and/or are local sources~~ (the Regional Solicitation award is the gap funding/remaining funding needed to implement the project); applicants may still pursue other funding sources after the project award to reduce the local contribution.

~~40% ☐ Stakeholders have been identified~~

~~0% ☐ The applicant is promising to cover the entire local match, but it is necessary for them to seek other sources (e.g., state bonding or various state/federal competitive grants) or funding partners to be able to successfully deliver the project (i.e., the local agency does not have the entire local match committed at this time) Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted~~

~~2)~~1) Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ (30 ~~5~~ Percent of Points)

Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries

100% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)~~completed~~). **A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.**

50% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan started~~completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. **A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.**

0% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ has not been started

Anticipated date or date of completion: _____

~~3) Environmental Documentation (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)~~2) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (~~10~~ 20 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

100% ☐ There are historical/archeological properties present but determination of "no historic properties affected" is anticipated.

80% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of ~~"no historic properties affected" or~~ "no adverse effect" anticipated

40% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated

0% ☐ Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological ~~resources~~ properties 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 (10 20 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 property 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)~~

~~8070% ☐ Section 4f resources present within the project area, but no adverse effectsimpacts are minor and they do not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the 4(f) property.~~

~~50% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. – Ccoordination/documentation has begun~~

~~30% ☐ Project impacts to Section 4f/6f present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. Coordination/documentation has not begun resources likely – coordination/documentation has not begun~~

~~0% ☐ Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area~~

~~6)~~3) **Right-of-Way (~~15 2~~30 Percent of Points)**

100% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired

50% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

~~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 all identified

~~0% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed~~

Anticipated date or date of acquisition _____

~~7)~~4) **Railroad Involvement (~~25~~ 20 Percent of Points)**

100% ☐ No railroad involvement on project or r

~~100%~~ ☐ ~~R~~ailroad Right-of-Way ~~Agreement~~ agreement is executed (**include signature page, if applicable**)

~~60%~~ ☐ ~~Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated~~

~~40~~50% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

~~20%~~ ☐ ~~Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; railroad has been contacted~~

0% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun~~railroad has not been contacted~~.

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: _____~~

SCORING GUIDANCE (130 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)*50 points or 29 points.

7. Cost Effectiveness ~~Ratio~~ (100 Points) – This criterion will assess the project's cost effectiveness based on the total TAB-eligible project cost and total points awarded in the previous criteria.

A. *MEASURE:* This measure will calculate the cost effectiveness of the project. Metropolitan Council staff will divide the number of points awarded in the previous criteria by the TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls) ~~by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria~~.

- Cost effectiveness= ~~total TAB-eligible project cost/~~total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible project cost

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 most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar ~~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 received .0005 points per dollar ~~had 35,000~~ and the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, ~~had 70,000,~~ this applicant would receive (.00025/.0005~~35,000/70,000~~)*100 points or 50 points.

The scorer for this measure will also complete a reasonableness check of the total project cost that is used for this measure. The scorer may follow up with the applicant to clarify any questions. Up to 50 percent of points awarded for this measure can be deducted if the scorer does not believe that the cost estimate is reasonable.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS

Safe Routes to School Infrastructure – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

July 11, 2017

Definition: An infrastructure project that is within a two-mile radius and directly benefiting a primary, middle, or high school site.

Examples of Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Projects:

- Sidewalks benefiting people going to the school
- Multiuse trails benefiting people going to the school
- Improved crossings benefiting people going to the school
- Multiple improvements

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
1. Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements	**250**	**~~25~~23%**
Measure A - Describe how project addresses 5 Es* of SRTS program	250	
2. Potential Usage	**250**	**~~25~~23%**
Measure A - Average share of student population that bikes or walks	170	
Measure B - Student population within school's walkshed	80	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**120**	**~~12~~11%**
Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation	50	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Deficiencies and Safety	**250**	**~~25~~23%**
Measure A - Barriers overcome or gaps filled	100	
Measure B - Deficiencies corrected or safety or security addressed	150	
5. Public Engagement/Risk Assessment	**130**	**12%**
Measure A - Public engagement process	45	
Measure B - Risk Assessment Form	85	
~~Sub-Total~~	**~~1,000~~**	**~~100%~~**
6. Cost Effectiveness	100	9%
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (~~total project cost/~~total points awarded/ total project cost/)	100	
Total	**1,100**	

** The 5 Es of Safe Routes to School include Evaluation, Engineering, Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement.*

1. Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements (250 Points) - This criterion assesses the program's ability to integrate the Safe Routes to School Program Elements: Engineering, Education, Enforcement, Encouragement, and Evaluation (the 5 E's).

