

ACTION TRANSMITTAL 2016-04

DATE: December 30, 2015
TO: Technical Advisory Committee
FROM: TAC Funding and Programming Committee
PREPARED BY: Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)
Steve Peterson, Planning Analyst (651-602-1819)
Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator (651-602-1717)

SUBJECT: 2016 Regional Solicitation: Weighting of Criteria and Measures

REQUESTED ACTION: Recommend the weighting of the criteria and measures for the 2016 Regional Solicitation as shown in Attachments 1 through 5.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That TAC recommend to TAB the weighting of the criteria and measures for the 2016 Regional Solicitation as shown in Attachments 1 through 5.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF ACTION: The Regional Solicitation for federal transportation project funding is part of the Metropolitan Council's federally-required continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning process for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. Attachment 1 shows the criteria and the proposed weighting for the criteria for each of the application categories. Attachments 2 through 5 show the proposed changes to the distribution of points within criteria that have more than one measure for each application category.

PROPOSED CRITERIA WEIGHTING CHANGES:

For the most part, the recommended criteria weightings remain the same as within the 2014 Regional Solicitation. Proposed weighting changes are shown on Attachment 1 and the explanation of why the change is being recommended is shown below.

- Addition of Cost Effectiveness as a new criterion will require a change in the scoring for all application categories. Two key questions are:
 - 1) whether this criterion and its weighting (score) should be above the 1,000 point application total or included within the 1,000 point total? and,
 - 2) the number of points to be given to the Cost Effectiveness criteria.
- In 2014 the Bridge application category was the only application category that contained a stand-alone criterion and measure for cost effectiveness. If Cost Effectiveness is recommended to be scored above the 1,000 point application total, the points previously allocated to this Bridge criterion need to be redistributed to other criteria and measures. Based on general feedback from TAC F&P and TAC on the importance of a bridge's Role in the Regional Transportation System as measured by its distance to other parallel bridges (i.e., the further the distance, the more important the bridge to the regional transportation system) and the importance of bridges for freight movements (Usage criterion), staff suggests reallocating the 75 points among these two criteria as shown on Attachment 1.

- Under the Pedestrian Facility application category, staff suggests equalizing the distribution of the points between the criteria Role in the Regional System and Usage. The Role in the Regional System criterion is measured by connections to jobs while the Usage criterion is measured by existing population within a half mile of the project. The suggested change would make these two criteria (jobs and population) equal at 150 points each.
- Under the Safe Routes to School application category, staff suggests eliminating the Multimodal connections criterion and redistributing the 50 points to the Usage criterion. This is recommended because Safe Routes to School projects are typically focused on providing sidewalk connections and are not focused on providing other multimodal connections.

DISTRIBUTION OF POINTS WITHIN CRITERIA WITH MORE THAN ONE MEASURE:

Attachments 2 through 5 show proposed changes to the distribution of points among criteria that have more than one measure.

Attachment 2 Roadway Applications Measures

Roadway Expansion

- Based on the sensitivity analysis conducted after the 2014 Regional Solicitation, staff recommends increasing the points from 20 to 30 under measure C in Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy criterion to increase its potential impact in the next solicitation. This recommendation applies to all four Roadway applications.
- With the removal of measures A and B in the Multimodal Facilities criteria (recommended under AT 2016-03), all points are now included in new measure A (former measure C). This recommendation applies to all four Roadway applications.

Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization

- Staff recommends redistribution of points for measures A and B under Congestion Reduction/Air Quality (i.e., increase the emissions reduced measure from 25 to 30 points and decrease the vehicle delay reduced measure from 50 to 45 points) to increase the potential impact of the emissions reduced measure in the next solicitation.

Bridges

- Staff recommends reallocating points from the eliminated Cost Effectiveness criterion to two Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy measures and one Usage measure based on feedback at TAC F&P and TAC related to bridges. This is a suggested starting point for discussion on how to redistribute the 75 points from the former Cost Effectiveness criterion.

Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization

- Under several criteria (Usage, Emissions Reduction, and Multimodal Connections) measures were consolidated to one measure and the points were allocated to remaining measure.

TDM

- Under two criteria (Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy and Innovation), measures were consolidated into one measure and the points were allocated to the remaining measure.
- Under the Risk Assessment criterion, one measure was eliminated and the points reallocated to the remaining two measures.

Multiuse Trails/Bike and Pedestrian Facilities

- With the removal of measure A/B in Multimodal Facilities, all points are included in new measure A (former measure C).

Safe Routes to Schools

- Points from Multimodal Facilities and Connections criterion were reallocated to the Potential Usage criterion. Since the concepts previously under Multimodal (i.e., transit usage to the school) were reallocated to the Potential Usage criterion, it is suggested that the 50 points also be reallocated to Potential Usage, under the average share of the student population that bikes, walks, or uses transit measure.

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

COMMITTEE COMMENTS AND ACTION: The following comments and actions took place:

- The committee recommended adding points for the Cost Effectiveness criterion that would be in addition to the existing 1,000-point total. They recommend adding 100 points for the Cost Effectiveness criterion across all 10 application categories, so the total points possible would now increase from 1,000 to 1,100.
- The committee recommended increasing the Risk Assessment criterion for all four roadway applications from 75 to 100 points and reducing the Multimodal criterion for the same applications categories from 100 to 75 points. The group wants to elevate the importance of Risk Assessment in an attempt to reduce the amount of scope change requests (there has already been one request from the solicitation approved last May). In addition, this change may increase the likelihood that applicants will be able to deliver the project in their program year, thereby reducing the tension on the region to reallocate those federal funds.
- As part of Action Transmittal 2016-03, the committee recommended deletion of the second measure under the Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy criterion for the Transit Expansion and Transit System Modernization application categories. Due to this change, the group recommends reallocating the 33 points from this deleted measure to the two other measures in the criterion. Therefore, measure A would increase from 33 to 50 points and measure C would increase from 34 to 50 points.

A motion was made to recommend the weighting of the criteria and measures for the 2016 Regional Solicitation as shown in Attachments 1 through 5, with the modifications shown above. The motion passed.

ROUTING

TO	ACTION REQUESTED	DATE COMPLETED
TAC Funding & Programming	Review & Recommend	December 17, 2015
Technical Advisory Committee	Review & Recommend	
Transportation Advisory Board	Review & Approve	

ATTACHMENT 1: DRAFT CRITERIA WEIGHTING

Criteria	Roadway Exp.	Roadway Reconst/ Modern.	Roadway System Man.	Roadway Bridges	Transit Exp.	Transit Modern.	TDM	Multi-Use Trails & Bike Facility	Ped. Facility	Safe Routes to School
Role in the Regional System	17.5%	17.5%	12.5%	12.5% 19.5%	10%	10%	10%	20%	10% 15%	--
Usage	17.5%	17.5%	12.5%	12.5% 13%	35%	30%	10%	20%	20% 15%	20% 25%
Safety	15%	15%	20%	--	--	--	--	25%	30%	25%
Congestion /Air Quality	15%	7.5%	20%	--	20%	10%	40%	--	--	--
Infrastructure Age	7.5%	15%	7.5%	40%	--	--	--	--	--	--
Equity and Housing Performance	10%	10%	10%	10%	20%	15%	15%	12%	12%	12%
Multimodal Facilities	10% 7.5%	10% 7.5%	10% 7.5%	10% 7.5%	10%	10%	--	10%	15%	5%
Risk Assessment	7.5% 10%	7.5% 10%	7.5% 10%	7.5% 10%	5%	10%	5%	13%	13%	13%
Total Bridge Cost Effect.	--	--	--	7.5%	--	--	--	--	--	--
Relationship Between SRTS Elements	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	25%
Transit Improvements	--	--	--	--	--	15%	--	--	--	--
TDM Innovation	--	--	--	--	--	--	20%	--	--	--
Total (1,000 Points)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Cost Effectiveness (Points)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
TOTAL POINTS	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100

ATTACHMENT 2: ROADWAY MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	System			
	Expansion	Recon/Mod	Mgmt	Bridge
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	175	175	125	125195
Measure A - Average distance to nearest parallel roadways/bridges	90 80	90 80	65 55	65 115
Measure B – Current daily heavy commercial traffic	65	65	40	40 50
Measure C – Connection to Total Jobs, Manu/Dist Jobs, and Educational Inst.	20 30	20 30	20 30	20 30
Usage	175	175	125	125130
Measure A – Current daily person throughput	110	110	85	95 100
Measure B – Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume	65	65	40	30
Equity and Housing Performance	100	100	100	100
Measure A – Connection to disadvantageded pop and benefits, impacts, mitigation	30	30	30	30
Measure B – Housing Performance Score	70	70	70	70
Infrastructure Age/Condition	75	150	75	400
Measure A – Date of construction	75	50	75	
Measure B - Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies	75	100		
Measure A – Bridge Sufficiency Rating				300
Measure B – Load-Posting				100
Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	150	75	200	
Measure A – Vehicle delay reduced	100	50 45	150	
Measure B – Kg of emissions reduced	50	25 30	50	
Safety	150	150	200	
Measure A – Crashes reduced	150	150	200	
Multimodal Facilities Elements and Existing Connections	10075	10075	10075	10075
Measure A/B – Transit and bike/ped connections	50	50	50	50
Measure A - Transit, bicycle, pedestrian, <u>freight project elements and connections</u>	50 10075	50 10075	50 10075	50 10075
Risk Assessment	75100	75100	75100	75100
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	75 100	75 100	75 100	75 100
Cost Effectiveness				75
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)				75
Sub-Total	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
9. Cost Effectiveness	100	100	100	100
Measure A - Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)	100	100	100	100
Total	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100

ATTACHMENT 3: TRANSIT MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Transit Expansion	Transit Modernization
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	100	100
Measure A - Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	33 50	33 50
- Measure B—Existing population within 0.25 mile (bus stop), 0.5 mile (transitway), and/or 2.5 miles (park & ride lot)	33	33
Measure C – Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project	34 50	34 50
Usage	350	300
Measure A – Cost effectiveness per Existing riders	105	210 300
Measure B – Operating cost effectiveness	70	90
Measure C – Cost effectiveness per new New riders	175 350	
Equity and Housing Performance	200	150
Measure A - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project’s benefits, impacts, and mitigation	130	80
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	70
Emissions Reduction	200	100
Measure A - Total emissions reduced	133 200	100
Measure B – Cost effectiveness of emissions reduced	67	
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	100	100
Measure A – Bike/Ped Connections	50	50
Measure A - Multimodal elements of the project and existing connections	50 100	50 100
Risk Assessment	50	100
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	50	100
Service and Customer Improvements		150
Measure A – Travel Time Reduction		75
Measure B – Cost Reduction		38
Measure C – Service Improvement		37
Sub-Total	1,000	1,000
Cost Effectiveness	100	100
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Total	1,100	1,100

ATTACHMENT 4: TDM MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Points
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	100
Measure A – Ability to capitalize on existing regional transportation facilities and resources	50 <u>100</u>
Measure B – Identify the existing regional transportation facilities and resources on which the project will capitalize (transit stations, bikeways, etc.).	50
2. Usage	100
Measure A – Cost effectiveness of Users	100
3. Equity and Housing Performance	150
Measure A - Project’s benefits, impacts, and mitigation to disadvantaged populations	80
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70
4. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	400
Measure A - Congested roadways in project area	200
Measure B - Emissions reduced	200
5. Innovation	200
Measure A - Project innovations or <u>new geographic area</u>	100 <u>200</u>
Measure B – New Geographic Area	100
6. Risk Assessment	50
Measure A – Risk Assessment Form	15
Measure A - Technical capacity of applicant's organization	20 <u>25</u>
Measure B - Continuation of project after initial federal funds are expended	15 <u>25</u>
Sub-Total	1,000
7. Cost Effectiveness	<u>100</u>
<u>Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)</u>	<u>100</u>
Total	<u>1,100</u>

ATTACHMENT 5: BIKE / PEDESTRIAN MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Multiuse Trails / Bike	Pedestrian	SRTS
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	200	100 150	250
Measure A - Identify location of project relative to Regional Bicycle Transportation Network	200		
Measure A – Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions		100 150	
Measure A – “5 Es”			250
Potential Usage	200	200 150	200 250
Measure A – Cost effectiveness of Existing population and employment	200		
Measure A – Cost effectiveness of Existing population and employment		200 150	
Measure A - Average share of student population that bikes, walks, <u>or uses public transit</u>			120 170
Measure B - Student population within school's walkshed			80
Equity and Housing Performance	120	120	120
Measure A - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project’s benefits, impacts, and mitigation	50	50	50
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	70	70
Deficiencies and Safety	250	300	250
Measure A – Gaps closed/barriers removed, and/or continuity between jurisdictions improved by the project	100	120	100
Measure B - Deficiencies corrected or safety problem addressed	150	180	150
Multimodal Facilities and <u>Existing Connections</u>	100	150	50
Measure A/B – Transit or pedestrian connections	50	75	50
Measure C - Transit or pedestrian elements of the project; and <u>existing connections</u>	50 100	75 150	
Risk Assessment/Public Engagement	130	130	130
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	130	130	85
Measure A – Public Engagement			45
Sub-Total	1,000	1,000	1,000
<u>Cost Effectiveness</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Measure A-Cost effectiveness (Total project cost/total points awarded)</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Total	<u>1,100</u>	<u>1,100</u>	<u>1,100</u>