

**Information Item**

**DATE:** October 6, 2017  
**TO:** Transportation Advisory Board  
**PREPARED BY:** Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)  
**SUBJECT:** Regional Solicitation Update: Including CMSP IV in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization Application Scoring

Following a recent presentation on the topic, TAB members suggested the possibility of including the Congestion Management Safety Plan (CMSP) IV as a part of the scoring of the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization application. The current draft of the application, previously reviewed by TAB includes a measure (1A) awarding points for inclusion on the Principal Arterial Intersection Study, along with congestion on parallel routes. The attached proposes also providing the option to receiving points for inclusion in the CMSP IV study. Each project would be scored for congestion on parallel routes, their level of priority on the Principal Arterial Conversion Study, and their level of priority on the CMSP IV study and be awarded the highest of the three scores.

TAC recommended inclusion of the CMSP IV study in this measure.

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

September 20, 2017

**Definition:** A roadway project that does not add thru-lane capacity, but reconstructs, reclaims, or modernizes, or adds new spot mobility elements (e.g., new turn lanes, traffic signal, or roundabout)the facility. Routine maintenance including mill and overlay projects are not eligible. Projects must be located on a non-freeway principal arterial or A-minor arterial functionally-classified roadway, consistent with the latest TAB approved functional classification map.

**Examples of Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility Projects:**

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

## Scoring:

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

## Roadway Reconstruction and Modernization

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

## Roadway Reconstruction and Modernization

**1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (175-170 Points)** – Tying regional policy (Thrive MSP2040) to the Regional Solicitation, this criterion measures the project’s ability to serve a transportation purpose within the regional transportation system and economy based on how well it reduces congestion; aligns with the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study and Congestion Management and Safety Plan IV; fulfills its functional classification role, serves heavy commercial traffic, and connects to employment, and manufacturing/distribution-related employment, and post-secondary students; and aligns with the Regional Truck Corridor Study.

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

### **Congestion on Parallel Routes:**

The measure will analyze the level of congestion on the parallel A-minor arterial or principal arterial to determine the importance of the roadway in reducing congestion on the Regional Highway System. Council staff will use Streetlight travel speed data on an applicant-selected parallel route to the proposed project. The analysis will compare the peak hour travel speed on a parallel route to free-flow conditions on this same route to see whether the proposed project could relieve congestion on the parallel route too. The applicant must identify the parallel corridor as part of the response.

#### RESPONSE (Calculation):

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

### **Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study:**

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

Use the final study report for this measure: [metro council.org/PAICS](http://metro council.org/PAICS)

#### RESPONSE (Select one for your project):

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

## Roadway Reconstruction and Modernization

### Congestion Management and Safety Plan IV:

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

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

RESPONSE (Select one for your project):

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

### SCORING GUIDANCE (80-65 Points)

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

Congestion on Parallel Routes: The applicant with the with the most congestion on a parallel route (measured by the largest percentage decrease in peak hour travel speeds relative to free-flow conditions) will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored showed a 5% decrease of travel speeds in the peak hour on the parallel route relative to free flow conditions and the top project had a 10% reduction, this applicant would receive  $(5/10) * 65$  points, or 33 points. ~~Relievers: The applicant with the highest number of hours per day in which current capacity exceeds the design capacity on the Principal Arterial will receive the full points. Remaining Reliever projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points, calculated as described above.~~

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

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

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

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

## Roadway Reconstruction and Modernization

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

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

Upload the “Regional Economy” map used for this measure.

**RESPONSE (Data from the “Regional Economy” map):**

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

## Roadway Reconstruction and Modernization

### SCORING GUIDANCE (~~30-40~~ Points)

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

The applicant with the highest existing total employment will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 workers within one mile and the top project had 1,500 workers, this applicant would receive  $(1,000/1,500) * \del{30-40} points or ~~20-27~~ points.$

The applicant with the highest existing manufacturing/distribution-related employment will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points equal to the existing manufacturing/distribution-related employment within one mile of the project being scored divided by the project with the highest manufacturing/distribution-related employment within one mile multiplied by the maximum points available for the measure (30). For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 manufacturing/distribution-related workers within one mile and the top project had 1,500 manufacturing/distribution-related workers, this applicant would receive  $(1,000/1,500) * \del{30-40} points or ~~20-27~~ points.$

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

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

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

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

Use the final study report for this measure:

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

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

- [Along Tier 1:](#)  (65 Points)
- [Along Tier 2:](#)  (45 Points)
- [Along Tier 3:](#)  (25 Points)
- The project provides a direct and immediate connection (i.e., intersects) with either a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor:  (10 Points)
- None of the tiers:  (0 Points)

**Information Item**

**DATE:** October 5, 2017  
**TO:** Transportation Advisory Board  
**PREPARED BY:** Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)  
**SUBJECT:** Regional Solicitation Update: Multiuse Trails and Bikeways Application

Attached is a draft Multiuse Trails and Bikeways application for the 2018 Regional Solicitation. Potential changes are tracked for consideration. The Committee reviewed the Safe Routes to School and Pedestrian applications in August. This application was delayed with the intent of incorporating the Regional Bicycle Barriers Study into the scoring process. However, that study will not be ready for incorporation into the 2018 Regional Solicitation. Therefore, the attached draft application language includes minimal change from the 2016 version.

TAC recommended awarding 50 points within the Usage criterion to applicants who agree to remove snow to enable year-round use of trails.



# Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

September 21, 2017

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

## Examples of Multiuse Trail and Bicycle Facility Projects:

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

## Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
<b>1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>2018%</b>
Measure A - Identify location of project relative to Regional Bicycle Transportation Network	200	
<b>2. Potential Usage</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>2018%</b>
Measure A - Existing population and employment within 1 mile ( <u>potential usage</u> )	<del>200</del> 150	
<u>Measure B – Snow clearance</u>	50	
<b>3. Equity and Housing Performance</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>1211%</b>
Measure A - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project’s benefits, impacts, and mitigation	50	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
<b>4. Deficiencies and Safety</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>2523%</b>
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	
<b>5. Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>109%</b>
Measure A - Transit or pedestrian elements of the project and connections	100	
<b>6. Risk Assessment/<del>Public Engagement</del></b>	<b>130</b>	<b>1312%</b>
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	130	
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>7. Cost Effectiveness</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>9%</b>
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total <del>project cost</del> points awarded/total <u>project cost</u> points awarded)	100	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,100</b>	

**1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (200 Points)** - This criterion measures the project's ability to serve a transportation purpose within the regional transportation system and economy through its inclusion within or direct connection to the [Regional Bicycle Transportation Network \(RBTN\)](#), which is based on the Twin Cities Regional Bicycle System Study (2015).

- A. **MEASURE:** Reference the "RBTN Evaluation" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Draw the proposed trail on the map.

Upload the "RBTN Evaluation" map used for this measure.

**RESPONSE** (*Select one, based on the "RBTN Evaluation and Major Barriers" map*):

- Tier 1, Priority RBTN Corridor (200 Points)
  - Tier 1 RBTN Alignment (200 points)
  - Tier 2, RBTN Corridor (175 Points)
  - Tier 2, RBTN Alignment (175 Points)
  - Direct connection to an RBTN Tier 1 corridor or alignment: (150 Points)
  - Direct connection to an RBTN Tier 2 Corridor or Alignment (125 Points)
- OR*
- Project is not located on or directly connected to the RBTN, but is part of a local system and identified within an adopted county city, or regional parks implementing agency plan. (50 Points)

### SCORING GUIDANCE (200 Points)

The applicant will receive the points shown in the above bullets based on the location of the project relative to the RBTN.

