

## INFORMATION ITEM

**DATE:** June 30, 2021  
**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee  
**PREPARED BY:** Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)  
Steve Peterson, Manager of Highway Planning and TAC/TAB  
Process (651-602-1819)  
Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator (651-602-1717)  
**SUBJECT:** 2022 Regional Solicitation: Application Category Criteria and  
Weighting

During the process of the 2014 Regional Solicitation redesign, TAB established scoring criteria to be included in each scoring category. TAB assigned point values to each of the criteria. Within each of the criteria are one or more scoring measures. TAB approved these scoring measures and their point values with input from TAC and the TAC Funding & Programming Committee. Over the years several changes have occurred to the scoring measures and their values, while fewer changes have occurred to the criteria and weights. Notable exceptions include the addition of a 100-point cost-effectiveness score for 2016 along with a new slate of criteria and measures for the Spot Mobility & Safety category that was added in 2020.

Prior to the Funding & Programming Committee meeting of June 17, 2021, no changes were proposed to the weighting of the criteria or the measures from what was used in 2020.

Attachment 1 shows the criteria and weighting for each of the application categories. Attachments 2 through 5 show distribution of points within and between the criteria.

### Funding & Programming Committee Comments

At the June 17, 2021 meeting, members focused on the Spot Mobility and Safety category, which was new in 2020. One suggestion is that while the category weighs congestion/air quality evenly with safety (as is the case with Strategic Capacity), safety should be weighted higher (as is the case with Reconstruction/Modernization). Another suggestion was that the two criteria, given the purpose of the category, should be weighted more heavily than the 25% that each is currently weighted.

It was also suggested to compare the weights to the draft purpose statements.

### ATTACHMENT 1: DRAFT CRITERIA WEIGHTING

Criteria	Traffic Mgmt. Tech.	Spot Mobility & Safety	Strategic Capacity	Roadway Recon / Mod	Roadway Bridges	Transit Exp	Transit Mod.	TDM	Multi-Use Trails & Bike Facility	Ped. Facility	Safe Routes to School
Role in the Regional System	16%	16%	19%	10%	18%	9%	9%	18%	18%	14%	--
Usage	11%	--	16%	16%	12%	32%	30%	9%	18%	14%	23%
Safety	18%	25%	14%	16%	--	--	--	--	23%	27%	23%
Congestion /Air Quality	18%	25%	14%	7%	--	18%	5%	27%	--	--	--
Infrastructure Age	7%	--	4%	16%	36%	--	--	--	--	--	--
Equity and Housing Performance	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	18%	16%	14%	11%	11%	11%
Multimodal Facilities	5%	9%	9%	10%	9%	9%	9%	--	9%	14%	--
Risk Assessment	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	5%	5%	5%	12%	12%	12%
Relationship Between SRTS Elements	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	23%
Transit Improvements	--	--	--	--	--	--	18%	--	--	--	--
TDM Innovation	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	18%	--	--	--
Cost Effectiveness	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>

Changes shown from 2020: none.

Changes from 2018 to 2020: In Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization, Role in the Regional System moved from 15% to 10% with small changes in other criteria. The reason is that a measure (Level of Congestion, Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study Priorities, and Congestion Management and Safety Plan Opportunity Areas) was removed.

## ATTACHMENT 2: ROADWAY MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Traffic Mgmt	Spot Mob.	Strat Cap.	Recon/Mod	Bridge
<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>195</b>
Distance to the nearest parallel bridge					100
Congestion, Adjacent Congestion, or PA Intersection Conversion Study Priorities		100	80		
Functional Classification of project	50				
Connection to Total Jobs, Manu/Dist. Jobs, and Post-Secondary Students			50	65	30
Integration within existing traffic management systems	50				
Highway Truck Corridor Tiers	50	75	80	40	65
Coordination with other agencies	25				
<b>Usage</b>	<b>125</b>		<b>175</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>130</b>
Current daily person throughput	85		110	110	100
Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume	40		65	65	30
<b>Equity and Housing Performance</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations	50	50	50	50	50
Housing Performance Score / affordable housing connection	50	50	50	50	50
<b>Infrastructure Age/Condition</b>	<b>75</b>		<b>40</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>400</b>
Date of construction			40	50	
Upgrades to obsolete equipment	75				
Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies				125	
Bridge Sufficiency Rating					300
Load-Posting					100
<b>Congestion Reduction/Air Quality</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>80</b>	
Vehicle delay reduced		200	100	50	
Congested roadway (V/C Ratio)	150				
Kg of emissions reduced		75	50	30	
Emissions and congestion benefits of project	50				
<b>Safety</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>180</b>	
Crashes reduced	50	225	120	150	
Safety issues in project area	150				
Pedestrian Crash Reduction (Proactive)		50	30	30	
<b>Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>100</b>
Transit, bicycle, pedestrian, elements and connections	50	100	100	110	100
<b>Risk Assessment</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>75</b>
Risk Assessment Form	75	75	75	75	75
<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost)	100	100	100	100	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>

### ATTACHMENT 3: TRANSIT MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Transit Expansion	Transit Modernization
<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	50	50
Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project	50	50
<b>Usage</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>325</b>
Existing Riders		325
New Annual Riders	350	
<b>Equity and Housing Performance</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>175</b>
Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations	150	125
Housing Performance Score / affordable housing connection	50	50
<b>Emissions Reduction</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>50</b>
Total emissions reduced	200	50
<b>Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project and connections	100	100
<b>Risk Assessment</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>
Risk Assessment Form	50	50
<b>Service and Customer Improvements</b>		<b>200</b>
Project improvement for transit users		200
<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total annual project cost)	100	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>

## **ATTACHMENT 4: TDM MEASURES**

<b>Criteria and Measures</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>	<b>200</b>
Ability to capitalize on existing regional transportation facilities and resources	200
<b>2. Usage</b>	<b>100</b>
Users	100
<b>3. Equity and Housing Performance</b>	<b>150</b>
Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations	100
Housing Performance Score / affordable housing connection	50
<b>4. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality</b>	<b>300</b>
Congested roadways in project area	150
VMT reduced	150
<b>5. Innovation</b>	<b>200</b>
Project innovations and geographic expansion	200
<b>6. Risk Assessment</b>	<b>50</b>
Technical capacity of applicant's organization	25
Continuation of project after initial federal funds are expended	25
<b>7. Cost Effectiveness</b>	<b>100</b>
Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,100</b>

## ATTACHMENT 5: BIKE / PEDESTRIAN MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Multiuse Trails / Bike	Pedestrian	SRTS
<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>150</b>	
Identify location of project relative to Regional Bicycle Transportation Network	200		
Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions		150	
<b>Potential Usage</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>250</b>
Existing population and employment within 1 mile	200		
Existing population within ½ mile		150	
Average share of student population that bikes, walks, or uses transit			170
Student population within school's walkshed			80
<b>Equity and Housing Performance</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>120</b>
Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations	70	70	70
Housing Performance Score / affordable housing connection	50	50	50
<b>Deficiencies and Safety</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>250</b>
Barriers overcome or gaps filled	100	120	100
Deficiencies corrected or safety problem addressed	150	180	150
<b>Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>150</b>	
Transit or pedestrian elements of the project and existing connections	100	150	
<b>Risk Assessment/Public Engagement</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>
Risk Assessment Form	130	130	85
Public Engagement			45
<b>Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements</b>			<b>250</b>
Describe how project addresses 6 Es of SRTS Program			170
Completion of Safe Routes to School Plan			80
<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Measure A-Cost effectiveness (Total project cost/total points awarded)	100	100	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,100</b>