

Action Transmittal

Transportation Advisory Board



Meeting Date: August 18, 2022

Date: August 11, 2022

Action Transmittal: 2022-33

2022 Regional Solicitation Scoring Appeals and Approval of Final Scores

To: TAC Funding & Programming Committee

Prepared By: Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner, phone 651-602-1705

Requested Action

Applicants for five applications request changes to one scoring measure each. Additionally, Metropolitan Council staff requests approval of final Regional Solicitation scores following decisions on these appeals.

Recommended Motion

That TAC F&P approve the final Regional Solicitation scores with any changes from the scoring appeals.

Background and Purpose

Regional Solicitation applicants were given the opportunity to appeal their scores after the initial release of scores that occurred at the July 21, 2022, Funding & Programming Committee meeting. Appeals were due on Wednesday, August 3. Metropolitan Council staff consulted with scorers and chairs to generate recommendations for each appeal as shown in the accompanying attachment.

New material cannot be considered in the review of an appeal. Appeals are meant only to challenge scoring errors or misinterpretations of the scoring guidance. In the appeal process, the burden is on the applicant to illustrate that an error occurred in the scoring of their application. Deference should be given to the volunteer scorer and the scoring committee, particularly on qualitative scoring measures.

The Funding & Programming Committee, which makes the final decision on appeals, is not required to follow the scorer's recommendation.

Please note that any changes made to the scores may also affect the Cost Effectiveness formula, and therefore the project's overall score.

A summary of appeals and scorer recommendations is shown on the next page.

App #	Pages	Sponsor	Category	Measure	Max Score	Original Score	Scorer-Suggested Score (Change)
17654	3-5	Minneapolis	System Mgmt	1B (Truck Corridor)	50	0	25 (+25)
17576	6-8	Maple Grove	Recon / Mod	5B (Emissions)	30	0	10 (+10)
17563	9-10	Metro Transit	TDM	4B (VMT Reduced)	150	0	0
17506	11-14	Move Minnesota	TDM	4B (VMT Reduced)	150	0	0
17637	15-17	Carver County	StratCap	7A (Multimodal)	100	0	0

Routing

To	Action Requested	Date Completed
TAC Funding & Programming Committee	Approve	August 18, 2022



Roadway System Management

Application 17654: City of Minneapolis; City of Minneapolis ITS Upgrades and Enhancements

Request:

Applicant requested re-evaluation of Measure 1B: Regional Truck Corridor Study Tiers **(50 points)**

Measure:

This measure relies on the results of the Regional Truck Corridor Study, which prioritized all principal and minor arterials based on truck volume, truck percentage of total traffic, proximity to freight industry clusters, and proximity to regional freight terminals. The truck corridors were grouped into tiers 1, 2, and 3, in order of priority. [2021 Updated Regional Truck Corridors](#). Scoring is distributed as follows:

- The majority of the project funds will be invested on either a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor: 50 Points
- A majority of the project funds will NOT be invested on a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor, but at least 10 percent of the funds will be invested on these corridors: 25 Points
- No project funds will be invested on a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor: 0 Points

The application **scored zero points**. This score is based on the scorer's interpretation that less than 10% of the project is on a regional truck corridor, which is based on the citywide nature of the project. The project concept layout identified multiple corridors that are not on the tiered network, making it difficult to confirm that 10% threshold for the 25 points.

Applicant's Challenge:

The applicant states that the proposed project includes 0.8 miles on regional truck corridors, which is 19.3% of the 4.3-mile "Focus Corridor" and that this therefore should be worth 25 points. Additionally, while the project is more "citywide" (i.e., beyond the "Focus Corridor") it does touch other regional truck corridors.

Scoring Review:

In reviewing the application, the scorer noted that the appeal letter summarized information that had been reflected throughout the application (including replies to other scoring measures). This includes various descriptions of the work including Cedar Avenue generally, two general segments of Cedar Avenue, and specific sections of Cedar (listed in the equity section). The maps describe the 2 locations. The appeal provided all this information in the same place. The scorer recommends **increasing the score to 25 points**.

To: Elaine Koutsoukos – TAB Coordinator, Metropolitan Council
From: Ben Brassler, P.E., City of Minneapolis Public Works – Traffic & Parking Services
Date: July 29, 2022
Subject: Re-Evaluation Request: City of Minneapolis ITS Upgrades and Enhancements, 2022 Regional Solicitation Application

Dear Ms. Koutsoukos,

I would like to request the re-evaluation of the City of Minneapolis ITS Upgrades and Enhancements 2022 Regional Solicitation application, submitted by me on behalf of the City of Minneapolis in the Traffic Management Technologies category. Specifically, I would like the Committee to review the score assigned to the Minneapolis application in Measure 1B, which measures the proposed project’s relationship to the Regional Truck Corridors.

In the original submitted application, we checked the box labeled *“A majority of the project funds will NOT be invested on a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor, but at least 10 percent of the funds will be invested on these corridors.”* This selection would have resulted in 25 out of 50 points for Measure 1B; however, the preliminary scoring indicated that our application received 0 out of 50 points. We believe our original selection was accurate and our application should receive 25 points for this measure. The basis for this selection is the following:

Cedar Avenue Focus Corridor

Although the proposed project is expected to make improvements in a wide geographic area throughout the City of Minneapolis, the Cedar Avenue corridor was selected as the Focus Corridor for the highest priority installation of fiber optic communication infrastructure and associated ITS upgrades. The Focus Corridor contains two segments: Washington Ave/15th Ave to 24th Street, and Lake Street to W Lake Nokomis Parkway. This segmentation was selected to avoid overlap with Hennepin County’s proposed reconstruction of Cedar Avenue from 24th Street to Lake Street. The Focus Corridor was used to measure all quantitative application criteria, such as Usage and Equity/Affordable Housing.

Using this Focus Corridor to measure the portion of the project along Regional Truck Corridors, our proposed project contains 0.8 miles along Tier 2 and Tier 3 corridors – specifically 0.6 miles along Corridor 196 (Cedar Ave) and 0.2 miles along Corridor 146 (Minnehaha Ave). Please note that our original application miscalculated the total distance of truck corridors and entered 1.0 miles, rather than the correct value of 0.8 miles. Nevertheless, Regional Truck Corridors comprise approximately 19% of the 4.3-mile Focus Corridor, which is greater than the 10% required to receive 25 out of 50 points for this measure.

Other Project Improvements

If the scoring committee assigned a score of 0 out of 50 to our application because of the citywide nature of the project, I would also like to point out two additional Regional Truck corridors within the potential project. The Project Concept Layout, attached to the original application, identifies Broadway Street NE and Hennepin Avenue E as Potential Fiber Optic Expansion corridors. These two segments combine for an additional 5.1 miles of potential fiber optic communication installation along Tier 1 and Tier 2 truck corridors. It is the intent of the project to prioritize installation of fiber optic communications along the Focus Corridor and the additional Potential Fiber Optic Expansion corridors as allowed by the project budget.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and appeal the scores assigned to the City of Minneapolis ITS Upgrades and Enhancements Regional Solicitation application. Based on the above, we believe that our application should receive 25 out of 50 points for Measure 1B. Please feel free to reach out if any further clarification or discussion is needed.

Thank you for your consideration,

A handwritten signature in red ink, appearing to read "Ben Brasser", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ben Brasser, P.E.
Minneapolis Public Works – Traffic & Parking Services

cc: Nathan Koster

Roadway Reconstruction and Modernization

Application 17576: Maple Grove; Highway 169/County Road 130 Interchange Reconstruction

Request:

Applicant requested re-evaluation of Measure 5B: KG of Emissions Reduced (**30 points**)

Measure:

Total Peak Hour Emissions Reduced (Kilograms)= Total Peak Hour Emissions without the project
– Total Peak Hour Emissions with the Project

The application **scored zero points**.

Applicant's Challenge:

The applicant suggests the score of zero seems low given that the application reported a peak-hour emissions reduction of 2.76.

Scoring Review:

The scorer indicates that the emissions reduction reading of 2.76 KG per day was omitted from the report generated by the WebGrants program. Inserting the correct emissions reduction of 2.76 KG, would bring the score to 10, based on the revised formula awarding 15 points to the second-ranked project. Therefore, the scorer suggests that the score should be changed to **10 points**.



Hi Elaine,

The purpose of this email to respectfully request a score re-evaluation of our Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization Project (ID No. 17576 – City of Maple Grove: Highway 169/County Road 130 Interchange Reconstruction) – Criteria No. 5B – Air Quality (Peak Hour Emission Reduction).

A review of our draft score for Criteria 5B revealed that we were given a score of zero (0). However, this seems low when looking at our reported Total Peak Hour Emissions Reduction by the Project (2.76 kilograms), and comparing our emissions reduction to other similar projects. Our project (ID No. 17576) reported a peak hour emissions reduction of 2.76 kilograms. The City of Rogers project (ID No. 17580) reported a peak hour emissions reduction of 2.82 kilograms. The next closest project (Anoka County – ID No. 17519) reported a peak hour emissions reduction of 1.90 kilograms. Since our project’s reported emissions reduction falls between the emission reductions reported for these two projects, one would think that our score should have been between their scores of 10 and 7. However, for some reason, our recorded score was zero (0).

Even following the scoring guidance (*“The applicant with the most kilograms reduced by the project improvement will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full.”*) should have given us a score greater than zero (0). However, as shown in the calculations below, using the scoring guidance doesn’t seem to produce the scores given to the two projects will similar order of magnitude emissions reductions (The City of Rogers Project ID No. 17580 and Anoka County Project ID No. 17519). I’m guessing that this might be due to some adjustments made to the scoring guidance in order to account for outliers or improve the scoring spread. Below is my math:

Criteria 5B – Emission Reduction Calculation for Project ID No. 17576 – Highway 169 and County Road 130 Interchange Reconstruction:

Top project’s (Washington County – ID No. 17728) reported peak hour emission reduction = 23.4 kilograms

ID No. 17576 project’s reported peak hour emission reduction = 2.76 kilograms

Projects with similar reported peak hour emission reduction:

- The City of Rogers project (ID No. 17580) reported peak hour emissions reduction = 2.82 kilograms
- Anoka County project (ID No. 17519) reported peak hour emissions reduction = 1.90 kilograms.

Using Scoring Guidance (*“The applicant with the most kilograms reduced by the project improvement will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full.”*):

Top project’s (Washington County – **ID No. 17728**) project’s Emission Reduction score = **$23.4/23.4 = 1.0000 * 30 = 30$ points** (30 points were awarded – **Check**)

ID No. 17576 project’s Emission Reduction score = **$2.76/23.4 = 0.1179 * 30 = 3.54$ or approximately 4 points** (0 points were awarded – **Does not Check**)

Similar project’s Emission Reduction scores:

- The City of Rogers project (ID No. 17580) Emission Reduction score = $2.82/23.4 = 0.1205 * 30 = 3.62$ or approximately 4 points (10 points were awarded – **Does not Check**)
- Anoka County project (ID No. 17519) Emission Reduction score = $1.90/23.4 = 0.0812 * 30 = 2.44$ or approximately 2 points (7 points were awarded – **Does not Check**)

If my math (above) is correct, then our draft score for the Emission Reduction criteria should have definitely been more than the zero (0) points that were awarded. However, I am not able to actually calculate what our updated score should have been without knowing what possible adjustments were made to account for any outliers or improve the scoring spread.

While the potential increase in our Emissions Reduction score may not ultimately change the overall ranking of our project, we are asking for some clarification on why our project received no score for Criteria 5B, when other projects with similar emission reduction numbers received scores between 7 and 10 points.

Let me know if you have any questions regarding our request

Thanks for your time!

John

John Hagen, P.E., PTOE
Transportation Operations Engineer

Travel Demand Management

Application 17563: Metro Transit; Metro Transit Wayfinding Project

Request:

Applicant requested re-evaluation of Measure 4B: VMT Reduction (**150 points**)

Measure:

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

- $VMT\ reduced = \text{Number daily of one-way commute trips reduced} * 12.1$

The application **scored zero points**.

Applicant's Challenge:

Based on the large number of users identified in Measure 2: Users, the applicant expected more points to be awarded and suspected that not repeating the methodology was the rationale for not awarding points.

Scoring Review:

During the scoring committee meeting, members did not find the methodology resulting in 11,114 weekday riders to be sound or realistic. While the application scored points in Measure 2, these points were for other elements (support given for methodology and definition of target group) and not for average weekday users. Therefore, the scorer recommends **no change**.



RE: Regional Solicitation Application 17563 Scoring Appeal

I would appreciate the Committee's re-evaluation of the score given to Application 17563 (Metro Transit Wayfinding Project) in Section 4B: VMT reduction. The committee assigned a score of zero (0); I believe no points were awarded because no methodology was provided. However, the methodology used to estimate the average weekday users, which was then used to calculate VMT, was detailed in Section 2: Users. I did not understand it was necessary to reiterate the methodology for estimating average weekday users in Section 4B. The methodology stated in Section 2 and used to calculate VMT reduction in Section 4B is:

"The groups that directly benefit are residents who live or work close to the METRO Network; with express bus service to job concentration areas limited for the time being, those near a METRO line will be in the best position to use transit for commuting. However, their commute may require transfers they are not accustomed to navigating.

The exact impact of improved wayfinding is difficult to estimate. One case study from 2003 in Australia showed high quality navigation tools resulted in a 17 percent shift from SOV commuting (RTA, 2003). This shift also included an office relocation. Considering those caveats and the continued uncertainty of the pandemic, we estimate 10 percent of METRO and bus riders will move more efficiently between routes at transfer points as results of this project. The average weekday ridership on Green Line, Blue Line, BRT, and bus routes in 2020 was 111,139, making the estimated average weekday users 11,114."

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kelly Morrell, Transit Information Project Manager

Metro Transit

612-349-7563

Kelly.morrell@metrotransit.org

Travel Demand Management

Application 17506: Move Minnesota; 15 Minute Cities of Saint Paul

Request:

Applicant requested re-evaluation of Measure 4B: VMT Reduction **(150 points)**

Measure:

The applicant must show that the project will reduce CO, NO_x, CO₂e, PM_{2.5}, and/or VOC due to the reduction in VMT. Calculate and provide the number daily of one-way commute trips reduced and the average commute trip length to calculate VMT reduction. The emissions factors will be automatically applied to the VMT reduction to calculate the total reduced emissions. Applicants must describe their methodology for determining the number of daily one-way trips reduced.

- $VMT\ reduced = \text{Number daily of one-way commute trips reduced} * 12.1$

The application **scored zero points**.

Applicant's Challenge:

The applicant suggests that the score of zero is not appropriate as the application aims to decrease VMT by overcoming knowledge and comfort barriers to mode shift. The applicant also cites the application's VMT reduction estimation (4,800 average weekday users).

Scoring Review:

Similar to the above application, the scoring committee members did not find the methodology resulting in 4,800 weekday riders to be sound or realistic (specifically, the engagement of 5,200 people will not likely result in 4,800 users). Also, as with the above appeal, while the application scored points in Measure 2, the points were for other elements (support given for methodology and definition of target group) and not for average weekday users. Therefore, the scorer recommends **no change**.



August 3, 2022

Dear Elaine Koutsoukos,

I am writing to submit an appeal for the scoring for Move Minnesota's 15 Minute Cities of St. Paul Regional Solicitation application. We appreciated the opportunity to submit the application and we appreciate the excellence of all the applications submitted.

We believe that the score of "0" in section 4B ("VMT reduction") does not take into account the themes and facts within the application, including specific figures pertaining to VMT. We are submitting this appeal so that Move Minnesota's section 4B scoring can be revisited. Thank you for your time in ensuring a review of the application.

In the text below, the page numbers referred to in our citations refer to the PDF page numbers of Move Minnesota's 15 Minute Cities application, available on the Metropolitan Council's website at

<https://metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Planning-2/Transportation-Funding/Regional-Solicitation/Results-of-Solicitations/2022-Applications/Travel-Demand-Management/17506MoveMn15MinCityTDM.aspx>.

I. MOVE MINNESOTA'S PROPOSAL CONTAINS EXPLICIT GOALS TO REDUCE VMT

Move Minnesota's application weaves the theme—and goal—of VMT reduction throughout the application. For example, the stated goal of this project is to "increase walking rates [and] decrease car trips." (pg. 4). The project is exciting to us "because of the potential for long-term impact. By working to change behavior patterns during a time when there is a car shortage and prohibitively high prices, there is the potential for exponential reduction in SOV ["single occupancy vehicle"] trips when a person re-thinks their commute and their need to own a car." (pg. 30).

Specifically, "the central goal of the project is to encourage participants to increase walking trips to destinations that are within a 15-minute walk from their home. Because we know walking is essential to transit use, [the project] will concentrate ... efforts around existing and upcoming METRO lines in St. Paul." (pg.15).

- a. Move Minnesota's Proposal focuses on overcoming knowledge and comfort barriers to mode shift—AKA VMT reduction

Move Minnesota's proposal is based on education, and on asking community members to "take a pledge to walk" in their communities, consistent with the need to "spark a culture shift" to increase walking. (pg. 3; pg. 8 (quoting the St. Paul Pedestrian Plan)). The proposal outlines a process of "ideation sessions, introduction to the 15-minute city concept, [and] walking workshops" in advance of the challenge to "increase walking trips." (pg. 17).

b. Move Minnesota’s Proposal contains explicit goals to increase transit use and walking

Move Minnesota’s proposal specifically targets community locations where “use of transportation modes that depend on walkable connections, like transit,” are present and frequent. (pg. 3). The goal and intent here is that “intervention for pedestrians in these areas will shift pedestrians toward utilizing present and future transit.” (pg. 15).

Importantly, part of the goal of this project is to build a walking culture in advance of future transit lines (the B Line, G Line, and Gold Line) to bolster the ridership of those line when they open. (See pgs. 15-16). In short, the project aims to reduce VMT in the short term in order to more significantly reduce VMT in the long term.

c. Move Minnesota’s Proposal contains explicit goals to decrease single occupancy vehicle use

Move Minnesota’s goal in the project is “reducing VMT” and de-incentivizing SOV trips... [to] decrease emissions that cause asthma and other health complications.” (pg. 22).

II. MOVE MINNESOTA’S PROPOSAL INCLUDES AN ESTIMATE OF VMT REDUCTION

Move Minnesota estimated that the project would engage a total of 5,280 residents through in-person and virtual direct engagements. (pg. 17). The goal of the project is to engage these residents—who live in “communities [with] a mix of destinations that are within a 15 minute walk and...are...within a 15 minute walk of high frequency transit.” (pg. 25). There are more than 10 billion car trips per year that are under a mile, so the focus on neighborhood education and short trips has substantial potential to reduce automobile trips. (pg. 27).

Specifically, the project anticipates a 50% reduction in one-mile trips among project participants for a one-month pledge. (pg. 28). The calculated reduction during that pledge month alone is 81,600 vehicle miles traveled. (pg. 28). Based on Move Minnesota data from past engagements, including several regional solicitation projects and our work as the St. Paul TMO (see pg. 31), Move Minnesota anticipates a 3% long-term retention rate of this VMT reduction (i.e., we expect 3% of the pledgees to maintain their reduced-VMT lifestyle). (pg. 28). This would equal a long-term VMT reduction of 2,448 vehicle miles traveled per month into the future (.03 x 81,600), or 29,376 vehicle miles traveled per year into the future (2,448 monthly VMT reduction x 12 months).

In reviewing the calculations included on page 27, we recognize that there was an error in the calculation that was corrected (or not made) in the text explanation: in the calculation in Measure B: Emissions Reduction, the average commute trip length was left at the default 12.1 miles. The to-be-reduced trips articulated in this proposal are “one-mile trips.” (several mentions on the one-mile target on pg. 28). We were not intending to hide this fact: the entire premise of the proposal is to “increase walking rates [in] places where there are many places to walk,” specifically within “a 15 minute walk from [residents’] home[s].” (pg. 4; pg. 15. See also the title of the proposal; pg. 3, pg. 17, pg. 25; pg. 27; pg. 28; pg. 29.).

III. CONCLUSION

Move Minnesota's 15-Minute Cities proposal is centered on reducing VMT. "As the cost of owning a car is increasing, there is an opportunity to shift car trips toward sustainable options with intervention, education and incentive. Calculable reductions in SOV trips start with behavior changes." (pg. 29). "By working to change behavior patterns during a time when there is a car shortage and prohibitively high prices (1), there is the potential for exponential reduction in SOV trips when a person re-thinks their commute and their need to own a car." (pg. 30)

We are all at a unique point in history, and Move Minnesota believes this project description outlines ways that education and reconceiving the definition of a city and neighborhood provides an opportunity to reduce VMT in the short and long term.

Thank you for considering this appeal,



Sam Rockwell
Executive Director
Move Minnesota

Strategic Capacity

Application 17637: Carver County; Highway 5 Lake Minnewashta and Arboretum Access and Mobility Improvement

Request:

Applicant requested re-evaluation of Measure 7: Multimodal Elements and Connections (**100 points**)

Measure:

- Describe how the project positively affects the multimodal system.
- Discuss any bicycle, pedestrian, or transit 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. 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 (e.g., a bicycle system plan that locates bikeway facilities on a lower-volume parallel route).
- Describe how the proposed multimodal improvements positively affect identified alignments in the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) or along a regional trail, if applicable.
- Describe how the proposed multimodal improvements either provide a new, or improve an existing Major River Bicycle Barrier Crossing (MRBBC) as defined in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) or how they provide a new or improved crossing of a Regional Bicycle Barrier with respect to the tiered Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas as defined in the TPP and Technical Addendum to the Regional Bicycle Barriers Study (May 2019), if applicable.
- Discuss the existing bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections and how the project enhances these connections.
- Discuss whether the project implements specific locations identified as being deficient in a completed ADA Transition Plan.

The application **scored zero points**. The application received zero points for this measure because the trail is not part of the project, and no bicycle or pedestrian facilities are being constructed with the project.

Applicant's Challenge:

Following receipt of the scorer's scoring rubric, the applicant suggests that the following points are deserved for the application:

1. Multimodal elements included and improve travel experience, safety, security: Applicant suggests **15 points** (20 max) based on the application's identification of a separated trail on one side.
2. Alignment with RBTN or regional trails: Applicant suggests **20 points** (20 max) based on the project's location on an RBTN Tier 1 alignment.
3. Major River Bicycle Barrier Crossing: N/A
4. Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas: Applicant suggests **15 points** (20 max), stating the project improves a Tier 2 Bicycle Barrier Crossing
5. Enhancement to existing bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections: Applicant suggests **15 points** (20 max), stating that the project improves 2 of the three modes mentioned.
6. ADA Transition Plan: N/A.

Scoring Review:

The scorer reviewed the application following receipt of the appeal and because no multimodal improvements are included (nor are any connections being enhanced), believes the score should remain at zero and suggests **no change**.



**Carver County
Public Works**

11360 Highway 212, Suite 1
Cologne, MN 55322

August 3, 2022

Elaine Koutsoukos
TAB Coordinator
Metropolitan Council Transportation Advisory Board
390 Robert St. N
St. Paul, MN 55101

SUBJECT: CARVER COUNTY REQUEST FOR SCORE RE-EVALUATION OF MEASURE 7: MULTIMODAL FOR HIGHWAY 5 LAKE MINNEWASHTA AND ARBORETUM ACCESS AND MOBILITY IMPROVEMENT

Dear Ms. Koutsoukos,

Carver County respectfully requests a score re-evaluation for Application #17637, Highway 5 Lake Minnewashta and Arboretum Access and Mobility Improvement, Measure 7: Multimodal.

The scorer incorrectly notes that there are no bicycle or pedestrian components in this project. The initial scoring recommendation for this measure is 0/100 points; however, the application specifically lists and identifies multimodal benefits from the project.

Metropolitan Council staff provided the scoring rubric used to score this measure, and the project meets several of the key components that were used to allocate points. The scoring rubric and associated points for each component are listed. The request is for the eligible points to be assigned to the project similar to how other projects in this category were scored.

1. *Multimodal elements included and improve travel experience, safety, security.*
 - a. *Separated bike facility 2 side = 20 points*
 - b. *Separated bike facility 1 side = 15 points*
 - c. *Dedicated bike lanes = 10 points*
 - d. *Bikeable shoulder = 5 points*
 - i. **The application text specifically identifies a separated trail on one side of the project. Respectfully request addition of 15 points.**
2. *Alignment with RBTN or regional trails*
 - a. *RBTN Tier 1 = 20 points*
 - b. *RBTN Tier 2 = 15 points*
 - c. *Regional Trail = 10 points*
 - i. **This project is part of the RBTN Tier 1, which is specifically noted in the application text. Respectfully request addition of 20 points.**
3. *Major River Bicycle Barrier Crossing*
 - a. *Included = 20 points*
 - i. This Bicycle Barrier Crossing type is not located on this project.
4. *Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas*
 - a. *Tier 1 = 20 points*
 - b. *Tier 2 = 15 points*
 - c. *Tier 3 = 10 points*
 - d. *Crosses a barrier but not specifically identified = 5 points*

CARVER COUNTY

- i. This project improves a Tier 2 Bicycle Barrier Crossing, which is noted in the application response. Respectfully request addition of 15 points.**
- 5. *Enhancement to existing bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections*
 - a. *Walking, biking, transit improved = 20 points*
 - b. *2 of 3 improved = 15 points*
 - c. *1 of 3 improved = 10 points*
 - i. This project improves 2 out of 3 modes, which is specifically identified in the application text. Respectfully request addition of 15 points.**
- 6. *Project implements specific locations identified as being deficient in a completed ADA Transition Plan*
 - a. *ADA Transition Plan = 10 points*
 - b. *Mentions ADA = 5 points*
 - i. The narrative did not mention ADA improvements due to character limit. We understand that no additional information can be added for this score re-evaluation and do not have a request related to this component.

For context and relevance to how other projects were scored on this measure, please consider the Carver County application for Highway 5 Victoria Mobility and Safety Improvement (#17638), which is located less than a mile west of the subject project application and was proposed with the same typical highway section (existing trail on one side). This application is also in the Strategic Capacity category and was given a score of 93/100 points for Measure 7: Multimodal. These projects are very similar in their proposed multimodal components, benefits, and location, yet one received 0/100 and the other 93/100. This further confirms the finding that this is a scoring error that needs to be corrected and scored using the same methodology as other projects.

We understand and appreciate the monumental task of scoring the Regional Solicitation applications and commend the transportation professionals that take time to carefully score the applications. Furthermore, the scoring rubric for the Multimodal measure is helpful in creating a fair analysis of project attributes and benefits. We request that Metropolitan Council staff and committees thoughtfully consider this re-evaluation item and recommend a raw Multimodal score for this project of **65 points** (*score to be adjusted to the top score*), consistent with the project components described in the application and the scoring rubric for this measure.

Sincerely,



Lyndon Robjent, P.E.
Public Works Division Director/County Engineer

CC: Commissioner Tom Workman, Carver County, Transportation Advisory Board Member
Commissioner Matt Udermann, Carver County, Transportation Advisory Board Alternate
Darin Mielke, P.E., Carver County, Assistant Public Works Director, Deputy County Engineer
Angie Stenson, AICP, Carver County, Senior Transportation Planner
Joe Barbeau, Metropolitan Council, Senior Planner