#### **RBTN Projects (Tier 1/Tier 2 corridors and alignments)**

To receive the available points associated with Tier 1 and Tier 2 corridors and alignments, a project must accomplish one of the following:

- Improve a segment of an existing Tier 1 or Tier 2 alignment beyond a simple resurfacing of the facility;
- Implement a currently non-existing segment of a Tier 1 or Tier 2 alignment within and along a Tier 1 or Tier 2 corridor; OR
- Connect directly to a specific Tier 1 or Tier 2 corridor or alignment of the RBTN.  
\* Note: if connecting to a RBTN **corridor**, the project must connect to a roadway or to the planned terminus of a trail in a way that makes possible a future connection to a potential RBTN alignment for the corridor.

#### **Projects that include both on-RBTN and off-RBTN improvements**

Projects will be scored based on the proportion of the project that is within and along a RBTN corridor or along a designated RBTN alignment as shown on the RBTN map. Specifically:

- Tier 1 projects with 50% or more of the project's length within and along a Tier 1 corridor or alignment will receive 200 points.
- Tier 2 projects with 50% or more of the project's length within and along a Tier 2 corridor or alignment will receive 175 points.
- A project with less than 50% of its length within and along a Tier 1 corridor or alignment will be considered a Tier 1 direct connection and will receive 150 points for providing the direct connection.
- A project with less than 50% of its length within and along a Tier 2 corridor or alignment will be considered a Tier 2 direct connection and will receive 125 points for providing the direct connection.
- A project with less than 50% of its length within and along a Tier 1 or Tier 2 corridor or along a Tier 1 or Tier 2 alignment, but with 50% or more of its length within and along a combined Tier 1/Tier 2 corridor or alignment will receive the number of points corresponding to the Tier level with the higher proportion of project length.

Note: If no projects meet the above criterion for 200 points, the top scoring project(s) will be adjusted to 200 points and all other project scores will be adjusted proportionately. Due to tiered scoring, it is possible that ~~no, or~~ multiple, projects will receive the maximum allotment of 200 points.

## Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities

**2. Potential Usage (200 Points)** - This criterion quantifies the project's potential usage based on the existing population and employment adjacent to the project. Metropolitan Council staff will calculate the potential usage of the project using the Metropolitan Council model.

- A. MEASURE: Reference the "Population Summary" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing population and employment within one mile, as depicted on the "Population Summary" map.

Upload the "Population Summary" map used for this measure.

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

- Existing Population within 1 Mile (Integer Only, ~~100-75~~ Points): \_\_\_\_\_
- Existing Employment within 1 Mile (Integer Only, ~~100-75~~ points): \_\_\_\_\_

### SCORING GUIDANCE (200-150 Points)

The applicant with highest population will receive the full ~~100-75~~ points, as will the applicant with the highest number of jobs. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points for population and jobs, respectively. As an example for population, projects will score equal to the existing population within 1 mile of the project being scored divided by the project with the highest population within 1 mile multiplied by the maximum points available for the measure (~~100-75~~). For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 people within 1 mile and the top project had 1,500 people, this applicant would receive  $(1,000/1,500) * \del{100-75} points or ~~67-50~~ points.$

- Existing population: ~~100-75~~ Points
- Existing employment: ~~100-75~~ Points

Using the Metropolitan Council model, all Census block groups that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project will be included in the analysis.

The highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 200 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 80 points and the top project had ~~190-140~~ points, this applicant would receive  $(80/\del{190-140}) * \del{200-150} points or ~~84-86~~ points.$

- B. MEASURE: Confirm that the applicant and/or controlling jurisdiction will maintain the facility for year-round bicycle usage via removal of snow within 24 hours after the conclusion of a snowfall.

RESPONSE:

- Will remove snow for year-round bicycle use (50 Points): \_\_\_\_\_
- Will not remove snow for year-round bicycle use (0 Points): \_\_\_\_\_

### SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)

Applicants that commit to year-round usage by removing snow from trails will receive 50 points. Those who do not will receive zero points.

**3. Equity and Housing Performance (120 Points)** – This criterion addresses the Council’s role in advancing equity by examining the project’s positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. The criterion also evaluates a community’s efforts to promote affordable housing.

- A. MEASURE: Reference the “Socio-Econ” map generated at the beginning of the application process. Identify the project’s location from the list below, as depicted on the map. ~~Describe the project’s positive benefits, and negative impacts, and mitigation for low income populations; people of color; children, people with disabilities, and the elderly.~~ Geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive the full points listed below. In order to receive the maximum points, the response should address equitable distribution of the benefits, mitigation of negative impacts, and community engagement ~~impacts, and mitigation~~ for the populations selected. (130 Points)

Upload the “Socio-Econ” map used for this measure.

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

- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50):  (up to 100% of maximum score 0 to 30 Points)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty:  (up to 80% of maximum score 0 to 24 Points)
- Project’s census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color:  (up to 60% of maximum score 0 to 18 Points)
- Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color, or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly:  (up to 40% of maximum score 0 to 12 Points)

1. (0 to 3 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project engages the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; and residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project.

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

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

## Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **SCORING GUIDANCE (130 Points)**

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

## Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities

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

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

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

Note: Due to the geographic adjustment to scores, it is possible that the above process will result in no project receiving the maximum allotment of ~~30~~ points. In this case, the highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full ~~30~~ points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 10 points and the top project had 20 points, this applicant would receive  $(10/20) * 50$  points or 25 points. Note also that it is possible to score negative points on this measure.

- B. **MEASURE:** Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the 2015 Housing Performance Score for the city or township in which the project is located. The score includes consideration of affordability and diversification, local initiatives to facilitate affordable workforce housing development or preservation, and density of residential development. If the project is in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on an average score of the jurisdictions. If a project is located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), then the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project's total score will be adjusted as a result.

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

- City/Township: \_\_\_\_\_ (Cities and Townships entered by applicant)
- Housing Score: \_\_\_\_\_

### SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)

The applicant with the highest 2015 Housing Performance Score will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. Note: Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

Projects will use the city Housing Performance Score based on the project location. If a project is located in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on a weighted average of the city or

## Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities

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

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

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



**4. Deficiencies and Safety (250 Points)** – This criterion addresses the project’s ability to overcome barriers or system gaps through completion of a [Critical Bicycle Transportation Link](#), as defined in the 2040 TPP. **Critical Bicycle Transportation Links** encompass several types of barriers that can disrupt the connectivity of the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) and isolate communities and key destinations. In addition to providing critical links, projects will be scored on their ability to correct deficiencies and improve the overall safety/security of an existing facility, or expand safe biking opportunities with a future multiuse trail or bicycle facility.

Note: Routine maintenance activities on a multiuse trail or bicycle facility are not eligible for funding. As defined by the FHWA, examples of routine maintenance activities include shrub and brush removal or minor drainage improvements. In order to be eligible for funding, reconstruction projects must be replacing a facility at the end of its useful life or include improvements to the facility (e.g., ADA, safety, other deficiencies). Resurfacing of a facility is eligible only if other improvements to the facility are also included in the proposed project.

- A. **MEASURE:** Discuss how the project will close a gap and/or improve continuity or connections between jurisdictions. The applicant should include a description of gap improvements for the project. (100 Points)

**RESPONSE (Check all that apply):**

- **Closes a transportation network gap and/or provides a facility that crosses or circumvents a physical barrier**  (0-90 Points):

Gap improvements can be on or off the RBTN and may include the following:

- Providing a missing link between existing or improved segments of a regional (i.e., RBTN) or local transportation network;
- Improving bikeability to better serve all ability and experience levels by:
  - Providing a safer, more protected on-street facility;
  - Improving crossings at busy intersections (signals, signage, pavement markings); OR
  - Improving a bike route or providing a trail parallel to a highway or arterial roadway along a lower-volume neighborhood collector or local street.

Barrier crossing improvements (on or off the RBTN) can include crossings (over or under) of rivers or streams, railroad corridors, freeways, or multi-lane highways, or enhanced routes to circumvent the barrier by channeling bicyclists to existing safe crossings or grade separations. (For new barrier crossing projects, data about the nearest parallel crossing (as described above) must be included in the application to be considered for the full allotment of points under this criterion).

- **Improves continuity and/or connections between jurisdictions** (on or off the RBTN) (e.g., extending a specific bikeway facility treatment across jurisdictions to improve consistency and inherent bikeability):  (10 Points)

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

<b>SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)</b>
--------------------------------------

## Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities

The applicant will receive up to 90 points if the response shows that the project closes a gap and/or crosses or circumvents a physical barrier and up to 10 points if it improves continuity and/or connections between jurisdictions. The project that the most meets the intent of each the criteria will receive the maximum points (e.g., 90 points for the project that best overcomes a gap or barrier). Remaining projects will receive a portion of the maximum points based on the response. Projects that do not check the box or whose description does not fulfill the intent of the criteria, will receive 0 points.

The highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 100 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 80 points and the top project had 90 points, this applicant would receive  $(80/90)*100$  points or 89 points.

- B. **MEASURE:** Discuss how the project will correct existing deficiencies or address an identified safety or security problem on the facility. The applicant should also include any available project site-related safety data (e.g. crash data, number of conflict points to be eliminated by the project by type of conflict (bicyclist/pedestrian, bicyclist/vehicle, pedestrian/vehicle, and vehicle/vehicle)) to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem. Where available, use of local crash data for the project length is highly encouraged. Crashes involving bicyclists and pedestrians should be reported for 2011-2015. As part of the response, demonstrate that the project improvements will reduce the crash potential and provide a safer environment (by referencing crash reduction factors or safety studies) and/or correct a deficiency. (150 Points)

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

### SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)

The applicant will receive the points shown below, based on the magnitude of the deficiencies or safety issues and the quality of the improvements, as addressed in the response. The scorer will first place each project into one of the two categories below based on if-whether crash data is cited as part of the response. The project with the most extensive improvements will receive the full points for each category. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points as listed below.

- For applicants that provide actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem only. Project also demonstrates that the project will reduce the crash potential and provide a safer environment and/or correct a deficiency. The project that will reduce the most crashes will receive 150 points. The other projects in this category will receive a proportional share between ~~101-76~~ and 150 points (i.e., a project that reduces one-half of the crashes of the top project would receive 125 points): ~~101-76~~ to 150 Points
- For applicants that do not provide actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data. However, the applicant demonstrates the project's ability to reduce the risk for bicycle and pedestrian crashes with the reduction of modal conflict points (bike/pedestrian, bike/vehicle, pedestrian/vehicle, and vehicle/vehicle), safety improvements that address these modal conflicts, or the project's ability to correct deficiencies. The top project will receive 100 points while other projects will receive a portion of the 100 points based on the quality of the project and response: 0 to 100 Points

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

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

**RESPONSE (200 words or less):**

**SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)**

The project with the most comprehensive enhancements to the travel experience and safe integration of other modes, as addressed in the required response, will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. The project score will be based on the quality of the improvements, as opposed to being based solely on the number of modes addressed. Projects that include the transit or pedestrian elements as part of the project should receive slightly more points than existing or planned multimodal facilities on parallel routes, consistent with the supporting plans and studies.

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

**6. Risk Assessment (130 Points)** - This criterion measures the number of risks associated with the project and the steps already completed in the project development process. These steps are outlined in the checklist in the required Risk Assessment.

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

RESPONSE (Complete Risk Assessment):

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

- 100%  ~~Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurred. All funding sources are identified and/or are local sources (the Regional Solicitation award is the gap funding/remaining funding needed to implement the project); applicants may still pursue other funding sources after the project award to reduce the local contribution.~~
- 40%  ~~Stakeholders have been identified~~
- 0%  ~~The applicant is promising to cover the entire local match, but it is necessary for them to seek other sources (e.g., state bonding or various state/federal competitive grants) or funding partners to be able to successfully deliver the project (i.e., the local agency does not have the entire local match committed at this time). Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted~~

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

- Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries
- 100%  Layout or Preliminary Plan approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s) completed). A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.
  - 50%  Layout or Preliminary Plan started/completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.
  - 0%  Layout or Preliminary Plan has not been started

Anticipated date or date of completion: \_\_\_\_\_

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

- ~~EIS~~  ~~EA~~  ~~PM~~

Document Status:

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

Anticipated date or date of completion/approval: \_\_\_\_\_

**4)2) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (10-20 Percent of Points)**

- 100%  No known historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places are located in the project area, and project is not located on an identified historic bridge

- ~~80~~100%  Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~ property impacted; determination of "no historic properties affected" or "no adverse effect" anticipated
- 40%  Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~ property impacted; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated
- 0%  Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological ~~resources~~ properties in the project area.

Anticipated date or date of completion of historic/archeological review:     

Project is located on an identified historic bridge:

~~5)~~ 3) **Review of Section 4f/6f Resources (10-20 Percent of Points)**

- ~~4(f) — Does the project impacts any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild & scenic rivers or public private historic properties?~~
- ~~6(f) — Does the project impact any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild & scenic rivers or historic property that was purchased or improved with federal funds?~~

- 100%  ~~No Section 4f/6f resources property located in or adjacent to the project~~
- 100%  ~~Impact to 4(f) property. The project is an Independent Bikeway/Walkway project covered by the bikeway/walkway Negative Declaration statement. Letter of support received (potential option for bicycle and pedestrian facility applications only)~~
- ~~80~~70%  ~~Section 4f resources present within the project area, but no adverse effects impacts are minor and they do not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the 4(f) property.~~
- 50%  ~~Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. — Coordination/documentation has begun~~
- 30%  ~~Project impacts to Section 4f/6f present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. Coordination/documentation has not begun resources likely — coordination/documentation has not begun~~
- 0%  ~~Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area~~

~~6)~~ 3) **Right-of-Way (15-20 Percent of Points)**

- 100%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired
- 50%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete
- 100%  ~~Right of way, permanent or temporary easements has/have been acquired~~
- 75%  ~~Right of way, permanent or temporary easements required, offers made~~
- 50%  ~~Right of way, permanent or temporary easements required, appraisals made~~
- 25%  ~~Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels identified~~
- 0%  ~~Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels not all identified~~
- 0%  ~~Right of way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed~~

Anticipated date or date of acquisition     

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

- 100%  No railroad involvement on project or r

~~100%~~  Railroad Right-of-Way ~~Agreement~~ agreement is executed (include signature page, if applicable)

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

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

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

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

Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement \_\_\_\_\_

**~~8) Interchange Approval (15 Percent of Points)\*~~**

~~100%~~  Project does not involve construction of a new/expanded interchange or new interchange ramps

~~100%~~  Interchange project has been approved by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee

~~0%~~  Interchange project has not been approved by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee

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

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

~~100%~~  Construction plans completed/approved (include signed title sheet)

~~75%~~  Construction plans submitted to State Aid for review

~~50%~~  Construction plans in progress; at least 30% completion

~~0%~~  Construction plans have not been started

~~Anticipated date or date of completion: \_\_\_\_\_~~

**~~10) Letting~~**

~~Anticipated Letting Date: \_\_\_\_\_~~

**SCORING GUIDANCE (130 Points)**

The applicant with the most points on the Risk Assessment (more points equate to less project risk) will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 40 points and the top project had 70 points, this applicant would receive  $(40/70) * 130$  points or 74 points.

