Regional Solicitation Policy Work Group Meeting Notes – May 21, 2021

Attendees:

James Hovland; Kevin Reich; Peter Dugan; Christopher Geisler; Deb Barber; Mathews Hollinshead; Frank Boyles; Mary Giuliani Stephens; Jon Ulrich; Trista MatasCastillo; Stan Karwoski

Staff Attendees:

Cole Hiniker; Jenna Ernst; Jon Solberg; Nick Thompson; Amy Vennewitz; Steve Peterson; Emily Jorgenson; Michael Thompson; Joe Barbeau; Elaine Koutsoukos

Notes:

1. Welcome, Meeting Overview, and Meeting #2 Recap

Cole Hiniker went over the results from the previous meeting, including themes from the guest speakers and the Mentimeter exercise results. There were general comments that the results matched the discussion from the previous meeting.

There was some discussion about the difference between scalability and regional significance and that both are important factors to evaluate.

2. Unique Project Evaluation Framework Confirmation

Cole Hiniker presented a concept for unique project evaluation with proposed criteria.

It was suggested there should be a cost-effectiveness element to the evaluation framework. It was noted by staff that the existing methodology in the rest of the regional solicitation would be difficult to translate to Unique Projects because of the expected qualitative nature of the scoring.

There were questions about how significance and scalability can be defined. It was suggested that scalability relates to the ability to expand whereas significance relates to the how broad the impact will be.

Members generally thought that the multimodal communities criteria captures the intent well.

A member commented on the TAB presentation from Tawanna Black and that connectivity and access need to be included in some of the criteria.

A question was asked about where “senior” would come in, since the demographics of the region are changing and aging. Another comment mentioned the disabled community and how mobility is an equity issue.

A comment was made about noise and light being an environmental consideration as well.

A comment discussed how innovation is important and that cost-effectiveness may not be as important here if innovation is a true goal.
3. Application Process Concept and Discussion

Cole Hiniker presented a proposal for a two-step application process and proposed several questions for the group to consider.

Members were supportive of an ongoing role for the group into the evaluation phase, particularly for this first time evaluating Unique Projects. It was generally agreed that this group would be better prepared than the full TAB.

There were questions about the timing of the application process and the public comment process, whether this would be discouraging to applicants with some uncertainty during the initial phase. Some slight schedule tweaks were discussed for the initial application deadlines.

A member asked about those who go through the Unique Projects process only to find that the project is not actually unique, and they need a different category. Hiniker said the evaluation of eligibility for federal dollars is the first consideration and the first step would allow for time for the application to consider other application categories.

4. Evaluation Metrics and Technical Committee Role Discussion

Cole Hiniker presented some background for a discussion on metrics and went through an exercise for the six evaluation criteria. There were questions about whether congestion is truly a measure of environmental impact. A member noted that it means cars spending less time sitting in traffic creating pollution. A point was made that congestion generally has not been reduced in the long-run when investments in congestion are made, so it is not directly tied to environmental impacts, particularly the long-term land use impacts.

Below are the results of the exercises:

How would you measure or evaluate "Reduce Environmental Impacts of Transportation"?
How would you measure or evaluate "Improve Racial Equity"?

- access
- connectivity
- average mean income
- listening to bipoc
- rcap outreach
- increase engagement
- economics
- compensatory scoring
- survey
- access to service
- diversity in the work pla
- prioritizing investments
- common positive impact
- higher quality service
- areas of poverty
- not sure
- jobs housing and transport
- access to good jobs
- cost effective for user
- diverse team
- access to jobs
- rcap projects

How would you measure or evaluate "Support Multimodal Communities"?

- collaboration
- complementary service
- pedestrian safety
- number of multimode trips
- data
- integrating modes
- access to jobs
- efficiency
- ease of switching modes
- access to system
How would you measure or evaluate "Innovation"?

collaboration
new to region
change in behavior
connects to community
outside of box new idea
new technology
not tried before
outside kickstart funding
future forward thinking
new and emerging tech
technology jump
new energy source
system efficiency
system improvement
outcomes
emerging technology
ideas made bigger
creativity

How would you measure or evaluate "Regional Significance/ Scalability"?

bang for the buck
software tools
urban and suburban
multiple communities
replicable
connectedness
works in all counties
complements other efforts
serves urban and suburban
results
buy-in bipartisan support
local and regional impact
collaboration
clear plan to expand
breadth of benefit
metrics
can be replicated
interest
modeling
outcomes
How would you measure or evaluate "Partnerships/Collaboration"?