INFORMATION ITEM

DATE:	June 13, 2019
TO:	TAC Funding and Programming Committee
PREPARED BY:	Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705) Steve Peterson, Manager of Highway Planning and TAC/TAB Process (651-602-1819) Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator (651-602-1717)
SUBJECT:	2020 Regional Solicitation: Technical Changes on Bicycle/Pedestrian Applications

Attached are Regional Solicitation measures and scoring guidance for the following funding categories: Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities; Pedestrian Facilities; and Safe Routes to School. The text reflects what was used for the 2018 Regional Solicitation, except where changes are tracked. Tracked changes represent potential updates for 2020.

Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities

Measure 2B: Snow and Ice Control

In 2018, this measure read: "Confirm that the applicant and/or controlling jurisdiction has a maintenance plan or other policy that mandates snow and ice control to promote year-round usage." This led to confusion over whether certain actions qualified as confirmation. After meeting with the Funding & Programming Committee in May, staff has proposed language requiring a resolution be made by applicants stating that they will maintain the trails being applied for year-round. See page 8. Note also that it was suggested during the June 5, 2019 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting that this become a qualifying criterion.

Measure 4A: Gaps and Barriers

The Council recently updated its Regional Bicycle Barriers Study (RBBS). Additionally, the Transportation Policy Plan (2018 update) defined regional bicycle barrier crossing areas and Major River Bicycle Barrier Crossings established them as a "high priority for federal transportation funds." Discussion of two possible alternatives for incorporating these new regional designations into Measure 4A of the 2020 Regional Solicitation is shown on page 3.

Maximum Federal Award

Currently, the maximum federal award for Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities is $5.5 million. Over time, various lower amounts have been suggested. Below is some data related to federal requests in the 2018 Regional Solicitation:

- Average federal request: $2,401,510
- Average for bridge/underpass projects: $2,891,157. Seventeen projects ranging from $480,000 to $5.5 million
- Average federal request not including anything $5M or over: $1,666,352. Thirty-two projects.

Table 1 below shows how many rejects in the category would likely have been funded with various reduced maximum. This assumes all additional projects would have been awarded in

390 North Robert St., St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-1805 (651) 602-1000 Fax (651) 602-1739

this category; note that it is possible this would have led to increased funding in the Safe Routes to School and/or Pedestrian Facilities category.

Table 1: Number of Funded Projects by Federal Amount

	Applicant	Project Name	Fed Request	Score
1	St Paul	Kellogg Boulevard Capital City Bikeway Phase I	*$5,312,000*	932
2	Hennepin Co	University Ave and 4th St SE Protected Bikeways	*$5,500,000*	858
3	Hennepin Co	Hennepin Ave and 1st Ave NE Bicycle and Ped Facilities	*$5,500,000*	854
4	St Paul	Fish Hatchery Trail Stabilization and Reconstruction	*$2,216,800*	819
5	Dakota Co	North Creek Greenway in Lakeville and Farmington	$480,000	814
6	Fridley	Fridley 7th Street and 57th Ave Trail Connections	$516,120	801
7	Hennepin Co	Midtown Greenway Accessible Connections	$1,120,000	795
8	Dakota Co	CSAH 42 Multiuse Trail and Crossing in Apple Valley	$1,256,000	795
9	Dakota Co	Minnesota River Greenway in Eagan	*$3,508,000*	794
10	Scott County	CSAH 17 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge over US 169	$950,080	786
11	Washington Co	CSAH 38 Multi-Use Trail in Washington County	$460,800	783
12	Ramsey Co	Bruce Vento Regional Trail Extension in Ramsey County	*$4,026,278*	782
13	Apple Valley	Apple Valley Johnny Cake Ridge Road Trail	$515,484	777
14	St Paul	Sam Morgan Regional Trail Segment 1 Reconstruction	$1,877,600	776
15	Inver Grove Hts	Inver Grove Heights Babcock Trail	$300,160	769
16	Hennepin Co	Bass Lake Road Multi-Use Trail in Crystal	$457,220	762
17	Hennepin Co	Bottineau Boulevard Multi-Use Trail	$1,562,348	759
18	Ramsey (City)	Regional Mississippi Skyway Multiuse Trail Bridge	*$3,240,000*	756
19	Chaska	Circle the Brick Trail Connection in Chaska	$1,197,792	750
20	Three Rivers PD	Bassett Creek Regional Trail in Golden Valley	$1,635,600	749

Actual funded projects: 11.	$26,819,800
$5M Max: 11 Funded Projects	$26,819,800
$4M Max: 13 Funded Projects	$27,023,284
$3.5M Max: 14 funded projects	$26,892,884
$2M Max: 20 Funded Projects	$26,329,204

Pedestrian Facilities

No major changes proposed.