**7. Cost Effectiveness (100 Points)** – This criterion will assess the project’s cost effectiveness based on the total TAB-eligible project cost and total points awarded in the previous 6 criteria.

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

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

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

- Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form): \_\_\_\_\_

**SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)**

The applicant with the most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar ~~lowest dollar value per point earned in the application (i.e., the benefits)~~ will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a ~~proportional~~ proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the top project received .0005 points per dollar and had 35,000 ~~and~~ the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, had 70,000, this applicant would receive  $(.00025 \times 35,000 / .0005 \times 70,000) * 100$  points or 50 points.

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

**TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS**

## Information Item

**DATE:** October 5, 2017  
**TO:** Transportation Advisory Board  
**PREPARED BY:** Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)  
**SUBJECT:** Regional Solicitation Update: Transit and TDM Applications

Attached are draft Transit Expansion, Transit Modernization, and Travel Demand Management (TDM) applications for the 2018 Regional Solicitation. Potential changes are tracked for consideration.

The draft changes were informed through the work of two work groups: Transit (for Expansion and Modernization) and TDM.

Key changes reflected in the attached are:

- Transit Expansion and Modernization
  - Definitions of the two applications are clarified to simplify applicants' decisions regarding to which category to apply.
  - (Transit Expansion only) Enabling ridership projections to be deducted up to 100%. Applicants would be able to share their projections with staff for "reasonableness" checks prior to the submittal deadline.
  - (Transit Modernization only) Shifting the emission reduction measure to be more qualitative, which reflects the application's role as serving existing, as opposed to new, riders.
    - (Transit Modernization only) Reducing the criterion "Service and Customer Improvements" from three measures to one, with more focus on user-based improvements, as opposed to operating and maintenance costs.
- TDM
  - Shifting of some criteria point values.
  - Change the "Usage" criterion from a simple count of users to incorporate a focus on populations being reached.



# Transit Expansion – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

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

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

## Examples of Transit Expansion Projects:

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

## Scoring:

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

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

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

Upload the “Regional Economy” map used for this measure.

**RESPONSE (Data from the “Population/Employment” and map):**

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

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)**

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

- B. **MEASURE:** Reference the “Transit Connectivity” map generated at the beginning of the application process. List the transit routes directly connected to the project to help determine the average weekday transit trips these connecting routes provide, as depicted on the “Transit Connectivity” map. Metropolitan Council staff will provide the average number of weekday trips for each connecting transit route.

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

Upload the “Transit Connectivity” map used for this measure.

**RESPONSE (Data from the “Transit Connectivity” map):**

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

## Transit Expansion

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

**Note:** Transitways offer travel time advantages for transit vehicles, improve transit service reliability, and increase the convenience and attractiveness of transit service. Transitways are defined in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail, light rail, highway and arterial bus rapid transit. Eligible transitway projects are those that have a mode and alignment identified in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan.

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

### SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

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

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

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

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

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

**~~For~~ Park-and-Rides and Express Routes Projects to Minneapolis and St. Paul Only:**

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

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

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

**~~For~~ Transitways Projects Only:**

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

Note: Transitways offer travel time advantages for transit vehicles, improve transit service reliability, and increase the convenience and attractiveness of transit service. Transitways are defined in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail, ~~light rail,~~ ~~and~~ highway, ~~dedicated,~~ and arterial bus rapid transit. Eligible transitway projects are those ~~included in either funding scenarios in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan and~~ that have a mode and alignment identified ~~through a local process. in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan.~~

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

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

## Transit Expansion

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

RESPONSE (Cost effectiveness will be automatically calculated):

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

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (350 Points)

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

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

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

**3. Equity and Housing Performance (200 Points)** -- This criterion addresses the Council’s role in advancing equity by examining the project’s positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. The criterion also evaluates a community’s efforts to promote affordable housing.

A. MEASURE: Reference the “Socio-Econ” map generated at the beginning of the application process. Identify the project’s location from the list below, as depicted on the map. ~~Describe the project’s positive benefits, and negative impacts, and mitigation for low income populations; people of color; children, people with disabilities, and the elderly.~~ Geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive the full points listed below. In order to receive the maximum points, the response should address equitable distribution ofthe benefits, mitigation of negative impacts, and community engagement~~impacts, and mitigation~~ for the populations selected. (130 Points)

Upload the “Socio-Econ” map used for this measure.

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

- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50):  (up to 100% of maximum score 0 to 30 Points)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty:  (up to 80% of maximum score 0 to 24 Points)
- Project’s census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color:  (up to 60% of maximum score 0 to 18 Points)
- Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color, or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly:  (up to 40% of maximum score 0 to 12 Points)

1. (0 to 3 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project engages the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; and residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project.

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

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

Transit Expansion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (130 Points)**  
Each application will be scored on a 10-point scale as described below.

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

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

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

Note: Due to the geographic adjustment to scores, it is possible that the above process will result in no project receiving the maximum allotment of ~~30~~ points. In this case, the highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full ~~30~~ points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 10 points and the top project had 20 points, this applicant would receive (10/20)\*130 points or 65 points. Note also that it is possible to score negative points on this measure.

B. **MEASURE:** Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the 2015 Housing Performance Score for the city or township in which the project’s stops are located. The score includes consideration of affordability and diversification, local initiatives to facilitate affordable workforce housing development or preservation, and density of residential development. If the project includes express service with no reverse commute trips, the applicant should only report the number of stops and corresponding jurisdictions in which the inbound service originates. If the project has stops in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on a weighted average using the length of the project in each jurisdiction. If a project’s stops are located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), then the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project’s total score will be adjusted as a result.

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

- City/Township: \_\_\_\_\_
- Number of Stops within City/Township:

**SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)**



The applicant with the highest 2015 Housing Performance Score will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. Note: Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

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

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

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

**4. Emissions Reduction (200 Points)** – This criterion measures the impact that the project’s implementation will have on air quality as measured by reductions in CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO<sub>2e</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and VOC emissions. Applications for transit operating, vehicle or capital funds must calculate the benefit for the third year of service.

- A. **MEASURE:** The applicant must show that the project will reduce CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO<sub>2e</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and/or VOC due to the reduction in VMT. Calculate and provide the number of new daily transit riders and the distance from terminal to terminal in miles to calculate VMT reduction. The emissions factors will be automatically applied to the VMT reduction to calculate the total reduced emissions.

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

**Emissions Factors**

- CO reduced = VMT reduced \* 2.39
- NO<sub>x</sub> reduced = VMT reduced \* 0.16
- CO<sub>2e</sub> reduced = VMT reduced \* 366.60
- PM<sub>2.5</sub> reduced = VMT reduced \* 0.005
- VOCs reduced = VMT reduced \* 0.03

RESPONSE (Total reduced emissions will automatically calculate):

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

**VMT Reduction**

**CO Reduced**

**NOx Reduced**

**CO2e Reduced**

**PM2.5 Reduced**

**VOCs Reduced**

**Total Emissions Reduced**

**SCORING GUIDANCE (200 Points)**

The applicant with the greatest daily reduction in emissions due to VMT reduction will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored reduced emissions by 3 kilograms and the top project reduced emissions by 5 kilograms, this applicant would receive (3/5)\*200 points or 120 points.

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

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

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

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)**

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

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

**6. Risk Assessment (50 Points)** - This criterion measures the number of risks associated with the project and the steps already completed in the project development process. These steps are outlined in the checklist in the required Risk Assessment.

**Facility Projects:**

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

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

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

RESPONSE (Complete Risk Assessment):

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

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

40%  ~~Stakeholders have been identified~~

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

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

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

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

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

Anticipated date or date of completion: \_\_\_\_\_

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

EIS  EA  PM

Document Status:

100%  ~~Document approved (include copy of signed cover sheet)~~

75%  ~~Document submitted to State Aid for review (date submitted: \_\_\_)~~

50%  ~~Document in progress; environmental impacts identified; review request letters sent~~

0%  ~~Document not started~~

~~Anticipated date or date of completion/approval: \_\_\_~~

**4)2) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (10-20 Percent of Points)**

- 100%  No known historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places are located in the project area, and project is not located on an identified historic bridge
- 80100%  Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~ property impacted; determination of "no historic properties affected" or "no adverse effect" anticipated
- 40%  Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~ property impacted; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated
- 0%  Unsure if there are any historic/archeological ~~resources~~ properties in the project area.

~~Anticipated date or date of completion of historic/archeological review: \_\_\_~~

Project is located on an identified historic bridge:

**5) ~~Review of Section 4f/6f Resources (10-20 Percent of Points)~~**

- ~~4(f) — Does the project impacts any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild & scenic rivers or public private historic properties?~~
- ~~6(f) — Does the project impact any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild & scenic rivers or historic property that was purchased or improved with federal funds?~~

- ~~100%  No Section 4f/6f resources property located in or adjacent to the project~~
- ~~100%  Impact to 4(f) property. The project is an Independent Bikeway/Walkway project covered by the bikeway/walkway Negative Declaration statement. Letter of support received (potential option for bicycle and pedestrian facility applications only)~~
- ~~8070%  Section 4f resources present within the project area, but no adverse effects impacts are minor and they do not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the 4(f) property.~~
- ~~50%  Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. — Ccoordination/documentation has begun~~
- ~~30%  Project impacts to Section 4f/6f present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. Coordination/documentation has not begun resources likely — coordination/documentation has not begun~~
- ~~0%  Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area~~

**6)3) Right-of-Way (15-230 Percent of Points)**

- 100%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired
- 50%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete
- ~~100%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements has/have been acquired~~
- ~~75%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, offers made~~
- ~~50%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, appraisals made~~
- ~~25%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels identified~~
- ~~0%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels not all identified~~

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

Anticipated date or date of acquisition \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement \_\_\_\_\_

~~8)~~ **Interchange Approval (15 Percent of Points)\***

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

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

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

- ~~100%~~  ~~Construction plans completed/approved (include signed title sheet)~~
- ~~75%~~  ~~Construction plans submitted to State Aid for review~~
- ~~50%~~  ~~Construction plans in progress; at least 30% completion~~
- ~~0%~~  ~~Construction plans have not been started~~

~~Anticipated date or date of completion: \_\_\_~~

**10) Letting**

Anticipated Letting Date: \_\_\_

**SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)**

The applicant with the most points on the Risk Assessment (more points equate to less project risk) will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 40 points and the top project had 70 points, this applicant would receive  $(40/70)*50$  points or 29 points.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Transit Expansion

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

- Total Annual Operating Cost: \_\_\_\_\_
- Total Annual Capital Cost of Project: \_\_\_\_\_
- Total Annual Project Cost: \_\_\_\_\_
- Assumptions Used (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words): \_\_\_\_\_
- Cost effectiveness = ~~total TAB-eligible annual project cost~~/total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible annual project cost

### SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The applicant with the most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar~~lowest dollar value per point earned in the application (i.e., the benefits)~~ will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the top project received .0005 points per dollar and the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, this applicant would receive (.00025/.0005)~~had 35,000 and the application being scored had 70,000, this applicant would receive (35,000/70,000)~~ \*100 points or 50 points.

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

**TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS**



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

May 18, 2016

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

## Examples of Transit ~~System~~ Modernization Projects:

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

## Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
<b>1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>	<b>100</b>	<b><del>10</del>30%</b>
Measure A - Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	50	
Measure B – Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project	50	
<b>2. Usage</b>	<b><del>300</del>325</b>	<b>30%</b>
Measure A - Total existing annual riders	<del>300</del> 325	
<b>3. Equity and Housing Performance</b>	<b><del>150</del>175</b>	<b><del>15</del>16%</b>
Measure A - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project’s benefits	<del>80</del> 105	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
<b>4. Emissions Reduction</b>	<b><del>100</del>50</b>	<b><del>5</del>10%</b>
Measure A – Description of emissions reduced	<del>100</del> 50	
<b>5. Service and Customer Improvements</b>	<b><del>150</del>200</b>	<b><del>15</del>18%</b>
- Measure A – Percent reduction in passenger travel time	75	

-	Measure B – Percent reduction in operating & maintenance costs	38	
	Measure <del>C</del> A - Project improvements for transit users	<del>37</del> 200	
<b>6. Multimodal Facilities and Connections</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>
	Measure A - Bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project and connections	100	
<b>7. Risk Assessment</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>
	Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	100	
<b>Sub-Total</b>		<b>1,000</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>8. Cost Effectiveness</b>		100	9%
	Measure A – Cost effectiveness ( <del>total annual project cost</del> /total points awarded/ <u>total annual project cost</u> )	100	
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,100</b>	

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

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

Upload the “Regional Economy” map used for this measure.

RESPONSE (Data from the “Population/Employment” map):

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)**

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

- B. **MEASURE:** Reference the “Transit Connectivity” map generated at the beginning of the application process. List the transit routes directly connected to the project to help determine the average weekday transit trips ~~annual transit ridership of~~ these connecting routes provide, as depicted on the “Transit Connectivity” map. Metropolitan Council staff will provide the average number of weekday trips for each connecting transit route.

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

Upload the “Transit Connectivity” map used for this measure.

**RESPONSE (Data from the “Transit Connectivity” map):**

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

**Note:** Transitways offer travel time advantages for transit vehicles, improve transit service reliability, and increase the convenience and attractiveness of transit service. Transitways are defined in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail, light rail, highway and arterial bus rapid transit. Eligible transitway projects are those that have a mode and alignment identified in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan.

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)**

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

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

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

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

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

RESPONSE:

- Existing Transit Routes on the Project: \_\_\_\_\_

SCORING GUIDANCE (300 Points)

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

**3. Equity and Housing Performance (150–200 Points)** -- This criterion addresses the Council’s role in advancing equity by examining the project’s positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. The criterion also evaluates a community’s efforts to promote affordable housing.

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

Upload the “Socio-Econ” map used for this measure.

*RESPONSE (Select one, based on the “Socio-Econ” map):*

- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50):  (up to 100% of maximum score 0 to 30 Points)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty:  (up to 80% of maximum score 0 to 24 Points)
- Project’s census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color:  (up to 60% of maximum score 0 to 18 Points)
- Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color, or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly:  (up to 40% of maximum score 0 to 12 Points)

1. (0 to 3 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project engages the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; and residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (30-X Points)**

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

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

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

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

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

- B. MEASURE: Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the 2015 Housing Performance Score for the city or township in which the project's stops are located. The score includes consideration of affordability and diversification, local initiatives to facilitate affordable workforce housing development or preservation, and density of residential development. If the project includes express service with no reverse commute

trips, the applicant should only report the number of stops and corresponding jurisdictions in which the inbound service originates. If the project has stops in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on a weighted average using the length of the project in each jurisdiction. If a project's stops are located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), then the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project's total score will be adjusted as a result.

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

- City/Township: \_\_\_\_\_
- Number of Stops within City/Township:

SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)

The applicant with the highest 2015 Housing Performance Score will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. Note: Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

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

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

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



**4. Emissions Reduction (100 Points)** - This criterion measures the impact that the project's implementation may have on air quality by rating the potential that project's elements have to contribute to reductions~~will have on air quality as measured by reductions~~ in CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO<sub>2e</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and VOC emissions. Projects can include improvements to rolling stock,~~;~~ increases in travel speed and reductions in idling;~~;~~ and facility modernization improvements, and systemwide upgrades that reduce congestion~~reduce emissions, reduce exposure, reduce congestion, and/or~~ improve energy efficiency and use of renewable energy.

~~A. **MEASURE:** Describe how the project will reduce CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO<sub>2e</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and/or VOC due to the reduction in SOV trips, reduction in VMT, and/or an increase of speeds. The applicant should also describe capital improvements that will reduce emissions and energy consumption.~~

~~Most projects will reduce CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO<sub>2e</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and/or VOC due to the reduction in VMT that comes about from adding new daily transit riders (computed in the third year of service). As part of the response, applicants may want to indicate the daily emissions reductions by using the formula and emissions factors below.~~

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

~~**Emissions Factors**~~

- ~~• CO reduced = VMT reduced \* 2.39~~
- ~~• NO<sub>x</sub> reduced = VMT reduced \* 0.16~~
- ~~• CO<sub>2e</sub> reduced = VMT reduced \* 366.60~~
- ~~• PM<sub>2.5</sub> reduced = VMT reduced \* 0.005~~
- ~~• VOCs reduced = VMT reduced \* 0.03~~

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)**

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

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

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

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

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

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

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

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

- ~~• Current Passenger Travel Time (Minutes): \_\_\_\_\_~~
- ~~• Proposed Passenger Travel Time (Minutes): \_\_\_\_\_~~

**SCORING GUIDANCE (75 Points)**

~~The applicant with the greatest reduction in travel time will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points.~~

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

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

- ~~• Current Annual Transit Operating Costs: \_\_\_\_\_~~
- ~~• Proposed Annual Transit Operating Costs: \_\_\_\_\_~~

- ~~• Description of how the proposed cost change was determined (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):~~

**SCORING GUIDANCE (38 Points)**

~~The applicant with the greatest reduction in operating and maintenance costs will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points.~~

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

- Improved boarding area
- Improved passenger waiting facilities
- Real-time signage
- Heated facilities or weather protection
- Safety and security equipment
- Improved lighting
- ITS measures that improve reliability and the customer experience
- Transit advantages
- Travel time or reliability improvements

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE** (~~37~~200 Points)

The applicant should describe improvements included in the project that will make transit service more attractive and improve the user experience. The project will be scored based on the quality of the responses. Projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.

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

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

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)**

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

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

**7. Risk Assessment (100-50 Points)** –This criterion measures the number of risks associated with the project and the steps already completed in the project development process. These steps are outlined in the required Risk Assessment.

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

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

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

RESPONSE (Complete Risk Assessment):

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

- 100%  ~~Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurred. All funding sources are identified and/or are local sources (the Regional Solicitation award is the gap funding/remaining funding needed to implement the project); applicants may still pursue other funding sources after the project award to reduce the local contribution.~~
- 40%  ~~Stakeholders have been identified~~
- 0%  ~~The applicant is promising to cover the entire local match, but it is necessary for them to seek other sources (e.g., state bonding or various state/federal competitive grants) or funding partners to be able to successfully deliver the project (i.e., the local agency does not have the entire local match committed at this time). Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted~~

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

- Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries
- 100%  Layout or Preliminary Plan approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s) completed). A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.
- 50%  Layout or Preliminary Plan started/completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.
- 0%  ~~Layout or Preliminary Plan has not been started~~

Anticipated date or date of completion: \_\_\_\_\_

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

- ~~EIS~~  ~~EA~~  ~~PM~~

Document Status:

- 100%  ~~Document approved (include copy of signed cover sheet)~~
- 75%  ~~Document submitted to State Aid for review (date submitted: \_\_\_)~~

- 50%  Document in progress; environmental impacts identified; review request letters sent
- 0%  Document not started

Anticipated date or date of completion/approval:     

**4)2) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (10-20 Percent of Points)**

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

Anticipated date or date of completion of historic/archeological review:     

Project is located on an identified historic bridge:

**5) ~~Review of Section 4f/6f Resources (10-20 Percent of Points)~~**

- ~~4(f) — Does the project impacts any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild & scenic rivers or public private historic properties?~~
- ~~6(f) — Does the project impact any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild & scenic rivers or historic property that was purchased or improved with federal funds?~~

- 100%  ~~No Section 4f/6f resources property located in or adjacent to the project~~
- 100%  ~~Impact to 4(f) property. The project is an Independent Bikeway/Walkway project covered by the bikeway/walkway Negative Declaration statement. Letter of support received (potential option for bicycle and pedestrian facility applications only)~~
- 80/70%  ~~Section 4f resources present within the project area, but no adverse effects/impacts are minor and they do not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the 4(f) property.~~
- 50%  ~~Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. — Coordination/documentation has begun~~
- 30%  ~~Project impacts to Section 4f/6f present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. Coordination/documentation has not begun resources likely — coordination/documentation has not begun~~
- 0%  ~~Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area~~

**6)3) Right-of-Way (15-230 Percent of Points)**

- 100%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired
- 50%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete
- 100%  ~~Right of way, permanent or temporary easements has/have been acquired~~
- 75%  ~~Right of way, permanent or temporary easements required, offers made~~
- 50%  ~~Right of way, permanent or temporary easements required, appraisals made~~

- 25%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels identified
- 0%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels not all identified
- ~~0%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed~~

Anticipated date or date of acquisition \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement \_\_\_\_\_

~~8)~~ **Interchange Approval (15 Percent of Points)\***

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

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

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

- ~~100%  Construction plans completed/approved (include signed title sheet)~~
- ~~75%  Construction plans submitted to State Aid for review~~
- ~~50%  Construction plans in progress; at least 30% completion~~
- ~~0%  Construction plans have not been started~~

~~Anticipated date or date of completion: \_\_\_\_\_~~

~~10) Letting~~

~~Anticipated Letting Date: \_\_\_\_\_~~

**SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)**

The applicant with the most points on the Risk Assessment (more points equate to less project risk) will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 40 points and the top project had 70 points, this applicant would receive (40/70)\*~~100~~50 points or ~~57~~29 points.



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

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

Estimate and provide the annualized capital cost of the project and the annual operating cost of the project; the sum of these cost components equals the total annual project cost.

The annualized project cost is derived from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidelines on useful life.

