Introduction: Regional Solicitation for Transportation Projects

January 22, 2020

The Regional Solicitation is a competitive process to award federal transportation funding to projects that meet regional transportation needs. The solicitation is part of the Metropolitan Council’s federally required continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning process for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. The funding program and related rules and requirements are established by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) and administered locally through collaboration with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT).

The online application can be accessed at: <https://metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Planning-2/Transportation-Funding/Regional-Solicitation.aspx>

# Federal Program Overview

As authorized by the most recent federal surface transportation funding act, Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, projects will be selected for funding as part of two federal programs: Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program. The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) was folded into STBGP in the FAST Act. It is assumed that federal funding will continue to be available in 2024 and 2025, but there is no money set aside at the current time with current federal legislation.

# Connection to the Regional Policy

The Regional Solicitation process and criteria were overhauled in 2014 to reflect new federal guidance and regional goals. These regional goals were defined through Thrive MSP 2040, the regional development framework for the metropolitan area. The region’s long-range transportation plan, the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan (TPP), was developed to meet federal requirements but also reflect and help implement the regional goals established in Thrive. It is useful to understand the intent behind both Thrive and the TPP to ensure that all projects funded through the Regional Solicitation meet these shared goals. These funds are intended to implement the region’s transportation plan and to address local problems identified in required comprehensive plans.

While there are national goals for the region’s transportation system, including the implementation of a performance-based planning approach to investments, federal legislation requires metropolitan areas to set their own goals. Projects funded through the Regional Solicitation do not need to be specifically named in the TPP because they must prove consistency with regional goals and policies to pass the qualifying review step of the Regional Solicitation process. In addition, the goals of the TPP are strongly reflected in the prioritizing criteria used to select projects shown in the following table.

Table 1: Regional Solicitation Connection to Regional Policy

| Prioritizing Criteria | Thrive Outcomes | TPP Goals |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy | * Prosperity * Livability | * Access to Destinations * Competitive Economy |
| Usage | * Livability * Prosperity | * Access to Destinations * Competitive Economy |
| Equity and Housing Performance | * Equity * Livability | * Access to Destinations * Leveraging Transportation Investments to Guide Land Use |
| Infrastructure Age | * Stewardship * Sustainability | * Transportation System Stewardship |
| Congestion Reduction/Air Quality | * Prosperity * Livability | * Healthy Environment * Competitive Economy |
| Safety | * Livability * Sustainability | * Safety and Security |
| Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections | * Prosperity * Equity * Livability * Sustainability | * Access to Destinations * Transportation and Land Use * Competitive Economy |
| Risk Assessment | * Stewardship | * Transportation System Stewardship |
| Risk Assessment | * Stewardship | * Transportation System Stewardship |


# Modal Categories and Application Categories

As depicted in on the following page, the applications are grouped into three primary modal categories:

1. Roadways Including Multimodal Elements
2. Transit and Travel Demand Management (TDM) Projects
3. Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Each of these modal categories includes three to five application categories for a total of 11 categories. Applicants for the Regional Solicitation will select the appropriate application category for their proposed project based on the mode requiring the largest percentage of cost. For instance, a roadway reconstruction project that includes a new sidewalk would apply under the Roadway Reconstruction/ Modernization application category because the roadway improvements are the largest cost for the project. If an applicant submits a project in the incorrect application category, the application may be disqualified. It is advised that applicants contact Metropolitan Council staff prior to submission if there are any questions about which application category is the most appropriate for their project.

Figure 1: TAB-Approved Application Categories



# Funding Availability, Minimums, and Maximums

A total of approximately $180 million in federal funds is anticipated to be available in this solicitation for program years 2024 and 2025. As shown in Table 2, modal funding ranges have been established by TAB, based on historic levels, to give applicants an understanding of the general funding levels available by mode. TAB reserves the right to adjust these modal funding levels depending on the amount and quality of projects submitted. In addition, TAB approved a target to allocate approximately $10 million to the Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement category, as part of the Roadways Including Multimodal Elements category. Base-level 2024 and 2025 TDM funding for the TMOs and Metro Transit will be taken out of the Transit and TDM category for the next solicitation. Additionally, there is $1.2 million of TDM funding that is available for 2022 and 2023 for innovative projects from the previous solicitation.

Table 2: Modal Funding Levels\*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Roadways Including Multimodal Elements | Transit and TDM | Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities | Total |
| Modal Funding Levels | Range of 46%-65%  Range of $83M-$117M Midpoint $100M | Range of 25%-35%  Range of $45M-$63M Midpoint $54M | Range of 9%-20% Range of $16M-$36M Midpoint $26M | 100% $180M (Est)\* |

\* 2.5% ($4M-$5M) will be set aside for unique projects out of the total funds available, leaving the remaining funds to be distributed to the above modes within the percentage ranges shown. Amounts shown assume that some level of over programming will occur, but TAB will determine the exact amount as part of project selection.

Within Roadways Including Multimodal Elements, at least one project will be funded from each of the five eligible functional classifications: A-minor arterial augmenters, connectors, expanders, and relievers, as well as non-freeway principal arterials.

Within the Transit modal category, there is a new Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Project category. There is also a New Market guarantee to ensure that at least one Transit Expansion or Modernization project is funded that serves areas outside of Transit Market Area 1 and 2 from the Transportation Policy Plan for at least one end of the project. The combined maximum funding amount for bus rapid transit projects funded in the Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Project, Transit Expansion, and Transit Modernization categories will be $32,000,000.

For the first time, 2.5% of the total available funds available will be set-aside for Unique Projects, including the Travel Behavior Inventory/Regional Travel Model. These 2024 and 2025 funds will be allocated as part of the 2022 Regional Solicitation, closer to project implementation. TAB will first approve a funding level for the Travel Behavior Inventory/Regional Travel Model and then the remaining funds will be considered for any submitted Unique Projects. TAB may elect to fund Unique Projects at an amount lower than 2.5% (approximately $4.5 million), depending on the amount and quality of the submittals. Details on project selection and eligibility will be worked out prior to the 2022 funding cycle.

Table 3 shows the minimum and maximum federal award for application categories that applicants can apply for as part of the Regional Solicitation. The values do not account for 20 percent local match minimum that applicants must contribute to the project.

Table 3: Regional Solicitation Funding Award Minimums and Maximums

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Modal Application Categories | Minimum Federal Award | Maximum Federal Award |
| Roadways Including Multimodal Elements |  |  |
| * Traffic Management Technologies (Roadway System Management) | $250,000 | $3,500,000 |
| * Spot Mobility and Safety | $1,000,000 | $3,500,000 |
| * Strategic Capacity (Roadway Expansion) | $1,000,000 | $10,000,000 |
| * Roadway Reconstruction/ Modernization | $1,000,000 | $7,000,000 |
| * Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement | $1,000,000 | $7,000,000 |
| Transit and TDM Projects |  |  |
| * Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Project | N/A | $25,000,000 |
| * Transit Expansion | $500,000 | $7,000,000 |
| * Transit Modernization | $500,000 | $7,000,000 |
| * Travel Demand Management (TDM) | $100,000 | $500,000 |
| Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities |  |  |
| * Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities | $250,000 | $5,500,000 |
| * Pedestrian Facilities | $250,000 | $1,000,000 |
| * Safe Routes to School (Infrastructure Projects) | $250,000 | $1,000,000 |

The following pages include definitions, examples, and scoring overviews of each of the application categories.

# Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

## Traffic Management Technologies

**Definition:** An intelligent transportation system (ITS) or similar projects that primarily benefit roadway users. Roadway System Management projects can include project elements along a continuous route (could be more than one roadway) or defined geographic area such as a downtown area. The system management project must make improvements to at least one A-minor arterial or non-freeway principal arterial as part of the project. Projects that are more transit-focused must apply in the Transit Modernization application category.

### Examples of Traffic Management Technologies Projects:

* Flashing yellow arrow traffic signals
* Traffic signal retiming projects
* Integrated corridor signal coordination
* Traffic signal control system upgrades
* New/replacement detectors
* Passive detectors for bicyclists and pedestrians
* New or replacement traffic management centers
* Other emerging ITS technologies
* New or replacement traffic communication
* New or replacement closed-circuit television (CCTV) cameras
* New or replacement variable message signs and other traveler information improvements
* New or replacement detectors
* Incident management coordination
* Vehicle-to-infrastructure technology

### Scoring:

| Criteria and Measures | Points | % of Total Points |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy | **175** | **16%** |
| Measure A - Functional classification of project | 50 |  |
| Measure B - Regional Truck Corridor Study Tiers | 50 |  |
| Measure C - Integration within existing traffic management systems | 50 |  |
| Measure D - Coordination with other agencies | 25 |  |
| 1. Usage | **125** | **11%** |
| Measure A - Current daily person throughput | 85 |  |
| Measure B - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume | 40 |  |
| 1. Equity and Housing Performance | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A - Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations | 50 |  |
| Measure B - Housing Performance Score/ affordable housing connection | 50 |  |
| 1. Infrastructure Age | **75** | **7%** |
| Measure A – Date of construction | 75 |  |
| 1. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality | **200** | **18%** |
| Measure A - Vehicle delay reduced | 150 |  |
| Measure B - Kg of emissions reduced | 50 |  |
| 1. Safety | **200** | **18%** |
| Measure A - Crashes reduced | 50 |  |
| Measure B – Safety issues in project area | 150 |  |
| 1. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections | **50** | **5%** |
| Measure A - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections | 50 |  |
| 1. Risk Assessment | **75** | **7%** |
| Measure A - Risk Assessment Form | 75 |  |
| 1. Cost Effectiveness | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost) | 100 |  |
| Total | **1,100** |  |

## Spot Mobility and Safety

**Definition:** An at-grade intersection or corridor-level intersection improvement project that focuses on mobility and safety (described as a Regional Mobility project under Spot Mobility in the TPP). New interchanges or projects that add new thru lane capacity (e.g., two-lane to four-lane expansions) should apply in the Strategic Capacity application category. Projects that address mobility and safety at multiple intersections on a corridor are encouraged. However, projects that propose to reconstruct the roadway for the length of the corridor should apply in the Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization application category.

### Examples of Spot Mobility and Safety Projects:

* New or extended turn lanes at one or more intersections
* New intersection controls such as roundabouts or traffic signals
* Unsignalized or signalized reduced conflict intersections
* Other innovative/alternative intersection designs such as green t-intersections

### Scoring:

| Criteria and Measures | Points | % of Total Points |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy | **175** | **16%** |
| Measure A - Congestion within the Project Area, Level of Adjacent Congestion, Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study Priorities, or Congestion Management Safety Plan Opportunity Areas | 100 |  |
| Measure B - Regional Truck Corridor Study Tiers | 75 |  |
| 1. Equity and Housing Performance | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A - Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations | 50 |  |
| Measure B - Housing Performance Score / affordable housing connection | 50 |  |
| 1. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality | **275** | **25%** |
| Measure A - Vehicle delay reduced | 200 |  |
| Measure B - Kg of emissions reduced | 75 |  |
| 1. Safety | **275** | **25%** |
| Measure A - Crashes reduced | 225 |  |
| Measure B - Pedestrian Crash Reduction (Proactive) | 50 |  |
| 1. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements & connections | 100 |  |
| 1. Risk Assessment | **75** | **7%** |
| Measure A - Risk Assessment Form | 75 |  |
| 1. Cost Effectiveness | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A - Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost) | 100 |  |
| Total | **1,100** |  |

## Strategic Capacity (Roadway Expansion)

**Definition:** A roadway project that adds thru-lane capacity (described as a Regional Mobility project under Strategic Capacity Enhancements in the TPP). Projects must be located on a non-freeway principal arterial or A-minor arterial functionally classified roadway, consistent with the latest TAB approved functional classification map. However, A-minor connectors cannot be expanded with new thru-lane capacity with these federal funds per regional policy.

### Examples of Roadway Expansion Projects:

* New roadways
* Two-lane to four-lane expansions
* Other thru-lane expansions (excludes additions of a continuous center turn lane)
* Four-lane to six-lane expansions
* New interchanges with or without associated frontage roads
* Expanded interchanges with either new ramp movements or added thru lanes
* New bridges, overpasses and underpasses

### Scoring:

| Criteria and Measures | Points | % of Total Points |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy | **210** | **19%** |
| Measure A - Congestion within Project Area, Level of Adjacent Congestion, or Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study Priorities | 80 |  |
| Measure B - Connection to Total Jobs, Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs, and Students | 50 |  |
| Measure C - Regional Truck Corridor Study Tiers | 80 |  |
| 1. Usage | **175** | **16%** |
| Measure A - Current daily person throughput | 110 |  |
| Measure B - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume | 65 |  |
| 1. Equity and Housing Performance | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A - Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations | 50 |  |
| Measure B - Housing Performance Score/ affordable housing connection | 50 |  |
| 1. Infrastructure Age | **40** | **4%** |
| Measure A - Date of construction | 40 |  |
| 1. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality | **150** | **14%** |
| Measure A - Vehicle delay reduced | 100 |  |
| Measure B - Kg of emissions reduced | 50 |  |
| 1. Safety | **150** | **14%** |
| Measure A - Crashes reduced | 120 |  |
| Measure B - Pedestrian Crash Reduction (Proactive) | 30 |  |
| 1. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections | 100 |  |
| 1. Risk Assessment | **75** | **7%** |
| Measure A- Risk Assessment Form | 75 |  |
| 1. Cost Effectiveness | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost) | 100 |  |
| Total | **1,100** |  |

## Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization

**Definition:** A roadway project that does not add thru-lane capacity, but reconstructs, reclaims, and/or modernizes a corridor with improved safety, multimodal, or mobility elements (e.g., new turn lanes, traffic signal, or roundabout). Routine maintenance including mill and overlay projects are not eligible. Projects must be located on a non-freeway principal arterial or A-minor arterial functionally classified roadway, consistent with the latest TAB approved functional classification map.

### Examples of Roadway Reconstruction/Modernization Projects:

* Intersection improvements, including innovative intersection designs
* Alternative intersections such as unsignalized or signalized reduced conflict intersections (one intersection or multiple intersections)
* Interchange reconstructions that do not involve new ramp movements or added thru lanes
* Turn lanes
* Two-lane to three-lane conversions (with a continuous center turn lane)
* Four-lane to three-lane conversions
* Roundabouts
* Addition or replacement of traffic signals
* Shoulder improvements
* Strengthening a non-10-ton roadway
* Raised medians, frontage roads, access modifications, or other access management
* Roadway improvements with the addition of multimodal elements
* Roadway improvements that add safety elements
* New alignments that replace an existing alignment and do not expand the number of lanes

### Scoring:

| Criteria and Measures | Points | % of Total Points |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy | **105** | **10%** |
| Measure A - Connection to Total Jobs and Manufacturing/ Distribution Jobs | 65 |  |
| Measure B - Regional Truck Corridor Study Tiers | 40 |  |
| 1. Usage | **175** | **16%** |
| Measure A - Current daily person throughput | 110 |  |
| Measure B - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume | 65 |  |
| 1. Equity and Housing Performance | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A - Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations | 50 |  |
| Measure B - Housing Performance Score/ affordable housing connection | 50 |  |
| 1. Infrastructure Age/Condition | **175** | **16%** |
| Measure A - Date of construction | 50 |  |
| Measure B - Geometric, structural, or infrastructure deficiencies | 125 |  |
| 1. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality | **80** | **7%** |
| Measure A - Vehicle delay reduced | 50 |  |
| Measure B - Kg of emissions reduced | 30 |  |
| 1. Safety | **180** | **16%** |
| Measure A - Crashes reduced | 150 |  |
| Measure B – Pedestrian Crash Reduction (Proactive) | 30 |  |
| 1. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections | **110** | **10%** |
| Measure A - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections | 110 |  |
| 1. Risk Assessment | **75** | **7%** |
| Measure A- Risk Assessment Form | 75 |  |
| 1. Cost Effectiveness | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost) | 100 |  |
| Total | **1,100** |  |

## Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement

**Definition:** A bridge rehabilitation or replacement project located on a non-freeway principal arterial or A-minor arterial functionally classified roadway, consistent with the latest TAB-approved functional classification map. Bridge structures that have a separate span for each direction of travel can apply for both spans as part of one application.

The bridge must carry vehicular traffic but may also include accommodations for other modes. Bridges that are exclusively for bicycle or pedestrian traffic must apply under one of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities application categories. Rail-only bridges are not eligible for funding. Completely new bridges, interchanges, or overpasses should apply in the Roadway Expansion application category.

### Examples of Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement Projects:

* Bridge rehabilitation of 20 or more feet with a sufficiency rating less than 80 and classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.
* Bridge replacement of 20 or more feet with a sufficiency rating less than 50 and classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

### Scoring:

| Criteria and Measures | Points | % of Total Points |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy | **195** | **18%** |
| Measure A - Distance to the nearest parallel bridge | 100 |  |
| Measure B - Connection to Total Jobs, Manufacturing/Distribution Jobs, and post-secondary students | 30 |  |
| Measure C - Regional Truck Corridor Study tiers | 65 |  |
| 1. Usage | **130** | **12%** |
| Measure A - Current daily person throughput | 100 |  |
| Measure B - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume | 30 |  |
| 1. Equity and Housing Performance | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A - Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations | 50 |  |
| Measure B - Housing Performance Score/ affordable housing connection | 50 |  |
| 1. Infrastructure Condition | **400** | **36%** |
| Measure A – National Bridge Inventory Condition | 300 |  |
| Measure B – Load-Posting | 100 |  |
| 1. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements & connections | 100 |  |
| 1. Risk Assessment | **75** | **7%** |
| Measure A - Risk Assessment Form | 75 |  |
| 1. Cost Effectiveness | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A - Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost) | 100 |  |
| Total | **1,100** |  |

## Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Project

**Definition**: An arterial bus rapid transit expansion project that is consistent with the definition in the Transportation Policy Plan (TPP). A new project can include extensions to existing or planned lines. Improvements to existing arterial BRT lines are not eligible and should apply under Transit Modernization. Highway BRT and Dedicated Guideway BRT are eligible in the Transit Expansion and Transit Modernization categories.

### Scoring and Project Selection:

The arterial bus rapid transit project will not be evaluated with a scored application. TAB will select the arterial BRT project concurrent with other Regional Solicitation project selections. Background information on the potential arterial BRT lines and the prioritization through Network Next will be provided by Metro Transit along with a funding recommendation for TAB decision-making.

## Transit Expansion

**Definition**: A transit project that provides new or expanded transit service/facilities with the intent of attracting new transit riders to the system. Expansion projects may also benefit existing or future riders, but the projects will be scored primarily on the ability to attract new riders. Routine facility maintenance and upkeep and fleet replacement is not eligible. Projects that deliver elements of a new arterial bus rapid transit (BRT) line are not eligible, although projects that benefit a wide range of services and users that includes arterial BRT lines may be eligible. If a project includes both expansion and modernization elements, it is the applicant’s discretion to choose which application category the project would best fit. However, an application can be disqualified if it is submitted to the wrong category. It is suggested that applicants contact Council staff for consultation before the application deadline to determine eligibility.

### Examples of Transit Expansion Projects:

* Operating funds for new or expanded transit service
* Transit vehicles for new or expanded service
* Customer facilities along a route for new or expanded service, new transit centers or stations
* Park-and-ride facilities or expansions
* Highway BRT and Dedicated Guideway BRT

### Scoring:

| Criteria and Measures | Points | % of Total Points |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A – Connection to jobs and educational institutions | 50 |  |
| Measure B – Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project | 50 |  |
| 1. Usage | **350** | **32%** |
| Measure A – New annual riders | 350 |  |
| 1. Equity and Housing Performance | **200** | **18%** |
| Measure A – Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations | 150 |  |
| Measure B – Housing Performance Score/ affordable housing connection | 50 |  |
| 1. Emissions Reduction | **200** | **18%** |
| Measure A – Total emissions reduced | 200 |  |
| 1. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A – Bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project and connections | 100 |  |
| 1. Risk Assessment | **50** | **5%** |
| Measure A – Risk Assessment Form | 50 |  |
| 1. Cost Effectiveness | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost) | 100 |  |
| Total | **1,100** |  |

## Transit Modernization

**Definition**: A transit project that makes transit more attractive to existing riders by offering faster travel times between destinations or improving the customer experience. Modernization projects may also benefit new or future riders, but the projects will be scored primarily on the benefit to existing riders. Routine facility maintenance and upkeep and fleet replacement is not eligible. Projects that deliver elements of a new arterial bus rapid transit (BRT) line are not eligible, although projects that benefit a wide range of services and users that includes arterial BRT lines may be eligible. Projects associated wholly or in part with new service/facilities intended to attract new transit riders, such as the purchase of new buses or expansion of an existing park-and-ride, should apply in the Transit Expansion application category. If a project includes both expansion and modernization elements, it is the applicant’s discretion to choose which application category the project would best fit. Council staff can be consulted before the application deadline to determine a project’s eligibility.

### Examples of Transit Modernization Projects:

* Improved boarding areas, lighting, or safety and security equipment, real-time signage;
* Passenger waiting facilities, heated facilities or weather protection
* New transit maintenance and support facilities/garages or upgrades to existing facilities
* Intelligent transportation system (ITS) measures that improve reliability and the customer experience on a specific transit route or in a specific area
* Improved fare collection systems
* Multiple eligible improvements along a route
* Highway BRT and Dedicated Guideway BRT

### Scoring:

| Criteria and Measures | Points | % of Total Points |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A – Connection to jobs and educational institutions | 50 |  |
| Measure B – Average number of weekday transit trips connected to the project | 50 |  |
| 1. Usage | **325** | **30%** |
| Measure A - New annual riders | 325 |  |
| 1. Equity and Housing Performance | **175** | **16%** |
| Measure A – Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations | 125 |  |
| Measure B – Housing Performance Score/ affordable housing connection | 50 |  |
| 1. Emissions Reduction | **50** | **5%** |
| Measure A – Description of emissions reduced | 50 |  |
| 1. Service and Customer Improvements | **200** | **18%** |
| Measure A – Project improvements for transit users | 100 |  |
| 1. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A – Bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project and connections | 100 |  |
| 1. Risk Assessment | **50** | **5%** |
| Measure A – Risk Assessment Form | 50 |  |
| 1. Cost Effectiveness | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost) | 100 |  |
| Total | **1,100** |  |

## Travel Demand Management (TDM)

**Definition:** Travel demand management (TDM) provides residents/commuters of the Twin Cities Metro Area with greater choices and options regarding how to travel in and throughout the region. Projects should reduce the congestion and emissions during the peak period. Similar to past Regional Solicitations, base-level TDM funding for the Transportation Management Organizations (TMOs) and Metro Transit will be not part of the competitive process.

### Examples of TDM Projects:

* Bikesharing
* Carsharing
* Telework strategies
* Carpooling
* Parking management
* Managed lane components

### Scoring:

| Criteria and Measures | Points | % of Total Points |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy | **200** | **18%** |
| Measure A - Ability to capitalize on existing regional transportation facilities and resources | 200 |  |
| 1. Usage | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A – Users | 100 |  |
| 1. Equity and Housing Performance | **150** | **14%** |
| Measure A – Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations | 100 |  |
| Measure B – Housing Performance Score/ affordable housing connection | 50 |  |
| 1. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality | **300** | **27%** |
| Measure A - Congested roadways in project area | 150 |  |
| Measure B - VMT reduced | 150 |  |
| 1. Innovation | **200** | **18%** |
| Measure A - Project innovations and geographic expansion | 200 |  |
| 1. Risk Assessment | **50** | **5%** |
| Measure A - Technical capacity of applicant's organization | 25 |  |
| Measure B - Continuation of project after initial federal funds are expended | 25 |  |
| 1. Cost Effectiveness | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost) | 100 |  |
| Total | **1,100** |  |

# Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

## Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities

**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. 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.

### 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 - Identify location of project relative to Regional Bicycle Transportation Network | 200 |  |
| 1. Potential Usage | **200** | **18%** |
| Measure A - Existing population and employment within 1 mile | 200 |  |
| 1. Equity and Housing Performance | **120** | **11%** |
| Measure A – Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations | 70 |  |
| Measure B – Housing Performance Score/ affordable housing connection | 50 |  |
| 1. 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 |  |
| 1. Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A - Transit or pedestrian elements of the project and connections | 100 |  |
| 1. Risk Assessment/Public Engagement | **130** | **12%** |
| Measure A - Risk Assessment Form | 130 |  |
| 1. Cost Effectiveness | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost) | 100 |  |
| Total | **1,100** |  |

## Pedestrian Facilities (Sidewalks, Streetscaping, and ADA)

**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. 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.

### 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 |  |
| 1. Potential Usage | **150** | **14%** |
| Measure A - Existing population within ½ mile | 150 |  |
| 1. Equity and Housing Performance | **120** | **11%** |
| Measure A – Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations | 70 |  |
| Measure B – Housing Performance Score/ affordable housing connection | 50 |  |
| 1. Deficiencies and Safety | **300** | **27%** |
| Measure A - Barriers overcome or gaps filled | 120 |  |
| Measure B - Deficiencies corrected or safety problems addressed | 180 |  |
| 1. Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections | **150** | **14%** |
| Measure A - Transit or bicycle elements of the project and connections | 150 |  |
| 1. Risk Assessment/Public Engagement | **130** | **12%** |
| Measure A - Risk Assessment Form | 130 |  |
| 1. Cost Effectiveness | **100** | **9%** |
| Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost) | 100 |  |
| Total | **1,100** |  |

## Safe Routes to School (Infrastructure Projects)

**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 |  |  |
| Measure B – Completion of Safe Routes to School Plan or local plan | 250 |  |
| 1. 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 |  |
| 1. Equity and Housing Performance | **120** | **11%** |
| Measure A – Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations | 70 |  |
| Measure B – Housing Performance Score/ affordable housing connection | 50 |  |
| 1. Deficiencies and Safety | **250** | **23%** |
| Measure A - Barriers overcome or gaps filled | 100 |  |
| Measure B - Deficiencies corrected or safety problems addressed | 150 |  |
| 1. Risk Assessment/Public Engagement | **130** | **12%** |
| Measure A - Public engagement process | 45 |  |
| Measure B - Risk Assessment Form | 85 |  |
| 1. 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.

Project applicants can also “bundle” two or more projects together, but they must either be:

* Projects located along the same corridor (e.g., filling multiple trail gaps along a trail corridor or projects at stops/stations along a transit route)
* Similar improvements within a defined neighborhood or downtown area (e.g., adding benches along the sidewalks in a downtown area)

Traffic management technologies projects are exempt from the bundling rules.

Bundling of independent projects that are not related to one another as described above are not allowed. For eligible bundled projects, when doing scoring of multiple locations, an average will be used for geographically based measures.

Applicants are encouraged to contact TAB Coordinator Elaine Koutsoukos at [Elaine.koutsoukos@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Elaine.koutsoukos@metc.state.mn.us) or 651-602-1717 if they have questions regarding project bundling.

# General Process and Rules

1. TAB selected 57 transportation projects as part of the 2018 Regional Solicitation. An evaluation process took place in the spring and summer of 2019 to continue to improve all aspects of the Regional Solicitation including the scoring criteria. The following are the major changes that are implemented in the 2020 Regional Solicitation:

* Required completion of an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) transition plan as a qualifying criterion. Only substantial work toward completion of a plan was required in the last funding cycle.
* Added a new Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Project category and created a $32M maximum funding amount for all bus rapid transit projects awarded in the Regional Solicitation.
* Created a Transit New Market guarantee to fund at least one Transit Expansion or Transit Modernization project that is outside of Transit Market Areas 1 and 2 for at least one end of the project.
* Set aside 2.5% of the total available funds for Unique Projects, including the Travel Behavior Inventory/Regional Travel Model. These 2024 and 2025 funds will be allocated as part of the 2022 Regional Solicitation, closer to project implementation.
* Adjusted the modal funding ranges to increase the transit funding range by $5M and reduce the Roadway midpoint by $4M and Bicycle and Pedestrian midpoint by $1M.
* Improved the equity scoring measure to focus less on geography and more on the benefits and outreach specific to the project.
* Added as a qualifying criterion that Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities project sponsors include a letter from the operator of the facility confirming that they will maintain trails for year-round bicycle and pedestrian use, including snow and ice control.
* Eliminated the $10 million minimum set-aside for the Bridge application category.
* Added a new roadways application category, Spot Mobility and Safety, with a minimum award of $1M and a maximum federal award of $3.5M.
* Change the following federal award limits:
  + Decreased the Traffic Management Technologies maximum federal award from $7M to $3.5M.
  + Increased the Strategic Capacity (Roadway Expansion) maximum federal award from $7M to 10M.
  + Increased the Transit Modernization minimum award from $100,000 to $500,000.
  + Increased the TDM minimum award from $75,000 to $100,000.
  + Established the Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Project maximum federal award at $25M.
* Began implementation of the region’s Congestion Management Process (CMP) using a new congestion measure in the roadway applications.
* Added a new pedestrian safety measure in the roadway application categories to emphasize the regional need for improved pedestrian safety.
* Included a new provision in the roadway Cost Effectiveness measure that allows projects that have been awarded other outside, competitive funding (e.g., state bonding, Transportation Economic Development Program, Minnesota Highway Freight Program), to reduce the total project cost for the purposes of the scoring measure by the amount of the outside funding award.
* Added a new sub-part to the Risk Assessment measure that asks applicants about public and stakeholder involvement on the proposed project.
* Included the Regional Bicycle Barriers Study into the scoring in the Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities application category and the roadways application (Multimodal Facilities and Connections measure).

1. Project sponsors must incur the cost of the project prior to repayment. Costs become eligible for reimbursement only after a project has been approved by MnDOT State-Aid and the appropriate USDOT modal agency.
2. Projects may apply for both the Regional Solicitation and the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), but projects can only be awarded funds from one of the two programs.
3. Projects selected to receive federal funding through this solicitation will be programmed in the regional TIP in years 2024 and 2025, taking into consideration the applicant’s request and the TAB’s balancing of available funds.
4. The fundable amount of a project is based on the original submittal. TAB must approve any significant change in the scope or cost of an approved project as described in TAB’s Scope Change Policy. <http://www.metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Planning-2/Transportation-Funding/Regional-Solicitation/Regional-Scope-Change-Policy.aspx>
5. **A project will be removed from the program if it does not meet its program year.** The program year aligns with the state fiscal year. For example, if the project is programmed for 2024 in the TIP, the project program year begins July 1, 2023, and ends June 30, 2024. Projects selected from this solicitation will be programmed in 2024 and 2025. The Regional Program Year Policy outlines the process to request a one-time program year extension. [http://www.metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Planning-2/Transportation-Funding/Regional-Solicitation/TAB-Regional-Program-Year-Policy-(PDF-154-KB).aspx](htttp://www.metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Planning-2/Transportation-Funding/Regional-Solicitation/TAB-Regional-Program-Year-Policy-(PDF-154-KB).aspx)
6. Applicants for transit projects should be aware of the schedule and associated time lag for receiving federal funds for transit vehicle and transit operating projects.  Applicants are encouraged to contact Michael Hochhalter at the Metropolitan Council [Michael.hochhalter@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Heather.Johnson@metc.state.mn.us) or 651-602-1961) for more details on selecting a preferred program year as part of the application given this time lag.
7. Transit projects will be given an opportunity to have their ridership projections reviewed by Council staff prior to submittal in order to determine whether the scoring methodology is sound. Any applicant wanting to have an optional review should submit draft ridership information to the TAB Coordinator two weeks prior to the application deadline.
8. The announcement of funding availability is posted on the Metropolitan Council website and emailed to local stakeholders.
9. The applicant must show that the project meets all of the qualifying requirements of the appropriate application category to be eligible to be scored and ranked against other projects. Applicants whose projects are disqualified may appeal and participate in the review and determination of eligibility at the Technical Advisory Committee Funding & Programming (TAC F&P) Committee meeting.
10. A set of prioritizing criteria with a range of points assigned is provided for each application category. The applicant must respond directly to each prioritizing criterion in order for it to be scored and receive points. Projects are scored based on how well the response meets the requirements of the prioritizing criteria and, in some cases, how well the responses compare to those of other qualifying applications in the same project application category.
11. Members of the TAC Funding and Programming Committee or other designees will evaluate the applications and prepare a ranked list of projects by application category based on a total score of all the prioritizing criteria. The TAC will forward the ranked list of projects with funding options to TAB. TAB may develop its own funding proposals. TAB will then recommend a list of projects to be included in the region's TIP and the Metropolitan Council concurs. TAB submits the Draft TIP to the Metropolitan Council for concurrence.
12. TAB may or may not choose to fund at least one project from each application category.
13. Scoring committees have the option to recommend a deviation from the approved scoring guidance if a rationale for the deviation is provided to the TAC Funding and Programming Committee.
14. For many of the quantitative measures in the Regional Solicitation, the scoring guidance gives the top project 100% of the points and the remaining projects a proportionate share of the full points. If there is a high-scoring outlier on a particular measure, the scorer will have the option to prorate the other scores based on the second highest scoring project instead of the top project.
15. TAB will only fund a roadway or bridge project on a roadway that is spaced at least 3.5 miles away from the center point of another funded project on the same roadway (only applies to two separate applications selected in the same solicitation).
16. TAB will not fund more than one transit capital project in a transitway corridor (only applies to two separate applications selected in the same solicitation).

TAB will not fund more than one bicycle or pedestrian facility project in the same corridor (only applies to two separate applications selected in the same solicitation). For trails, a funded project may be on the same trail facility as another funded project as long as the two projects serve different users and destinations.

# Project Schedule

Table 4 shows the key milestones in the Regional Solicitation review, scoring, and selection process. All applications are due by 4:00 P.M. on April 16, 2020\*.

Table 4: Regional Solicitation Schedule

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date | Process |
| 2/1/2020 (Tentative) | Applicants can obtain on-line access at this time. |
| 4/09/2020 | Applicants must apply for on-line access by 4:00 P.M. |
| 4/16/2020 | Application deadline – 4:00 P.M. |
| 4/22/2020 | Qualifying reviews begin. |
| 5/14/2020 | Qualifying review completed (staff notify applicants that do not qualify). |
| 5/21/2020 | TAC F&P Committee meeting: Qualifying appeals heard. |
| 5/25/2020 | Scoring committees begin evaluating all qualified applications. |
| 7/5/2020 | Scoring completed. Staff prepares results for TAC F&P Committee meeting (7/16/20). |
| 7/17/2020 | TAC F&P releases project scores. |
| 7/17/2020 | Scores distributed to applicants; appeal period begins. |
| 7/31/2020 | Scoring appeal deadline. |
| 8/20/2020 | TAC F&P Committee meeting: Scoring appeals reviewed, funding options developed. |
| 9/17/2020 | TAC F&P considers funding options presented by staff and votes to eliminate, modify or create options and forwards them to the TAC. |
| 10/7/2020 | TAC review of funding options and recommendation to TAB. |
| 11/18/2020 | TAB approval of funding recommendations and direct staff to include them into the draft 2021-2024 TIP. Council concurrence on 12/9/2020. |

\*Subject to change based on TAB and Metropolitan Council approval.

# Contacts

For general questions about the Regional Solicitation, please contact:

Elaine Koutsoukos, TAB Coordinator  
Metropolitan Council  
390 North Robert Street  
St. Paul, MN 55101

(651) 602-1717

[Elaine.Koutsoukos@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Elaine.Koutsoukos@metc.state.mn.us)

To request special accommodation for submitting Regional Solicitation applications, please email [webteam@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:webteam@metc.state.mn.us).

## Technical Assistance Contacts

Table 5 provides contacts for technical assistance in providing necessary data in order to address various prioritizing criteria. Before contacting any technical expert below, please use existing local sources. Local experts in many cases are the appropriate contact for much of the data needed to respond to criteria. In some instances, it may take five or more workdays to provide the requested data. Please request data as soon as possible.

Table 5. Technical Assistance Contacts

| Subject | Name | Agency | Email | Phone Number |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| General | Elaine Koutsoukos  Joe Barbeau | TAB  Met Council | [Elaine.koutsoukos@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Elaine.koutsoukos@metc.state.mn.us)  [Joseph.barbeau@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Joseph.barbeau@metc.state.mn.us) | (651) 602-1717  (651) 602-1705 |
| Traffic Volumes |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways | Jason Junge | MnDOT | [Jason.Junge@state.mn.us](mailto:Jason.Junge@state.mn.us) | (651) 234-7875 |
| State Roads | Christy Prentice  Gene Hicks | MnDOT  MnDOT | [Christy.prentice@state.mn.us](mailto:Mark.flinner@state.mn.us)  [Gene.hicks@state.mn.us](mailto:Gene.hicks@state.mn.us) | (651) 366-3844  (651) 366-3856 |
| Heavy Commercial | John Hackett | MnDOT | [John.Hackett@state.mn.us](mailto:John.Hackett@state.mn.us) | (651) 366-3851 |
| 2040 Projections | Mark Filipi | Met Council | [Mark.Filipi@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Mark.Filipi@metc.state.mn.us) | (651) 602-1725 |
| Synchro | Kevin Schwartz | MnDOT | [Kevin.schwartz@state.mn.us](mailto:Kevin.schwartz@state.mn.us) | (651) 234-7840 |
| Crashes | Cherzon Riley | MnDOT | [Cherzon.riley@state.mn.us](mailto:Chad.erickson@state.mn.us) | (651) 234-7836 |
| Freeway Management | Terry Haukom | MnDOT | [Terry.haukom@state.mn.us](mailto:Terry.haukom@state.mn.us) | (651) 234-7980 |
| Trunk Highway Traffic Signals |  |  |  |  |
| Signal Operations | Mike Fairbanks | MnDOT | [Mike.Fairbanks@state.mn.us](mailto:Mike.Fairbanks@state.mn.us) | (651) 234-7819 |
| Signal/Lighting Design | Michael Gerbensky | MnDOT | [Michael.gerbensky@state.mn.us](mailto:Michael.gerbensky@state.mn.us) | (651) 234-7816 |
| State Aid Standards | Colleen Brown | MnDOT | [Colleen.brown@state.mn.us](mailto:Colleen.brown@state.mn.us) | (651) 234-7779 |
| Bikeway/Walkway Standards | Mackenzie Turner Bargen | MnDOT | [Mackenzie.turnerbargen@state.mn.us](mailto:Mackenzie.turnerbargen@state.mn.us) | (651) 234-7879 |
| Interchange Approvals | Michael Corbett | MnDOT | [Michael.J.Corbett@state.mn.us](mailto:Michael.J.Corbett@state.mn.us) | (651) 234-7793 |
| Safe Routes to School | Dave Cowan | MnDOT | [Dave.Cowan@state.mn.us](mailto:Dave.Cowan@state.mn.us) | (651) 366-4180 |
| Regional Bicycle Transportation Network and Bicycle Barriers | Steve Elmer | Met Council | [Steven.elmer@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Steven.elmer@metc.state.mn.us) | (651) 602-1756 |
| Housing Performance Scores | Hilary Lovelace | Met Council | [hilary.lovelace@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Jonathan.stanley@metc.state.mn.us) | (651)-602-1555 |
| Equity Measures | Heidi Schallberg | Met Council | [Heidi.schallberg@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Heidi.schallberg@metc.state.mn.us) | (651)602-1721 |
| Demographics by TAZ | Mark Filipi | Met Council | [Mark.Filipi@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Mark.Filipi@metc.state.mn.us) | (651) 602-1725 |
| Transit Ridership | Daniel Pena | Met Council | [daniel.pena@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Heidi.schallberg@metc.state.mn.us) | (651) 602-1721 |
| Transit Funding Timeline | Michael Hochhalter | Met Council | [Michael.hochhalter@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Heather.Johnson@metc.state.mn.us) | (651) 602-1961 |
| Emissions Data | Mark Filipi | Met Council | [Mark.Filipi@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Mark.Filipi@metc.state.mn.us) | (651) 602-1725 |
| Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study | Steve Peterson | Met Council | [Steven.peterson@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Steven.peterson@metc.state.mn.us) | (651) 602-1819 |
| Regional Truck Highway Corridor Study | Steve Elmer | Met Council | [Steven.elmer@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Steven.elmer@metc.state.mn.us) | (651) 602-1756 |
| Congestion Management Safety Plan | Michael Corbett | MnDOT | [Michael.J.Corbett@state.mn.us](mailto:Michael.J.Corbett@state.mn.us) | (651) 234-7793 |