

**ACTION TRANSMITTAL 2016-04**

**DATE:** December 14, 2015 (Revised)  
**TO:** TAC Funding and Programming Committee  
**PREPARED BY:** Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)  
Steve Peterson, Planning Analyst (651-602-1819)  
Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator (651-602-1717)  
**SUBJECT:** 2016 Regional Solicitation: Weighting of Criteria and Measures  
**REQUESTED ACTION:** Recommend the weighting of the criteria and measures for the 2016 Regional Solicitation as shown in Attachments 1 through 5.  
**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** That TAC Funding and Programming recommend to TAC the weighting of the criteria and measures for the 2016 Regional Solicitation as shown in Attachments 1 through 5.

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF ACTION:** The Regional Solicitation for federal transportation project funding is part of the Metropolitan Council's federally-required continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning process for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. Attachment 1 shows the criteria (expected to be approved by TAB on December 16, 2015) and the proposed weighting for the criteria for each of the application categories. Attachments 2 through 5 show the proposed changes to the distribution of points within criteria that have more than one measure for each application category.

**PROPOSED CRITERIA WEIGHTING CHANGES:**

For the most part, the recommended criteria weightings remain the same as within the 2014 Regional Solicitation. Proposed weighting changes are shown on Attachment 1 and the explanation of why the change is being recommended is shown below.

- Addition of Cost Effectiveness as a new criterion (expected approval by TAB on December 16, 2015) will require a change in the scoring for all application categories. Two key questions for the Funding & Programming Committee are:
  - 1) whether this criterion and its weighting (score) should be above the 1,000 point application total or included within the 1,000 point total? and,
  - 2) the number of points to be given to the Cost Effectiveness criteria.
- In 2014 the Bridge application category was the only application category that contained a stand-alone criteria and measure for cost effectiveness. If Cost Effectiveness is recommended to be scored above the 1,000 point application total, the points previously allocated to this Bridge criteria need to be redistributed to other criteria and measures. Based on general feedback from TAC F&P and TAC on the importance of a bridge's Role in the Regional Transportation System as measured by its distance to other parallel bridges (i.e., the further the distance, the more important the bridge to the regional transportation system) and the importance of bridges for freight movements (Usage criteria), staff suggests reallocating the 75 points among these two criteria as shown on Attachment 1.

- Under the Pedestrian Facility application category, staff suggests equalizing the distribution of the points between the criteria Role in the Regional System and Usage. The Role in the Regional System criterion is measured by connections to jobs while the Usage criterion is measured by existing population within a half mile of the project. The suggested change would make these two criteria equal (jobs and population) at 150 points each.
- Under the Safe Routes to School application category, staff suggests eliminating the Multimodal connections criterion and redistributing the 50 points to the Usage criterion. This is recommended because Safe Routes to School projects are typically focused on providing sidewalk connections and are not focused on providing other multimodal connections.

**DISTRIBUTION OF POINTS WITHIN CRITERIA WITH MORE THAN ONE MEASURE:**

Attachments 2 through 5 show proposed changes to the distribution of points among criteria that have more than one measure.

Attachment 2 Roadway Applications Measures

Roadway Expansion

- Based on the sensitivity analysis conducted after the 2014 Regional Solicitation, staff recommends increasing the points from 20 to 30 under measure C in Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy criterion to increase its potential impact in the next solicitation. This recommendation applies to all four Roadway applications.
- With the removal of measures A and B in the Multimodal Facilities criteria (recommended under AT 2016-03), all points are now included in new Measure A (former measure C). This recommendation applies to all four Roadway applications.

Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization

- Staff recommends redistribution of points for Measures A and B under Congestion Reduction/Air Quality (i.e., increase the emissions reduced measure from 25 to 30 points and decrease the vehicle delay reduced measure from 50 to 45 points) to increase the potential impact of the emissions reduced measure in the next solicitation.

Bridges

- Staff recommends reallocating points from Cost Effectiveness criterion to Role in two Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy measures and one Usage measure because of general feedback from TAC F&P and TAC related to bridges. This is a suggested starting point for discussion on how to redistribute the 75 points from the former Cost Effectiveness Criterion and Measure.

Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization

- Under several criteria (Usage, Emissions Reduction, and Multimodal Connections) measures were consolidated to one measure and the points were allocated to remaining measure.

TDM

- Under two criteria (Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy, and Innovation) measures were consolidated to one measure and the points were allocated to the remaining measure.
- Under the Risk Assessment criterion, one measure was eliminated and the points reallocated to the remaining two measures.

Multiuse Trails/Bike and Pedestrian Facilities

- With the removal of Measure A/B in Multimodal Facilities, all points are included in new Measure A (former measure C).

