INFORMATION ITEM

DATE:	March 05, 2021
TO:	Transportation Advisory Board
PREPARED BY:	Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (joseph.barbeau@metc.state.mn.us)
SUBJECT:	2020 Regional Solicitation Surveys

Following the 2020 Regional Solicitation, surveys were sent to applicants, scorers, TAB members, and TAC/Funding & Programming members. This survey has been conducted since the 2014 Regional Solicitation and is meant to inform staff and committee members on how to improve the process.

Within each of the four surveys is a list of themes. Also, based on feedback received, staff has identified the following major issues to be discussed before the 2022 funding cycle:

1. Develop unique project application.
2. Discuss the role of geographic balance in the Regional Solicitation: how to measure; whether a new policy is needed, whether a new scoring measure is needed; and how to avoid unattended consequences.
3. Given the number of categories (at least four) in which a bike/pedestrian bridge is eligible, determine whether eligibility within categories needs to be adjusted or if a new bike/ped bridge category is needed. If so, are there other categories that could be eliminated?
4. Evaluate rules and measures that were new from 2020 cycle and adjust where needed.
   A. Connection to Affordable Housing
   B. Pedestrian Safety
5. Simplify measures/process where possible.

Surveys:
- Responses from TAB Members: Page 2
- Responses from TAC and Funding & Programming Committee Members: Pages 3-12
- Responses from Applicants: pages 13-16
- Responses from Scoring Committee Members: Pages 17-23

SUMMARY OF TAC/F&PC RESPONSES TO 2020 REGIONAL SOLICITATION SURVEY
Two TAB members replied to the survey.

Themes
No themes identified as there were only two responses.

Replies (2 Respondents)

1. Agency type (check one)

	Responses
State	0
County	1
City	0
Citizen representative	1
Transit representative	0
Freight representative	0
Non-motorized representative	0
Total Respondents	**2**

2. **Do you have any concerns you would like to comment on related to modal distribution, geographic Distribution, scoring, funding categories, funding scenarios, etc?**
1. NONE
2. I will always have concern on these items but I realize we are always evolving for the better. There is not perfect answer. My biggest particular concern would be to get a bigger federal $$ amount.

3. Are there specific changes you would make to the criteria/measures established?
1. The process feels a bit messy but the results for the last 2 solicitations have been pretty good.
2. Nothing major but we should keep evolving for the better.

4. How well did the regional solicitation process reflect regional policy?
1. It is always a work in progress and I think we are working well as a group and leaving behind the parochialism that seems to creep in from time to time.
2. Pretty good.

5. Are there any things you would change about the next solicitation?
1. Nothing comes to mind right now. I like how we are finishing the work prior to new TAB members coming aboard after the new year.
2. Solidify the concept that each County should receive funding for at least on project. Also, continue to work toward fairer regional funding/project balance.

SUMMARY OF TAC/F&PC RESPONSES TO 2020 REGIONAL SOLICITATION SURVEY
Fourteen TAC and Funding & Programming members/alternates/friends replied to the survey.

Themes
- Corridor study inclusion (e.g., Congestion Management Process)
- Clarify definition and submission process for a layout.
- Collector and/or B-Minor eligibility (bridges or all roads)
- Low scoring in the new Spot Mobility and Safety Category. Explore the scoring by category (e.g., low-scoring safety projects scored well overall)
- Consider removing (temporarily?) Safe Route to School Planning scores, as schools are focused on remote learning.
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridges allowed in several categories.
- Forcing geographic balance can be counter to the outcomes created by the scoring process.
- Allowing for funding of studies to help smaller cities and to aid in project development.
- Strategic Capacity overvalued over maintenance / safety, particularly given environmental and fiscal impacts of roadway expansion.?
- Use access to destinations as a scoring measure.
  Try to prescribe scoring methodology as much as possible.

Replies (14 Respondents)

1. Member/alternate of (check all that **apply)**

	Responses
TAC	3
Funding & Programming	9
Neither	3
Total Respondents	**14**

2. Agency type (check one)

	Responses
State	3
County	4
City	1
Other	6
Total Respondents	**14**

3. Do you have any concerns you would like to comment on related to point weighting, categories, modal distribution, geographic, scoring, funding scenarios, qualifying criteria, max/min awards, etc.

2. I can only really speak to the Transit categories. And while I think a good compromise was reached that was workable for the categories to balance geographic equity, it felt like the end result was hard for those outside of transit to follow and understand.
3. Please provide a definition of approved layout? Please set some ground rules for this well in advance of the application process.
5.
   - o Qualifying Requirements
      - ▪ Consider reviewing the functional class requirements for bridge projects. Prior to the 2014 solicitation, I recall that bridges classified as a B-Minor Arterial or Major Collector could apply for funding.
      - ▪ ADA Plan Requirements – Will agencies be required to obtain council/board approval of their ADA Transition Plan? And will it be required for the plan to have been updated within 5 years?
      - ▪ Consider re-wording the Section 3 under Roadways Including Multimodal Elements.[1] The county submitted an application to replace MnDOT's TH 169 Bridge at CSAH 9; and that section didn't seem to be relevant even though we were required to answer it.
   - o Spot Mobility and Safety Category: Consider adjusting the criteria/weights as I recall that projects didn't seem to score all that well even though they were scoped to address both congestion and safety issues.
   - o Minimum and Maximum Awards: Retain award amounts for at least 1 cycle. I realize that we are likely experiencing some unintended consequences due to the $25 mil towards the F Line and the $10 mil max allowed in Strategic Capacity. However, those changes were made for good reason, and I'm excited to see the benefits in 4-5 years of those decisions when those projects begin construction.
6.

---

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

- o Measure 4.B./6.B. Pedestrian Crash Reduction was not scored according to the guidance to evaluate safety countermeasures for pedestrians, did not consistently apply scoring methods across applications within categories, or consistently apply scoring methods across funding categories. Subjective measures about what is 'safe' were scored such as perceived connectivity and access to destinations. The quantitative pedestrian safety countermeasures included in each project need to be the basis for the score, as the other qualitative measures are included in the Multimodal measure.
- o Measure 4.A./6.A. Safety – Crashes Reduced was not scored per the scoring guidance regarding fatalities. Committees need to work through how to evaluate projects with more than one fatality in a 3-year period.
- o Measure 3.A. Equity – Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations needs to be scored more consistently. This was apparent when two applications with almost the exact same text due to similar location and outreach received substantially different scores. This lack of consistency and wide interpretation by scorers in the scoring process is not acceptable.
- o Lower the maximum award for the Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities category and/or limit the number of projects that can receive $5.5 million. The unintended consequence in this funding round was that the overprogramming funding went towards projects in the Pedestrian and SRTS categories due to the lower maximum award amount. There were more projects and high-scoring projects that could have been funded in the Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities category if the award maximum was lower.
- o When developing options to use the funding available from overprogramming, a base option needs to be developed that presents how the funding would be distributed following the typical distribution process across modes and categories based on technical criteria such as midpoint and number of projects submitted per category. All overprogramming options this round were geared towards special interests without an option based on technical reasoning. Another way to consider evaluation of balance by category within a mode would be to look at the percentage of points earned by project compared to the top scoring project within each category and develop a scenario that shows a similar percentage score across categories.
- o Fair and consistent messaging from Metropolitan Council staff is needed regarding the funding scenarios. For example, the discussion regarding every county receiving a project was presented in staff reports as a driving force of the decision-making process. Another example, scenarios that skip projects should not be developed at the staff level and presented to committees. If there is a deviation from the solicitation guidance, it should come only as official direction from a committee vote.
- o The 'Geographic Balance' conversation and narrative needs more context and information if it continues to be an area of emphasis. The 'Geographic Balance' conversation subverts the work of the solicitation because it ignores the other factors included in the scoring and evaluation of projects. For example, population and employment are already factored heavily into the scoring of projects. The 'Geographic Balance' conversation, if brought forward, needs to include more than just these two factors.
- o Committees should consider a change to the qualifying criteria for future eligibility of partially funded projects. Partially funded projects should be eligible to apply for the unfunded portion of funds to the maximum award amount and also eligible to apply under future HSIP solicitations for the unfunded amount (to the award maximum).

7. Regarding geographic considerations around distribution of regional federal funds: Geographic balance/distribution runs the risk of perpetuating inequitable outcomes across the region's communities and residents. How might equity be applied to the consideration of geographic distribution across the region and lead in developing a regional definition of "geographic balance" that helps guide investment? What disparities exist across the region today regarding the benefit provided in pursuing the regional transportation goals and key outcomes? How can the idea of geographic balance be leveraged to help advance equity? How could an equity lens be applied to each of the other outcomes and performance areas? I support looking holistically at the distribution across all federal funding categories including HSIP when assessing for geographic distribution, as well as identifying at the outset a clear definition of "geographic balance" and seeking to understand regional equity implications to such an approach.

8.
- o Annual review of RBTN is important
- o Some of the cost-effectiveness scores don't make sense. I have a hard time believing that smaller projects requesting less than $500,000 are being delivered efficiently with local funds when considering environmental reviews and bidding requirements.
- o Need to update Regional Truck Tiers with new land uses and Streetlight data
- o Strategic Capacity funding is significantly skewed towards outer ring areas given ROW and PAICS Study
- o SRTS Measure 1B (Average share of student population that bikes or walks) – We could not get MPS to commit to submit an application for a planning grant due to COVID and remote learning. I recommend that this measure is suspended for the 2022 solicitation.

9. I would like to see some criteria that relates to having some level of planning for corridor impacts for proposed projects ie CMP for next solicitation. Project safety, bike ped improvement and equity should be rated higher in accordance with feedback received on the latest TPP update.

10.
- o Pedestrian bridges – ped bridges (and underpasses) are allowed to apply in 3 or 4 categories. Would like the evaluation to look at whether they need their own category, or more guidance on which category they belong in
- o Maintenance costs. Long term maintenance costs are not considered for expansion application.
- o Roadway expansion: Would like the applications to include a narrative of why a high-cost improvement was chosen over a low-cost, high-benefit improvement, or an abbreviated congestion management plan

11. On the trails, as you may remember, I found it ridiculous that we were penalized 15 points because there was a sidewalk on the other side of a 4-lane road, thereby knocking our score down because there is an existing facility. I get scoring trails is difficult, but I don't think saying there is a sidewalk in the corridor on the other side of the road should be a limiting factor on scoring for a new trail.

12.
- o The council should consider eliminating maximum awards—reduce the need to combine lots of funding sources to get a project completed. Obviously, federal maximum share would apply. Could add another scoring criterion for non-federal share to still reward projects that bring other resources.
- o Ideally, the method to assign points for all categories should be clearer before projects apply not vaguely described and then left up to individual scorers to create.