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

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

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

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

- Total Annual Operating Cost: \_\_\_\_\_
- Total Annual Capital Cost of Project: \_\_\_\_\_
- Total Annual Project Cost: \_\_\_\_\_
- Assumptions Used (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words): \_\_\_\_\_
- Cost effectiveness = ~~total TAB-eligible annual project cost~~/total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible annual project cost

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

~~The applicant with the lowest dollar value per point earned in the application (i.e., the benefits) will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the top project had 35,000 and the application being scored had 70,000, this applicant would receive (35,000/70,000) \*100 points or 50 points.~~The applicant with the most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the top project received .0005 points per dollar and the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, this applicant would receive (.00025/.0005)\*100 points or 50 points.

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

**TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS**

# Travel Demand Management (TDM) – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

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

## Definition:

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

## Examples of TDM Projects:

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

## Scoring:

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

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

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

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (~~100~~-200 Points)**

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

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

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

Benefits may include:

- Access to jobs
  - Reduced congestion
  - Reverse commute assistance
  - Ability to live car-free
  - Overcoming barriers to non-traditional commuting (e.g., ~~7~~ shift times not adhering to transit schedules; long transit trips due to transfers/timing)
  - Major employers or employment areas
  - Reduced transportation costs through subsidizing/incentivizing alternative modes
- (100 Points)

**RESPONSE:**

- Average Weekday Users: \_\_\_\_\_

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)**

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

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

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

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

Responses

1. (20 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project engages the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; and residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project.

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

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

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

## Travel Demand Management

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

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

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

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

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

### **SCORING GUIDANCE (80 Points)**

Each application will be scored as described below.

1. (60 points): The project with the most impactful and meaningful community engagement will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion.
2. (20 points) The project with the most positive benefits will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion.
3. (up to 0 points) The scorer will reduce the score by one point for each negative externality. Note that the scorer can deduct points for negatives not acknowledged in the application. The scorer can add one to three points for successful mitigation of negative project elements based on the degree to which they are mitigated. Note that this score cannot provide more points than deducted.

Following the scoring of the two above elements, each project’s combined score will be determined. The top-scoring project will be adjusted to 80 points with all other projects adjusted

~~proportionately. The project with the most positive benefits and appropriate mitigation for negative impacts will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. This response is intended to be qualitative. Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.~~

B. ***MEASURE***: Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the 2015 Housing Performance Score for the city or township in which the project is located. The score includes consideration of affordability and diversification, local initiatives to facilitate affordable workforce housing development or preservation, and density of residential development. If the project is in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on an average score of the jurisdictions. If a project is located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), then the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project's total score will be adjusted as a result.

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

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)**

The applicant with the highest 2015 Housing Performance Score will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. Note: Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

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

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

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



**4. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality (400-300 Points)** – This criterion measures the project’s ability to reduce congestion during the peak period in an area or corridor. This criterion also measures the impact that the project’s implementation will have on air quality as measured by reductions in CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO<sub>2e</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and VOC emissions.

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

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (200-150 Points)**

The applicant with best response will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion.

- The project is located in an area of traffic congestion served by one or more principal arterials or A-minor arterials: Up to 60-50 Points, plus
- The project will reduce congestion and/or SOV trips in the project area: Up to 140-100 Points

- B. **MEASURE:** The applicant must show that the project will reduce CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO<sub>2e</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and/or VOC due to the reduction in VMT. Calculate and provide the number of one-way commute trips reduced and the average commute trip length to calculate VMT reduction. The emissions factors will be automatically applied to the VMT reduction to calculate the total reduced emissions Applicants must describe their methodology for determining the number of one-way trips reduced. (200 Points)

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

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

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

**Emissions Factors**

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

*RESPONSE (Emissions reduction will be automatically calculated):*

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (200-150 Points)**

The applicant with the greatest reduction in emissions will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the top project reduced 5 kg and the

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

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

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

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

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (200 Points)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (25 Points)**

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

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

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

*RESPONSE (Check one):*

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

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (25 Points)**

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

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

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

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

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

- Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form): \_\_\_\_\_

**SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)**

The applicant with the most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar ~~lowest dollar value per point earned in the application (i.e., the benefits)~~ will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the top project received .0005 points per dollar ~~had 35,000~~ and the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, ~~had 70,000~~, this applicant would receive  $(.00025/0.0005) * 100$  points or 50 points.

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

**TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS**

## Information Item

**DATE:** October 6, 2017  
**TO:** Transportation Advisory Board  
**PREPARED BY:** Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)  
**SUBJECT:** Regional Solicitation Update: Risk Assessment

After receiving feedback that the Risk Assessment form does not differentiate projects and spreads scores too thinly, staff worked with MnDOT Metro District's State Aid Office to reduce the number of elements included in the Risk Assessment, weeding out those elements that led to the least amount of differentiation. At the August 17 TAC Funding & Programming Committee meeting, members suggested having a Risk Assessment work group to re-examine the form.

The work group met and recommends focusing the form on four elements. These elements are:

- Layout or Preliminary Plan. This had been removed from the previous draft, but the work group felt that inclusion of a plan approved by the sponsor and key jurisdictions indicates that a project is likely to come to fruition.
- Section 106 Historic Resources. This was left unchanged from the previous draft.
- Right-of-way. This was consolidated into a simpler scoring system designed to provide more differentiation.
- Railroad involvement. This was also consolidated into a simpler scoring system.

Review of Section 4f and 6f resources was removed, as this has rarely been an issue leading to projects being withdrawn.

The work group also recommended adding a requirement that the applicant's board agrees to cover the non-federal project cost.

TAC provided a small adjustment within the Section 106 Element. It eliminated an 80% score for impacted property with a determination of "no adverse effect" anticipated, rolling that into a 100% score for "no historic properties affected."

# Risk Assessment

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

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

- 100%  ~~Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurred. All funding sources are identified and/or are local sources (the Regional Solicitation award is the gap funding/remaining funding needed to implement the project); applicants may still pursue other funding sources after the project award to reduce the local contribution.~~
- 40%  ~~Stakeholders have been identified.~~
- 0%  ~~The applicant is promising to cover the entire local match, but it is necessary for them to seek other sources (e.g., state bonding or various state/federal competitive grants) or funding partners to be able to successfully deliver the project (i.e., the local agency does not have the entire local match committed at this time). Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted.~~

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

- Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries.
- 100%  ~~Layout or Preliminary Plan~~ approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s) ~~completed~~). A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.
- 50%  ~~Layout or Preliminary Plan started~~ completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.
- 0%  ~~Layout or Preliminary Plan~~ has not been completed. ~~started~~

Anticipated date or date of completion: \_\_\_\_\_

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

EIS  EA  PM

Document Status:

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

~~Anticipated date or date of completion/approval: \_\_\_\_\_~~

## ~~4)2) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (10-20 Percent of Points)~~

- 100%  No known historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places are located in the project area, and project is not located on an identified historic bridge
- ~~80~~100%  Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~ property impacted; determination of "no historic properties affected" or "no adverse effect" anticipated
- 40%  Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~ property impacted; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated

0%  Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological ~~resources~~ properties in the project area.