Safe Routes to School

Criterion 1: Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements
Currently, this criterion consists of one measure: Describe how project addresses the 5 E's of SRTS program. Each of the five E's is worth up to 50 points, for a total of 250 points. The 5 E's are engineering, education, enforcement, encouragement, and evaluation.

In discussion with MnDOT Safe Routes to School staff, it was suggested that points could be awarded for completion of a Safe Routes to School Plan. Staff therefore offers for consideration of awarding 50 points to applicants that have completed plans. This would reduce the existing measure to 200 points (i.e., 40 points for each "E"). This is shown on page 33.

Measure 2B: Student Population

The measure reads: "Student population within one mile of the elementary school, middle school, or high school served by the project." In 2018, applicants interpreted this in various ways:

- Students at the school(s) in question
- Children in the age group of the school(s) in question
- Children between 5 and 18 years old
- All children below 18 years old.

The inconsistency was not able to be reconciled during the scoring period and the measure was therefore eliminated from the point total.

MnDOT Safe Routes to School staff expressed the sentiment that the intent of the program is to serve the students at the school, as opposed to the general population near the school. That staff member also stated that applicants should be able to get data from the schools. Therefore, Council staff suggests that the measure change to: "Population of enrolled students within one mile of the elementary school, middle school, or high school served by the project. Enrollment data from the impacted school(s) should be used in this response." This is reflected on page 34.

MnDOT Safe Routes to School staff also suggested the possibility of taking "busing boundaries" (i.e., the minimum distance students should live from the school in order to be eligible for bus service). This has the potential to be a complicating factor to the score. This is not reflected in the attachment, but could be added if members wish.

Multi-Use Trails and Bicycle Facilities
Criterion 4.A.: Gaps and Barriers Handout

2018 Regional Solicitation Scoring Breakdown (100 points)

Qualitative assessment of project narrative explaining how improvement:

- **"Closes a transportation network gap (on regional or local network) and/or provides a facility that crosses or circumvents a physical barrier." (0 to 90 pts)**
- **"Improves continuity and/or connections between jurisdictions" (0 to 10 pts)**

Option A: "Sum of Two Parts" (100 points)

Part 1: Bike Network Gaps and Physical Barriers
Qualitative assessment of project narrative (0 to 50 pts)

Part 2 (NEW): Regional Bike Barrier Crossings
Quantitative assignment of (50 pts):

- **Tier 1** Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas & Major River Bike Barrier Crossings = 50 pts
- **Tier 2** Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas = 30 pts
- **Tier 3** Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas = 20 pts
- **Multi-barrier** crossings = + 10 pts
- **Non-tiered** regional bicycle barrier crossings **=** 5 pts

Option B: "Regional Barriers with Scaled Ranges" (100 points)

(NEW) Qualitative assessment of project narrative and regional bicycle barrier crossings **assigned within scaled score ranges,** as follows:

• **Tier 1** Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas and Major River Bike Barrier Crossing projects	75 to 100 pts
• **Tier 2** Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas projects	60 to 80 pts
• **Tier 3** Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas projects	50 to 70 pts
• **Projects that don't cross regional barriers:**	0 to 60 pts

Additional considerations for regional barrier crossing projects:

- **Multi-barrier** crossing projects (i.e., crossing multiple, closely-spaced barriers)
- **Non-tiered** regional bicycle barrier crossings (i.e., outside of Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas)

Scoring Options Summary

Project Category	OPTION A: "Sum of Two Parts"			Option B: "Scaled Ranges"
	Qualitative Part 1 Score	Quantitative Part 2 Score	Total Score	
Tier 1 Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas & Major River Bike Barrier Crossings	0 - 50	50	50 - 100	75 - 100
Tier 2 Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas	0 - 50	30	30 - 80	60 - 80
Tier 3 Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas	0 - 50	20	20 - 70	50 - 70
Projects not Crossing Regional Barriers	0 - 50	0	0 - 50	0 - 60

Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

June 10, 2019

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

Examples of Multiuse Trail and Bicycle Facility Projects:

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

Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	**200**	**18%**
Measure A - Project location relative to the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN)	200	
2. Potential Usage	**200**	**18%**
Measure A - Existing population and employment within 1 mile (potential usage)	150	
Measure B – Snow and ice control	50	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**120**	**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**	**23%**
Measure A – Gaps closed/barriers removed and/or continuity between jurisdictions improved by the project	100	
Measure B - Deficiencies corrected or safety problems addressed	150	
5. Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections	**100**	**9%**
Measure A - Transit or pedestrian elements of the project and connections	100	
6. Risk Assessment	**130**	**12%**
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	130	
7. Cost Effectiveness	**100**	**9%**
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost)	100	
Total	**1,100**	

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (200 Points) - This criterion measures the project's ability to serve a transportation purpose within the regional transportation system and economy through its inclusion within or direct connection to the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN), which is based on the Twin Cities Regional Bicycle System Study (2015).

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Project to RBTN Orientation" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Draw the proposed trail on the map.

RESPONSE (Select one, based on the "Project to RBTN Orientation" map):

- Tier 1, Priority RBTN Corridor (200 Points)
- Tier 1, RBTN Alignment (200 points)
- Tier 2, RBTN Corridor (175 Points)
- Tier 2, RBTN Alignment (175 Points)
- Direct connection to an RBTN Tier 1 Corridor or Alignment (150 Points)
- Direct connection to an RBTN Tier 2 Corridor or Alignment (125 Points)

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

Upload the "Project to RBTN Orientation" map used for this measure.

SCORING GUIDANCE (200 Points)

The applicant will receive the points shown in the above bullets based on the location of the project relative to the RBTN.

RBTN Projects (Tier 1/Tier 2 corridors and alignments)

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

- Improve a segment of an existing Tier 1 or Tier 2 alignment beyond a simple resurfacing of the facility;
- Implement a currently non-existing segment of a Tier 1 or Tier 2 alignment within and along a Tier 1 or Tier 2 corridor; OR
- Connect directly to a specific Tier 1 or Tier 2 corridor or alignment of the RBTN.
  * Note: if connecting to a RBTN ***corridor***, the project must connect to a roadway or to the planned terminus of a trail in a way that makes possible a future connection to a potential RBTN alignment for the corridor.

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

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

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

Note: If no projects meet the above criterion for 200 points, the top scoring project(s) will be adjusted to 200 points and all other project scores will be adjusted proportionately. Due to tiered scoring, it is possible that multiple projects will receive the maximum allotment of 200 points.

2. Potential Usage (200 Points) - This criterion quantifies the project's potential usage based on the existing population and employment adjacent to the project. Metropolitan Council staff will calculate the potential usage of the project using the Metropolitan Council model.

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

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

- Existing Population within 1 Mile (Integer Only, 75 Points): _____
- Existing Employment within 1 Mile (Integer Only, 75 points): _____

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)

The applicant with highest population will receive the full 75 points, as will the applicant with the highest number of jobs. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points for population and jobs, respectively. As an example for population, projects will score equal to the existing population within 1 mile of the project being scored divided by the project with the highest population within 1 mile multiplied by the maximum points available for the measure (75). For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 people within 1 mile and the top project had 1,500 people, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)*75 points or 50 points.

- Existing population: 75 Points
- Existing employment: 75 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.

The highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 150 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 80 points and the top project had 140 points, this applicant would receive (80/140)*150 points or 86 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Confirm that the applicant ~~and/or controlling jurisdiction has a maintenance plan or other policy that mandates snow and ice control to promote year-round usage~~will remove snow and ice from the proposed trail so that it can be used year-round for bicycling and walking. Confirm must come in the form of a ~~resolution~~letter by the agency that would be responsible for trail maintenance and upkeep.

RESPONSE:

- ~~Maintenance plan or policy for snow removal for year-round use~~~~Resolution~~Letter that the trail will be maintained for year-round bicycle and pedestrian use (50 Points): _____
- No resolution that the trail will be maintained~~maintenance plan or policy for snow-removal~~ for year-round bicycle and pedestrian use (0 Points): _____

Include a ~~link to and/or description of maintenance plan language. You may also upload a PDF of the maintenance plan if no link is available~~copy of the ~~resolution~~letter.

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)
Applicants that have resolved to ~~policy language that~~ commit~~s~~ to year-round usage by controlling snow and ice on ~~from~~ trails will receive 50 points. Those who do not will receive zero points.

3. Equity and Housing Performance (120 Points) – This criterion addresses the Council's role in advancing equity by examining the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. 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 map. Geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive the full points. In order to receive the maximum points, the response should address equitable distribution of benefits, mitigation of negative impacts, and community engagement for the populations selected. (30 Points)

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): ☐ (up to 100% of maximum score)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐ (up to 80% of maximum score)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (up to 60% of maximum score)
- Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color, or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly: ☐ (up to 40% of maximum score)

1. (0 to 3 points) A successful project is one that has actively engaged in low-income populations, people of color, children, persons with disabilities, and the elderly during the project's development with the intent to limit negative impacts on them and, at the same time, provide the most benefits. Describe how the project has encouraged or will engage the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Identify the communities to be engaged and where in the project development process engagement has occurred or will occur. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project; and surveys, study recommendations, or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If relevant, describe how NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities.

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

2. (0 to 7 points) Describe the project's benefits to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Benefits could relate to safety; public health; access to destinations; travel time; gap closure; leveraging of other beneficial projects and investments; and/or community cohesion. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

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

3. (-3 to 0 points) Describe any negative externalities created by the project along with measures that will be taken to mitigate them. Negative externalities can result in a reduction in points, but mitigation of externalities can offset reductions.

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

Below is a list of negative impacts. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

- Increased difficulty in street crossing caused by increased roadway width, increased traffic speed, wider turning radii, or other elements that negatively impact pedestrian access.
- Increased noise.
- Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
- Project elements that are detrimental to location-based air quality by increasing stop/start activity at intersections, creating vehicle idling areas, directing an increased number of vehicles to a particular point, etc.
- Increased speed and/or "cut-through" traffic.
- Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
- Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.
- Displacement of residents and businesses.
- Construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings. These tend to be temporary.
- Other

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

Each application will be scored on a 10-point scale as described below.

1. (3 points) The project(s) with the most impactful and meaningful community engagement will receive the full three points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
2. (7 points) The project(s) with the most positive benefits will receive the full seven points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
3. (-3 to 0 points) The scorer will reduce the score by one point (up to three total) for each negative externality. Note that the scorer can deduct points for negatives not acknowledged in the application; the scorer will document any negatives not acknowledged in the application and the reasons for any associated point reductions. The scorer can add one to three points for successful mitigation of negative project elements based on the degree to which they are mitigated. Note that this score cannot provide more points than are deducted.

Each score from the above 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography.

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 points. In this case, the highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 10 points and the top project had 20 points, this applicant would receive (10/20)*50 points or 25 points. Note also that it is possible to score negative points on this measure.

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the ~~2017~~ 2019 Housing Performance Score for the city or township in which the project is located. The score includes consideration of affordability and diversification, local initiatives to facilitate affordable workforce housing development or preservation, and density of residential development. If the project is in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on an average score of the jurisdictions.

RESPONSE:

- City/Township: _____ *(Cities and Townships entered by applicant)*
- Length of Segment within each City/Township: _____
- Housing Score: _____ *(online calculation)*

SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)

The applicant with the highest ~~2017~~ 2019 Housing Performance Score will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. Note: Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure.

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

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

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

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

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

A. *MEASURE:* Discuss how the project will close a gap and/or improve continuity or connections between jurisdictions. The applicant should include a description of gap improvements for the project. (100 Points)

***NOTE:* THIS MEASURE WILL SHOW TRACKED CHANGES FOLLOWING DISUCSSION AT THE JUNE 20 FUNDING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE MEETING**

RESPONSE (Check all that apply):

- **Closes a transportation network gap and/or provides a facility that crosses or circumvents a physical barrier** ☐ (0-90 Points)**:**
  Gap improvements can be on or off the RBTN and may include the following:
  - Providing a missing link between existing or improved segments of a regional (i.e., RBTN) or local transportation network;
  - Improving bikeability to better serve all ability and experience levels by:
    - Providing a safer, more protected on-street facility;
    - Improving crossings at busy intersections (signals, signage, pavement markings); OR
    - Improving a bike route or providing a trail parallel to a highway or arterial roadway along a lower-volume neighborhood collector or local street.