13.
- o Congestion relief is overvalued in roadway application categories. The current approach to congestion relief on minor arterials is likely to only have short-term benefits (e.g., traffic will eventually worsen again) and there are many other potential negative effects with the projects being built.
- o To help achieve goals for safety in the state's Strategic Highway Safety Plan, safety should be valued more.
- o The maximum funding amount for pedestrian projects is too low and discourages any significant pedestrian improvements unless coupled with a roadway project. This reinforces the automobile as the top choice for transportation investment, despite many surveys showing desires for other choices.
- o Multimodal elements are undervalued and improperly evaluated in the roadway categories. They are typically evaluated on an existence basis and not a needs assessment, quality basis, or evaluated based on the roadway's potential impact to multimodal travel. The idea that roadway categories is called "including multimodal elements" is not a fair assessment, since many times the roadway itself is the barrier to multimodal travel.
- o There are too many points allocated to Infrastructure Age/Condition for roadway reconstruction/modernization. The focus could be on better adapting roadways to their existing or future context so that we are focused on the outcome of the reconstruction. Stewardship does not seem like something that should be a focus of the Solicitation, but should be a local

responsibility. Geometric issues are only one part of the problem and multimodal needs are ignored as part of this.

o The modal funding splits should be shifted more toward walking, biking, and transit. These modes are underdeveloped relative to roadways. The fact that most walkable areas in the region are highly valued economically indicates higher demand than supply for these areas. In order to meet that supply, more areas like this need to be created so that multimodal travel is more available to those that want to choose that lifestyle. In particular, making these areas more affordable requires more availability.

o Geographic balance is best achieved through an assessment of need and not geopolitical assessment. If geographic balance is a goal of TAB, they should make sure the criteria reflect their priorities and accept the results or make exceptions (e.g. skip projects) rather than adjusting entire funding scenarios to achieve balance. This last cycle should be an example of what not to do, but also should be analyzed to understand what in the structure led to imbalance.

o There is a lack of consideration for land use context in the Regional Solicitation. Many measures consider existing population and employment, which is a helpful measure, but not the community vision, context-specific considerations, or regional priorities for growth (which admittedly are somewhat lacking). This really limits to ability to implement needs-based assessments for multimodal elements, since many of the ideas are based on upgrading an area to attract more walking, biking, or transit. Roadway categories are easier to assess because everyone that can drive can already get everywhere by car comfortably.

14. We did feel there was a better way to estimate new transit rides. With the help of Eric Lind in Metro Transit's Strategic Initiatives Division, Service Development used a methodology that we felt was more realistic and in particular did not overestimate new rides. We recommend that something like it, if not exactly the same process, be proposed for consistent use across future solicitations. Strategic Initiatives and Service Development would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further.

4. Are there specific changes you would make to the criteria/measures?

4.

    o Layout:
- add points for "layout started or begun"??
- filename on checklist doesn't match the attachment name. When there are multiple attachments, it can be difficult to sort through which one they consider their "layout."
- Clarify that a layout is not a colored line on an aerial photo
- Clarify what approval means for projects that include a MnDOT TH layout (MnDOT support letter does not mean layout approval). May need to include another line with points related to MnDOT layout process.
- Include a note that layout is N/A for signal and signal timing projects… include a "location map"
- For Park and Ride, a note indicating a site concept drawing would be appropriate

    o Right of Way
- Add a line for MnDOT Agreement/Limited Use Permit required and if initiated or not
- Still need to figure out how to confirm when they state they have RW. I questioned several agencies when looking at their layout, and saw what appeared to be work outside RW, however, they stated they did not need RW or easements

5.

    o Continue limiting the number of words/characters allowed in responses. Even the 300/400 word sections can get excessive.

    o Improve the applicant's ability to illustrate issues with videos/images. It's a lot easier to see a deficiency than it is to read about one.

    o Continue exploring how StreetLight could be leveraged in scoring certain measures.

    o Equity and Housing Performance – Consider adding more guidance to applicants as both Measure A and Measure B continue to be adjusted each year as we gain a better understanding of disparities.

6.
- o In the Spot Mobility and Safety category, Measure 1.B. Regional Truck Corridor Study Tiers was not a representative way to score the freight value of the smaller type of projects that apply in this category. For example, only three projects scored any points in this measure with 7 out of 10 receiving zero points. This was a major differentiator in determining funding awards as it created a 65-75 point swing in what was otherwise a competitive category.
- o In the Spot Mobility and Safety category, the top scoring project had low scores in the mobility (10/275) and safety (89/275) score areas. The committees need to look at how the scoring structure favors project location over project impacts and consider changes to the weight of the scores including allocating more points to the mobility and safety score areas.
- o The Regional Solicitation Introduction includes the following direction: "If there is a high-scoring outlier on a particular measure, the scorer will have the option to prorate the other scores based on the second highest scoring project instead of the top project." Add guidance that clarifies at what threshold a scorer should do this and how to implement it. Right now each scorer and committee interprets this in different ways.
  - ▪ In addition, change this guidance to not penalize the top scoring project. The text currently states, the top-scoring, outlier project would receive the same score as the second highest project, which takes away any advantage the high scoring project earned by having a higher score. A better approach would be to define an outlier score as greater than 100% of the next highest score. The second highest score could then be moved to 50% of the highest score with projects then prorated based on that. This way the top scoring project is not penalized, and the remaining projects are still prorated to receive score differentiation.
    - • Example, top scoring project receives 100 points, next highest score is 30 points. Move the next highest score to 50 points and prorate based on that score.
7. TDM is such a very different beast than very concrete infrastructure investments and improvements, and an important piece of the puzzle. Review of the evaluation criteria and measures to develop both better guidance for applicants to improve consistency in approach for how certain measures are calculated, as well as additional guidance for the folks scoring certain criteria.
8.
- o Engagement Scores for all projects – very limited right now and into 2021, may need to be lenient on next round's scores.
- o SRTS Planning Work – similar theme to above; most schools are focusing on remote learning and less willing to take on planning work for infrastructure.
9. The use of the RBTN as a selection criterion with high points are out of sync with pedestrian needs that support equity and regional centers. Example 22nd Ave Ped bridge over I-94.
10.
- o The use of equity criteria should continue to be refined and expanded beyond engagement/need creation.
- o Equity and geographic distribution of awards. Roadway expansion projects are primarily in the 3rd ring suburbs and serve communities that are primarily white. Is this consistent with Thrive2040 and other equity goals for the region? Is equity in geographic distribution mean each county receives a project or some other determination.
12.
- o Why are students limited to post-secondary?
- o Consider adding a change in access to destinations measure to the scoring process.
- o Consider deducting points from projects that primarily benefit an area of concentrated wealth
- o Consider having a GHG emissions metric for all categories
- o Related to bridges and multimodal:
  - ▪ Consider splitting transit and nonmotorized – they're not the same and should probably be treated separately for scoring purposes

- ▪ There should be an explicit discussion about how to view preservation of existing, high quality multimodal elements vs. adding new. The guidance is vague and was challenging for me to wrestle with

13.
- o Add elements related to future land use, community vision, and regional vision
- o Deemphasize congestion as a measure
- o Add more weight to multimodal elements in roadway applications and assess them more comprehensively based on proven best practices (e.g. multimodal level of service or similar). Make sure it assesses from multimodal user perspective, not infrastructure perspective.
- o Do not use existing bike/ped counts in lieu of the population/employment density criterion as an indication of potential demand, as has been suggested. It is unlikely any inferences from counts on nearby existing facilities would be relevant to a new facility. The one exception might be where the planned improvement is to fill a gap or upgrade an existing facility along an existing bikeway with a count that is adjacently upstream or downstream from the project location. It would be possible to suggest to applicants that available counts in this circumstance could be referenced in the narrative to highlight potential benefits. However, counts alone on any facility do not necessarily reflect the importance in the project context for people who are biking or walking. We also do not currently have a regional perspective on what would be considered high or low counts in different community contexts for both walking and biking, and this work needs to be developed.
- o Reduce the number of overall measures so that each category has a clearer focus. Are the 50-point categories really that important or should they be qualitatively rolled into other categories? With the way the scoring works based on best project getting top points, this type of change can matter more than potentially perceived.
- o Transit Expansion Criterion 1, Measure B should be changed. Currently it awards 15 points to projects that are connected to planned transitway project; that punishes projects that already connect to an existing transitway but not to a planned one. The language of the scoring makes it seem as if we are rewarding points because transitways offer specific benefits; in that case they should be awarded to projects that already serve existing transitways.

14. See Q1.

5. What one item would you change about the solicitation above all else?

1. Inclusion of a Met Council vetted CMP Corridor Study as an eligibility determinate for Regional Solicitation funds.
2.
- o First and foremost, a new State funding solution needs to be worked out for transit overall so hopefully then we can simplify the transit category and not have the region's planned ABRT/BRT system so heavily reliant on receiving Regional Solicitation funding for its buildout and operation.
- o Second, understanding State transit funding is a separate issue, and that ABRT/BRT is generally going to score towards the top in the Regional Solicitation, why not have transit stakeholders come to an agreement on how much money to set aside for ABRT/BRT (which we have come close to already doing), and leave the rest available for other non-BRT projects? If desired, we could create a third transit category: BRT, and have those dollars be competitive as well.
- o We could still discuss the need for a New Market guarantee in one or both of the existing transit categories, but having both the BRT rules and New Market rules within the same categories led to some confusion and I think making BRT a separate funding category would help simplify things a bit.
3.
- o Applicants can only apply a project for one category for the solicitation process, even if they qualify for two categories with their project.
- o The unwritten rules need to be written so we are not making rules up or bringing unwritten rules when evaluating applications or past practice. For a person like me I don't have the background of past practice or what has occurred in the past.

- 4.
- 5.
  - o When the discussion regarding contesting the points allocated to categories by the application/applicants, only one person from the designated agency can be at the funding and programing meeting to speak on behalf of the agency.

  - o I greatly appreciated the "Rules of the Reg Sol Project Selection" matrix that Met Council staff created. I encourage your team to consider re-creating that document each time. Also, some of the checkpoints would be helpful to know earlier on in the process (i.e. are all roadway projects spaced 3.5 miles apart on a corridor) to confirm that all projects being considered for funding satisfy the solicitation requirements.
  - o Encourage the use of "Targets" or "Goals" versus "Rules" or "Policies" as it promotes flexibility in decision-making. We were fortunate that the tie observed in the bridge category involved the top two projects; it would have been complicated if project #2 and project #3 tied.
- 6.
  - o More consideration needs to be given to who the scorers are for each measure. Scorers need to be subject matter experts and understand the regional solicitation process. Staff also need to review the scorer's work to check for accuracy and consistency.
  - o A second scoring committee review was needed to finalize the scores and review scores that were not ready at the time of the initial committee meeting.
  - o More respect and time need to be given to applicants that choose to appeal. Staff need to review the appeals more thoroughly for consideration and not rely solely on the scorer. Each committee could convene to review the appeals instead of only the individual scorer and chair. There was also not enough time given at the Funding and Programming Committee meeting, and some of the applicants were dismissed without much consideration.
- 7.
  - o I would welcome the possibility of reimagining the process in a way that centers equity to inform the overall approach to regional transportation investment solicitation across all funding categories and funding strategies. Neither equity, nor the goal of Healthy and Equitable Communities can be fully realized without applying an equity lens to ALL of the goals, objectives and key outcomes, performance measures, and evaluation criteria.
  - o How do the funding categories, performance measures, evaluation criteria and investment record of past projects funding through the solicitation help or hinder the ability to achieve equitable outcomes?
  - o Funding Categories for consideration:
    - ▪ Pedestrian/bicycle bridges and under crossings were applied for across several categories – in the spirit of improving access across regional barriers, could there be a pedestrian/bicycle grade-separated crossing specific funding category?
    - ▪ Corridor Studies: Funding studies along an identified network of corridors in the region could aid in developing projects that are more supportive of both achieving the Thrive MSP outcomes, and addressing the performance-based goals.
    - ▪ "Main Street": Consideration of a category focused to urban arterials like those in rural centers as well as those in urban areas. The "main street" context along regional roadways is challenging and gets very complex quickly. This has a tendency to lead to deferred maintenance with an outsized impact on the pedestrian network and ADA compliance. "Main Streets" often see the highest level of pedestrians and active transportation, in addition to all other transportation users based on destinations and generators.
- 8.
  - o It is hard to understand what the region is trying to achieve with funding besides regional balance and continuing to fund each modal bucket at a historical precedent. The new BRT set aside is the only funding bucket that seemingly has a clear outcome in mind (i.e., build out a specific interconnected network of high quality, high frequency transitways).
  - o There is consistent tie to Thrive/TPP in the sense that each agency can debate for a different set of values (expansion, equity, safety, mobility, asset management, etc.).

- o The process has not addressed the state's broader goals towards VMT reduction, GHG emissions/climate change, and the overwhelming role that the transportation sector plays (24%!).
- o There is no sense of urgency to address environmental and fiscal realities, which is highlighted by recommending a Capacity Expansion scenario in 2020.
- o A huge component of the solicitation is rooted in the prioritization of LOS for vehicles and how the scoring drives the project selection process. This foundational (and misguided) aspect of transportation planning has created enormous social and environmental disparities, while perpetuating a system that is financially unsustainable to maintain.
- o HSIP projects should count as a part of the regional balance conversation and have been used in the past to show funding distribution.
- o Rely on scoring process; do not skip projects
- o Greater number and distribution of projects across region and modal categories
- o Consider funding distribution over time, not by individual cycle
- o Focus on lower cost, higher benefit solutions amid stagnant transportation funding
- o Less reliance on Strategic Capacity; higher risk for agencies with MnDOT constraints
- o MnDOT Metro is moving towards preservation focus with less funding available in metro
- o Adjust Strategic Capacity back to $7M or set a hard cap at $30M. This should be a lowest-priority category and has become a locally sponsored MnDOT CIP
- o Are parking ramps and bridges eligible elements for transit projects?
- o Consider eligibility requirements for multiple projects within same project limits in same funding cycle (road and bike/ped)
- o Strong prioritization for Traffic Management and Spot Mobility/Safety projects
- o Consider Streetlight data and how projects benefit more than the sponsoring agency.
- o Projects focus on localized congestion and air quality, but are we pushing these issues elsewhere?
- o The TPP says traffic management first, then spot mobility, then strategic capacity. In my opinion, we should take this into consideration when drawing funding lines. This past cycle funded $64M in highway expansion, as compared to $13M in TMT / Spot Mobility ….. COMBINED!

9.
- o Include a small amount for planning studies to support equity of fiscally disparate cities and reduce finance burden of regional solicitation process.
- o Geographic balance of the regional solicitation must be determined before the scoring takes place to ensure decisions are made based on regional priorities rather than last minute desires for projects based on political boundaries.

10. Roadway Expansion: The funding awards for roadway expansion projects are only a small amount of the overall project costs, and often times less than a 1/3 of total project costs. These projects could be treated like the new aBRT policy to fully fund an entire route.

11. One thing that MnDOT is doing on a pilot grant project for greenhouse gas reduction is going through a 2 part process. First part is a pretty undetailed submittal that they are going to "grade" to see if the concept moves on to the 2nd stage. I wonder if this would be a good idea, create an initial submittal with some various criteria that don't take a lot of effort to submit saving time and money for submitters that never have a shot. Then if you move past that first round, then you go ahead and put your horsepower in and time, etc. knowing you at least have a shot. Just thinking about some submittals that aren't close to close to being funded yet they spent considerable time and likely expense putting together a detailed submittal. Also, it could save time on scoring the detailed submittals as well as only those that made it past the first round submit their projects.

12. Make Major Collectors eligible – consistent with what's actually federally eligible. This is has created unnecessary pressure to up classify roads in order to be eligible for the regional solicitation.

13. Reduce the number of application categories because the money is getting spread pretty thin and there is perception that applications = demand, which is likely not true. There are many reasons to apply for and not apply for federal funding, so to assume applications = demand is misleading. Twelve application categories plus unique projects is too much and this is what requires projects to split up their scope and build incrementally. More large projects, fewer categories, and a more focused, outcome-based approach would reduce the overall workload of the region to run this process. Allow or encourage local governments to collaborate and put forward their best projects within a more focused approach (i.e.

encourage (incentivize) local prioritization among multiple applicants to happen before the solicitation). Counties could potentially foster this engagement from their cities.

14. Areas that we would look to change are as follows:

    o **Housing data** – The application required mapping/describing affordable housing within a certain distance of the project area. This would probably be fairly straightforward for projects that occur at a single site, but it was cumbersome for transit projects needing to record affordable housing along the entire route. In many cases, we ended up using the Housing Link data to create a GIS-based map so any transit application could easily use the data. But, we essentially did not include any info on naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH) since it is tracked differently by city, or often not tracked at all. Further, finding information on new/anticipated affordable housing development requires reaching out to each individual city. We believe the affordable housing section of the application could be modified for transit expansion projects to simplify and directly state the minimum requirements. Additionally, a tool or GIS layer created by the Council tracking affordable housing would reduce a lot of work on future applications as well as be useful for everyday planning purposes.

    o **Regional Economy Map** – One map generated in the Council's Make-a-Map tool is a "Regional Economy" map that lists within one mile (1) postsecondary students, (2) population, (3) employment, and (4) Manufacturing and Distribution Employment. This map is not requested anywhere in the Transit Expansion application, which was confusing. Perhaps, users who select "transit expansion" within Make-A-Map should not have the option to generate the Regional Economy map.

    o **Other maps** – The transit expansion applications also requested additional mapping under "Measure A: Connection to disadvantaged populations…" sub-measure "Equity Population Engagement." The application requests mapping of low-income populations, communities of color, people with disabilities, youth, and older adults. We had to generate our own maps, but the appropriate data layers could be a map-able feature on the Make-A-Map application.

    o **Make-A-Map** – This application did have limitations in terms of quality of maps generated. The maps are useful for pulling spatial data, but as visual aids the maps are often not very useful. Users can "explore" data layers but cannot customize or generate maps beyond four default maps. Users also have no control over the map extent (i.e., scale and positioning). Since Make-a-Map requires quite a bit of time to draw transit stops and routes per project, we were thinking the application would have more utility if it could export a wider array of customizable maps.

    o **Revenue Clarification –** On our end, we felt there could have been better clarification of when and when not to include revenue as part of the overall cost.

Again, as noted before, we felt that the structure and process was fair, and with few exceptions, understandable and easy to use.

SUMMARY OF APPLICANT RESPONSES TO 2020 REGIONAL SOLICITATION SURVEY
Nine applicants replied to the survey.

Themes
- The online interface is cumbersome and can be difficult to navigate.
- There are potential improvements to the mapping function.
- Data for the new affordable housing sub-measure was difficult to obtain.
- A glossary of terms would be valuable.

Responses (9 Respondents)

1. Agency type (check one)

	Responses
State	0
City	3
County	2
Other -Nonprofit -Nonprofit -Nonprofit -Regional	4
Total Respondents	**9**

2. Category you submitted in (Check all that apply)

	Responses
Strategic Capacity	0% (0)
Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization	22.2% (2)
Traffic Management Technologies	11.1% (1)
Spot Mobility/Safety	22.2% (2)
Bridges	11.1% (1)
Transit Expansion	11.1% (1)
Transit Modernization	0% (0)
Travel Demand Management	22.2% (2)
Multi-use Trails & Bicycle Facilities	22.2% (2)
Pedestrian Facilities	22.2% (2)
Safe Routes to School	0.0% (0)
Total Respondents:	18

3. Are there specific features of the online application that should be changed?
1. NA
2. The application software is pretty clunky. Updating the portal and making the application more streamlined would help.
3. None
4.
    a. Inconsistent/not intuitive user interface, especially when trying to edit fields (e.g. encountering issues with entering and editing bus stop counts by city).
    b. Too much scrolling and navigating back and forth between the pages. Might be helpful to have a split-pane view that lets you navigate quickly through application sections/questions on the left side and enter fields on the right side.

       c. Attachments should be consolidated in one place only with an explicit set of directions for document format, dimensions, etc.
5. Online mapping tool could be improved to have better/clearer basemaps
6. no
7. I'd like to offer the following considerations:
       a. Ability to include bulleted lists that are better formatted
       b. Ability to embed hyperlinks and use a nickname in the application so that the entire URL doesn't show up
       c. Ability to direct application reviewers to specific attachments to minimize manual efforts to number and call out attachment numbers in the application (it's really annoying when you have to renumber attachments)
       d. Build in a comment review tool in the application. We save the draft application as a pdf and then route it for comment; which doesn't feel like the most efficient way to collect comments.
       e. Under the safety section, it was confusing to report the number of A's & K's; and then report the number of A's & K's involving people biking and walking. This was new for the 2020 Solicitation; and it came as a surprise to me (although, I support including the metric).
9. I had wished that the mapping function be more robust, We wanted to show the radius from a location and we had to use two maps hoping that the scoring team would understand the connection.

4. Are there changes you would make in the application training (overall regional solicitation information, online application, mapping, MnDOT State Aid information)?
1. NA
2. N/A
3. No
4. It would be helpful to have a webinar session for using the mapping application, since the training video didn't seem all that applicable to the projects I submitted.
5. No
6. no
7. Nope. You seem to get excellent attendance at training sessions. I'm able to answer 90% of my questions from information posted on your website and MetCouncil staff is VERY responsive.
8. The mapping interface requires that all points are identified in a series of clicks. For a dispersed TDM project with many datapoints, it is difficult to accurately pinpoint all the nodes because the map must be zoomed far out to accommodate the project boundaries.
9. No. The training was good.

5. Are there specific changes you would make to the qualifying criteria/requirements established to determine whether projects are eligible?
1. NA
2. The application software is pretty clunky. Updating the portal and making the application more streamlined would help.
3. No
4. n/a
5. Consider lowering the max amount for multi-use trail to $3.5M in order to fund additional projects. Or limit amount a geographic area can receive in a given solicitation category. Generally - try to better distribute funding
6. add contribution to citizen quality of life
7. I'd like to offer the following as a consideration: Bridges along B-Minor Arterials and Major Collectors be eligible for federal funding. I believe this was the case in previous solicitations (2011 and prior?). I'm not aware of why this was changed.
8. Provide clear definitions of terms and web links to referring outside guidance.
9. No

6. There are a number of submittals/attachments required with applications. Were any of these difficult to produce or obtain?
1. NA

2. The information on affordable housing was difficult to obtain, and it seemed like some applications didn't bother trying to obtain that data. Need to make it easier to find or should remove.
3. Yes
4. n/a
5. No
6. no
7. Our team had difficulty producing the affordable housing access maps; primarily due to how data was obtained from the HousingLink website.
8.
   - Information on affordable housing was challenging to effectively compile for a TDM project, which has a more dispersed geographic impact than most infrastructure projects. Even after compilation, its use to scoring the overall project is unclear. Consider amending or omitting this requirement for the TDM category.
   - We appreciated the additional flexibility around letters of support that was provided due to COVID-19.
9. No

7. Was there any confusion or difficulty with any prioritizing criteria (i.e., scoring measures)? Please highlight specific issues that can be addressed.
1. N/A
2. NA
3. No
4. n/a
5. No
6. no
7. Under the safety section, it was confusing to report the number of A's & K's; and then report the number of A's & K's involving people biking and walking. This was new for the 2020 Solicitation; and it came as a surprise to me (although, I support including the metric).
9. No

8. Was the scoring guidance clear and helpful to your understanding the criteria?
1. NA
2. Yes
3. Yes, the scoring guidance was clear and helpful
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Yes
7. Yes. Additionally, whenever I had questions; MetCouncil staff was very responsive in providing clarity.
9. Yes

9. What thing(s) would you change about the solicitation process, criteria, or scoring?
1. NA
2. N/A
3. Nothing
4. The affordable housing criterion seems new. It would be helpful to have more explicit guidance over what to include in the application in the context of a transit expansion project. The application seems to ask for as much information as possible about nearby affordable housing, which for transit routes can include dozens of projects across multiple cities.
5. Score project based on the Federal request vs. total project cost. Reward agencies that contribute greater than the 20%
6. Make mapping more robust
7. I'd like to offer the following as considerations:
   - Converting the "Project's connection to the 2040 TPP" from a text section to checkboxes. This section isn't scored and I think the same outcomes could be accomplished by having the applicant just acknowledge that the project is consistent with one or more goal/objective/strategy

- o Adjusting how the response is written the Affordable Housing Access measure. Other sections allow the applicant to enter info for multiple items (i.e. the roadway age) and then the application will auto-populate a list. Whereas, it felt like I was manually typing a never-ending list that utilized characters.

10. What changes would you make to the Regional Solicitation to simplify the application or other parts of the process?

1. NA
2. N/A
3. No changes needed at this time
4. The application should provide clear definitions of terms that it is using throughout the forms. This could be a glossary or notes at the bottom of each page of the online application. This would improve consistency within and across projects.
5. Application process works well
7. I'd like to offer the following as considerations:
    - o Reduce the number of maximum characters in many of the sections. The solicitation has grown since it was last revised (significantly) in 2014. Agencies either have to hire consultants or apply staff resources to complete funding applications; so we want to be mindful of the financial implications of submitting an application(s).
    - o Work with MnDOT to make additional adjustments to the Benefit/Cost Worksheets. I encountered a number of challenges when using these for the first time in 2020. Additionally, I don't believe any formal training was offered to applicants to demonstrate how they are intended to be used.
    - o Utilize the results of the Reg Sol & HSIP Before/After Study to guide changes to the solicitation. I was completely shocked by the benefits shown by historical HSIP projects in terms of reducing crashes resulting in injuries. One outcome could be that the safety measure includes a relatively high point total; noting that it appears to be a very effective measure to determining "good projects".

SUMMARY OF SCORER/CHAIR RESPONSES TO 2020 REGIONAL SOLICITATION SURVEY
Twenty-eight scorers/chairs replied to the survey.

Themes
- Clarity is needed regarding what information scorers can consult.
  - Can they examine responses to other questions? Are they expected to?
  - Can applicants reference attachments with the expectation that scorers are going to look at them?
  - Similarly, brought up during appeals, was the degree to which a scorer can use their own knowledge or do things like visit proposed project sites.
  - Explain to applicants what scorers will or will not read.
- Clarity on what category a project type should be submitted in. For example, pedestrian bridges were included in several categories (Trail/Bike, Ped, Transit)
- Consider whether chairs should be F&P members or ways around having a chair whose agency is represented in the category.
- Several general comments on improved scoring guidance and criteria to help both applicants and scorers.
- Cost effectiveness: examine the impact on the new Spot Mobility category (where it was very impactful) along with whether it should still be used at all. Also consider awarding points for taking on more local match than required.
- The new pedestrian safety and housing connectivity measures need to be examined for how they should be answered and how they'll be scored.
  - Assuming the housing connectivity measure can be improved should the split be changed between this and the performance score? Should the latter even be eliminated?
- When outliers are to be used should be codified.
- Need a better definition of a project layout and better explanation of right-of-way costs.
- Sometimes it was hard to find the relevant information quickly within the applications submitted. Bold or underline headings with corresponding number (e.g. 1A, 3A) would be helpful. There was at least one for which the output provided the wrong title, which resulted in the scorer being given the wrong responses.
- More clarity within transit about project level application vs system level applications. The current guidelines provide a big advantage to system-level applications.
- Do scoring rubrics need to be included in scoring guidance (i.e., less scorer freedom?)
- Has perfect become the enemy of good? Is there a way to simplify for the scorers and applicants?

Responses (28 Respondents)

1. On a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), do you agree with the following?

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total
Information from the applications was easy to find and interpret	3.6% (1)	14.3% (4)	21.4% (6)	32.1% (9)	25.0% (7)	3.6% (1)	28
The scoring committee structure was effective	0.0% (0)	3.6% (1)	17.9% (5)	35.7% (10)	35.7% (10)	7.1% (2)	28
The way to distribute scores within the measure made sense	3.6% (1)	7.1% (2)	17.9% (5)	32.1% (9)	32.1% (9)	7.1% (2)	28
My scoring methodology was consistent with the scoring guidelines	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	14.3% (4)	28.6% (8)	53.6% (15)	3.6% (1)	28
The scoring guidelines were useful/understandable	0.0% (0)	10.7% (3)	14.3% (4)	39.3% (11)	35.7% (10)	0.0% (0)	28

2. Please provide any comments you may have for question number 1

1. Any time I had a question about how to score something, I was able to discuss it either with Joe B ahead of time, or with the Committee during our meeting.
2. My particular category leaves a lot of room for interpretation for the scorer, which makes it more challenging to score consistently, especially across 40 applications that can vary quite a bit. This becomes especially challenging when there is a scoring appeal and the scorer has to justify a score-- some applicants are rightly confused about where/why they missed the mark.
3. The applications are often massive and finding what is supposed to be considered for scoring is difficult.
7. I picked 3 for the first question because it was easy to find, difficult to interpret. To be expected, though, as we had updated criteria this year.
9. In general fine. with the traffic mgmt tech. that was more difficult. for example the mpls project involved numerous spots in the city so not as clear how to score.
11. Should request a summary of analysis so that scorer is not hunting for information.
12.
    - 1) I'd suggest that Criteria #8 within my measure (4B) be modified/omitted as I noticed that the other scorer and I interpreted "Other Improvements" differently. I wonder if it would make sense to name it "Unique Elements".
    - 2) I'd suggest that more guidance be given to applicants to not only describe the current conditions, but also describe how the project will improve those conditions across each of the 8 criteria within Measure 4B.
    - 3) I'd suggest that we encourage applicants to include photos that illustrate existing conditions to assist scorers in evaluating the project's benefits.
13. N/A
15. I'd suggest looking at a way to better title the sections in the output of the online survey so that reviewers can easily move between sections. The inconsistent titling with large documents and no index/TOC made it challenging (but obviously not impossible ;) to work through applications.
16. The scoring guidance needs to be clearer that the scorer is making the choice here and not using the applicant-selected score. The application should require materials that substantiate what outreach occurred; some applicants claimed fully completing the outreach requirements, though it appears they did not.
18. I think the multimodal scoring rubric and guidelines could use some discussion and refinement.
20. Sometimes it was hard to find the relevant information quickly within the applications submitted. Bold or underline headings with corresponding number (e.g. 1A, 3A) would be helpful.
21. In general, it's difficult to try and have a completely objective criteria for very different types of projects. (Weighing service improvements vs bus garage improvements vs new routes, etc.) It also felt like many reviewers were scoring the quality of the application ("Did not mention X") rather than the project itself.
23. I was a first-time scorer and there was a lot of information and process to get on top of. Met Council staff could have made this a little easier with better organization. For example, I originally received application answers for a different measure than the one I was scoring. I think I'd also have more specific things to say on this survey if I'd received it shortly after I had completed the scores- three months later it's not as fresh.
24. Since it was my first time rating these applications, it was difficult to put my head around the scoring. Now that I have been thru the process one time now, I am ready for this again in a couple of years. I cannot wait.
25. An additional scoring committee meeting was needed to work out issues and confirm any changes prior to F&P.
26.
    - TDM is such a different beast than very concrete infrastructure investments and improvements. It is an important piece of the puzzle to better understanding how people make their transportation choices and leveraging that for better health, environment, and equitable transportation access outcomes.
    - Review of the evaluation criteria and developing both better guidance for applicants and the folks scoring certain criteria as well as seeking feedback from past applicants in the category could help improve the process and clarify expectations?
    - Also – it would be helpful to have some further guidance on what the role of the chair is for the different project scoring categories. For me, it would have been helpful to get a base level understanding/introduction to each of the evaluation criteria to be able to better make determinations if

there were issues to be resolved, and back to the chair's role – what that is with regard to issues and questions that may arise.

27. As a committee chair, I would like to meet or connect with MTS staff before the committee meetings start to go over meeting agenda(s), and any issues staff anticipate being a problem. TAC-F&P Chair and scoring committee chairs should have some input to the make-up of the committees.

28. Equity scorers met as a group so scoring guidelines were clear.

3. Were there any issues/concerns you raised during the solicitation process that were not addressed? Please provide a brief description of the issue and how the issue was not addressed.

1. I raised a few issues, but all were addressed.
4. no
6. In transit expansion, it's difficult to compare the applications that are asking for operating dollars to the applications that are physically improving the bike/ped environment.
7. everyone addressed my concerns :)
8. I raised a concern about how data MAY have skewed the scoring. I suppose that is how it works and the committee was okay with it since I did not receive a response.
9. Missed discussion
11. No
12.
    o 1) I did not raise any significant issues/concerns during the solicitation process. However, I would like to use this response as an opportunity to request that MetCouncil Staff provides assurance to both the scoring committees and TAC F&P that MetCouncil Staff reviewed each of the applications and confirmed that they meet the qualifying requirements. A couple of requirements/rules that come to mind include: the project must be located along an A-Minor Arterial (does it need to be the entire project length?) and two projects must be spaced at least 3.5 miles apart.
    o While reviewing applications during scoring, I sometimes come across an application(s) that appears to fall within a gray area; therefore, I would appreciate hearing that assurance from MetCouncil that each of the applications being scored meet the qualifying requirements.
13. N/A
15. I don't believe so.
20. N/A
22. everything was addressed as best we could during this solicitation. Edits to future solicitations will help alleviate those from popping up again.
24. NA
25. The pedestrian safety measure needs better scoring guidance. It was scored based on qualitative information rather than as a quantitative safety countermeasure.
26. Not that I can recall. This was my first time as a chair, and I didn't fully understand what was required of me.
28. No

4. What one thing would you change about solicitation scoring above all else?

1. Nothing. Joe corrected my scores to make sure they met the scoring criteria but still accurately represented the order in which I ranked them. He did a great job.
2. Is there a way to simplify? I'm challenged to think of how we could possibly do this without making the process too rigid, but there is a lot of time that goes into preparing and scoring the applications to essentially select 10 projects (multiuse trails/ped facilities).
4. make it simpler, perfect is the enemy of the good, are we past diminishing returns with the details?
6. Metro Transit does not provide a lot of information in their answers which makes it very hard to score. I'm unsure if this is because they assume a certain level of familiarity with all routes or something else.
7. More points to equity and housing, they just aren't enough points for applicants to take them very seriously.
11. Better web portal reporting. PDF report is not formatted very well
12. Review the scoring rubric for the Spot Mobility & Safety Category. I agree that Congestion Mitigation & Safety should receive a relatively high number of points when compared to other criteria. However, the current

methodology of assigning a proportionate share of points in these two criteria results in relatively low point totals for applications that weren't the top scorer (or close to it) in those two criteria.

13. More clarity within transit about project level application vs system level applications. The current guidelines provides a big advantage to system-level applications.

14. Recommend more points awarded to projects that take on a higher local match percentage, which in turn reduces the federal amount requested. This will help fund more projects.

15. I'd consider better understanding what school walk zones look like, what percentage of students live within those zones and what parents at the school identify as their primary barriers to more walking and bicycling. This usually comes out in a SRTS Plan, but in the instance that they are relying on a more general bike/ped plan or comp plan (or a SRTS plan that for some reason didn't capture and analyze this data)

16. Equity, safety, and other goals-based measures should be elevated, while measures of forecasted volume should be de-emphasized.

18. Look more closely at cost effectiveness

20. In my category, I was scoring it alone, so I had no one else to compare interpretations with. I had to rely on previous years examples.

21. We discussed the connections to future transitways "bonus" points, and after seeing the results, I think 15 out of 50 points is much too high of a number to award to routes that may or may not see that ridership when the transitway is completed. These points tipped the scales in a way that nullified any project that did not receive them. There is also some ambiguity in terms of what is a "Planned" transitway - connections to existing Blue/Green line stations, for example.

25. There needs to be more consideration of who is on the scoring committee. Include scorers who are familiar with the process and are experts in the technical area of the scoring measure.

26. Clearer guidance on how to approach the scoring of the different evaluation measures I think would be helpful.

27. Pedestrian bridges were submitted in 3 categories, across 2 modes (Transit, Multiuse Trails, and Pedestrian). The Reg Sol evaluation should address having a stand along Ped Bridge category or create more guidance for these types of applications.

28. Focus equity scoring on the population groups that have experienced the most historical discrimination/adverse effects (i.e. people of color, people with disabilities, people with lower incomes). Age is not as meaningful a group for this measure for transportation; someone who has secure financial resources and able bodied is not at a disadvantage automatically because they are 65 or older. On the other end, Safe Routes to School also illustrates this - in the realm of those who do Safe Routes to School work, when they talk about equity, it's often focused more on people of color and those with lower incomes, not just all youth because they're young. Consider MnDOT's STEPP tool for SRTS equity [http://www.dot.state.mn.us/saferoutes/equity-atlas.html] for use in that category and consider eliminating age alone as a consideration to better focus this on those who have experienced more impacts over time.

5. Are there any other things you would change about solicitation scoring?

1. No

2. I think the trail category is too large and the type of projects submitted is so diverse it can be hard to compare them. A bike/ped bridge is very different from a trail project and trail projects vary widely in issues trying to be addressed.

6.
   o Anything that could be done to create consistency across the responses from applicants would be very helpful.
   o I think explaining to application writers how the scoring process works as far as it's divided up into sections by questions and scorers don't read the whole application would help.

7. Really talk to the scoring TACs and PACs about whether or not we want to continue to use the housing performance score, which we no longer use for LCA fund consideration.

8. No

11. Add criteria related to climate change.

12.
   o Confirm that Cost Effectiveness is a good criteria to continue using.

- o Seek out opportunities to measure usage (people biking, people driving, people walking, and people using transit).
- o I'm unsure if Forecasted Usage will be a good criteria in the 2022 Regional Solicitation given the impacts caused by COVID-19.

15. It is a pretty complex system, and opportunities to simplify while maintaining a fair and just system would be helpful.
16. I didn't score this area, but I found the transit ridership scores questionable. The method should be refined to capture the direct benefits of a transit facility (e.g. station elevator, station building). Some projects that will benefit very few users got high ridership scores. The method should count through-riders or riders from nearby stops.
18. More detailed discussion about equity and how it may work into other categories
19. I'm mixed on how open ended the scoring was in the sense that I could set up the scoring almost any way that I chose. I liked the flexibility and freedom to identify what was important, but it also may have been nice to have some consistent factors. For example: closing a regional bicycle barrier always receives X % of the score and then build around that important criteria. This idea probably needs more thought put into it if it were to advance in the next cycle.
20. I think each category should have a minimum of two people on it.
21. I wonder if there needs to be a little more oversight into which projects qualify for which categories. In the transit modernization category, there was a project that scored quite well that is clearly a pedestrian/bike project that happens to be near transit. I know the team puts a lot of time and effort into balancing where funds are allocated, so I think projects that are awarded each pot of funds should reflect that.
24. There were no issues with my category of 1B Connection to Jobs/Students, 2A Current Daily person throughput, and 2B 2040 ADT, well at least once I got my head around what I was supposed to do.
25. Need to revisit and provide guidance to scorer/committee on when to apply the outlier calculation to their scoring measure. This is very difficult to decide on without guidance and impacts scores drastically.
26. I appreciate the desire to have F&P members chair the scoring committees, and I think it could be helpful to revisit that based on the agencies that so many represent being the agencies submitting project funding applications. Perhaps a co-chair format could help in that regard, in the event that one of their agencies is contesting scores in the same funding category?
28. Look at recommendations for pedestrian safety from the work just starting now with the pedestrian safety action plan to see if there are improvements from the quantitative work in that

6. Please provide any comments you have on your application scoring experience. Please highlight specific issues that can be addressed for the next Regional Solicitation. Examples could include imbalances in score distribution, criteria that are too rigid or lacking in specificity, or lack of clarity in the scoring guidelines.
1. The committee meeting, even entirely online, provided an example to discuss this completely, and resolve disputes or differences in understanding. It was well done, and I hope to be part of this again in the future.
2. I would take a hard look at the criteria that have a high degree of subjectivity and see if there are ways to standardize them or clarify in the scoring criteria. I think the multimodal and the gaps/deficiencies are still fairly subjective in the multiuse trails category. Some subjectivity will always be needed for applicants to be able to tell the "story" of why a project is needed beyond what data can tell you. But I'm concerned that when scorers have to develop their own system to differentiate between projects, it becomes unfair to the applicants (and is time consuming for scorers).
6.
- o Determining how to weight applications seeking operating dollars vs. applications with construction/infrastructure pieces is difficult and there is no scoring guidance on that piece.
- o Sharing with Metro Transit that their responses are lacking in detail would be beneficial for the next round.
7. Brain dump of thoughts for next cycle before I forget: I don't think it is appropriate to award points for just housing nearby without a meaningful connection in future application cycles, but responses were just so completely all over the place this round. Many communities that put some meaningful effort into answering the question would have been awarded zero points along with communities that refused to answer the question, and I don't want to completely discourage good effort which I see as a first step to more appropriate responses in the

future. I have made some notes in the "appropriate to share with communities" comments column about what I would expect to see in future years. To receive full points or as many points as I awarded this year. Another reason I decided to score this way was to give us more helpful scoring to use in analysis of this scoring criteria split (HPS vs meaningful connection) to discuss with scoring committees as we consider scoring for the 2024 cycle. Anecdotally and without looking into the data, I think at least an even split of HPS to meaningful connection would be fairer across the region /and/ more meaningful, see project 14069 as an example of why. Happy to talk more about the reasoning we discussed with the Community Development Committee of the Council to stop using the HPS altogether for LCA grant scoring.

8. I think it all balances out in the end. Once the criteria are set, everyone is scored the same and it becomes defensible.

12.
    - o Continue exploring opportunities to utilize StreetLight.
    - o Provide additional guidance to applicants on how to effectively respond to the new Housing Performance Measure (affordable housing options within 0.5 miles of the project).
    - o Revisit the Congestion & Air Quality Criteria within the Reconstruction Category. It's fairly common for projects to propose a new design that causes a reduced Level of Service for people driving, however, that new design offers substantial improvements in terms of accessibility and/or safety.

16. Guidance around current and forecast volume should be tightened. Applicants should be required to submit volumes for a segment representative of a project as a whole (e.g. midpoint), not the segment that inflates volume as much as possible. The guidance should explicitly state an authoritative source for current volumes and require its use. I not considering applicant models for forecast volumes; Council staff are preparing this for all projects anyway, would be most fair to compare regional projects on the same footing. If applicant forecasts are retained, the guidance should provide a decision tree when to accept or reject an applicant's forecast over the Council's forecast.

20. Despite this being my first time, I was relieved when I saw how other people scored their categories and it made me feel like my interpretation/judging/scoring was in line with expectations.

21. Dealing with outliers should be a standardized process. Planned transitway points should be balanced to not disqualify other projects. As a whole, I thought Ridership could stand to be weighed a little heavier overall.

22. I had many issues with the layout and right of way sections, which required me to change scores, which, in some cases, ended up causing an appeal. I would like to re-visit the criteria prior to the next solicitation. Need to address projects with MnDOT layout requirements, and better define what a layout is, to eliminate the submittal of a color crayon type drawing. Also need to try to define right of way more; even though, it appears to be clear to most, some agencies are not understanding that any acquisition of land is right of way acquisition.

24. If there could be better definitions on what an approved layout means.

25. A few items from the new Spot Mobility category that came up from Committee:
    - o Measure 1B - Truck Corridor Tiers - was not a good fit for this category - need to look at other way to weight freight impact and/or decrease amount of points within this measure.
    - o Measure 7 - Cost-effectiveness - had a large impact on project ranking, which was unlike other roadway categories. Should discuss this impact and if this is OK or unintended consequences of this being smaller project category.
    - o Overall - as mentioned above there was a major issue across categories with how the new Pedestrian safety measure was scored. This was supposed to consider safety countermeasures incorporated into the project but was scored based on qualitative items such as system connectivity and destinations.