A. *MEASURE:* Describe how the SRTS program associated with the project addresses or integrates the 5 Es. The response should include examples, collaborations or partnerships, and planned activities in the near-term (within five years) to further illustrate the incorporation of the 5Es into the SRTS program associated with the project.

MnDOT Safe Routes to School guidance defines these elements as follows:

- **Engineering** – Creating operational and physical improvements to the infrastructure surrounding schools that reduce speeds and potential conflicts with motor vehicle traffic, and establish safer and fully accessible crossings, walkways, trails, and bikeways. (0-50 points)
- **Education** - Teaching children about the broad range of transportation choices, instructing them in important lifelong bicycling and walking safety skills, and launching driver safety campaigns in the vicinity of schools. (0-50 points)
- **Enforcement -** Partnering with local law enforcement to ensure traffic laws are obeyed in the vicinity of the schools (this includes enforcement of speeds, yielding to pedestrians, and proper walking and bicycling behaviors) and initiating community enforcements such as a crossing guard program. (0-50 points)
- **Encouragement -** Using events and activities to promote walking and bicycling. (0-50 points)
- **Evaluation -** Monitoring and documenting outcomes and trends through the collection of data before and after the project(s). (0-50 points)

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (250 Points)

The applicant will receive up to 50 points for each of the five sub-measures based on the program's ability to demonstrate the incorporation of each of the 5 E's through activities completed or to be implemented in the near-term (within five years). Applicants will receive up to the full points for each element at the scorer's discretion. The project that most meets the intent of each of the sub-measure will receive the maximum points (e.g., 50 points for the project that best meets the engineering element). Remaining projects will receive a portion of the maximum points based on the response. Projects that do not check the box or whose description does not fulfill the intent of the criteria, will receive 0 points.

- Engineering: 0-50 Points
- Education: 0-50 Points
- Enforcement: 0-50 Points
- Encouragement: 0-50 Points
- Evaluation: 0-50 Points

The highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 250 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points relative to the proportion of the full points assigned to the highest-scoring project. For example, if the application being scored had 100 points and the top project had 200 points, this applicant would receive (100/200)*250 points or 125 points.

2. Potential Usage (250 Points) - This criterion quantifies the project's potential impact to existing population.

A. *MEASURE:* Average percent of student population that currently bikes, walks, or takes public transit to school, as identified on the Safe Routes to School student travel tally worksheet. Public transit usage does not refer to school buses. Public transit usage should only be considered when the bus route does not have a stop at the school (since these students must walk or bike to get to the school grounds). As part of the required attachments, applicants should attach copies of all original travel tally documentation. (170 Points)

RESPONSE:

- Average percent of student population:_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (170 Points)
The applicant with the highest average share of student population that currently bikes, walks, or takes public transportation to school will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 15 percent of the students and the top project had 30 points, this applicant would receive (0.15/0.30)*170 points or 85 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Student population within one mile of the elementary school, middle school, or high school served by the project.

RESPONSE:

- Student population within one mile of the school:_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (80 Points)
The applicant with the highest student population within one mile of the school will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 150 students and the top project had 300 points, this applicant would receive (150/300)*80 points or 40 points.

3. Equity and Housing Performance (120 Points) – This criterion addresses the Council's role in advancing equity by examining the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. 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 equitable distribution of~~the~~ benefits, mitigation of negative impacts, and community engagement ~~impacts, and mitigation~~ for the populations selected. (~~30~~ 50 Points)

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

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

- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50): ☐ (up to 100% of maximum score~~0 to 30 Points~~)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐ (up to 80% of maximum score ~~0 to 24 Points~~)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (up to 60% of maximum score ~~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: ☐ (up to 40% of maximum score ~~0 to 12 Points~~)

1. (0 to 3 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project has encouraged or will engage the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Identify the communities to be engaged and where in the project development process engagement has occurred or will occur. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project; and surveys, study recommendations, or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If relevant, describe how NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities.

(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

2. (0 to 7 points) Describe the project's benefits to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Benefits could relate to safety; public health; access to destinations; travel time; gap closure; leveraging of other beneficial

projects and investments; and/or community cohesion. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

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

3. (-3 to 0 points) Describe any negative externalities created by the project along with measures that will be taken to mitigate them. Negative externalities can result in a reduction in points, but mitigation of externalities can offset reductions.

