TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD

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

NOTICE OF A MEETING
of the
FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE

Thursday, July 20, 2017
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 May 18, 2017 meeting*
4) TAB Report
5) ADA Transition Plans
6) 2018 Regional Solicitation: Qualifying Requirements and Forms – Information Item*
7) 2018 Regional Solicitation: Safe Routes to School and Pedestrian Facilities – Information Item*
8) Bicycle Barriers Study– Information Item
9) Other Business
10) 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
May 18, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Oehme (Acting Chair, Chanhassen), Colleen Brown (MnDOT State Aid), Charles Carlson (Metro Transit), Innocent Eyoh (MPCA), Jenifer Hager (Minneapolis), Craig Jenson (Scott County), Karl Keel (Bloomington), Elaine Koutsoukos (TAB), Jen Lehmann (MVTA), Joe MacPherson (Anoka County), Gina Mitteco (MnDOT Bike & Ped), Ryan Peterson (Burnsville), Steve Peterson (Metropolitan Council), Lyndon Robjent (Carver County), John Sass (Dakota County), Michael Thompson (Maplewood), Anne Weber (St. Paul), and Joe Barbeau (staff)

OTHERS PRESENT: Tony Fischer (Metropolitan Council)

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order just after 1:30 p.m.

2. Adoption of Agenda
MOTION: Thompson moved to adopt the agenda. Seconded by Koutsoukos. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. Approval of the Minutes from the April 20, 2017, Meeting
MOTION: Koutsoukos moved to approve the minutes. Seconded by Brown. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. TAB Report – Information Item
Koutsoukos reported on the May 17, 2017, TAB meeting. Andrew Emanuele, FHWA, invited TAB members to attend the Congestion Management Process Peer Exchange on May 23 and 24, to be hosted by FHWA. David Thornton reported that because the Twin Cities metro area will no longer be an air quality maintenance area, CMAQ funding will likely drop from the current $30 million received annually. Streamlined TIP amendments were approved for projects on Minnesota Highway 149 and US Highway 169, both requested by MnDOT. Information items on the 2016 Regional Solicitation survey results, the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan, the Transportation System Performance Evaluation, and MnDOT's Minnesota State Highway Investment Plan were provided.

5. Draft 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program – Action Item 2017-16
Barbeau provided a brief presentation on the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and funding sources and mode share within. Mary Gustafson, Metro Transit, provided a presentation on transit funding sources, key projects, and formula funds.

MOTION: Keel moved to recommend that the draft TIP be adopted by TAB for release for a public comment period. Seconded by Thompson. The motion was approved unanimously.

6. Interchange Approval Process – Information Item
Tony Fischer from the Metropolitan Council presented an update on the interchange approval process for the Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) update.

Ryan Peterson asked why interchange maintenance projects are not included in the process. Fischer replied that the process only concerns capacity expansions.

Hager suggested that local entities will be interested in engaging on the TPP. Steve Peterson replied that targeted outreach to cities and counties is planned.

Robjent said that the access management section makes sense and added that access points on linear projects are no longer scrutinized. Steve Peterson replied that in the past businesses would complain about reduced access and the projects would come back, successfully, for scope changes.

7. 2016 Regional Solicitation Survey Responses and 2018 Discussion Topics – Information Item

Barbeau discussed major changes that occurred prior to the 2016 Regional Solicitation and provided a 2018 Regional Solicitation timeline.

Discussion Questions

Members discussed the following discussion questions.

1. Should interchange projects have their own application category?

Steve Peterson said that interchange projects scored very well in the Roadway Expansion category. Keel asked whether other projects were doing poorly in any scoring measure, to which Steve Peterson replied that staff is uncertain, though the projects likely did poorly in safety and congestion. Sass suggested the possibility of putting more emphasis on cost effectiveness, given that interchange projects tend to be costly.

2. Should the use of two transit application categories (Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization) be continued?

Carlson said that both application categories are important, as they accommodate different project types. Lehmann suggested separating transitway and non-transitway projects. Eyoh suggested providing good examples of each type of project.

3. How can more clarity be provided to applicants about what types of projects should be applied for in Transit Expansion versus Transit System Modernization?

Barbeau said that there was some confusion regarding which projects fit into which of these categories. Staff will try to improve on that.

4. Should different project elements of the same transit route be allowed to apply in both transit categories in consecutive Regional Solicitation cycles?

Steve Peterson said that different elements of some arterial bus rapid transit routes were secured in the 2014 and 2016 Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization categories, respectively. It was decided that this was within the rules because the two projects have independent utility. Lehmann said that the routes are treated as one project in the TPP. Carlson said that they are separate projects and it would be difficult to invest in some projects if this were not allowed. Koutsoukos said that there was concern about the idea of modernizing something that has yet to be built.

5. Should the $5.5M maximum federal award in the Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities category be reduced?

Barbeau said that in approving the 2016 Regional Solicitiaton, TAC recommended reducing the maximum federal award to $3.5M but TAB elected to keep it at $5.5M. In the past, bicycle projects had been served by two categories: Enhancements, with a $1M maximum and STP Bike/Walk with a $5.5M maximum. Mitteco said that since TAB cited the need for the larger maximum to fund large projects, she would like more information.

6. Should applicants be required or allowed to attach a one-page project overview pdf of their project?

Barbeau said that a survey respondent asked for the ability to create a one-page project overview and staff feels that this could be used while limiting the number and size of attachment pages. Robjent said that the one-pager should be prescriptive and Brown said that care should be taken to not be too specific with the one-pager in order to avoid scope changes.

7. Should TAB continue to fund at least one project from each of the five eligible roadway functional classifications?

Steve Peterson said that a connector was funded in the Roadway Modernization category, even though it scored fewer points than 15 un-funded projects. Thompson asked whether there were complaints from any of

the applicants whose projects were skipped, to which Koutsoukos replied there were none. Keel suggested that connectors could be in their own category. Members generally felt that the provision to fund at least one project from each functional classification should remain. Lehmann suggested that a similar technique could be used in the Transit categories.

