# **Action Transmittal**

**Transportation Advisory Board** 



Committee Meeting Date: May 3, 2023

Date: April 26, 2023

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

# Action Transmittal: 2023-22

2024 Regional Solicitation: Weighting of Criteria and Measures

To: Technical Advisory Committee

From: TAC Funding and Programming Committee

**Prepared By:** Steve Peterson, Senior Manager of Highway Planning and TAB/TAC Process (Steven.Peterson@metc.state.mn.us)

Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (Joseph.Barbeau@metc.state.mn.us)

# **Requested Action**

Approve the weighting of criteria and measures for the 2024 Regional Solicitation as attached.

#### **Recommended Motion**

That the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommend to the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) approval of the weighting of the criteria and measures for the 2024 Regional Solicitation with the following adjustments from 2022:

- Adding 100 points to safety-related criteria for all application categories except Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization.
- Distribution of the additional 100 safety points based on current measure weighting within the safety criterion in the Roadway Categories.

# **Background and Purpose**

Each criterion contains measures, the scores for which are determined by TAB following TAC recommendation. The specific draft criteria weighting and measures for Roadway including Multimodal Elements, Transit and Travel Demand Management, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities funding categories are attached to this document. For 2024, technical and policy committee members requested additional emphasis be placed on safety.

# **Relationship to Regional Policy**

TAB develops and issues a Regional Solicitation for federal funding.

# **Staff Analysis**

Council staff previously evaluated the impact of adding 100 or 300 points to the safety-related criteria across all application categories. The 100-point option results in adding six to eight percentage points to the safety-related criteria and the 300-point option results in adding 15 to 20 percentage points to the safety-related criteria. Some application categories do not have a direct safety criterion. In these cases, the 100 or 300 points would have been added to criteria that represent safety. For example, in the Bridges application category, points have been added to the

Multimodal criterion as this represents investment in facilities that increase the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists accessing transit.

The bullets below describe how the recommendation for adding 100 points to safety-related criteria is distributed across specific scoring measure(s) within each application category.

- Traffic Management Technologies application category: Points added 75% to Crashes Reduced measure and 25% to Safety Issues in Project Area measure.
- Roadway Spot Mobility and Safety, Strategic Capacity, and Reconstruction/Modernization application categories: Proportionate to previous weighting of measures within the Safety Criterion:
  - Roadway Spot Mobility and Safety: 70% to Crashes Reduced and 30% to Pedestrian Safety
  - Strategic Capacity: 80% to Crashes Reduced and 20% to Pedestrian Safety
  - Reconstruction/Modernization: 83% to Crashes Reduced and 17% to Pedestrian Safety
- Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities, Pedestrian Facilities and Safe Routes to School application categories: Points added 50% to Barriers Overcome measure and 50% to Deficiencies Corrected measure.
- Bridges application category: All points added to the Multimodal Elements and Connections measures.
- Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization application categories: No points added.
  - NOTE: If points were to be added, it is suggested to add 75 points to Usage and 25 points to Multimodal Elements in Transit Expansion and 100 points to Service and Customer Improvements in Transit Modernization.
- Travel Demand Management application category: All points added to the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Reduction measure.

# **Committee Comments and Actions**

In previous information item discussions, the Transit Planning Technical Working Group preferred not to add points to any Transit application categories and TAC expressed agreement, along with comfort with having differing point totals across the application categories.

The Bridges and Travel Demand Management (TDM) application categories do not have direct safety measures, but TAC members expressed comfort with including the above measures in the increase.

At its April 20, 2023, meeting, the TAC Funding & Programming Committee recommended approval of the weighting of the criteria and measures for the 2024 Regional Solicitation with the following adjustments:

- Adding 100 points to safety-related criteria for all application categories except Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization.
- Distribution of the additional 100 safety points based on current measure weighting within the safety criterion in the Roadway Categories, aside from Bridges.

Members preferred a proportionate addition to the Roadways including Multimodal Elements funding category because it awards more points to the quantitative measure. They also preferred to defer to the Transit Planning Technical Working Group's preference to not change any scoring values. If safety-related points are added to Transit Expansion application category, the Working Group recommended a split of 75 points to the Usage criterion and 25 points to the Multimodal criterion.

# Routing

То	Action Requested	Date Scheduled / Completed
TAC Funding & Programming Committee	Review & Recommend	April 20, 2023
Technical Advisory Committee	Review & Recommend	May 3, 2023
Transportation Advisory Board	Review & Adopt	May 17, 2023

# ATTACHMENT 1: DRAFT CRITERIA WEIGHTING - ADDING 100 POINTS

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	<del>16<u>15</u>%</del>	10%*	<del>19<u>18</u>%</del>	<del>10</del> 9%	<del>18<u>16</u>%</del>	<u>98</u> %	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<u>1413</u> %	
Usage	<del>11<u>10</u>%</del>		<del>16</del> 15%	<del>16</del> 15%	<del>12</del> 11%	<del>32</del> 29%	<del>30<u>27</u>%</del>	<mark>98</mark> %	<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>14<u>13</u>%</del>	<del>23</del> 21%
Safety	<del>18</del> 25%	<del>30<u>36</u>%</del>	<u>1421</u> %	<del>16<u>23</u>%</del>					<del>23<u>29</u>%</del>	<del>27<u>33</u>%</del>	<del>23</del> 29%
Congestion /Air Quality	<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>25</del> 23%	<del>14<u>13</u>%</del>	7%*		<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>5</del> 4%	<del>27<u>33</u>%</del>			
Infrastructure Age	<mark>76</mark> %		4 <u>3</u> %	<del>16</del> 15%	<del>36<u>33</u>%</del>						
Equity and Housing Performance	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>16<u>15</u>%</del>	<del>14<u>13</u>%</del>	<del>11<u>10</u>%</del>	<del>11<u>10</u>%</del>	<del>11<u>10</u>%</del>
Multimodal Facilities	5 <u>4</u> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<del>10<u>9</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>9</del> 8%		<mark>98</mark> %	<del>14<u>13</u>%</del>	
Risk Assessment	<mark>76</mark> %	<mark>76</mark> %	<mark>76</mark> %	<mark>76</mark> %	<mark>76</mark> %	<mark>54</mark> %	<mark>54</mark> %	<mark>54</mark> %	<del>12<u>11</u>%</del>	<del>12<u>11</u>%</del>	<del>12</del> 11%
Relationship Between SRTS Elements											<del>23<u>21</u>%</del>
Transit Improvements							<del>18</del> 25%				
TDM Innovation								<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>			
Cost Effectiveness	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>9</mark> 8%	<mark>98</mark> %	<del>9</del> 8%	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %
Total Points <del>1,100</del>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>

\*Some criteria show no change due to rounding to the nearest integer.

# ATTACHMENT 1A: ROADWAY MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Traffic Mgmt	Spot Mob.	Strat Cap.	Recon/Mod	Bridge
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	175	115	210	105	195
Distance to the nearest parallel bridge					100
Congestion, Adjacent Congestion, or PA Intersection Conversion Study Priorities		70	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	45	80	40	65
Coordination with other agencies	25				
Usage	125		175	175	130
Current daily person throughput	85		110	110	100
Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume	40		65	65	30
Equity and Housing Performance	100	100	100	100	100
Engagements	30	30	30	30	30
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	40	40	40	40	40
Affordable Housing Access	30	30	30	30	30
Infrastructure Age/Condition	75		40	175	400
Date of construction			40	50	
Upgrades to obsolete equipment	75				
Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies				125	
Bridge Sufficiency Rating					300
Load-Posting					100
Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	200	275	150	80	
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				
Safety	<del>200</del> 300	<del>335</del> 435	<del>150</del> 250	<del>180</del> 280	
Crashes reduced	<del>50</del> 75	<del>235</del> 305	<del>120</del> 200	<del>150</del> 233	
Safety issues in project area	<del>150</del> 225				
Pedestrian Crash Reduction (Proactive)		<del>100</del> 130	<del>30</del> 50	<del>30</del> 47	
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	50	100	100	110	<del>100</del> 200
Transit, bicycle, pedestrian, elements and connections	50	100	100	110	<del>100</del> 200
Risk Assessment	75	75	75	75	75
Risk Assessment Form	75	75	75	75	75
Cost Effectiveness	100	100	100	100	100
Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost)	100	100	100	100	100
	<del>1,100</del> 1,200				

Transit	Transit
Expansion	Modernization
100	100
50	50
50	50
<del>350<u>425</u></del>	325
	325
<del>350<u>425</u></del>	
200	175
60	50
80	75
60	50
200	50
200	50
<del>100<u>125</u></del>	100
<del>100<u>125</u></del>	100
50	50
50	50
	<del>200</del> 300
	<del>200</del> 300
100	100
100	100
	Expansion 100 50 50 350425 200 60 80 60 80 60 200 200 200 100125 50 50 50

# ATTACHMENT 1B: TRANSIT MEASURES (NOTE: No changes are Proposed)

# ATTACHMENT 1C: TDM MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Points
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	200
Ability to capitalize on existing regional transportation facilities and resources	200
2. Usage	100
Users	100
3. Equity and Housing Performance	150
Engagements	45
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	60
Affordable Housing Access	45
4. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	<del>300<u>400</u></del>
Congested roadways in project area	150
VMT reduced	<del>150</del> 250
5. Innovation	200
Project innovations and geographic expansion	200
6. Risk Assessment	50
Technical capacity of applicant's organization	25
Continuation of project after initial federal funds are expended	25
7. Cost Effectiveness	100
Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)	100
Total	<u>1,200</u> 1,100

## **ATTACHMENT 1D: BIKE / PEDESTRIAN MEASURES**

	Multiuse		
Criteria and Measures	Trails / Bike	Pedestrian	SRTS
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	200	150	
Identify location of project relative to Regional Bicycle Transportation Network	200		
Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions		150	
Potential Usage	200	150	250
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
Equity and Housing Performance	120	120	120
Engagements	36	36	36
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	48	48	48
Affordable Housing Access	36	36	36
Deficiencies and Safety	<del>250</del> 350	<del>300<u>400</u></del>	<del>250</del> 350
Barriers overcome or gaps filled	<del>100</del> 150	<del>120</del> 170	<del>100</del> 150
Deficiencies corrected or safety problem addressed	<del>150</del> 200	<del>180</del> 230	<del>150</del> 200
Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections	100	150	
Transit or pedestrian elements of the project and existing connections	100	150	
Risk Assessment/Public Engagement	130	130	130
Risk Assessment Form	130	130	85
Public Engagement			45
Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements			250
Describe how project addresses6 Es of SRTS Program			150
Completion of Safe Routes to School Plan			100
Cost Effectiveness	100	100	100
Measure A-Cost effectiveness (Total project cost/total points awarded)	100	100	100
Total	<del>1,100</del> 1,200	<del>1,100</del> 1,200	<del>1,100</del> 1,200