

INFORMATION ITEM

DATE: August 11, 2021
TO: Transportation Advisory Board
PREPARED BY: Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)
Steve Peterson, Manager of Highway Planning and TAC/TAB
Process (651-602-1819)
Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator (651-602-1717)
SUBJECT: 2022 Regional Solicitation: Potential Measure Changes

Through the surveys and meeting discussions, partners and applicants had comments on specific scoring measures, particularly new measures. This month staff will recap discussions at various committee levels and then concentrate on any potential changes discussed below.

1. Equity and Affordable Housing (pages 11-15)

In previous cycles, the “Equity and Affordable Housing” criterion has been split into one measure from each topic. The attached proposed changes combine them more holistically into one criterion containing three measures, along with a fourth for bonus points. The measures are:

1. Equity Population Engagement (30%). This was used for socio-economic equity over the past two cycles and would now apply to housing as well.
2. Equity Population Benefits and Impacts (40%). This reflects the evolving primary measure used for socio-economic equity in recent cycles. The ability to deduct points for negative impacts is removed.
3. Affordable Housing Access (30%). This is similar to the new affordable housing access sub-measure established in 2020, though the data will be provided in the mapping tool.
4. Bonus points. This was used in 2020 for the socio-economic measure and will apply to the three above measures, encompassing housing for the first time. Bonus points will be assigned as follows, based on the highest-scoring geography the project contacts:
 - a. ~~25 points to projects within an Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more people of color~~
 - b. 20 25 points to projects within an Area of Concentrated Poverty
 - c. 15 points to projects within census tracts with the percent of population in poverty or population of color above the regional average percent
 - d. 10 points for all other areas

Several changes are reflected in the above (and attached associated language). The term “elderly” has been changed to “older adults” to reflect current terminology. Regarding the bonus points, Council has discontinued use of the geography titled “Area of Concentrated Poverty where 50% or more of residents are people of color.”

Prior to 2020, housing was entirely scored with the Housing Performance Score (HPS). This was used as a “carrot” to entice applicants to improve affordable housing policy. The Metropolitan Council’s Community Development staff, however, does not think that this is a successful strategy. For 2020, 20% of the housing score was dedicated to a more project-

specific qualitative element (Connection to Affordable Housing) and the proposed updated language enables a similar question for applicants to answer more easily than in 2020.

Funding & Programming Committee Comments

At its July 22, 2021, meeting, members supported this effort, adding the following comments:

- Members are interested in training options for applicants.
- Care should be taken that the character limit does not hinder appropriate responses.
- The half-mile housing buffer might not be as appropriate in rural and suburban areas, where projects tend to impact people further away.

TAC Committee Comments

At its August 4, 2021, meeting, members supported this effort, adding the following comments:

- Moving from housing score to a more project-oriented approach, along with allowing for naturally occurring affordable housing, is an improvement.

2. Update of Other Technical Measure Changes

A. Pedestrian Safety Measure in Roadway Applications (Strategic Capacity, Modernization, and Spot Mobility and Safety)

In the previous solicitation, three of the Roadway categories (Strategic Capacity, Modernization, and Spot Mobility and Safety) had a new pedestrian safety measure that generally asked applicants for a brief description of elements that will improve pedestrian safety.

The following proposal would replace this existing measure in these three application categories. It includes three sub-measures. The first is centered on how the project's design will impact pedestrian safety, while the other two sub-measures evaluate existing safety risk and exposure factors, based on trends and patterns identified in crash data analysis done as part of the Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan.

Determine if these measures do not apply to your project.

Does the project match either of the following descriptions?

- Project is primarily a freeway (or transitioning to a freeway) **and** does not provide safe and comfortable pedestrian facilities and crossings.
- Existing location lacks any pedestrian facilities (e.g., sidewalks, marked crossings, wide shoulders in rural contexts) **and** project does not add pedestrian elements (e.g., reconstruction of a roadway without sidewalks, that doesn't also add pedestrian crossings and sidewalk or sidepath on one or both sides).

If either of the items above are checked, then **score for entire pedestrian safety measure is zero**. Applicant does not need to respond to the sub-measures and can proceed to the next section.

SUB-MEASURE 1: Project-Based Pedestrian Safety Enhancements and Risk Elements

To receive maximum points in this category, pedestrian safety countermeasures selected for implementation in projects should be, to the greatest extent feasible, consistent with the countermeasure recommendations in the Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan and state and

national best practices. Links to resources are provided on the Regional Solicitation Resources web page.

Please answer the following two questions with as much detail as possible based on the known attributes of the proposed design. If any aspect referenced in this section is not yet determined, describe the range of options being considered, to the greatest extent available. If there are project elements that may increase pedestrian risk, describe how these risks are being mitigated.

- **Describe how this project will address the safety needs of people crossing the street at signalized intersections, unsignalized intersections, midblock locations, and roundabouts.**

Treatments and countermeasures should be well-matched to the roadway’s context (e.g., appropriate for the speed, volume, crossing distance, and other location attributes). Refer to the Regional Solicitation Resources web page for guidance links. (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

Considerations

Is the distance in between signalized intersections increasing (e.g., removing a signal)?

- No
- Yes. If yes, describe what measures are being used to fill the gap between protected crossing opportunities for pedestrians (e.g., adding High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk beacons to help motorists yield and help pedestrians find a suitable gap for crossing, turning signal into a roundabout to slow motorist speed, etc.). (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)

- Will your design increase the crossing distance or crossing time across any leg of an intersection? (e.g., by adding turn or through lanes, widening lanes, using a multi-phase crossing, prohibiting crossing on any leg of an intersection, pedestrian bridge requiring length detour, etc.). This does not include any increases to crossing distances solely due to the addition of bike lanes (i.e., no other through or turn lanes being added or widened).

- No
- Yes. If yes:
 - How many intersections will likely be affected? _____
 - Describe what measures are being used to reduce exposure and delay for pedestrians (e.g., median crossing islands, curb bulb-outs, etc.) (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)

- If grade separated pedestrian crossings are being added and increasing crossing time, describe any features that are included that will reduce the detour required of pedestrians and make the separated crossing a more appealing option (e.g., shallow tunnel

that doesn't require much elevation change instead of pedestrian bridge with numerous switchbacks). (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

- If mid-block crossings are restricted or blocked, explain why this is necessary and how pedestrian crossing needs and safety are supported in other ways (e.g., nearest protected or enhanced crossing opportunity). (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
-
-

- **Describe how motorist speed will be managed in the project design, both for through traffic and turning movements.** Describe any project-related factors that may affect speed directly or indirectly, even if speed is not the intended outcome (e.g., wider lanes and turning radii to facilitate freight movements, adding turn lanes to alleviate peak hour congestion, etc.). Note any strategies or treatments being considered that are intended to help motorists drive slower (e.g., visual narrowing, narrow lanes, truck aprons to mitigate wide turning radii, etc.) or protect pedestrians if increasing motorist speed (e.g., buffers or other separation from moving vehicles, crossing treatments appropriate for higher speed roadways, etc.). (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)
-
-
-
-

- If known, what are the existing and proposed design, operation, and posted speeds? Is this an increase or decrease from existing conditions? (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
-

SCORING GUIDANCE (X Points)

Projects that will provide the most improvement to pedestrian safety across the two questions will receive full points. Other projects will receive a share of the full points, based on scorer's discretion, considering the following scoring guidance. Weight the responses to each of these questions equally and consider them cumulatively when scoring. If mid-block crossings are not applicable for the project, and the applicant's explanation adequately shows that pedestrian needs are still being safely met, do not penalize the applicant.

See the *FHWA STEP Studio* resource, *FHWA STEP Guide for Improving Pedestrian Safety at Uncontrolled Crossing Locations*, *NCHRP Report 926: Guidance to Improving Pedestrian and Bicyclist Safety at Intersections*, and related resources referenced in the application prompt for state-of-practice guidance on pedestrian-oriented safety design and treatments.

Assume that pedestrians may need to travel along and across the entire extent of the project, and evaluate how well the pedestrian safety countermeasures described serve those needs. Projects that serve those needs with the greatest safety and least pedestrian delay, detour, or discomfort should score highest. For example, projects that provide safe at-grade crossings or

comfortable tunnels with minimal detour and elevation change should score higher than projects that include pedestrian bridges requiring lengthy detours and elevation change. Projects that provide frequent crossing opportunities or crossing opportunities well-aligned with transit or other likely places with pedestrian crossing needs should score higher than projects that have infrequent or non-existent protected crossings.

Consider how safely, easily, and comfortably children, older adults, and people with disabilities will be able to navigate crossing the street. Score projects more highly if the safety countermeasures selected are designed to be comfortably used by people of all ages and abilities.

Consider pedestrian-oriented safety treatments in context with motor vehicle design elements. If there are motor vehicle design elements that raise concerns about pedestrian safety (e.g., increased speed, increased crossing distance) that are not fully mitigated by the pedestrian safety countermeasures described, consider a lower score. For roadway expansion projects, where all projects *by definition* will be increasing crossing distance, consider how much additional distance is added as well as the types of countermeasures being considered. If the only element causing an increase in crossing distance is the addition of bike lanes or other bike facilities, especially if the project has reduced other elements to help mitigate this impact (e.g., reducing through lane widths), do not penalize the score for the crossing distance attributable to bike lanes.

Regardless of the speed limit, score projects more highly if they include design elements to help motorists drive slowly. For example, narrow lanes, visual narrowing, and elements to help motorists turn slowly, such as tight turning/corner radius or truck aprons, curb extensions, medians/crossing islands, and hardened centerlines.

SUB-MEASURE 2: Existing Location-Based Pedestrian Safety Risk Factors

These factors are based on based on trends and patterns observed in pedestrian crash analysis done for the Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. Check off how many of the following factors are present. Applicants receive more points if more risk factors are present.

- Existing road configuration is **either**:
 - One-way, 3+ through lanes
 - Two-way, 4+ through lanes
- Existing road has a design speed, posted speed limit, or speed study/data showing 85th percentile travel speeds in excess of:
 - 30 MPH or more
- Existing road has AADT of greater than 15,000 vehicles per day (List the AADT _____)

SCORING GUIDANCE (X Points)

Multiply the score from Sub-Measure 1 by the proportion of risk factors indicated to calculate the number of points earned for Sub-Measure 2. Applications where all three factors are present score additional points equal to 100% of their Sub-Measure 1 score. Applications where two of the three factors are present score additional points equal to 2/3 (or 67%) of their Sub-Measure 1 score. And so on. To earn the maximum possible score on Sub-Measure 2, a project would need to earn maximum points on Sub-Measure 1 and also have all 3 risk factors present.

SUB-MEASURE 3: Existing Location-Based Pedestrian Safety Exposure Factors

These factors are based on based on trends and patterns observed in pedestrian crash analysis done for the Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. Check off how many of the following existing location exposure factors are present. Applicants receive more points if more risk factors are present.

- Existing road has transit running on or across it with 1+ transit stops in the project area (If flag-stop route with no fixed stops, then 1+ locations in the project area where roadside stops are allowed. Do not count portions of transit routes with no stops, such as non-stop freeway sections of express or limited-stop routes. If service was temporarily reduced for the pandemic but is expected to return to 2019 levels, consider 2019 service for this item.)

- Existing road has high-frequency transit running on or across it and 1+ high-frequency stops in the project area (high-frequency defined as service at least every 15 minutes from 6am to 7pm weekdays and 9am to 6pm Saturdays. If service frequency was temporarily reduced for the pandemic but is expected to return to 2019 levels, consider 2019 frequency for this item.)

- Existing road is within 500' of 1+ shopping, dining, or entertainment destinations (e.g., grocery store, restaurant)

If yes, please describe (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

- Existing road is within 500' of other known pedestrian generators (e.g., school, civic/community center, senior housing, multifamily housing, regulatorily-designated affordable housing)

If yes, please describe (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (X Points)

Multiply the score from Sub-Measure 1 by the proportion of exposure factors indicated to calculate the number of points earned for Sub-Measure 3. Applications where all four factors are present score additional points equal to 100% of their Sub-Measure 1 score. Applications where two of the four factors are present score additional points equal to 2/4 (or 50%) of their Sub-Measure 1 score. And so on. To earn the maximum possible score on Sub-Measure 3 a project would need to earn maximum points on Sub-Measure 1 and also have all 4 exposure factors present.