26. I have participated in scoring for a few solicitations now. First time as chair this year and felt a little lost and I would have benefitted from clarification on the expectations of that role.
    - o Funding Categories: Pedestrian/bicycle bridges and under crossings were applied for across several categories – in the spirit of improving access across regional barriers, could there be a pedestrian/bicycle grade separated crossing specific funding category?
    - o Corridor Studies: Funding studies along an identified network of corridors in the region could aid in developing projects that are more supportive of both achieving the Thrive MSP outcomes, and addressing the performance-based goals.
    - o On the overall regional solicitation process, I appreciate the chance between solicitations to reflect on the process and consider opportunities for improvement.

- o I would welcome the possibility of reimagining the process in a way that centers Equity to inform the overall approach to regional transportation investment. Neither equity, nor the goal of Healthy and Equitable Communities can be fully realized without applying an equity lens to ALL of the goals, objectives and key outcomes, performance measures, and evaluation criteria.
- o How do the funding categories, performance measures, evaluation criteria and investment record of past projects funding through the solicitation help or hinder the ability to achieve equitable outcomes?
- o Regarding geographic considerations around distribution of regional federal funds: Geographic balance/distribution runs the risk of perpetuating inequitable outcomes across the region's communities and residents. How might equity be applied to the consideration of geographic distribution across the region and lead in developing a regional definition of "geographic balance" that helps guide investment? What disparities exist across the region today regarding the benefit provided in pursuing the regional transportation goals and key outcomes? How can a geographic balance be leveraged to help advance equity? How could an equity lens be applied to each of the other outcomes and performance areas?

28.

- o Some issues need to be addressed with how applicants answered questions to ensure consistency and clarity in instructions and scoring. At least one applicant referenced an attachment as part of their word-limited response. Is this acceptable? (It didn't end up mattering in their case because the attachment wasn't applicable.) Do scorers really need to wade through long attachments because the applicant couldn't be bothered to address the question?
- o Also need clear instructions on radius used for population numbers. Applicants varied; some cited county-wide numbers (which were not helpful), others used consistent smaller radius. Needs to be the same within the same application category with clear instructions to applicants so scorers don't have to figure out how to handle inconsistencies like this and all applicants are working from the same base.
- o Equity scorers weren't automatically consistent across different categories/scorers, but a concerted effort was made going into the process to aim for this. Understand that the process is qualitative, and we are all human. We aren't comparing applications across categories, just within each category.
- o Clarify if scorers should be looking at answers to other questions other than the ones they are scoring so that is consistent.

Transportation Advisory Board

of the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities

Information Item

DATE:	March 5, 2021
TO:	Transportation Advisory Board
PREPARED BY:	Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (joseph.barbeau@metc.state.mn.us) Steve Peterson, Manager of Highways and TAB/TAC Process (steven.peterson@metc.state.mn.us)
SUBJECT:	Sensitivity Analysis of the 2020 Regional Solicitation Measures

This information item presents a sensitivity analysis of the scoring measures used in the 2020 Regional Solicitation. The analysis repeats what was completed after Regional Solicitations dating back to 2014 and is meant to help point to any needed changes to scoring measures for the next Regional Solicitation (2022).

In this analysis, measures were evaluated on how they impacted application rankings, which ultimately contribute to which projects were funded. The key findings of this analysis include the following:

1. Across most application categories measures with higher point values tend to have had a larger impact on application rankings. This suggests that these higher point value measures are generally performing as intended.
2. There are very few underperforming measures.
3. In 2016, one of the key obstacles to differentiation was scoring outliers (e.g., when one project scored 100 points on a measure and the rest of the applications only scored one or two points, rendering the measure meaningless) as staff identified 18 measures as outliers. Enabling scoring committees to adjust for outliers improved this situation. The analysis for 2018 identifies only three measures as outliers and only one is identified for 2020, after adjustments. It should be noted that there is no definition for what constitutes an outlier, nor how to correct for one.

Evaluation Method

There are between nine and 16 measures per application category. Each of these measures was assigned a point value based largely on the results of the Regional Solicitation Evaluation and Redesign in 2013 and 2014. Then, submitted applications were scored on each of the measures, adding to a total score out of 1,100 possible points. Tables 1 through 11 present the measures used to evaluate each application category. Each measure is presented with three statistics: Impact on ranked order, applications that cross the "funding line," and standard deviation.

Impact on Ranked Order when a Measure is Removed
The primary gauge for evaluating a measure's actual impact in the 2020 Regional Solicitation is how many applications change their rank position within an application subcategory if that measure is removed. Measures that have a large impact on how the applications score relative to each other have more potential to impact a funding decision.

Impact on the Funding Line when a Measure is Removed
Changes in ranked order sometimes cause an application to move above or below the TAB-approved funding line. It is important to note that movement across the line tends to be a fairly arbitrary statistic, as that line is not predictable. Further, it is not a given that the flipping of two applications across that line would have resulted in funding the application that moved up (and not funding the application that

moved down), as point spread, geographic impacts, and federal funding request amounts could move funding from one category to another.

Standard Deviation
To further explore the potential for a measure to contribute to an application's funding decision, each measure's standard deviation is calculated. Higher standard deviations usually suggest scores that are widely spaced, though it is possible for outliers to skew standard deviations. Lower standard deviations indicate score clustering. Standard deviation also depends on the number of points allocated to a measure, with higher-value measures expected to have generally higher standard deviations.

Findings

Overall Findings
Overall, the measures create differentiation, as intended. There are few counterintuitive results. Lower-performing measures tend to be measures with lower values. Few individual measures are significantly impactful. This may point to tweaks, which are often complicating factors, to individual measures as counterproductive.

Roadways Findings
For three established roadways funding categories (Strategic Capacity, Reconstruction/Modernization, and Bridge), the measures were roughly as difference-making as expected. The fourth established category, Traffic Management Technologies only received five applications and no conclusions are able to be made, except that all eight applications over the previous two cycles scored the same points in Measure 1A, Functional Classification.

Spot Mobility and Safety was a new funding category for 2020. The scoring measures were generally impactful with the most surprising result being Measure 5, Multimodal, impacting the ranking of nine out of 10 projects, which somewhat overperforms its standard deviation (27) and point value (100) relative to the other measures.

Transit/Travel Demand Management (TDM) Findings
As expected, the two transit application categories saw the most impact in their 350- and 325-point Usage measures (Measure 2). There are some deviations from expectation in Transit Modernization (see page 10) but with only nine applications, this could be an anomaly.

Bicycle/Pedestrian Findings
In the Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities application category, each of the nine measures changed the ranking of at least 21 of the 37 applications, which is in large part due to the bunching of scores. Pedestrian Facilities and Safe Routes to School showed no surprises.

Strategies for Underperforming Measures
While this does not seem to be a significant issue for the 2020 Regional Solicitation, for lower-impact measures or measures that are not distinguishing applications as intended, there are several strategies that can be employed:
- Do nothing. Some measures may serve to improve all applications even if they do not differentiate scores.
- Change the number of points allocated to the measure.
- Change the measure's scoring guidance or applicant instructions.
- Convert the measure to a required qualification instead of a scoring measure.
- Remove the measure.

Key for Tables 1-11:

Rank order changed: How many applications changed in ranked order by including that measure.	**Crossed funding line:** How many applications flipped across the TAB-approved funding line by including that measure.
St. dev.: Standard deviation; a measure of how clustered or spread out application scores are.	**Outliers:** Those denoted by letters (e.g., A or B) were adjusted during the scoring process while those denoted by numbers (e.g., 1 or 2) were not adjusted. There is no definition of an outlier; the numbered outliers are included in this analysis based on staff judgement.

Table 1. Summary of Traffic Management Technologies Measure Performance (5 applications; 2 funded)

Criteria	#	Measures	Max Points	Rank order changed	Crossed funding line*	St. Dev.	Outliers (None)
				# of applications:			
Regional Role	1A	Functional Classification	50	0	0	0	
	1B	Reg. Truck Corridor Study Tiers	50	0	0	14	
	1C	Integration with existing systems	50	2	0	9	
	1D	Coordination with Other Agencies	25	2	0	2	
Usage	2A	Daily person throughput	85	**4**	**1**	17	
	2B	Forecast 2040 average daily traffic	40	3	**1**	8	
Equity / Housing	3A	Socio-Economic	50	2	0	12	
	3B	Housing	50	0	0	11	
Infra Age	4	Infrastructure Age	75	3	**1**	22	
Congestion / Air Quality	5A	Vehicle delay reduced	**150**	3	**1**	**42**	
	5B	Kg of emissions reduced	50	2	**1**	9	
Safety	6A	Crashes reduced	50	2	0	19	
	6B	Safety Issues	**150**	**4**	**1**	28	
Multimodal	7	Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections	50	0	0	12	
Risk	8	Risk Assessment Form	75	2	**1**	10	
Cost Effect	9	Cost Effectiveness	100	3	**1**	19	
		TOTAL	**1,100**			79	

The number indicates projects that moved above the funding line. For each such instance, another project moved below the funding line. This is the case on Tables 1-11.

Comments: Given the low number of applications (5), very little can be gleaned. This is the second consecutive cycle for which measure 1A saw all applications (3 and 5 applications, respectively) scored the full 50 points (adjusted to the maximum because the projects are all on A-minor arterials).

Key differences from 2018: No key differences are evident, given the minimal number of applications.

#	Measure (Sorted by Max Points)	Max Pts	Rank Change	Cross Line	St. Dev
6B	Safety Issues	**150**	**4**	**1**	28
5A	Vehicle delay reduced	**150**	3	**1**	**42**
9A	Cost Effectiveness	100	3	**1**	19
2A	Throughput	85	**4**	**1**	17
4	Infrastructure Age	75	3	**1**	22
8	Risk Assessment	75	2	**1**	10
3A	Equity	50	2	0	12
3B	Housing	50	2	0	12
1A	Functional Class	50	0	0	0
1B	Truck Study	50	2	0	2
1C	Integration w/Systems	50	2	0	9
6A	Crashes reduced	50	2	0	19
7	Multimodal	50	0	0	12
5B	Emissions	50	2	**1**	9
2B	Forecast ADT	40	3	**1**	8
1D	Coordination/Agencies	25	2	0	2

Table 2. Spot Mobility and Safety Measure Performance (10 applications; 4 funded)

Criteria	#	Measures	Max Points	# of applications: Rank order changed	# of applications: Crossed funding line	St. Dev.	Outliers (None)
Regional Role	1A	Congestion, PA intersection conversion, CMSP	100	4	0	23	
	1B	Reg. Truck Corridor Study Tiers	75	5	**1**	35	
Equity / Housing	2A	Socio-Economic	50	3	**1**	17	
	2B	Housing	50	7	0	19	
Congestion / Air Quality	3A	Vehicle delay reduced	200	7	**1**	**79**	
	3B	Kg of emissions reduced	75	3	**1**	26	
Safety	4A	Crashes reduced	**225**	6	**1**	67	
	4B	Ped crash reduction	50	6	**1**	11	
Multimodal	5	Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections	100	**9**	**1**	27	
Risk	6	Risk Assessment Form	75	2	0	12	
Cost Effect	7	Cost Effectiveness	100	4	**1**	29	
		TOTAL	**1,100**			122	

Comments: While the standard deviations are not unusually large, several measures did cause the majority of applications to change their rankings. Most notably, nine applications changed in ranking due to the Multimodal measure (Measure 5), including one that decreased by three spots. Since this measure only had a standard deviation of 27, it could be argued that vehicle delay reduction, with a standard deviation of 79 and impact on the ranking of seven projects, is the most impactful measure in the category. At least two projects* changed rankings in each measure.

Measure 1B was also impactful in that the top three projects were the only projects that scored points (75, 65, and 75, respectively). Removal of that measure would cause those projects to be ranked, 3, 4, and 5, respectively.

Key differences from 2018: N/A. This is a new funding category.

Sorted by Max Points		Max	Rank	Cross	St.
#	Measure	Pts	Change	Line	Dev
4A	Crashes reduced	**225**	6	**1**	67
3A	Vehicle delay reduced	200	7	**1**	**79**
1A	Congestion, PA, CMSP	100	4	0	23
5	Multimodal	100	**9**	**1**	27
6	Cost Effectiveness	100	4	**1**	29
1B	Truck Study	75	5	**1**	35
3B	Emissions	75	3	**1**	26
6	Risk Assessment	75	2	0	12
3A	Equity	50	3	**1**	17
3B	Housing	50	7	0	19
4B	Ped crash reduction	50	6	**1**	12

*it is not possible for exactly one project to change ranking.

Table 3. Summary of Strategic Capacity Measure Performance (17 applications; 10 funded)

Criteria	#	Measures	Max Points	# of applications: Rank order changed	# of applications: Crossed funding line	St. dev.	Outliers
Regional Role	1A	Congestion/PA Intersection Study	80	9	0	30	A
	1B	Connection to Total Jobs and Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs	50	8	0	16	B
	1C	Regional Truck Corridor Study	80	**12**	**1**	29	
Usage	2A	Daily person throughput	110	7	0	30	
	2B	Forecast 2040 average daily traffic	65	5	0	18	
Equity / Housing	3A	Socio-Economic	50	6	**1**	15	
	3B	Housing	50	5	0	18	
Infra.	4	Date of construction	40	5	0	12	
Congestion / Air Quality	5A	Vehicle delay reduced	100	3	0	26	
	5B	Kg of emissions reduced	50	3	0	18	
Safety	6	Crashes reduced	**120**	7	**1**	**34**	
	6B	Ped crash reduced	30	5	0	8	
Multimodal	7	Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections	100	7	0	19	
Risk Assess.	8	Risk Assessment Form	75	3	0	10	
Cost Effect.	9	Cost Effectiveness	100	10	0	23	
		TOTAL	**1,100**			**154**	

Comments: Most measures were impactful, with all measures impacting the ranking of at least three out of 17 applications. Vehicle Delay (Measure 5A) seems to have underproduced, along Risk Assessment (Measure 8).

Measures with outliers:
  A. 1A. The total score is the highest of three separate components. The "Congestion on Adjacent Parallel component included an outlier (72% decrease) so the applications were scored proportionality to the second-highest project (56%). This improved the scores of five projects.
  B. 1B. Similarly, the total score here is the highest score of three different components. The "Employment within one mile" component included an outlier (10,285) so the applications were scored proportionality to the second-highest project (9,363). This improved the score for nine projects.

Key differences from 2018: None.

Sorted by Max Points

#	Measure	Max Pts	Rank Change	Cross Line	St. Dev
6	Crashes reduced	**120**	7	**1**	**34**
2A	Throughput	110	7	0	30
7	Multimodal	100	7	0	19
5A	Vehicle Delay	100	3	0	26
9	Cost Effectiveness	100	10	0	23
1A	Congestion/PA	80	9	0	30
1C	Reg. Truck Study	80	**12**	**1**	29
8	Risk Assessment	75	3	0	10
2B	Forecast ADT	65	5	0	18
3A	Equity	50	6	**1**	15
3B	Housing	50	5	0	18
5B	Emissions	50	3	0	18
1B	Connection to Jobs	50	8	0	16
4	Construction date	40	5	0	12
6B	Ped crash reduced	30	5	0	8

Table 4. Summary of Roadway Reconstruction / Modernization Measure Performance (17 applications submitted; 4 funded).

Criteria	#	Measures	Max Points	# of applications: Rank order changed	# of applications: Crossed funding line	St. Dev.	Outliers (None)
Regional Role	1A	Connection to Total Jobs and Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs	65	11	0	11	
	1B	Reg. Truck Corridor Study Tiers	40	6	0	12	
Usage	2A	Daily person throughput	110	10	0	**26**	
	2B	Forecast 2040 average daily traffic	65	10	0	13	
Equity / Housing	3A	Socio-Economic	50	2	0	8	
	3B	Housing	50	3	0	20	
Infrastructure Age	4A	Date of construction	50	6	0	11	
	4B	Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies	125	7	0	23	
Congestion / Air Quality	5A	Vehicle delay reduced	50	8	0	8	
	5B	Kg of emissions reduced	30	8	0	8	
Safety	6A	Crashes reduced	**150**	**12**	1	**26**	
	6B	Proactive Ped Crash Reduction	30	3	0	6	
Multimodal	7	Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections	110	8	0	23	
Risk Assess.	8	Risk Assessment Form	75	2	0	10	
Cost Effect.	9	Cost Effectiveness	100	6	0	20	
		TOTAL	**1,100**			**97**	

Comments: No surprising results.

Key differences from 2018: None.

Sorted by Max Points					
#	Measure	Max Pts	Rank Change	Cross Line	St. Dev
6	Crashes	**150**	**12**	**1**	**26**
4B	Deficiencies	125	7	0	23
2A	Throughput	110	10	0	**26**
7	Multimodal	110	8	0	23
9	Cost Effect.	100	6	0	20
8	Risk	75	2	0	10
1A	Jobs	65	11	0	11
2B	Forecast ADT	65	10	0	13
4A	Construction Date	50	6	0	11
3A	Equity	50	2	0	8
3B	Housing	50	3	0	20
5A	Delay reduced	50	8	0	8
1B	Truck Study	40	6	0	12
5B	Emissions	30	8	0	8
6B	Ped Crash	30	3	0	6

Table 5. Summary of Bridges Measure Performance (7 applications submitted; 2 funded).

Criteria	#	Measures	Max Points	# of applications: Rank order changed	# of applications: Crossed funding line	St. Dev.	Outliers (None)
Regional Role	1A	Distance to nearest parallel bridge	100	3	**1**	27	
	1B	Connection to Total Jobs and Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs	30	1	0	11	
	1C	Reg. Truck Corridor Study Tiers	65	4	0	33	
Usage	2A	Daily person throughput	100	5	**1**	26	
	2B	Forecast 2040 average daily traffic	30	1	0	8	
Equity / Housing	3A	Socio-Economic	50	3	0	10	
	3B	Housing	50	1	0	5	
Infrastructure Condition	4A	NBI Condition Rating	**300**	3	**1**	45	
	4B	Load-posting	100	5	**1**	**53**	
Multimodal	5	Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections	100	3	0	18	
Risk Assessment	6	Risk Assessment Form	75	1	0	10	
Cost Effectiveness	7	Cost Effectiveness	100	**6**	0	35	
		TOTAL	1,100			87	

Comments: With only seven applications submitted, conclusions are difficult to draw. The category-specific measures (4A and 4B) are both very impactful, NBI condition (4A) because of its 300-point value and load-posting (4B) because of its all-or-none scoring. One unfunded project would likely have been funded had the bridge been load-posted.

Key differences from 2018: None.

Sorted by Max Points #	Measure	Max Pts	Rank Change	Cross Line	St. Dev
4A	NBI Condition Rate	**300**	3	**1**	**45**
1A	Distance to Parallel	100	3	**1**	27
4B	Load-posting	100	5	**1**	53
7	Cost Effectiveness	100	**6**	0	35
2A	Throughput	100	5	**1**	26
5	Multimodal	100	3	0	18
6	Risk Assessment	75	1	0	10
1C	Heavy Commercial	65	4	0	33
3A	Equity	50	3	0	10
3B	Housing	50	1	0	5
1B	Connection to Jobs	30	1	0	11
2B	Forecast ADT	30	1	0	8

Table 6. Summary of Transit Expansion Measure Performance (10 applications submitted; 4 funded*).

Criteria	#	Measures	Max Points	Rank order changed	Crossed funding line	St. Dev.	Outliers (None)
				# of applications:			
Regional Role	1A	Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	50	4	**1**	17	
	1B	Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project	50	4	**1**	16	
Usage	2	New Annual Riders	**350**	**6**	1	**97**	
Equity / Housing	3A	Socio-Economic	150	2	**1**	13	
	3B	Housing	50	0	0	5	
Emissions Reduction	4	Total emissions reduced	200	0	0	55	
Multimodal	5	Bicycle and pedestrian elements and connections	100	4	0	17	
Risk Assessment	6	Risk Assessment Form	50	0	0	5	
Cost Effectiveness	7	Cost Effectiveness	100	2	0	27	
	TOTAL		**1,100**			**167**	

*Only three projects were funded, with the top-ranked project skipped due to limitations on funding of BRT projects and projects on the same corridor. For the purpose of this analysis, this project is considered funded.

Comments: New Annual Riders (Measure 2) proved to be a key differentiator, as six of ten applications changed rank with its removal. This makes sense given its 350-point value. Measure 4, Emissions Reduction, worth 200 points, did not change the rank order of any project. However, the spread of the scores here is significant, indicating that this lack of impact is an anomaly. Eight of the ten applications scored 50 out of 50 in risk assessment, though this could change in 2022 if all applicants are required to respond to the public outreach question.

Key differences from 2018: Measure 4 was more impactful in 2018 (changed rank of 3 out of 9 applications), but as discussed above, this cycle's lack of impact was probably an anomaly.

Sorted by Max Points		Max Pts	Rank Change	Cross Line	St. Dev
#	Measure				
2	New Riders	**350**	**6**	**1**	**97**
4	Emissions	200	0	0	55
3A	Equity	150	2	**1**	13
5	Multimodal	100	4	0	17
7	Cost Effect.	100	2	0	27
3B	Housing	50	0	0	5
1A	Jobs/Edu	50	4	**1**	17
1B	Trips	50	4	**1**	16
6	Risk Assessment	50	0	0	5

Table 7. Summary of Transit Modernization Measure Performance (9 applications submitted; 6 funded*).

Criteria	#	Measures	Max Points	# of applications: Rank order changed	# of applications: Crossed funding line	St. Dev.	Outliers
Regional Role	1A	Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	50	3	0	16	1
	1B	Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project	50	3	0	15	A
Usage	2	Total existing annual riders	**325**	5	0	**94**	B
Equity / Housing	3A	Socio-Economic	125	3	0	19	
	3B	Housing	50	0	0	10	
Emissions Reduction	4	Description of emissions reduced	50	4	0	16	
Service and Customer Improvements	5	Project improvements for users	200	2	0	30	
Multimodal	6	Bicycle and pedestrian elements and connections	100	**6**	0	36	
Risk	7	Risk Assessment Form	50	2	0	16	
Cost Effect.	8	Cost Effectiveness	100	3	0	35	
		TOTAL	**1,100**			**146**	

*Only four projects were funded, with the third- and fifth- ranked projects skipped due to limitations on funding of BRT projects. For the purpose of this analysis, these projects are considered funded.

Comments: There are slight diversions from expectations. For example, Measure 5, at 200 points, appears to be one of the least-impactful measures. But for the most part, the performance is consistent with expectations.

Measures with outliers:
1. Top scoring project scored 50 with no others scoring over 9.
A. For existing trips component, treated farebox upgrade (regional) and Gold Line (magnitude) as outliers with full points. Provided full points to Burnsville Bus Garage Modernization and adjusted the remaining projects proportionate to that.
B. Treated farebox upgrade (regional) and Gold Line (magnitude) as outliers with full points. Provided full points to Burnsville Bus Garage Modernization and adjusted the remaining projects proportionate to that.

Key differences from 2018: Measure 5 was far more impactful in 2018 (four of 10 applications changed and a standard deviation of 84).

Sorted by Max Points

#	Measure	Max Pts	Rank Change	Cross Line	St. Dev
2	Existing Riders	**325**	5	0	**94**
5	User Improvements	200	2	0	30
3A	Equity	125	3	0	19
6	Multimodal	100	**6**	0	36
8	Cost Effectiveness	100	3	0	35
3B	Housing	50	0	0	10
1A	Jobs/Edu	50	3	0	16
1B	Trips	50	3	0	15
4	Emissions	50	4	0	16
7	Risk Assessment	50	2	0	16

Table 8. Summary of Travel Demand Management Measure Performance (4 applications submitted; 4 funded).

Criteria	#	Measures	Max Points	# of applications: Rank order changed	# of applications: Crossed funding line	St. Dev.	Outliers (None)
Regional Role	1	Ability to capitalize on existing regional transportation facilities and resources	**200**	0	N/A	34	
Usage	2	Users	100	0	N/A	33	
Equity / Housing	3A	Socio-Economic	100	0	N/A	10	
	3B	Housing	50	0	N/A	1	
Congestion Reduction / Air Quality	4A	Congested roadways	150	0	N/A	61	
	4B	VMT reduced	150	0	N/A	**69**	
Innovation	5	Project innovations and geographic expansion	**200**	0	N/A	62	
Risk Assessment	6A	Technical capacity of organization	25	0	N/A	3	
	6B	Continuation of project after initial federal funds are expended	25	0	N/A	11	
Cost Effectiveness	7	Cost Effectiveness	100	0	N/A	14	
		TOTAL	**1,100**			**191**	

Comments: Only four applications were submitted and the closest total scoring gap between any two of them was 135 points. Therefore, no single scoring measure impacted the rankings. This appears to be more an issue of overall project quality than ineffectiveness of any measure. The higher-valued scoring measures tend to create separation that would be meaningful with more evenly-matched projects, or simply more projects.

Key differences from 2018: In 2018, 13 applications were submitted. Therefore, there were closer scoring gaps and the measures were difference making. The standard deviations in 2020 follow a nearly identical pattern to 2018.

Sorted by max points				
#	Measure	Max Pts	Rank Change	Cross Line	St. Dev
5	Innovation/Expansion	**200**	0	0	62
1	Facilities/Resources	**200**	0	0	34
4A	Congestion	150	0	0	61
4B	VMT reduced	150	0	0	**69**
7	Cost Effectiveness	100	0	0	14
2	Users	100	0	0	33
3A	Equity	100	0	0	10
3B	Housing	50	0	0	1
6A	Technical Capacity	25	0	0	3
6B	Project continuation	25	0	0	11

Table 9. Summary of Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities Measure Performance (37 applications submitted; 11 funded).

Criteria	#	Measures	Max Points	Rank order changed	Crossed funding line	St. Dev.	Outliers (None)
Regional Role	1	Identify location of project relative to RBTN*	**200**	**31**	**2**	39	
Potential Usage	2	Existing population and employment within 1 mile	**200**	28	0	**42**	
Equity / Housing	3A	Socio-Economic	70	25	0	18	
	3B	Housing	50	21	0	13	
Deficiencies and Safety	4A	Gaps closed, barriers removed, and / or improved connectivity between jurisdictions	100	23	1	13	
	4B	Deficiencies corrected or safety problems addressed	150	26	**2**	19	
Multimodal	5	Transit or pedestrian elements and connections	100	22	0	10	
Risk Assessment	6	Risk Assessment Form	130	25	1	19	
Cost Effectiveness	7	Cost Effectiveness	100	30	**2**	22	
		TOTAL	**1,100**			98	

Regional Bicycle Transportation Network

Comments: As is always the case, this category has had significant "bunching" of scores near the funding line (particularly between the lowest-scoring funded project and the four highest-scoring unfunded projects). This is due at least in part to the number of applications. The measure that stands out the most is Measure 1, Location Relative to the RBTN, which changed the rank order of all but six applications. And while it only caused two projects to drop below (and, therefore, two to move above) the funding line, it easily had the highest average change in ranking, including one project ranked 32 that would be ranked 12 without the measure. This relates to the number of applications for projects within/along an RBTN corridor or alignment (27, with eight having direct connection and two not connected.) those projects with no connection to the RBTN (50 points) are greatly impacted. The standard deviation is not exceptionally large and it appears that the reason for the impact on 31 rankings (including 31 of 34 outside of the top-3) is because one low-scoring project can cause a large shift in rank as evidenced by the average rank change, amongst those that changed, of 4.6, while no other measure has a rank change higher than 2.75.

Each measure changed the rank order of at least 20 applications and no clear cause of the "bunching" problem, aside from volume of applications, is evident.

Key differences from 2018: None.

Sorted by Max Points					
#	Measure	Max Pts	Rank Change	Cross Line	St. Dev
1	RBTN	**200**	**31**	**2**	39
2	Pop/Employment	**200**	28	0	**42**
4B	Deficiencies	150	26	**2**	19
6	Risk Assessment	130	25	1	19
4A	Gaps/Barriers	100	23	1	13
5	Multimodal	100	22	0	10
7	Cost Effectiveness	100	30	**2**	22
3A	Equity	70	25	0	18
3B	Housing	50	21	0	13

Table 10. Summary of Pedestrian Facilities Measure Performance (8 applications submitted; 8 funded).

Criteria	#	Measures	Max Points	Rank order changed	Crossed funding line	St. Dev.	Outliers
Regional Role	1	Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	150	**6**	N/A	**53**	A, 1
Potential Usage	2	Existing population within ½ mile	150	4	N/A	42	1
Equity / Housing	3A	Socio-Economic	70	2	N/A	25	1
	3B	Housing	50	3	N/A	14	
Deficiencies and Safety	4A	Barriers overcome or gaps filled	120	2	N/A	16	
	4B	Deficiencies corrected or safety problems addressed	**180**	**6**	N/A	49	
Multimodal	5	Transit or bicycle elements and connections	150	2	N/A	40	1
Risk Assessment	6	Risk Assessment Form	130	3	N/A	33	
Cost Effectiveness	7	Cost Effectiveness	100	2	N/A	32	
		TOTAL	**1,100**			**151**	

(The header "# of applications:" spans the Rank order changed and Crossed funding line columns.)

Comments: Since all projects were funded no measures led to projects crossing the funding line.

Measures with outliers:
A. The total employment and enrollment of the City of Minneapolis Phillips Neighborhood Pedestrian project was more than triple that of the second-highest-scoring project. Therefore, the top-two projects were awarded full points with the remaining projects adjusted proportionally to the second-ranked project.
1. The top-scoring project was dominant to the point that it scored more than double the points of any competitors on four measures (even after the adjustment on measure 1, the top two were still nearly triple the third project). While this reduced the spread for the other projects, it did not eliminate it and measures 2, 3A, and 5 probably did not need to be adjusted. However, the overall spread of projects 2-8 would have been truer had project 1 been removed and recorded as scoring 1,100 points.

Key differences from 2018: None.

Sorted by Max Points					
#	Measure	Max Pts	Rank Change	Cross Line	St. Dev
4B	Deficiencies/Safety	**180**	**6**	0	49
1	Jobs/Edu	150	**6**	0	**53**
2	Population	150	4	0	42
5	Multimodal	150	2	0	40
6	Risk Assessment	130	3	0	33
4A	Gaps/Barriers	120	2	0	16
7	Cost Effectiveness	100	2	0	32
3A	Equity	70	2	0	25
3B	Housing	50	3	0	14

Table 11. Summary of Safe Routes to School Measure Performance (6 applications submitted; 6 funded).

Criteria	#	Measures	Max Points	# of applications: Rank order changed	# of applications: Crossed funding line	St. Dev.	Outliers (None)
SRST Elements	1A	Describe how the project addresses 5 E's* of SRST Program	150	2	N/A	18	
	1B	SRTS Plan	100	0	N/A	20	
Usage	2A	Average share of student population that bikes or walks	**170**	**5**	N/A	**61**	
	2B	Student population within school's walkshed	80	2	N/A	26	
Equity / Housing	3A	Socio-Economic	70	0	N/A	18	
	3B	Housing	50	2	N/A	10	
Deficiencies / Safety	4A	Barriers overcome or gaps filled	100	4	N/A	30	
	4B	Deficiencies corrected or safety or security addressed	150	4	N/A	28	
Public Engagement / Risk Assessment	5A	Public engagement process	45	4	N/A	9	
	5B	Risk Assessment Form	85	2	N/A	15	
Cost Effectiveness	6	Cost Effectiveness	100	2	N/A	30	
		TOTAL	**1,100**			**104**	

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

Comments: Criterion 1 changed by adding 1B, SRTS Plan, which did not change any rank order. 1A moved from 250 to 150 points. Given the small sample size (eight in 2018 and six in 2020). It is difficult to state definitively, but the impact of the measure seems be have been reduced.

Key differences from 2018: As alluded to above, measure 1A, in being reduced from 250 points to 150 points changed the rank order of 6 applications in 2018 and only 2 in 2020. Those 100 points were moved to 1B, which does not seem to have been impactful.

Sorted by Max Points					
#	Measure	Max Pts	Rank Change	Cross Line	St. Dev
2A	Students that walk/bike	**170**	**5**	0	**61**
1A	5 E's	150	2	0	18
4B	Deficiencies/Safety	150	4	0	28
4A	Gaps/Barriers	100	4	0	30
1B	SRTS Plan	100	0	0	20
6	Cost Effectiveness	100	2	0	30
5B	Risk Assessment	85	2	0	15
2B	Students in walkshed	80	2	0	26
3A	Equity	70	0	0	18
3B	Housing	50	2	0	10
5A	Public engagement	45	4	0	9