INFORMATION ITEM

DATE:	March 12, 2019
TO:	TAC Funding and Programming Committee
PREPARED BY:	Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)
SUBJECT:	2018 Regional Solicitation Surveys

Following the 2018 Regional Solicitation, a link to a survey was sent to applicants, scorers, TAB members, and TAC/Funding & Programming members. This survey has been conducted since the 2014 Regional Solicitation and is meant to inform staff and committee members on how to improve the process.

- Responses from Applicants: pages 2-8
- Responses from TAC and Funding & Programming Committee Members: Pages 9-17
- Responses from Scoring Committee Members: Pages 18-23
- Responses from TAB Members: Pages 24-28

SUMMARY OF APPLICANT RESPONSES TO 2018 REGIONAL SOLICITATION SURVEY

Eighteen applicants replied to the survey. At least one respondent completed an application in nine of the ten funding categories with Traffic Management Technologies the only one not represented.

Themes

- Timeline: applications not due near 4th of July; complete process in calendar year.
- Limit the number of attachment pages.
- How to assign points to projects included (or not) in studies (e.g., Regional Truck Corridor Study)
- Online mapping difficulties.
- Confusion regarding the snow and ice control measure in Multiuse Trails & Bicycle Facilities.
- Geographic balance
- Online application losing/changing characters with copy/paste.
- Some confusion with what attachments are needed and where they need to be attached.
- Reduced maximum awards to allow for more projects.
- Reward projects with funding secured/committed
- More funding for Multiuse Trails & Bicycle Facilities
- Consider new application categories for intersection and/or interchange projects

SUMMARY OF TAC/F&PC RESPONSES TO 2018 REGIONAL SOLICITATION SURVEY
Twenty-one TAC and Funding & Programming members/alternates replied to the survey.

Themes

- Timeline; avoid summer/4th of July deadline. Better sequencing at end of process.
- Geographic distribution and project type head-to-head competition (e.g., BRT vs. local route)
- Fix or eliminate snow/ice control in Multiuse Trails category
- Use studies (Intersection Conversion, Bicycle Barrier) to generate points (or, even, instead of arduous scoring process)
- More focus on innovation; new category? How to score?
- Select projects with air-quality/environmental benefits
- Use Streetlight and other data sources (possibly remove time-consuming/costly modeling)
- Mode/sub-mode distribution
    - Less roadway expansion
    - More bike/ped/transit.
- Truck corridor study scoring; points off the corridor?
- Deadline for new funding scenarios
- Proportionate scoring can have drawbacks.

Replies (21 Respondents)

1 Member/alternate of (check all that apply)

	Responses
TAC	14
Funding & Programming	13
Total Respondents	**21**

2. Agency type (check one)

	Responses
State	4
County	5
City	6
Other	6
Total Respondents	**21**

3. Do you have concerns related to any of the following? (Check all that apply)

	Responses	'16 Responses	'14 Responses
Weighting/distribution of points	38.9% (7)	37.5% (6)	**33.3% (5)**
Number and type of sub-categories within the three modal categories	33.3% (6)	18.8% (3)	20.0% (3)
Project cost inflation	N/A	18.8% (3)	6.7% (1)
Modal distribution of funds	22.2% (4)	25.0% (4)	26.7% (4)
Geographic distribution of funds	38.9% (7)	25.0% (4)	N/A
Scoring committee structure	16.7% (3)	18.8% (3)	6.7% (1)
Scoring criteria	38.9% (7)	**56.3% (9)**	26.7% (4)
Qualifying criteria	11.1% (2)	25.0% (4)	13.3% (2)
Process for determining final program of projects	38.9% (7)	31.3% (5)	13.3% (2)
Maximum and minimum fund requests	**50.0% (9)**	18.8% (3)	20.0% (3)
Restrictions (e.g., project bundling)	16.7% (3)	25.0% (4)	20.0% (3)
Other (please specify, only 2018 shown) • "Special Direction" for distribution, A-minor distrib., bridge • MnDOT as applicant • Suggest new category for non-downtown/Univ route types • How to handle unique projects going forward	22.2% (4)	0.0% (0)	26.7% (4)
Total Respondents	18	16	15

4. Please provide specific comments to help articulate the concerns alluded to in the above question.
    1.
        - Modal distribution. The amount of roadway expansion funding could be considered contrary to regional policy. Needs evaluation.
        - Scoring criteria. Important suburban and exurban roads that do not involve an interchange have had trouble getting funding. Are there ways to change the scoring criteria to improve this situation in a way that's consistent with regional policy? (relates to geographic balance)
        - TAB seems to want to encourage innovation through unique projects, but they are tough to score. Is there a better way to evaluate unique projects?
    2. Smaller counties and cities have harder chances of getting their project funded
    3. -

4. -
5. See Appendix A.
6.
    - There should be no points awarded under the Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities for having a maintenance program/policy for year-round maintenance of the trail system. Each agency has a different policy (for unique reasons) and some agencies don't plow in the winter because the trails are used for winter sports, such as skiing. Under the safe routes to school infrastructure category, criteria 2A (Average share of student population that bikes or walks) and 2B (Student population within school's walkshed) were difficult to measure and should be reviewed. The equity criteria within several of the modes/categories raised a lot of questions/comments and should also be reviewed for the next solicitation.
    - In regards to the max./min. funding amounts, I think the multiuse trail and bicycle facilities max needs to be lowered from $5.5M to something much less (maybe $3M). This category received a lot of interest/applications and lowering the max funding amount would help fund more projects in this category. It may be worth looking at an interchange only category and doing something similar to the bridge category and funding a minimum of two projects.
7. Lack of cohesion between funded projects and TPP, such that adopted policy priorities are often not reflected in the final program.
8.
    - 1) Number and type of sub-categories within the three modal categories
        - a) I've heard comments related to the potential of converting the existing "Unique Project" category to an "Innovation" category that would formalize how special projects are evaluated. I am supportive of establishing this new "Innovation" category that would provide clarity to both applicants and the various Met Council committees versus our current practice of TAB voting Yes/No on unique projects. This new category would also allow the consideration of projects that may implement a new technology not currently listed as an eligible project within any of the current categories.
        - b) I'd like to recommend the inclusion of a fifth sub-category within the "Roadways including Multimodal Elements" category that could be called "Spot Mobility". This new sub-category would be intended for intersection specific projects that generally provide safety (crashes reduced) and mobility (improved level of service) benefits. I'd encourage a relatively modest funding maximum for projects in this sub-category (such as $2 to $3 MIL). This would provide Met Council with more flexibility in selecting projects (since more projects could be selected for $7 MIL in this sub-category versus a typical $7 MIL project in the expansion sub-category). Additionally, projects that provide an improvement along a corridor (such as a reconstruction) are difficult for intersection projects to compete against as they are typically targeting a specific location.
    - 2) Scoring Criteria
        - a) I am supportive of retaining the current "Snow and Ice Control" measure within the Multi-Use Trails and Bicycle Facilities, however, I recommend that more clarity is provided in how points are assigned. It was clear during the scoring appeal process that many applicants felt that they did not receive an adequate number of points based on their information provided. It seems like sub-criteria should be assigned to allow for the receipt of 0, 10, 20, 30, 40, or 50 points (or something to that effect).
    - 3) Maximum and Minimum Federal Funding Amounts
        - a) I am supportive of reducing the federal funding maximum amount for bikeway projects by $1.5 MIL from $5.5 MIL to $4 MIL. This will likely allow for the selection of more applications to fund within this sub-category (as 40 applications were submitted in 2018) and it's unlikely that an agency is unable to deliver a bikeway project if they only received $4 MIL. In review of the applications submitted in 2018, the average federal amount requested was $2.4 MIL, with 8 applications exceeding $4.2 MIL (I figured if an application was seeking $4.2 MIL of federal funding, then $4.0 MIL is good enough).