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

Below is a list of negative impacts. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

- Increased difficulty in street crossing caused by increased roadway width, increased traffic speed, wider turning radii, or other elements that negatively impact pedestrian access.
- Increased noise.
- Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
- Project elements that are detrimental to location-based air quality by increasing stop/start activity at intersections, creating vehicle idling areas, directing an increased number of vehicles to a particular point, etc.
- Increased speed and/or "cut-through" traffic.
- Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
- Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.
- Displacement of residents and businesses.
- Construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings. These tend to be temporary.
- Other

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~30~~ 50 Points)

Each application will be scored on a 10-point scale as described below.

1. (3 points): The project(s) with the most impactful and meaningful community engagement will receive the full three points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
2. (7 points) The project(s) with the most positive benefits will receive the full seven points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
3. (-3 to 0 points) The scorer will reduce the score by one point (up to three total) for each negative externality. Note that the scorer can deduct points for negatives not acknowledged in the application; the scorer will document any negatives not acknowledged in the application and the reasons for any associated point reductions. The scorer can add one to three points for successful mitigation of negative project elements based on the degree to which they are mitigated. Note that this score cannot provide more points than are deducted.

Each score from the above 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography.

~~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 proportionate 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~~ 50 points or ~~15~~ 25 points. Note also that it is possible to score negative points on this measure.

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the 2015 Housing Performance Score 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.

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 proportionate 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. Deficiencies and Safety (250 Points) - This criterion addresses the project's ability to improve the overall safety of the proposed project area. This includes how the project will overcome physical barriers or system gaps, correct deficiencies, and/or fix a safety problem.

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "RBTN Evaluation and Major Barriers" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Discuss how the project will overcome barriers (i.e., bridge or tunnel), fill gaps, or connects system segments in the pedestrian/bicycle network serving a K-12 school. The applicant should include a description of barriers and gap improvements for the project in context with the existing bicycle or pedestrian network serving the school(s). If the project is crossing or circumventing a barrier (e.g., river, stream, railroad corridor, freeway, or multi-lane highway), the applicant should describe the magnitude of the barrier (number of lanes, average daily traffic, posted speed, etc.) and how the proposed project will improve travel across or around that barrier. The description should include distance to and condition of the nearest parallel crossing of the barrier, including the presence or absence of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, number of lanes, average daily traffic, and posted speed limit. (100 Points)

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)
The applicant will receive up to 100 points if the response shows that the project overcomes a physical barrier or system gap. The project that the most meets the intent will receive the maximum points. Remaining projects will receive a portion of the maximum points based on the response. Projects that do not check the box or whose descriptions do not fulfill the intent of the criteria, will receive 0 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Discuss how the project will correct existing deficiencies or address an identified safety or security problem on the facility or within the project site. Address how these improvements will make bicycling and walking to the school a safer and appealing transportation alternative. Include any available project site-related safety data (e.g. crash data, number of conflict points to be eliminated by the project by type of conflict (bicyclist/pedestrian, bicyclist/vehicle, pedestrian/vehicle, and vehicle/vehicle)) to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem. Where available, use of local crash data for the project length is highly encouraged. Crashes involving bicyclists and pedestrians should be reported for 2011-2015. As part of the response, demonstrate that the project improvements will reduce the crash potential and provide a safer environment (by referencing crash reduction factors or safety studies) and/or correct a deficiency. Qualitative data from parent surveys, other internal survey data, or stakeholder engagement supporting the safety/security improvements or deficiencies should also be addressed.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)

The applicant will receive the points shown below, based on the magnitude of the deficiencies or safety issues and the quality of the improvements, as addressed in the response. The scorer will first place each project into one of the two categories below based on if crash data or other qualitative data is cited as part of the response. Improvements that are supported by crash reduction factors, safety studies, survey data, and/or stakeholder engagement should be scored highest. The project with the most extensive improvements will receive the full points for each category below. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.

- For applicants that provide actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem only. Applicant also demonstrates that the project will reduce the crash potential and provide a safer environment and/or correct a deficiency, supported by crash reduction factors, safety studies, survey data, and/or stakeholder engagement. The project that will reduce the most crashes will receive 150 points. The other projects in this category will receive a proportionate share between ~~101~~ 76 and 150 points (i.e., a project that reduces one-half of the crashes of the top project would receive 125 points): ~~101~~ 76 to 150 Points
- For applicants that do not provide actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data. However, the applicant demonstrates the project's ability to reduce the risk for bicycle and pedestrian crashes with the reduction of modal conflict points (bike/pedestrian, bike/car, pedestrian/car, and vehicle/vehicle), safety improvements that address these modal conflicts, or the project's ability to correct deficiencies. The top project will receive 100 points while other projects will receive a portion of the 100 points based on the quality of the project and response: 0 to 100 Points

5. Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (130 Points) - This criterion measures the planned public engagement, 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:* Describe the public engagement process that will be used to include partners and stakeholders (e.g., schools, parents, law enforcement, road authorities, and other impacted community members) and build consensus during the development of the proposed project. The number and types of meetings to be held, notices or other notification distributed, stakeholder contacts, and any additional descriptive information should be included in the discussion of the engagement process. As part of the required attachments, copies of all parent survey results must also be attached to the application. The applicant should note if parent surveys were not collected as part of the SRTS planning process.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (45 Points)
The applicant will be scored on the comprehensiveness and quality of the planned public engagement activities. Additionally, applicants with a project selected through a public engagement process should score higher than projects without this engagement step. Community support, as displayed through parent surveys and stakeholder contacts, should also be considered in the scoring. Note: parent surveys are attached for MnDOT informational purposes only.

The project with the most extensive near-term engagement process (current year through project construction year), including any completed engagement activities for the proposed project, will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.

B. *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):
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 ScopeFunding (5 20 Percent of Points)~~
~~100% ☐ Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurredAll funding sources are identified and/or are local sources (the Regional Solicitation award is the gap funding/remaining funding needed to implement the project); applicants may still pursue other funding sources after the project award to reduce the local contribution.~~
~~40% ☐ Stakeholders have been identified~~
~~0% ☐ The applicant is promising to cover the entire local match, but it is necessary for them to seek other sources (e.g., state bonding or various state/federal competitive grants) or funding partners to be able to successfully deliver the project (i.e., the local agency does not have the entire local match committed at this time) Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted~~

~~2)~~1) Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ (30 ~~5~~ Percent of Points)

Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries

100% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)~~completed~~). **A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.**

50% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan started~~completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. **A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.**

0% ☐ Layout ~~or Preliminary Plan~~ has not been started

Anticipated date or date of completion: _____

~~**3) Environmental Documentation (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)~~2) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (~~10~~ 20 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

100% ☐ There are historical/archeological properties present but determination of "no historic properties affected" is anticipated.

80% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of ~~"no historic properties affected" or~~ "no adverse effect" anticipated

40% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated

0% ☐ Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological ~~resources~~ properties 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 (10 20 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 property 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)~~

~~8070%~~ ☐ ~~Section 4f resources present within the project area, but no adverse effects~~impacts are minor and they do not adversely affect the activities, features, or ~~attributes of the 4(f) property.~~

~~50%~~ ☐ ~~Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. – C~~coordination/documentation has begun

~~30%~~ ☐ ~~Project impacts to Section 4f/6f present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. Coordination/documentation has not begun~~ resources likely – coordination/documentation has not begun

~~0%~~ ☐ ~~Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area~~

~~6)~~3) **Right-of-Way (~~15 2~~30 Percent of Points)**

100% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired

50% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

~~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 all identified

~~0% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed~~

Anticipated date or date of acquisition _____

~~7)~~4) **Railroad Involvement (~~25 20~~ Percent of Points)**

100% ☐ No railroad involvement on project or r

~~100% ☐ R~~ailroad Right-of-Way ~~Agreement~~ agreement is executed (**include signature page, if applicable**)

~~60% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated~~

~~40~~50% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

~~20% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; railroad has been contacted~~

0% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun~~railroad has not been contacted~~.

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: _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (85 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 proportionate 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)*50 points or 29 points.

6. Cost Effectiveness (100 Points) – This criterion will assess the project's cost effectiveness based on the total TAB-eligible project cost and total points awarded in the previous five criteria.

A. *MEASURE:* This measure will calculate the cost effectiveness of the project. Metropolitan Council staff will divide the number of points awarded in the previous criteria by the TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls) ~~by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria~~.

- Cost effectiveness = ~~total TAB-eligible project cost/~~total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible project cost

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 most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar ~~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 proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the top project received .0005 points per dollar ~~had 35,000~~ and the application being ~~scored~~ scored received .00025 points per dollar ~~had 70,000~~, this applicant would receive (.00025~~35,000~~/.0005~~70,000~~)*X 100 points or 50 points.

The scorer for this measure will also complete a reasonableness check of the total project cost that is used for this measure. The scorer may follow up with the applicant to clarify any questions. Up to 50 percent of points awarded for this measure can be deducted if the scorer does not believe that the cost estimate is reasonable.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS