

## 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: Scoring Measure Changes

Through surveys and meeting discussions, partners and applicants had comments on specific scoring measures, particularly measures new to the 2020 Regional Solicitation. Below are scoring measures that were commented on with frequency and seem to have room for improvement. At this point, members should discuss potential changes.

Highway-specific potential measure changes will be addressed at the August meeting.

### 1. Risk Assessment

The risk assessment includes five elements: layout (25% of points); review of Section 106 historic resources (15% of points); right-of-way (25% of points); railroad involvement (15% of points); and public involvement (20% of points). Two of these elements need thorough examination (and a third, right-of-way may need attention as well):

- Layout: This element awards 100% for a layout approved by the applicant and impacted jurisdictions, 50% for a completed layout not approved by all jurisdictions, and 0% for a layout that has not been started. This proved challenging from a scoring perspective because “layout” has not been defined. Further, there is room in between “completed but not approved...” and “not been started.” Some potential ways to address this:
  - Define what a layout is.
  - Add points (e.g., 25%) for a layout that has been started
  - Clarify that approval includes MnDOT approval for a MnDOT trunk highway project
  - Are there any projects for which a layout is not applicable (e.g., signal timing)?
- Right-of-way: It appears that some applicants do not understand that any property acquisition is a right-of-way acquisition; therefore, a better definition may be needed. It has also been suggested to add a line for whether a MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit is required and whether it has been initiated.
- Public Involvement: Public involvement was added to the risk assessment for 2020, with the premise that lack of outreach is a risk to the project not being completed. In the long-run, TAB will need to consider whether including outreach within the risk assessment makes sense. In the meantime, the scoring element includes space to list meeting dates, targeted online/mail outreach, and the number of responses. It also includes checkboxes (with assigned percentages) for the degree to which the meetings were targeted to the project and an open-ended response box. This created confusion for scorers and applicants regarding:
  - How the meeting descriptions, participation numbers, checkboxes, and open-ended responses related to each other in terms of generating a score.
  - Whether the open-ended response is required. Some applicants did not fill it out, tying the scorers’ hands in terms downgrading checkboxes.

- Non-construction projects are exempt from the rest of the risk assessment. A decision is needed about whether they should be exempt from the public involvement element.

Scorer feedback identified that the measure was too focused on quantity of meetings and attendees as opposed to analyzing the impact of the engagement on selection of the project, the method that helped arrive at key decisions, whether the outreach/engagement changed the project, and effectiveness of the efforts.

### Funding & Programming Committee Comments

At its June 17, 2021, meeting, the Funding & Programming Committee had the following comments:

- Layouts: Better definition of what a layout is (and is not) is needed so applicants do not simply show an aerial photo with a line drawn along a roadway. Some projects may not need layouts at all. Others may have had extensive MnDOT involvement but have not gone through MnDOT's approval process. Is there a way to give them full credit? More point tiers could be used.
- Right-of-way: The only change discussed was to call out limited use permits as a risk.
- Public involvement: Members agreed that the public involvement objective in the risk assessment should be about the opportunity for involvement, as opposed to the quality of input received. Members also expressed caution on the degree to which the language in the measure focuses on meetings when there are other ways to reach out to the public. Members generally suggested that the dates and number of meetings should be removed in favor of the tiered checkboxes, though the text box for an open-ended response should remain.

## **2. Affordable Housing**

Prior to 2020, housing was entirely scored with the Housing Performance Score (HPS). For 2020, 20% of the housing score was dedicated to a more project-specific qualitative element (connection to affordable housing).

Describe and map any affordable housing developments—planned, under construction or existing, within ½ mile of the proposed project. The applicant should note the development stage, number of units, number of bedrooms per unit, and level of affordability using 2019 affordability limits. Also note whether the affordability is guaranteed through funding restrictions (i.e. LIHTC, 4d) or is unsubsidized, if housing choice vouchers are/will be accepted, and if there is a fair housing marketing plan required or in place.

Describe how the proposed project will improve or impact access for residents of the affordable housing locations within ½ mile of the project. This should include a description of improved access by all modes, automobiles, transit, bicycle and pedestrian access. Since residents of affordable housing are more likely not to own a private vehicle, higher points will be provided to roadway projects that include other multimodal access improvements.

Applicants found it difficult to find all the information being requested. This is particularly true for transit projects that have several stops/stations. Similarly, this was difficult for TDM applicants, who tend not to be connected to housing data.

The intent of the sub-measure is to help shift the role of housing from being a citywide “carrot” to improve affordable housing to rewarding applications for projects that locate near existing and

developing affordable housing. Ultimately, TAB will need to determine which approach is preferred (or both; or neither). If the project-specific approach is included, the measure will have to be adjusted.

#### Funding & Programming Committee Comments

At the June 17, 2021, Funding & Programming Committee meeting, members expressed that it was time-consuming to find all existing and developing affordable housing, particularly for projects that enter multiple jurisdictions and/or cover long corridors. The time needed to fill out the response was not in proportion with the ten-point value of the sub-measure. While members generally appreciated TAB's interest in locating projects where affordable housing exists and is being developed, the preference of members is to go back to only using the Housing Performance Score, barring a more easily accessible information source being available.

### 3. Equity and Housing Performance (100 Points)

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

**HOUSING MEASURE:** Projects will be scored based on two housing measures: 1. the 2019 Housing Performance Score for the city or township in which the project is located (40 points) and 2. the project's connection to affordable housing (10 points) as described below.

#### Part 1 (40 points): Housing Performance Score

#### Part 2 (10 points): Affordable Housing Access

This measure is a qualitative scoring measure. Describe and map any affordable housing developments—planned, under construction or existing, within ½ mile of the proposed project. The applicant should note the development stage, number of units, number of bedrooms per unit, and level of affordability using 2019 affordability limits. Also note whether the affordability is guaranteed through funding restrictions (i.e. LIHTC, 4d) or is unsubsidized, if housing choice vouchers are/will be accepted, and if there is a fair housing marketing plan required or in place.

Describe how the proposed project will improve or impact access for residents of the affordable housing locations within ½ mile of the project. This should include a description of improved access by all modes, automobiles, transit, bicycle and pedestrian access. Since residents of affordable housing are more likely not to own a private vehicle, higher points will be provided to roadway projects that include other multimodal access improvements.

#### RESPONSE:

(Limit 2,100 characters; approximately 300 words):

#### SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

Part 1 (40 points): The applicant with the highest 2019 Housing Performance Score will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. (redacted to save space)

Part 2 (10 points): The project that best provides meaningful improvements to access to the affordable housing units will receive the full 10 points. Multiple projects may receive the highest possible score of 10 points based on this assessment. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.

Final Score (50 points): The scores in Parts 1 and 2 will be totaled. If no application gets 50 points, the highest-scoring project will be awarded 50 points, with other projects adjusted proportionately.

Note: Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

## 8. Risk Assessment (75 Points)

This criterion measures the number of risks associated with successfully building the project. High-risk applications increase the likelihood that projects will withdraw at a later date. If this happens, the region is forced to reallocate the federal funds in a short amount of time or return them to the US Department of Transportation. These risks are outlined in the checklist in the required Risk Assessment.

- A. **MEASURE:** Applications involving construction must complete the Risk Assessment. This checklist includes activities completed to-date, as well as an assessment of risks (e.g., right-of-way acquisition, proximity to historic properties, etc.).

### **RESPONSE** (Complete Risk Assessment):

Please check those that apply and fill in anticipated completion dates for all projects. ~~Not~~ **except for new/expanded transit service projects will receive full credit for items 1-4 but must fill out item 5. Transit vehicle purchases will receive full credit.**

#### 1. Layout (25 Percent of Points)

Layout ~~should~~ **includes** proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries. A basic layout should include a base map (north arrow; scale; legend;\* city and/or county limits; existing ROW, labeled; existing signals;\* and bridge numbers\*) and design data (proposed alignments; bike and/or roadway lane widths; shoulder width;\* proposed signals;\* and proposed ROW). An aerial photograph with a line showing the project's termini does not suffice and will be awarded zero points.

\*If applicable

100%  Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties ~~MnDOT that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)~~). If a MnDOT trunk highway is impacted, approval by MnDOT must have occurred to receive full points. **A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.**

100%  A layout does not apply (signal replacement/signal timing, stand-alone streetscaping, minor intersection improvements). Applicants that are not certain whether a layout is required should contact Colleen Brown at MnDOT Metro State Aid – [colleen.brown@state.mn.us](mailto:colleen.brown@state.mn.us).

50%  Layout completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. **A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.**

25%  Layout has been started but is not complete. A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.

0%  Layout has not been started

~~Anticipated date or date of completion: \_\_\_\_\_~~

#### 2. Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (15 Percent of Points)

(No changes recommend)

#### 3. Right-of-Way (25 Percent of Points)

100%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, [and MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit](#) either not required or all have been acquired

50%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, [and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit](#) required, ~~\_-~~ plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

25%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, [and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit](#) required, ~~\_-~~ parcels identified

0%  Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, [and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit](#) required, ~~\_-~~ parcels not all identified

~~Anticipated date or date of acquisition \_\_\_\_\_~~

#### 4. Railroad Involvement (15 Percent of Points)

(No changes recommended)

#### 5. Public Involvement (20 Percent of Points)

Projects that have been through a public process with residents and other interested public entities are more likely than others to be successful. The project applicant must indicate that events and/or targeted outreach (e.g., surveys and other web-based input) were held to help identify the transportation problem, how the potential solution was selected instead of other options, and the public involvement completed to date on the project. [The focus of this section is on the opportunity for public input as opposed to the quality of input. NOTE: A written response is required and failure to respond will result in zero points.](#)

~~List Dates of most recent meetings and outreach specific to this project:~~

- ~~• Meeting with general public: \_\_\_\_\_~~
- ~~• Meeting with partner agencies: \_\_\_\_\_~~
- ~~• Targeted online/mail outreach: \_\_\_\_\_~~
  - ~~○ Number of respondents: \_\_\_\_\_~~

100%  [Multiple types of targeted outreach efforts \(such as meetings or online/mail outreach\)](#) ~~Meetings~~ specific to this project with the general public and partner agencies have been used to help identify the project need.

~~75%  Targeted outreach specific to this project with the general public and partner agencies have been used to help identify the project need.~~

50%  At least one meeting specific to this project with the general public has been used to help identify the project need.

50%  At least ~~one meeting~~ [online/mail outreach effort](#) specific to this project with [the general public](#) ~~key partner agencies~~ has been used to help identify the project need.

25%  No meeting or outreach specific to the project was conducted, but the project was identified through meetings and/or outreach related to a larger planning effort.

0%  No outreach has led to the selection of this project.

**RESPONSE** (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words). [Describe the type\(s\) of outreach selected for this project \(i.e., online or in-person meetings, surveys, demonstration projects\), the](#)

[method\(s\) used to announce outreach opportunities, and how many people participated. Include any public website links to outreach opportunities.](#)

**SCORING GUIDANCE** (75 Points)

The applicant with the most points on the Risk Assessment (more points equate to less project risk) will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 40 points and the top project had 70 points, this applicant would receive  $(40/70)*75$  points or 43 points.