- b) I am supportive of removing the current "At least one project will be funded from each of the five eligible functional classifications" requirement. It is impossible to know if a "good" project will be submitted along each of the eligible functional classifications, therefore, this current requirement could award funds to relatively modest project only because of its functional classification designation. I understand the logic behind including the requirement (connectors are typically located in rural areas), however, we'll never have difficulty finding enough projects to fund. We may come to a point where only two applications are submitted along Connector roadways where one application scored last in the Reconstruction sub-category, and the other application scored last in the Expansion sub-category.

9.
   - There are too many categories for distributing funds to the point where we are drawing lines on project categories without being able to compare the value of projects across categories. The solicitation should determine the specific areas of need for the region and be more targeted in its investment approach. A similar comment would apply to modal distribution of funds. The distribution is not needs based and does not consider funding availability for that mode from other funding sources. There seems to be a propensity to prioritize projects that have other funding sources based on the idea that they are the best projects, but that doesn't make sense if the projects do not score well. Also, the lack of other funding opportunities for certain types of projects, like transit, is not factored into the modal split. The funding picture for roads and counties has change substantially in the last 10 years and that should be taken into account in the regional solicitation. If counties can raise more funds for roads through sales taxes, perhaps the federal funding should be prioritized elsewhere.
   - The scoring committee structure needs a better balance of multi-modal planners in each committee. Committee members do not necessarily need to be experts to score these applications.
   - There needs to be a more comprehensive opportunity for public comment on the project of projects. The TIP input process is not adequate, since it is too late in the process to really change the distribution of funds. TAB should not be immune to hearing public input on the distribution of hundreds of millions of dollars every two years.
10.
   - Increase max for roadways, transit, and peds.
   - Allow bundling on SRTS and ped projects. Need regional priorities for ped projects.
11. -
12.
   - Analysis of recent solicitations provided by Council staff shows the geographic distribution of scores has become focused on the core in recent years; the high point value of certain measures contributes to this effect. Additionally, for transit projects, there seemed to be a natural break between urban focused projects and suburban projects where suburban projects can rarely compete unless they serve the core due to the way points are distributed across measures.
   - The process seemed to go around in circles this year at all committee levels. The ultimate decision made by each body makes sense but the process and need to recommendations up & back down should be reviewed.
   - Project bundling seems to come up more during the application process; however there were several transit projects this year that had overlapping components, and while identified by the applicant, the project didn't seem to be completely vetted for independent utility during the eligibility review.
13. –
14. 7 million doesn’t go very far on critical expansion projects
15. Overall I think the application is good. However I think that Criteria 4- Deficiencies and Safety Measure A is very important. When major gaps are closed on a trail system it strengthens the entire system, not just a localized area. It is perhaps hard to quantify yet it is important.
16. I feel we should use newly available data to figure out who uses various projects -- the use should be geographically distributed -- not necessarily projects. I expect this "fair" review would tend to support more urban projects that serve a broader range of users. Regarding minimum and maximums, as project

costs continue to rise, we should always review these mins/max to make sure federal amounts are still a significant amount of a project -- otherwise, we would only do projects that have predominantly local funding.

17. Some smaller counties have problems being able to get funding for their project based on current selection criteria.
18.
    - The proportionate scoring seems to be overly influential in the outcomes.
    - Express bus, regular route and BRT should not compete in the same category.
    - Interchanges and road improvements should not compete in the same category.
    - There is no consideration of geographic distribution of the funds built into the process.
    - The Truck Corridor study does not consider geographical context. The way the criteria is set up it doesn't allow for projects that would benefit the corridors to score well. There is also no spot to attach a narrative to this criteria to make a case prior to scoring.
    - We would like to discuss the idea of a max number of applications per agency.
    - A deadline for new scenarios should be imposed.
19. At some point it becomes unclear what direction/feedback TAB is looking for from the subcommittees on the program of projects. Once we get so many different scenarios, it becomes difficult to wade through the information and advocate for any particular scenario. If we are going to select a scoring scenario so that each county gets a certain # of projects, it should be made clear in the application process. Otherwise it looks like we are going to extraordinary measures to accommodate geographic balance and the scoring process seems undermined.
20. -
21.
    - Using proportionate scoring for subjective criteria is challenging. It puts a lot of decision making in the hands of a single reviewer and it can be like splitting hairs. I can understand proportionate scoring with its used with numerical data. I recommend for subject criteria that a high, medium high, neutral, medium low and low evaluation be given with a set point value for each. This would also take some of the scoring burden off the scorer for subjective criteria.
    - Interchanges should not complete with A-minors and BRT should not compete with express and regular route bus.
    - There needs to be a criterion related to balancing funds geographically... perhaps at the end after the technical scoring is complete. Or perhaps there is a base amount of funding provded to each county and beyond that the funding is competitive. Or perhaps there is a maximum number of applications that can be submitted per geographic area so that one area of the region does not dominate based on the staffing resources they have available to work on applications.
    - There needs to be a cutoff for when new funding scenarios can be brought forward. Walking on a new scenario to TAB is unacceptable.

5. Are there specific changes you would make to the criteria/measures?
    1. No. In fact, I think many of the criteria we currently have are very good. No need to toss the baby with the bath water.
    2. More points for green projects
    3. No. Process was managed very efficiently and equitable.
    4. -
    5. See above (Appendix A, below)
    6. See above comment.
    7. Winter maintenance, "getting points" just for answering questions
    8. Scoring Criteria
        - a) Snow and Ice Control - I am supportive of retaining the current "Snow and Ice Control" measure within the Multi-Use Trails and Bicycle Facilities, however, I recommend that more clarity is provided in how points are assigned. It was clear during the scoring appeal process that many applicants felt that they did not receive an adequate number of points based on their information provided. It seems like sub-criteria should be assigned to allow for the receipt of 0, 10, 20, 30, 40, or 50 points (or something to that effect).