8. Should the point distribution, criteria, and measures for the Roadway System Management application category be revamped to better-reflect the types of projects applying to it and to allow bundling of projects?
Robjent said that it makes sense to have a working committee, given the difference between Roadway System Management projects and other roadway projects. Eyoh said that the Synchro model does not work well and suggested the use of MOVES, which would better-capture the emissions impacts of some elements, including signal timing.

9. Should any measures for the Travel Demand Management projects be revamped to better-reflect the types of projects applying in the category?

10. Should more points be given to the freight measures on roadway projects?
Ryan Peterson said that the measure was not worth enough points to make a difference and, therefore, should either be eliminated or be worth more points. Thompson said that a lot of things he considered in scoring that measure are addressed in other measures.

11. Should the "infrastructure age" criterion be removed from Roadway Expansion and Roadway System Management since many of these projects include new elements compared to the Roadway Reconstruction application category?
Steve Peterson said that scoring "Infrastructure Age" has been challenging in the Roadway Expansion category, given that some roadway expansion applications are for new roadways. Perhaps even more difficult is scoring the measure for Roadway System Management projects, which often have brand new infrastructure along with various types of existing infrastructure of various ages. Keel said that he does not have a problem giving a new roadway zero points. Ryan Peterson questioned using age at all given that a roadway constructed in the 1980s can be in poorer condition than a roadway constructed in the 1950s. Members generally agreed with leaving the age criterion in Roadway Modernization and eliminating it from Roadway Expansion and Roadway System Management.

12. What improvements can be made to the way cost effectiveness is measured?
Barbeau said that at times there has been consideration of measuring cost effectiveness on the federal portion, though the likelihood that that would favor large projects has quieted any momentum for that. Further, the exemption of noise walls could lead to gaming the system. Two projects had very expensive noise walls that, if eliminated, will retroactively give the project bonus points. The Cost Effectiveness measure was impacted in Transit Expansion by a LRT station that had no operating costs and a 70-year useful life. Keel suggested standardizing costs of various project elements. Oehme suggested that more developed projects should receive more points, to which someone pointed out that this is the purpose of the Risk Assessment measure. Ryan Peterson said that with so much vulnerability perhaps Cost Effectiveness should just be removed.

13. Should the scoring committees have the flexibility to consider an alternative to prorating scores when high-scoring outlier projects diminish the separation given to most projects?
Members generally favored giving flexibility to scoring committees, perhaps with some guidance as to when or how it can be applied.

14. Do scoring measures that auto-calculate need to be scored by outside scorers or can it be done by Council staff?
Members generally preferred to let staff score the auto-calculated projects. Mitteco suggested that this could free up scorers to pair up on more difficult measures.

15. Should the methodology to distribute funds within a mode be tied back to priorities in the Transportation Policy Plan?

16. What other ways should regional balance of awarded funds be measured?

17 How should the results of recently completed and ongoing studies (e.g., Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study, Regional Truck Highway Corridor Study, and Bicycle Barriers Study) be incorporated into the scoring?

18. Should the "average distance to other arterials" measure be removed from Roadway Expansion, Roadway Reconstruction, and Roadway System Management due to the difficulty in accurately comparing projects?
Koutsoukos said that staff is in the process of improving the mapping application, which will help simplify the measure for applicants.

19. Should the 70 points for "Housing Performance Score" be reduced?
Members generally felt the point value should be reduced.

20. Should the "equity" measure be modified to better-incorporate the potential negative impacts of projects of various populations? If so, how?
Barbeau said that it has been difficult to score the negative elements of projects.

8. Other Business
None.

9. Adjournment
Robjent moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by MacPherson. The meeting was adjourned.

Information Item

DATE:	July 13, 2017
TO:	TAC Funding and Programming Committee
PREPARED BY:	Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)
SUBJECT:	Regional Solicitation Update: Qualifying Requirements and Forms

With the recent programming of FY 2020-2021 funds, Metropolitan Council staff is now turning its attention to the 2018 Regional Solicitation, which will program funds for fiscal years 2022-2023.

Attached are the Qualifying Criteria and Forms with potential changes tracked for consideration.

Key changes reflected in the attached are:

- Qualifying Requirements
  - Additional requirement that an ADA Transition Plan must be in process or completed in order for a project to be included in the TIP and approved by FHWA.
  - As decided upon in preparation for the 2016 Regional Solicitation, requirement that interchange projects must have approval by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Interchange Planning Review Committee prior to application submittal.
  - (Roadway Expansion Only) If expanding thru lanes or building a new interchange on an existing signalized corridor, signal retiming must be completed within five years of project submittal.
- Forms
  - Limitations on attachment page size and number of pages.
  - Optional one-page project summaries to provide succinct information to TAB members and the scoring committees.
  - Removal of some risk assessment elements in order to provide more weight to key elements.

Qualifying Requirements

June 22, 2017

The applicant must show that the project meets all of the qualifying requirements to be eligible to be scored and ranked against other projects. All qualifying requirements must be met before completing an application. Applicants whose projects are disqualified may appeal and participate in the review and determination of eligibility at the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Funding & Programming Committee meeting.

By selecting each checkbox, the applicant confirms compliance with the following project requirements:

All Projects

1. The project must be consistent with the goals and policies in these adopted regional plans: Thrive MSP 2040 (2014), the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan (2015), the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan (2015), and the 2040 Water Resources Policy Plan (2015).

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

2. The project must be consistent with the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan. Reference the 2040 Transportation Plan goals, objectives, and strategies that relate to the project. List the goals, objectives, strategies, and associated pages):

3. The project or the transportation problem/need that the project addresses must be in a local planning or programming document. Reference the name of the appropriate comprehensive plan, regional/statewide plan, capital improvement program, corridor study document [studies on trunk highway must be approved by the Minnesota Department of Transportation and the Metropolitan Council], or other official plan or program of the applicant agency [includes Safe Routes to School Plans] that the project is included in and/or a transportation problem/need that the project addresses. List the applicable documents and pages):

4. The project must exclude costs for studies, preliminary engineering, design, or construction engineering. Right-of-way costs are only eligible as part of bicycle/pedestrian projects, transit stations/stops, transit terminals, park-and-ride facilities, or pool-and-ride lots. Noise barriers, drainage projects, fences, landscaping, etc., are not eligible for funding as a standalone project, but can be included as part of the larger submitted project, which is otherwise eligible.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

5. Applicants that are not cities or counties in the seven-county metro area with populations over 5,000 must contact the MnDOT Metro State Aid Office prior to submitting their application to determine if a public agency sponsor is required.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

6. Applicants must not submit an application for the same project elements in more than one funding application category.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

7. The requested funding amount must be more than or equal to the minimum award and less than or equal to the maximum award. The cost of preparing a project for funding authorization can be substantial. For that reason, minimum federal amounts apply. Other federal funds may be combined with the requested funds for projects exceeding the maximum award, but the source(s) must be identified in the application. Funding amounts by application category are listed below in Table 1. *Details of minimum and maximum awards to be discussed this fall*

Table 1: ~~2016~~ Regional Solicitation Funding Award Minimums and Maximums

Modal Categories	~~2016~~ Regional Solicitation		
	Application Categories	Minimum Federal Award	Maximum Federal Award
Roadways Including Multimodal Elements	Roadway Expansion	$1,000,000	$7,000,000
	Roadway Reconstruction/ Modernization and Spot Mobility	$1,000,000	$7,000,000
	~~Roadway System~~Traffic Management Technologies	$250,000	$7,000,000
	Bridges Rehabilitation/ Replacement	$1,000,000	$7,000,000
Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities	Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities	$250,000	$5,500,000
	Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA)	$250,000	$1,000,000
	Safe Routes to School	$150,000	$1,000,000
Transit and TDM Projects	Transit Expansion	$500,000	$7,000,000
	Transit ~~System~~ Modernization	$100,000	$7,000,000
	Travel Demand Management (TDM)	$75,000	$300,000

☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement

8. The project must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

9. If the agency sponsoring the project has greater than 50 employees, the agency must have an adopted Americans with Disabilities Act Transition Plan or be substantially working towards completing its Transition Plan in order for the selected project to be included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and approved by FHWA.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

10. The project must be accessible and open to the general public.

    ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

11. The owner/operator of the facility must operate and maintain the project for the useful life of the improvement.

    ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

12. The project must represent a permanent improvement with independent utility. The term "independent utility" means the project provides benefits described in the application by itself and does not depend on any construction elements of the project being funded from other sources outside the regional solicitation, excluding the required non-federal match.

    Projects that include traffic management or transit operating funds as part of a construction project are exempt from this policy.

    ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

13. The project must not be a temporary construction project. A temporary construction project is defined as work that must be replaced within five years and is ineligible for funding. The project must also not be staged construction where the project will be replaced as part of future stages. Staged construction is eligible for funding as long as future stages build on, rather than replace, previous work.

    ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

14. The project applicant must send written notification regarding the proposed project to all affected state and local units of government prior to submitting the application.

    ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

1. All roadway projects that involve the construction of a new/expanded interchange or new interchange ramps must have approval by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Interchange Planning Review Committee prior to application submittal. Unless stated otherwise in the approval letter, all interchange projects must include removal of all access within 1/2-mile of the center of the proposed interchange and removal of any at-grade full access intersections within one mile of the center of the proposed interchange. Please contact Michael Corbett at MnDOT (Michael.J.Corbett@state.mn.us or 651-234-1756) to determine whether your project needs to go through this process.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

~~1.~~2. All roadway and bridge projects must be identified as a Principal Arterial (Non-Freeway facilities only) or A-Minor Arterial as shown on the latest TAB approved roadway functional classification map.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

~~2.~~3. **Roadway Expansion and Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility projects only:** The project must be designed to meet 10-ton load limit standards.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

3. **Roadway Expansion projects only:** If expanding thru lanes or building a new interchange on an existing signalized corridor, signal retiming must be completed within five years of project submittal, consistent with regional policy in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

4. **Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only:** Projects requiring a grade-separated crossing of a Principal Arterial freeway must be limited to the federal share of those project costs identified as local (non-MnDOT) cost responsibility using MnDOT's "Cost Participation for Cooperative Construction Projects and Maintenance Responsibilities" manual. In the case of a federally funded trunk highway project, the policy guidelines should be read as if the funded trunk highway route is under local jurisdiction.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

5. **Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only:** The bridge must carry vehicular traffic. Bridges can carry traffic from multiple modes. However, bridges that are exclusively for bicycle or pedestrian

traffic must apply under one of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities application categories. Rail-only bridges are ineligible for funding.

☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

6. **Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only:** The length of the bridge must equal or exceed 20 feet.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

7. **Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only**: The bridge must have a sufficiency rating less than 80 for rehabilitation projects and less than 50 for replacement projects. Additionally, the bridge must also be classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

~~Please note: In this 2016 solicitation, points will be awarded as part of the Risk Assessment for applicable projects that have completed this interchange approval process. In the next Regional Solicitation, applicable interchange projects will need to go through the approval prior to submitting an application (i.e., it will become a qualifying requirement). Please contact Karen Scheffing at MnDOT (Karen.Scheffing@state.mn.us or 651-234-7784) to determine if your project needs to go through the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee.~~

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Projects Only

1. All projects must relate to surface transportation. As an example, for multiuse trail and bicycle facilities, surface transportation is defined as primarily serving a commuting purpose and/or that connect two destination points. 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.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

2. **Multiuse Trails on Active Railroad Right-of-Way:** All multiuse trail projects that are located within right-of-way occupied by an active railroad must attach an agreement with the railroad that this right-of-way will be used for trail purposes.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

3. **Safe Routes to School projects only:** All projects must be located within a two-mile radius of the associated primary, middle, or high school site.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

4. **Safe Routes to School projects only:** All schools benefitting from the SRTS program must conduct after-implementation surveys. These include the student travel tally form and the parent survey available on the National Center for SRTS website. The school(s) must submit the after-evaluation data to the National Center for SRTS within a year of the project completion date. Additional guidance regarding evaluation can be found at the MnDOT SRTS website.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the applicant understands this requirement and will submit data to the National Center for SRTS within one year of project completion.

Transit and Travel Demand Management (TDM) Projects Only

1. **Transit Expansion projects only:** The project must provide a new or expanded transit facility or service (includes peak, off-peak, express, limited stop service, or dial-a-ride).

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

2. **Transit Expansion projects only:** The applicant must have the capital and operating funds necessary to implement the entire project and commit to continuing the service or facility project beyond the initial three-year funding period for transit operating funds.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

3. **Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization projects only:** The project is not eligible for either capital or operating funds if the corresponding capital or operating costs have been funded in a previous solicitation. However, Transit Modernization projects are eligible to apply in multiple solicitations if new project elements are being added with each application. Each transit application must show independent utility and the points awarded in the application should only account for the improvements listed in the application.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

4. **Transit Expansion and Transit ~~System~~ Modernization projects only:** The applicant must affirm that they are able to implement a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funded project in accordance with the grant application, Master Agreement, and all applicable laws and regulations, using sound management practices. Furthermore, the applicant must certify that they have the technical capacity to carry out the proposed project and manage FTA grants in accordance with the grant agreement, sub recipient grant agreement (if applicable), and with all applicable laws. The applicant must certify that they have adequate staffing levels, staff training and experience, documented procedures, ability to submit required reports correctly and on time, ability to maintain project equipment, and ability to comply with FTA and grantee requirements.

   ☐ Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

Application: Regional Solicitation for Transportation Projects in ~~2020~~ 2022 and ~~2021~~2023

June 22, 2017

Complete and submit the following online application **by 4:00 PM on July 15, ~~2016~~2018**.

For questions contact (Elaine Koutsoukos) at (elaine.koutsoukos@metc.state.mn)

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. APPLICANT:
2. UNIT OF GOVERNMENT: (Select from drop down list)
3. PRIMARY COUNTY WHERE THE PROJECT IS LOCATED: (Select from drop down list)
4. CITIES OR TOWNSHIPS WHERE THE PROJECT IS LOCATED:
~~4~~5. JURISDICTIONAL AGENCY (IF DIFFERENT THAN THE APPLICANT):
6~~5~~. APPLICANT MAILING ADDRESS STREET: CITY: STATE: ZIP CODE:
7~~6~~. PROJECT CONTACT PERSON: TITLE: PHONE NO. ( ) E-MAIL ADDRESS:

II. PROJECT INFORMATION

~~7~~8. PROJECT NAME:

~~8~~9. APPLICATION CATEGORIES – Check only one project category in which you wish your project to be considered.

Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

- ☐ Roadway Expansion
- ☐ ~~Roadway System~~Traffic Management Technologies
- ☐ Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility
- ☐ Bridge Rehabilitation/Reconstruction

Transit and Travel Demand Management (TDM) Projects

- ☐ Transit Expansion
- ☐ Transit ~~System~~ Modernization
- ☐ TDM

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

- ☐ Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities
- ☐ Safe Routes to School Infrastructure
- ☐ Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA)

~~9~~10. BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION (Include location, road name/functional class, type of improvement, etc. – limit to 400 words):

~~10~~11. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) DESCRIPTION – will be used in TIP if the project is selected for funding (Link):

~~11~~12. PROJECT LENGTH (to the nearest one-tenth of a mile):

13. LOCAL SUPPORT (list any public involvement completed to date as part the project planning, local government resolutions, or inclusion of the specific project in approved planning or programming documents):

III. PROJECT FUNDING

~~12~~14. Are you applying for competitive funds from another source(s) to implement this project? Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, please identify the source(s):
~~12~~15. FEDERAL AMOUNT: $
~~13~~16. MATCH AMOUNT: $ (Minimum of 20% of the project total)
~~14~~17. PROJECT TOTAL: $
~~15~~18. MATCH PERCENTAGE (Minimum of 20%): (Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total)
~~16~~19. SOURCE OF MATCH FUNDS (A minimum of 20% of the total project cost must come from non-federal sources; additional match funds over the 20% minimum can come from other federal sources):
~~17~~20. PROGRAM YEARS (Check all years that are feasible): ☐ ~~2018~~ 2020 (TDM Only) ☐ ~~2019~~ 2021 (TDM Only) ☐ ~~2020~~ 2022 ☐ ~~2021~~2023
~~18~~21. ADDITIONAL PROGRAM YEARS (Check all years that are feasible if funding in an earlier year becomes available): ☐ 201~~9~~7 ☐ ~~2018~~ 2020 ☐ ~~2019~~2021

IV. REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS

~~19~~22. MAPS:

- A map or concept drawing of the proposed improvements that clearly labels the beginning and end of the project, all roadways in the project area, roadway geometry, and any bicycle, pedestrian, and transit components upon completion of the project.

- A photograph ~~or Google Street View screen capture (or similar)~~ showing the existing conditions within the project area. If awarded funds, this photograph will be utilized in the Metropolitan Council's online mapping tool to show a before-and-after comparison of the improvement. By submitting the application, the applicant is agreeing to allow the Council to use this photograph. If applicants wish to use a google street view, they should adhere to the copyright guidelines, on the Google website: https://www.google.com/permissions/geoguidelines.html#streetview.

- **For Roadway Expansion, Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization, and Roadway System Management projects only:** The Synchro/Highway Capacity Manual emission reduction reports including the Timing Page Report that displays input and output information. *This report must be attached within the web-based application form for Measure 5A (Congestion Reduction/Air Quality).*

- **For Safe Routes to School Projects only:** The completed travel tally and parent survey results from the SRTS planning process. The travel tally form can be found on the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) SRTS website: http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/sites/default/files/resources/SRTS_Two_Day_Tally.pdf. *The travel tally and parent survey results must be attached within the web-based application form for Measure 2A (Usage).*

- All project information maps generated through the Metropolitan Council Make-A-Map web-based application completed at the beginning of the application process. Attachment/upload locations are placed throughout all appropriate web-based application forms.

- Each individual attachment must be saved as an 8.5''X11''pdf and cannot be more than 15 pages in length to be considered. Only pdf files that meet the size and length limits will be accepted.

- Applicants are encouraged to submit a one-page project summary to be used by the scoring committees and TAB members. This one-pager may include the project name, applicant, route, a map, township/city/county where project is located, requested award amount, total project cost, before photo, project description, list of project benefits, or other pertinent information.

~~20~~23. COORDINATION

- The applicant must include a letter of support from the agency that owns ~~with jurisdiction over~~ the facility and/or the agency that will be operating the transit service (if different than the applicant) indicating that it is aware of and understands the project being submitted, and that it commits to operate and maintain the facility for its design life.

- If the applicant expects any other agency to provide part of the local match, the applicant must include a letter or resolution from the other agency agreeing to financially participate.

- **For Transit Expansion projects that include service expansion only:** Applicants must provide a letter of support for the project from the transit provider that will commit to providing the service or manage the contract for the service provider.

~~21~~24. OTHER

- **For Transit and TDM Projects that include public/private joint-use parking facilities only**: The applicant must upload a plan for and make a commitment to the long-term management and enforcement of ensuring exclusive availability of parking to public transit users during commuting times. Federal rules require that parking spaces funded be available exclusively to transit users during the hours of transit service. In the plan, the applicant must indicate how commuter and transit parking will coexist with parking needs for joint use tenants. The entity charged with ensuring exclusive parking for transit commuters after the facility opens must be designated in the plan.
- **TDM Projects only:** Upload Project Budget (budget should include applicable costs, such as, salary, fringe benefits, overhead expenses, marketing, materials, etc.). If using a sub-vendor as part of the project, proper procurement procedures must be used after the project is awarded to select the vendor.

Project Information Form – Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

(To be used to assign State Project Number after project is selected)

Please fill in the following information as it pertains to your proposed project. Items that do not apply to your project, please label N/A.

COUNTY, CITY, OR LEAD AGENCY _____

ZIP CODE WHERE MAJORITY OF WORK IS BEING PERFORMED _____

APPROXIMATE BEGIN CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

APPROXIMATE END CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

NAME OF TRAIL/PED FACILITY: _____ (i.e., CEDAR LAKE TRAIL)

TERMINI: (Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work)

From:_____

To: _____
(DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION; INCLUDE NAME OF ROADWAY IF MAJORITY OF FACILITY RUNS ADJACENT TO A SINGLE CORRIDOR)

OR At: _____

PRIMARY TYPES OF WORK _____
_____

Examples: GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT BASE, BIT SURF, SIDEWALK, SIGNALS, LIGHTING, GUARDRAIL, BIKE PATH, PED RAMPS, BRIDGE, PARK AND RIDE, ETC.

BRIDGE/CULVERT PROJECTS (IF APPLICABLE)

OLD BRIDGE/CULVERT NO.: _____ _____
NEW BRIDGE/CULVERT NO.: _____
STRUCTURE IS OVER/UNDER: _____

Project Information Form – Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

(To be used to assign State Project Number after project is selected)

Please fill in the following information as it pertains to your proposed project. Items that do not apply to your project, please label N/A.

COUNTY, CITY, OR LEAD AGENCY _____

FUNCTIONAL CLASS OF ROAD _____

ROAD SYSTEM_____ (TH, CSAH, MSAS, CO. RD., TWP. RD., CITY STREET)

ROAD/ROUTE NO. _____ (i.e., 53 FOR CSAH 53)

NAME OF ROAD_____(Example; 1st ST., MAIN AVE)

ZIP CODE WHERE MAJORITY OF WORK IS BEING PERFORMED _____

APPROXIMATE BEGIN CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

APPROXIMATE END CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

TERMINI: (Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work)

From:_____

To: _____
(DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION)

OR At: _____

PRIMARY TYPES OF WORK _____

_____

Examples: GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT BASE, BIT SURF, SIDEWALK, CURB AND GUTTER,STORM SEWER, SIGNALS, LIGHTING, GUARDRAIL, BIKE PATH, PED RAMPS, BRIDGE, PARK AND RIDE, ETC.

BRIDGE/CULVERT PROJECTS (IF APPLICABLE)

OLD BRIDGE/CULVERT NO.: _____

NEW BRIDGE/CULVERT NO.: _____

STRUCTURE IS OVER/UNDER: _____

Project Information Form – Transit and TDM (for Park-and-Ride and Transit Station Projects Only)

(To be used to assign State Project Number after project is selected)

Please fill in the following information as it pertains to your proposed project. Items that do not apply to your project, please label N/A.

