TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD

Metropolitan Council, 390 Robert Street North, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

NOTICE OF A MEETING
of the
FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE

Thursday, November 19, 2015
1:30 P.M. – Metropolitan Council, Room LLA
390 Robert Street N, Saint Paul, MN

AGENDA

1) Call to Order

2) Adoption of Agenda

3) Approval of the Minutes from the October 15, 2015 meeting*

4) TAB Report – Information Item

5) Hennepin County STP Defederalization – Action Item 2015-46*

6) TIP Amendment – Hennepin County CSAH 46 and CSAH 53 – Action Item 2015-47*

7) Process to Defederalize TAB-Selected Projects – Information Item*

8) 2015 TDM Solicitation Score List – Information Item*

9) Regional Solicitation Changes and Key Topics – Information Item*

10) Other Business

11) Adjournment

*Attachments

Please notify the Council at 651-602-1000 or 651-291-0904 (TTY) if you require special accommodations to attend this meeting. Upon request, the Council will provide reasonable accommodations to persons with disabilities.

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD
Metropolitan Council
390 N. Robert St., St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-1805

Minutes of a Meeting of the
FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
October 15, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tim Mayasich (chair), Colleen Brown, Kyle Burrows (for Mary Karlsson), Bob Byers, Innocent Eyoh, Andy Hingeveld (for Craig Jenson), Jane Kansier, Karl Keel, Andrew Korsberg, Jim Kosluchar, Elaine Koutsoukos, Bruce Loney, Eriks Ludins, Molly McCartney, Gina Mitteco, Ryan Peterson, Steve Peterson, Ann Pung-Terwedo, Lyndon Robjent, Michael Thompson, Andrew Witter and Joe Barbeau (staff)

OTHERS PRESENT: John Doan (Hennepin County) and Carl Ohrn (Metropolitan Council)

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Adoption of Agenda

Motion: Kansier moved to adopt the agenda. Seconded by Koutsoukos. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. Approval of the Minutes

MOTION: Ludins moved to approve the minutes. Seconded by Steve Peterson. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. Scope Change Request – Cedar Lake LRT Regional Trail Crossings – Action Item

John Doan from Hennepin County provided a summary of the scope change request. The project includes three trail grade separations near the planned Southwest Light Rail (SWLRT) extension: a bridge near the Beltline Station and tunnels near the Wooddale and Blake Stations. The updated scope would incorporate the project into the base SWLRT project, returning $2.1 million to TAB, provided the SWLRT full-funding grant agreement (FFGA) is approved. The project sponsor would change from Hennepin County to Metro Transit and stairs would be added to each crossing. The County requests that TAB not reallocate the funds until after the FFGA is signed, which would enable the project to revert to its original scope should the agreement not be completed. The project will be completed on or before the same timeline as originally proposed.

Steve Peterson asked whether TAB's Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding is being used as the local match for the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) New Starts funding. Koutsoukos replied that it is not a match. New Starts funding and the TAB funding will cover the federal portion of the project. All match is local. Doan said that the match would be covered by the City of St. Louis Park, the City of Hopkins, Three Rivers Park District, and Hennepin County. MnDOT State Aid will still monitor the project.

Mayasich asked what happens if the FFGA does not come to fruition. Doan replied that the original proposal would be completed. Koutsoukos added that this is why TAB is asked to hold the project until the end of 2016.

Robjent asked whether there is enough New Starts funding to fund the entire project. Doan replied that New Starts only funds up to 50 percent of a project.

Robjent asked whether the request could be made after the fate of the FFGA is known. Doan replied that the budget needs to be set prior to that time.

Brown said that the trail crossings are shown in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), as required by FTA if the project is to be absorbed by SWLRT.

Mayasich asked whether Metro Transit staff would be working on project design. Doan replied that the SWLRT project office is already working on that.

MOTION: Keel moved to approve the scope change request. Seconded by Mitteco. The motion was approved unanimously.

5. TIP Amendment – Cedar Lake LRT Regional Trail Crossings – Action Item

Barbeau said that the TIP amendment goes along with the scope change request.

Keel moved to recommend approval of the TIP amendment with the condition that $2,119,000 be held by TAB until and unless the FFGA is declined. Seconded by Thompson. The motion was approved unanimously.

6. Regional Solicitation Update: Roadways – Information Item

Steve Peterson discussed potential changes to the application forms, qualifying requirements, and Roadways applications in the Regional Solicitation.

Application Forms

The title of the "Bridges" application is proposed to change to "Bridge Rehabilitation/Reconstruction," which clarifies that the application is not directed to new bridges.

After discussing the application and procurement processes with transit providers, staff proposes inflating transit vehicle and operating costs as it does other costs.

Brown suggested clarifying that "estimate of eligible project costs really means "estimate of federally eligible project costs."

The budget has been adjusted to be able to better-track multimodal elements.

Staff recommends that noise walls not be included for the purpose of calculating cost/benefit measures. The reason for this is that there tends to be a great deal of uncertainty around whether noise walls will be included, rendering the potential for an unfair disadvantage in cost/benefit scoring for those who incorrectly program a noise wall.

Staff recommends that completion of the MnDOT interchange approval process be included in the risk assessment measure. The handout provided suggests 25 percent of the risk assessment be devoted to this. Keel suggested that 25 percent is high, given that right-of-way and railroad involvement show lower percentages. Robjent expressed agreement and suggested that completion of the interchange approval process should be worth less than right-of-way and railroad involvement.

Robjent said that Risk Assessment had minimal impact on the rankings in the previous Solicitation and suggested that it should be worth more points. Koutsoukos replied that point allocations will be discussed after the measures are complete.

Qualifying Requirements

Staff recommended increases in the award minimums for the Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities categories. Staff suggested an increase to $250,000 for Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities and Pedestrian Facilities and to $150,000 for Safe Routes to School. No application to the 2014 Regional Solicitation was lower than these amounts. This would help assure that applicants do not have cost-prohibitive federal requirements.

Robjent suggested that the maximum of $5.5 million for Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities should be changed. Previous Regional Solicitations had a $1 million maximum for Transportation Enhancements, though STP funds could be used in larger amounts. He suggested a maximum of $3.5 million. Burrows asked what the rational was for the $5.5 million maximum, to which Robjent replied that this was the STP maximum in the old Solicitations. Korsberg said that some DNR solicitations sort projects into scoring groups by funding range. Keel expressed

doubt that TAB would want to go down that path. Byers said that expensive projects tend to be more regional, to which Mayasich replied that this needs to be balanced with geographic equity. Mitteco said that pedestrian bridges often cost as much as $3 million. Staff will provide the $3.5 million maximum for Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities as an option to TAC.

Staff suggested quantifying expected useful life for various project types. Members did not feel that this is necessary and the qualification to operate and maintain projects for their useful life should remain as is.

Roadway Applications

Staff recommended that the Daily Heavy Commercial Traffic measure ask applicants to identify, for new roadways, the current daily heavy traffic volume that will be relocated from any parallel roadway(s) to the new roadway.

As a way to address the difficulty that less-traveled A-minor sub-classifications have competing, staff suggested separating the scoring by sub-classifications for several measures. Had this been done in the 2014 Regional Solicitation, some projects would have flipped and one connector may have been funded. Keel suggested that a risk could be that a project from a sub-class with few applications could be awarded funding despite not being a good project. He asked whether there could be a policy to fund at least one roadway in each sub-classification. Ohrn replied that this has been discussed but skipping projects on the ranked list has not been a popular idea. Staff will provide options to TAC.

Staff recommended removal of the existing local activity center points for the Regional Economy measure. This provided difficulty and confusion to applicants. Koutsoukos added that staff is considering the possibility of using a range rather than a "yes/no" score, which can make up for eliminating the local activity center score. Robjent expressed preference for that option, as it would create more spread in the scores. He suggested using traffic analysis zones (TAZs). Staff will explore the possibility of doing this.

Staff suggested eliminating the 50-year old cap from Infrastructure Age and simply providing the most points to the oldest roadway. Ryan Peterson suggested that age is not a great indicator of condition. Keel replied that there is no consistent pavement rating so age may be the best option.

Staff recommended that the Congestion Reduction measure allow for analysis at multiple intersections, which would provide a better indication of project benefits. Eyoh said that for new roadways, the Synchro program sometimes shows negative emissions.

TAC asked for options to include railroad crossing statistics as an allowable substitute for intersection crashes in safety scoring. Staff has created a railroad crossing scoring mechanism that could be used. Only two railroad crossing projects were submitted in response to the 2014 Regional Solicitation, with neither funded. Had the scoring mechanism been used, one of them would have been funded. General consensus among committee members was to leave this scoring mechanism out of the measure.

Staff suggested eliminating the Multimodal Connections measures and focusing on the Multimodal Facilities measure. It has been suggested to include freight as a multimodal element. This could include, for example, widening shoulders. This idea will be shared with TAC.

Because cost effectiveness of emissions reduction did not provide meaningful results, staff suggested removing cost effectiveness and replacing it with an additional "cost/benefit" measure.

The Infrastructure Deficiencies measure within the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization application proved difficult to score. Staff suggested adding criteria to make this less arbitrary. The Committee agreed to eliminate the "full-depth reclamation" criterion. Mitteco suggested including a criterion for streetscape elements.

7. Quarterly Report on Streamlined TIP Amendments – Information Item

Barbeau said that two TIP amendments started in Quarter 3, one streamlined and one standard.

8. Scope Change Review Process – Information Item

Mayasich requested that members read the material provided as this issue will be addressed at a future meeting.

9. Other Business

No other business.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.

ACTION TRANSMITTAL No. 2015-46

DATE:	October 27, 2015
TO:	TAC Funding & Programming Committee
PREPARED BY:	Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)
SUBJECT:	Hennepin County STP Defederalization
REQUESTED ACTION:	Hennepin County requests defederalization of its 2016 CSAH 45 Godfrey Bridge Replacement (#027-646-007). Federal funds would be provided to its 2016 CSAH 53 reconstruction project (#027-653-021). Both projects were awarded STP funding in the 2011 Regional Solicitation.
RECOMMENDED MOTION:	Recommend approval of the defederalization request on the condition that the County will deliver both projects as approved in the TAB solicitation.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF ACTION: Hennepin County received $1,792,000 of federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding in the 2011 Regional Solicitation for replacement of the CSAH 46 Bridge (often referred to as the Godfrey Bridge) over Godfrey Parkway in Minneapolis. Hennepin County also received $7,840,000 in STP funding in the same solicitation for reconstruction of CSAH 53.

To save cost and staff time, Hennepin County requests “defederalization” of the Godfrey Bridge project, which would entail moving STP funds from that project to the CSAH 53 reconstruction project and funding the entire Godfrey Bridge project with local funds.

As is acknowledged in the attached draft County Board resolution, the County agrees to the following:

- Both projects will be delivered in fiscal year 2016, as originally programmed.
- Both projects remain subject to the Council’s Program Year Policy.
- Both projects will be completed as proposed in the 2011 Regional Solicitation. Should the County desire to make any project changes, both projects are subject to the Council’s Scope Change Policy.
- Should all or part of the Godfrey Bridge project be unable to be completed, the County will reimburse the region for the appropriate amount.

The County’s request is attached. The County is aware that the defederalization action cannot be completed until the resolution is official.

RELATIONSHIP TO REGIONAL POLICY: Projects that receive funding through the regional solicitation process must have significant changes (such as, but not limited to, scope changes or program year extensions) approved by TAB. This requested funding exchange does not change either project from a technical perspective,. Each project will continue to be monitored by MnDOT Metro District State Aid to assure that they are completed as proposed and on time.

ROUTING

TO	ACTION REQUESTED	DATE COMPLETED
TAC Funding & Programming Committee	Review & Recommend	
Technical Advisory Committee	Review & Recommend	
Transportation Advisory Board	Review & Adopt	

Hennepin County
Public Works

Transportation Department
James N. Grube P.E.
1600 Prairie Drive
Medina, Minnesota 55340
www.hennepin.us/transportation

612-596-0300, Phone
612-321-3410, Fax

October 28, 2015

Mr. Dan Erickson
MnDOT Metro State Aid Engineer
1500 County Road B2 West
Roseville, MN 55113

RE: S.P. 027-646-007 – Bridge 90585 carrying CSAH 46 over Godfrey Ave. in Minneapolis

Dear Mr. Erickson:

This letter is to inform you of Hennepin County's intent to transfer federal aid funding currently assigned to the project referenced above, and seek your partnership in this effort through the revision of the TIP/STIP to reflect the above mentioned transfer in funding.

Hennepin County proposes the transfer of federal aid from the Godfrey Bridge Replacement Project, S.P. 027-646-007, to the CSAH 53 Reconstruction Project, S.P. 027-653-021. This transfer would increase the percentage of federal funding on the CSAH 53 Reconstruction Project from 20% to 24%. The resulting information for these projects following the proposed transfer of funds is shown below:

Project Number	Road	Project Name	Allocation Year	Funding Requested	Federal Funding for Allocation Year (Current)	Federal Funding for Allocation Year (Proposed)	Funding Source
027-646-007	CSAH 46	Godfrey Bridge Replacement	2016	$ 1,600,000	$ 1,792,000	$ 0	STP/BIR
027-653-021	CSAH 53	CSAH 53 Reconstruction	2016	$ 7,000,000	$ 7,840,000	$ 9,632,000	STP

Hennepin County will use County State Aid funds to close the funding gap created by the transfer of funds from S.P. 027-646-007.

Hennepin County commits to following the state aid process and associated requirements for project S.P. 027-646-007. This commitment will be carried forward in the adoption of a county board resolution agreeing to repay the region if for any reason the project is not delivered.

Sincerely,

James N. Grube

James N. Grube, P.E.
County Highway Engineer
Hennepin County
1600 Prairie Drive
Medina, MN 55340
Office: 612-596-0305 Cell: 612-250-2615
james.grube@hennepin.us

cc: File
Other

Section 1: Item Description

Stating an understanding with the Transportation Advisory Board and the Minnesota Department of Transportation for the transfer of Federal Surface Transportation Program funds on projects in Hennepin County and requesting acceptance by the Transportation Advisory Board.

Section 2: Resolution

WHEREAS, Hennepin County has received Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) grants through the 2011 Transportation Advisory Board regional solicitation for replacement of the CSAH 46 (46th Street East) bridge, over Godfrey Road, in the City of Minneapolis (CP 2111700; SP 027-646-007), and for the reconstruction of CSAH 53 (66th Street) between CSAH 31 (Xerxes Avenue South) and Cedar Avenue South in the City of Richfield (CP 2101100; SP 027-653-021); and

WHEREAS, the 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program identifies the CSAH 46 (46th Street East) bridge replacement project in program year 2016 with a total STP grant of $1,792,000, and the CSAH 53 (66th Street) reconstruction project in program year 2016 with a STP grant of $7,840,000; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Advisory Board, the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) and Hennepin County acknowledge that Federal funding on projects take more staffing resources and increase timelines and costs to deliver projects; and

WHEREAS, all three parties share a mutual goal of delivering federal-aid projects in a cost effective manner; and

WHEREAS, Hennepin County has identified an opportunity for such efficiencies and is requesting the federal funding grant in the amount of $1,792,000 for the CSAH 46 (46th Street East) bridge replacement project be transferred to the CSAH 53 (66th Street) reconstruction project; and

WHEREAS, the CSAH 53 (66th Street) reconstruction project is significantly larger in scope and federal funding can be up to 80 percent of the total construction costs preliminarily estimated at $40,000,000; and

WHEREAS, after discussion with the Transportation Advisory Board and MnDOT all parties have agreed that this is an efficient and effective approach to minimizing the costs for delivering locally led federal projects; and

WHEREAS, Hennepin County commits to deliver the CSAH 46 (46th Street East) bridge replacement project in the designated 2016 program year under the State Aid process and it will comply with permits and environmental requirements as a State Aid Project; and

WHEREAS, if a scope change from the application submitted for the CSAH 46 (46th Street East) bridge replacement project is needed, all parties understand that the Transportation Advisory Board policy on Scope changes will apply; and

WHEREAS, MnDOT State Aid staff will monitor the CSAH 46 (46th Street East) bridge replacement project to ensure consistency with the project's application, project schedule to meet program year requirements and field monitor final construction for consistency with the plans; and

WHEREAS, Hennepin County understands that failure to deliver the CSAH 46 (46th Street East) bridge replacement project within the application scope or the program year could result in the need to repay a portion or all of the federal money back to the region for distribution to other regional projects; and

WHEREAS, Hennepin County understands that the grant funds for the CSAH 53 (66th Street) reconstruction project will remain in program year 2016 and will not be advanced by Hennepin County; and

WHEREAS, Hennepin County has provided project schedules that demonstrate its ability to deliver both projects by the timelines that Metro State Aid requires for federal-aid projects; and

WHEREAS, the CSAH 53 (66th Street) reconstruction project will be delivered by Hennepin County using the local Federal Aid Delegated Contract Process; and

WHEREAS, all parties commit to assisting Hennepin County with this delivery schedule for the CSAH 53 (66th Street) reconstruction project and will ensure that this arrangement for funding transfer is incorporated in the 2016-2019 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program and MnDOT Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners in and for the County of Hennepin Minnesota hereby commits to this understanding with the Transportation Advisory Board and the Minnesota Department of Transportation regarding the transfer of the CSAH 46 (46th Street East) bridge replacement project grant funds to the CSAH 53 (66th Street) reconstruction project; and

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Commissioners request that the Transportation Advisory Board approves this request by formal action at its _____, 20___ meeting.

Section 3: Background

History:

Current Request:

Impact/Outcomes:

APEX contract description (limit 30 characters)

Section 4: Refer to Excel Financial Template

Have funds been included in the budget? NA

Did you obtain a Substitute W-9 (required in most cases)? NA

Section 5 : Other Information

Contact Person Wayne Loos
Contact Phone Number 612-596-0380

Request Immediate (No)

Certified Copy Needed (Yes)

Section 6 : Add Additional Readers
Abeba Abebe, Dushani Dye, Kariann Gottesman, Allen P. Rezac

Proposal: To place federal funds on one large Hennepin County project being delivered in 2016.

Federal dollars from a smaller Hennepin County project, the Godfrey Bridge Replacement, selected in the 2011 solicitation would be transferred to the CSAH 53 reconstruction project. The Godfrey Bridge Replacement project will be delivered in the original TIP program year as a County or State Aid project rather than a federal aid project.

In 2011 Hennepin County was selected for the following federal funds in the STP category:

Project Number	Road	Project Name	Allocation Year	Funding Requested	Federal Funding for Allocation Year (Current)	Federal Funding for Allocation Year (Proposed)	Funding Source
027-646-007	CSAH 46	Godfrey Bridge Replacement	2016	$ 1,600,000	$ 1,792,000	$ 0	STP/BIR
027-653-021	CSAH 53	CSAH 53 Reconstruction	2016	$ 7,000,000	$ 7,840,000	$ 9,632,000	STP

Hennepin County seeks to **transfer federal funds from the Godfrey Bridge Replacement Project to the CSAH 53 Reconstruction Project**. Both projects will remain in the 2016-2019 TIP. With inflation; the federal STP funding for the CSAH 53 Reconstruction will be $9,632,000. The total construction cost is estimated at $40,000,000 (uninflated), thus the transfer of funds results in a CSAH 53 Reconstruction Project in which 24 percent or less of the preliminary construction estimate is federal aid.

ACTION TRANSMITTAL No. 2015-47

DATE:	November 2, 2015
TO:	TAC Funding and Programming Committee
PREPARED BY:	Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)
SUBJECT:	2016-2019 TIP Amendment for Hennepin County: Federal and Local Funds Exchange
REQUESTED ACTION:	Hennepin County requests an amendment to the 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to move $1,792,000 in STP funds from its Godfrey Bride Replacement (SP# 027-646-007) to its CSAH 53 Reconstruction (SP# 027-653-021) in exchange for local funds.
RECOMMENDED MOTION:	Recommend that the Transportation Advisory Board adopt the amendment into the 2016-2019 TIP to move $1,792,000 in STP funds from the Godfrey Bride Replacement (SP# 027-646-007) to its CSAH 53 Reconstruction (SP# 027-653-021) in exchange for local funds.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF ACTION: Hennepin County wishes to re-allocate its federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding from the Godfrey Bride Replacement (SP# 027-646-007) to its CSAH 53 Reconstruction (SP# 027-653-021) in exchange for local funds. This transfer of $1,792,000 leaves the former with no federal aid and increases the proportion of federal aid in the latter from 19.6% to 24%, which is well below the STP program limit of 80%.

RELATIONSHIP TO REGIONAL POLICY: Federal law requires that all transportation projects that will be funded with federal funds must be in an approved TIP and meet the following four tests: fiscal constraint; consistency with the adopted regional transportation plan; air quality conformity; and opportunity for public input. It is the TAB's responsibility to adopt and amend the TIP according to these four requirements. Because both projects were selected through TAB's regional solicitation process, both will remain in the TIP, even though SP# 027-646-007 no longer includes federal funds.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The TIP amendment meets fiscal constraint because the federal and local funds are sufficient to fully fund the project. This amendment is consistent with the Metropolitan Council Transportation Policy Plan, adopted by the Metropolitan Council on January 14, 2015 with FHWA/FTA conformity determination established on March 13, 2015.The Minnesota Interagency Air Quality and Transportation Planning Committee determined that the project is exempt from air quality conformity analysis. Public input opportunities for this amendment are provided through the TAB's and Council's regular meetings.

ROUTING

TO	ACTION REQUESTED	DATE COMPLETED
TAC Funding & Programming Committee	Review & Recommend	
Technical Advisory Committee	Review & Recommend	
Transportation Advisory Board	Review & Recommend	
Transportation Committee	Review & Recommend	
Metropolitan Council	Review & Release	

Please amend the 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to adjust the funding sources for the below two projects:

PROJECT 1 IDENTIFICATION:

SEQ #	STATE FISCAL YEAR	ATP	DIST	ROUTE SYSTEM	PROJECT NUMBER (S.P. #) (Fed # if available)	AGENCY	DESCRIPTION include location, description of all work, & city (if applicable)	MILES
1470	2016	M	M	CSAH 46	027-646-007	Hennepin County	CSAH 46 (46th St East) over Godfrey Pkwy in Mpls-Replace BR 90585 (New Bridge 27B84)	-

PROG	TYPE OF WORK	PROP FUNDS	TOTAL $	FHWA $	AC $	FTA $	TH $	OTHER $
BR	Bridge Replace	STP	$5,140,000	~~$1,792,000~~ 0	-	-	-	~~$3,348,000~~ $5,140,000

PROJECT 2 IDENTIFICATION:

SEQ #	STATE FISCAL YEAR	ATP	DIST	ROUTE SYSTEM	PROJECT NUMBER (S.P. #) (Fed # if available)	AGENCY	DESCRIPTION include location, description of all work, & city (if applicable)	MILES
1471	2016	M	M	CSAH 53	027-653-021	Hennepin County	CSAH 53, from Xerxes Ave S to Richfield Parkway in Richfield-Roundabout, turn lanes, bike/ped facility	-

PROG	TYPE OF WORK	PROP FUNDS	TOTAL $	FHWA $	AC $	FTA $	TH $	OTHER $
RD	Grade and Surface	STP	$40,000,000	~~$7,840,000~~ $9,632,000	-	-	-	~~$32,160,000~~ $30,368,000

PROJECT BACKGROUND:

1. Briefly describe why amendment is needed (e.g., project in previous TIP but not completed; illustrative project and funds now available; discretionary funds received; inadvertently not included in TIP).

   An amendment is needed to adjust the federal funding for these two projects. Project 1 will be funded entirely with local funds. Project 2 will use the FHWA funds from Project 1 and use less local funding. The scopes of these project are not changing.

2. How is Fiscal Constraint Maintained as required by 23 CFR 450.216 (check all that apply)?

   - New Money
   - Anticipated Advance Construction
   - ATP or MPO or MnDOT Adjustment by deferral of other projects
   - Earmark or HPP not affecting fiscal constraint
   - Other X

Cumulative federal and local funds are not changing for these two projects. The federal funding from Project 1 will be reduced by $1,792,000 and the local funding will be increased by $1,792,000. The federal funding for Project 2 will be increased by $1,792,000 and the local funding will be reduced by $1,792,000. These federal and local funds are sufficient to fully fund the projects; therefore, fiscal constraint is maintained.

CONSISTENCY WITH MPO LONG RANGE PLAN:

This amendment is consistent with the Metropolitan Council Transportation Policy Plan, adopted by the Metropolitan Council on January 14, 2015 with FHWA/FTA conformity determination established on March 13, 2015.

AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY:

- Subject to conformity determination
- Exempt from regional level analysis X
- N/A (not in a nonattainment or maintenance area

Project 1 (027-646-007) is exempt (S-19, Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes).

Project 2 (SP 027-653-021) is subject to conformity determination - A20.

Because this is an exchange of funds involving no change to the projects, no conformity determination is needed.

Information Item

DATE:	November 10, 2015
TO:	TAC Funding and Programming Committee
PREPARED BY:	Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)
SUBJECT:	Draft Policy and Process to Defederalize TAB-Selected Projects

In recent months, two recipients of TAB-awarded STP funding have approached Council staff about the possibility of "defederalizing" projects. In each case, the applicants wanted to move federal funds from a smaller project to a larger project, leaving the former free of federal funding. This provides several advantages in terms of local expense and staff time.

A work group was established to work with the applicants on their requests and to establish a long-term policy and process for future requests. Members expressed concern that all projects must be completed on time and as applied for in the solicitation application. Any time a TAB-selected project is not completed, the amount of federal funds programmed to it will be returned to the region. All defederalized projects are subject to the Council's scope change and program year policies.

Attached are a policy/process and a table, supplied by MnDOT Metro District State Aid, highlighting federal versus state requirments.

While the attached policy and process is essentially reflective of the work group's general consensus, there was one point of contention that the committee may wish to address: whether to include policy language that federal funds cannot be moved back a year (which could leave TAB/State Aid with the burden of having to reallocate funds). Currently, no such language is included.

POLICY AND PROCESS TO DEFEDERALIZE TAB-SELECTED PROJECTS

OVERVIEW

Projects selected through the TAB Regional Solicitation and HSIP processes are awarded federal funds and are therefore subject to federal requirements that can cost an agency considerable time and money. When conditions are right, an agency may consider "defederalizing" a project. Defederalization entails transferring federal funds from one project ("defederalized project") to another project already subject to federal requirements ("receiving project"), allowing the former project to proceed without adherence to some federal requirements.

POLICY

Project Sponsors:

- Project sponsors must voluntarily agree to participate in the defederalization of a project, be it their own or another sponsor's.
- One sponsor may defederalize one or more of its projects by shifting federal funds to one or more of its other projects.
- One sponsor may defederalize one or more of its projects by working with other sponsor(s) to absorb federal funds in exchange for local funding.
- TAB will not recognize agreements for "future consideration" (i.e., TAB will not enforce an agreement for one sponsor to "return the favor" to another sponsor at a future time).
- All sponsors involved with a defederalization request must provide a resolution agreeing to be responsible for the project, the project's timing, and the risks.

Funding:

- All federally funded projects must maintain the federally required minimum local match (usually 20%, but 10% for Highway Safety Improvement Program).
- All funds transfers should be one-to-one in terms of funding amount. A sponsor may not "purchase" defederalization by exchanging federal funds for a lesser amount of local funding.
- All transferred funds must be eligible to be used on the project they are proposed to fund.
- Defederalized funds may only be transferred to a project that is eligible to receive those funds. In cases in which the funds are not eligible to the project proposed to receive funds, the MnDOT Metro District State Aid office may "flex" funds though the USDOT.
- If federal funds are transferred to a project with an earlier program year, the sponsor must advance construct (AC) the project and be reimbursed in the year to which the funds are assigned in the TIP. A TIP amendment is required to reflect the use of AC.

Defederalized Projects:

- Defederalized projects must be completed with all elements, and in the time frame, shown in the original application for funding. MnDOT Metro District State Aid or Metropolitan Council Transit Grants, depending on the project, will continue to monitor all TAB-selected projects to assure that they are completed consistent with policy.
- Defederalized projects are subject to TAB's Scope Change Consultation and Evaluation processes. Project sponsors must consult with MnDOT Metro District State Aid or Metropolitan Council Transit Grants, depending on the project, in order to seek permission to deviate from the approved scope.

- Defederalized projects are subject to TAB's Program Year Policy.
- Should a TAB-selected project be withdrawn or otherwise unable to be completed, the project sponsor must return its federal funding to the region. If the federal funding has already been committed to a local project, the sponsor must provide local funds to TAB. This will be reflected in the resolution provided by the sponsor.

PROCESS

1. Applicant submits a project defederalization request. Requests must be made by December 31 of the state fiscal year prior to the program year associated with the earliest-programmed project involved in the transfer. For example, defederalization of a project programmed in fiscal year 2018 must be requested by December 31, 2016.

2. Applicant provides a proposal to Metropolitan Council and MnDOT Metro State Aid. The proposal must include the following:
   - Description and funding table showing proposed defederalized project(s) and receiving project(s) will absorb the federal funds. Amount and source of funds must be shown as well.
   - Resolution(s) from the governing board of any agencies involved with the defederalization. The resolution must include:
     - Identification of any proposed defederalized project(s) and receiving project(s). Amounts must be included
     - Source(s) of non-federal funds.
     - Commitment to completing all TAB-selected projects in the program year identified in the TIP.
     - Acknowledgement that all TAB-selected projects will comply with all MnDOT State Aid or Metropolitan Council Transit Grants project requirements.
     - Acknowledgement that all TAB-selected projects will be completed with the scope and timing proposed in the original application and that MnDOT State Aid and/or Metropolitan Council Transit Grants will monitor the project to assure that this happens.
     - Acknowledgement that all TAB-selected projects are subject to TAB's scope change policy.
     - Guarantee that should they fail to deliver part or all of the TAB-funded projects, federal funding will be turned back to the region for distribution to other regional projects.
     - Acknowledgment of any project advancement and advanced construction that needs to occur.
     - Guarantee that the project will be delivered using the local State Aid process or Metropolitan Council Transit Grants process.

Federal and State Aid Requirements

Task	State Aid Funding	Federal Aid Funding
Project in the STIP (State Transportation Improvement Program)		X
PPMS (MnDOT Scheduling Software)		X
Project of Divisional Interest (PODI) - if applicable **-** required full FHWA oversight/approvals of environmental, construction plans and construction		X
Kickoff Meeting (project sponsor & State Aid)		X
Advance Construct (AC) Agreement if applicable		X
DCP Agency Agreement		X
Environmental Impacts	X (State Process)	X (Federal Process)
Environmental Document Preparation/Review (Environmental Assessment or Project Memorandum)	(1)	X
- Public Involvement	(1)	X
- Cultural Resources/SHPO		X
- Threatened and Endangered Species		X
- Noise Analysis		X
- 4 (f)/6 (f)		X
- Environmental Justice		X
Delegated Contract Process (DCP)		X
Construction Plans	X	X
- Design complies with State Aid Rules	X	X
- ADA Compliance	(1)	X
- Traffic Control Plan	(1)	X
- Erosion Control Plan	(1)	X
- State Aid Force Account for work by local forces	X	
- Federal Aid Force Account for work by local forces **-** requires review/approval and federal funding authorization by FHWA prior to the work being done.		X
Right of Way Acquisition	(1)	X
Right of Way Review/Certificate		X
Utility Relocation Certificate		X
Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE)/On the Job Training (OJT) Goals/Determination		X
Specifications/Proposal Preparation	X	X
Specifications Review		X
- Federal documents included		X
- Federal Wage Rates		X
- State Wage Rates	X	X
- Schedule of Materials Control	X	X
- Buy America		X

Task	State Aid Funding	Federal Aid Funding
Proprietary Items	X	
- Proprietary Items not allowed unless a Public Interest Statement is provided/approved		X
Local Hiring Preferences	X	
- Local Hiring Preferences not allowed		X
Required Permits (DNR, COE, NPDES, etc.)		X
Federal Authorization of funding by FHWA		X
Advertisement for Bid		
- Ad language Review/Approval (required federal language)		X
- local agency publishes advertisement	X	X
Bid Opening	X	X
- Project Sponsor consults with State Aid to set bid opening date (must follow federal requirements)		X
- DBE Review/Clearance from Office of Civil Rights		X
- Bid Abstract Review		X
- Bid Justification Review/Approval if bids +/- 10% of Engineers Estimate		X
Project Award	X	X
- Project Award Concurrence		X
POST- AWARD		
Payment Requests submitted	X	X
- 95% of bid paid following contract award and required documentation	X	
- Federal funds are reimbursed up to the participation level as costs are incurred.		X
Independent Assurance Testing		X
DBE/OJT Monitoring		X
Supplemental Agreement (SA) and Change Order (CO) Submittals/Review/Approval	X	X
Materials Exception Summary Review/Approval by MnDOT Materials		X
Final Inspection	X	X

(1) Project sponsor follows local process. Not reviewed by State Aid or FHWA.

Information Item

DATE:	November 10, 2015
TO:	TAC Funding and Programming Committee
PREPARED BY:	Katie White, Senior Planner (651-602-1716)
SUBJECT:	TDM Solicitation Score List

On June 24, 2015, the Metropolitan Council authorized the release of a solicitation for Transportation Demand Management (TDM) projects. Applications for funding were due September 11, 2015. A total of 11 projects were submitted requesting a total of $2,420,696, which is greater than the $1,800,000 available.

Below is a table with the recommended scores from the scoring team. Members of the team included: Jan Lucke; Innocent Eyoh; Jane Kansier; Paul Oehme; Dan Marckel; John Kari; Tara Beard; and Craig Jenson. Elaine Koutsoukos and Katie White assisted the scoring team.

As currently scored, seven projects would be fully funded, and one would be partially funded.

Following the November Funding & Programming meeting, the scores will be released to applicants and the appeals process will begin. At the December Funding & Programming meeting the appeals will be heard, and the final project list will be adopted.

2015 Regional Solicitation Application Scoring

TDM

Prioritizing Criteria

ID	Applicant	Project Name	Funding Information			1. Role in Trans. System & Econ.		2. Usage	3. Equity / Housing		4. Cong. Mit. AQ		5. Innovation		6. Risk Assessment			Total	Recommended Funding Amount
						100 pts avail		100 pts avail	150 pts avail		400 pts avail		200 pts avail		50 pts avail				
						1A	1B	2	3A	3B	4A	4B	5A	5B	6A	6B	6C		
						0-50	0-50	0-100	0-80	0-70	0-200	0-200	0-100	0-100	0-15	0-20	0-15	**0-1,000**	
			Federal	Match	Total														
3778	Nice Ride	Densification and Infill Initiative	$300,000	$150,000	$450,000	40	38	55	40	69.29	200	200	79	56	15	20	15	**827**	$300,000
3733	UMN -- Y. Fan	Smartphone based interventions	$300,000	$75,000	$375,000	40	38	45	20	59.50	180	150	100	83	15	20	15	**766**	$300,000
3855	St. Paul Smart Trips	Trip Planning	$95,000	$56,944	$151,944	50	50	100	40	70.00	100	46	86	56	15	20	10	**643**	$95,000
3816	UMN -- A. Lari	eWorkplace Phase III	$300,000	$75,000	$375,000	50	12	18	40	64.99	160	100	50	83	15	20	10	**623**	$300,000
3811	Carver County	Transportation Management Association	$160,000	$40,000	$200,000	50	14	73	20	39.37	121	90	64	83	15	20	15	**604**	$160,000
3856	Anoka County	Fridley Northstar Station Shuttle Service	$240,000	$60,000	$300,000	50	15	64	40	57.14	97	84	79	72	15	12	10	**595**	$240,000
3794	Cycles for Change	Bicycle Access & Training at Spokes	$300,000	$75,000	$375,000	40	26	36	80	69.29	107	24	57	100	15	20	10	**584**	$300,000
3830	Metro Transit	Integrated Real Time Information	$120,000	$30,000	$150,000	0	26	91	40	60.07	30	86	86	83	15	20	15	**552**	$105,000
3780	Mpls Bicycle Coalition	Community Bicycle Connectors	$239,000	$64,000	$303,000	0	12	9	80	69.29	105	18	100	89	15	20	12	**529**	$0
3851	Transit for Livable Communities	Transportation Leadership for Cities	$66,696	$16,674	$83,370	0	0	27	20	70.00	130	58	86	72	15	20	10	**508**	$0
3781	Metro Transit	Mobility Ecosystem	$300,000	$75,000	$375,000	0	26	82	0	43.30	30	86	29	22	15	12	10	**355**	$0
Total funds requested			$2,420,696																
Total amount available			$1,800,000																

Information Item

DATE:	November 12, 2015
TO:	TAC Funding and Programming Committee
PREPARED BY:	Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)
SUBJECT:	2016 Regional Solicitation Update

Today's regional solicitation discussion will include a review of potential changes to be made to the Transit, TDM, and non-motorized applications.

Transit Expansion – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

Definition: A transit project that provides new or expanded transit service/facilities. Routine facility maintenance and upkeep is not eligible.

Examples of Transit Expansion Projects:

- Operating funds for new or expanded transit service
- Transit vehicles for new or expanded service
- Transit shelters, centers, stations, and platforms for new or expanded service along a route
- Park-and-ride facilities

Minimum Federal Award: $500,000
Maximum Federal Award: $7,000,000

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	**100**	**10%**
Measure A - Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions~~, Manufacturing / Distribution Locations, and Educational Institutions and local activity centers~~	33	
Measure B - Existing population within 0.25 mile (bus stop) or 0.5 mile (transitway)	33	
Measure C ~~–~~ ~~Ridership~~Average daily ~~of~~ transit routes directly connected to the project	34	
2. Usage	**350**	**35%**
~~Measure A - Cost effectiveness of project per rider~~	~~105~~	
~~Measure B - Cost effectiveness of project per new rider~~	~~70~~	
Measure ~~C~~ A - ~~Service (operating) cost effectiveness of project per new rider~~New annual riders	~~175~~350	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**200**	**20%**
Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation	130	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Emissions Reduction	**200**	**20%**
Measure A - Total emissions reduced	~~133~~200	
~~Measure B - Cost effectiveness (project cost/kg of emissions reduced)~~	~~67~~	
5. Multimodal Facilities and Connections	**100**	**10%**
~~Measure A - Bicycle and pedestrian connections~~	~~50~~	
Measure ~~B~~ A - Multimodal elements of the project and existing connections	~~50~~100	
6. Risk Assessment	**50**	**5%**
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	50	
Sub-Total	**1,000**	**100%**
7. Cost-Benefit Ratio	**TBD**	
Measure A – Cost-benefit ratio (total project cost/total points awarded)	TBD	
	TBD	

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (100 Points; 10 Percent of Total Points) - Tying regional policy (Thrive MSP2040) to the Regional Solicitation, this criterion measures the regional significance of the project, including the project's connections to jobs, Educational Institutions (as defined in ThriveMSP 2040)~~, local activity centers~~, population centers, and the project's ability to provide regional transit system connections (measured through the ~~annual transit ridership~~number of ~~of~~ connecting, weekday transit trips).

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Regional Economy" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing employment and educational institution enrollment within 1/4 mile of the project's bus stops or within 1/2 mile of the project's transitway stations. Existing employment will be measured by summing the employment located in the TAZ's that intersect the 1/4-mile or 1/2-mile buffers. Enrollment at public and private post-secondary institutions will also be measured. (33 Points)

Upload the "Regional Economy" map used for this measure.

RESPONSE (Data from the "Regional Economy" map):

- Existing Employment: _____
- Existing Post-Secondary Enrollment: _____

~~Reference the "Regional Economy" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Identify whether the project connects to an the project's connections to the Job Concentrations, Manufacturing/ Distribution Locations and educational institutionEducational Institutions as defined in ThriveMSP 2040, and depicted in the "Regional Economy" map. If the project does not provide a connection to a Job Concentration, Manufacturing/Distribution Location, or Educational Institution, but provides a connection to a local activity center, reference the adopted county or city plan identifying this area. (5 points)~~

~~*RESPONSE (Select all that apply, based on the "Regional Economy" map):*~~

- ~~Direct connection to or within 1/4 mile (bus stop) or 1/2 mile (transitway station) of a Job Concentration: ☐ (33 Points)~~
- ~~Direct connection to or within 1/4 mile (bus stop) or 1/2 mile (transitway station) of a Manufacturing/Distribution Location: ☐ (33 Points)~~
- ~~Direct connection to or within 1/4 mile (bus stop) or 1/2 mile (transitway station) of an Educational Institution:☐ (33 5 Points)~~
- ~~Project provides a direct connection to or within 1/4 mile (bus stop) or 1/2 mile (transitway station) of an existing local activity center identified in an adopted county or city plan:☐ (20 Points)~~

Note: Transitways offer travel time advantages for transit vehicles, improve transit service reliability, and increase the convenience and attractiveness of transit service. Transitways are defined in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail, light rail, highway and arterial bus rapid transit. Eligible transitway projects are those that have a mode and alignment identified in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan.

If the project includes construction of a park-and-ride facility, employment and eligible educational institutions only include those directly connected by the transit routes exiting the facility.

SCORING GUIDANCE (option 1) (33 Points)

The applicant with the highest employment will receive the full 33 points for the employment portion of this measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 workers within 1/4 mile and the top project had 1,500 workers, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*33 points or 22 points. Using the Metropolitan Council model, all census blocks that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project.

For the connection to educational institutions portion of this measure, the applicant with the highest post-secondary enrollment will receive the full 33 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 students within 1/4 mile and the top project had 1,500 students, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*33 points or 22 points.

The scorer will assess if the applicant would score higher with the employment part of the measure or the school enrollment part of the measure, and give the applicant the higher of the two scores out of a maximum of 33 points.

Using the Metropolitan Council model, all Census block groups that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project will be included in the analysis.

SCORING GUIDANCE (option 2) (33 Points)

The applicant with the highest combined total employment and post-secondary education enrollment will receive the full 33 points for this measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 workers/students within 1/4 mile and the top project had 1,500 workers/students, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*33 points or 22 points. Using the Metropolitan Council model, all census blocks that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project.

Using the Metropolitan Council model, all Census blocks groups that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project will be included in the analysis.

B. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Population Summary" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing population within 1/4 mile of the project's bus stops or within 1/2 mile of the project's transitway stations. Existing population will be measured by summing the population located in the Census block that intersect the 1/4-mile or 1/2-mile buffers. (33 Points)

Upload the "Population Summary" map used for this measure.

RESPONSE (Data from the "Population Summary" map):

- Existing Population:_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (33 Points)
The applicant with the highest population will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 people within 1/4 mile and the top project had 1,500 people, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*33 points or 22 points.

Using the Metropolitan Council model, all Census blocks that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project will be included in the analysis.

C. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Transit Connectivity" map generated at the beginning of the application process. List the transit routes directly connected to the project to help determine the ~~annual~~ average weekday transit trips these connecting routes provide, as depicted on the "Transit Connectivity" map. Metropolitan Council staff will provide ~~annual ridership~~the average weekday trips for each connecting transit route. Connections to planned transitway stations should be separately cited. Any transitway connection is worth 10 points. (34 Points)

Upload the "Transit Connectivity" map used for this measure.

RESPONSE (Data from the "Transit Connectivity" map):

- Existing transit routes directly connected to the project: _____ (24 Points)
- Planned transitways directly connect to the project (mode and alignment determined and identified in the 2040 TPP): : ☐ (10 Points)

SCORING GUIDANCE (34 Points)
The applicant with route connections having the highest ~~annual transit ridership~~number of ~~available daily rides~~weekday trips will receive the full points (as shown above). Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had connecting ridership of 100 trips and the top project had 150 trips, this applicant would receive (100/150)*24 points or 16 points.

Any project with a connection to a planned transitway station should be awarded 10 points.

After each of the above scores are tabulated the top total score will be adjusted to 34 with all other projects adjusted proportionately. For example, if the top application scored 28 points, it would be adjusted to 34. A project that scored 19 points would be awarded (19/28)*34, or 23 points.

2. Usage (350 Points; 35 Percent of Total Points) – This criterion quantifies the project's impact by estimating the annual transit ridership of the project ~~to determine the overall cost-effectiveness per rider~~.

A. *MEASURE:* This measure will calculate the project's ~~total~~new riders~~cost effectiveness per rider~~. Based on the service type, estimate and provide the ~~total~~ new annual transit ridership ~~(existing plus new ridership)~~ that is produced by the new project in the third year of service ~~(~~2024~~)~~. ~~Total annual transit ridership will be used as an input to calculate cost effectiveness.~~

~~In addition to ridership estimation, estimate and provide the annualized capital cost of the project and the annual operating cost of the project; the sum of these cost components equal the total annual project costs. The annualized project cost is derived from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidelines on useful life. Annualized project cost is the lump sum total project cost divided by the FTA "years of useful life" as listed belowhere. If the project has two or more components with differing years of useful life, annualize the components (see examples below). If the project type is not listed belowin the document, use most similar project type or provide supporting documentation on useful life value used.~~

~~*RESPONSE (Cost effectiveness will be automatically calculated):*~~
~~Total Annual Operating Cost: _____~~
~~Total Annual Capital Cost of Project: _____~~
~~Total Annual Project Cost: _____~~
~~Total Annual Ridership: _____~~

- ~~Cost Effectiveness of Total Ridership = Total annual project cost / total annual transit ridership.~~

Select the service type and provide the annual transit ridership, based on the methodology listed below

For Express Route Projects to Minneapolis and St. Paul Only:

- Use the 2020 forecast from the park-and-ride demand estimation model in the 2030 Regional Park-and-Ride Plan (Appendix B) to develop a ridership estimate. The market will be defined using the prescribed site location criteria in the plan and demand estimates determined by the TAZs in the express bus route market area. If possible, the applicant will use the ridership figures provided for an existing or planned facility.

  The 2030 Regional Park-and-Ride Plan forecasts 2020 demand to downtown Minneapolis and downtown St. Paul based off 2008 data. If the applicant wants to use more up-to-date data than 2008, then they must follow the methodology and equations from the Park-and-Ride Plan and clearly describe the methodology and assumptions used to estimate annual ridership.

  Note: Any Express routes not going to these downtown areas should follow the peer route methodology described in the "**For Urban and Suburban Local Routes and Suburb-to-Suburb Express Routes Only**" section.

For Transitways Projects Only:

- Use most recent forecast data to estimate ridership for the third year of service. Forecast data for the transitway must be derived from a study or plan that uses data approved by Metropolitan Council staff. This includes the most up-to-date estimates from plans that have been already adopted. Describe the methodology and assumptions used to estimate annual ridership.

Note: Transitways offer travel time advantages for transit vehicles, improve transit service reliability, and increase the convenience and attractiveness of transit service. Transitways are defined in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail, light rail, highway and arterial bus rapid transit. Eligible transitway projects are those that have a mode and alignment identified in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan.

For Urban and Suburban Local Routes and Suburb-to-Suburb Express Routes Only:

- Use peer routes that are currently in service to develop a ridership estimate for the third year of service. Applicants must use the most recent annual ridership figures that are available. To select the peer routes, the applicant should identify routes in the same transit market area (as defined in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan), or routes that serve locations with similar development patterns. Applicants must use the average passengers per service hour of at least three peer routes to apply a rate of ridership for the proposed service project. Additionally, describe how a peer route was selected in the response and any assumptions used.

RESPONSE:

- Service Type:____
- New Annual Ridership ~~(Existing plus New Riders)~~:_____
- Assumptions Used (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):_____
- Urban and Suburban Local Routes Peer Route Selection (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (350 Points)

The applicant with the highest ~~total~~ new annual ridership will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had ridership of 1,000,000 riders and the top project had a ridership of 1,500,000 riders, this applicant would receive (1,000,000/1,500,000)*350 points or 233 points.

For urban and suburban local bus service and suburb-to-suburb express service, applicants should use peer routes from the same Transportation Policy Plan market area or peer routes that serve locations with similar development patterns. Points are scored based on sound methodology and clear relationship to the peer routes.

For all service types, 50 percent of points can be deducted if the applicant provides no methodology. If a methodology is provided, then points should only be deducted if the estimation methodology is not sound.

B. *MEASURE:* This measure will calculate the **Operating Cost Effectiveness** of the project, which is the new annual operating cost of the project per annual rider in the third year of service.

Estimate the new annual transit ridership that is produced by the new project in the third year of service. New annual transit ridership will be used as an input to measure cost effectiveness. Additionally, provide the new annual operating cost, which consists of the additional annual operating cost that will result from this project's implementation.

- Operating Cost Effectiveness = New annual operating cost of the project / new annual transit ridership

Respond to one type of transit service (i.e., Express Routes, Transitways, or Urban and Suburban Routes) in order to determine new annual transit ridership. (70 Points)

Calculate the cost effectiveness of the project per new rider using the 2020 forecast (equivalent to the third year of ridership) from the park-and-ride demand estimation model in the 2030 Regional Park and Ride Plan to develop a ridership estimate. The market will be defined using the prescribed site location criteria in the plan and demand estimates determined by the TAZs in the express bus route market area. If possible, the applicant will use the ridership figures provided for an existing or planned facility.

- New Annual Operating Cost: _____
- Cost Effectiveness: _____

Select the service type and provide the new annual transit ridership produced by the project in the third year of service, based on the methodology listed below.

Express Routes

- Use the 2020 forecast (equivalent to the third year of ridership) from the park-and-ride demand estimation model in the 2030 Regional Park and Ride Plan to develop a ridership estimate. The market will be defined using the prescribed site location criteria in the plan and demand estimates determined by the TAZs in the express bus route market area. If possible, the applicant should will use the ridership figures provided for an existing or planned facility.

RESPONSE (Cost effectiveness will be automatically calculated):

- New Annual Operating Cost: _____
- Total Annual Ridership: _____

Transitways

- Use forecast data (current year and 2030) to estimate ridership for the third year of service. Forecast data for the transitway must derived from a study or plan that uses data approved by Metropolitan Council staff. This includes the most up-to-date estimates from plans that have been already adopted.

Note: Transitways offer travel time advantages for transit vehicles, improve transit service reliability, and increase the convenience and attractiveness of transit service. Transitways are defined in the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail, light rail, highway and arterial bus rapid transit, and express bus with transit advantages. Eligible transitway projects are those that have a mode and alignment identified in the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan.

RESPONSE (Cost effectiveness will be automatically calculated):

- New Annual Operating Cost _____
- Total Annual Ridership:_____

Urban and Suburban Local Routes

- Use peer routes that are currently in service to develop a ridership estimate for the third year of service. Applicants must use the most recent annual ridership figures that are available. To select the peer routes, the applicant should identify routes in the same transit market area (as defined in the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan), or routes that serve locations with similar development patterns. Applicants must use the average passengers per in service hour of at least three peer routes to apply a rate of ridership for the proposed service project. Additionally, describe how a peer route was selected in the response.

RESPONSE (Cost effectiveness will be automatically calculated):

- New Annual Operating CostRidership (Integer Only): _____
- Total Annual RidershipUrban and Suburban Local Routes Peer Route Selection (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words): _____

RESPONSE (200 words or less):

SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)
The applicant with the lowest project operating cost per new rider, equal to total annual project-related operating cost divided by total annual new ridership, will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For urban and suburban local bus service, applicants should use peer routes form the same Transportation Policy Plan market area or peer routes that serve locations with similar development patterns. Points are scored based on sound methodology and clear relationship to the peer routes. Fifty percent of points should be deducted if the applicant provides no methodology. If a methodology is provided, then points should only be deducted if the estimation methodology is not sound.

C. *MEASURE:* This measure will calculate the cost effectiveness of the project's per new riders. Estimate the new annual transit ridership that is produced by the new project in the third year of service. New annual transit ridership will be used as an input to measure cost effectiveness.

D. Additionally, estimate the total annual project cost, which consists of the annualized capital cost of the project added to the annual operating cost of the project. The annualized project cost is derived from the FTA guidelines on useful life. Annualized project cost is the lump sum total project cost divided by the FTA "years of useful life" as listed belowhere. If the project has two or more components with differing years of useful life, annualize the components

(see examples below). If the project type is not listed below, use most similar project type or provide supporting documentation on useful life value used.

Respond to one type of transit service (i.e., Express Routes, Transitways, or Urban and Suburban Routes) in order to determine new annual transit ridership. Use the same methodology as described in measure 2A for each service type. (175 245 Points)

- Service Type: _____

Total Annual Ridership (Existing plus New Riders): _____

- Assumptions Used and Urban and Suburban Local Routes Peer Route Selection (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)

Express Routes

- Use the 2020 forecast (equivalent to the third year of ridership) from the park-and-ride demand estimation model in the 2030 Regional Park-and-Ride Plan to develop a ridership estimate. The market will be defined using the prescribed site location criteria in the plan and demand estimates determined by the TAZs in the express bus route market area. If possible, the applicant should use the ridership figures provided for an existing or planned facility.

RESPONSE (Cost effectiveness will be automatically calculated):

- Total Annual Operating Cost: _____
- Total Annual Capital Cost of Project: _____
- New Annual RidershipTotal Annual Project Costs: _____

Transitways

- Use forecast data (current year and 2030) to estimate ridership for the third year of service. Forecast data for the transitway must derived from a study or plan that uses data approved by Metropolitan Council staff. This includes the most up-to-date estimates from plans that have been already adopted.

Note: Transitways offer travel time advantages for transit vehicles, improve transit service reliability, and increase the convenience and attractiveness of transit service. Transitways are defined in the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail, light rail, highway and arterial bus rapid transit, and express bus with transit advantages. Eligible transitway projects are those that have a mode and alignment identified in the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan.

RESPONSE (Cost effectiveness will be automatically calculated):

- Total Annual Operating Cost: _____
- Total Annual Capital Cost: _____
- New Annual Ridership: _____

Urban and Suburban Local Routes

- Use peer routes that are currently in service to develop a ridership estimate for the third year of service. Applicants must use the most recent annual ridership figures that are available. To select the peer routes, the applicant should identify routes in the same

transit market area (as defined in the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan), or routes that serve locations with similar development patterns. Applicants must use the average passengers per in service hour of at least three peer routes to apply a rate of ridership for the proposed service project. Additionally, describe how a peer route was selected in the response.

RESPONSE (Cost effectiveness will be automatically calculated):

- Total Annual Operating Cost: _____
- Total Annual Capital Cost:_____
- New Annual Ridership:_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (175 245 Points)

The applicant with the lowest project cost per new riderhighest new ridership, equal to total annual project cost divided by total annual new ridership, will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points equal to the ridership of the project being scored divided by the project with the highest ridership multiplied by the maximum points available for the measure (245). For example, if the application being scored had ridership of 1,000 riders and the top project had a ridership of 1,500 riders, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*245 points or 163 points.

For urban and suburban local bus service, applicants should use peer routes formfrom the same Transportation Policy Plan market area or peer routes that serve locations with similar development patterns. Points are scored based on sound methodology and clear relationship to the peer routes.

For all service types, fifty percent of points can be deducted if the applicant provides no methodology. If a methodology is provided, then points should only be deducted if the estimation methodology is not sound.

3. Equity and Housing Performance (200 Points; 20 Percent of Total Points) -- This criterion addresses the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. The criterion also evaluates a community's efforts to promote affordable housing. Measure yet to be updated.

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Socio-Econ" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Identify the project's location from the list below, as depicted on the "Housing Equity" map. Describe the project's positive benefits, and negative impacts, and mitigation for low-income populations; people of color; children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. A project's service must stop in one of the eligible areas to qualify as a direct connection. In addition, a direct connection is one that does not require a transfer. Geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive the full points listed below. In order to receive the maximum points, the response should address the benefits, impacts, and mitigation for the populations listed above. (130 Points)

Upload the "Socio-Econ" map used for this measure.

RESPONSE (Select one, based on the "Socio-Econ" map):

- Project's service directly connects to Racially Concentrated Area of Poverty: ☐ (0 to 130 Points)
- Project's service directly connects to Concentrated Area of Poverty: ☐ (0 to 104 Points)
- Project's service directly connects to census tracts that are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (0 to 52 Points)
- Project's service directly connects to a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color, or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly: ☐ (0 to 37 Points)

RESPONSE (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (130 Points)

Based on the "Socio-Econ" map's output, the applicant will select the appropriate option from the above bullets. However, geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive full points. The applicant must fully describe the positive benefits and negative impacts (with mitigation to address the issue) for those identified groups (200 words or less). Each project will first be graded on a 10-point scale, not accounting for geography. Each score from the 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography. The project with the most positive benefits and appropriate mitigation for negative impacts will receive the full points relative to its maximum geographic sub-area defined above. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. This response is intended to be qualitative. Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

Note: Due to the geographic adjustment to scores, it is possible that the above process will result in no project receiving the maximum allotment of 130 points. In this case, the highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 130 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 50 points and the top project had 100 points, this applicant would receive (50/100)*130 points or 65 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the 2015 Housing Performance Score for the city or township in which the project's stops are located. The score includes consideration of affordability and diversification, local initiatives to facilitate affordable workforce housing development or preservation, and density of residential development. If the project includes express service with no reverse commute trips, the applicant should only report the number of stops and corresponding jurisdictions in which the inbound service originates. If the project has stops in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on a weighted average using the length of the project in each jurisdiction. If a project's stops are located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), then the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project's total score will be adjusted as a result. (70 Points)

RESPONSE (Affordable Housing Score completed by Metropolitan Council staff):

- City/Township: _____
- Number of Stops within City/Township:

SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)

The applicant with the highest 2015 Housing Performance Score will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. Note: Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

Projects will use the city Housing Performance Score based on the project location. If a project is located in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on a weighted average of the city or township scores for the project location based on the length of the project in each jurisdiction. If a project is located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), then the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project's total score will be adjusted as a result.

If this is the case, then the total points possible in the application will be 930 instead of 1,000. The total points awarded through the rest of the application (900 as a hypothetical example) will be divided by 930, then multiplied by 1,000. Therefore, a project scoring 900 out of 930, will equate to 968 points on a 1,000-point scale.

If a portion of the project is located in a city with an affordable housing allocation and the other portion is located in a township with no affordable housing allocation, then a combination of the weighted average and no affordable housing methodologies should be used. This will result in a total score that will be somewhere between 930 and 1,000; then the score will need to be adjusted to fit a 1,000-point scale.

4. Emissions Reduction (200 Points; 20 Percent of Total Points) – This criterion measures the impact that the project's implementation will have on air quality as measured by reductions in CO, NO_x, CO_{2e}, $PM_{2.5}$, and VOC emissions. Applications for transit operating, vehicle or capital funds must calculate the benefit for the third year of service.

A. *MEASURE:* The applicant must show that the project will reduce CO, NOx, CO2e, PM2.5, and/or VOC due to the reduction in VMT. Calculate and provide the number of new daily transit riders and the distance from terminal to terminal in miles to calculate VMT reduction. The emissions factors will be automatically applied to the VMT reduction to calculate the total reduced emissions. (133 Points)

Daily VMT Reduction = New Daily Transit Riders multiplied by Distance from Terminal to Terminal

Emissions Factors

- CO reduced = VMT reduced * 2.39
- NO_X reduced = VMT reduced * 0.16
- CO_{2e} reduced = VMT reduced * 366.60
- $PM_{2.5}$ reduced = VMT reduced * 0.005
- VOCs reduced = VMT reduced * 0.03

RESPONSE (Total reduced emissions will automatically calculate):

- New Daily Transit Riders: _____
- Distance from Terminal to Terminal (Miles)_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (200 Points)
The applicant with the greatest daily reduction in emissions due to VMT reduction will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored reduced emissions by 3 kilograms and the top project reduced emissions by 5 kilograms, this applicant would receive (3/5)*200 points or 120 points.

~~*B.* *MEASURE:* This measure will calculate the cost effectiveness of the project as it relates to emissions reduction. (67 Points)~~

- ~~Cost Effectiveness = Total annual project cost / kilograms of emissions reduced per day~~

~~The total annual project cost can be calculated by adding the annualized capital cost and the annual operating costs for the third year of service.~~

~~*RESPONSE (Cost Effectiveness will automatically calculate):*~~

- ~~Total Annual Capital Project Cost: _____~~
- ~~Total Annual Operating Cost: _____~~
- ~~Total Kilograms of Emissions Reduced per Day (summed result from Measure 4A)~~

~~SCORING GUIDANCE (67 Points)~~
~~The applicant with the lowest project cost per kg of emissions reduced, equal to total annual project cost divided by kg of emissions reduced per day, will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points.~~

5. Multimodal Facilities and Connections (100 Points) – This criterion measures how the project improves the travel experience, safety, and security for other modes of transportation, provides strong connections, and addresses the safe integration of these modes.

~~Multimodal Connections (50 Points)~~

~~A. *MEASURE:* Identify the pedestrian and bicycle connections to the project, describe these existing facilities, and discuss how the project provides a direct connection to an existing high pedestrian-traffic area (e.g., commercial, mixed-use, or entertainment nodes/districts; town or village centers) identified in an adopted county or city plan or study. Applicants should also discuss any bicycle and pedestrian connections that will be constructed before the completion of the proposed project, or planned future connections. If the bicycle or pedestrian connection is planned, also describe the timing of the project and the adopted county or city plan or study that identifies this facility.~~

~~*RESPONSE (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):*~~

~~SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)~~
~~The project with the most extensive connections to other modes will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.~~

~~The scorer will weigh the project's connections to bikeways, high-traffic pedestrian areas (e.g., commercial, mixed-use, or entertainment nodes/districts; town or village centers) as detailed in the required response (200 words or less), and other pedestrian facilities. A higher value will be placed on connections present at the time of project construction over planned future connections.~~

~~Multimodal Facilities (50 Points)~~

~~B.~~A. *MEASURE:* Discuss any ~~roadway,~~ bicycle~~,~~ or pedestrian elements that are included as part of the total project and how they improve the travel experience, safety, and security for users of these modes. Also, describe the existing ~~roadway,~~ bicycle~~,~~ and pedestrian facilities and accommodations or roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian connections. Furthermore, address how the proposed project safely integrates all modes of transportation (i.e., transit, vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians). Applicants should also identify supporting studies or plans that address why a mode may not be incorporated into the project.

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)
The project that results in the most comprehensive connectivity to non-motorized modes (via existing or added elements), as addressed in the required response (400 words or less), will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. Example improvements are listed below:

- Improves the safety and security of the pedestrian or bicyclist (e.g., pedestrian-scale lighting, removing obstructions to create safe gathering spaces, leading pedestrian signal phasing, traffic calming, bike facilities separated from pedestrians)
- Improves the quality of the travel experience (e.g., pavement improvements, public art, benches, wayfinding)

- Improves the pedestrian network near the transit stop/station
- Improves the bicycle network near the transit stop/station
- Uses roadway shoulders or MnPASS lanes for faster service
- Connects to transit stops accessible via bike
- Connects to transit tops with safe / comfortable areas for pedestrians to walk or wait

6. Risk Assessment (50 Points; 5 Percent of Total Points) - This criterion measures the number of risks associated with the project and the steps already completed in the project development process. These steps are outlined in the checklist in the required Risk Assessment. The Risk Assessment only needs to be completed for construction projects. All other projects do not need to complete this form. Projects that only involve transit operating assistance will receive all possible points under this criterion if the project meets funding requirements.

Facility Projects:

A. *MEASURE:* Applications involving construction must complete the Risk Assessment. The Risk Assessment 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):

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

The applicant will receive up to the full points based on the eight Risk Assessment elements. A project that is not required to complete the checklist will receive full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional 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)*50 points or 29 points.

7. Cost-Benefit Ratio (100 Points) – This criterion will assess the project's cost-benefit based on the total annual project cost and total points awarded.

A. *MEASURE: Calculate the cost-benefit ratio of the project.* The Scoring Committee will divide the total project cost by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria.

Estimate and provide the annualized capital cost of the project and the annual operating cost of the project; the sum of these cost components equals the total annual project cost. The annualized project cost is derived from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidelines on useful life.

Total annual project cost is the lump sum total project cost divided by the FTA "years of useful life" as listed here. As noted in the useful life table, operating costs should also be annualized. If the project has two or more components with differing years of useful life, annualize each component. If the project type is not listed in the document, use most similar project type or provide supporting documentation on useful life value used.

Applicants should include all operating and capital costs associated with implementing the entire project, even though the applicant may only be applying for part of these costs as part of the solicitation.

Project Type	Years of Useful Life
Operating funds	3
Passenger Automobile/Sedan/Minivan	4
Medium Duty Transit Buses	5
Heavy Duty Transit Buses	12
Over-the-Road Coach Buses	14
Park & Ride – Surface Lot	20
Park & Ride – Structured	50
Transit Center/Station/Platform	70
Transit Shelter	20
Light Rail Vehicles	25
Commuter Rail Vehicles	25
Land Purchase	100

- Cost-Benefit Ratio= total TAB-eligible project cost/total number of points awarded in previous criteria

RESPONSE (This measure will be calculated after the scores for the other measures are tabulated by the Scoring Committee):

- Total Annual Operating Cost: _____
- Total Annual Capital Cost of Project: _____

- Total Annual Project Cost: _____
- Assumptions Used (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words): _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The applicant with the lowest dollar value per point earned in the application (i.e., the benefits) will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the top project had 35,000 and the application being scored had 70,000, this applicant would receive (35,000/70,000)*100 points or 50 points.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS~~**TOTAL: 1,000 POINTS**~~

Transit System Modernization – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

November 4, 2015

Usage (300 points; 30 Percent of Total Points) - This criterion quantifies the project's impact based on how many annual riders the improvement(s) will benefit ~~by estimating the annual transit ridership of the project to determine the overall cost-effectiveness per rider~~.

MEASURE: This measure will ~~calculate~~ display ~~the project's cost effectiveness of the project per riders~~ the number of annual riders ~~to~~that will benefit from the project. This would entail, for example, riders on a bus route with buses fitted for wi-fi or users boarding or alighting at a park-and-ride ~~or station~~ being improved.

~~A. (existing plus new ridership). Based on the service type, estimate and provide the total annual transit ridership (existing plus new ridership) that is produced by the new project in the third year of service. Total annual transit ridership will be used as an input to calculate cost effectiveness.~~

~~In addition to ridership estimation, estimate and provide the *annualized capital cost of the project and the annual operating cost of the project; the sum of these cost components equal the total annual project cost*. The annualized project cost is derived from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidelines on useful life. Annualized project cost is the lump sum total project cost divided by the FTA "years of useful life" as listed belowhere. If the project has two or more components with differing years of useful life, annualize the components (see examples below). . If the project type is not listed belowin the document, use most similar project type or provide supporting documentation on useful life value used.~~

~~Project Type~~	~~Years of Useful Life~~
~~Operating funds~~	~~3~~
~~Passenger Automobile/Sedan/Minivan~~	~~4~~
~~Medium Duty Transit Buses~~	~~5~~
~~Heavy Duty Transit Buses~~	~~12~~
~~Over-the-Road Coach Buses~~	~~14~~
~~Park & Ride – Surface Lot~~	~~20~~
~~Park & Ride – Structured~~	~~50~~
~~Transit Center/Station/Platform~~	~~70~~
~~Transit Shelter~~	~~20~~
~~Light Rail Vehicles~~	~~25~~
~~Commuter Rail Vehicles~~	~~25~~
~~Land Purchase~~	~~100~~

- Cost Effectiveness of Total Ridership = Total annual project cost / total annual transit ridership.
- *RESPONSE (Cost effectiveness will be automatically calculated):*
- Total Annual Operating Cost (3rd Year): _____
- Total Annual Capital Cost of Project: _____

Total Annual RidershipProject Cost: _____

- Cost Effectiveness: _____

Select the service type and provide the annual transit ridership, based on the methodology listed below. (210 Points)

Express Routes

B. Use the 2020 forecast (equivalent to the third year of ridership) from the park-and-ride demand estimation model in the 2030 Regional Park and Ride Plan to develop a ridership estimate. The market will be defined using the prescribed site location criteria in the plan and demand estimates determined by the TAZs in the express bus route market area. If possible, the applicant will use the ridership figures provided for an existing or planned facility.

RESPONSE (Cost effectiveness will be automatically calculated):
- Total Annual Operating Cost (3rd Year): _____
- Total Annual Capital Cost: _____
- Total Annual Ridership: _____

Transitways

- Use forecast data (current year and 2030) to estimate ridership for the third year of service. Forecast data for the transitway must be derived from a study or plan that uses data approved by Metropolitan Council staff. This includes the most up-to-date estimates from plans that have been already adopted.

Note: Transitways offer travel time advantages for transit vehicles, improve transit service reliability, and increase the convenience and attractiveness of transit service. Transitways are defined in the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail, light rail, highway and arterial bus rapid transit, and express bus with transit advantages. Eligible transitway projects are those that have a mode and alignment identified in the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan.

RESPONSE (Cost effectiveness will be automatically calculated):
- Total Annual Operating Cost: _____
- Total Annual Capital Cost: _____
- Total Annual Ridership: _____

Urban and Suburban Local Routes

C. Use peer routes that are currently in service to develop a ridership estimate for the third year of service. Applicants must use the most recent annual ridership figures that are available. To

~~select the peer routes, the applicant should identify routes in the same transit market area (as defined in the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan), or routes that serve locations with similar development patterns. Applicants must use the average passengers per in service hour of at least three peer routes to apply a rate of ridership for the proposed service project. Additionally, describe how a peer route was selected in the response.~~

RESPONSE:

- Annual Number of Existing Riders Benefiting from Project (Integer Only): _____

Description of methodology used to determine existing riders (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (300 Points)
The applicant with the most existing riders who annually benefit will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points equal to the riders of the project being scored divided by the project with the highest number of riders multiplied by the maximum points available for the measure (300). For example, if the application being scored impacts 100,000 riders and the top project had impacts 150,000 riders, this applicant would receive (100,000/150,000)*300 points or 200 points.

~~D. *MEASURE:* This measure will calculate the **Operating Cost Effectiveness** of the project, which is the new annual operating cost of the project per annual rider in the third year of service.~~

~~Estimate the new annual transit ridership that is produced by the new project in the third year of service. New annual transit ridership will be used as an input to measure cost effectiveness. Additionally, provide the new annual operating cost, which consists of the additional annual operating cost that will result from this project's implementation.~~

- ~~Operating Cost Effectiveness = New annual operating cost of the project / new annual transit ridership~~

~~Respond to one type of transit service (i.e., Express Routes, Transitways, or Urban and Suburban Routes) in order to determine new annual transit ridership. (90 Points)~~

~~*Calculate the cost effectiveness of the project per new rider using the 2020 forecast (equivalent to the third year of ridership) from the park-and-ride demand estimation model in the 2030 Regional Park-and-Ride Plan to develop a ridership estimate. The market will be defined using the prescribed site location criteria in the plan and demand estimates determined by the TAZs in the express bus route market area. If possible, the applicant will use the ridership figures provided for an existing or planned facility.*~~

- ~~New Annual Operating Cost: _____~~

Cost Effectiveness: _____

Express Routes

- Use the 2020 forecast (equivalent to the third year of ridership) from the park-and-ride demand estimation model in the 2030 Regional Park-and-Ride Plan to develop a ridership estimate. The market will be defined using the prescribed site location criteria in the plan and demand estimates determined by the TAZs in the express bus route market area. If possible, the applicant will use the ridership figures provided for an existing or planned facility.

RESPONSE (Cost effectiveness will be automatically calculated):

- New annual operating cost _____
- Total Annual Ridership: _____

Transitways

- Use forecast data (current year and 2030) to estimate ridership for the third year of service. Forecast data for the transitway must derived from a study or plan that uses data approved by Metropolitan Council staff. This includes the most up-to-date estimates from plans that have been already adopted.

Note: Transitways offer travel time advantages for transit vehicles, improve transit service reliability, and increase the convenience and attractiveness of transit service. Transitways are defined in the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail, light rail, highway and arterial bus rapid transit, and express bus with transit advantages. Eligible transitway projects are those that have a mode and alignment identified in the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan.

RESPONSE (Cost effectiveness will be automatically calculated):

- New annual operating cost _____
- Total Annual Ridership: _____

Urban and Suburban Local Routes

- Use peer routes that are currently in service to develop a ridership estimate for the third year of service. Applicants must use the most recent annual ridership figures that are available. To select the peer routes, the applicant should identify routes in the same transit market area (as defined in the 2030 Transportation Policy Plan), or routes that serve locations with similar development patterns. Applicants must use the average passengers per in service hour of at least three peer routes to apply a rate of ridership for the proposed service project. Additionally, describe how a peer route was selected in the response.

RESPONSE (Cost effectiveness will be automatically calculated):

- New annual operating costridership (Integer Only) _____
- Total Annual RidershipUrban and Suburban Local Routes Peer Route Selection (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words): _____

~~*RESPONSE (200 words or less):*~~

~~SCORING GUIDANCE (90 Points)~~
~~The applicant with the lowest project operating cost per new rider, equal to total annual project-related operating cost divided by total annual new ridership, will receive the full points Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points.~~

~~For urban and suburban local bus service, applicants should use peer routes form the same Transportation Policy Plan market area or peer routes that serve locations with similar development patterns. Points are scored based on sound methodology and clear relationship to the peer routes. Fifty percent of points should be deducted if the applicant provides no methodology. If a methodology is provided, then points should only be deducted if the estimation methodology is not sound.~~

BELOW IS THE MEAURE WITH ALL "TRACK CHANGES" ACCEPTED

Usage (300 points; 30 Percent of Total Points) - This criterion quantifies the project's impact based on how many annual riders the improvement(s) will benefit.

MEASURE: This measure will display the number of annual riders that will benefit from the project. This would entail, for example, riders on a bus route with buses fitted for wi-fi or users boarding or alighting at a park-and-ride being improved.

RESPONSE:

- Annual Number of Existing Riders Benefiting from Project (Integer Only): _____

Description of methodology used to determine existing riders (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (300 Points)
The applicant with the most existing riders who annually benefit will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points equal to the riders of the project being scored divided by the project with the highest number of riders multiplied by the maximum points available for the measure (300). For example, if the application being scored impacts 100,000 riders and the top project had impacts 150,000 riders, this applicant would receive (100,000/150,000)*300 points or 200 points.

Travel Demand Management (TDM) – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

Definition: An innovative project that reduces the congestion and emissions during the peak period. Similar to past Regional Solicitations, base-level TDM funding for the Transportation Management Organizations (TMOs) and Metro Transit will be not part of the competitive process.

Examples of TDM Projects:

- Bikesharing
- Carsharing
- Telework strategies
- Carpooling
- Parking management
- Managed lane components

Minimum Federal Award: $75,000
Maximum Federal Award: $300,000

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	**100**	**10%**
~~Measure A - Connection to Job Concentrations, Manufacturing/Distribution Locations, Educational Institutions, and local activity centers~~	~~50~~	
Measure ~~B~~ A - Existing regional transportation facilities and resources	~~50~~100	
2. Usage	**100**	**10%**
Measure A - ~~Cost effectiveness of project per user~~Users	100	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**150**	**15%**
Measure A - ~~Connection and p~~Project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation to disadvantaged populations	80	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	**400**	**40%**
Measure A - Congested roadways in project area	200	
Measure B - Emissions reduced	200	
5. Innovation	**200**	**20%**
Measure A - Project innovations or new geographic area	~~100~~200	
~~Measure B - New geographic area~~	~~100~~	
6. Risk Assessment	**50**	**5%**
Measure A - Technical capacity of applicant's organization	~~15~~25	
Measure B - Continuation of project after initial federal funds are expended	~~20~~25	
~~Measure C - Risk Assessment Form~~	~~15~~	
Sub-Total	**1,000**	**100%**
7. Cost-Benefit Ratio	**TBD**	
Measure A – Cost-benefit ratio (total project cost/total points awarded)	**TBD**	
Total	**TBD**	

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (100 Points) - This criterion measures the ~~regional significance of the project, including the project's connections to jobs, manufacturing/distribution, and educational institutions as defined in ThriveMSP 2040, as well as existing local activity centers. This criterion also measures the~~ existing regional transportation resources that can be capitalized on as part this project.

~~*A. MEASURE:* Reference the "Regional Economy" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing total employment, manufacturing/distribution-related employment, and educational institution enrollment . Identify the project's connections to the Job Concentrations, Manufacturing/ Distribution Locations and Educational Institutions as defined in ThriveMSP 2040, and depicted in the "Regional Economy" map. If the project does not provide a connection to a Job Concentration, Manufacturing/Distribution Location, or Educational Institution, but provides a connection to a local activity center, reference the adopted county or city plan identifying this area. (50 Points)~~

~~Upload the "Regional Economy" map used for this measure.~~

~~*RESPONSE (Select all that apply, based on the "Regional Economy" map):*~~

- ~~Direct connection to or within a Job Concentration: ☐ (50 Points)~~
- ~~Direct connection to or within an Educational Institution: ☐ (40 Points)~~
- ~~Direct connection to or within a Manufacturing/Distribution Location: ☐ (40 Points)~~
- ~~Project provides a direct connection to or within an existing local activity center identified in an adopted county or city plan: ☐ (30 Points)~~

~~*RESPONSE (Data from the "Regional Population" map):*~~

~~Existing Total Employment within 1 Mile:~~
~~Existing Manufacturing/Distribution-Related Employment within 1 Mile:~~
~~Existing Educational Institution Enrollment within 1 Mile:~~

~~*RESPONSE (City or county plan reference; 100 words or less):*~~

~~B.~~A. *MEASURE*: Identify the existing regional transportation facilities and resources on which the project will capitalize (transit stations, key roadways, bikeways, etc.). (~~50~~ 100 Points)

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~50~~ 100 Points)

The applicant will receive points based on the quality of the response. Projects that effectively use existing regional infrastructure will receive the most points. The applicant with the top score will receive full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points.

- ~~Uses existing bicycle facilities: 6 Points~~
- ~~Uses existing pedestrian facilities: 6 Points~~
- ~~Uses existing transit facilities: 7 Points~~
- ~~Uses existing ITS or other technological infrastructure: 6 Points~~

2. Usage (100 Points) – This criterion quantifies the project's impact by estimating the number of direct users of the TDM ~~project to help determine the overall cost effectiveness per user~~.

A. *MEASURE:* Calculate and provide the ~~total annual~~average weekday users of the project ~~in order to calculate the cost effectiveness of the project per user~~. A direct project user is someone who will participate in the TDM program or project~~,~~ and not one who receives an indirect benefit from the project. For example, if the project involves teleworking, a user would be the individual that is teleworking, not the roadway users that benefit from reduced congestion. Applicants must describe their methodology for determining the number of project users. (100 Points)

~~• Cost Effectiveness = Total project cost / total annual users~~

RESPONSE (Cost Effectiveness will be automatically calculated):

~~• Total Project Cost (entered in Estimate of Project Cost Form)~~

• ~~Annual~~ Average Weekday Users:_____

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The applicant with the most users will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the top project had 90 users and the application being scored had 50, this applicant would receive (50/90)*100 points or 56 points.

Fifty percent of points can be deducted if the applicant provides no methodology. If a methodology is provided, then points should only be deducted if the estimation methodology is not sound.

3. Equity and Housing Performance (150 Points) -- This criterion addresses the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. The criterion also evaluates a community's efforts to promote affordable housing.

A. *MEASURE:* ~~Reference the "Socio-Econ" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Identify the project's location from the list below, as depicted on the map.~~ Describe the project's positive benefits, and negative impacts, and mitigation for low-income populations; people of color; children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. ~~Geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive the full points listed below.~~ In order to receive the maximum points, the response should address the benefits, impacts, and mitigation for low-income populations; people of color; children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. As part of the response, reference the "Socio-Econ" map generated at the beginning of the application process to identify if the project is located in Racially Concentrated Area of Poverty, Concentrated Area of Poverty, or census tracts above the regional average in poverty or populations of color. (80 Points)

~~Upload the "Socio-Econ" map used for this measure.~~

~~*RESPONSE (Select one, based on the "Socio-Econ" map):*~~

- ~~Project located in Racially Concentrated Area of Poverty: ☐ (0 to 80 Points)~~
- ~~Project located in Concentrated Area of Poverty: ☐ (0 to 64 Points)~~
- ~~Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (0 to 48 Points)~~
- ~~Project located in census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color, or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly: ☐ (0 to 32 Points)~~

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (80 Points)

~~Based on the "Socio-Econ" map's output, the applicant will select the appropriate option from the above bullets. However, geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive full points. The applicant must fully describe the positive benefits and negative impacts (with mitigation to address the issue) for those identified groups (200 words or less). Each project will first be graded on a 10-point scale, not accounting for geography. Each score from the 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography.~~ The project with the most positive benefits and appropriate mitigation for negative impacts will receive the full points ~~relative to its maximum geographic sub-area defined above~~. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. This response is intended to be qualitative. Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

~~Note: Due to the geographic adjustment to scores, it is possible that the above process will result in no project receiving the maximum allotment of 130 points. In this case, the highest scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 130 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 50 points and the top project had 100 points, this applicant would receive (50/100)*130 points or 65 points.~~

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the 2015 Housing Performance Score for the city or township in which the project is located. The score includes consideration of affordability and diversification, local initiatives to facilitate affordable workforce housing development or preservation, and density of residential development. If the project is in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on an average score of the jurisdictions. If a project is located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), then the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project's total score will be adjusted as a result. (105 Points)

RESPONSE (Affordable Housing Score completed by Metropolitan Council staff):

- City/Township: _____ *(Cities and Townships entered by applicant)*
- Housing Score: _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)

The applicant with the highest 2015 Housing Performance Score will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. Note: Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

Projects will use the city Housing Performance Score based on the project location. If a project is located in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on a weighted average of the city or township scores for the project location based on the length of the project in each jurisdiction. If a project is located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), then the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project's total score will be adjusted as a result.

If this is the case, then the total points possible in the application will be 930 instead of 1,000. The total points awarded through the rest of the application (900 as a hypothetical example) will be divided by 930, then multiplied by 1,000. Therefore, a project scoring 900 out of 930, will equate to 968 points on a 1,000-point scale.

If a portion of the project is located in a city with an affordable housing allocation and the other portion is located in a township with no affordable housing allocation, then a combination of the weighted average and no affordable housing methodologies should be used. This will result in a total score that will be somewhere between 930 and 1,000; then the score will need to be adjusted to fit a 1,000-point scale.

4. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality (400 Points) – This criterion measures the project's ability to reduce congestion during the peak period in an area or corridor. This criterion also measures the impact that the project's implementation will have on air quality as measured by reductions in CO, NO_x, CO_{2e}, $PM_{2.5}$, and VOC emissions.

A. *MEASURE:* Describe the congested roadways in the geographic area of the project and how this project will address or alleviate those issues by reducing congestion and/or single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips. (200 Points)

RESPONSE: (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (200 Points)
The applicant with best response will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. • The project is located in an area of traffic congestion: Up to 60 Points • The project will reduce congestion and/or SOV trips in the project area: Up to 140 Points

B. *MEASURE:* The applicant must show that the project will reduce CO, NOx, CO2e, PM2.5, and/or VOC due to the reduction in VMT. Calculate and provide the number of one-way commute trips reduced and the average commute trip length to calculate VMT reduction. The emissions factors will be automatically applied to the VMT reduction to calculate the total reduced emissions. Applicants must describe their methodology for determining the number of one-way trips reduced. (200 Points)

- VMT reduced = Number of one-way commute trips reduced * 12.1

(12.1 is the regional average commute trip length in miles as determined by the 2011 Travel Behavior Inventory, conducted by Metropolitan Transportation Services. You may use a number other than 12.1 if you know the commute length of your targeted market area).

Emissions Factors

- CO reduced = VMT reduced * 2.39
- NO_X reduced = VMT reduced * 0.16
- CO_{2e} reduced = VMT reduced * 366.60
- $PM_{2.5}$ reduced = VMT reduced * 0.005
- VOCs reduced = VMT reduced * 0.03

RESPONSE (Emissions reduction will be automatically calculated):

- Number of One-Way Commute Trips Reduced:_____
- Average Commute Trip Length (Default 12.1):_____

RESPONSE: (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (200 Points)

The applicant with the greatest reduction in emissions will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the top project reduced 5 kg and the application being scored reduced 4 kg, this applicant would receive (4/5)*200 points or 160 points.

Fifty percent of points can be deducted if the applicant provides no methodology. If a methodology is provided, then points should only be deducted if the estimation methodology is not sound.

5. Innovation (200 Points) – This prioritizing criterion measures how well the project introduces new concepts to the region. Innovative TDM projects may involve the deployment of new creative strategies for the region, expand the geographic scope of a project to a new geographic area, serve populations that were previously unserved, or incorporate new, significant enhancements to an existing program.

A. *MEASURE:* Describe how the project is innovative. (~~100~~ 200 Points)

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)
The applicant will receive the full points shown for each of innovation categories based on the quality of the response. The applicant with the top score will receive full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points.

- Project introduces a new policy, program, or creative strategy: Up to ~~50~~ 200 Points
- Project expands the geographic scope of an existing project, serves or engages a new group of people, or significantly enhances an existing program: Up to ~~20~~ 100 Points

~~B. *MEASURE:* Describe how the project is new to a particular geographic area or population. (100 Points)~~

~~*RESPONSE (200 words or less):*~~

~~SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)~~
~~The applicant will receive a maximum of the points shown below based on the project's ability to reach a previously unserved population or a new geographic area, as addressed in the response (200 words or less). The applicant with the top score will receive full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points.~~

- ~~Project expands the geographic scope of an existing project: 50 Points~~
- ~~Project serves or engages a new group of people: 50 Points~~

6. Risk Assessment (50 Points) - This criterion ~~measures the number of risks associated with the project and the steps already completed in the project development process. These steps are outlined in the required Risk Assessment. Additionally, these~~ measures ~~will assess~~ the technical capacity of the applicant and their long-term strategy to sustain their proposed projects beyond the initial funding period.

~~A. *MEASURE:* Applications involving construction must complete the Risk Assessment. All other projects do not need to complete this form and will receive all possible points under this criterion if the project meets funding requirements. The Risk Assessment includes activities completed to-date, as well as an assessment of risks (e.g., right-of-way acquisition, proximity to historic properties, etc.). (15 Points)~~

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

~~SCORING GUIDANCE (15 Points)~~
~~The applicant will receive up to the full points based on the eight Risk Assessment elements. A project that is not required to complete the checklist will receive full points.~~

~~B.~~A. *MEASURE:* Describe the technical capacity of the applicant's organization and what makes them well suited to deliver the project. (~~20~~ 25 Points)

RESPONSE (200 words or less):

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~20~~ 25 Points)
The applicant will receive a maximum of the points listed below, based on the quality of their response (200 words or less). Highest scoring projects will be led by agencies with staff expertise in TDM, experience in the field, and adequate resources to deliver the project in a timely manner. The applicant with the top score will receive full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the top project had 15 points and the application being scored had 10, this applicant would receive (10/15)*25 points or 17 points.

- Organization has experience implementing similar projects: ~~8~~ Up to 10 Points, plus
- Organization has adequate resources to implement the project in a timely manner: ~~12~~ Up to 15 Points

~~C.~~B. *MEASURE:* Describe if the project will continue after the initial federal funds are expended. Identify potential future sources of funding, if needed, to continue the project. (2~~1~~5 Points)

RESPONSE (Check one):

Project funding sources are identified and secured to continue the project past the initial funding period, and/or carry on the project to a future phase: ☐ (25 Points)

Applicant has identified potential funding sources that could support the project beyond the initial funding period: ☐ (15 Points)

Applicant has not identified funding sources to carry the project beyond the initial funding period: ☐ (0 Points)

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~15~~ 25 Points)

The applicant will receive a maximum of the points shown below based on the quality of their response. Applicants that receive the highest scores will have a financial plan in place to continue the project after the initial funding period. The applicant with the top score will receive full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the top project had 15 and the application being scored had 0, this applicant would receive (0/15)*25 points or 0 points.

~~• Project funding sources are identified and secured to continue the project past the initial funding period, and/or carry on the project to a future phase: 15 Points~~

~~• Applicant has identified potential funding sources that could support the project beyond the initial funding period: 10 Points~~

~~• Applicant has not identified funding sources to carry the project beyond the initial funding period: 0 Points~~

7. Cost-Benefit Ratio (100 Points) –This criterion will assess the project's cost-benefit based on the total TAB-eligible project cost and total points awarded in the previous 6 criteria. Calculations must be based on the total project cost of TAB-eligible expenses. Any eligible dollars allocated to noise walls should be excluded from this measure because of the uncertainty of needing them at this stage of the project development cycle.

A. *MEASURE: Calculate the cost-benefit ratio of the project.* The Scoring Committee will divide the total project cost by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria (1-6).

- Cost-Benefit Ratio= total TAB-eligible project cost/total number of points awarded in previous criteria (1-6)

RESPONSE (This measure will be calculated after the scores for the other measures are tabulated by the Scoring Committee):

- Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form):_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (X Points)
The applicant with the lowest dollar value per point earned in the application (i.e., the benefits) will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the top project had 35,000 and the application being scored had 70,000, this applicant would receive (35,000/70,000)*100 points or 50 points.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS~~**TOTAL: 1,000 POINTS**~~

Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

Definition: A project that benefits bicyclists (or bicyclists and other non-motorized users). All projects must have a transportation purpose (i.e., connecting people to destinations). A facility may serve both a transportation purpose and a recreational purpose. Multiuse trail bridges or underpasses should apply in this sub-category instead of the Pedestrian Facilities sub-category given the nature of the users and the higher maximum award amount.

Examples of Multiuse Trail and Bicycle Facility Projects:

- Multiuse trails
- Trail bridges/underpasses
- On-street bike lanes
- Filling multiple gaps, improving multiple crossings, or making other similar improvements along a trail corridor

Minimum Federal Award: $250,000
Maximum Federal Award: $3,500,000

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	**200**	**20%**
Measure A - Identify location of project relative to Regional Bicycle Transportation Network	200	
2. Usage	**200**	**20%**
Measure A - Cost effectiveness per population and employment	200	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**120**	**12%**
Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation	50	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Safety	**250**	**25%**
Measure A – Gaps closed, barriers removed, and/or continuity between jurisdictions improved by the project	100	
Measure B - How project will correct deficiencies or address safety problem	150	
5. Multimodal Facilities and Connections	**100**	**10%**
~~Measure A - Ridership of transit routes directly and indirectly connected to project~~	~~25~~	
~~Measure B – Pedestrian Connections~~	~~25~~	
Measure ~~A.~~ C - Transit or pedestrian elements of the project; or connections	~~50~~100	
6. Risk Assessment/Public Engagement	**130**	**13%**
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	130	
Sub-Total	**1,000**	**100.0%**
7. Cost-Benefit Ratio	**TBD**	
Measure A-Cost-benefit ratio (Total project cost/total points awarded)	TBD	
Total	**TBD**	

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (200 Points) - This criterion measures the project's ability to serve a transportation purpose within the regional transportation system and economy through its inclusion within or direct connection to the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN), which is based on the Twin Cities Regional Bicycle System Study (2014).

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "RBTN Evaluation" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Identify the location of the project relative to the RBTN, as depicted on the "Bicycle Transportation" map. If the project is not on or does not provide a direct connection to the RBTN, but is located on a local system within an adopted county or city plan, indicate this on the "Connection to Local Planning" section within the "Project Information" form.

Upload the "RBTN Evaluation" map used for this measure.

RESPONSE (Select one, based on the "RBTN Evaluation and Major Barriers" map):

- Tier 1, Priority RBTN Corridor (200 Points)
- Tier 1 RBTN Alignment (200 points)
- Tier 2, RBTN Corridor (~~160~~ 175 Points)
- Tier 2, RBTN Alignment (175 Points)
- Direct connection to an RBTN Tier 1 corridor or alignment ~~or Tier 2)~~: (~~120~~ 150 Points)
- Direct connection to an RBTN Tier 2 Corridor or Alignment (125 Points)

OR

- Project is not located on or directly connected to the RBTN, but is part of a local system and identified within an adopted county, city, or regional parks implementing agency plan (~~20~~ 50 Points)

SCORING GUIDANCE (200 Points)
The applicant will receive the points shown in the above bullets based on the location of the project relative to the RBTN.

RBTN Projects (Tier 1/Tier 2 corridors and alignments)
To receive the available points associated with Tier 1 and Tier 2 corridors and alignments, a project must accomplish one of the following:

- Improve a segment of an existing Tier 1 or Tier 2 alignment beyond a simple resurfacing of the facility:
- Implement a currently non-existing segment of a Tier 1 or Tier 2 alignment; within and along a Tier 1 or Tier 2 corridor; OR
- Connect directly to a specific Tier 1 or Tier 2 corridor or alignment of the RBTN.

  * Note: if connecting to a RBTN ***corridor***, the project must connect to a roadway or to the planned terminus of a trail in a way that makes possible a future connection to a potential RBTN alignment for the corridor.

Projects that include both on-RBTN and off-RBTN improvements

Projects will be scored based on the proportion of the project that is within and along a RBTN corridor or along a designated RBTN alignment as shown on the RBTN map. Specifically:

- Tier 1 projects with 50% or more of the project's length within and along a Tier 1 corridor alignment will receive the full Tier 1 allotment of 200 points.
- Tier 2 projects with 50% or more of the project's length within and along a Tier 2 corridor or alignment will receive the full Tier 2 allotment of 175 points.
- A project with less than 50% of its length within and along a Tier 1 corridor or alignment will be considered a Tier 1 direct connection and will receive 150 points for providing the direct connection.
- A project with less than 50% of its length within and along a Tier 2 corridor or alignment will be considered a Tier 2 direct connection and will receive 125 points for providing the direct connection.
- A project with less than 50% of its length within and along a Tier 1 or Tier 2 corridor or along a Tier 1 or Tier 2 alignment, but with 50% or more of its length within and along a combined Tier 1/Tier 2 corridor or alignment will receive the number of points corresponding to the Tier level with the higher proportion of project length.

Note: Due to tiered scoring, it is possible that no, or multiple, projects will receive the maximum allotment of 200 points.

2. Potential Usage (200 Points) - This criterion quantifies the project's potential usage based on the ~~impact to~~ existing population and employment adjacent to the project. Metropolitan Council staff will calculate the ~~cost effectiveness~~potential usage of the project using the Metropolitan Council model~~, the project location, and total project cost from previous sections~~.

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Population Summary" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing population and employment within one mile, as depicted on the "Population Summary" map.

Upload the "Population Summary" map used for this measure.

- ~~Cost Effectiveness = Total project cost/Eexisting population within one mile of the project (100 Points)~~
- ~~ECost Effectiveness = Total project cost/existing employment within one mile of the project (100 Points)~~

RESPONSE (Data from the "Population Summary" map):

- Existing Population within 1 Mile (100 Points): _____
- Existing Employment within 1 Mile (100 Points):_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (200 Points)

The applicant with ~~the lowest project cost per person or~~highest population will receive the full 100 points, as will the applicant with the highest number of jobs~~job will receive the full points listed below~~. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points for population and jobs, respectively. As an example for population, projects will score equal to the existing population within 1 mile of the project being scored divided by the project with the highest population within 1 mile multiplied by the maximum points available for the measure (100). For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 people within 1 mile and the top project had 1,500 people, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*100 points or 67 points.

- ~~Total project cost/~~Eexisting population: 100 Points
- ~~Total project cost/e~~Existing employment: 100 Points

Using the Metropolitan Council model, all traffic analysis zones that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project will be included in the analysis. ~~Cost effectiveness calculations must be based on the total cost of the project, not just the portion of the project eligible for federal funding.~~

The highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 200 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 80 points and the top project had 190 points, this applicant would receive (80/190)*200 points or 84 points.

3. Equity and Housing Performance (120 Points) – This criterion addresses the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. The criterion also evaluates a community's efforts to promote affordable housing. This measure has not yet been modified.

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Socio-Econ" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Identify the project's location from the list below, as depicted on the map. Describe the project's positive benefits, and negative impacts, and mitigation for low-income populations; people of color; children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive the full points listed below. In order to receive the maximum points, the response should address the benefits, impacts, and mitigation for the populations listed above. (50 Points)

Upload the "Socio-Econ" map used for this measure.

RESPONSE (Select one, based on the "Socio-Econ" map):

- Project located in Racially Concentrated Area of Poverty: ☐ (0 to 50 Points)
- Project located in Concentrated Area of Poverty: ☐ (0 to 40 Points)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (0 to 30 Points)
- Project located in census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color, or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly: ☐ (0 to 20 Points)

RESPONSE (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

Based on the "Socio-Econ" map's output, the applicant will select the appropriate option from the above bullets. However, geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive full points. The applicant must fully describe the positive benefits and negative impacts (with mitigation to address the issue) for those identified groups (200 words or less). Each project will first be graded on a 10-point scale, not accounting for geography. Each score from the 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography. The project with the most positive benefits and appropriate mitigation for negative impacts will receive the full points relative to its maximum geographic sub-area defined above. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. This response is intended to be qualitative. Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

Note: Due to the geographic adjustment to scores, it is possible that the above process will result in no project receiving the maximum allotment of 50 points. In this case, the highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 50 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 20 points and the top project had 40 points, this applicant would receive (20/40)*50 points or 25 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the 2014 Housing Performance Score for the city or township in which the project is located. The score includes consideration of affordability and diversification, local initiatives to facilitate affordable workforce housing development or preservation, and density of residential

development. If the project is in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on a weighted average using the length of the project in each jurisdiction. If a project is located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), then the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project's total score will be adjusted as a result. (70 Points)

RESPONSE (Affordable Housing Score completed by Metropolitan Council staff):

- City/Township: _____
- Length of Segment within City/Township:

SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)

The applicant with the highest 2015 Housing Performance Score will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. Note: Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

Projects will use the city Housing Performance Score based on the project location. If a project is located in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on a weighted average of the city or township scores for the project location based on the length of the project in each jurisdiction. If a project is located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), then the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project's total score will be adjusted as a result.

If this is the case, then the total points possible in the application will be 930 instead of 1,000. The total points awarded through the rest of the application (900 as a hypothetical example) will be divided by 930, then multiplied by 1,000. Therefore, a project scoring 900 out of 930, will equate to 968 points on a 1,000-point scale.

If a portion of the project is located in a city with an affordable housing allocation and the other portion is located in a township with no affordable housing allocation, then a combination of the weighted average and no affordable housing methodologies should be used. This will result in a total score that will be somewhere between 930 and 1,000; then the score will need to be adjusted to fit a 1,000-point scale.

4. Deficiencies and Safety (250 Points) – This criterion addresses the project's ability to overcome barriers or ~~system~~ network gaps through the completion of ~~a~~ Critical Bicycle Transportation Links, as defined in the ~~Twin Cities Regional Bicycle System Study (2014)~~2040 TPP. **Critical Bicycle Transportation Links** encompass several types of barriers that can disrupt the connectivity of the ~~bicycle network~~Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) and isolate communities from~~and~~ key destinations. In addition to providing critical links, ~~P~~projects will ~~also~~ be scored on their ability to correct deficiencies and improve the overall safety/security of an existing facility, or expand safe biking opportunities with a ~~or~~ future multiuse trail or bicycle facility.

Note: Routine maintenance activities on a multiuse trail or bicycle facility are not eligible for funding. As defined by the FHWA, examples of routine maintenance activities include shrub and brush removal or minor drainage improvements. In order to be eligible for funding, reconstruction projects must be replacing a facility at the end of its useful life or include improvements to the facility (e.g., ADA, safety, other deficiencies). Resurfacing of a facility is eligible only if other improvements to the facility are also included in the proposed project.

A. *MEASURE:* ~~Select the type(s) of Critical Bicycle Transportation Link(s) completed by the project and d~~Discuss how the project will close a gap, cross or circumvent a physical barrier, and/or improve continuity or connections between jurisdictions. The applicant should include a description of barriers and gap improvements for the project. If the project is crossing or circumventing a barrier (e.g., river, stream, railroad corridor, freeway, or multi-lane highway), the applicant should describe the magnitude of the barrier (number of lanes, average daily traffic, posted speed limit, etc.) and how the proposed project will improve travel across or around that barrier. The description should include the distance to and condition of the nearest parallel crossing of the barrier, including the presence or absence of bicycle facilities, number of lanes, average daily traffic, and posted speed limit. (100 Points)

RESPONSE (Check all that apply):

- **Closes ~~a~~ a transportation network gap and/or provides a facility that crosses or circumvents a physical barrier** ☐ (0-90 Points)**:**

  Gap improvements ~~s~~ can be on or off the RBTN ~~including~~ and may include the following:
  - Providing a missing link between existing or improved segments of a regional (i.e., RBTN) or local transportation network;
  - ~~I~~improving bikeability ~~for~~ to better serve all ability and ~~age/~~experience levels by:
    - ~~(within urban, high-demand corridors that may already have a continuous bikeway facility, this could include adding an off-road trail where there is only an on-street bike lane or adding a bike lane where only a trail exists)~~ providing a safer, more protected on-street facility;
    - improving crossings at busy intersections (signals, signage, pavement markings); OR
    - improving a bike route or providing a trail parallel to a highway or arterial roadway along a lower-volume neighborhood collector or local street.

  Barrier crossing improvements ~~Barriers (bridge or tunnel;~~ on or off the RBTN) can include ~~a~~ crossings (over or under) of rivers or streams, railroad corridors, freeways, or multi-lane highways, or enhanced routes to circumvent the barrier by channeling

byiclists to existing safe crossings or grade separations. (For new barrier crossing projects, data about the nearest parallel crossing (as described above) must be included in the application to be considered for the full allotment of points under this criterion). ~~:~~ ~~☐ (0-90 Points)~~

- **Improves continuity and/or connections between jurisdictions** (on or off the RBTN) including~~(e.g.,~~ extending a specific bikeway facility treatment across jurisdictions to improve consistency and inherent bikeability/convenience for all bicyclists~~)~~: ☐ (0-10 Points)

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)
The applicant will receive ~~the full points shown for each of the critical links identified in the bullets above if the supporting response (200 words or less) demonstrates the project's ability to fully complete the link.~~up to 90 points if the response shows that the project closes a gap and/or crosses or circumvents a physical barrier and up to 10 points if it improves continuity and/or connections between jurisdictions. The project that the most meets the intent of each of the three criteria will receive the maximum points (e.g., 90 points for the project that best overcomes a gap or barrier). Remaining projects will receive a portion of the maximum points based on the response. Projects that do not check the box or whose description does not fulfill the intent of the criteria, will receive 0 points.

The highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 100 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 80 points and the top project had 90 points, this applicant would receive (80/90)*100 points or 89 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Discuss how the project will correct existing deficiencies or address an identified safety or security problem on the facility. The applicant should also include any available project site-related safety data (e.g., crash data, number of conflict points to be eliminated by the project by type of conflict (bicyclist/pedestrian, bicyclist/vehicle, pedestrian/vehicle, and vehicle/vehicle)) to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem. Where available, use of local crash data for the project length is highly encouraged. Crashes involving bicyclists and pedestrians should be reported for ~~2009~~2011-~~2013~~2015. As part of the response, demonstrate that the project improvements will reduce the crash potential and provide a safer environment (by referencing crash reduction factors or safety studies) and/or correct a deficiency. (150 Points)

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)
The applicant will receive the points shown below, based on the magnitude of the deficiencies or safety issues and the quality of the improvements, as addressed in the response. The scorer will first place

each project into one of the two categories below based on if crash data is cited as part of the response. The project with the most extensive improvements will receive the full points for each category ~~below~~. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points as listed below.

- For applicants that provide actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem only. Project also demonstrates that the project will reduce the crash potential and provide a safer environment and/or correct a deficiency. The project that will reduce the most crashes will receive 150 points. The other projects in this category will receive a proportional share between 101 and 150 points (i.e., a project that reduces one-half of the crashes of the top project would receive 125 points): 101 to 150 Points
- For applicants that do not provide actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data. However, the applicant demonstrates the project's ability to reduce the risk for bicycle and pedestrian crashes with the reduction of modal conflict points (bike/pedestrian, bike/vehicle, pedestrian/vehicle, and vehicle/vehicle), safety improvements that address these modal conflicts, or the project's ability to correct deficiencies. ~~Scorer will rate the projects in this category at their own discretion~~. The top project will receive 100 points while other projects will ~~be evenly distributed across the range~~receive a portion of the 100 points based on the quality of the project and response: 0 to 100 Points
- ~~Demonstrates the project's ability to correct deficiencies. Scorer will rate the projects in this category at their own discretion. The top project will receive 50 points while other projects will be evenly distributed across the range: 25 to 50 Points (17 to 34 Percent of Points)~~

5. Multimodal Facilities and Connections (100 Points) - This criterion measures how the project improves the travel experience, safety, and security for other modes of transportation, provides strong connections, and addresses the safe integration of these modes.

~~Multimodal Connections (50 Points)~~

~~**Transit Connections**~~

~~*A. MEASURE:* Reference the "Transit Connectivity" map generated at the beginning of the application process. List the transit routes directly connected to the project and indirectly connected (within a one-mile radius of the project) to help determine the annual transit ridership of these connecting routes, as depicted on the "Transit Connectivity" map. Potential connections include transitway stations (existing transitways or planned transitways with a mode and alignment determined in the 2030 TPP), high frequency express and local stations/stops, and other non-high-frequency fixed-route stations/stops. Metropolitan Council staff will provide annual ridership for each connecting route.~~

~~Upload the "Transit Connectivity" map used for this measure.~~

~~**Note:** Transitways offer travel time advantages for transit vehicles, improve transit service reliability, and increase the convenience and attractiveness of transit service. Transitways are defined in the Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail, light rail, highway and arterial bus rapid transit, and express bus with transit advantages. Eligible transitway projects are those that have a mode and alignment identified in the Transportation Policy Plan.~~

~~*RESPONSE (Data from the "Transit Connectivity" map):*~~

- ~~Existing routes directly connected to the project: _____~~
- ~~Planned transitways directly connected to the project (alignment and mode determined and identified in the 2030 TPP): _____~~
- ~~Existing routes indirectly connected within one mile of the project: _____~~
- ~~Planned transitways indirectly connected within one mile of the project (alignment and mode determined and identified in the 2030 TPP): _____~~

~~SCORING GUIDANCE~~
~~NOTE: 5A IS SCORED BELOW, ALONG WITH 5B.~~

~~**Pedestrian Connections**~~

~~B. *MEASURE:* Identify the pedestrian connections to the project and describe these existing facilities. As part of the required response, discuss how the project provides a direct connection to an existing high pedestrian traffic area (e.g., commercial, mixed-use, or entertainment nodes/districts; town or village centers) identified in an adopted county or city plan or study. Applicants should also discuss any pedestrian connections that will be constructed before the completion of the proposed project, or planned future connections. If the pedestrian connection is planned, also describe the timing of the project and the adopted county or city plan or study that identifies this facility.~~

~~*RESPONSE (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):*~~

~~SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)~~
~~NOTE: THIS SCORING SECTION IS FOR 7A and 7B, COMBINED~~

~~The applicant should provide a response to measures A and B. The project with the most extensive connections to other modes will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.~~

~~The scorer will weigh the project's connections to transit (as measured through annual transit ridership), high-traffic pedestrian areas (e.g., commercial, mixed-use, or entertainment nodes/districts; town or village centers) and pedestrian facilities, as detailed in the required response (200 words or less). A higher value will be placed on existing transit ridership and infrastructure connections present at the time of project construction over future transit ridership and planned infrastructure connections.~~

Multimodal Facilities (100 ~~50~~ Points)

~~C.~~A. *MEASURE:* Discuss any transit or pedestrian elements that are included as part of the project and how they improve the travel experience, safety, and security for users of these modes. Applicants should make sure that new multimodal elements described in the response are accounted for as part of the cost estimate form earlier in the application. Also, describe the existing transit and pedestrian accommodations. Furthermore, address how the proposed bikeway project safely integrates all modes of transportation (i.e., bicyclists, transit, pedestrians, and vehicles). Applicants should note if there is no transit service in the project area and identify supporting studies or plans that address why a mode may not be incorporated in the project.

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~50~~ 100 Points)
The project with the most comprehensive enhancements to the travel experience and safe integration of other modes, as addressed in the required response, will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. The project score will be based on the quality of the improvements, as opposed to being based solely on the number of modes addressed. Projects that include the transit or pedestrian elements as part of the project should receive slightly more points than existing or planned multimodal facilities on parallel routes, consistent with the supporting plans and studies.

Scorers should make sure that new multimodal elements described in the response are accounted for on the cost estimate form earlier in the application.

6. Risk Assessment (130 Points) - This criterion measures the number of risks associated with the project and the steps already completed in the project development process. These steps 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):

SCORING GUIDANCE (130 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 proportional 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.~~The applicant will receive up to the full points based on the eight Risk Assessment elements, as identified in the Risk Assessment within the application.~~

~~Note: The highest-scoring application will be adjusted to receive the full 130 points. Other applications will be increased proportionately.~~

7. –Cost-Benefit Ratio (100 Points) – This criterion will assess the project's cost-benefit based on the total TAB-eligible project cost and total points awarded in the previous 6 criteria. Calculations must be based on the total project cost of TAB-eligible expenses.

A. *MEASURE: Calculate the cost-benefit ratio of the project.* The Scoring Committee will divide the total project cost by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria (1-6).

- Cost-Benefit Ratio= total TAB-eligible project cost/total number of points awarded in previous criteria (1-6)

RESPONSE (This measure will be calculated after the scores for the other measures are tabulated by the Scoring Committee):

- Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form):_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)
The applicant with the lowest dollar value per point earned in the application (i.e., the benefits) will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the top project had 35,000 and the application being scored had 70,000, this applicant would receive (35,000/70,000)*100 points or 50 points.

TOTAL: 1,~~000~~ 100 POINTS

Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA) – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

Definition: A project that primarily benefits pedestrians as opposed to multiple types of non-motorized users. Most non-motorized projects should apply in the Multiuse Trail and Bicycle Facilities sub-category. All projects must relate to surface transportation. A facility may serve both a transportation purpose and a recreational purpose; a facility that connects people to recreational destinations may be considered to have a transportation purpose. Multiuse trail bridges or underpasses should apply in the Multiuse Trail and Bicycle Facilities sub-category instead of this sub-category given the nature of the users and the higher maximum awards.

Examples of Pedestrian Facility Projects:

- Sidewalks
- Streetscaping
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) improvements
- Making similar improvements in a concentrated geographic area, such as sidewalk gap closure throughout a defined neighborhood or downtown area

Minimum Federal Award: $250,000
Maximum Federal Award: $1,000,000

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	**100**	
Measure A - Connection to Jobs and ~~Concentrations, Manufacturing/Distribution Locations,~~ Educational Institutions~~, and local activity centers~~	100	
2. Usage	**200**	
Measure A - Cost effectiveness per population and employment	200	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**120**	
Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation	50	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Safety	**300**	
Measure A - Barriers overcome, gaps filled, or system connections	120	
Measure B - Deficiencies correct or safety problems addressed	180	
5. Multimodal Facilities and Connections	**150**	**15%**
~~Measure A - Ridership of transit routes directly / indirectly connected to project~~	~~75~~	
~~Measure B - Bikeway connections~~		
Measure C - Transit or bicycle elements of the project	~~75~~150	
6. Risk Assessment	**130**	**13%**
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	130	
Sub-Total	**1,000**	**100%**
7. Cost-Benefit Ratio	**TBD**	
Measure A – Cost-benefit ratio (total project cost/total points awarded)	TBD	
Total	**TBD**	

November 4, 2015

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (~~100~~ 150 Points) - Tying regional policy (Thrive MSP2040) to the Regional Solicitation, this criterion measures the regional significance of the project, including the project's connections to jobs and Educational Institutions, as defined in ThriveMSP 2040.

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Regional Economy" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing employment and educational institution enrollment within 1/2 mile of the project. Existing employment will be measured by summing the employment located in the TAZ's that intersect the 1/2-mile buffer. Enrollment at public and private post-secondary institutions will also be measured. (150 Points)

Upload the "Regional Economy" map used for this measure.

RESPONSE (Data from the "Regional Economy" map):

- Existing Employment: _____
- Existing Post-Secondary Enrollment: _____

~~*RESPONSE (Select all that apply, based on the "Regional Economy" map):*~~

- ~~Direct connection into, on an adjacent street, or within a Job Concentration: ☐ (100 Points)~~
- ~~Direct connection into, on an adjacent street, or within a Manufacturing/Distribution Location: ☐ (50 Points)~~
- ~~Direct connection into, on an adjacent street, or within an Educational Institution: ☐ (100 Points)~~
- ~~Project provides a direct connection into, on an adjacent street, or within an existing local activity center identified in an adopted county or city plan: ☐ (50 20 Points)~~

~~*RESPONSE (City or county plan reference; limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words):*~~

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~100~~ 150 Points)

The applicant with the highest employment will receive the full 150 points for the employment portion of this measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 workers within 1/4 mile and the top project had 1,500 workers, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*150 points or 100 points. Using the Metropolitan Council model, all traffic analysis zone that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project.

For the connection to educational institutions portion of this measure, the applicant with the highest post-secondary enrollment will receive the full 150 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 students within 1/4 mile and the top project had 1,500 students, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*150 points or 100 points.

The scorer will assess if the applicant would score higher with the employment part of the measure or the school enrollment part of the measure, and give the applicant the higher of the two scores out of a maximum of ~~100~~150 points.

2. Potential Usage (~~200~~ 150 Points) - This criterion quantifies the project's potential ~~impact~~ usage ~~to~~ based on the existing population ~~and employment~~ adjacent to the project. ~~Metropolitan Council staff will calculate the cost effectiveness of the project using the Metropolitan Council model, the project location, and total project cost from previous sections.~~

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Population Summary" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing population ~~and employment~~ within 1/2-mile, as depicted on the "Population Summary" map. ~~Metropolitan Council staff will calculate the cost effectiveness of the project using the input population data and the total project cost reported in the General Information and Construction Cost Estimate forms.~~

Upload the "Population Summary" map used for this measure.

- ~~Cost Effectiveness = Total project cost/existing population within a half mile of the proposed pedestrian facility (100 Points)~~
- ~~Cost Effectiveness = Total project cost/existing employment within a half-mile of the proposed pedestrian facility (100 Points)~~

~~**Note**: Future population and employment data are not considered under this measure due to the lack of reliable data.~~

RESPONSE (Data from the "Population Summary" map):

- Existing Population within 1/2 Mile: _____
- ~~Existing Employment within One-half Mile (integer only):_____~~

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~200~~ 150 Points)

The applicant with the highest population will receive the full 150 points, as will the applicant with the highest number of jobs. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 people within 1/2 mile and the top project had 1,500 people, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*150 points or 100 points.

~~for population and jobs, respectively. equal to the lowest project cost per person or job divided by the project cost per person or job for the application being scored.~~

- ~~Total project cost/existing population: 100 Points (50 Percent of Points)~~
- ~~Total project cost/existing employment: 100 Points (50 Percent of Points)~~

Using the Metropolitan Council model, all traffic analysis zones that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project will be included in the analysis. ~~Cost effectiveness calculations must be based on the total cost of the project, not just the portion of the project eligible for federal funding.~~

~~Note: Because the measure is divided into two halves, it is possible that no application will receive the full 200 points. An application will only receive 200 points if it has the highest population and employment.~~

3. Equity and Housing Performance (120 Points) – This criterion addresses the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. The criterion also evaluates a community's efforts to promote affordable housing. This measure has not yet been modified.

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Socio-Econ" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Identify the project's location from the list below, as depicted on the "Housing Equity" map. Describe the project's positive benefits, and negative impacts, and mitigation for low-income populations; people of color; children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive the full points listed below. In order to receive the maximum points, the response should address the benefits, impacts, and mitigation for the populations listed above. (50 Points)

Upload the "Socio-Econ" map used for this measure.

RESPONSE (Select one, based on the "Socio-Econ" map):

- Project located in Racially Concentrated Area of Poverty: ☐ (0 to 50 Points)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐ (0 to 40 Points)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (0 to 30 Points)
- Project located in census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color, or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly: ☐ (0 to 20 Points)

RESPONSE (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

Based on the "Socio-Econ" map's output, the applicant will select the appropriate option from the above bullets. However, geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive full points. The applicant must fully describe the positive benefits and negative impacts (with mitigation to address the issue) for those identified groups (200 words or less). Each project will first be graded on a 10-point scale, not accounting for geography. Each score from the 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography. The project with the most positive benefits and appropriate mitigation for negative impacts will receive the full points relative to its maximum geographic sub-area defined above. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. This response is intended to be qualitative. Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

The highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 50 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 20 points and the top project had 40 points, this applicant would receive (20/40)*50 points or 25 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the ~~2014~~ 2015 Housing Performance Score for the city or township in which the project is located. The score includes consideration of affordability and diversification, local initiatives to facilitate affordable workforce housing development or preservation, and density of residential

development. If the project is in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on a weighted average using the length of the project in each jurisdiction. If a project is located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), then the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project's total score will be adjusted as a result. (70 Points)

RESPONSE (Affordable Housing Score completed by Metropolitan Council staff):

- City/Township: _____
- Length of Segment within City/Township:

SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)

The applicant with the highest 2015 Housing Performance Score will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. Note: Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

Projects will use the city Housing Performance Score based on the project location. If a project is located in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on a weighted average of the city or township scores for the project location based on the length of the project in each jurisdiction. If a project is located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), then the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project's total score will be adjusted as a result.

If this is the case, then the total points possible in the application will be 930 instead of 1,000. The total points awarded through the rest of the application (900 as a hypothetical example) will be divided by 930, then multiplied by 1,000. Therefore, a project scoring 900 out of 930, will equate to 968 points on a 1,000-point scale.

If a portion of the project is located in a city with an affordable housing allocation and the other portion is located in a township with no affordable housing allocation, then a combination of the weighted average and no affordable housing methodologies should be used. This will result in a total score that will be somewhere between 930 and 1,000; then the score will need to be adjusted to fit a 1,000-point scale.

4. Deficiencies and Safety (300 Points) – This criterion addresses the project's ability to improve the overall safety of an existing or future pedestrian facility. This includes how the project will overcome physical barriers or system gaps, correct deficiencies, and/or fix a safety problem.

Note: Routine maintenance activities on a pedestrian facility are not eligible for funding. As defined by the FHWA, examples of routine maintenance activities include shrub and brush removal or minor drainage improvements. In order to be eligible for funding, reconstruction projects must be replacing a facility at the end of its useful life or include improvements to the facility (e.g., ADA, safety, other deficiencies). Resurfacing of a facility is eligible only if other improvements to the facility are also included in the proposed project.

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "RBTN Evaluation and Major Barriers" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Discuss how the project will overcome barriers (i.e., bridge or tunnel), fill gaps, or connect system segments in the pedestrian network. The applicant should include a description of barriers and gap improvements for the project. If the project is crossing or circumventing a barrier (e.g., river, stream, railroad corridor, freeway, or multi-lane highway), the applicant should describe the magnitude of the barrier (number of lanes, average daily traffic, posted speed, etc.) and how the proposed project will improve travel across or around that barrier. The description should include distance to and condition of the nearest parallel crossing of the barrier, including the presence or absence of pedestrian facilities, number of lanes, average daily traffic, and posted speed limit. (120 Points)

RESPONSE (Check all that apply):

- **Overcomes a physical barrier or system gap** ☐ (0-120 Points)

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (120 Points)
The applicant will receive up to 120 points if the response shows that the project overcomes a physical barrier or system gap. The project that the most meets the intent will receive the maximum points. Remaining projects will receive a portion of the maximum points based on the response. Projects that do not check the box or whose description does not fulfill the intent of the criteria, will receive 0 points.

~~If the applicant is proposing to close a gap to improve continuity and/or connections, the applicant will receive full points if the response (200 words or less) and project map demonstrate the project's ability to fully address the connection/gap.~~

~~If the applicant is proposing to provide a facility to cross or circumvent a physical barrier (i.e., bridge or tunnel), the applicant removing the most critical barrier will receive the full points, as described through the discussion of the magnitude and type of barrier to be crossed; the distance to the nearest parallel crossing; the type of facility and its condition at this alternate crossing; and as demonstrated on the project map. Projects with an alternate crossing that has a safe bicycle/pedestrian facility within one mile should be considered a non-critical barrier and should be scored lower than barriers with a greater distance to a parallel crossing. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.~~

~~Applications can receive points for each of the below elements:~~

- ~~Closes a gap to improvement continuity and/or connections. The applicant(s) that best demonstrates the project's ability to fully address the connection/gap will receive all points from this element. Other projects will receive fewer points at the scorer's discretion.~~
- ~~Crosses or circumvents a physical barrier (i.e., bridge or tunnel). The applicant removing the most critical barrier will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. This is described through the discussion of the magnitude and type of barrier to be crossed; the distance to the nearest parallel crossing; the type of facility and its condition at this alternate crossing; and as demonstrated on the project map. Projects with an alternate crossing that has a safe bicycle/pedestrian facility within one mile should be considered a non-critical barrier and should receive a maximum of 90 points.~~

B. *MEASURE:* Discuss how the project will correct existing deficiencies or address an identified safety or security problem on the facility. The applicant should also include any available project site-related safety data (e.g. crash data, number of conflict points to be eliminated by the project by type of conflict (bicyclist/pedestrian, bicyclist/vehicle, pedestrian/vehicle, and vehicle/vehicle)) to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem. Where available, use of local crash data for the project length is highly encouraged. Crashes involving bicyclists and pedestrians should be reported for 2009-2013. As part of the response, demonstrate that the project improvements will reduce the crash potential and provide a safer environment (by referencing crash reduction factors or safety studies) and/or correct a deficiency. (180 Points)

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (180 Points)

The applicant will receive the points shown below, based on the magnitude of the deficiencies or safety issues and the quality of the improvements, as addressed in the response. The scorer will first place each project into one of the two categories below based on if crash data is cited as part of the response. ~~Improvements supported by crash reduction factors should be scored highest.~~ The project with the most extensive improvements will receive the full points for each category. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points as listed below.

- For ~~A~~applicant that provide~~s~~ actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem only. Project also demonstrates that the project will reduce the crash potential and provide a safer environment and/or correct a deficiency. The project that will reduce the most crashes will receive 180 points. The other projects in this category will receive a proportional share between 121 and 180 points (i.e., a project that reduces one-half of the crashes of the top project would receive 150 points): 121 to 180 Points
- For applicants that do not provide actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data. However, the applicant demonstrates the project's ability to reduce the risk for bicycle and pedestrian crashes with the reduction of modal conflict points (bike/pedestrian, bike/vehicle, pedestrian/vehicle, and vehicle/vehicle), safety improvements that address these modal conflicts, or the project's ability to correct deficiencies. ~~Scorer will rate the projects in this category at their own discretion.~~ The top

project will receive a portion of the 120 points based on the quality of the project and response ~~while other projects will be evenly distributed across the range~~: ~~60~~ ~~61~~0 to 120 Points

The highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 180 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 80 points and the top project had 160 points, this applicant would receive (80/160)*180 points or 90 points.

5. Multimodal Facilities and Connections (150 Points) - This criterion measures how the project improves the travel experience, safety, and security for other modes of transportation, provides strong connections, and addresses the safe integration of these modes.

~~Multimodal Connections (50 Points)~~

~~**Transit Connections**~~

~~*A. MEASURE:* Reference the "Transit Connectivity" map generated at the beginning of the application process. List the transit routes directly connected to the project and indirectly connected (within a one-mile radius of the project) to help determine the annual transit ridership of these connecting routes, as depicted on the "Transit Connectivity" map. Potential connections include transitway stations (existing transitways or planned transitways with a mode and alignment determined in the 2030 TPP), high frequency express and local stations/stops, and other non-high-frequency fixed-route stations/stops. Metropolitan Council staff will provide annual ridership for each connecting route.~~

~~Upload the "Transit Connectivity" map used for this measure.~~

~~**Note:** Transitways offer travel time advantages for transit vehicles, improve transit service reliability, and increase the convenience and attractiveness of transit service. Transitways are defined in the Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail, light rail, highway and arterial bus rapid transit, and express bus with transit advantages. Eligible transitway projects are those that have a mode and alignment identified in the Transportation Policy Plan.~~

~~*RESPONSE (Data from the "Transit Connectivity" map):*~~

- ~~Existing routes directly connected to the project: _____~~
- ~~Planned transitways directly connected to the project (alignment and mode determined and identified in the 2030 TPP): _____~~
- ~~Existing routes indirectly connected within a half-mile of the project: _____~~
- ~~Planned transitways indirectly connected within a half-mile of the project (alignment and mode determined and identified in the 2030 TPP): _____~~

~~*RESPONSE (200 words or less):*~~

~~SCORING GUIDANCE~~
~~NOTE: 5A IS SCORED BELOW, ALONG WITH 5B.~~

~~**Bicycle Connections**~~

~~B. *MEASURE:* Identify the bikeway connections to the project and describe these existing facilities. As part of the required response, discuss how the project provides a direct connection to an existing bikeway identified in an adopted county or city plan or study. Applicants should also discuss any bikeway connections that will be constructed before the completion of the proposed project, or planned future connections. If the bikeway connection is planned, also describe the timing of the project and the adopted county or city plan or study that identifies this facility.~~

~~*RESPONSE (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):*~~

~~SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)~~

~~The applicant should provide a response to measures A and B. The project with the most extensive connections to other modes will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. The scorer will weigh the project's connections to transit (as measured through annual transit ridership) and bikeways. A higher value will be placed on existing transit ridership and infrastructure connections present at the time of project construction over future transit ridership and planned infrastructure connections.~~

Multimodal Facilities (150 Points)

~~C.~~A. *MEASURE:* Discuss any transit or bicycle elements that are included as part of the project and how they improve the travel experience, safety, and security for users of these modes. Applicants should make sure that new multimodal elements described in the response are accounted for as part of the cost estimate form earlier in the application. Also, describe the existing transit and bicycle accommodations. Furthermore, address how the proposed pedestrian facility project safely integrates all modes of transportation (i.e., pedestrians, transit, bicyclists, and vehicles). Applicants should note if there is no transit service in the project area and identify supporting studies or plans that address why mode may not be incorporated into the project.

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~50~~ 150 Points)

The project with the most comprehensive enhancements to the travel experience and safe integration of other modes, as addressed in the required response, will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. The project score will be based on the quality of the improvements, as opposed to being based solely on the number of modes addressed. Projects that include the transit or bicycle elements as part of the project should receive slightly more points than existing or planned multimodal facilities on parallel routes, consistent with the supporting plans and studies.

6. Risk Assessment (130 Points) - This criterion measures the number of risks associated with the project and the steps already completed in the project development process. These steps are outlined in the checklist in the required Risk Assessment.

PROJECT SCORING: Projects selected through this solicitation will be programmed for construction in 2017/2018/2019. The region must manage the federal funds in each year of the TIP. Projects are expected to be authorized in their program year in accordance with TAB's Regional Program Year Policy. Projects that do not have many risks and have already completed some of the work are more likely to be ready for funding authorization in the program year.

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):

SCORING GUIDANCE (130 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 proportional 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)*130 points or 74 points.~~The applicant will receive up to the full points based on the eight Risk Assessment elements, as identified in the Risk Assessment within the application.~~

7. –Cost-Benefit Ratio (100 Points) – This criterion will assess the project's cost-benefit based on the total TAB-eligible project cost and total points awarded in the previous 6 criteria. Calculations must be based on the total project cost of TAB-eligible expenses.

A. *MEASURE: Calculate the cost-benefit ratio of the project.* The Scoring Committee will divide the total project cost by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria (1-6).

- Cost-Benefit Ratio= total TAB-eligible project cost/total number of points awarded in previous criteria (1-6)

RESPONSE (This measure will be calculated after the scores for the other measures are tabulated by the Scoring Committee):

- Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form): _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points) The applicant with the lowest dollar value per point earned in the application (i.e., the benefits) will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the top project had 35,000 and the application being scored had 70,000, this applicant would receive (35,000/70,000)*100 points or 50 points.

~~**TOTAL: 1,000 POINTS**~~ **TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS**

Safe Routes to School Infrastructure – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

Definition: An infrastructure project that is within a two-mile radius and directly benefiting a primary, middle, or high school site. A Safe Routes to School Plan (SRTS) must be established prior to applying for this infrastructure funding.

Examples of Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Projects:

- Sidewalks benefiting people going to the school
- Multiuse trails benefiting people going to the school
- Improved crossings benefiting people going to the school
- Multiple improvements

Minimum Federal Award: $150,000
Maximum Federal Award: $1,000,000

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total
1. Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements	**250**	**25%**
Measure A - Describe how project addresses 5 Es* of SRTS program	250	
2. Usage	**~~200~~250**	**~~20~~25%**
Measure A - Average share of student population that bikes or walks	~~120~~150	
Measure B - Student population within school's walkshed	~~80~~100	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**120**	**12%**
Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation	50	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Safety	**250**	**25%**
Measure A - Barriers overcome, gaps filled, or system connections	100	
Measure B - Deficiencies corrected or safety or security addressed	150	
~~**5. Multimodal Facilities (Transit) and Connections**~~	~~**50**~~	~~**5%**~~
~~Measure A - Ridership of transit routes directly connected to the project~~	~~50~~	
~~6~~5. Public Engagement/Risk Assessment	**130**	**13%**
Measure A - Public engagement process	45	
Measure B - Risk Assessment Form	85	
Sub-Total	**1,000**	**100.0%**
6. Cost-Benefit Ratio	**TBD**	
Measure A – Cost-benefit ratio (total project cost/total points awarded)	TBD	
Total	**TBD**	

** The 5 E's of Safe Routes to School include Evaluation, Engineering, Education, Encouragement, and Enforcement.*

October 28, 2015

1. Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements (250 Points) - This criterion assesses the program's ability to integrate the Safe Routes to School Program elements: Engineering, Education, Enforcement, Encouragement, and Evaluation (the 5 E's).

A. *MEASURE:* Describe how the SRTS program associated with the project addresses or integrates the 5 E's. The response should include examples, collaborations or partnerships, and planned activities in the near-term (within five years) to further illustrate the incorporation of the 5 E's into the SRTS program associated with the project.

MnDOT Safe Routes to School guidance defines these elements as follows:

- **Engineering** - Creating operational and physical improvements to the infrastructure surrounding schools that reduce speeds and potential conflicts with motor vehicle traffic, and establish safer and fully accessible crossings, walkways, trails, and bikeways. (0-50 points)
- **Education** - Teaching children about the broad range of transportation choices, instructing them in important lifelong bicycling and walking safety skills, and launching driver safety campaigns in the vicinity of schools. (0-50 points)
- **Enforcement** - Partnering with local law enforcement to ensure traffic laws are obeyed in the vicinity of the schools (this includes enforcement of speeds, yielding to pedestrians, and proper walking and bicycling behaviors) and initiating community enforcements such as a crossing guard program. (0-50 points)
- **Encouragement** - Using events and activities to promote walking and bicycling. (0-50 points)
- **Evaluation** - Monitoring and documenting outcomes and trends through the collection of data before and after the project(s). (0-50 points)

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (250 Points)

The applicant will receive up to 50 points for each of the five sub-measures based on the program's ability to demonstrate the incorporation of each of the 5 E's through activities completed or to be implemented in the near-term (within five years). Applicants will receive up to the full points for each element at the scorer's discretion. The project that most meets the intent of each of the sub-measure will receive the maximum points (e.g., 50 points for the project that best meets the engineering element). Remaining projects will receive a portion of the maximum points based on the response. Projects that do not check the box or whose description does not fulfill the intent of the criteria, will receive 0 points.

- Engineering: 0-50 Points
- Education: 0-50 Points
- Enforcement: 0-50 Points
- Encouragement: 0-50 Points
- Evaluation: 0-50 Points

The highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 250 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points relative to the proportion of the full points assigned to the highest-scoring project. For example, if the application being scored had 100 points and the top project had 200 points, this applicant would receive (100/200)*250 points or 125 points.

2. Usage (~~200~~ 250 Points) - This criterion quantifies the project's potential impact to existing population.

A. *MEASURE:* Average percent of student population that currently bikes or walks to school, as identified on the Safe Routes to School student travel tally worksheet. As part of the required attachments, applicants should attach copies of all original travel tally documentation. (~~120~~ 150 Points)

RESPONSE:

- Average percent of student population:_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (120 Points)
The applicant with the highest average share of student population that currently bikes or walks to school will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 15 percent of the students and the top project had 30 points, this applicant would receive (0.15/0.30)*150 points or 75 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Student population within one ~~half~~ mile of the elementary school, ~~or one mile of the~~ middle school, or high school served by the project. (~~80~~ 100 Points)

RESPONSE:

- Student population within one ~~half~~ mile ~~or mile~~ of the school:_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (80 Points)
The applicant with the highest student population within one ~~half~~ mile of the ~~elementary~~ school ~~or one mile of the middle school or high school~~ will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 150 students and the top project had 300 points, this applicant would receive (150/300)*100 points or ~~4~~50 points.

3. Equity and Housing Performance (120 Points) – This criterion addresses the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, and people with disabilities. The criterion also evaluates a community's efforts to promote affordable housing. Measure still under development.

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Socio-Econ" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Identify the project's location from the list below, as depicted on the "Housing Equity" map. Describe the project's positive benefits, and negative impacts, and mitigation for low-income populations; people of color; students, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive the full points listed below. In order to receive the maximum points, the response should address the benefits, impacts, and mitigation for the populations listed above. (50 Points)

Upload the "Socio-Econ" map used for this measure.

RESPONSE (Select one, based on the "Socio-Econ" map):

- Project located in Racially Concentrated Area of Poverty: ☐ (0 to 50 Points)
- Project located in Concentrated Area of Poverty: ☐ (0 to 40 Points)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (0 to 30 Points)
- Project located in census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color, or includes students, people with disabilities, or the elderly: ☐ (0 to 20 Points)

RESPONSE (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)
Based on the "Socio-Econ" map's output, the applicant will select the appropriate option from the above bullets. However, geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive full points. The applicant must fully describe the positive benefits and negative impacts (with mitigation to address the issue) for those identified groups (200 words or less). Each project will first be graded on a 10-point scale, not accounting for geography. Each score from the 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography. The project with the most positive benefits and appropriate mitigation for negative impacts will receive the full points relative to its maximum geographic sub-area defined above. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. This response is intended to be qualitative. Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

Note: Due to the geographic adjustment to scores, it is possible that the above process will result in no project receiving the maximum allotment of 50 points. In this case, the highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 50 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points equal to the points. For example, if the application being scored had 20 points and the top project had 40 points, this applicant would receive (20/40)*50 points or 25 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the 2014 Housing Performance Score for the city or township in which the project is located. The score

includes consideration of affordability and diversification, local initiatives to facilitate affordable workforce housing development or preservation, and density of residential development. If the project is in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on a weighted average using the length of the project in each jurisdiction. If a project is located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), then the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project's total score will be adjusted as a result. (70 Points)

RESPONSE (Affordable Housing Score completed by Metropolitan Council staff):

- City/Township: _____
- Length of Segment within City/Township:

SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)

The applicant with the highest 2014 Housing Performance Score (calculated from the Summer 2014 survey with the 2012 calculation methodology) will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. Note: Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

Projects will use the city Housing Performance Score based on the project location. If a project is located in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on a weighted average of the city or township scores for the project location based on the length of the project in each jurisdiction. If a project is located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), then the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project's total score will be adjusted as a result.

If this is the case, then the total points possible in the application will be 930 instead of 1,000. The total points awarded through the rest of the application (900 as a hypothetical example) will be divided by 930, then multiplied by 1,000. Therefore, a project scoring 900 out of 930, will equate to 968 points on a 1,000-point scale.

If a portion of the project is located in a city with an affordable housing allocation and the other portion is located in a township with no affordable housing allocation, then a combination of the weighted average and no affordable housing methodologies should be used. This will result in a total score that will be somewhere between 930 and 1,000; then the score will need to be adjusted to fit a 1,000-point scale.

4. Deficiencies and Safety (250 Points) - This criterion addresses the project's ability to improve the overall safety of the proposed project area. This includes how the project will overcome physical barriers or system gaps~~, correct deficiencies,~~ and/or fix a safety problem.

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "RBTN Evaluation and Major Barriers" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Discuss how the project will overcome barriers (i.e., bridge or tunnel), fill gaps, or connect system segments in the pedestrian/bicycle network serving a K-12 school. The applicant should include a description of barriers and gap improvements for the project in context with the existing bicycle or pedestrian network serving the school(s). If the project is crossing or circumventing a barrier (e.g., river, stream, railroad corridor, freeway, or multi-lane highway), the applicant should describe the magnitude of the barrier (number of lanes, average daily traffic, posted speed, etc.) and how the proposed project will improve travel across or around that barrier. The description should include distance to and condition of the nearest parallel crossing of the barrier, including the presence or absence of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, number of lanes, average daily traffic, and posted speed limit. (100 Points)

RESPONSE (Check all that apply):

- **Overcomes a physical barrier or system gap** ☐ (0-100 Points)

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The applicant will receive up to 100 points if the response shows that the project overcomes a physical barrier or system gap. ~~For each of the criteria, t~~The project that the most meets the intent will receive the maximum points. Remaining projects will receive a portion of the maximum points based on the response. Projects that do not check the box or whose description does not fulfill the intent of the criteria, will receive 0 points.

~~If the applicant is proposing to close a system gap to improve continuity and/or connections to the project school, the applicant will receive full points if the response (200 words or less) and project map demonstrate the project's ability to fully address the connection/gap.~~

~~If the applicant is proposing to provide a facility to cross or circumvent a physical barrier (i.e., bridge or tunnel), the applicant removing the most critical barrier will receive the full points, as described through the discussion of the magnitude and type of barrier to be crossed; the distance to the nearest parallel crossing; the type of facility and its condition at this alternate crossing; and as demonstrated on the project map. Projects with an alternate crossing that has a safe bicycle/pedestrian facility within one mile should be considered a non-critical barrier and should be scored lower than barriers with a greater distance to a parallel crossing. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.~~

~~Applications can receive points for each of the below elements:~~

- ~~Closes a gap to improvement continuity and/or connections. Applications proposing to close a system gap to improve continuity and/or connections to the project school will receive full points~~

- ~~Crosses or circumvents a physical barrier (i.e., bridge or tunnel). The applicant removing the most critical barrier will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. This is described through the discussion of the magnitude and type of barrier to be crossed; the distance to the nearest parallel crossing; the type of facility and its condition at this alternate crossing; and as demonstrated on the project map. Projects with an alternate crossing that has a safe bicycle/pedestrian facility within one mile should be considered a non-critical barrier and should receive a maximum of 75 points.~~

B. *MEASURE:* Discuss how the project will correct existing deficiencies or address an identified safety or security problem on the facility or within the project site. Address how these improvements will make bicycling and walking to the school a safer and appealing transportation alternative. Include any available project site-related safety data (e.g. crash data, number of conflict points to be eliminated by the project by type of conflict (bicyclist/pedestrian, bicyclist/vehicle, pedestrian/vehicle, and vehicle/vehicle)) to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem. Where available, use of local crash data for the project length is highly encouraged. Crashes involving bicyclists and pedestrians should be reported for 2011-2015. As part of the response, demonstrate that the project improvements will reduce the crash potential and provide a safer environment (by referencing crash reduction factors or safety studies) and/or correct a deficiency. Qualitative data from parent surveys, other internal survey data, or stakeholder engagement supporting the safety/security improvements or deficiencies should also be addressed. (150 Points)

RESPONSE (Limit ~~1,400~~2,800 characters; approximately ~~200~~ 400 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)

The applicant will receive the points shown below, based on the magnitude of the deficiencies or safety issues and the quality of the improvements, as addressed in the response. The scorer will first place each project into one of the two categories below based on if crash data or other qualitative data is cited as part of the response. Improvements that are supported by crash reduction factors, safety studies, survey data, and/or stakeholder engagement should be scored highest. The project with the most extensive improvements will receive the full points for each category below. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.

- For applicants that provide actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem only. Applicant also demonstrates that the project will reduce the crash potential and provide a safer environment and/or correct a deficiency, supported by crash reduction factors, safety studies, survey data, and/or stakeholder engagement. The project that will reduce the most crashes will receive 150 points. The other projects in this category will receive a proportional share between 101 and 150 points (i.e., a project that reduces one-half of the crashes of the top project would receive 125 points): 101 to 150 Points
- For applicants that do not provide actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data. However, the applicant demonstrates the project's ability to reduce the risk for bicycle and pedestrian crashes with the reduction of modal conflict points (bike/pedestrian, bike/car, pedestrian/car, and vehicle/vehicle), ~~or~~ safety improvements that address these modal conflicts, or the project's ability to correct deficiencies. The top project will receive 100 points while other projects will ~~be evenly distributed across the range~~receive a portion of the 100 points based on the quality of the project and response: ~~50~~ ~~51~~0 to 100 Points

Multimodal Facilities (Transit) and Connections (50 Points) – This criterion measures how the project provides strong connections to fixed-route transit stops and stations.

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Transit Connectivity" map generated at the beginning of the application process. List the transit routes directly connected to the project and indirectly connected to help determine the annual transit ridership of these connecting routes, as depicted on the "Transit Connectivity" map. Indirectly connected transit stops or stations must be served by an existing bicycle or pedestrian facility and cannot be located further than a half-mile from an elementary school, or one mile from a middle or high school served by the project. Additionally, applicants should provide the average number of students currently using public transit to travel to school, as well as information regarding the school's public transit policy in the response, if applicable.

Potential connections include transitway stations (existing transitways or planned transitways with a mode and alignment determined in the 2030 TPP), high-frequency express and local stations/stops, and other non-high-frequency fixed-route stations/stops. Metropolitan Council staff will provide annual ridership for each connecting route.

Upload the "Transit Connectivity" map used for this measure.

Note: Transitways offer travel time advantages for transit vehicles, improve transit service reliability, and increase the convenience and attractiveness of transit service. Transitways are defined in the Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail, light rail, highway and arterial bus rapid transit, and express bus with transit advantages. Eligible transitway projects are those that have a mode and alignment identified in the Transportation Policy Plan.

RESPONSE (Data from the "Transit Connectivity" map):

- Existing routes directly connected to the project: _____
- Planned transitways directly connected to the project (alignment and mode determined and identified in the 2030 TPP): _____
- Existing routes indirectly connected within a half-mile of the elementary school or one mile of a middle/high school: _____
- Planned transitways indirectly connected within a half-mile of the elementary school or one mile of a middle/high school (alignment and mode determined and identified in the 2030 TPP): _____

RESPONSE (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

The applicant with route connections having the highest annual transit ridership will receive the full points shown below. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. If provided, student public transit ridership and public transit policy information will be used for MnDOT SRTS information purposes only and should not impact scoring.

- Existing routes directly connected to the project: 15 Points (30 Percent of Points)
- Planned transitways directly connected to the project: 15 Points (30 Percent of Points)
- Existing routes indirectly connected to the project: 10 Points (20 Percent of Points)
- Planned transitways indirectly connected to the project: 10 Points (20 Percent of Points)

~~The highest-scoring application will be adjusted to receive the full points. Other applications will be increased proportionately.~~

5. Public Engagement/Risk Assessment (130 Points) - This criterion measures the planned public engagement, the number of risks associated with the project, and the steps already completed in the project development process. These steps are outlined in the checklist in the required Risk Assessment.

A. *MEASURE:* Describe the public engagement process that will be used to include partners and stakeholders (e.g., schools parents, law enforcement, road authorities, and other impacted community members) and build consensus during the development of the proposed project. The number and types of meetings to be held, notices or other notification distributed, stakeholder contacts, adoption of the SRTS plan by the community and school district, and any additional descriptive information should be included in the discussion of the engagement process. As part of the required attachments, copies of all parent survey results must also be attached to the application. The applicant should note if parent surveys were not collected as part of the SRTS planning process. (45 Points)

RESPONSE (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (45 Points)

The applicant will be scored on the comprehensiveness and quality of the planned public engagement activities. Additionally, applicants with a project selected through a public engagement process should score higher than projects without this engagement step. Community support, as displayed through parent surveys, stakeholder contacts, and/or adoption of the SRTS plan by the community and school district, should also be considered in the scoring. Note: parent surveys are attached for MnDOT informational purposes only.

The project with the most extensive near-term engagement process (current year through project construction year), including any completed engagement activities for the proposed project, will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.

B. *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.). (85 Points)

RESPONSE (Complete Risk Assessment):

SCORING GUIDANCE (85 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 proportional 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)*85 points or 49 points. ~~The applicant will receive up to the full points based on the eight Risk Assessment elements, as identified within the application.~~

6. Cost-Benefit Ratio (100 Points) – This criterion will assess the project's cost-benefit ratio based on the total TAB-eligible project cost and total points awarded in the previous five criteria. Calculations must be based on the total project cost of TAB-eligible expenses.

A. *MEASURE: Calculate the cost-benefit ratio of the project.* The Scoring Committee will divide the total project cost by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria (1-6).

- Cost-Benefit Ratio= total TAB-eligible project cost/total number of points awarded in previous criteria (1-6)

RESPONSE (This measure will be calculated after the scores for the other measures are tabulated by the Scoring Committee):

- Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form): _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)
The applicant with the lowest dollar value per point earned in the application (i.e., the benefits) will receive the full points for the measure. For example, if the top project had 35,000 and the application being scored had 70,000, this applicant would receive (35,000/70,000)*100 points or 50 points.

~~**TOTAL: 1,000 POINTS**~~

TOTAL: 1,000 POINTS