- b) Measures A and C were new in the Roadway Reconstruction sub-category. They were added with good intentions, however, they didn't necessary apply to a large percentage of the projects being considered. Level of congestion didn't necessarily make sense unless your project was classified as a Reliever. I'm curious to know if many projects received their highest score in either the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study or the CMSP IV sub-sections of Measure A. I recommend requiring the applicant to enter a narrative in Measure C (Regional Truck Corridor Study) to receive their maximum number of points, otherwise, applicants are receiving points based on their location, and not necessarily, based on their proposed improvements.
- c) Measure 5 (Congestion Reduction / Air Quality) - I'm wondering if we can investigate using Street Light to evaluate this measure in the 2020 Regional Solicitation instead of requiring the applicant to perform an exhausting Synchro analysis.
- d) Measure 6 (Safety) - I'd like to recommend that we split this measure into two sub-measures. Reactive Safety (70% of the points) that follows the same process. Proactive Safety (30% of the points) that allows the applicant to list all the safety strategies included in the project.

9. -
10. Add a cost effectiveness measure for amount requested, in addition to total project cost.
11. -
12. A transit work group is needed.
13. –
14. –
15. We should consider the system as a whole when scoring- we do that some in Criteria 1 by measuring value to the RBTN but there are some projects that close gaps between RBTN corridors, which strengthen the RBTN as a whole and create a more robust system.
16. Nothing specific. I think we should continually review the statistical influence of each criteria and get rid of those that do not contribute to project selection. If the issue covered by the criteria is disproportionately important to the region, we should increase its relative points so that it does contribute to selection. We need to keep in mind that our process simply picks projects and that any system we have will be not be precise. Making the process more complicated usually does not make the ultimate selections more precise or fair. Considering that application preparation is expensive (~$10K), we should simplify whenever possible.
17. Awards more points for projects that show better environmental improvements.
18. The Truck Corridor study does not consider geographical context. The way the criteria is set up it doesn't allow for projects that would benefit the corridors to score well. There is also no spot to attach a narrative to this criteria to make a case prior to scoring.
19. Instead of striving for geographic balance by county perhaps we should look to planning area (i.e. urban, suburban, suburban edge, rural center, etc). That way projects are competing with other projects with similar demographic and land use characteristics and we don't get so much of an urban/rural battle when it comes to selecting projects. This approach certainly has its own challenges, but it might be worth exploring how to integrate geographic context (instead of county) into the scoring somehow.
20. -
21. The truck corridor scoring criteria needs to allow projects that benefit truck corridors through overpasses and other investments that are not directly on the interstate. Not every freight need is captured in the truck corridor study's efforts to rank interstate investments. Of particular concern is that some counties only have one or two truck corridors as defined by Met Council, which only allows projects on the interstate to access full points in the roadway expansion category. The regional solicitation is gravitating towards an interstate solicitation in the roadway category, which moves it away from it's core purpose of providing funding to local counties and cities for regional needs. Interstates are the realm of MnDOT.

6. On a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), do you agree with the following?

	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Avg	2016 Avg
TAC F&P & TAC had adequate time to discuss funding options	1	2	6	7	5	21	3.62	4.38
The funding options provided to TAC by TAC F&P made sense	0	4	5	7	5	21	3.62	4.13

7. What one item would you change about the solicitation above all else?
    1. Greater share of funding to bike, ped, and transit
    2. -
    3. -
    4. But for the last minute question about funding allocation by category, I thought process worked.
    5. Continue to reduce reliance on interpretation in scoring wherever possible.
    6. We need to continue tweaking the scoring criteria and points
    7. There should be stronger consideration for Streetlight data and less focus on geographic distribution, such that the solicitation's focus should be on asset management, safety, multimodal, and sustainable transportation. Move away from highway expansion projects unless critical gap or key safety metrics.
    8. The introduction of the "Innovation" category to replace the existing "Unique Projects" category.
    9. Allow the solicitation to fund more large-scale regional projects or focus more on opportunities for innovation and let local governments take care of A Minor or similar needs with their own funding.
    10. Incorporate CMP, Bike Barriers Study, and other regional studies into scoring
    11. the weighting of projects means that areas with less development have a hard time competing with the more developed areas. While it is understood that regional dollars should go where there is the "greater good", this also kicks the project can down the road for those developing areas. This also causes consternation about project distribution. maybe some thought to differentiate between urbanized, growing and rural and some type of recognition for funding within that split would help?
    12. -
    13. Reduce the maximum amount of funds for bike/ped projects so more projects get funded.
    14. –
    15. Overall I think the process is sufficient and our bi-annual reviews improve the process even more.
    16. Simplify -- it would still do just as good a job of selecting projects!
    17. Try to be equitable. Select more green projects and those that provide more regional air quality benefits.
    18. Geographic equity needs to be built in if this process is meant to be truly regional and fund local projects.
    19. -
    20. -
    21. Geographic balance criteria

8. Are there any other things you would change about the solicitation?
    1. Craft a schedule so that you don't feel the need to show things to TAB before TAC and F&P because of how the dates line up. That seemed unnecessarily chaotic and put everybody in tough positions.
    2. -
    3. Well done. Not an easy task to manage due to various inputs required.
    4. -
    5. No.
    6. -
    7. Raising the minimum award in certain categories, reducing the maximum award in certain categories (e.g., bike and multi-use trails), are MnDOT trunk highways eligible?, greater consideration for new transportation trends such as advanced mobility and 21st century transportation as compared to SOV based highway projects
    8. Accelerate the deadline of applications to May to allow adequate time for TAC F&P and TAC to review preliminary scores, complete the scoring appeal process, and develop various funding scenarios before the information is shared with TAB and still complete the approval process by December.
    9. Develop a program of projects for funding needs every 10 years based on regional planning studies and programs and pick projects from this list every year to prioritize. For example, intersection conversion study has a list of prioritized improvements. Scrap the current system entirely and let planning dictate the needs, not a rigorous application process with unclear regional benefits.
    10. Increase max awards and work on federal funds swaps
    11. -
    12. –
    13. –
    14. –

15. Consider adding criteria for eliminating barriers identified in MET Council's Bicycle Barrier study.
16. Automate calculations to take advantage of ever evolving data sources (i.e. Streetlight Data, Census) and technologies (i.e. Data Analytics and GIS).
17. Use better air quality models and modeling methodologies for some highway projects that could show greater air emissions reductions than what we currently get.
18. The timeline. Applications should be due at the end of June or later in July. Mid-July is awful due to the 4th of July holiday.
19. -
20. -
21. Respondent skipped this question

APPENDIX A: Respondent #5's reply to Q4 (Please provide specific comments for the items checked in the above question.)

Weighting/Distribution of Points
Suggest rather than using the range of points from applications received to set 0 and 100 point values for some measures, that a range of points corresponding to measure responses is developed ahead of time for each measure. This avoids a tight measure (points are very close) from dominating the scoring more than it should. See example below where Application 3 is generally lower scoring than Application 1, but scores the highest of applications because of limited range of scores in Measure B.

