

ACTION TRANSMITTAL No. 2017-33

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: Policies, Qualifying criteria, and Project Eligibility
REQUESTED ACTION: Approval of policies, qualifying criteria, and project eligibility for the 2018 Regional Solicitation
RECOMMENDED MOTION: That TAB adopt the attached policies, qualifying criteria, and project eligibility for the 2018 Regional Solicitation.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF ACTION: Along with the scoring criteria and measures and their scoring values that TAB must approve are qualifying requirements, project eligibility, and other policy concerns.

Attached are three draft sections of the Regional Solicitation: Introduction, Qualifying Requirements, and Forms. Key changes to consider, shown tracked in the attachments, include:

1. Whether to allow funding of transit maintenance and support facilities and garages through the Transit Modernization category. Staff recommends disallowing the funding of transit maintenance and support facilities, as Transit Modernization projects are meant to more directly serve riders. (Page 20)
2. In which roadway category (Expansion or Reconstruction/Modernization) two-to-three-lane conversions should be eligible. Staff recommends Reconstruction Modernization, as those projects tend to be completed for safety and turn-movement reasons, as opposed to system expansion. (Page 14)
3. Whether to allow scoring committees the flexibility to deviate from the approved scoring guidance (with a rationale provided to the Funding & Programming Committee). Staff recommends allowing this. (Page 27)
4. Whether to allow scorers the option to prorate scores based on the second-highest scoring project (as opposed to the top-scoring project) in cases where strict adherence to the scoring guidance creates an outlier. Staff recommends allowing this. (Page 29)
5. Whether to remove the restriction that TAB will only fund one roadway, bridge, bicycle, or pedestrian trail within the same corridor. Any projects in the same corridor must prove independent utility as a qualifying requirement. (Not shown in attached; this was not recommended by F&P or TAC.)
6. Whether to include additional language notifying transit applicants the opportunity to have their ridership projections reviewed by Council staff prior to submittal in order to determine whether the scoring methodology is sound. Staff recommends this change. (Page 28)
7. Whether to add a rule that higher-scoring-projects cannot be skipped over to funding lower-scoring projects within the same category, except if it is needed to satisfy another rule (e.g., funding of one application per functional classification). Staff recommends this. (Page 29) Per TAB's request, a list of transit projects selected in the 2014 and 2016 Regional Solicitations is shown on page 5.
8. Whether to require an application earn a minimum score to be eligible for funding. Staff recommends this and suggests a minimum score that is 50% of the top score within each

category as opposed to a flat number. (Not shown in attached; this was not recommended by F&P or TAC.)

9. Whether to add a qualifying criterion requiring that any sponsoring agency with at least 50 employees must be substantially working toward completing its ADA Transition Plan. Staff recommends this, as it is consistent with direction from FHWA.
10. Whether to require that all roadway projects that involve the construction of a new or expanded interchange or new interchange ramps have approval by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Interchange Planning Review Committee prior to application submittal. Staff recommends this, as it was agreed upon prior to release of the 2016 Regional Solicitation. (Page 37)
11. Whether to require that Roadway Expansion projects expanding thru lanes or building a new interchange on an existing signalized corridor have completed signal retiming within the five-year time period before the project was submitted for funding. Staff recommends this addition for the following reasons:
 - It is consistent with Highway Investment chapter of the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan, which states that signal retiming and related traffic management technologies should be implemented before exploring expansion of the roadway.
 - Retiming principal arterials and other roadways with greater than 20,000 average daily traffic must be completed every five years as required by state statute:
<https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/?id=160.235>
 - The congestion reduction scoring measure asks applicant for intersection delay before and after the improvement. Without an updated signal timing of the corridor, the magnitude of the problem/delay at an intersection may be overestimated and it makes it more difficult to assess whether an expensive expansion improvement is needed.
(Not shown in attached; this was not recommended by F&P or TAC. Proposed qualifying criterion had read: "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.")
12. Whether to add a requirement to the Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization categories that each application must show independent utility and the points awarded in the application should only account for the improvements listed in the application. (Page 38)
13. Whether to add a requirement that Travel Demand Management (TDM) applicants must be properly categorized as a subrecipient in accordance with [2CFR200.330](#). Staff recommends this as a way to address project risk. (Page 38)
14. Whether to add a requirement that TDM applicants must not have received any audit findings, material weaknesses, significant deficiencies, or material non-compliances in either of the two preceding fiscal years. (Not shown in attached; this was not recommended by F&P or TAC. Proposed qualifying criterion had read: "The applicant must not have received any audit findings, material weaknesses, significant deficiencies, or material non-compliances in either of the two preceding fiscal years.")
15. Whether to add a requirement that TDM applicants must adhere to Subpart E Cost Principles of [2CFR200](#) under the proposed sub award. Staff recommends this to address project risk. (Page 38)
16. Whether to require that all applications include a "before" photo. This will be part of a before and after analyses of the projects funded through the Regional Solicitation. Staff recommends this. (Page 41)
17. Whether to request documentation of local support, by listing any public involvement completed to date. (Not shown in attached; this was not recommended by F&P or TAC. Proposed information request item had read: "LOCAL SUPPORT (list any public involvement completed to date as part the project planning, local government resolutions, or inclusion of the specific project in approved planning or programming documents)")

18. Whether to limit application attachments to fewer than 15 pages for each attachment. Staff recommends this along with a requirement that all pages be 8.5" by 11". (Page 41)
19. Whether to require applicants to submit a one-page project summary to be used by the scoring committees and TAB members. Staff recommends this change. (Page 41)
20. Whether to require applicants to include a letter or resolution from their governing boards committing to fund the entire local match if the agency is not successful in securing other funding sources for the local match. Staff recommends this change. (Page 42)

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 policies, qualifying criteria, and project eligibility for the 2018 Regional Solicitation, with the following changes:

- (Item 1, above): The Committee unanimously voted to allow maintenance facilities and garages in the Transit Modernization application.
- (Item 5, above): The Committee unanimously voted to recommend retaining this restriction because it helps create geographic balance.
- (Item 8, above): The Committee unanimously voted to recommend eliminating this item because it would limit funding options before scores are even tabulated and could be impacted by scoring aberrations such as outliers.
- (Item 9, above): The Committee voted, with one vote against, to recommend eliminating this item because there is uncertainty of the timing and specifics of federal expectations (since adjusted by TAC; see below).
- (Item 11, above): The Committee unanimously voted to recommend eliminating this item because members did not feel it was necessary.
- (Item 14, above): The Committee unanimously voted to recommend eliminating this item because the impacts are unclear and even the Council has had audit findings.
- (Item 17, above): The Committee unanimously voted to recommend eliminating this item because listing public involvement activities without tying them to points or qualification would not provide any purpose.
- Per the Funding & Programming Committee's recommendation to remove points for snow removal, the attached qualifying criteria adds the phrase "year-round" to the qualifying criterion related to maintenance along with a reference to an FHWA release (<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/preservation/082708.cfm>, page 35).

At its November 1, 2017, meeting, the Technical Advisory Committee voted unanimously to include a qualifying criterion requiring that any sponsoring agency with at least 50 employees must be substantially working toward completing its ADA Transition Plan (page 35).

The Technical Advisory Committee also voted unanimously to recommend policies, qualifying criteria, and project eligibility for the 2018 Regional Solicitation, inclusive of the following changes:

1. Two-to-three-lane conversions will be eligible in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization category. Language was clarified regarding two-to-three lane expansions still being eligible in the Roadway Expansion category. (Page 14)
2. Allow scoring committees the flexibility to deviate from the approved scoring guidance (with a rationale provided to the Funding & Programming Committee). (Page 27)

3. Allow scorers the option to prorate scores based on the second-highest scoring project (as opposed to the top-scoring project) in cases where strict adherence to the scoring guidance creates an outlier. (Page 29)
4. Include additional language notifying transit applicants the opportunity to have their ridership projections reviewed by Council staff prior to submittal in order to determine whether the scoring methodology is sound. (Page 28)
5. Add a rule that higher-scoring-projects cannot be skipped over to funding lower-scoring projects within the same category, except if it is needed to satisfy another rule (e.g., funding of one application per functional classification). Staff recommends this. (Page 29) Per TAB's request, a list of transit projects selected in the 2014 and 2016 Regional Solicitations is shown on page 5.
6. Add a qualifying criterion requiring that any sponsoring agency with at least 50 employees must be substantially working toward completing its ADA Transition Plan.
7. Require that all roadway projects that involve the construction of a new or expanded interchange or new interchange ramps have approval by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Interchange Planning Review Committee prior to application submittal. (Page 37)
8. Add a requirement to the Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization categories that each application must show independent utility and the points awarded in the application should only account for the improvements listed in the application. (Page 38)
9. Add a requirement that Travel Demand Management (TDM) applicants must be properly categorized as a subrecipient in accordance with 2CFR200.330. (Page 38)
10. Add a requirement that TDM applicants must adhere to Subpart E Cost Principles of 2CFR200 under the proposed sub award. (Page 38)
11. Require that all applications include a "before" photo. This will be part of a before and after analyses of the projects funded through the Regional Solicitation. (Page 41)
12. Limit application attachments to fewer than 15 pages for each attachment, with a requirement that all pages be 8.5" by 11". (Page 41)
13. Require applicants to submit a one-page project summary to be used by the scoring committees and TAB members. (Page 41)
14. Require applicants to include a letter or resolution from their governing boards committing to fund the entire local match if the agency is not successful in securing other funding sources for the local match. (Page 42)

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 | - |

TRANSIT PROJECTS FUNDED IN THE LAST TWO REGIONAL SOLICITATIONS

- 2014:
 - Metro Transit: Chicago Avenue Corridor Bus and Technology Improvements
 - Metro Transit: Emerson-Fremont Avenue Corridor Bus and Technology Improvements
 - Metro Transit: Penn Avenue Corridor Bus and Technology Improvements
 - St. Louis Park: Beltline LRT Station Park & Ride Structure
 - MVTA: Apple Valley Transit Station Modernization
 - 2016:
 - Metro Transit: Chicago Avenue Corridor Bus and Technology Improvements
 - Metro Transit: Lake St/Marshall Ave Bus and Technology Improvements in Minneapolis and St. Paul
 - Metro Transit: Route 63 Service Improvement in St. Paul
 - SW Transit: SouthWest Transit Fixed Route Service to Mall of America
 - Eden Prairie: Town Center LRT Station Construction in Eden Prairie
 - Metro Transit: Regional Communication Improvements by Metro Transit
 - Metro Transit: Heywood II Bus Garage Construction in Minneapolis
 - Metro Transit: Penn Ave Bus Stop Modernization Between Brooklyn Center and Minneapolis
 - Metro Transit: Chicago Ave Corridor Bus Stop Modernization in Minneapolis
-

Introduction to the Regional Solicitation for Transportation Projects

November 6, 2017

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. The funding program and related rules and requirements are established by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) and administered locally through collaboration with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT).

The online application can be accessed at: <http://www.metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Planning-2/Transportation-Funding/Regional-Solicitation/Regional-Solicitation.aspx>

Federal Program Overview

As authorized by the most recent federal surface transportation funding act, Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, projects will be selected for funding as part of ~~two federal programs: the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program. The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) was folded into STBGP in the FAST Act is the~~ It is assumed that federal funding will continue to be available in 2022 and 2023~~1~~, but there is no money set aside at the current time with current federal legislation.

Connection to the Regional Policy

The Regional Solicitation process and criteria were overhauled in 2014 to reflect new federal guidance and regional goals. These regional goals were defined through *Thrive MSP 2040*, the regional development framework for the metropolitan area. The region's long-range transportation plan, the *2040 Transportation Policy Plan (TPP)*, was developed to meet federal requirements but also reflect and help implement the regional goals established in *Thrive*. It is useful to understand the intent behind both *Thrive* and the *TPP* to ensure that all projects funded through the Regional Solicitation meet these shared goals. These funds are intended to implement the region's transportation plan and to address local problems identified in required comprehensive plans.

While there are national goals for the region's transportation system, including the implementation of a performance-based planning approach to investments, federal legislation requires metropolitan areas to set their own goals. Projects funded through the Regional Solicitation do not need to be specifically named in the *TPP* because they must prove consistency with regional goals and policies to pass the qualifying review step of the Regional Solicitation process. In addition, the goals of the *TPP* are strongly reflected in the prioritizing criteria used to select projects shown in the following table.

TABLE 1: REGIONAL SOLICITATION CONNECTION TO REGIONAL POLICY

| Prioritizing Criteria | Thrive Outcomes | TPP Goals |
|---|--|---|
| <u>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Prosperity</u> - <u>Livability</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Access to Destinations</u> - <u>Competitive Economy</u> |
| <u>Usage</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Livability</u> - <u>Prosperity</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Access to Destinations</u> - <u>Competitive Economy</u> |
| <u>Equity and Housing Performance</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Equity</u> - <u>Livability</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Access to Destinations</u> - <u>Leveraging Transportation Investments to Guide Land Use</u> |
| <u>Infrastructure Age</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Stewardship</u> - <u>Sustainability</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Transportation System Stewardship</u> |
| <u>Congestion Reduction/Air Quality</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Prosperity</u> - <u>Livability</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Healthy Environment</u> - <u>Competitive Economy</u> |
| <u>Safety</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Livability</u> - <u>Sustainability</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Safety and Security</u> |
| <u>Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Prosperity</u> - <u>Equity</u> - <u>Livability</u> - <u>Sustainability</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Access to Destinations</u> - <u>Transportation and Land Use</u> - <u>Competitive Economy</u> |
| <u>Risk Assessment</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Stewardship</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Transportation System</u> |
| <u>Cost Effectiveness</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Stewardship</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Transportation System</u> |

Modal Categories and Application Categories

As depicted in on the following page, the applications are grouped into three primary modal categories:

1. Roadways Including Multimodal Elements
2. Transit and Travel Demand Management (TDM) Projects
3. Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Each of these modal categories includes three to four application categories for a total of 10 categories. TAB will also consider unique federally eligible projects that do not fit one of the 10 application categories on their merits, if they are submitted. These unique projects, which are ~~are~~ required to be federally eligible and generate regional benefit, cannot be included in the competitive process because they are not easily compared to other submitted projects. These projects should request funding directly from the TAB. While unique projects may be submitted at any time, if they are submitted during the formal solicitation process, TAB will consider them in the same time frame, if possible, so funding decisions can be coordinated.

Applicants for the Regional Solicitation will select the appropriate application category for their proposed project based on the mode requiring the largest percentage of cost. For instance, a roadway reconstruction project that includes a new sidewalk would apply under the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization application category because the roadway improvements are the largest cost for the project. If an applicant submits a project in the incorrect application category, the application may be

disqualified. It is advised that applicants contact Metropolitan Council staff prior to submission if there are any questions about which application category is the most appropriate for their project.

Figure 1: TAB-Approved Application Categories

Funding Availability, Minimums, and Maximums

A total of approximately \$~~180-200~~ million in federal funds is anticipated to be available in this solicitation for program years ~~2020-2022~~ and ~~2021-2023~~. ~~Also, due to increased funding levels under the new federal FAST Act legislation, there is also a limited amount of money available for 2018 and 2019.~~ As shown in Table 2, modal funding ranges have been established by TAB, based on historic levels, to give applicants an understanding of the general funding levels available by mode. TAB reserves the right to adjust these modal funding levels depending on the amount and quality of projects submitted. ~~In addition, TAB approved allocating \$10 million to \$15 million to the Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement application category, with this money coming out of funding for Roadways Including Multimodal Elements.~~ Base-level ~~2020-2022~~ and ~~2021-2023~~ TDM funding for the TMOs and Metro Transit will be taken out of the Transit and TDM category ~~for the next solicitation~~. Additionally, there is \$1.2 million of TDM funding that is available for ~~2018-2020~~ and ~~2019-2021~~ for innovative projects ~~form the previous solicitation~~.

TABLE 2: ~~2020-2022-2021-2023~~ MODAL FUNDING LEVELS

| | Roadways Including Multimodal Elements | Transit and TDM Projects | Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities | Total |
|-----------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------|
| Modal Funding Levels | Range of 48%-68% Range of \$ 96M - \$136M | Range of 22%-32% Range of \$ 44M - \$64M | Range of 10%-20% Range of \$ 20M - \$40M | 100% \$ 200M |

Within Roadways Including Multimodal Elements, at least one project will be funded from each of the five eligible functional classifications: A-minor arterial augmentors, connectors, expanders, and relievers, as well as non-freeway principal arterials.

Table 3 shows the minimum and maximum federal award for application categories that applicants can apply for as part of the Regional Solicitation. The values do not account for 20 percent local match minimum that applicants must contribute to the project.

TABLE 3: ~~2016~~ REGIONAL SOLICITATION FUNDING AWARD MINIMUMS AND MAXIMUMS

| Modal Categories | 2016 Regional Solicitation | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| | Application Categories | Minimum Federal Award | Maximum Federal Award |
| Roadways Including Multimodal Elements | Roadway Expansion | \$1,000,000 | \$7,000,000 |
| | Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility | \$1,000,000 | \$7,000,000 |
| | Roadway Traffic System Management Technologies | \$250,000 | \$7,000,000 |
| | Bridge Rehabilitation/-Replacement | \$1,000,000 | \$7,000,000 |
| Transit and TDM Projects | Transit Expansion | \$500,000 | \$7,000,000 |
| | Transit System Modernization | \$100,000 | \$7,000,000 |
| | Travel Demand Management (TDM) | \$75,000 | \$300 500,000 |
| | Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities | \$250,000 | \$ 5 3,500,000 |
| | Pedestrian Facilities | \$250,000 | \$1,000,000 |

| | | | |
|--|---|-----------|-------------|
| Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities | Safe Routes to School (Infrastructure Projects) | \$150,000 | \$1,000,000 |
|--|---|-----------|-------------|

Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

The following pages include definitions, examples, and scoring overviews of each of the application categories.

Roadway Expansion

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 | 17.5 19% |
| Measure A - nearest Level of Congestion and Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study PrioritiesAverage distance to nearest parallel roadways | 80 | |
| Measure B - Connection to Total Jobs, and Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs, and Students | 30 50 | |
| Measure C - traffic Regional Truck Corridor Study TiersCurrent daily heavy commercial traffic | 50 80 | |
| Measure D—Freight project elements | 15 | |
| 2. Usage | 175 | 17.5 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, 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 and connections | 100 | |
| 8. Risk Assessment | 75 | 7.5 % |
| Measure A - Risk Assessment Form | 75 | |
| Sub-Total | 1,000 1,000 | 100 100% |
| 9. Cost Effectiveness | 100 | 10 9% |

Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

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

Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility

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
- Alternative intersections such as unsignalized or signalized reduced conflict intersections (one intersection or multiple 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 ~~reconstructions~~ 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 with the addition of 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 | 17.5 % |
| Measure A - <u>Level of Congestion, Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study Priorities, and Congestion Management and Safety Plan Opportunity Areas</u> Average distance to nearest parallel roadways | 80 | 65 |
| Measure B - Connection to Total Jobs and Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs | 40 | 30 |
| Measure C - <u>Regional Truck Corridor Study Tiers</u> Current daily heavy commercial traffic | 65 | 50 |
| Measure D - Freight project elements | 15 | |
| 2. Usage | 175 | 17.5 % |
| Measure A - Current daily person throughput | 110 | |
| Measure B - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume | 65 | |
| 3. Equity and Housing Performance | 100 | 10 % |
| Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits | 30 | |
| Measure B - Housing Performance Score | 70 | |
| 4. Infrastructure Age/Condition | 150 | 15 % |
| Measure A - Date of construction | 50 | |
| Measure B - Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies | 100 | |
| 5. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality | 75 | 7.5 % |
| Measure A - Vehicle delay reduced | 45 | 50 |
| Measure B - Kg of emissions reduced | 30 | |
| 6. Safety | 150 | 15 % |
| Measure A - Crashes reduced | 150 | |
| 7. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections | 100 | 10 % |
| Measure A - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections | 100 | |

Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

| Criteria and Measures | Points | % of Total Points |
|--|--------------|-------------------|
| 8. Risk Assessment | 75 | 7.57% |
| Measure A - Risk Assessment Form | 75 | |
| Sub-Total | 1,000 | 100% |
| 9. Cost Effectiveness | 100 | 9% |
| Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost) | 100 | |
| Total | 1,100 | |

Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

Roadway System Traffic Management Technologies

Definition: An Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) or similar projects that primarily benefit roadway users. Roadway System Management projects can include project elements along a continuous route (could be more than one roadway) or defined geographic area such as a downtown area. The system management project 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 Technologies 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 or replacement traffic management centers
- New or replacement ~~fiber optic cables used for~~ traffic communication control, etc.
- New or replacement closed-circuit television (CCTV) cameras
- New or replacement variable message signs and other traveler information improvements
- New or replacement detectors
- Incident management coordination

Scoring:

| Criteria and Measures | Points | % of Total Points |
|--|------------|-------------------|
| 1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy | 125 | 17.5 % |
| Measure A - Average distance to nearest parallel roadways <u>Functional classification of project</u> | 55 | 50 |
| Measure B - Connection to Total Jobs and Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs <u>Regional Truck Corridor Study tiers</u> | 30 | 50 |
| Measure C - Current daily heavy commercial traffic <u>Integration within existing traffic management systems</u> | 30 | 50 |
| Measure D - <u>Coordination with other agencies</u> Freight project elements | 10 | 25 |
| 2. Usage | 125 | 17.5 % |
| Measure A - Current daily person throughput | 85 | |
| Measure B - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume | 40 | |
| 3. Equity and Housing Performance | 100 | 10 % |
| Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits | 30 | |
| Measure B - Housing Performance Score | 70 | |
| 4. Infrastructure Age | 75 | 7.5 % |
| Measure A - Date of construction | 75 | |
| 5. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality | 200 | 20 % |
| Measure A - Vehicle delay reduced | 150 | |
| Measure B - Kg of emissions reduced | 50 | |
| 6. Safety | 200 | 20 % |
| Measure A - Crashes reduced | 200 | 50 |
| <u>Measure B – Safety issues in project area</u> | 150 | |
| 7. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections | 100 | 10 % |
| Measure A - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections | 100 | 50 |

Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

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

Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement

Definition: A bridge rehabilitation or replacement project located on a non-freeway principal arterial or A-minor arterial 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 | 19.518% |
| Measure A - Average Distance to <u>the</u> nearest parallel bridges | 115 100 | |
| Measure B - Connection to Total Jobs, and Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs, <u>and post-secondary students</u> | 30 | |
| Measure C - Current daily heavy commercial traffic | 35 65 | |
| Measure D - Freight project elements | 15 | |
| 2. Usage | 130 | 13.12% |
| Measure A - Current daily person throughput | 100 | |
| Measure B - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume | 30 | |
| 3. Equity and Housing Performance | 100 | 10.09% |
| Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation | 30 | |
| Measure B - Housing Performance Score | 70 | |
| 4. Infrastructure Condition | 400 | 40.36% |
| Measure A - Bridge Sufficiency Rating | 300 | |
| Measure B - Load-Posting | 100 | |
| 5. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections | 100 | 10.09% |
| 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 points awarded/total project cost) | 100 | |
| Total | 1,100 | |

Transit and Travel Demand Management (TDM) Projects

Transit Expansion

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
- Customer facilities ~~Transit shelters, centers, stations, and platforms~~ 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 % |
| Measure A - Risk Assessment Form | 50 | |
| Sub-Total | 1,000 | 100 % |
| 7. Cost Effectiveness | 100 | |
| Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total annual project cost) | 100 | |
| Total | 1,100 | |

Transit and Travel Demand Management (TDM) Projects

Transit ~~System~~ Modernization

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 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. Council staff can be consulted before the application deadline to determine a project’s 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 <u>9</u> % |
| 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 <u>325</u> | 30% |
| Measure A - Total existing annual riders | 300 <u>325</u> | |
| 3. Equity and Housing Performance | 150 <u>175</u> | 15 <u>16</u> % |
| Measure A - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project’s benefits | 80 <u>105</u> | |
| Measure B - Housing Performance Score | 70 | |
| 4. Emissions Reduction | 100 <u>50</u> | 10 <u>5</u> % |
| Measure A – Description of emissions reduced | 100 <u>50</u> | |
| 5. Service and Customer Improvements | 150 <u>200</u> | 15 <u>18</u> % |
| 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 <u>200</u> | |
| 6. Multimodal Facilities and Connections | 100 | 10 <u>9</u> % |

Transit and Travel Demand Management (TDM) Projects

| | | |
|--|-------------------|------------------|
| 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 points awarded/total project cost) | 100 | |
| Total | 1,100 | |

Transit and Travel Demand Management (TDM) Projects

Travel Demand Management (TDM)

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 ~~An innovative project that~~ reduces 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 disadvantageded populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation | 80 | |
| Measure B - Housing Performance Score | 70 | |
| 4. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality | 400 300 | 40 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 1,000 | 100 100% |
| 7. Cost Effectiveness | 100 | 9% |
| Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost) | 100 | |
| Total | 1,100 | |

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities

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 | 200 150 | |
| Measure B – Snow and ice control | 50 | |
| 3. Equity and Housing Performance | 120 | 12 11% |
| Measure A - Connection to disadvantageded 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 points awarded/total project cost) | 100 | |
| Total | 1,100 | |

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA)

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 | 1514% |
| Measure A - Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions | 150 | |
| 2. Potential Usage | 150 | 1514% |
| Measure A - Existing population within 1/2 mile | 150 | |
| 3. Equity and Housing Performance | 120 | 1211% |
| Measure A - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation | 50 | |
| Measure B - Housing Performance Score | 70 | |
| 4. Deficiencies and Safety | 300 | 3027% |
| Measure A - Barriers overcome or gaps filled | 120 | |
| Measure B - Deficiencies corrected or safety problems addressed | 180 | |
| 5. Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections | 150 | 1514% |
| Measure A - Transit or bicycle elements of the project and connections | 150 | |
| 6. Risk Assessment | 130 | 1312% |
| Measure A - Risk Assessment Form | 130 | |
| Sub-Total | 1,000 | 100% |
| 7. Cost Effectiveness | 100 | 9% |
| Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost) | 100 | |
| Total | 1,100 | |

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Safe Routes to School (Infrastructure Projects)

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 | 2523% |
| Measure A - Describe how project addresses 5 Es* of SRTS program | 250 | |
| 2. Potential Usage | 250 | 2523% |
| 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 | 1211% |
| 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 | 2523% |
| Measure A - Barriers overcome or gaps filled | 100 | |
| Measure B - Deficiencies corrected or safety or security addressed | 150 | |
| 5. Public Engagement/Risk Assessment | 130 | 1312% |
| 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 points awarded/total project cost) | 100 | |
| Total | 1,100 | |

* The 5 Es of Safe Routes to School include Evaluation, Engineering, Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement.

Project applicants can also “bundle” two or more projects together to meet the funding minimum. Bundled projects must fall into one of ~~three~~two types:

- Projects located along the same corridor (e.g., filling multiple trail gaps along a trail corridor)
- ~~Systemwide improvements (e.g., retiming traffic signals on a continuous roadway or across a downtown area)~~
- Similar improvements within a defined neighborhood or downtown area (e.g., adding benches along the sidewalks in a downtown area)

Traffic management technologies projects are exempt from the bundling rules.

Bundling of independent projects that can each meet the project minimum and are not related to one another as described above is not allowed. For eligible bundled projects, when doing scoring of multiple locations, an average will be used for geographically-based measures.

Applicants are encouraged to contact TAB Coordinator Elaine Koutsoukos (Elaine.koutsoukos@metc.state.mn.us; 651-602-1717) if they have questions regarding project bundling.

General Process and Rules

1. ~~On May 15, 2015,~~ TAB selected ~~51-58~~ transportation projects as part of the ~~2014-2016~~ Regional Solicitation. An evaluation process took place in the summer and fall of ~~2015-2017~~ to continue to improve all aspects of the Regional Solicitation including the scoring criteria. The following are the major changes that are implemented in the ~~2016-2018~~ Regional Solicitation:
 1. ~~Added a new cost effectiveness criterion to all application categories.~~
 2. ~~Inserted the scoring guidance into each application to give applicants more information regarding how their project will be evaluated.~~
 3. ~~Approved allocating \$10 million to \$15 million to the Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement application category, with this money coming out of funding for Roadways Including Multimodal Elements.~~
 4. ~~Guaranteed that at least one roadway project in each of the eligible roadway classifications (i.e., non freeway Pprincipal Aarterials, A Mminor aAugmentor, A mMinor cConnector, A mMinor eExpander, and A mMinor rReliever) will be funded.~~
 5. ~~Adjusted measures to make roadways/railroad grade separation projects more competitive.~~
 6. ~~Consolidated and simplified the Multimodal criteria and measures.~~
~~Increased the funding federal minimum award amounts.~~
 - 7.1. Included the MnDOT/Metropolitan Council Interchange Request process as a qualifying criterion.
 2. Incorporated regional prioritization studies into the project scoring including the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study, Congestion Management and Safety Plan IV, and Regional Truck Corridor Study.

3. Staff will check project cost estimates for reasonableness and will be able to deduct up to 50% of the points awarded in the Cost Effectiveness measure if the estimate is not reasonable.
 4. Encouraged the option to submit transit ridership projections before the application deadline for Council review.
 5. Required that each transit application must show independent utility and the points awarded in the application should only account for the improvements listed in the application.
 6. Required that TDM applicants are properly categorized as a subrecipient in accordance with 2CFR200.330 and adhere to Subpart E Cost Principles of 2CFR200 under the proposed subaward.
 7. Made improvements to the equity measure that address public outreach and mitigation of potential negative externalities.
 8. Decreased the maximum federal award for Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities and increased the maximum federal award for Travel Demand Management (TDM).
 9. Made a clear connection between Thrive MSP 2040, the Transportation Policy Plan, and the prioritization criteria and measures used to select projects in the Regional Solicitation.
 10. Change the titles of the following application categories to better-reflect terminology in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan.
 - o Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization is now Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility.
 - o Roadway System Management is now Traffic Management Technologies.
 - o Transit System Modernization is now Transit Modernization.
 11. Mandated that higher-scoring projects cannot be skipped over to fund lower-scoring projects except when another rule, such as the funding of each roadway functional classification, allows for it.
 12. Allowed flexibility for scoring committees to deviate from the scoring guidance when they are able to convey a sound rationale to the Funding & Programming Committee.
 13. Required applicants to submit a “before” photo and a one-page project summary.
 14. Mandated that sponsoring agencies with greater than 50 employees are, at a minimum, working toward completing its Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Transition Plan.
 15. Required applicants to limit each attachment to 15 8.5” by 11” pages.
 - ~~8.~~16. Required applicants to include a letter or resolution from their governing board committing to fund the entire local match if the agency is not successful in securing other funding sources for the local match.
2. Project sponsors must incur the cost of the project prior to repayment. Costs become eligible for reimbursement only after a project has been approved by MnDOT State-Aid and the appropriate USDOT modal agency.
 3. The construction cost of projects listed in the region’s draft or adopted TIP is assumed to be fully funded. TAB will not consider projects already listed in the draft or adopted TIP, nor the reimbursement of advanced construction funds for those projects, for funding through the solicitation process.

4. Projects selected to receive federal funding through this solicitation will be programmed in the regional TIP in years ~~2020-2022~~ and ~~2021-2023~~, taking into consideration the applicant's request and the TAB's balancing of available funds. ~~When the selected projects are programmed, the TAB may adjust the federal award and the non-federal match amount to account for anticipated inflation.~~
5. The fundable amount of a project is based on the original submittal. TAB must approve any significant change in the scope or cost of an approved project as described in the scope change process memo. <http://www.metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Planning-2/Transportation-Funding/Regional-Solicitation/Regional-Scope-Change-Policy.aspx>
6. **A project will be removed from the program if it does not meet its program year.** The program year aligns with the state fiscal year. For example, if the project is programmed for ~~2020-2022~~ in the TIP, the project program year begins July 1, ~~2019-2021~~, and ends June 30, ~~2020-2022~~. Projects selected from this solicitation will be programmed in ~~2020-2022~~ and ~~2021-2023~~. The Regional Program Year Policy outlines the process to request a one-time program year extension. [http://www.metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Planning-2/Transportation-Funding/Regional-Solicitation/TAB-Regional-Program-Year-Policy-\(PDF-154-KB\).aspx](http://www.metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Planning-2/Transportation-Funding/Regional-Solicitation/TAB-Regional-Program-Year-Policy-(PDF-154-KB).aspx)
7. Applicants for transit projects should be aware of the schedule and associated time lag for receiving federal funds for transit vehicle and transit operating projects. Applicants are encouraged to contact [Christopher Nguyen](mailto:Christopher.Nguyen@metc.state.mn.us) at the Metropolitan Council (Christopher.Nguyen@metc.state.mn.us or 651-602-1961) for more details on selecting a preferred program year as part of the application given this time lag.
8. Transit projects will be given an opportunity to have their ridership projections reviewed by Council staff prior to submittal in order to determine whether the scoring methodology is sound. Any applicant wanting to have an optional review should submit draft ridership information to the TAB Coordinator two weeks prior to the application deadline.
- ~~8-9.~~ The announcement of funding availability is posted on the Metropolitan Council website and emailed to local stakeholders.
- ~~9-10.~~ The applicant must show that the project meets all of the qualifying requirements of the appropriate application category to be eligible to be scored and ranked against other projects. Applicants whose projects are disqualified may appeal and participate in the review and determination of eligibility at the Technical Advisory Committee Funding & Programming (TAC F&P) Committee meeting.
- ~~10-11.~~ _____ A set of prioritizing criteria with a range of points assigned is provided for each application category. The applicant must respond directly to each prioritizing criterion in order for it to be scored and receive points. Projects are scored based on how well the response meets the requirements of the prioritizing criteria and, in some cases, how well the responses compare to those of other qualifying applications in the same project application category.
- ~~11-12.~~ _____ Members of the TAC Funding and Programming Committee or other designees will evaluate the applications and prepare a ranked list of projects by application category based on a total score of all the prioritizing criteria. The TAC will forward the ranked list of projects with funding options to TAB. TAB may develop its own funding proposals. TAB will then recommend a list of

projects to be included in the region's TIP to receive federal funds. TAB submits the Draft TIP to the Metropolitan Council for concurrence.

13. TAB may or may not choose to fund at least one project from each application category.

14. The Regional Solicitation is a performance-based program, so higher scoring projects will not be skipped over to fund lower scoring projects within the same category (except if it is needed to satisfy another approved rule).

15. Scoring committees have the option to recommend a deviation from the approved scoring guidance if a rationale for the deviation is provided to the TAC Funding and Programming Committee.

~~12.~~16. For many of the quantitative measures in the Regional Solicitation, the scoring guidance gives the top project 100% of the points and the remaining projects a proportionate share of the full points. If there is a high-scoring outlier on a particular measure, the scorer will have the option to prorate the other scores based on the second highest scoring project instead of the top project.

~~13.~~ ~~Projects involving new or expanded interchanges are funded conditional on the successful completion of the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request procedures. In this solicitation, points are awarded as part of the Risk Assessment for applicable projects that have completed this interchange approval process. In the next Regional Solicitation, applicable interchange projects will need to go through the approval prior to submitting an application (i.e., it will become a qualifying requirement). Please contact Karen Scheffing at MnDOT (Karen.Scheffing@state.mn.us or 651-234-7784) to determine if your project needs to go through the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee.~~

~~14.~~17. In the 2016 Regional Solicitation, TAB will only fund a roadway or bridge project on a roadway that is spaced at least 3.5 miles away from another funded project on the same roadway (only applies to two separate applications selected in the same solicitation).

~~15.~~18. In the 2016 Regional Solicitation, TAB will not fund more than one transit capital project in a transitway corridor (only applies to two separate applications selected in the same solicitation).

~~16.~~19. In the 2016 Regional Solicitation, the TAB will not fund more than one bicycle or pedestrian facility project in the same corridor (only applies to two separate applications selected in the same solicitation). For trails, a funded project may be on the same trail facility as another funded project as long as the two projects serve different users and destinations.

Project Schedule

Table 4 shows the key milestones in the Regional Solicitation review, scoring, and selection process. All applications are due by 4:00 P.M. on July 13, 2018*.

TABLE 4: REGIONAL SOLICITATION SCHEDULE

| Date | Process |
|------------|---|
| 5/18/2018 | Regional Solicitation Released. Applicants can obtain on-line access at this time. |
| 7/9/2018 | Applicants must apply for on-line access by 4:00 P.M. |
| 7/13/2018 | Application deadline – 4:00 P.M. |
| 7/19/2018 | Qualifying reviews begin. |
| 8/10/2018 | Qualifying review completed (staff notify applicants that do not qualify). |
| 8/16/2018 | TAC F&P Committee meeting: Qualifying appeals heard. |
| 8/20/2018 | Scoring committees begin evaluating all qualified applications. |
| 10/5/2018 | Scoring completed. Staff prepares results for TAC F&P Committee meeting (10/18/18). |
| 10/18/2018 | TAC F&P releases project scores. |
| 10/18/2018 | Scores distributed to applicants; appeal period begins. |
| 10/31/2018 | Scoring appeal deadline. |
| 11/15/2018 | TAC F&P Committee meeting: Scoring appeals reviewed, funding options developed. |
| 12/20/2018 | TAC F&P considers funding options presented by staff and votes to eliminate, modify or create options and forwards them to the TAC. |
| 1/2/2019 | TAC review of funding options and recommendation to TAB. |
| 1/16/2019 | TAB approval of funding recommendations and direct staff to include them into the draft 2018-2021 TIP. |

**Subject to change based on TAB and Metropolitan Council approval.*

Contacts

For general questions about the Regional Solicitation, please contact:

Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator
 Metropolitan Council
 390 North Robert Street
 St. Paul, MN 55101
 (651) 602-1717
elaine.koutsoukos@metc.state.mn.us

Technical Assistance Contacts

Table 5 provides contacts for technical assistance in providing necessary data in order to address various prioritizing criteria. Before contacting any technical expert below, please use existing local sources. Local experts in many cases are the appropriate contact for much of the data needed to respond to criteria. In some instances, it may take five or more workdays to provide the requested data. Please request data as soon as possible.

TABLE 5. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CONTACTS

| Subject | Name | Organization | Email | Phone Number |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|--|----------------|
| General | Elaine Koutsoukos | TAB | Elaine.koutsoukos@metc.state.mn.us | (651) 602-1717 |
| | Joe Barbeau | Met Council | Joseph.barbeau@metc.state.mn.us | (651) 602-1705 |
| Traffic Volumes | | | | |
| Freeways | Jason Junge | MnDOT | Jason.Junge@state.mn.us | (651) 234-7875 |
| State Roads | Mark Flinner | MnDOT | Mark.flinner@state.mn.us | (651) 366-3849 |
| | Gene Hicks | MnDOT | Gene.hicks@state.mn.us | (651) 366-3856 |
| Heavy Commercial | Shannon Foss | MnDOT | shannon.foss@state.mn.us | (651) 366-3878 |
| | John Hackett | | John.Hackett@state.mn.us | (651) 366-3851 |
| 2040 Projections | Mark Filipi | Met Council | Mark.Filipi@metc.state.mn.us | (651) 602-1725 |
| Synchro | Kevin Schwartz | MnDOT | Kevin.schwartz@state.mn.us | (651) 234-7840 |
| | Pat Otto | MnDOT | Pat.otto@state.mn.us | (651) 234-7837 |
| Crashes | Chad Erickson | MnDOT | Chad.erickson@state.mn.us | (651) 234-7806 |
| Freeway Management | Terry Haukom | MnDOT | Terry.haukom@state.mn.us | (651) 234-7980 |
| Trunk Highway Traffic Signals | | | | |

| Subject | Name | Organization | Email | Phone Number |
|---|--------------------|--------------|--|----------------|
| Signal Operations | Mike Fairbanks | MnDOT | Mike.Fairbanks@state.mn.us | (651) 234-7819 |
| Signal/Lighting Design | Michael Gerbensky | MnDOT | Michael.gerbensky@state.mn.us | (651) 234-7816 |
| State Aid Standards | Colleen Brown | MnDOT | Colleen.brown@state.mn.us | (651) 234-7779 |
| Bikeway/Walkway Standards | Gina Mitteco | MnDOT | Gina.mitteco@state.mn.us | (651) 234-7878 |
| Interchange Approvals | Michael Corbett | MnDOT | Michael.J.Corbett@state.mn.us | (651) 234-7793 |
| Safe Routes to School | Dave Cowan | MnDOT | Dave.Cowan@state.mn.us | (651) 366-4180 |
| Regional Bikeway Network | Steve Elmer | Met Council | Steven.elmer@metc.state.mn.us | (651) 602-1756 |
| Thrive MSP 2040 Centers | Dan Marckel | Met Council | Dan.marckel@metc.state.mn.us | (651) 602-1548 |
| Housing Performance Scores | Jonathan Stanley | Met Council | Jonathan.stanley@metc.state.mn.us | (651)-602-1051 |
| Equity Measures | Heidi Schallberg | Met Council | Heidi.schallberg@metc.state.mn.us | (651)602-1721 |
| Demographics by TAZ | Mark Filipi | Met Council | Mark.Filipi@metc.state.mn.us | (651) 602-1725 |
| Transit Ridership | Heidi Schallberg | Met Council | Heidi.schallberg@metc.state.mn.us | (651) 602-1721 |
| Transit Funding Timeline | Christopher Nguyen | Met Council | Christopher.Nguyen@metc.state.mn.us | (651) 602-1961 |
| Emissions Data | Mark Filipi | Met Council | Mark.Filipi@metc.state.mn.us | (651) 602-1725 |
| Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study | Steve Peterson | Met Council | Steven.peterson@metc.state.mn.us | (651) 602-1819 |
| Regional Truck Highway Corridor Study | Steve Elmer | Met Council | Steven.elmer@metc.state.mn.us | (651) 602-1756 |
| Congestion Management and Safety Plan | Michael Corbett | MnDOT | Michael.J.Corbett@state.mn.us | (651) 234-7793 |

Qualifying Requirements

June 22, 2017

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

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

All Projects

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1: ~~2016~~ Regional Solicitation Funding Award Minimums and Maximums

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

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement

8. The project must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

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

9. In order for a selected project to be included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and approved by USDOT, the public agency sponsor must either have, or be substantially working towards, completing a current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) self-evaluation or transition plan that covers the public right of way/transportation, as required under Title II of the ADA.

The applicant is a public agency that employs 50 or more people and has an adopted ADA transition plan that covers the public right of way/transportation. Date plan adopted by governing body: _____

The applicant is a public agency that employs 50 or more people and is currently working towards completing an ADA transition plan that covers the public rights of way/transportation. Date process started _____ Date of anticipated plan completion/adoption: _____

The applicant is a public agency that employs fewer than 50 people and has a completed ADA self-evaluation that covers the public rights of way/transportation. Date self-evaluation completed: _____

The applicant is a public agency that employs fewer than 50 people and is working towards completing an ADA self-evaluation that covers the public rights of way/transportation. Date process started _____ Date of anticipated plan completion/adoption: _____

(TDM Applicants Only) The applicant is not a public agency subject to the self-evaluation requirements in Title II of the ADA.

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

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

10. The owner/operator of the facility must operate and maintain the project year-round for the useful life of the improvement, per FHWA direction established 8/27/2008 and updated 6/27/2017.

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

11. The project must represent a permanent improvement with independent utility. The term "independent utility" means the project provides benefits described in the application by itself and does not depend on any construction elements of the project being funded from other sources outside the regional solicitation, excluding the required non-federal match.

Projects that include traffic management or transit operating funds as part of a construction project are exempt from this policy.

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

12. The project must not be a temporary construction project. A temporary construction project is defined as work that must be replaced within five years and is ineligible for funding. The project must also not be staged construction where the project will be replaced as part of future stages.

Staged construction is eligible for funding as long as future stages build on, rather than replace, previous work.

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

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

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

Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

1. All roadway and bridge projects must be identified as a principal arterial (non-freeway facilities only) or A-minor arterial as shown on the latest TAB approved roadway functional classification map.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. Roadway Expansion, Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility, and Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only: All roadway projects that involve the construction of a new/expanded interchange or new interchange ramps must have approval by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Interchange Planning Review Committee prior to application submittal. Please contact Michael Corbett at MnDOT (Michael.J.Corbett@state.mn.us or 651-234-1756) to determine whether your project needs to go through this process.

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

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

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Projects Only

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Transit and Travel Demand Management (TDM) Projects Only

1. **Transit Expansion projects only:** The project must provide a new or expanded transit facility or service (includes peak, off-peak, express, limited stop service, or dial-a-ride).
 Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
2. **Transit Expansion projects only:** The applicant must have the capital and operating funds necessary to implement the entire project and commit to continuing the service or facility project beyond the initial three-year funding period for transit operating funds.
 Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
3. **Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization projects only:** The project is not eligible for either capital or operating funds if the corresponding capital or operating costs have been funded in a previous solicitation. However, Transit Modernization projects are eligible to apply in multiple solicitations if new project elements are being added with each application. Each transit application must show independent utility and the points awarded in the application should only account for the improvements listed in the application.
 Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
4. **Transit Expansion and Transit ~~System~~ Modernization projects only:** The applicant must affirm that they are able to implement a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funded project in accordance with the grant application, Master Agreement, and all applicable laws and regulations, using sound management practices. Furthermore, the applicant must certify that they have the technical capacity to carry out the proposed project and manage FTA grants in accordance with the grant agreement, sub recipient grant agreement (if applicable), and with all applicable laws. The applicant must certify that they have adequate staffing levels, staff training and experience, documented procedures, ability to submit required reports correctly and on time, ability to maintain project equipment, and ability to comply with FTA and grantee requirements.
 Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
5. Travel Demand Management projects only: The applicant must be properly categorized as a subrecipient in accordance with 2CFR200.330.
 Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
6. Travel Demand Management projects only: The applicant must adhere to Subpart E Cost Principles of 2CFR200 under the proposed subaward.
 Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

Application: Regional Solicitation for Transportation Projects in ~~2020~~2022 and ~~2021~~2023

June 22, 2017

Complete and submit the following online application **by 4:00 PM on July ~~15~~13, ~~2016~~2018**.

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

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

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

II. PROJECT INFORMATION

| | |
|---|---|
| 7. PROJECT NAME: | |
| 8. APPLICATION CATEGORIES – Check only one project category in which you wish your project to be considered. | |
| Roadways Including Multimodal Elements | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Roadway Expansion | <input type="checkbox"/> Roadway System Traffic Management <u>Technologies</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization <u>and Spot Mobility</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> Bridge Rehabilitation/Reconstruction |
| Transit and Travel Demand Management (TDM) Projects | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transit Expansion | <input type="checkbox"/> Transit System -Modernization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TDM | |
| Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Safe Routes to School Infrastructure |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA) | |
| 9. BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION (Include location, road name/functional class, type of improvement, etc. – limit to 400 words): | |
| 10. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) DESCRIPTION – will be used in TIP if the project is selected for funding (Link): | |
| 11. PROJECT LENGTH (to the nearest one-tenth of a mile): _____ | |

III. PROJECT FUNDING

12. Are you applying for competitive funds from another source(s) to implement this project? Yes No

If yes, please identify the source(s):

12. FEDERAL AMOUNT: \$

13. MATCH AMOUNT: \$ (Minimum of 20% of the project total)

14. PROJECT TOTAL: \$

15. MATCH PERCENTAGE (Minimum of 20%):

(Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total)

16. SOURCE OF MATCH FUNDS (A minimum of 20% of the total project cost must come from non-federal sources; additional match funds over the 20% minimum can come from other federal sources):

17. PROGRAM YEARS (Check all years that are feasible): ~~2018-2020~~ (TDM Only) ~~2019-2021~~ (TDM Only)
2020-2022 2021-2023

18. ADDITIONAL PROGRAM YEARS (Check all years that are feasible if funding in an earlier year becomes available):
 ~~2019~~ ~~2018~~ ~~2020~~ ~~2019~~ 2021

IV. REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS

1921. MAPS:

- A map or concept drawing of the proposed improvements that clearly labels the beginning and end of the project, all roadways in the project area, roadway geometry, and any bicycle, pedestrian, and transit components upon completion of the project.
- A photograph showing the existing conditions within the project area. If awarded funds, this photograph will be utilized in the Metropolitan Council's online mapping tool to show a before-and-after comparison of the improvement. By submitting the application, the applicant is agreeing to allow the Council to use this photograph. If applicants wish to use a google street view, they should adhere to the copyright guidelines, on the Google website:

<https://www.google.com/permissions/geoguidelines.html#streetview>.
- **For Roadway Expansion, Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization, and Roadway System Management projects only:** The Synchro/Highway Capacity Manual emission reduction reports including the Timing Page Report that displays input and output information. *This report must be attached within the web-based application form for Measure 5A (Congestion Reduction/Air Quality).*
- **For Safe Routes to School Projects only:** The completed travel tally and parent survey results from the SRTS planning process. The travel tally form can be found on the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) SRTS website:
http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/sites/default/files/resources/SRTS_Two_Day_Tally.pdf. *The travel tally and parent survey results must be attached within the web-based application form for Measure 2A (Usage).*
- All project information maps generated through the Metropolitan Council Make-A-Map web-based application completed at the beginning of the application process. Attachment/upload locations are placed throughout all appropriate web-based application forms.
- Each individual attachment must be saved as an 8.5"X11"pdf and cannot be more than 15 pages in length to be considered. Only pdf files that meet the size and length limits will be accepted.
- Applicants are required to submit a one-page project summary to be used by the scoring committees and TAB members. This one-pager may include the project name, applicant, route, a map, township/city/county where project is located, requested award amount, total project cost, before photo, project description, list of project benefits, or other pertinent information.

2022. COORDINATION

- The applicant must include a letter of support from the agency that owns/operates with jurisdiction over the facility and/or the agency that will be operating the transit service (if different than the applicant) indicating that it is aware of and understands the project being submitted, and that it commits to operate and maintain the facility for its design life.
- If the applicant expects any other agency to provide part of the local match, the applicant must include a letter or resolution from the other agency agreeing to financially participate.
- The applicant must include a letter or resolution from their governing board committing to fund the entire local match if the agency is not successful in securing other funding sources for the local match.
- **For Transit Expansion projects that include service expansion only:** Applicants must provide a letter of support for the project from the transit provider that will commit to providing the service or manage the contract for the service provider.

2123. OTHER

- **For Transit and TDM Projects that include public/private joint-use parking facilities only:** The applicant must upload a plan for and make a commitment to the long-term management and enforcement of ensuring exclusive availability of parking to public transit users during commuting times. Federal rules require that parking spaces funded be available exclusively to transit users during the hours of transit service. In the plan, the applicant must indicate how commuter and transit parking will coexist with parking needs for joint use tenants. The entity charged with ensuring exclusive parking for transit commuters after the facility opens must be designated in the plan.
- **TDM Projects only:** Upload Project Budget (budget should include applicable costs, such as, salary, fringe benefits, overhead expenses, marketing, materials, etc.). If using a sub-vendor as part of the project, proper procurement procedures must be used after the project is awarded to select the vendor.

Project Information Form – Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

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

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

COUNTY, CITY, OR LEAD AGENCY _____

ZIP CODE WHERE MAJORITY OF WORK IS BEING PERFORMED _____

APPROXIMATE BEGIN CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

APPROXIMATE END CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

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

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

From: _____

To: _____

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

OR At: _____

PRIMARY TYPES OF WORK _____

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

BRIDGE/CULVERT PROJECTS (IF APPLICABLE)

OLD BRIDGE/CULVERT NO.: _____

NEW BRIDGE/CULVERT NO.: _____

STRUCTURE IS OVER/UNDER: _____

Project Information Form – Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

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

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

COUNTY, CITY, OR LEAD AGENCY _____

FUNCTIONAL CLASS OF ROAD _____

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

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

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

ZIP CODE WHERE MAJORITY OF WORK IS BEING PERFORMED _____

APPROXIMATE BEGIN CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

APPROXIMATE END CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

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

From: _____

To: _____
(DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION)

OR At: _____

PRIMARY TYPES OF WORK _____

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

BRIDGE/CULVERT PROJECTS (IF APPLICABLE)

OLD BRIDGE/CULVERT NO.: _____

NEW BRIDGE/CULVERT NO.: _____

STRUCTURE IS OVER/UNDER: _____

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

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

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

COUNTY, CITY, OR LEAD AGENCY _____

ZIP CODE WHERE MAJORITY OF WORK IS BEING PERFORMED _____

APPROXIMATE BEGIN CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

APPROXIMATE END CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

NAME OF PARK AND RIDE OR TRANSIT STATION: _____

(i.e., MAPLE GROVE TRANSIT STATION)

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

From: _____

To: _____
(DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION)

OR At: _____

PRIMARY TYPES OF WORK _____

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

Estimate of TAB-Eligible Project Costs

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

Please use ~~2016-2018~~ cost estimates for all project elements including transit vehicle and operating costs. ~~The TAB may apply an inflation factor to awarded projects. If TAB includes an inflation factor, then all project elements will be inflated, unlike past years, when only certain project elements were inflated.~~

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

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

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Traffic Signals | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Wetland Mitigation | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Railroad Crossing | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Roadway Contingencies | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other Roadway Elements | \$ |
| Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Path/Trail Construction | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Sidewalk Construction | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Right-of-Way | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Pedestrian Curb Ramps (ADA) | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Crossing Aids (e.g., Audible Pedestrian Signals, HAWK) | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Pedestrian-Scale Lighting | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Streetscaping | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Wayfinding | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Bicycle and Pedestrian Contingencies | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements | \$ |
| Specific Transit and TDM Elements | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Fixed Guideway Elements | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Stations, Stops, and Terminals | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Support Facilities | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Transit Systems (e.g. communications, signals, controls, fare collection, etc.) | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Vehicles | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Contingencies | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Right-of-Way | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other Transit and TDM Elements | \$ |
| TOTAL TAB-ELIGIBLE CONSTRUCTION COSTS | | \$ |
| | | |
| Transit Operating Costs | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Number of platform hours | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Cost per platform hour (fully loaded costs) | \$ |
| | Subtotal - _____ | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other Costs – Administration, Overhead, etc. | \$ |
| | Total Transit Operating Costs | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | TDM Operating Costs | \$ |
| TOTAL TAB-ELIGIBLE TRANSIT AND TDM OPERATING COSTS | | \$ |
| | | |
| TOTAL TAB-ELIGIBLE COSTS | | \$ |