~~Anticipated date or date of completion of historic/archeological review: \_\_\_~~

Project is located on an identified historic bridge:

~~5) Review of Section 4f/6f Resources (10-20 Percent of Points)~~

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

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

~~100%  No Section 4f/6f resources property located in or adjacent to the project~~

~~100%  Impact to 4(f) property. The project is an Independent Bikeway/Walkway project covered by the bikeway/walkway Negative Declaration statement. Letter of support received (potential option for bicycle and pedestrian facility applications only)~~

~~80/70%  Section 4f resources present within the project area, but no adverse effects/impacts are minor and they do not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the 4(f) property.~~

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

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

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

~~6)3) Right-of-Way (15-230 Percent of Points)~~

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

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

~~100%  Right of way, permanent or temporary easements has/have been acquired~~

~~75%  Right of way, permanent or temporary easements required, offers made~~

~~50%  Right of way, permanent or temporary easements required, appraisals made~~

~~25%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels identified~~

~~0%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels not all identified~~

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

Anticipated date or date of acquisition \_\_\_\_\_

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

~~100%  No railroad involvement on project or r~~

~~100%  Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement agreement is executed (include signature page, if applicable)~~

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

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

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



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

Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement \_\_\_\_\_

**8) ~~Interchange Approval (15 Percent of Points)\*~~**

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

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

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

- 100%  ~~Construction plans completed/approved (include signed title sheet)~~
- 75%  ~~Construction plans submitted to State Aid for review~~
- 50%  ~~Construction plans in progress; at least 30% completion~~
- 0%  ~~Construction plans have not been started~~

~~Anticipated date or date of completion: \_\_\_\_\_~~

**10) Letting**

Anticipated Letting Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(Next page: All tracked changes accepted.)

**1) Layout (30 Percent of Points)**

- Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries
- 100%  Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)). **A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.**
- 50%  Layout completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. **A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.**
- 0%  Layout has not been completed.

Anticipated date or date of completion: \_\_\_\_\_

**2) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (20 Percent of Points)**

- 100%  No known historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places are located in the project area, and project is not located on an identified historic bridge
- 100%  Historic/archeological property impacted; determination of “no historic properties affected” or “no adverse effect” anticipated
- 40%  Historic/archeological property impacted; determination of “adverse effect” anticipated
- 0%  Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological properties in the project area.

Project is located on an identified historic bridge:

**3) Right-of-Way (30 Percent of Points)**

- 100%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired
- 50%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete
- 25%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels identified
- 0%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels not all identified

Anticipated date or date of acquisition \_\_\_\_\_

**4) Railroad Involvement (20 Percent of Points)**

- 100%  No railroad involvement on project or railroad Right-of-Way agreement is executed **(include signature page, if applicable)**
- 50%  Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun
- 0%  Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun.

Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement \_\_\_\_\_

## Information Item

**DATE:** October 6, 2017  
**TO:** Transportation Advisory Board  
**PREPARED BY:** Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)  
**SUBJECT:** Regional Solicitation Update: The Equity Scoring Measure

The 2014 Regional Solicitation overhaul led to the formation of a new scoring criterion: Equity and Housing Performance. The criterion, used in all application categories, consists of two measures: Housing Performance Score and a measure on the socio-economic impacts of the projects. While some form of housing-related measure had been in the Regional Solicitation for many years, the socio-economic measure was new. Following the 2016 Regional Solicitation, a work group was formed to consider updating that measure's language.

The attached proposed measure addresses feedback that the measure did not adequately address potential negative impacts of projects.

The attached proposed update differs primarily by enabling a more direct scoring impact of negative project elements and includes a public engagement scoring component (worth 30% of the points). Regarding the latter, work group members believe that the projects that best promote access (and avoid undue mitigation) are those that have been vetted through the communities that will be directly impacted.

Note that in the 2106 Regional Solicitation, the Travel Demand Management (TDM) application measure did not include a geographic adjustment, due to the sometimes-regional nature of projects. This approach is used in the language recommended by the Equity Work Group.

**3. Equity and Housing Performance (100 Points)** – This criterion addresses the Council’s role in advancing equity by examining the project’s positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. The criterion also evaluates a community’s efforts to promote affordable housing.

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

Upload the “Socio-Econ” map used for this measure.

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

- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50):  (up to 100% of maximum score ~~0 to 30 Points~~)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty:  (up to 80% of maximum score ~~0 to 24 Points~~)
- Project’s census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color:  (up to 60% of maximum score ~~0 to 18 Points~~)
- Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color, or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly:  (up to 40% of maximum score ~~0 to 12 Points~~)

1. (0 to 3 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project engages the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; and residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
- Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.
- Displacement of residents and businesses.
- Construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings. These tend to be temporary.
- Other

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (30-X Points)**

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

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

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

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

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

\*Note: The Travel Demand Management application has slightly different language, which can be found on the next page. The geographic element has been removed due to the frequently regional nature of the project applications.

## EQUITY SCORING MEASURE: TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT

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

### Responses

1. (20 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project engages the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; and residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (80 Points)**

Each application will be scored as described below.

1. (60 points): The project with the most impactful and meaningful community engagement will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
2. (20 points) The project with the most positive benefits will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
3. (up to 0 points) The scorer will reduce the score by one point for each negative externality. Note that the scorer can deduct points for negatives not acknowledged in the application. The scorer can add one to three points for successful mitigation of negative project elements based on the degree to which they are mitigated. Note that this score cannot provide more points than deducted.

Following the scoring of the two above elements, each project's combined score will be determined. The top-scoring project will be adjusted to 80 points with all other projects adjusted proportionately.~~The project with the most positive benefits and appropriate mitigation for negative impacts will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. This response is intended to be qualitative. Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.~~

## PROPOSED EQUITY MEASURE (Changes Accepted)

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

- A. **MEASURE:** Reference the “Socio-Econ” map generated at the beginning of the application process. Identify the project’s location from the list below as depicted on the map. Geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive the full points listed below. In order to receive the maximum points, the response should address equitable distribution of benefits, mitigation of negative impacts, and community engagement for the populations selected. (X Points)

Upload the “Socio-Econ” map used for this measure.

### RESPONSES

*(Select one, based on the “Socio-Econ” map):*

- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50):  (up to 100% of maximum score)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty:  (up to 80% of maximum score)
- Project’s census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color:  (up to 60% of maximum score)
- Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color:  (up to 40% of maximum score)

1. (0 to 3 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project engages the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; and residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SCORING GUIDANCE (X Points)**

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

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

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

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

\*Note: The Travel Demand Management application has slightly different language, which can be found on the next page. The geographic element has been removed due to the frequently regional nature of the project applications.

## EQUITY SCORING MEASURE: TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT

- A. MEASURE: Describe the project's positive benefits, negative impacts, and mitigation(s) to minimize harm and promote equity for low-income populations; people of color; children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with a description on how the impacted communities have been engaged.

### Responses

1. (20 points) The projects that are most effective at limiting negative externalities most impactful on low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly, as well as providing the most benefit to those populations, are those that have been vetted through thorough engagement activities with those groups. Describe how the project engages the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; and residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Increased difficulty in street crossing caused by increased roadway width, increased traffic speed, wider turning radii, or other elements that negatively impact pedestrian access.
- Increased noise.
- Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.

- Project elements that are detrimental to location-based air quality by increasing stop/start activity at intersections, creating vehicle idling areas, directing an increased number of vehicles to a particular point, etc.
- Increased speed and/or “cut-through” traffic.
- Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
- Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.
- Displacement of residents and businesses.
- Construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings. These tend to be temporary.
- Other

**SCORING GUIDANCE (80 Points)**

Each application will be scored as described below.

1. (60 points): The project with the most impactful and meaningful community engagement will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion.
2. (20 points) The project with the most positive benefits will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion.
3. (up to 0 points) The scorer will reduce the score by one point for each negative externality. Note that the scorer can deduct points for negatives not acknowledged in the application. The scorer can add one to three points for successful mitigation of negative project elements based on the degree to which they are mitigated. Note that this score cannot provide more points than deducted.

Following the scoring of the two above elements, each project’s combined score will be determined. The top-scoring project will be adjusted to 80 points with all other projects adjusted proportionately.