Proposed Scoring / Weighting

The current pedestrian safety measure is weighted as 30 points for roadway strategic capacity and roadway reconstruction projects, and 50 points for spot mobility & safety projects. Sub-measures 2 and 3 are scored by multiplying a percentage ranging from 0-100% by the score earned in sub-measure 1, so all three of these elements are effectively weighted equally. If this measure replaces the existing measure and keeps the same number of points, consider weighting each sub-measure equally in the worksheet as follows:

<i>Sub-Measure</i>	<i>Points Distribution – Roadway Strategic Capacity and Roadway Modernization</i>	<i>Points Distribution – Spot Mobility & Safety</i>
<i>SUB-MEASURE 1: Project-Based Pedestrian Safety Enhancements</i>	10	16.67
<i>SUB-MEASURE 2: Existing Location-Based Pedestrian Safety Risk Factors</i>	10	16.67
<i>SUB-MEASURE 3: Existing Location-Based Pedestrian Safety Exposure Factors</i>	10	16.67
TOTAL POINTS	30	50

Funding & Programming Committee Comments

At its July 22, 2021, meeting, members provided the following comments:

- The proposed measure will require a lot of work for few points, along with a lot of scorer interpretation and discretion.
- Basing the measure on easy-to-obtain checkboxes would not address the trend of increasing pedestrian-related crashes.
- New roadways would have a difficult time scoring points in sub-measures 1 and 2.
- Sub-measures 2 and 3 may need simplification. Also:
 - Sub-measure 2 may not lead to very much differentiation since most of the eligible roadways are four lanes with speeds above 35 mph. (Reply: In that case, differentiation will happen because this is a multiplier of the score for Sub-measure 1, which will have variation.)

- In sub-measure 3, the Urban Center Thrive community checkbox is redundant with transit checkboxes.
- Overall, members were supportive, but encouraged simplification of the measure. The above draft measure reflects this and other discussion in the following ways:
 - One of the original four questions in sub-measure 1 was removed, while two more were combined.
 - In sub-measure 2, the AADT threshold has been increased from 7,000 to 15,000.
 - In sub-measure 2, the speed threshold was standardized at 30 mph; it had been 30 mph for Urban Center communities and 35 mph for others
 - In sub-measure 3, a checkbox awarding points for inclusion in an Urban Center Thrive community has been removed

Technical Advisory Committee Comments

At its August 4, 2021, meeting, members provided the following comments:

- The point value for the measure should be higher, particularly in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization category because these projects tend to be located where pedestrian-related collisions happen.
- The 500-foot threshold for a walkshed to generators could be larger, as 500 feet is not a long way to walk (reply: most crashes come at locations nearby destinations, particularly transit stops, and this factor is focused on where people are crossing, which is where countermeasures are most needed and the greatest concentration of crashes are happening).
- Consider using projected or existing pedestrian traffic as opposed to generators (reply: generators are used as proxies in the crash data analysis this is based on because of the lack of consistent pedestrian exposure data region wide).
- In some suburban areas, transit is based less on specific stops and more on drivers “flagging down” a bus, which could lead to difficulty in scoring the transit elements (this has been addressed in the first two bullets of sub-measure 3).

B. Traffic Counts and Person Throughput

Usage is a criterion in four of the five roadway applications. Project sponsors are asked to use MnDOT traffic maps and transit ridership data as part of an equation that yields person throughput. Traffic counts are typically completed on roadways once every three years.

Allowing some applicants to use older counts would allow for a fairer comparison between projects, so one project is not using a 2019 count (pre-COVID 19) when traffic counts were normal, while another project is using a 2020 count (during the height of COVID when traffic counts were greatly diminished). Similarly, should applicants use 2019 transit ridership numbers given the dramatic changes in transit ridership in 2020 and 2021? Some of these topics were discussed by the Transit Work Group on July 28.

Funding & Programming Committee Comments

At its July 22, 2021 meeting, members provided the following comments:

- Similar consideration should be given to transit ridership data, particularly for transit expansion projects meant to improve frequency. It will be difficult to use 2019 data to project future ridership, but it might still be better than using 2020 transit ridership due to the dramatic drop in service. See pages X and Z for proposed changes in response to this discussion.
- Regional Solicitation language should provide clear guidance.

Transit Work Group Comments

At its July 28, 2021 meeting, members provided the following comment:

- Using transit counts from 2019 for person throughput is consistent with using pre-2020 traffic counts.

Technical Advisory Committee Comments

At its August 4, 2021 meeting, members provided no comments.

C. Transit Ridership (pages 16-17)

The question of whether applicants should use 2019 transit ridership numbers given the dramatic changes in transit ridership in 2020 and 2021 has been asked. Some of these topics were discussed by the Transit Work Group on July 28. To account for impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic while still recognizing the resiliency of certain routes through 2020, the group suggests providing the choice on which year's ridership to use (Transit Expansion ridership projection) or a 75/25 split between 2019 and 2020 (Transit Modernization existing ridership and weekday trip counts in both transit applications).

Funding & Programming Committee Comments

At its July 22, 2021 meeting, members provided the following comments:

- It is difficult to determine how best to project post-COVID ridership. On one hand, 2019 data may not reflect a changing landscape. However, 2020 data may not be optimal due to the dramatic drop in service.
- A hybrid of 2019 and 2020 should be considered.
- Regional Solicitation language should provide clear guidance.

Transit Work Group Comments

At its July 28, 2021 meeting, members provided the following comments:

- Using 2020 counts may undercount proposed return of ridership from pre-Covid years.
- Using 2019 counts may assume a return to "normalcy" that may not come.
- The group compromised with:
 - Allowing applicants the choice on which year's ridership to use for projections in Transit Expansion.
 - Using a 75% (2019) and 25% (2020) split for existing ridership in Transit Modernization.
 - Using the same 75/25 split for weekday trip counts in both transit applications.

Technical Advisory Committee Comments

At its August 4, 2021 meeting, members provided the following comment:

- It is challenging to determine how quickly, and to what degree, service will regenerate. This is particularly true in the case of commuter express routes.

3. Equity and Affordable Housing (100 Points)

This criterion addresses the [Council's role in advancing equity](#) by examining how a project directly benefits or impacts (positively and negatively) Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) populations, low-income populations, people with disabilities, youth, older adults, and residents of affordable housing. The criterion evaluates whether the applicant engaged these populations to identify transportation needs and potential solutions and how the project will address these identified needs. The criterion also evaluates a community's overall efforts to implement affordable housing and how the project improves multimodal access to affordable housing.

A. **MEASURE:** Engagement (0 to 30 points). This measure is a qualitative scoring measure.

A successful project is the result of active engagement of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, persons with disabilities, youth, older adults, and residents in affordable housing. Engagement should occur prior to and during project development, with the intent to provide direct benefits or solve an expressed transportation issue, while also limiting and mitigating any negative impacts.

- i. Describe any Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, disabled populations, youth, or older adults within a ½ mile of the proposed project. Describe how these populations relate to regional context. Location of affordable housing will be addressed in Measure C.
- ii. Describe how Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, persons with disabilities, youth, older adults, and residents in affordable housing were engaged, whether through community planning efforts, project needs identification, or during the project development process.
- iii. Describe the progression of engagement activities in this project. A full response should answer these questions:
 1. What engagement methods and tools were used?
 2. How did you engage specific communities and populations likely to be directly impacted by the project?
 3. What techniques did you use to reach populations traditionally not involved in community engagement related to transportation projects?
 4. How were the project's purpose and need identified?
 5. How was the community engaged as the project was developed and designed?
 6. How did you provide multiple opportunities for of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, persons with disabilities, youth, older adults, and residents in affordable housing to engage at different points of project development?
 7. How did engagement influence the project plans or recommendations? How did you share back findings with community and re-engage to assess responsiveness of these changes?
 8. If applicable, how will NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities?

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (0 to 30 Points)

Each application will be qualitatively scored based on the available points and will receive the number of points awarded.

- B. **MEASURE:** Equity Population Benefits and Impacts (0 to 40 points). This measure is a qualitative scoring measure.

Successful projects are designed to provide direct benefits to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, persons with disabilities, youth, older adults. All projects must mitigate potential negative benefits as required under federal law. Projects that are designed to provide benefits go beyond the mitigation requirement to proactively provide transportation benefits and solve transportation issues experienced by Equity populations. Benefits to residents of affordable housing are addressed in Measure C.

Describe the project's benefits to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, children, people with disabilities, youth, and older adults. Benefits could relate to:

- pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements;
- public health benefits;
- direct access improvements for residents or improved access to destinations such as jobs, school, health care, or other;
- travel time improvements;
- gap closures;
- new transportation services or modal options;
- leveraging of other beneficial projects and investments;
- and/or community connection and cohesion improvements.

This is not an exhaustive list. A full response will support the benefits claimed, identify benefits specific to Equity populations residing or engaged in activities near the project area, identify benefits addressing a transportation issue affecting Equity populations specifically identified through engagement, and substantiate benefits with data.

Acknowledge and describe any negative project impacts to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, children, people with disabilities, youth, and older adults. Describe measures to mitigate these impacts. Unidentified or unmitigated negative impacts may result in a reduction in points.

Below is a list of potential negative impacts. This is not an exhaustive list.

- Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, 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.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (0 to 40 Points)

Each application will be qualitatively scored based on the available points and will receive the number of points awarded.

- C. **MEASURE:** Affordable Housing Access (0 to 30 points). This measure is a qualitative scoring measure.

Describe any affordable housing developments—existing, under construction, or planned—within ½ mile of the proposed project. The applicant should note the number of existing subsidized units, which will be provided on the Socio-Economic Conditions map. Applicants can also describe other types of affordable housing (e.g., naturally-occurring affordable housing, manufactured housing) and under construction or planned affordable housing that is within a half mile of the project. If applicable, the applicant can provide self-generated PDF maps to support these additions. Applicants are encouraged to provide a self-generated PDF map describing how a project connects affordable housing residents to destinations (e.g., childcare, grocery stores, schools, places of worship).

Describe the project’s benefits to current and future affordable housing residents within ½ mile of the project. Benefits must relate to affordable housing residents. Examples may include:

- specific direct access improvements for residents
- improved access to destinations such as jobs, school, health care or other;
- new transportation services or modal options;
- and/or community connection and cohesion improvements.

This is not an exhaustive list. Since residents of affordable housing are more likely not to own a private vehicle, higher points will be provided to roadway projects that include other multimodal access improvements. A full response will support the benefits claimed, identify benefits specific to residents of affordable housing, identify benefits addressing a transportation issue affecting residents of affordable housing specifically identified through engagement, and substantiate benefits with data.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (30 Points)

The project that best provides meaningful improvements to access to affordable housing units will receive the full 30 points. Multiple projects may receive the highest possible score of 30

points based on this assessment. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.

- D. **BONUS POINTS (0 TO 25 POINTS ABOVE THE TOTAL CRITERION POINTS):** Those projects that score at least 80% of the maximum total points available through Measures A, B, and C will be awarded bonus points based on the geographic location of the project. These points will be assigned as follows, based on the highest-scoring geography the project contacts:
- 25 points to projects within an Area of Concentrated Poverty
 - 15 points to projects within census tracts with the percent of population in poverty or population of color above the regional average percent
 - 10 points for all other areas

Upload the "Socio-Economic Conditions" map used for this measure.

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

- Project is located in an Area of Concentrated Poverty:
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color:
- Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color:

SCORING GUIDANCE (0 to 25 Points)

If the applicant receives at least 80% of the available points in Measures A, B, and C (e.g., 80 points for the Roadway applications) the project will receive Bonus points as described. If an applicant qualifies for Bonus points it may result in an Equity and Affordable Housing score of more than the total points available.

Equity and Housing Score Changes

Current Measures	Traffic Mgmt.	Spot Mobility/ Safety	Strategic Capacity	Roadway Recon/ Mod	Bridges	Transit Expansion	Transit Mod	TDM	Multiuse Trails	Pedestrian	SRTS
Measure A: Socio-Economic Equity	50	50	50	50	50	150	125	100	70	70	70
Sub-measure 1: Equity Population Engagement	20	20	20	20	20	60	50	40	30	30	30
Sub-measure 2: Equity Population Benefits and Impacts	30	30	30	30	30	90	75	60	40	40	40
<i>Bonus Points</i>	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Measure B: Housing	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
Housing Performance Score	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Affordable Housing Access	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Total Possible (Excluding Bonus)	100	100	100	100	100	200	175	150	120	120	120

Proposed Measures	Traffic Mgmt.	Spot Mobility/ Safety	Strategic Capacity	Roadway Recon/ Mod	Bridges	Transit Expansion	Transit Mod*	TDM	Multiuse Trails	Pedestrian	SRTS
Measure A: Engagement	30	30	30	30	30	60	50	45	36	36	36
Measure B: Equity Population Benefits and Impacts	40	40	40	40	40	80	75	60	48	48	48
Measure C: Affordable Housing Access	30	30	30	30	30	60	50	45	36	36	36
<i>Bonus</i>	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Total Possible (Excluding Bonus)	100	100	100	100	100	200	175	150	120	120	120

*Proposed points rounded to avoid half-points.

Proposed Edits to Regional Solicitation Scoring – Measures Impacted by Transit

Transit Expansion

Measure 2A – Urban and Suburban Local Routes... (Existing)

Use peer routes that are currently in service to develop a ridership estimate for the third year of service. Applicants must use the most recent annual ridership figures that are available. To select the peer routes, the applicant should identify routes in the same transit market area (as defined in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan), or routes that serve locations with similar development patterns. Applicants must use the average passengers per service hour of at least three peer routes to apply a rate of ridership for the proposed service project. Additionally, describe how a peer route was selected in the response and any assumptions used.

Measure 2A – Urban and Suburban Local Routes... (Proposed)

Use peer routes that are currently in service to develop a ridership estimate for the third year of service. **To account for impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic while still recognizing the resiliency of certain routes through 2020**, applicants **will use their best judgement to choose** annual ridership figures **from 2019 or 2020. The year chosen should be appropriate to the proposed service.** To select the peer routes, the applicant should identify routes in the same transit market area (as defined in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan), or routes that serve locations with similar development patterns. Applicants must use the average passengers per service hour of at least three peer routes to apply a rate of ridership for the proposed service project. **The route proposed for expansion and all three routes must use the same year's annual ridership.** Additionally, describe how a peer route was selected in the response and any assumptions used. **The applicant must also explain why they chose a given year for their forecast.**

Transit Modernization

Measure 2B (Existing)

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 (325). 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 $(1,000/1,500)*325$ points or 217 points.

Measure 2B (Proposed)

The applicant with the highest existing annual ridership will receive the full points. **To account for the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic while still recognizing the resiliency of certain routes through 2020, annual ridership will be based on a weighted average of 2019 and 2020 annual ridership. The weighted average will be based on the following formula:**

$$(2019 \text{ Annual Ridership} \times 0.75) + (2020 \text{ Annual Ridership} \times 0.25)$$

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 (325). 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 $(1,000/1,500)*325$ points or 217 points.

Transit Expansion & Modernization

Measure 1B (Existing)

The applicant with route connections having the highest number of weekday trips will receive the full points. 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 $(100/150) \times 35$ points or 23 points.

Measure 1B (Proposed)

The applicant with route connections having the highest number of weekday trips will receive the full points. **To account for the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic while still recognizing the resiliency of certain routes through 2020, average weekday trips will be based on a weighted average of 2019 and 2020 trips. The weighted average will be based on the following formula: (Average 2019 Weekday Trips x 0.75) + (Average 2020 Weekday Trips x 0.25)**

Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had connecting ~~ridership~~ **service** of 100 trips and the top project had 150 trips, this applicant would receive $(100/150) \times 35$ points or 23 points.