Safe Routes to Schools

- Points from Multimodal Facilities and Connections criterion were reallocated to the Potential Usage criterion. Since the concepts previously under Multimodal (i.e., transit usage to the school) were reallocated to the Potential Usage criterion, it is suggested that the 50 points also be reallocated to Potential Usage, under the Average share of the student population that bikes, walks, or uses transit measure.

**RELATIONSHIP TO REGIONAL POLICY:** TAB develops and issues a Regional Solicitation for federal funding.

---

**ROUTING**

<b>TO</b>	<b>ACTION REQUESTED</b>	<b>DATE COMPLETED</b>
TAC Funding & Programming	Review & Recommend	
Technical Advisory Committee	Review & Recommend	
Transportation Advisory Board	Review & Approve	
Transportation Committee	Review & Recommend	
Metropolitan Council	Concurrence	

ATTACHMENT 1: DRAFT CRITERIA WEIGHTING

Criteria	Roadway Exp.	Roadway Reconst/ Modern.	Roadway System Man.	Roadway Bridges	Transit Exp.	Transit Modern.	TDM	Multi-Use Trails & Bike Facility	Ped. Facility	Safe Routes to School
Role in the Regional System	17.5%	17.5%	12.5%	<del>12.5%</del> 19.5%	10%	10%	10%	20%	<del>10%</del> 15%	--
Usage	17.5%	17.5%	12.5%	<del>12.5%</del> 13%	35%	30%	10%	20%	<del>20%</del> 15%	<del>20%</del> 25%
Safety	15%	15%	20%	--	--	--	--	25%	30%	25%
Congestion /Air Quality	15%	7.5%	20%	--	20%	10%	40%	--	--	--
Infrastructure Age	7.5%	15%	7.5%	40%	--	--	--	--	--	--
Equity and Housing Performance	10%	10%	10%	10%	20%	15%	15%	12%	12%	12%
Multimodal Facilities	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	--	10%	15%	5%
Risk Assessment	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%	5%	10%	5%	13%	13%	13%
<del>Total Bridge Cost Effect.</del>	--	--	--	7.5%	--	--	--	--	--	--
Relationship Between SRTS Elements	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	25%
Transit Improvements	--	--	--	--	--	15%	--	--	--	--
TDM Innovation	--	--	--	--	--	--	20%	--	--	--
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<u>Cost Effectiveness</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>TBD</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>

## ATTACHMENT 2: ROADWAY MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Expansion	Recon/Mod	System Mgmt	Bridge
<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>125</b>	<b><del>125</del>195</b>
Measure A - Average distance to nearest parallel roadways/bridges	<del>90</del> 80	<del>80</del> 90	<del>65</del> 55	<del>65</del> 115
Measure B – Current daily heavy commercial traffic	65	65	40	<del>40</del> 50
Measure C – Connection to Total Jobs and Manu/Dist Jobs	<del>20</del> 30	<del>20</del> 30	<del>20</del> 30	<del>20</del> 30
<b>Usage</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>125</b>	<b><del>125</del>130</b>
Measure A – Current daily person throughput	110	110	85	<del>95</del> 100
Measure B – Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume	65	65	40	30
<b>Equity and Housing Performance</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Measure A – Connection to disadvantageded pop and benefits, impacts, mitigation	30	30	30	30
Measure B – Housing Performance Score	70	70	70	70
<b>Infrastructure Age/Condition</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>400</b>
Measure A – Date of construction	75	50	<b>75</b>	
Measure B - Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies	75	100		
Measure A – Bridge Sufficiency Rating				300
Measure B – Load-Posting				100
<b>Congestion Reduction/Air Quality</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>200</b>	
Measure A – Vehicle delay reduced	100	<del>50</del> 45	150	
Measure B – Kg of emissions reduced	50	<del>25</del> 30	50	
<b>Safety</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>200</b>	
Measure A – Crashes reduced	150	150	200	
<b>Multimodal Facilities</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<del>Measure A/B – Transit and bike/ped connections</del>	<del>50</del>	<del>50</del>	<del>50</del>	<del>50</del>
Measure A - Transit, bicycle, pedestrian, or <u>freight project</u> elements	<del>50</del> 100	<del>50</del> 100	<del>50</del> 100	<del>50</del> 100
<b>Risk Assessment</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>75</b>
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	75	75	75	75
<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>				<b>75</b>
<del>Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)</del>				<del>75</del>
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>
<b>9. Cost Effectiveness</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
Measure A - Cost-benefit ratio (total project cost/total points awarded)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Total</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>