  Barrier crossing improvements (on or off the RBTN) can include crossings (over or under) of rivers or streams, railroad corridors, freeways, or multi-lane highways, or enhanced routes to circumvent the barrier by channeling bicyclists to existing safe crossings or grade separations. (For new barrier crossing projects, data about the nearest parallel crossing (as described above) must be included in the application to be considered for the full allotment of points under this criterion).

  Improves continuity and/or connections between jurisdictions (on or off the RBTN) (e.g., extending a specific bikeway facility treatment across jurisdictions to improve consistency and inherent bikeability): ☐ (10 Points)

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The applicant will receive up to 90 points if the response shows that the project closes a gap and/or crosses or circumvents a physical barrier and up to 10 points if it improves continuity and/or connections between jurisdictions. The project that most meets the intent of each the criteria will receive the maximum points (e.g., 90 points for the project that best overcomes a gap or barrier). Remaining projects will receive a portion of the maximum points based on the response. Projects that do not check the box or whose description does not fulfill the intent of the criteria, will receive 0 points.

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

B. *MEASURE:* Discuss how the project will correct existing deficiencies or address an identified safety or security problem on the facility. The applicant should also include any available project site-related safety data (e.g. crash data, number of conflict points to be eliminated by the project by type of conflict (bicyclist/pedestrian, bicyclist/vehicle, pedestrian/vehicle, and vehicle/vehicle)) to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem. Where available, use of local crash data for the project length is highly encouraged. Crashes involving bicyclists and pedestrians should be reported for 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. (150 Points)

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)

The applicant will receive the points shown below, based on the magnitude of the deficiencies or safety issues and the quality of the improvements, as addressed in the response. The scorer will first place each project into one of the two categories below based on whether 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 150 points. The other projects in this category will receive a proportional share between 76 and 150 points (i.e., a project that reduces one-half of the crashes of the top project would receive 125 points): 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/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 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. Multimodal Elements and Connections (100 Points) - This criterion measures how the project improves the travel experience, safety, and security for other modes of transportation, provides strong connections, and addresses the safe integration of these modes.

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

RESPONSE (400 words or less):

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

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

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

6. Risk Assessment (130 Points) - This criterion measures the number of risks associated with the project. High-risk applications increase the likelihood that projects will withdraw at a later date. If this happens, the region is forced to reallocate the federal funds in a short amount of time or return them to the US Department of Transportation. These risks are outlined in the checklist in the required Risk Assessment.

A. *MEASURE:* Applications involving construction must complete the Risk Assessment. This checklist includes activities completed to-date, as well as an assessment of risks (e.g., right-of-way acquisition, proximity to historic properties, etc.).

RESPONSE (Complete Risk Assessment):

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

1) Layout (30 Percent of Points)

Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries

100% ☐ Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)). **A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.**

50% ☐ Layout completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. **A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.**

0% ☐ Layout has not been started

Anticipated date or date of completion: _____

2) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (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 property impacted; determination of "no adverse effect" anticipated

40% ☐ Historic/archeological property impacted; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated

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

Project is located on an identified historic bridge: ☐

3) Right-of-Way (30 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired

50% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

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

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

Anticipated date or date of acquisition _____

4) **Railroad Involvement (20 Percent of Points)**

100% ☐ No railroad involvement on project or railroad Right-of-Way agreement is executed (**include signature page, if applicable**)

50% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

0% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun.

Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (130 Points)

The applicant with the most points on the Risk Assessment (more points equate to less project risk) will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 40 points and the top project had 70 points, this applicant would receive (40/70)*130 points or 74 points.

7. 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 6 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).

- Cost effectiveness = total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls)

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): _____ *(automatically calculated)*
- Enter amount of Noise Walls: _____
- Points Awarded in Previous Criteria: ____ (entered by Metropolitan Council staff)

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

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

The scorer for this measure will also complete a reasonableness check of the total project cost that is used for this measure. The scorer may follow up with the applicant to clarify any questions. Up to 50 percent of points awarded for this measure can be deducted if the scorer does not believe that the cost estimate is reasonable.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS

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

May 29, 2018

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**	**14%**
Measure A - Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	150	
2. Potential Usage	**150**	**14%**
Measure A - Existing population within 1/2 mile	150	
3. Equity and Housing Performance	**120**	**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	**300**	**27%**
Measure A - Barriers overcome or gaps filled	120	
Measure B - Deficiencies corrected or safety problems addressed	180	
5. Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections	**150**	**14%**
Measure A - Transit or bicycle elements of the project and connections	150	
6. Risk Assessment	**130**	**12%**
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	130	
7. Cost Effectiveness	**100**	**9%**
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost)	100	
Total	**1,100**	

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

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:_____

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

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 will be included in the analysis.

In the case of multiple project locations, the employment and post-secondary enrollments around each length or point will be added together.

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.

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

- Existing Population Within One-Half Mile: _____

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

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.

In the case of multiple project locations, population around each length or point will be added together.

3. Equity and Housing Performance (120 Points) – This criterion addresses the Council's role in advancing equity by examining the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. 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 map. Geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive the full points. In order to receive the maximum points, the response should address equitable distribution of benefits, mitigation of negative impacts, and community engagement for the populations selected. (30 Points)

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): ☐ (up to 100% of maximum score)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐ (up to 80% of maximum score)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (up to 60% of maximum score)
- Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color, or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly: ☐ (up to 40% of maximum score)

1. (0 to 3 points) A successful project is one that has actively engaged in low-income populations, people of color, children, persons with disabilities, and the elderly during the project's development with the intent to limit negative impacts on them and, at the same time, provide the most benefits. Describe how the project has encouraged or will engage the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Identify the communities to be engaged and where in the project development process engagement has occurred or will occur. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project; and surveys, study recommendations, or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If relevant, describe how NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities.

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

2. (0 to 7 points) Describe the project's benefits to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Benefits could relate to safety; public health; access to destinations; travel time; gap closure; leveraging of other beneficial projects and investments; and/or community cohesion. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

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

3. (-3 to 0 points) Describe any negative externalities created by the project along with measures that will be taken to mitigate them. Negative externalities can result in a reduction in points, but mitigation of externalities can offset reductions.

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

Below is a list of negative impacts. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

- Increased difficulty in street crossing caused by increased roadway width, increased traffic speed, wider turning radii, or other elements that negatively impact pedestrian access.
- Increased noise.
- Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
- Project elements that are detrimental to location-based air quality by increasing stop/start activity at intersections, creating vehicle idling areas, directing an increased number of vehicles to a particular point, etc.
- Increased speed and/or "cut-through" traffic.
- Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
- Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.
- Displacement of residents and businesses.
- Construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings. These tend to be temporary.
- Other

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

Each application will be scored on a 10-point scale as described below.

1. (3 points): The project(s) with the most impactful and meaningful community engagement will receive the full three points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
2. (7 points) The project(s) with the most positive benefits will receive the full seven points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
3. (-3 to 0 points) The scorer will reduce the score by one point (up to three total) for each negative externality. Note that the scorer can deduct points for negatives not acknowledged in the application; the scorer will document any negatives not acknowledged in the application and the reasons for any associated point reductions. The scorer can add one to three points for successful mitigation of negative project elements based on the degree to which they are mitigated. Note that this score cannot provide more points than are deducted.

Each score from the above 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography.

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 points. In this case, the highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 10 points and the top project had 20 points, this applicant would receive (10/20)*50 points or 25 points. Note also that it is possible to score negative points on this measure.

B. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the ~~2017~~ 2019 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 or population 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 :

- City/Township: _____
- Length of Segment within each City/Township: _____
- Housing Score: _____ *(online calculation)*

SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)

The applicant with the highest ~~2017~~ 2019 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.

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

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

A. *MEASURE:* Reference the "Project to RBTN Orientation" map generated at the beginning of the application process. Discuss how the project will overcome barriers (i.e., bridge or tunnel), fill gaps, or connect~~s~~ 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):

   Upload the "Project to RBTN Orientation" map.

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~~the latest available10-year period. 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 whether 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 101 and 180 points (i.e., a project that reduces one-half of the crashes of the top project would receive 150 points): 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

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

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.

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

6. Risk Assessment (130 Points) - This criterion measures the number of risks associated with the project. High-risk applications increase the likelihood that projects will withdraw at a later date. If this happens, the region is forced to reallocate the federal funds in a short amount of time or return them to the US Department of Transportation. These risks are outlined in the checklist in the required Risk Assessment.

A. *MEASURE:* Applications involving construction must complete the Risk Assessment. This checklist includes activities completed to-date, as well as an assessment of risks (e.g., right-of-way acquisition, proximity to historic properties, etc.).

RESPONSE (Complete Risk Assessment):

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

1) Layout (30 Percent of Points)

Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries

100% ☐ Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)). **A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.**

50% ☐ Layout completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. **A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.**

0% ☐ Layout has not been started

Anticipated date or date of completion: _____

2) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (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 property impacted; determination of "no adverse effect" anticipated

40% ☐ Historic/archeological property impacted; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated

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

Project is located on an identified historic bridge: ☐

3) Right-of-Way (30 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired

50% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

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

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

Anticipated date or date of acquisition _____

4) **Railroad Involvement (20 Percent of Points)**

100% ☐ No railroad involvement on project or railroad Right-of-Way agreement is executed (**include signature page, if applicable**)

50% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

0% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun.

Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement _____

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.

7. 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 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).

- Cost effectiveness = total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls)

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):_____ *(automatically calculated)*
- Enter amount of Noise Walls: _____
- Points Awarded in Previous Criteria: ____ (entered by Metropolitan Council staff)

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

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

The scorer for this measure will also complete a reasonableness check of the total project cost that is used for this measure. The scorer may follow up with the applicant to clarify any questions. Up to 50 percent of points awarded for this measure can be deducted if the scorer does not believe that the cost estimate is reasonable.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS

Safe Routes to School Infrastructure – Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

June 10, 2019

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**	**23%**
Measure A - Describe how project addresses 5 Es* of SRTS program	~~250~~150	
Measure B~~...~~ -Completion of Safe Routes to School Plan	100	
2. Potential Usage	**250**	**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**	**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**	**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	
6. Cost Effectiveness	**100**	**9%**
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (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 Es).

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.
- **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.
- **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.
- **Encouragement -** Using events and activities to promote walking and bicycling.
- **Evaluation -** Monitoring and documenting outcomes and trends through the collection of data before and after the project(s).

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (~~250~~ 200 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 Es 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~~ 30 Points
- Education: 0-~~50~~ 30 Points
- Enforcement: 0-~~50~~ 30 Points
- Encouragement: 0-~~50~~ 30 Points
- Evaluation: 0-~~50~~ 30 Points

The highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full ~~250~~ 150 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~~ 150 points or ~~125~~ 75 points.

B. *MEASURE:* Confirm that the applicant is working with a school(s) that has completed a Safe Routes to School Plan.

RESPONSE:

- All school(s) served by the project have a Safe Routes to School Plan (100 Points): _____
- At least one school involved in the project does not have a Safe Routes to School Plan, but at least one school involved in the project has a Safe Route to School Plan (50 Points):
- No school involved in the project has a Safe Route to School Plan (0 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:* Population of enrolled students~~Student population~~ within one mile of the elementary school, middle school, or high school served by the project. Enrollment data from the impacted school(s) must be used in this response.

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 Council's role in advancing equity by examining the project's positive and negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly along with outreach to those groups. 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 map. Geographic proximity alone is not sufficient to receive the full points. In order to receive the maximum points, the response should address equitable distribution of benefits, mitigation of negative impacts, and community engagement for the populations selected. (30 Points)

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): ☐ (up to 100% of maximum score)
- Project located in Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐ (up to 80% of maximum score)
- Project's census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐ (up to 60% of maximum score)
- Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color, or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly: ☐ (up to 40% of maximum score)

1. (0 to 3 points) A successful project is one that has actively engaged in low-income populations, people of color, children, persons with disabilities, and the elderly during the project's development with the intent to limit negative impacts on them and, at the same time, provide the most benefits. Describe how the project has encouraged or will engage the full cross-section of community in decision-making. Identify the communities to be engaged and where in the project development process engagement has occurred or will occur. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in the community engagement related to transportation projects; residents or users identifying potential positive and negative elements of the project; and surveys, study recommendations, or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If relevant, describe how NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities.

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

2. (0 to 7 points) Describe the project's benefits to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Benefits could relate to safety; public health; access to destinations; travel time; gap closure; leveraging of other beneficial projects and investments; and/or community cohesion. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

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

3. (-3 to 0 points) Describe any negative externalities created by the project along with measures that will be taken to mitigate them. Negative externalities can result in a reduction in points, but mitigation of externalities can offset reductions.

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

Below is a list of negative impacts. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

- Increased difficulty in street crossing caused by increased roadway width, increased traffic speed, wider turning radii, or other elements that negatively impact pedestrian access.
- Increased noise.
- Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
- Project elements that are detrimental to location-based air quality by increasing stop/start activity at intersections, creating vehicle idling areas, directing an increased number of vehicles to a particular point, etc.
- Increased speed and/or "cut-through" traffic.
- Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
- Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.
- Displacement of residents and businesses.
- Construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings. These tend to be temporary.
- Other

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

Each application will be scored on a 10-point scale as described below.

1. (3 points): The project(s) with the most impactful and meaningful community engagement will receive the full three points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
2. (7 points) The project(s) with the most positive benefits will receive the full seven points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.
3. (-3 to 0 points) The scorer will reduce the score by one point (up to three total) for each negative externality. Note that the scorer can deduct points for negatives not acknowledged in the application; the scorer will document any negatives not acknowledged in the application and the reasons for any associated point reductions. The scorer can add one to three points for successful mitigation of negative project elements based on the degree to which they are mitigated. Note that this score cannot provide more points than are deducted.

Each score from the above 10-point scale will then be adjusted to the appropriate geography.

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 points. In this case, the highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 10 points and the top project had 20 points, this applicant would receive (10/20)*50 points or 25 points. Note also that it is possible to score negative points on this measure.

~~B.~~C. *MEASURE:* Metropolitan Council staff will award points to the project based on the ~~2017~~ 2019 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 or population of the project in each jurisdiction.

RESPONSE (:

- City/Township: _____
- Length of Segment within each City/Township: _____
- Housing Score: _____ *(online calculation)*

SCORING GUIDANCE (70 Points)

The applicant with the highest ~~2017~~ 2019 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 "Project to RBTN Orientation" 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):

Upload the "Project to RBTN Orientation" map.

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 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~~the latest available10-year period. 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 points as demonstrated 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 whether or not 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 will 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 76 and 150 points (i.e., a project that reduces one-half of the crashes of the top project would receive 113 points): 76 to 150 Points
- For applicants that do not provide actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data. Note, the applicant must still demonstrate 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 75 points while other projects will receive a portion of the 75 points based on the quality of the project and response: 0 to 75 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):

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

1) Layout (30 Percent of Points)

Layout should include proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries

100% ☐ Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)). **A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.**

50% ☐ Layout completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. **A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.**

0% ☐ Layout has not been started

Anticipated date or date of completion: _____

2) Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (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 property impacted; determination of "no adverse effect" anticipated

40% ☐ Historic/archeological property impacted; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated

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

Project is located on an identified historic bridge: ☐

3) Right-of-Way (30 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired

50% ☐ Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

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

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

Anticipated date or date of acquisition _____

4) Railroad Involvement (20 Percent of Points)

100% ☐ No railroad involvement on project or railroad Right-of-Way agreement is executed (**include signature page, if applicable**)

50% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun

0% ☐ Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun.

Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement _____

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)*85 points or 49 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).

- Cost effectiveness = total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls)

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):_____ *(automatically calculated)*
- Enter amount of Noise Walls: _____
- Points Awarded in Previous Criteria: ____ (entered by Metropolitan Council staff)

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The applicant with the most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar 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 and the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, this applicant would receive (.00025/.0005)*X 100 points or 50 points.

The scorer for this measure will also complete a reasonableness check of the total project cost that is used for this measure. The scorer may follow up with the applicant to clarify any questions. Up to 50 percent of points awarded for this measure can be deducted if the scorer does not believe that the cost estimate is reasonable.

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS