

2016 Sensitivity Analysis of Regional Solicitation Measures

Technical Advisory Committee
May 3, 2017



Evaluating Impact of Measures

- Number of applications changing rank order
- Number of applications moving above/below funding line
- Standard deviation

- Strategies for Underperforming Measures
 - Do nothing
 - Change the number of points allocated to the measure
 - Change the measure's scoring guidelines or applicant instructions
 - Change the measure
 - Convert to a required qualification instead of a scored measure
 - Remove the measure

Key Findings

- No measures are clearly under-performing given the points allocated to them
 - Different finding than after 2014 Regional Solicitation
- Outlier projects with very high scores are clearly impactful to some measures
- Measures perhaps worthy of examination:
 - Risk Assessment Worksheet provides little differentiation.
 - Housing Performance scores are fairly high, particularly in categories that tend to be in Minneapolis and St. Paul.
 - Deficiencies and Safety (Multiuse Trails and Pedestrian categories) saw fairly high scores that were bunched.
 - Avg. number of weekday transit trips connected to the project (Transit Expansion) saw all applicants receive 15 points for connecting to a planned transitway

Biggest Outliers

Several applications had measures in which no application scored even half of the top-scoring application. This is due to top-scoring applications with large margins over all other applications. Key outliers include:

- Transit Expansion, Usage (Count of new riders, 350 points): Top application scored 350. Second application scored 247. Others scored from 10 to 76.
- Transit System Modernization, Usage (count of existing riders, 300 points): Top application scored 300. Others scored fewer than 100.
- Transit (both applications), Cost Effectiveness (100 points): Top application scored 100. No others scored more than 16.
- Roadway Expansion, crash reduction (150 points): Top application scored 150. Other applications scored fewer than 60 points.

2014 Comparison

- **Connection to Jobs (Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization)**
 - 2014: Minimal impact due to rigid scoring that only allowed 0, 12, or 20 points).
 - 2016: More impactful due to pro-rated scoring.
- **Gaps and Barriers (Multiuse Trails):**
 - 2014: Funding range of 120 to 150.
 - 2016 Funding range of 55 to 150 due to a 100-point cap on applications that did not include crash data.
- **Connections to Jobs and Educational Institutions (Transit Expansion):**
 - 2014: All applications scored 33 out of 33 points.
 - 2016: Standard deviation of 17 (50-point max), due to changing from “all-or-none” measure to proportionate scoring.

Questions

Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner

651-602-1705 or joseph.barbeau@metc.state.mn.us

Steve Peterson, Manager of Highways and TAB/TAC Process

651-602-1819 or steven.peterson@metc.state.mn.us