## ATTACHMENT 3: TRANSIT MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Transit Expansion	Transit Modernization
<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Measure A - Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	33	33
Measure B - Existing population within 0.25 mile (bus stop), 0.5 mile (transitway), and/or 2.5 miles (park & ride lot)	33	33
Measure C – Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project	34	34
<b>Usage</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>300</b>
Measure A – <del>Cost effectiveness per Existing riders</del>	<del>105</del>	<del>210</del> <u>300</u>
<del>Measure B – Operating cost effectiveness</del>	<del>70</del>	<del>90</del>
Measure C – <del>Cost effectiveness per new New riders</del>	<del>175</del> <u>350</u>	
<b>Equity and Housing Performance</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>150</b>
Measure A - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project’s benefits, impacts, and mitigation	130	80
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	70
<b>Emissions Reduction</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>
Measure A - Total emissions reduced	<del>133</del> <u>200</u>	100
<del>Measure B – Cost effectiveness of emissions reduced</del>	<del>67</del>	
<b>Multimodal Connections</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<del>Measure A – Bike/Ped Connections</del>	<del>50</del>	<del>50</del>
Measure A - Multimodal elements of the project and existing connections	<del>50</del> <u>100</u>	<del>50</del> <u>100</u>
<b>Risk Assessment</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	50	100
<b>Service and Customer Improvements</b>		<b>150</b>
Measure A – Travel Times		75
Measure B – Cost Reduction		38
Measure C – Service Improvement		37
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>
<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)	<u>TBD</u>	<u>TBD</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>

## ATTACHMENT 4: TDM MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Points
<b>1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>	<b>100</b>
Measure A – Ability to capitalize on existing regional transportation facilities and resources	<del>50</del> 100
<del>Measure B – Identify the existing regional transportation facilities and resources on which the project will capitalize (transit stations, bikeways, etc.).</del>	<del>50</del>
<b>2. Usage</b>	<b>100</b>
Measure A – <del>Cost effectiveness of</del> Users	100
<b>3. Equity and Housing Performance</b>	<b>150</b>
Measure A - Project’s benefits, impacts, and mitigation to disadvantaged populations	80
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70
<b>4. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality</b>	<b>400</b>
Measure A - Congested roadways in project area	200
Measure B - Emissions reduced	200
<b>5. Innovation</b>	<b>200</b>
Measure A - Project innovations or <u>new geographic area</u>	<del>100</del> 200
<del>Measure B – New Geographic Area</del>	<del>100</del>
<b>6. Risk Assessment</b>	<b>50</b>
<del>Measure A – Risk Assessment Form</del>	<del>15</del>
Measure A - Technical capacity of applicant's organization	<del>20</del> 25
Measure B - Continuation of project after initial federal funds are expended	<del>15</del> 25
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1,000</b>
<b>7. Cost Effectiveness</b>	<b>TBD</b>
<u>Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)</u>	<u>TBD</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>TBD</b>

## ATTACHMENT 5: BIKE / PEDESTRIAN MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Multiuse Trails / Bike	Pedestrian	SRTS
<b>Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy</b>	<b>200</b>	<del>100</del> <b>150</b>	<b>250</b>
Measure A - Identify location of project relative to Regional Bicycle Transportation Network	200		
Measure A – Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions		<del>100</del> <b>150</b>	
Measure A – “5 Es”			250
<b>Potential Usage</b>	<b>200</b>	<del>200</del> <b>150</b>	<del>200</del> <b>250</b>
Measure A – <del>Cost effectiveness of</del> Existing population and employment	200		
Measure A – <del>Cost effectiveness of</del> Existing population		<del>200</del> <b>150</b>	
Measure A - Average share of student population that bikes, walks, <u>or uses transit</u>			<del>120</del> <b>150</b>
Measure B - Student population within school's walkshed			100
<b>Equity and Housing Performance</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>120</b>
Measure A - Connection to disadvantageded populations and project’s benefits, impacts, and mitigation	50	50	50
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	70	70
<b>Deficiencies and Safety</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>250</b>
Measure A – Gaps closed/barriers removed, and/or continuity between jurisdictions improved by the project	100	120	100
Measure B - Deficiencies corrected or safety problem addressed	150	180	150
<b>Multimodal Facilities and Connections</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>150</b>	<del>50</del>
<del>Measure A/B – Transit or pedestrian connections</del>	<del>50</del>	<del>75</del>	<del>50</del>
Measure C - Transit or pedestrian elements of the project; <u>or connections</u>	<del>50</del> <b>100</b>	<del>75</del> <b>150</b>	
<b>Risk Assessment/Public Engagement</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	130	130	85
Measure A – Public Engagement			45
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>
<b>Cost Effectiveness</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>
<u>Measure A-Cost effectiveness (Total project cost/total points awarded)</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>TBD</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>	<b>TBD</b>