Example: Applications 1, 2, and 3, Measures A and B (both measures are proportioned and set 0 to 100)

Application	Measure A Raw Score	Measure B Raw Score	Measure A Weighted Score	Measure B Weighted Score	Total Score
1	50	100	48	0	100
2	0	0	50	100	100
3	10	10	50	100	100

Scoring Committee Structure
Suggest that cross-checking of scores is provided by chair or other staff, and chair has the authority to re-evaluate scoring with another member or to revise scoring when, in the chair's judgement, this is needed.

Maximum/Minimum Amounts
Trail projects should be limited to a lower ceiling to avoid having fewer projects absorb a high percentage of funding. $3 to $3.5 million seems to be a better limit to achieve this. Perhaps considering a higher match percentage requirement beyond a certain threshold would be a way of keeping the higher cap.

Restrictions
Suggest monitoring or policy to avoid bundling of multiple projects serving the same corridor/function within a time or application cycle limit. Secondly, consider limiting agencies from too many multiple awards in any one category by formula.

MnDOT as Applicant
This came up during multiple TAC meetings and guidance should be developed to establish MnDOT's application limitation(s).

Applicant Responses

Responses (18 Respondents)

1. Agency type (check one)

	Responses
State	0
City	7
County	7
Other -JPA -Nonprofit -Consultant -University	4
Total Respondents	**18**

2. Category you submitted in (Check all that apply)

	Responses
Roadway Expansion	50.0% (9)
Roadway Reconstruction, Modernization, Spot Mobility	50.0% (9)
Traffic Management Technologies	0.0% (0)
Bridges	11.1% (2)
Transit Expansion	11.1% (2)
Transit System Modernization	11.1% (2)
Travel Demand Management	22.2% (4)
Multi-use Trails & Bicycle Facilities	55.6% (10)
Pedestrian Facilities	33.3% (6)
Safe Routes to Schools	11.1% (2)
Unique Projects	0.0% (0)
Total Respondents:	18

3. Are there specific features of the online application that should be changed?

1. Reduce the word limit to a maximum of 200 for individual responses. In the bikeway category there were approximately 40 applications submitted, which results in a lot of reading for the reviewer.
2. -
3. -
4. No
5. no
6. -
7. None
8. Unclear, at times, where and when to upload attachments, such as maps. Often resorted to making sure the maps were added at the closing attachment section.
9. Confirm attachments needed before continuing - as sometimes attachments are at the end or in the body of solicitation.
10. There needs to be questions regarding EV/AV technology being employed for the new roadway. The incentive needs to be there to provide for the evolution of the system.
11. I thought the process developed by Met Council staff worked quite well.
12. No
13. The online application does not read some characters when copy/paste feature is used such as apostrophes. This creates a time consuming effort to go through all the text and remove unwanted symbols.
14. -

15. The application seems clunky and not very user friendly. It would be nice if improved editing could be offered. text characters need to be expanding to allow more writing if needed. Some sections are very limiting.
16. The online form has difficulty with apostrophes, and removes certain kinds of special characters when items are copy-pasted. It would be great if this could be resolved before the next Regional Solicitation.
17. Adding check boxes for each of the qualifying requirements.
18. too much emphasis on core cities/inside the beltway.

4. Are there changes you would make in the application training (overall regional solicitation information, online application, mapping, MnDOT State Aid information)?

1. It seems that staff from agencies who routinely submit applications feel very comfortable with the online system, so I think the training mainly benefits agencies who don't regularly apply for the Regional Solicitation.
2. -
3. -
4. No
5. no
6. -
7. None
8. Still challenging to map projects involving large areas or several locations like transit expansions
9. -
10. -
11. I thought the process developed by Met Council staff worked quite well.
12. No
13. No, the training is helpful and well-planned.
14. -
15. The online mapping feature should be more easily accessible if changes need to be made to specific mapping sections. Also, there should be the ability to add reference comments to the graphic if needed. Also, if you are going to give the option to copy from an old application, maybe there should be an option to select what information you would like to transfer.
16. –
17. No
18. –

5. Are there specific changes you would make to the qualifying criteria/requirements established to determine whether projects are eligible?

1.
    - 1) Simplify the section where agencies are required to describe how their project aligns with the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan. This section is not worth any points and it's exhausting to fill out.
    - 2) TAC Funding & Programming will want to review the new requirement for agencies to have completed (or started working on) an ADA Transition Plan.
    - 3) Consider eliminating the sufficiency rating criteria for Replacement/Rehabilitation eligibility. Bridge projects will receive points based on their sufficiency rating, so I don't think we'll ever run into an issue where a relatively new bridge is awarded funded.
2. -
3. -
4. Not sure if this belongs here, but I think we may need to break out interchange projects separately in the future.
5. In the Multi-Use Trail Category, peds and bikes are hit/injured/killed primarily as they cross a roadway. The category should be split in two with one dealing with projects that are primarily focused on upgrading crossings and the other with projects that are primarily focused on providing a new trail or a connection. The safety points for crossing improvement projects should be calculated differently. Recent crash history should only account for half the points. The other half of the points should be determined via a look up table or nomograph that considers # of peds crossing, # of bikes crossing, # of vehicles on roadway, speed limit of roadway, width of crossing and available sight distance.
6. -
7. None

8. Move trail maintenance from trail scoring criteria to qualifying criteria. Most agencies have policies of some sort.
9. -
10. -
11. I thought the process developed by Met Council staff worked quite well.
12. There was a lot of confusion about snow plowing trails. Rather than awarding points for that question, it should have just been made clear that snow plowing was required.
13. Under Table 1: Regional Solicitation Funding Award Minimums and Maximums, the maximum federal award for the Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities should be decreased from $5.5 million in order to fund a greater number of worthy projects.
14. -
15. Yes, the scoring/project criteria needs to be updated or redeveloped for multi-use trail applications. The scoring criteria used does not take into account for long regional trails that extend through multiple cities. there should be a percentage of points given for additional populations, housing connections, concentrated poverty, and trail use. Current standards do not take into account for other critical connections to communities outside of the project area. The population and housing scores need to be changed because if you are not in a highly urban area, you do not get any points even though the trail makes critical connections to these areas outside of the project area.
16. -
17. Limit the number of applications from any single agency. Larger agencies can afford to put together multiple applications. Smaller agencies struggle to do so. A cap would force large agencies to prioritize their needs and level the playing field.
18. mapping needs work. Does not account for D-A-R types of services.

6. There are a number of submittals/attachments required with applications. Were any of these difficult to produce or obtain?

1. No. I support the notion to limit attachments to 15 pages and require applicants to only submit PDFs that are 8.5 X 11. Whenever these guidelines are not followed, it is a headache for the reviewer.
2. -
3. -
4. No
5. no
6. -
7. None
8. Not difficult but just found it pointless to produce the one-pager. the information is available within the application. Scoring individuals need to just look and read.
9. NO, but inconsistent to where they go. Sometimes asked for in body, sometimes nothing but we know we need to add it somewhere
10. -
11. No
12. No
13. No, the addition of the 1-page project summary and the layout are positive additions to the solicitation process. There was confusion regarding what documentation was required to fulfill Measure 2B - Snow and Ice Control in the Multiuse Trails & Bicycle Facilities applications. This needs to be clarified for the next round.
14. It was difficult to reduce large corridor layouts into 8.5" x 11" displays. This required a lot of extra work for projects that were not in final design stages in which we had sheet layouts set up.
15. The online mapping needs to be more accessible and have the option for editing if needed. Better description of required attachments need to be clarified. Would suggest an option for uploading attachments for particular sections rather than just uploading all documents at the end. Also, a naming criteria could be used rather than just creating the name of the document you are going to attach.
16. -
17. -
18. Depends on the application type.

7. Was there any confusion or difficulty with any prioritizing criteria (i.e., scoring measures)? Please highlight specific issues that can be addressed.

Applicant Responses

1. There seemed to be confusion with the following criteria:
    - 1) How points were assigned in the "Level of Congestion" measure since we looked at parallel corridors and could gain points even though the given roadway may not function as a reliever.
    - 2) How points were assigned in the "Regional Truck Corridor Study Tiers" measure since projects that indirectly benefit a truck route did not receive points. I think the intent of this measure makes sense, however, too many projects did not receive points because of how it is scored.
    - 3) How points were assigned in the "Snow and Ice Control" measure. I anticipate we'll discuss this at Funding & Programming.
2. -
3. -
4. No
5. See answer to #5.
6. -
7. None
8. Reduce the number of points allocated to the safety category in the Transportation Management Technology applications.
9. -
10. -
11. No
12. see #5
13. Same as above - There was confusion regarding what documentation was required to fulfill Measure 2B - Snow and Ice Control in the Multiuse Trails & Bicycle Facilities applications. This needs to be clarified for the next round.
14. The scoring for maintenance language regarding sidewalks and trails could have been handled better. It would seem unnecessary for a city or county to change their language to include a new segment. Any language would imply that a new segment would be maintained in the same way as the existing system.
15. Yes, the scoring criteria was not readily available on the website or was old. Our applications are based on prioritizing criteria and they are not readily available it makes it really hard to make sure all information is provided in order to answer the question.
16. The use of equity scoring measures is helpful. However, they have relatively little weight, and projects in areas that require equitable approaches are often at odds with the priorities in the other parts of the solicitation. To successfully prioritize and fund equity, the weight of equity scoring measures needs to be significantly higher.
17. Can content outside of a specific answer be considered in the score? This is difficult when writing an application and also scoring. Applicants don't want to waste space on reiterating what is mentioned in other places but don't know if they should do so for the scorer of each question.
18. No, staff was very helpful.

8. Was the scoring guidance clear and helpful to your understanding the criteria?
    1. Yes, Met Council always does a great job elaborating within the application how the specific measure will be scored. The use of scoring committees gives me great confidence that we're being fair and transparent.
    2. -
    3. -
    4. Yes
    5. Yes
    6. -
    7. Yes
    8. Provide more direction in what is expected in the safety category for Transportation Management Technology group.
    9. No - not for maintenance plan in bike category
    10. -
    11. Yes
    12. Yes
    13. Overall, yes it was. However, two criteria need to be further developed to make sure they are scored per the guidance and consistently across project categories: Measure 3A - Connection to disadvantaged populations and

Measure 7A-Multimodal Elements. Both of these measures need to be evaluated to provide better guidance to the scorers and/or monitored more closely to make sure the scorers adhere to the guidance when scoring. Particularly for Measure 7A, there needs to be more consistency on how this is scored between categories.

14. -
15. no
16. Somewhat. The scoring guidance is very difficult to follow with the current evaluation process, where the backgrounds of individual scorers for questions can vary widely and is not transparent. Without having a clear sense of audience, it was unclear how to ensure we were providing the right level of base knowledge and context to meet the guidelines.
17. Scoring the multi-modal component of the transit applications was confusing. Giving examples but then also expecting items outside of the examples is hard to compare from application to application.
18. -

9. What one thing would you change about the solicitation process, criteria, or scoring above all else?
    1. I would introduce a "Spot Mobility" category where applicants could submit intersection specific projects that aim to improve safety and/or mobility. I realize that the HSIP solicitation exists, however, funding is capped at $2.0 MIL per project and is targeted towards safety projects. The use of a Spot Mobility category would likely include a funding maximum less than $7.0 MIL per project and would provide us with greater flexibility when distributing funds across the categories within Roads/Bridges (Modernization, Expansion, Bridge, etc.).
    2. Review scoring to equal the playing field for suburban communities, scoring favors MPLS and St. Paul.
    3. -
    4. Create separate category for interchange projects
    5. Allocated more funding towards Multi-use Trail Project Category as the number of applications/good projects in this category is large.
    6.
        - Scoring criteria should include projects with committed funding
        - Equitable distribution for transportation modernization/expansion
        - Population too heavily weighed upon
        - Project location relative to jobs is poorly structured and needs to either deleted or modified from how it's currently applied
    7. None
    8. Remove trail maintenance policy from scoring criteria.
    9. Maintenance plan - simple commitment to maintain from agency would be better than what was done with last solicitation
    10. Add scoring categories for EV/AV and not just a token amount.
    11. At times I think there is a disconnect between the planning for transportation and the planning for sanitary sewer service. Those things happen and there are unintended consequences. I would recommend that the Met Council hold back some funds for discretionary spending on projects that are warranted to correct unintended consequences.
    12. Make it more user friendly to apply online
    13. Measure 7A -Multimodal Elements in the roadway categories needs better guidance provided to scorers. It was not scored consistently between roadway categories, and too much leeway was given to the scorer to interpret using their own biases in scoring.
    14. Higher scores for projects that already have significant funding and support gathered.
    15. Criteria for multi-use trails needs to be revamped. Criteria used for this type of application does not work well for large regional trails.
    16. The requirement that all matching funds be secured at the time of application is an extremely difficult criterion for nonprofits. Private foundations, individual donors, and fee for service work all operate on a much shorter timescale than the Regional Solicitation process and other government funding. As an organization who has previously been awarded Regional Solicitation funds and has never run into issues drawing down funds, we would hope that this criterion would change in the future. If a select few organizations are having difficulty drawing down awarded funds, addressing that with those organizations would be more effective than changing the requirement for all applicants.
    17. Geographical equity.

18. –

10. Are there any other things you would change about the solicitation?
    1.
        - 1) Consider reducing the federal maximum totals in the main categories to $5 MIL or $6 MIL to allow for more projects to be awarded funding. Most of the applicants (counties and large cities) have the financial support to still deliver these projects if there was less federal funds tied to them. It seems like a 50% application success rate would be a great story to tell applicants and TAB (awesome Return on Investment of the $200 MIL of federal funds and applying is worth everyone's time).
        - 2) I support the notion of having applications due in May (instead of July) to allow for final awards to be determined prior to the end of the year.
        - 3) I'd support review of each of the individual measures prior to the 2020 Regional Solicitation. A number of studies were completed (Regional Truck, Principal Arterial Conversion Study, etc) and introduced as scoring measures, and I'm not sure how well they provide clarity when assigning points.
        - 4) Apply the results of the SRF Before/After solicitation analysis to inform which project types yield a high return on investment.
    2. -
    3. -
    4. Can’t think of any
    5. no
    6. -
    7. None
    8. Do not allow the Regional Barriers study to enter into scoring criteria for trails.
    9. Limit attachment pages if possible?
    10. -
    11. No
    12. Allow for an easier to read copy of the online application that we could save for our records.
    13.
        - In addition to consideration of a lower project maximum in the Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities category, consider separate categories either by project location or type in order to allow a diversity of worthy projects to be funded. This category needs a revamp and reanalysis based on the results of the last two solicitations.
        - Reevaluate the Cost Effectiveness calculation as it currently penalizes large projects even if they are leveraging large amounts of outside funding and that funding is secured. It encourages applicants to apply for only a piece of a larger project and then combine it with the larger project after the funding is awarded, which there were examples of this in this solicitation. If this happens, this measure should be re-scored.
    14. The Region (and this scoring criteria) needs to get behind furthering projects that already have significant funding secured. Projects that have been able to secure significant amount of funding should be evaluated higher than projects that don't have funding to fill the gap.
    15. There needs to be a limit for the amount of applications selected for funding. There seems to always be a couple applicants that receive funding on multiple applications and it eliminates an even spread or distribution of funds. Also, there needs to be more funding available for multi-use trails.
    16. The Regional Solicitation process is extremely time intensive, and we deeply appreciate the responsiveness and timeliness of staff in responding to our questions both in advance of and during the process, in particular Elaine Koutsoukos. This was extremely important for our capacity to successfully complete an application, and we hope it continues to be a priority in future years.
    17. Change the due date to end of June or at least 2 weeks after the 4th of July.
    18. -

SUMMARY OF SCORING COMMITTEE MEMBER RESPONSES TO 2018 REGIONAL SOLICITATION SURVEY

Twenty-one scoring committee members replied to the survey. At least one participant from each of the 10 application categories responded.

Themes

- Scoring Guidance clarity and subjectivity
- Various comments about equity
    - The presence of more scorers is valuable
    - Rationale not entirely clear
    - Doesn't incentivize meaningful project elements
- More time to score projects would have been valuable.
- More introductory info for scorers.
- Firmer expectations for applicants' clarifying their responses.

Replies (21 Respondents)

5. On a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), do you agree with the following?

	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total
Information from the applications was easy to find and interpret	0.0% (0)	19.1% (4)	14.3% (3)	52.4% (11)	14.3% (3)	0.0% (0)	21
The scoring committee structure was effective	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	19.1% (4)	47.6% (10)	28.6% (6)	4.8% (1)	21
The way to distribute scores within the measure made sense	0.0% (0)	14.3% (3)	19.1% (4)	38.1% (8)	28.6% (6)	0.0% (0)	21
My scoring methodology was consistent with the scoring guidelines	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	9.5% (2)	23.9% (5)	61.9% (13)	4.8% (1)	21
The scoring guidelines were useful/understandable	5.0% (1)	15.0% (3)	20.0% (4)	35.0% (7)	25.0% (5)	0.0% (0)	20

6. Please provide any comments you may have for question number 5

1. .
2. Met Council staff may want to consider pre-determining which ‘Innovation’ scoring category each submittal should be judged by prior to scorer review. Additionally, its not all that clear whether applicants submittals were expanding an existing program, or introducing a new program? Perhaps Met Council can determine that prior to leaving it open to interpretation by the scoring committee?
3. There were separate discussions amongst all the equity scorers regarding how to think about the equity measure in future applications, which I found really helpful. In particular thinking about broadening the ACP 50 location element to destination as well as point of origin, and other measures.
4. good process but there is a tendency to want to "improve" the process and deal with rare cases and decimal point information, would like to see a reduction in complexity where possible
5. Scoring guidelines were useful.
6. I was the chair and did not score projects. Overall the scoring process went well.
7. Alignment of the scoring approach within our committee could have been better. It would not have changed the outcomes but would have improved cohesion and optics.
8. -
9. -
10. -
11. I basically had to create my own scoring methodology because the guidelines I received didn't directly translate to a methodology. I didn't mind doing this, but from a global standpoint, it might not be desirable to have every scorer determining their own methodology, as people will inevitably come up with very different methods.
12. N/A
13. My applicants had an out-dated form so the form did not match the updated scoring guidelines.
14. Not all applicants seem to recognize scores are intended to be based on review of a single response. For open ended responses, many scorers review the full application but points are not awarded (or may be at a lower value) if not addressed in the specific measure.-
15. Scoring committee c/have been more effective if members had been willing to challenge/debate the veteran traditional scorers on their assumptions/methods. Would recommend alternating scorers for some categories.

16. -
17. We could have used more time, potentially another meeting, to review the more complicated/less quantitative measures. I was not 100% comfortable with some of the scoring methods developed by other scorers and new measures and would have liked more time to discuss and come to consensus.
18. -
19. This scoring measure (4A I believe) is still fairly subjective, which I don't believe we will ever be able to eliminate from the scoring. However, there is a big range of project types in this category, so the ability to evaluate the significance of the gap or deficiency requires the scorer to develop additional guidelines to compare like projects (i.e. trail gaps vs. grade separations, vs. resurfacing/reconstructions etc.). There was also significant variations in the length of the project, with some being very short gap fillers and others more significant. I think this gave the scorer perhaps too much freedom to determine the significance of the deficiency, which could easily be challenged. Some of the applications were not clear or did not provide clear graphics with information on where the existing facilities were and what gaps they were filling, which required me to look at every project on Google Maps to try and assess what it was connecting to and whether it was completely filling a gap. I would like a requirement to include a map of the proposed facility in relation to existing facilities.
20. There needs to be a better understanding of developed criteria for scoring.
21. See #8 below

7. Were there any issues/concerns you raised during the solicitation process that were not addressed? Please provide a brief description of the issue and how the issue was not addressed.

1. -
2. I believe they are being addressed
3. No
4. no
5. No.
6. There was one project in the Ped category that probably should have been eliminated because it was a bundled, multi-site application. This issue was raised with the committee after the appeal period was over, so removing the application from consideration did not happen. While the application did not receive funding, it was high scoring. Going forward, these types of bundled projects should not be allowed for consideration and is communicated to applicants.
7. We discussed a post-mortem discussion...will this be happening? I hope so; I recall lots of questions being deferred to the "after" discussion.
8. –
9. -
10. -
11. None.
12. N/A
13. I feel that scoring on a curve (putting the highest scoring project at full points, regardless of actual score) creates poor accountability to each measure by the applicant. It also gives extra weight to questions where the spread had to be expanded significantly due to low crude scores. --- essentially such applications get perhaps 50-100 "free points" for scoring best among applicants despite deficiently meeting criteria. I find the desire to create greater distance between scores to be inane. If they all score poorly, they all should understand that and know they need to do better. Same with if they all score well. They all should be credited for scoring well on a criteria area.
14. –

15. Yes. I raised Qs about the risk assessment scoring assumptions the scorer was not willing to answer and other members w/not challenge; perfect example of lack of interaction & engagement within the committee.
16. –
17. –
18. –
19. –
20. It did not seem like all areas were scored with similar criteria. Scoring criteria needs to be developed further to address more universal scoring methodologies, especially if there are components that may also relate to other sections.
21. No

8. What one thing would you change about solicitation scoring above all else?
1. -
2. More structure to the scoring methodology. I suppose there are reasonable arguments as to leaving it open to interpretation however
3. Creation of a cloud based site to store applications and score sheets.
4. simplify
5. Average "weekday user" determination utilized varying sources and assumptions by applicants which required scoring a subcategory of support/quality for given method which worked out fine. Requiring applicants to clearly explain how they arrived at their number instead of trying to replicate. Perhaps ask for the equation(s) showing how the number was calculated in more detail.
6. The Ped and SRTS categories went fairly smooth.
7. I think we are ready to articulate a clearer rationale for the equity content and approach.
8. -
9. The items I scored are inherently set up to benefit urban area projects that already see large amounts of traffic and have existing connections to jobs/schools. This makes it harder or rural projects to score well.
10. The scoring for equity should provide incentive for project proposers to include actions and not just do enough to avoid losing a minimum amount of points.
11. -
12. I'd discourage against the use of the Principal Arterial Conversion Study and the CMSP to assign points. Most of the recommended projects from these two studies are not related to a high percentage of Regional Solicitation projects.
13. In addition to my answer to #7, I was surprised by the lack of information and detail required by the applicants. Some understood the question and demonstrated it with their answer, but many did not and just cut & pasted their response from other parts of the application. I have reviewed for proposals responses to State RFPs, and to foundation RFPs, and these were poor, undetailed, and lacked accountability.
14. -
15. Revise the "gaps" scoring criterion to be less subjective.
16. -
17. Some of the measures need clearer scoring guidance for the Committee to reference. In this category, I would look at how Measure 4A is calculated and define guidance for Measure 5-Innovation more clearly.
18. -
19. -
20. Develop better scoring criteria
21.
    - The SRTS usage measure 2B was "student population w/in 1 mile of the elementary school, middle school, or high school served by the project." This measure was not used

in the scoring in the end because of inconsistent methods and data used by applicants that varied to the point where it was comparing apples to oranges and would not have resulted in a fair evaluation process for all. Solicitation staff should talk with local staff involved in SRTS projects and school data to identify what would work best and be consistent and readily available across school districts and communities. The measure wording should also be clarified as to whether the numbers should only be for those students actually attending the schools directly served by the project or for all students within the radius, regardless of age and school attendance.

9. Are there any other things you would change about solicitation scoring?
    1. -
    2. Perhaps each scorer scores along each measure so there is a broader interpretation of each aspect of the application
    3. Hosting a webinar for scorers & applicants prior to the solicitation & for lessons learned.
    4. no
    5. N/A
    6. -
    7.
        - Simpler explanation of all the components of RS funding, from overall goals to criteria to weighting to allocations to adjustments after the awards. Simple!
        - I would engage someone from CD Research or Hannah Gary in Livable Communities in this discussion.
    8. -
    9. -
    10. –
    11. –
    12. The existing usage and forecasted usage have a potential to double reward projects with a high existing traffic volumes. If a roadway already serves 30,000 vpd, and is provided with a growth factor of 0%, the project will likely still receive a high number of points in the Forecasted Usage measure even through no traffic growth is projected.
    13. Just my answers to #7 & #8
    14. -
    15. More definitive criteria/methods w/in the risk assessment measure.
    16. -
    17. Scoring my measure went well. I was able to use the guidance to create a clear scoring rubric for a qualitative measure. I do not feel all scorers take the time to do this with other qualitative measures, and perhaps it should be the task of the Committee or others to assist.
    18. -
    19. The winter maintenance question was not clear this year which created a lot of debate and challenges (which you are all aware of). That needs to be made more clear.
    20. Have more diversity for people that are scoring particular sections. It may be worth placing people with similar backgrounds and experience. There were a couple people scoring sections that did not relate or they had much experience in that area.
    21. For 2A (student population walking, biking, or taking transit to school), applicants do not need to submit individual classroom student arrival/departure tally sheets; they should be submitting that data to the National Center for Safe Routes to School [at http://saferoutesdata.org/] and then submitting the summary report they get from the center with their solicitation application. This report includes the percent of student population that currently bikes, walks, or takes public transit, which is what would be most useful for verification with the application rather than the raw data. The application asks for the copies of all original travel tally documentation and instead should ask for the summary report from the National Center.

10. Please provide any comments you have on your application scoring experience. Please highlight specific issues that can be addressed for the next Regional Solicitation. Examples could include imbalances in score distribution, criteria that are too rigid or lacking in specificity, or lack of clarity in the scoring guidelines.

1. -
2. Perhaps have more time for the scorers to deliberate their scores between each other
3. Additional thought should be put into the equity measure in particular, and expectations should be made clear to applicants and scorers.
4. great process for building trust among competing stakeholders
5. Overall the process was straightforward.
6. I was happy to see that more SRTS projects received funded from TAB than originally recommended. They are low cost projects that can have big impacts to school populations.
7.
    - More Scorers in Equity = Better experience.
    - Clearer expectations for using the full range of scores available (or not) to avoid the appearance of skewing.
8. –
9. –
10. –
11. As a first-time scorer, it would have been helpful to receive more introductory information about the process, the relevant federal and regional policies and expectations of scorers.
12. It would be worthwhile to investigate the potential of StreetLight data replacing the current process for determining vehicle delay and emissions reductions via a Synchro corridor analysis.
13. I think equity and community engagement must have more points and more accountability in the RFP/solicitation.
14. –
    - The scoring process takes a cycle or two to learn so teaming up or using a past method is helpful.
    - Overall, the scorers seem to be united in providing a thoughtful, data-driven review.
    - There seem to be more and more projects that don't fit in the constraints of the categories; consider creative ways/flexibility in scoring interpretation to support new ideas.
15. –
16. It appeared that the "contingencies" were quite large in the "Estimate of TAB-Eligible Project Costs" form. Not sure if they are adding in what they deem as inflation for the year they are constructing the project??? When we review projects, we do not allow "contingencies" in the project cost for authorization/bidding.
17. Scoring my measure went well. I was able to use the guidance to create a clear scoring rubric for a qualitative measure. I do not feel all scorers take the time to do this with other qualitative measures, and perhaps it should be the task of the Committee or others to assist.
18. –
19. We need to clarify how to evaluate trail reconstruction/resurfacing. There were 2 or 3 applications this time that fell into that category. One was not explicit and read like it was providing a new trail and only when you went to Google Maps to view the existing road, was it clear the trails were existing. They did not specify in their application that the trails would be widened or otherwise enhanced with the proposal. These were very difficult to evaluate.
20. This was my first time scoring. It was quite apparent that there was a lack of scoring methodology criteria for determining scores.
21. -