COUNTY, CITY, OR LEAD AGENCY _____

ZIP CODE WHERE MAJORITY OF WORK IS BEING PERFORMED _____

APPROXIMATE BEGIN CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

APPROXIMATE END CONSTRUCTION DATE (MO/YR) _____

NAME OF PARK AND RIDE OR TRANSIT STATION: _____
(i.e., MAPLE GROVE TRANSIT STATION)

TERMINI: (Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work)

From:_____

To: _____
(DO NOT INCLUDE LEGAL DESCRIPTION)

OR At: _____

PRIMARY TYPES OF WORK _____
_____

Examples: GRADE, AGG BASE, BIT BASE, BIT SURF, SIDEWALK, CURB AND GUTTER,STORM SEWER, SIGNALS, LIGHTING, GUARDRAIL, BIKE PATH, PED RAMPS, PARK AND RIDE, ETC.

Estimate of TAB-Eligible Project Costs

Fill out the scoping sheet below and provide the estimate of TAB-eligible costs for the project. Applicants are not required to fill out each row of the cost estimate. The list of project elements is meant to provide a framework to think about the types of costs that may be incurred from the project. The total cost should match the total cost reported for the project on the first page of this application. Costs for specific elements are solely used to help applicants come up with a more accurate total cost; adjustments to these specific costs are expected as the project is more fully developed. Per TAB direction, the project must exclude costs for studies, preliminary engineering, design, or construction engineering. Right-of-way costs are only eligible as part of bicycle/pedestrian projects, transit stations/stops, transit terminals, park-and-ride facilities, or pool-and-ride lots. Noise barriers, drainage projects, fences, landscaping, etc., are not eligible for funding as a standalone project, but can be included as part of the larger submitted project, which is otherwise eligible.

Please use ~~2016~~ 2018 cost estimates for all project elements including transit vehicle and operating costs. ~~The TAB may apply an inflation factor to awarded projects. If TAB includes an inflation factor, then all project elements will be inflated, unlike past years, when only certain project elements were inflated.~~

It is important that applicants accurately break out costs for the project's various multimodal elements. These costs will be used, in part, to help determine the score for the Multimodal Facilities scoring criterion. If no dollar amount is placed in the cost estimate form below, ~~than~~then it will be assumed that no multimodal elements are included with the project.

TAB-ELIGIBLE CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ELEMENTS/COST ESTIMATES		
Check all that apply	**ITEM**	**COST**
Specific Roadway Elements		
☐	**Mobilization (approx. 5% of total cost)**	**$**
☐	**Removals (approx. 5% of total cost)**	**$**
☐	**Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.)**	**$**
☐	**Roadway (aggregates and paving)**	**$**
☐	**Subgrade Correction (muck)**	**$**
☐	**Storm Sewer**	**$**
☐	**Ponds**	**$**
☐	**Concrete Items (curb & gutter, sidewalks, median barriers)**	**$**
☐	**Traffic Control**	**$**
☐	**Striping**	**$**
☐	**Signing**	**$**
☐	**Lighting**	**$**
☐	**Turf - Erosion & Landscaping**	**$**
☐	**Bridge**	**$**
☐	**Retaining Walls**	**$**
☐	**Noise Wall (do not include in cost effectiveness measure)**	**$**

☐	**Traffic Signals**	**$**
☐	**Wetland Mitigation**	**$**
☐	**Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection**	**$**
☐	**Railroad Crossing**	**$**
☐	**Roadway Contingencies**	**$**
☐	**Other Roadway Elements**	**$**
Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements		
☐	**Path/Trail Construction**	**$**
☐	**Sidewalk Construction**	**$**
☐	**On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction**	**$**
☐	**Right-of-Way**	**$**
☐	**Pedestrian Curb Ramps (ADA)**	**$**
☐	**Crossing Aids (e.g., Audible Pedestrian Signals, HAWK)**	**$**
☐	**Pedestrian-Scale Lighting**	**$**
☐	**Streetscaping**	**$**
☐	**Wayfinding**	**$**
☐	**Bicycle and Pedestrian Contingencies**	**$**
☐	**Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements**	**$**
Specific Transit and TDM Elements		
☐	**Fixed Guideway Elements**	**$**
☐	**Stations, Stops, and Terminals**	**$**
☐	**Support Facilities**	**$**
☐	**Transit Systems (e.g. communications, signals, controls, fare collection, etc.)**	**$**
☐	**Vehicles**	**$**
☐	**Contingencies**	**$**
☐	**Right-of-Way**	**$**
☐	**Other Transit and TDM Elements**	**$**
TOTAL TAB-ELIGIBLE CONSTRUCTION COSTS		**$**
Transit Operating Costs		
☐	Number of platform hours	
☐	Cost per platform hour (fully loaded costs)	**$**
	Subtotal - _____	**$**
☐	Other Costs – Administration, Overhead, etc.	**$**
	Total Transit Operating Costs	**$**
☐	**TDM Operating Costs**	**$**
TOTAL TAB-ELIGIBLE TRANSIT AND TDM OPERATING COSTS		**$**
TOTAL TAB-ELIGIBLE COSTS		**$**
TOTAL COMMITTED PRIVATE SECTOR CONTRIBUTION TO PROJECT (requires letter of commitment)		**$**

Risk Assessment

Please check those that apply and fill in anticipated completion dates for all projects, except for new/expanded transit service projects, transit vehicle purchases, or travel demand management (TDM) projects.

1) ~~Project Scope~~Funding (~~5~~ 20 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ ~~Meetings or contacts with stakeholders have occurred~~All funding sources are identified and confirmed (the Regional Solicitation award is the gap funding/remaining funding needed to implement the project)

~~40% ☐ Stakeholders have been identified~~

0% ☐ The applicant is promising to cover the entire local match, but they will need to seek other sources or funding partners to be able to deliver the project ~~Stakeholders have not been identified or contacted~~

~~**2) Layout or Preliminary Plan (5 Percent of Points)**~~

~~100% ☐ Layout or Preliminary Plan completed~~

~~50% ☐ Layout or Preliminary Plan started~~

~~0% ☐ Layout or Preliminary Plan has not been started~~

~~Anticipated date or date of completion: _____~~

~~**3) Environmental Documentation (5 Percent of Points)**~~

~~☐EIS ☐EA ☐PM~~

~~Document Status:~~

~~100% ☐ Document approved (include copy of signed cover sheet)~~

~~75% ☐ Document submitted to State Aid for review (date submitted: _____)~~

~~50% ☐ Document in progress; environmental impacts identified; review request letters sent~~

~~0% ☐ Document not started~~

~~Anticipated date or date of completion/approval: _____~~

~~4)~~2) **Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (~~10~~ 20 Percent of Points)**

100% ☐ No known historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places are located in the project area, and project is not located on an identified historic bridge

100% ☐ There are historical/archeological properties present, but determination of "no historic properties affected" is anticipated.

80% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of ~~"no historic properties affected" or~~ "no adverse effect" anticipated

40% ☐ Historic/archeological ~~review under way~~property impacted; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated

0% ☐ Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological ~~resources~~ properties in the project area.

~~Anticipated date or date of completion of historic/archeological review: _____~~

Project is located on an identified historic bridge: ☐

~~5)~~3) Review of Section 4f/6f Resources (~~10~~ 20 Percent of Points)

4(f) – Does the project impacts any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild & scenic rivers or public private historic properties?

6(f) – Does the project impact any public parks, public wildlife refuges, public golf courses, wild & scenic rivers or historic property that was purchased or improved with federal funds?

100% ☐ No Section 4f/6f ~~resources~~ property located in or adjacent to the project

100% ☐ Impact to 4(f) property. The project is an Independent Bikeway/Walkway project covered by the bikeway/walkway Negative Declaration statement. Letter of support received (potential option for bicycle and pedestrian facility applications only)

~~80~~70% ☐ Section 4f resources present within the project area, but ~~no adverse effects~~impacts are minor and they do not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the 4(f) property.

50% ☐ ~~Project impacts to~~ Section 4f/6f resources ~~likely~~ present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. ~~–~~ Ccoordination/documentation has begun

~~3~~0% ☐ ~~Project impacts to~~ Section 4f/6f present within project area; 4(f) evaluation required. Coordination/documentation has not begun ~~resources likely – coordination/documentation has not begun~~

0% ☐ Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area

~~6)~~4) Right-of-Way (~~15~~ 20 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements not required

100% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements has/have been acquired

75% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, offers made

50% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, appraisals made

25% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels identified

0% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels not identified

0% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been completed

~~Anticipated date or date of acquisition _____~~

~~7)~~5) Railroad Involvement (~~25~~ 20 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ No railroad involvement on project

100% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement is executed (include signature page)

60% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated

40% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

20% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; railroad has been contacted

0% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; ~~negotiations not begun~~railroad has not been contacted.

~~Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement _____~~

~~**8) Interchange Approval (15 Percent of Points)***~~

~~100% ☐ Project does not involve construction of a new/expanded interchange or new interchange ramps~~

100% ☐ Interchange project has been approved by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee

0% ☐ Interchange project has not been approved by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee

*Please contact Karen Scheffing at MnDOT (Karen.Scheffing@state.mn.us or 651-234-7784) to determine if your project needs to go through the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Highway Interchange Request Committee.

9) Construction Documents/Plan (10 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ Construction plans completed/approved (include signed title sheet)

75% ☐ Construction plans submitted to State Aid for review

50% ☐ Construction plans in progress; at least 30% completion

0% ☐ Construction plans have not been started

Anticipated date or date of completion: _____

10) Letting

Anticipated Letting Date: _____

Information Item

DATE:	July 13, 2017
TO:	TAC Funding and Programming Committee
PREPARED BY:	Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)
SUBJECT:	Regional Solicitation Update: Safe Routes to School and Pedestrian Facilities

Attached are the Safe Routes to School and Pedestrian Facilities applications with changes tracked for consideration.

Safe Routes to School Infrastructure – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

July 11, 2017

Definition: An infrastructure project that is within a two-mile radius and directly benefiting a primary, middle, or high school site.

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

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
1. Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements	**250**	**~~25~~23%**
Measure A - Describe how project addresses 5 Es* of SRTS program	250	
2. Potential Usage	**250**	**~~25~~23%**
Measure A - Average share of student population that bikes or walks	170	
Measure B - Student population within school's walkshed	80	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**120**	**~~12~~11%**
Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation	50	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
4. Deficiencies and Safety	**250**	**~~25~~23%**
Measure A - Barriers overcome or gaps filled	100	
Measure B - Deficiencies corrected or safety or security addressed	150	
5. Public Engagement/Risk Assessment	**130**	**12%**
Measure A - Public engagement process	45	
Measure B - Risk Assessment Form	85	
~~Sub-Total~~	**~~1,000~~**	**~~100%~~**
6. Cost Effectiveness	100	9%
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (~~total project cost/~~total points awarded/ total project cost/)	100	
Total	**1,100**	

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

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 Es. 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 5Es 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 proportionate 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. Potential Usage (250 Points) - This criterion quantifies the project's potential impact to existing population.

A. *MEASURE:* Average percent of student population that currently bikes, walks, or takes public transit to school, as identified on the Safe Routes to School student travel tally worksheet. Public transit usage does not refer to school buses. Public transit usage should only be considered when the bus route does not have a stop at the school (since these students must walk or bike to get to the school grounds). As part of the required attachments, applicants should attach copies of all original travel tally documentation. (170 Points)

RESPONSE:

- Average percent of student population:_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (170 Points)
The applicant with the highest average share of student population that currently bikes, walks, or takes public transportation to school will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate 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)*170 points or 85 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Student population within one mile of the elementary school, middle school, or high school served by the project.

RESPONSE:

- Student population within one mile of the school:_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (80 Points)
The applicant with the highest student population within one mile of the school will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate 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)*80 points or 40 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.

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Socio-Economic Conditions" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Identify the project's location from the list below, as depicted on the "Socio-Economic Conditions" 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-Economic Conditions" map):

- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50): ☐ ~~(0 to 50 Points)~~ (up to 100% of maximum score)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐ ~~(0 to 40 Points)~~ (up to 80% of maximum score)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ ~~(0 to 31 Points)~~ (up to 60% of maximum score)
- 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 19 Points)~~ (up to 40% of maximum score)

Any school identified as part of a proposal will capture the highest-scoring geography located on the route OR within ½-mile of the school (in order to capture the walkshed)

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

Based on the "Socio-Economic Conditions" 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 (2,800 or fewer characters or fewer). 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 proportionate 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 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.

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 proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had a Housing Performance Score of 55 and the top project had a Housing Performance Score of 90, this applicant would receive (55/90)*70 points or 43 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 connects 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 (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. 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 descriptions do not fulfill the intent of the criteria, will receive 0 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.

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 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 proportionate share between ~~101~~ 76 and 150 points (i.e., a project that reduces one-half of the crashes of the top project would receive 125 points): ~~101~~ 76 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), 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 receive a portion of the 100 points based on the quality of the project and response: 0 to 100 Points

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, 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.

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800characters; approximately 400 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 and stakeholder contacts, 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.).

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 proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 40 points and the top project had 70 points, this applicant would receive (40/70)*50 points or 29 points.

6. Cost Effectiveness (100 Points) – This criterion will assess the project's cost effectiveness based on the total TAB-eligible project cost and total points awarded in the previous five criteria.

A. *MEASURE:* This measure will calculate the cost effectiveness of the project. Metropolitan Council staff will divide the number of points awarded in the previous criteria by the TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls) ~~by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria~~.

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

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 most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar ~~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 proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the top project received .0005 points per dollar ~~had 35,000~~ and the application being ~~scored~~ scored received .00025 points per dollar ~~had 70,000~~, this applicant would receive (.00025~~35,000~~/.0005~~70,000~~)*X 100 points or 50 points.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS

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

July 12, 2017

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 application 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 application category instead of this application 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

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	~~150~~300	29~~15~~%
Measure A - Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	150	
~~**2. Potential Usage**~~	~~150~~	~~15%~~
Measure ~~A~~ B - Existing population within 1/2 mile (potential usage)	150	
~~3~~2. **Equity and Housing Performance**	**120**	~~12~~11%
Measure A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and project's benefits, impacts, and mitigation	50	
Measure B - Housing Performance Score	70	
~~4~~3. **Deficiencies and Safety**	**300**	~~30~~27%
Measure A - Barriers overcome or gaps filled	120	
Measure B - Deficiencies corrected or safety problems addressed	180	
~~5~~4. **Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections**	**150**	~~15~~14%
Measure A - Transit or bicycle elements of the project and connections	150	
~~6~~5. **Risk Assessment**	**130**	~~13~~12%
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	130	
~~Sub-Total~~	~~1,000~~	~~100%~~
~~7~~6. **Cost Effectiveness**	**100**	9%
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (~~total project cost/~~total points awarded/total project cost)	100	
Total	**1,100**	

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (~~150~~ 300 Points) - This criterion measures the regional significance of the project, including the project's connections to jobs, ~~and~~ Educational Institutions, ~~as defined in ThriveMSP 2040~~and people.

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 Census block groups that intersect the 1/2-mile buffer. Enrollment at public and private post-secondary institutions will also be measured.

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

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

- Existing Employment Within One-Half Mile:_____
- Existing Post-Secondary Enrollment Within One-Half Mile:_____

SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)
The applicant with the highest combined total employment and post-secondary education enrollment will receive the full 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 1/2 mile and the top project had 1,500 workers/students, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*150 points or 100 points. Using the Metropolitan Council model, all census block groups that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project.

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.

~~2. Potential Usage (150 Points) - This criterion quantifies the project's potential usage based on the existing population adjacent to the project.~~

B. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Population Summary" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing population within 1/2-mile, as depicted on the "Population Summary" map.

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

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

- Existing Population Within One-Half Mile: _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (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.

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.

2. 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.

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Socio-Economic Conditions" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Identify the project's location as it applies in the listed responses below. 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.

Upload the "Socio-Economic Conditions" map used for this measure.

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

- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50): ☐ ~~(0 to 50 Points)~~ (up to 100% of maximum score)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐ ~~(0 to 40 Points)~~ (up to 80% of maximum score)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ ~~(0 to 31 Points)~~ (up to 60% of maximum score)
- 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 19 Points)~~ (up to 40% of maximum score)

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

Based on the "Socio-Economic Conditions" 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. 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 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.

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. For example, if the application being scored had a Housing Performance Score of 55 and the top project had a Housing Performance Score of 90, this applicant would receive (55/90)*70 points or 43 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.

3. 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 connects 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. The description should also include details of any project elements that advance needs prioritized in an ADA Transition Plan. (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 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 fulfill the intent of the measure will receive 0 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 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.

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. 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 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 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~~ 101 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. The top project will receive 120 points based on the quality of the project and response: 0 to 120 Points

4. Multimodal Elements and Connections (150 Points 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.

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 connections. 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 (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.

5. 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.

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)*50 points or 29 points.

6. Cost Effectiveness ~~Ratio~~ (100 Points) – This criterion will assess the project's cost effectiveness based on the total TAB-eligible project cost and total points awarded in the previous criteria.

A. *MEASURE:* This measure will calculate the cost effectiveness of the project. Metropolitan Council staff will divide the number of points awarded in the previous criteria by the TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls) ~~by the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria~~.

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

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 most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar ~~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 received .0005 points per dollar ~~had 35,000~~ and the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, ~~had 70,000,~~ this applicant would receive (.00025/.0005~~35,000/70,000~~)*100 points or 50 points.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS