# **Action Transmittal**

**Transportation Advisory Board** 



Committee Meeting Date: April 20, 2023

Date: April 13, 2023

. . . . . . . . . . . . . .

#### Action Transmittal: 2023-22

2024 Regional Solicitation: Weighting of Criteria and Measures

To: TAC Funding and Programming Committee

Prepared By: Steve Peterson, Senior Manager of Highway Planning and TAB/TAC Process (Steven.Peterson@metc.state.mn.us)

Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (Joseph.Barbeau@metc.state.mn.us)

#### **Requested Action**

Approve the weighting of criteria and measures for the 2024 Regional Solicitation as attached.

#### **Recommended Motion**

That the TAC Funding and Programming Committee recommend to the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) approval of the weighting of the criteria and measures for the 2024 Regional Solicitation.

#### **Background and Purpose**

Each criterion contains measures, the scores for which are determined by TAB following TAC recommendation. The specific draft criteria weighting and roadway, transit, travel demand management, and bicycle and pedestrian scoring measures are attached to this document. For 2024, technical and policy committee members requested additional emphasis be placed on safety.

#### **Relationship to Regional Policy**

TAB develops and issues a Regional Solicitation for federal funding.

#### **Staff Analysis**

Council staff evaluated the impact of adding 100 and 300 points to the safety-related criteria across all application categories. The 100-point option results in adding 6%-8% to the safety-related criteria and the 300-point option results in adding 15%-20% to the safety-related criteria. It should be noted that some application categories do not have a direct safety criterion. In these cases, 100 and 300 points have been added to criteria that represent safety. For example, in the Transit Expansion application category, points have been added to the Multimodal criterion as this represents investment in facilities that increase the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists accessing transit.

The bullets below describe how the safety criteria point increases would be distributed across specific scoring measure(s) within each application category.

- Traffic Management Technologies category: Points added 50% to Crashes Reduced measure and 50% to Safety Issues in Project Area measure.
- Roadway Spot Mobility and Safety, Strategic Capacity, and Reconstruction/Modernization categories: Points added 50% to Crashes Reduced measure and 50% Pedestrian Crash Reduction measure.
- Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities, Pedestrian Facilities and Safe Routes to School categories: Points added 50% to Barriers Overcome measure and 50% to Deficiencies Corrected measure.
- Bridges and Transit Expansion categories: All points added to the Multimodal Elements and Connections measures.
- Transit Modernization category: All points added to the Project Improvements for Transit Users measure.
- Travel Demand Management category: All points added to the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Reduction measure.

### **Committee Comments and Actions**

The Transit Planning Technical Work Group would prefer not to add points to any Transit application measure and TAC expressed agreement, along with comfort with having differing point totals across the application categories.

The Bridges and Travel Demand Management (TDM) categories do not have direct safety measures, but TAC members expressed comfort with including the above measures in the increase.

TAC members expressed preference towards using a 100-point increase, as opposed to 300 points. This is because the impact to measure weighting in the 300-point scenario is very large and something that impactful should be a part of the reevaluation process.

In Roadway Spot Mobility and Safety, Strategic Capacity, and Reconstruction/Modernization categories, TAC discussed changing the additional 100-point allocation from 50/50 crash reduction/pedestrian safety to proportionate to current values. This option should be discussed more at TAC Funding and Programming committee.

### Routing

То	Action Requested	Date Scheduled / Completed
TAC Funding & Programming Committee	Review & Recommend	April 20, 2023
Technical Advisory Committee	Review & Recommend	May 3, 2023
Transportation Advisory Board	Review & Adopt	May 17, 2023

#### **ATTACHMENT 1: DRAFT CRITERIA WEIGHTING - ADDING 100 POINTS**

Criteria	Traffic Mgmt. Tech.	Spot Mobility & Safety	Strategic Capacity	Roadway Recon / Mod	Roadway Bridges	Transit Exp	Transit Mod.	TDM	Multi-Use Trails & Bike Facility	Ped. Facility	Safe Routes to School
	Tech.	& Salety	Capacity	IVIOU	Diluges	стр	IVIOU.	TDIVI	Facility	Facility	10 301001
Role in the Regional System	<del>16<u>15</u>%</del>	10%*	<del>19<u>18</u>%</del>	<del>10<u>9</u>%</del>	<del>18<u>16</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<u>14<u>13</u>%</u>	
Usage	<del>11<u>10</u>%</del>		<del>16<u>15</u>%</del>	<del>16<u>15</u>%</del>	<del>12<u>11</u>%</del>	<del>32<u>29</u>%</del>	<del>30<u>27</u>%</del>	<mark>98</mark> %	<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>14<u>13</u>%</del>	<del>23<u>21</u>%</del>
Safety	<del>18<u>25</u>%</del>	<del>30<u>36</u>%</del>	<del>14<u>21</u>%</del>	<del>16<u>23</u>%</del>					<del>23</del> 29%	<mark>27<u>33</u>%</mark>	<del>23</del> 29%
Congestion /Air Quality	<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>25<u>23</u>%</del>	<del>14<u>13</u>%</del>	7%*		<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>5</del> <u>4</u> %	<del>27<u>33</u>%</del>			
Infrastructure Age	<del>7<u>6</u>%</del>		4 <u>3</u> %	<del>16<u>15</u>%</del>	<del>36<u>33</u>%</del>						
Equity and Housing Performance	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<mark>98</mark> %	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>16<u>15</u>%</del>	<del>14<u>13</u>%</del>	<del>11<u>10</u>%</del>	<del>11<u>10</u>%</del>	<del>11<u>10</u>%</del>
Multimodal Facilities	<del>5<u>4</u>%</del>	<mark>98</mark> %	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<del>10<u>9</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>		<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<del>14<u>13</u>%</del>	
Risk Assessment	<mark>76</mark> %	<mark>76</mark> %	<mark>7<u>6</u>%</mark>	<mark>76</mark> %	<mark>7<u>6</u>%</mark>	<mark>54</mark> %	<mark>54</mark> %	<mark>54</mark> %	<del>12<u>11</u>%</del>	<del>12<u>11</u>%</del>	<del>12<u>11</u>%</del>
Relationship Between SRTS Elements											<del>23<u>21</u>%</del>
Transit Improvements							<del>18<u>25</u>%</del>				
TDM Innovation								<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>			
Cost Effectiveness	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>9<u>8</u>%</mark>	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %
Total Points <del>1,100</del>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>

\*Some criteria show no change due to rounding to the nearest integer.

## ATTACHMENT 1A: ROADWAY MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Traffic Mgmt			Recon/Mod	Bridge
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	175	115	210	105	195
Distance to the nearest parallel bridge					100
Congestion, Adjacent Congestion, or PA Intersection Conversion Study Priorities		70	80		
Functional Classification of project	50				
Connection to Total Jobs, Manu/Dist. Jobs, and Post-Secondary Students			50	65	30
Integration within existing traffic management systems	50				
Highway Truck Corridor Tiers	50	45	80	40	65
Coordination with other agencies	25				
Usage	125		175	175	130
Current daily person throughput	85		110	110	100
Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume	40		65	65	30
Equity and Housing Performance	100	100	100	100	100
Engagements	30	30	30	30	30
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	40	40	40	40	40
Affordable Housing Access	30	30	30	30	30
Infrastructure Age/Condition	75		40	175	400
Date of construction			40	50	
Upgrades to obsolete equipment	75				
Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies				125	
Bridge Sufficiency Rating					300
Load-Posting					100
Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	200	275	150	80	
Vehicle delay reduced		200	100	50	
Congested roadway (V/C Ratio)	150				
Kg of emissions reduced		75	50	30	
Emissions and congestion benefits of project	50				
Safety	<del>200<u>300</u></del>	<del>335</del> 435	<del>150</del> 250	180 <u>280</u>	
Crashes reduced	<del>50<u>100</u></del>	<del>235</del> 285	<del>120</del> 170	<u>150200</u>	
Safety issues in project area	<del>150</del> 200				
Pedestrian Crash Reduction (Proactive)		<del>100</del> 150	<del>30</del> 80	<del>30</del> 80	
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	50	100	100	110	100 <u>200</u>
Transit, bicycle, pedestrian, elements and connections	50	100	100	110	<del>100</del> 200
Risk Assessment	75	75	75	75	75
Risk Assessment Form	75	75	75	75	75
Cost Effectiveness	100	100	100	100	100
Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost)	100	100	100	100	100
		1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100

# ATTACHMENT 1B: TRANSIT MEASURES

	Transit	Transit
Criteria and Measures	Expansion	Modernization
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	100	100
Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	50	50
Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project	50	50
Usage	350	325
Existing Riders		325
New Annual Riders	350	
Equity and Housing Performance	200	175
Engagements	60	50
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	80	75
Affordable Housing Access	60	50
Emissions Reduction	200	50
Total emissions reduced	200	50
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	<u>100200</u>	100
Bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project and connections	<u>100200</u>	100
Risk Assessment	50	50
Risk Assessment Form	50	50
Service and Customer Improvements		<del>200</del> 300
Project improvement for transit users		<del>200</del> 300
Cost Effectiveness	100	100
Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total annual project cost)	100	100
Total	1,100	1,100

## **ATTACHMENT 1C: TDM MEASURES**

Points
200
200
100
100
150
45
60
45
<del>300<u>400</u></del>
150
<del>150</del> 250
200
200
50
25
25
100
100
1,100

#### **ATTACHMENT 1D: BIKE / PEDESTRIAN MEASURES**

	Multiuse		
Criteria and Measures	Trails / Bike	Pedestrian	SRTS
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	200	150	
Identify location of project relative to Regional Bicycle Transportation Network	200		
Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions		150	
Potential Usage	200	150	250
Existing population and employment within 1 mile	200		
Existing population within ½ mile		150	
Average share of student population that bikes, walks, or uses transit			170
Student population within school's walkshed			80
Equity and Housing Performance	120	120	120
Engagements	36	36	36
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	48	48	48
Affordable Housing Access	36	36	36
Deficiencies and Safety	<del>250</del> 350	<del>300<u>400</u></del>	<del>250</del> 350
Barriers overcome or gaps filled	<del>100</del> 150	<del>120</del> 170	<del>100</del> 150
Deficiencies corrected or safety problem addressed	<del>150</del> 200	<del>180</del> 230	<u> 150200</u>
Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections	100	150	
Transit or pedestrian elements of the project and existing connections	100	150	
Risk Assessment/Public Engagement	130	130	130
Risk Assessment Form	130	130	85
Public Engagement			45
Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements			250
Describe how project addresses6 Es of SRTS Program			150
Completion of Safe Routes to School Plan			100
Cost Effectiveness	100	100	100
Measure A-Cost effectiveness (Total project cost/total points awarded)	100	100	100
Total	<del>1,100</del> 1,200	<del>1,100</del> 1,200	<del>1,100<u>1,200</u></del>

#### **ATTACHMENT 2: DRAFT CRITERIA WEIGHTING - ADDING 300 POINTS**

Criteria	Traffic Mgmt. Tech.	Spot Mobility & Safety	Strategic Capacity	Roadway Recon / Mod	Roadway Bridges	Transit Exp	Transit Mod.	TDM	Multi-Use Trails & Bike Facility	Ped. Facility	Safe Routes to School
Role in the Regional System	<del>16<u>13</u>%</del>	<u>108</u> %	<del>19</del> 15%	<del>10<u>8</u>%</del>	<u>1814</u> %	<u>97</u> %	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<u>1815</u> %	<u>1814</u> %	<u>1411</u> %	
Usage	<del>11<u>9</u>%</del>		<del>16<u>13</u>%</del>	<del>16<u>13</u>%</del>	<del>12<u>9</u>%</del>	<del>32<u>25</u>%</del>	<del>30<u>23</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>18<u>14</u>%</del>	<u>1411</u> %	<del>23<u>18</u>%</del>
Safety	<del>18<u>36</u>%</del>	<del>30<u>45</u>%</del>	<mark>14<u>32</u>%</mark>	<del>16<u>34</u>%</del>					<del>23<u>39</u>%</del>	<del>27<u>43</u>%</del>	<del>23<u>39</u>%</del>
Congestion /Air Quality	<del>18<u>14</u>%</del>	<del>25<u>20</u>%</del>	<u> 1411</u> %	<del>7<u>6</u>%</del>		<del>18<u>14</u>%</del>	<del>5</del> <u>4</u> %	<del>27<u>43</u>%</del>			
Infrastructure Age	<del>7<u>5</u>%</del>		4 <u>3</u> %	<del>16<u>13</u>%</del>	<del>36<u>29</u>%</del>						
Equity and Housing Performance	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>18<u>14</u>%</del>	<del>16<u>13</u>%</del>	<del>14<u>11</u>%</del>	<del>11<u>9</u>%</del>	<del>11<u>9</u>%</del>	<del>11<u>9</u>%</del>
Multimodal Facilities	<del>5<u>4</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>10<u>8</u>%</del>	<mark>9<u>29</u>%</mark>	<del>9<u>29</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>		<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<u> 14<u>11</u>%</u>	
Risk Assessment	<mark>76</mark> %	<mark>7<u>5</u>%</mark>	<del>7<u>5</u>%</del>	<mark>7<u>5</u>%</mark>	<mark>7<u>5</u>%</mark>	<del>5<u>4</u>%</del>	<mark>54</mark> %	<mark>54</mark> %	<del>12</del> 9%	<del>12</del> 9%	<del>12</del> 9%
Relationship Between SRTS Elements											<del>23<u>18</u>%</del>
Transit Improvements							<del>18<u>36</u>%</del>				
TDM Innovation								<del>18<u>14</u>%</del>			
Cost Effectiveness	<del>9</del> 7%	<mark>9</mark> 7%	<del>9</del> 7%	<mark>9</mark> 7%	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>9</del> 7%	<del>9</del> 7%	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>9</del> 7%	<del>9</del> 7%	<del>9</del> 7%
Total Points <del>1,100</del>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>

## ATTACHMENT 2A: ROADWAY MEASURES

	-				
Criteria and Measures	Traffic Mgmt	Spot Mob.			Bridge
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	175	115	210	105	195
Distance to the nearest parallel bridge		70			100
Congestion, Adjacent Congestion, or PA Intersection Conversion Study Priorities	50	70	80		
Functional Classification of project	50		50	65	20
Connection to Total Jobs, Manu/Dist. Jobs, and Post-Secondary Students	50		50	65	30
Integration within existing traffic management systems	50				
Highway Truck Corridor Tiers	50	45	80	40	65
Coordination with other agencies	25				
Usage	125		175	175	130
Current daily person throughput	85		110	110	100
Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume	40		65	65	30
Equity and Housing Performance	100	100	100	100	100
Engagements	30	30	30	30	30
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	40	40	40	40	40
Affordable Housing Access	30	30	30	30	30
Infrastructure Age/Condition	75		40	175	400
Date of construction			40	50	
Upgrades to obsolete equipment	75				
Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies				125	
Bridge Sufficiency Rating					300
Load-Posting					100
Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	200	275	150	80	
Vehicle delay reduced		200	100	50	
Congested roadway (V/C Ratio)	150				
Kg of emissions reduced		75	50	30	
Emissions and congestion benefits of project	50				
Safety	<del>200</del> 500	<del>335<u>635</u></del>	<del>150</del> 450	<del>180</del> 480	
Crashes reduced	<del>50</del> 200	<del>235</del> 335	<del>120</del> 270	<del>150</del> 300	
Safety issues in project area	<del>150</del> 300				
Pedestrian Crash Reduction (Proactive)		<del>100</del> 300	<del>30</del> 180	<del>30<u>180</u></del>	
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	50	100	100	110	<del>100</del> 400
Transit, bicycle, pedestrian, elements and connections	50	100	100	110	<del>100</del> 400
Risk Assessment	75	75	75	75	75
Risk Assessment Form	75	75	75	75	75
Cost Effectiveness	100	100	100	100	100
Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost)	100	100	100	100	100
Total	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100
	-,	_,	-,	_,	-,100

# ATTACHMENT 2B: TRANSIT MEASURES

	Transit	Transit
Criteria and Measures	Expansion	Modernization
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	100	100
Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	50	50
Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project	50	50
Usage	350	325
Existing Riders		325
New Annual Riders	350	
Equity and Housing Performance	200	175
Engagements	60	50
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	80	75
Affordable Housing Access	60	50
Emissions Reduction	200	50
Total emissions reduced	200	50
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	<del>100</del> 200	100
Bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project and connections	<del>100</del> 200	100
Risk Assessment	50	50
Risk Assessment Form	50	50
Service and Customer Improvements		<del>200<u>500</u></del>
Project improvement for transit users		<del>200</del> 500
Cost Effectiveness	100	100
Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total annual project cost)	100	100
Total	1,100	1,100

## **ATTACHMENT 2C: TDM MEASURES**

Points
200
200
100
100
150
45
60
45
<del>300<u>600</u></del>
150
<del>150</del> 450
200
200
50
25
25
100
100
1,100

#### **ATTACHMENT 2D: BIKE / PEDESTRIAN MEASURES**

	Multiuse		
Criteria and Measures	Trails / Bike	Pedestrian	SRTS
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	200	150	
Identify location of project relative to Regional Bicycle Transportation Network	200		
Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions		150	
Potential Usage	200	150	250
Existing population and employment within 1 mile	200		
Existing population within ½ mile		150	
Average share of student population that bikes, walks, or uses transit			170
Student population within school's walkshed			80
Equity and Housing Performance	120	120	120
Engagements	36	36	36
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	48	48	48
Affordable Housing Access	36	36	36
Deficiencies and Safety	<del>250</del> 550	<del>300<u>600</u></del>	<del>250</del> 550
Barriers overcome or gaps filled	<del>100</del> 250	<del>120</del> 270	<del>100</del> 250
Deficiencies corrected or safety problem addressed	<del>150</del> 300	<del>180</del> 330	<del>150</del> 300
Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections	100	150	
Transit or pedestrian elements of the project and existing connections	100	150	
Risk Assessment/Public Engagement	130	130	130
Risk Assessment Form	130	130	85
Public Engagement			45
Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements			250
Describe how project addresses6 Es of SRTS Program			150
Completion of Safe Routes to School Plan			100
Cost Effectiveness	100	100	100
Measure A-Cost effectiveness (Total project cost/total points awarded)	100	100	100
Total	<del>1,100</del> 1,200	<del>1,100</del> 1,200	<del>1,100</del> 1,200

#### **ATTACHMENT 1: DRAFT CRITERIA WEIGHTING - ADDING 100 POINTS**

Criteria	Traffic Mgmt.	Spot Mobility	Strategic	Roadway Recon / Mod	Roadway	Transit	Transit	TDM	Multi-Use Trails & Bike	Ped. Facility	Safe Routes to School
	Tech.	& Safety	Capacity	Ινίοα	Bridges	Ехр	Mod.	I DIVI	Facility	Facility	
Role in the Regional System	<del>16<u>15</u>%</del>	10%*	<del>19<u>18</u>%</del>	<del>10<u>9</u>%</del>	<del>18<u>16</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>14<u>13</u>%</del>	
Usage	<del>11<u>10</u>%</del>		<del>16<u>15</u>%</del>	<del>16<u>15</u>%</del>	<del>12<u>11</u>%</del>	<del>32<u>29</u>%</del>	<del>30<u>27</u>%</del>	<mark>98</mark> %	<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>14<u>13</u>%</del>	<del>23<u>21</u>%</del>
Safety	<del>18<u>25</u>%</del>	<del>30<u>36</u>%</del>	<del>14<u>21</u>%</del>	<del>16</del> 23%					<del>23<u>29</u>%</del>	<del>27<u>33</u>%</del>	<del>23</del> 29%
Congestion /Air Quality	<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>25<u>23</u>%</del>	<del>14<u>13</u>%</del>	7%*		<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>5</del> <u>4</u> %	<del>27<u>33</u>%</del>			
Infrastructure Age	7 <u>6</u> %		4 <u>3</u> %	<del>16<u>15</u>%</del>	<del>36<u>33</u>%</del>						
Equity and Housing Performance	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<mark>98</mark> %	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>16<u>15</u>%</del>	<del>14<u>13</u>%</del>	<del>11<u>10</u>%</del>	<del>11<u>10</u>%</del>	<del>11<u>10</u>%</del>
Multimodal Facilities	<del>5<u>4</u>%</del>	<mark>98</mark> %	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<del>10<u>9</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>17</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>		<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>	<del>14<u>13</u>%</del>	
Risk Assessment	<mark>76</mark> %	<mark>76</mark> %	<mark>7<u>6</u>%</mark>	<mark>7<u>6</u>%</mark>	<mark>7<u>6</u>%</mark>	<mark>54</mark> %	<mark>54</mark> %	<mark>54</mark> %	<del>12</del> 11%	<del>12<u>11</u>%</del>	<del>12<u>11</u>%</del>
Relationship Between SRTS Elements											<del>23<u>21</u>%</del>
Transit Improvements							<del>18<u>25</u>%</del>				
TDM Innovation								<del>18<u>17</u>%</del>			
Cost Effectiveness	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>9<u>8</u>%</mark>	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<mark>98</mark> %	<del>9<u>8</u>%</del>
Total Points <del>1,100</del>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>

\*Some criteria show no change due to rounding to the nearest integer.

## ATTACHMENT 1A: ROADWAY MEASURES

Criteria and Measures	Traffic Mgmt			Recon/Mod	Bridge
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	175	115	210	105	195
Distance to the nearest parallel bridge					100
Congestion, Adjacent Congestion, or PA Intersection Conversion Study Priorities		70	80		
Functional Classification of project	50				
Connection to Total Jobs, Manu/Dist. Jobs, and Post-Secondary Students			50	65	30
Integration within existing traffic management systems	50				
Highway Truck Corridor Tiers	50	45	80	40	65
Coordination with other agencies	25				
Usage	125		175	175	130
Current daily person throughput	85		110	110	100
Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume	40		65	65	30
Equity and Housing Performance	100	100	100	100	100
Engagements	30	30	30	30	30
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	40	40	40	40	40
Affordable Housing Access	30	30	30	30	30
Infrastructure Age/Condition	75		40	175	400
Date of construction			40	50	
Upgrades to obsolete equipment	75				
Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies				125	
Bridge Sufficiency Rating					300
Load-Posting					100
Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	200	275	150	80	
Vehicle delay reduced		200	100	50	
Congested roadway (V/C Ratio)	150				
Kg of emissions reduced		75	50	30	
Emissions and congestion benefits of project	50				
Safety	<del>200<u>300</u></del>	<del>335</del> 435	<u>150250</u>	180 <u>280</u>	
Crashes reduced	<del>50</del> 100	<del>235</del> 285	<u>120170</u>	<u>150200</u>	
Safety issues in project area	<del>150</del> 200				
Pedestrian Crash Reduction (Proactive)		<del>100</del> 150	<del>30<u>80</u></del>	<del>30</del> 80	
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	50	100	100	110	<del>100</del> 200
Transit, bicycle, pedestrian, elements and connections	50	100	100	110	100 <u>200</u>
Risk Assessment	75	75	75	75	75
Risk Assessment Form	75	75	75	75	75
Cost Effectiveness	100	100	100	100	100
Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost)	100	100	100	100	100

# ATTACHMENT 1B: TRANSIT MEASURES

	Transit	Transit
Criteria and Measures	Expansion	Modernization
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	100	100
Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions	50	50
Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project	50	50
Usage	350	325
Existing Riders		325
New Annual Riders	350	
Equity and Housing Performance	200	175
Engagements	60	50
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	80	75
Affordable Housing Access	60	50
Emissions Reduction	200	50
Total emissions reduced	200	50
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	<u> 100200</u>	100
Bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project and connections	<del>100</del> 200	100
Risk Assessment	50	50
Risk Assessment Form	50	50
Service and Customer Improvements		<del>200<u>300</u></del>
Project improvement for transit users		<del>200</del> 300
Cost Effectiveness	100	100
Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total annual project cost)	100	100
Total	1,100	1,100

## **ATTACHMENT 1C: TDM MEASURES**

Points
200
200
100
100
150
45
60
45
<del>300<u>400</u></del>
150
<del>150</del> 250
200
200
50
25
25
100
100
1,100

#### **ATTACHMENT 1D: BIKE / PEDESTRIAN MEASURES**

	Multiuse		
Criteria and Measures	Trails / Bike	Pedestrian	SRTS
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	200	150	
Identify location of project relative to Regional Bicycle Transportation Network	200		
Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions		150	
Potential Usage	200	150	250
Existing population and employment within 1 mile	200		
Existing population within ½ mile		150	
Average share of student population that bikes, walks, or uses transit			170
Student population within school's walkshed			80
Equity and Housing Performance	120	120	120
Engagements	36	36	36
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	48	48	48
Affordable Housing Access	36	36	36
Deficiencies and Safety	<del>250</del> 350	<del>300<u>400</u></del>	<del>250</del> 350
Barriers overcome or gaps filled	<del>100</del> 150	<del>120</del> 170	<del>100</del> 150
Deficiencies corrected or safety problem addressed	<del>150</del> 200	<del>180</del> 230	<u> 150200</u>
Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections	100	150	
Transit or pedestrian elements of the project and existing connections	100	150	
Risk Assessment/Public Engagement	130	130	130
Risk Assessment Form	130	130	85
Public Engagement			45
Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements			250
Describe how project addresses6 Es of SRTS Program			150
Completion of Safe Routes to School Plan			100
Cost Effectiveness	100	100	100
Measure A-Cost effectiveness (Total project cost/total points awarded)	100	100	100
Total	<del>1,100</del> 1,200	<del>1,100</del> 1,200	<del>1,100<u>1,200</u></del>

#### **ATTACHMENT 2: DRAFT CRITERIA WEIGHTING - ADDING 300 POINTS**

Criteria	Traffic Mgmt. Tech.	Spot Mobility & Safety	Strategic Capacity	Roadway Recon / Mod	Roadway Bridges	Transit Exp	Transit Mod.	TDM	Multi-Use Trails & Bike Facility	Ped. Facility	Safe Routes to School
Role in the Regional System	<del>16<u>13</u>%</del>	<u>108</u> %	<del>19</del> 15%	<del>10<u>8</u>%</del>	<u>1814</u> %	<u>97</u> %	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<u>1815</u> %	<u>1814</u> %	<u>1411</u> %	
Usage	<del>11<u>9</u>%</del>		<del>16<u>13</u>%</del>	<del>16<u>13</u>%</del>	<del>12<u>9</u>%</del>	<del>32<u>25</u>%</del>	<del>30<u>23</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>18<u>14</u>%</del>	<u>1411</u> %	<del>23<u>18</u>%</del>
Safety	<del>18<u>36</u>%</del>	<del>30<u>45</u>%</del>	<mark>14<u>32</u>%</mark>	<del>16<u>34</u>%</del>					<del>23<u>39</u>%</del>	<del>27<u>43</u>%</del>	<del>23<u>39</u>%</del>
Congestion /Air Quality	<del>18<u>14</u>%</del>	<del>25<u>20</u>%</del>	<u> 1411</u> %	<del>7<u>6</u>%</del>		<del>18<u>14</u>%</del>	<del>5</del> <u>4</u> %	<del>27<u>43</u>%</del>			
Infrastructure Age	<del>7<u>5</u>%</del>		4 <u>3</u> %	<del>16<u>13</u>%</del>	<del>36<u>29</u>%</del>						
Equity and Housing Performance	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>18<u>14</u>%</del>	<del>16<u>13</u>%</del>	<del>14<u>11</u>%</del>	<del>11<u>9</u>%</del>	<del>11<u>9</u>%</del>	<del>11<u>9</u>%</del>
Multimodal Facilities	<del>5<u>4</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>10<u>8</u>%</del>	<mark>9<u>29</u>%</mark>	<del>9<u>29</u>%</del>	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>		<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<u> 14<u>11</u>%</u>	
Risk Assessment	<mark>76</mark> %	<mark>7<u>5</u>%</mark>	<del>7<u>5</u>%</del>	<mark>7<u>5</u>%</mark>	<mark>7<u>5</u>%</mark>	<del>5<u>4</u>%</del>	<mark>54</mark> %	<mark>54</mark> %	<del>12</del> 9%	<del>12</del> 9%	<del>12</del> 9%
Relationship Between SRTS Elements											<del>23<u>18</u>%</del>
Transit Improvements							<del>18<u>36</u>%</del>				
TDM Innovation								<del>18<u>14</u>%</del>			
Cost Effectiveness	<del>9</del> 7%	<mark>9</mark> 7%	<del>9</del> 7%	<mark>9</mark> 7%	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>9</del> 7%	<del>9</del> 7%	<del>9<u>7</u>%</del>	<del>9</del> 7%	<del>9</del> 7%	<del>9</del> 7%
Total Points <del>1,100</del>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>	<u>1,400</u>

## ATTACHMENT 2A: ROADWAY MEASURES

	-				
Criteria and Measures	Traffic Mgmt	Spot Mob.			Bridge
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	175	115	210	105	195
Distance to the nearest parallel bridge		70			100
Congestion, Adjacent Congestion, or PA Intersection Conversion Study Priorities	50	70	80		
Functional Classification of project	50		50	65	20
Connection to Total Jobs, Manu/Dist. Jobs, and Post-Secondary Students	50		50	65	30
Integration within existing traffic management systems	50				
Highway Truck Corridor Tiers	50	45	80	40	65
Coordination with other agencies	25				
Usage	125		175	175	130
Current daily person throughput	85		110	110	100
Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume	40		65	65	30
Equity and Housing Performance	100	100	100	100	100
Engagements	30	30	30	30	30
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	40	40	40	40	40
Affordable Housing Access	30	30	30	30	30
Infrastructure Age/Condition	75		40	175	400
Date of construction			40	50	
Upgrades to obsolete equipment	75				
Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies				125	
Bridge Sufficiency Rating					300
Load-Posting					100
Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	200	275	150	80	
Vehicle delay reduced		200	100	50	
Congested roadway (V/C Ratio)	150				
Kg of emissions reduced		75	50	30	
Emissions and congestion benefits of project	50				
Safety	<del>200</del> 500	<del>335<u>6</u>35</del>	<del>150</del> 450	<del>180</del> 480	
Crashes reduced	<del>50</del> 200	<del>235</del> 335	<del>120</del> 270	<del>150</del> 300	
Safety issues in project area	<del>150</del> 300				
Pedestrian Crash Reduction (Proactive)		<del>100</del> 300	<del>30</del> 180	<del>30</del> 180	
Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections	50	100	100	110	<del>100</del> 400
Transit, bicycle, pedestrian, elements and connections	50	100	100	110	<del>100</del> 400
Risk Assessment	75	75	75	75	75
Risk Assessment Form	75	75	75	75	75
Cost Effectiveness	100	100	100	100	100
Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost)	100	100	100	100	100
Total	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100
1000	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100

# ATTACHMENT 2B: TRANSIT MEASURES

Expansion 100	Modernization 100
	100
FO	
50	50
50	50
350	325
	325
350	
200	175
60	50
80	75
60	50
200	50
200	50
<u>100200</u>	100
<del>100</del> 200	100
50	50
50	50
	<del>200</del> 500
	<del>200</del> 500
100	100
100	100
1,100	1,100
	350 350 200 60 80 60 200 200 100200 50 50 50

## **ATTACHMENT 2C: TDM MEASURES**

Criteria and Measures	Points
1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	200
Ability to capitalize on existing regional transportation facilities and resources	200
2. Usage	100
Users	100
3. Equity and Housing Performance	150
Engagements	45
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	60
Affordable Housing Access	45
4. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality	<del>300<u>600</u></del>
Congested roadways in project area	150
VMT reduced	<del>150</del> 450
5. Innovation	200
Project innovations and geographic expansion	200
6. Risk Assessment	50
Technical capacity of applicant's organization	25
Continuation of project after initial federal funds are expended	25
7. Cost Effectiveness	100
Cost effectiveness (total project cost/total points awarded)	100
Total	1,100
Total	1,100

#### **ATTACHMENT 2D: BIKE / PEDESTRIAN MEASURES**

	Multiuse		
Criteria and Measures	Trails / Bike	Pedestrian	SRTS
Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy	200	150	
Identify location of project relative to Regional Bicycle Transportation Network	200		
Connection to Jobs and Educational Institutions		150	
Potential Usage	200	150	250
Existing population and employment within 1 mile	200		
Existing population within ½ mile		150	
Average share of student population that bikes, walks, or uses transit			170
Student population within school's walkshed			80
Equity and Housing Performance	120	120	120
Engagements	36	36	36
Benefits and Impacts to Disadvantaged Populations	48	48	48
Affordable Housing Access	36	36	36
Deficiencies and Safety	<del>250</del> 550	<del>300<u>600</u></del>	<del>250</del> 550
Barriers overcome or gaps filled	<del>100</del> 250	<del>120</del> 270	<del>100</del> 250
Deficiencies corrected or safety problem addressed	<del>150</del> 300	<del>180</del> 330	<del>150</del> 300
Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections	100	150	
Transit or pedestrian elements of the project and existing connections	100	150	
Risk Assessment/Public Engagement	130	130	130
Risk Assessment Form	130	130	85
Public Engagement			45
Relationship between Safe Routes to School Program Elements			250
Describe how project addresses6 Es of SRTS Program			150
Completion of Safe Routes to School Plan			100
Cost Effectiveness	100	100	100
Measure A-Cost effectiveness (Total project cost/total points awarded)	100	100	100
Total	<del>1,100</del> 1,200	<del>1,100</del> 1,200	<del>1,100</del> 1,200