SUMMARY OF TAB RESPONSES TO 2018 REGIONAL SOLICITATION SURVEY
Twelve TAB members replied to the survey.

Themes

- Geographic balance
- Emissions and climate change are key issues to focus on more
- Timing of the process: vote in December before membership turnover.

Replies (12 Respondents)

1. Agency type (check one)

	Responses
State	1
County	5
City	2
Citizen representative	2
Transit representative	2
Freight representative	0
Non-motorized representative	0
Total Respondents	**12**

2. Do you have concerns related to any of the following? (Check all that apply)

	Responses	'16 Responses	'14 Responses
Distribution of funds between the roadways, transit, and bicycle/pedestrian modal categories	5	**4**	2
Weighting/distribution of points	1	3	3
Number and type of sub-categories within the three modal categories	1	0	0
Geographic distribution of funds	5	3	N/A
Criteria/measures used to score applications	**6**	3	**4**
Process to create funding scenarios	**2**	N/A	N/A
Other (2016 response shown below) -1. Need greater MCTC integration of housing & transit -2. Naming of categories reflects a bias	2	2	2
Total Respondents	9	6	7

3. Please provide specific comments to help articulate the concerns alluded to in the above question.

1. The, "on the fly, horse trading proposal," done by Hennepin County etc. was a violation of the process and should not be repeated. The hour car proposal itself also a violated the process.
2. Very concerned about geographic balance in the funding formula.
3. -
4. -
5. With the scoring criteria it makes it virtually impossible to score well enough in the cities on the outer edges of the 7 county metro to be at all competitive.
6. -
7. I feel there should be some set minimum (not necessarily equitable) for each county.
8. I believe the overall funding should be higher for roadways and bus/rapid transit, versus bike and pedestrian access.
9. Equity scoring not working.
10. As a transit rider, I find what makes driving easier makes transit harder, especially at bus stops and transfer points. Road applications to "improve" busy signalized arterial intersections that are also transfer points, for example, should prioritize safety, convenience and efficiency of transfer over vehicle LOS.
11. -

12. Given that transit and roads take so much money (biggest systems), I have concerns about how we can fund pedestrian projects adequately. It seems like infrastructure that's desperately needed, but always swept aside.

4. Are there specific changes you would make to the criteria/measures established?
    1. -
    2. A level of funding guaranteed to each geographic area.
    3. Climate (carbon emissions) and Environmental Impact should have more weight in criteria
    4. No.
    5. Find a way to dedicate a small percentage of the overall funding to the outer edges and have those areas compete with each other vs competing in a futile battle with the inner core.
    6. -
    7. -
    8. To have geographical balance across the metro - We may have to weigh certain areas differently as to keep a good balance.
    9. Specific projects for AOD's.
    10. Criteria that assess whether grants in nontransit categories make using transit easier, safer, faster or the opposite. Would like to see nontransit applicants for transit-related grants -- cities, counties, even school districts, for example, upgrading their own infrastructure at transit stops to make waiting, boarding and deboarding much more attractive and acceptable. Some relationship between city and county applications in any categories and the degree to which applicants themselves, or the local property owners they regulate, clear bus stops not on transit operators' own snow emergency priority lists; assign points based on these ratings to be added or subtracted automatically to application scores in any categories for projects on, at or beside transit stops, especially transfer points.
    11. -
    12. -

5. How well did the regional solicitation process reflect regional policy?
    1. -
    2. -
    3. -
    4. I think it was a success. There was a considerate effort to ensure all parts of the region benefited from the solicitation and geography and equity were top of mind.
    5. -
    6. Staff recommendations followed regional policy guidelines. TAB deliberations resulted in slight variances, but results were agreeable.
    7. Overall I thought it worked well.
    8. –
    9. Not exactly, but reflected actual regional needs. Policy out of wack with safety concerns.
    10. Need basic work on climate change policy vis-a-vis TAB awards. Not sure what, but it seems little of what TAB awards to road projects takes climate change seriously. Link land use and transit closely. Cities control the latter, transit operators control the former, but TAB awards do not really reflect they impact on each other.
    11. -
    12. I think it did this well; it was a lot of discussion, and consideration given to the big regional picture.

6. On a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), do you agree with the following?

	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Avg	2016 Avg	2014 Avg
TAB had adequate time to discuss funding options	0	1	1	4	6	12	4.25	4.25	3.13
The funding options provided to TAB by TAC made sense	0	0	5	1	6	12	4.08	4.50	3.88

7. Were there any issues/concerns you raised during the solicitation process that were not addressed? Please provide a brief description of the issue and how the issue was not addressed.

1. -
2. -
3. -
4. -
5. -
6. -
7. -
8. -
9. Need to use TAC's recommendation more.
10. See above.
11. -
12. No.

8. What one item would you change about the solicitation above all else?

1. Following our process without violating it because a couple jurisdictions wanted something. that was outside the process.
2. -
3. -
4. Move the process back one month so we don't lose voting members in January who have been working on this for months-have the vote in December instead of Jan.
5. Geographic balancing
6. -
7. -
8. More weight given to projects focused on the future infrastructure needs versus waiting for congestion to happen and then try to react to the issues.
9. Equity Scoring not working. Ignores poverty in the suburbs.
10. Fit the full timeline into the calendar year.
11. -
12. -

9. Are there any other things you would change about the solicitation?

1. Less bias in the category names.
2. -
3. Reducing carbon emissions from transportation will continue to receive more attention and support from many places and TAB should be prepared to more strongly factor in and support projects that reduce carbon emissions. I would like to see the TAB take a longer view (not be so short sighted) with regard to transportation. EV's are coming and TAB can help ease the transition.
4. Can we get more money to fund more projects please? Maybe and extra few hundred million a year:)
5. -
6. -

7. -
8. -
9. The funding pots to really reflex the needs of the entire region. Not one county dominating the process greatly exceeding their regional share.
10. –
11. -
12. -