Transit Modernization

Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

January 22, 2020

**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** |  |

## Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (100 Points)

This criterion measures the regional significance of the project, including the project’s connections to jobs and post-secondary educational institutions (as defined in Thrive MSP 2040) and the project’s ability to provide regional transit system connections (measured through the number of connecting, weekday transit trips).

1. MEASURE: Reference the “Population/Employment” map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing employment and educational institution enrollment within 1/4 mile of the project’s bus stops or within 1/2 mile of the project’s transitway stations. Existing employment will be measured by summing the employment located in the census block groups that intersect the 1/4-mile or 1/2-mile buffers. Enrollment at public and private post-secondary institutions will also be measured. Applications for projects that include “last mile” service provided by employers or educational institutions can get credit for the employment and enrollment, respectively, if a commitment letter is provided guaranteeing service for three years. (50 Points)

RESPONSE: (Data from the “Population/Employment” map):

* Existing Employment within ¼ (bus stop) or ½ mile (transitway station) buffer:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Existing Post-Secondary Enrollment within ¼ (bus stop) or ½ mile (transitway station) buffer:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Existing Employment outside ¼- or ½ mile buffer to be served by shuttle service (Letter of commitment required):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Existing Post-Secondary Enrollment outside ¼- or ½ mile buffer to be served by shuttle service (Letter of commitment required):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

EXPLANATION of last-mile service, if necessary (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):

Upload the “Population/Employment” map used for this measure.

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

The applicant with the highest combined total employment and post-secondary education enrollment will receive the full points for this measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 workers/students within 1/4 mile and the top project had 1,500 workers/students, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)\*50 points or 33 points. Using the Metropolitan Council model, all Census block groups that are included within or intersect the buffer area around the project will be included in the analysis.

1. MEASURE: Reference the “Transit Connections” map generated at the beginning of the application process. List the transit routes directly connected to the project to help determine the average weekday transit trips these connecting routes provide, as depicted on the “Transit Connections” map. Metropolitan Council staff will provide the average number of weekday trips for each connecting transit route.

Connections to planned transitway stations should be separately cited. Any transitway connection is worth 15 points.

RESPONSE (Data from the “Transit Connections” map):

* Existing transit routes directly connected to the project: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (35 Points).
* Planned transitways directly connected to the project (mode and alignment determined and identified in the 2040 TPP): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_(15 Points)

Upload the “Transit Connections” map used for this measure.

**Note:** Transitways offer travel time advantages for transit vehicles, improve transit service reliability, and increase the convenience and attractiveness of transit service. Transitways are defined in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan to include commuter rail, light rail, bus rapid transit (dedicated, highway, and arterial), and modern streetcar. Eligible transitway projects are those that have a mode and alignment identified in the Current Revenue Scenario of the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan.

If the project includes construction of a park-and-ride facility, employment and eligible educational institutions only include those directly connected by the transit routes exiting the facility.

|  |
| --- |
| SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)The applicant with route connections having the highest number of weekday trips will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had connecting ridership of 100 trips and the top project had 150 trips, this applicant would receive (100/150)\*35 points or 23 points. Any project with a connection to a planned transitway station should be awarded 15 points.After each of the above scores are tabulated the top total score will be adjusted to 50 with all other projects adjusted proportionately. For example, if the top application scored 28 points, it would be adjusted to 50. A project that scored 19 points would be awarded (19/28)\*50, or 34 points. |

## Usage (325 points)

This criterion quantifies the project’s impact based on how many riders the improvement(s) will impact, i.e., existing riders.

1. MEASURE: This measure will display the existing riders that will benefit from the project. This would entail, for example, riders on a bus route with buses fitted for Wi-Fi or users boarding or alighting at a park‐and‐ride being improved. Ridership data will be provided by the Metropolitan Council staff.

RESPONSE:

* Existing Transit Routes on the Project:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

SCORING GUIDANCE (325 Points)

The applicant with the highest existing annual ridership will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points equal to the existing ridership of the project being scored divided by the project with the highest existing ridership multiplied by the maximum points available for the measure (325). For example, if the application being scored had ridership of 1,000 riders and the top project had a ridership of 1,500 riders, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500)\*325 points or 217 points.

## Equity and Housing Performance (175 Points)

This criterion addresses the [Council’s role in advancing equity](https://metrocouncil.org/About-Us/why-we-matter/Equity.aspx) by examining how a project directly provides benefits to, or impacts (positive and negative) low-income populations, people of color, people with disabilities, youth and the elderly. The criterion evaluates whether the applicant engaged these populations to identify transportation needs and potential solutions and how the project will address these identified needs. The criterion also evaluates a community’s overall efforts to implement affordable housing and how the project improves multimodal access to affordable housing residents.

1. MEASURE: Socio-Economic Equity
2. **Sub-measure**: Equity Population Engagement (0 to 50 points): A successful project is one that is the result of active engagement of low-income populations, people of color, persons with disabilities, youth and the elderly. Engagement should occur prior to and during a project’s development, with the intent to provide direct benefits to, or solve, an expressed transportation issue, while also limiting and mitigating any negative impacts. Describe and map the location of any low-income populations, people of color, disabled populations, youth or the elderly within a ½ mile of the proposed project. Describe how these specific populations were engaged and provided outreach to, whether through community planning efforts, project needs identification, or during the project development process. Describe what engagement methods and tools were used and how the input is reflected in the projects’ purpose and need and design. Elements of quality engagement include: outreach and engagement to specific communities and populations that are likely to be directly impacted by the project; techniques to reach out to populations traditionally not involved in community engagement related to transportation projects; feedback from these populations identifying potential positive and negative elements of the proposed project through engagement, study recommendations, or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If relevant, describe how NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities.

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

1. **Sub-measure:** Equity Population Benefits and Impacts (0 to 75 points): A successful project is one that has been designed to provide direct benefits to low-income populations, people of color, persons with disabilities, youth and the elderly. All projects must mitigate potential negative benefits as required under federal law. Projects that are designed to provide benefits go beyond the mitigation requirement to proactively provide transportation benefits and solve transportation issues experienced by Equity populations.
2. (0 to 75 points) Describe the project’s benefits to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Benefits could relate to pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements; public health benefits; direct access improvements for residents or improved access to destinations such as jobs, school, health care or other; travel time improvements; gap closures; new transportation services or modal options, leveraging of other beneficial projects and investments; and/or community connection and cohesion improvements. Note that this is not an exhaustive list.

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

1. (-10 to 0 points) Describe any negative impacts to low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, and the elderly created by the project, along with measures that will be taken to mitigate them. Negative impacts that are not adequately mitigated can result in a reduction in points.

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

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

* Increased difficulty in street crossing caused by increased roadway width, increased traffic speed, wider turning radii, or other elements that negatively impact pedestrian access.
* Increased noise.
* Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
* Project elements that are detrimental to location-based air quality by increasing stop/start activity at intersections, creating vehicle idling areas, directing an increased number of vehicles to a particular point, etc.
* Increased speed and/or “cut-through” traffic.
* Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
* Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.
* Displacement of residents and businesses.
* Mitigation of temporary construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings.
* Other
1. **Sub-measure: Bonus Points (0 to 25 points)** Those projects that score at least 80% of the maximum total points available through measures A and B will be awarded bonus points based on the geographic location of the project. These points will be assigned as follows, based on the highest-scoring geography the project contacts:
	1. 25 points to projects within an Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more people of color
	2. 20 points to projects within an Area of Concentrated Poverty
	3. 15 points to projects within census tracts with the percent of population in poverty or population of color above the regional average percent
	4. 10 points for all other areas

Upload the “Socio-Economic Conditions” map used for this measure.

RESPONSE (Select one, based on the “Socio-Economic Conditions” map):

* Project is located in an Area of Concentrated Poverty where 50% or more of residents are people of color (ACP50): ☐
* Project is located in an Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐
* Project’s census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color: ☐
* Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color, or includes children, people with disabilities, or the elderly: ☐

SCORING GUIDANCE (125 Points)

Each application will be qualitatively scored based on the available points for each measure and will receive the number of points awarded. If the applicant receives at least 80% of the available points, i.e., 40 points for the Roadway applications, the project will receive Bonus points as described under Measure C. If an applicant qualifies for Bonus points it will result in a Socio-Economic Equity score of more than the total points available.

1. MEASURE: Projects will be scored based on two housing measures: 1. the 2019 Housing Performance Score for the city or township in which the project is located (40 points) and 2. the project’s connection to affordable housing (10 points) as described below.

**Part 1 (40 points): Housing Performance Score**

A city or township’s housing performance score is calculated annually by the Metropolitan Council using data from four categories: new affordable or mixed-income housing completed in the last ten years; preservation projects completed in the last seven years and/or substantial rehabilitation projects completed in the last three years; housing program participation and production, and housing policies and ordinances; and characteristics of the existing housing stock. Data for the housing performance scores are updated each year by the Council, and the city or township is provided with an opportunity to review and revise the information

Council staff will use the most current housing score for each city or township. If the project is located in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on a weighted average using the number of stops in each jurisdiction. If the project includes express service with no reverse commute trips, the applicant should only report the number of stops and corresponding jurisdictions in which the inbound service originates. If a project is located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), the project will not be disadvantaged by this measure and the project’s total score will be adjusted during scoring to remove this scoring measure.

RESPONSE: (NOTE: The below bullets vary slightly by funding category)

* City/Township: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Total project cost: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Number of Stops within each City/Township: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Percent of Stops within City/Township: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Part 2 (10 points): Affordable Housing Access**

This measure is a qualitative scoring measure. Describe and map any affordable housing developments— planned, under construction or existing, within ½ mile of the proposed project. The applicant should note the development stage, number of units, number of bedrooms per unit, and level of affordability using 2019 affordability limits. Also note whether the affordability is guaranteed through funding restrictions (i.e. LIHTC, 4d) or is unsubsidized, if housing choice vouchers are/will be accepted, and if there is a fair housing marketing plan required or in place.

Describe how the proposed project will improve or impact access for residents of the affordable housing locations within ½ mile of the project. This should include a description of improved access by all modes, automobiles, transit, bicycle and pedestrian access. Since residents of affordable housing are more likely not to own a private vehicle, higher points will be provided to roadway projects that include other multimodal access improvements.

RESPONSE:

(Limit 2,100 characters; approximately 300 words):

|  |
| --- |
| SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)Part 1 (40 points): The applicant with the highest 2019 Housing Performance Score will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had a Housing Performance Score of 55 and the top project had a Housing Performance Score of 90, this applicant would receive (55/90)\*40 points or 24 points.Projects will use the city Housing Performance Score based on the project location. If a project is located in more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on a weighted average of the city or township scores for the project location based on the length of the project in each jurisdiction. For stand-alone roadway (intersection, bridge, underpass, and interchange) projects, a one-mile radius-buffer will be drawn around the project. If the radius-buffer enters more than one jurisdiction, the points will be awarded based on the proportionate population of the Census blocks in each jurisdiction that are all or partially located in the area within the one-mile radius-buffer.If a project is located in a city or township with no allocation of affordable housing need (either there is no forecasted household growth or the area does not have land to support sewered development), the project’s total score will be adjusted as a result. If this is the case, the hold-harmless method will be used: the total points possible in the application will be 960 instead of 1,000. The total points awarded through the rest of the application (900 as a hypothetical example) will be divided by 960, then multiplied by 1,000. Therefore, a project scoring 900 out of 960, will equate to 938 points on a 1,000-point scale. If a portion of the project is located in a city with an affordable housing allocation and the other portion is located in a township with no affordable housing allocation, then a combination of the Housing Performance Score (or weighted average) and the hold-harmless method should be used. This will result in a total score that will be somewhere between 960 and 1,000; then the score will need to be adjusted to fit a 1,000-point scale. NOTE: Any community without a Housing Performance Score in 2018 will be awarded the better of its new score in 2020 and the above method. NOTE: in these cases, the raw points from Part 2 will be included in the 960-point total.Part 2 (10 points): The project that best provides meaningful improvements to access to the affordable housing units will receive the full 10 points. Multiple projects may receive the highest possible score of 10 points based on this assessment. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion.Final Score (50 points): The scores in Parts 1 and 2 will be totaled. If no application gets 50 points, the highest-scoring project will be awarded 50 points, with other projects adjusted proportionately.Note: Metropolitan Council staff will score this measure. |

## Emissions Reduction (50 Points)

This criterion measures the impact that the project’s implementation may have on air quality by rating the potential that project’s elements have to contribute to reductions in CO, NOx, CO2e, PM2.5, and VOC emissions. Projects can include improvements to rolling stock; increases in travel speed and reductions in idling; and facility improvements that reduce emissions, reduce exposure, reduce congestion, and/or improve energy efficiency and use of renewable energy.

1. MEASURE: Discuss how the project will reduce emissions. Examples of project elements that can reduce emissions include (note that this is not an exhaustive list):
* Improved fuel efficiency and reduced tailpipe emissions through vehicle upgrades
* Improved ability for riders to access transit via non-motorized transportation
* Improved accommodation of transit-oriented development walkable from transit stop(s) and/or station(s)
* Reduced vehicle acceleration/deceleration cycles, “dead head” time, or idling time
* Electric vehicle charging stations
* Sustainable facility features such as energy efficient equipment, “green infrastructure” for storm water management, and use of renewable energy

RESPONSE: Applicants are recommended to provide any data to support their argument.

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

The project that has the most benefits for reduced emissions, reduced exposures, reduced congestion, and/or improved energy efficiency will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion.

## Service and Customer Improvements (200 Points)

Measures under this criterion assess how the overall quality of transit service is improved, and how the regional transit system will provide a better customer experience as a result of this project. Service and customer improvements include but are not limited to providing faster travel times, providing new or improved amenities or customer facilities, and improving customer interface with transit. This criterion will place particularly emphasis on travel time and reliability improvements.

1. MEASURE: Discuss how the project will improve transit service to the users. Proposed improvements and amenities can include, but are not limited to the following (200 Points):
* Travel time or reliability improvements
* Improved boarding area
* Improved customer waiting facilities
* Real-time signage
* Heated facilities or weather protection
* Safety and security equipment
* Improved lighting
* ITS measures that improve reliability and the customer experience
* Transit advantages

When providing a description of improvements and amenities, provide quantitative information, as applicable. This could include number of improved customer facilities by the type of amenity, number of routes impacted, or number of riders impacted. Of particular importance is quantifying travel time and reliability improvement. Examples include time saved per route, the portion of the route along which time is saved, and ridership or frequency on this route(s).

RESPONSE: (Limit 5,600 characters; approximately 800 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (200 Points)

The applicant should describe improvements included in the project that will make transit service more attractive and improve the user experience. The project will be scored based on the quality of the responses. When possible, quantitative information on service and customer improvements will be considered in the quality of the responses. A particular emphasis will be placed on travel time or reliability improvements. Projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion.

## Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections (100 Points)

This criterion measures how the project improves the travel experience, safety, and security for other modes of transportation, provides strong connections, and addresses the safe integration of these modes.

1. MEASURE: Discuss any bicycle or pedestrian elements that are included as part of the total project and how they improve the travel experience, safety, and security for users of these modes. Also, describe the existing bicycle, and pedestrian facilities and accommodations or bicycle and pedestrian connections. Furthermore, address how the proposed project safely integrates all modes of transportation (i.e., transit, vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians). Applicants should also identify supporting studies or plans that address why a mode may not be incorporated into the project.

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

|  |
| --- |
| SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)The project that results in the most comprehensive connectivity to non-motorized modes (via existing or added elements), as addressed in the required response (2,800 or fewer characters), will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion. Example improvements are listed below: * Improves the safety and security of the pedestrian or bicyclist (e.g., pedestrian-scale lighting, removing obstructions to create safe gathering spaces, leading pedestrian signal phasing, traffic calming, bike facilities separated from pedestrians)
* Improves the quality of the travel experience (e.g., pavement improvements, public art, benches, wayfinding)
* Improves the pedestrian network near the transit stop/station
* Improves the bicycle network near the transit stop/station
* Uses roadway shoulders or MnPASS lanes for faster service
* Connects to transit stops accessible via bike
* Connects to transit stops with safe / comfortable areas for pedestrians to walk or wait
 |

## Risk Assessment (50 Points)

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

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

If the applicant is completing a transit application that is operations only, check the box and do not complete the remainder of the form. These projects will receive full points for the Risk Assessment. [ ]

Park-and-Ride and other transit construction projects require completion of the Risk Assessment below.

RESPONSE: (Complete Risk Assessment):

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

1. **Layout (30 Percent of Points)**

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 100% | [ ]  | Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties that the project goes through or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)). A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points. |
| 50% | [ ]  | Layout completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points. |
| 0% | [ ]  | Layout has not been started |

Anticipated date or date of completion: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (20 Percent of Points)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 100% | [ ]  | No known historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places are located in the project area, and project is not located on an identified historic bridge |
| 100% | [ ]  | There are historical/archeological properties present but determination of “no historic properties affected” is anticipated. |
| 80% | [ ]  | Historic/archeological property impacted; determination of “no adverse effect” anticipated |
| 40% | [ ]  | Historic/archeological property impacted; determination of “adverse effect” anticipated |
| 0% | [ ]  | Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological properties in the project area. |

Project is located on an identified historic bridge: [ ]

1. **Right-of-Way (30 Percent of Points)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 100% | [ ]  | Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements either not required or all have been acquired |
| 50% | [ ]  | Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete |
| 25% | [ ]  | Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels identified |
| 0% | [ ]  | Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels not all identified |

Anticipated date or date of acquisition \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Railroad Involvement (20 Percent of Points)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 100% | [ ]  | No railroad involvement on project or railroad Right-of-Way agreement is executed (include signature page, if applicable) |
| 50% | [ ]  | Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun |
| 0% | [ ]  | Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun. |

Anticipated date or date of executed Agreement \_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Public Involvement (20 Percent of Points)**

Projects that have been through a public process with residents and other interested public entities are more likely than others to be successful. The project applicant must indicate that events and/or targeted outreach (e.g., surveys and other web-based input) were held to help identify the transportation problem, how the potential solution was selected instead of other options, and the public involvement completed to date on the project.

List Dates of most recent meetings and outreach specific to this project:

* Meeting with general public: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Meeting with partner agencies: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Targeted online/mail outreach: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Number of respondents: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 100% | [ ]  | Meetings specific to this project with the general public and partner agencies have been used to help identify the project need. |
| 75% | [ ]  | Targeted outreach specific to this project with the general public and partner agencies have been used to help identify the project need. |
| 50% | [ ]  | At least one meeting specific to this project with the general public has been used to help identify the project need. |
| 50% | [ ]  | At least one meeting specific to this project with key partner agencies has been used to help identify the project need. |
| 25% | [ ]  | No meeting or outreach specific to the project was conducted, but the project was identified through meetings and/or outreach related to a larger planning effort. |
| 0% | [ ]  | No outreach has led to the selected of this project. |

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

The applicant with the most points on the Risk Assessment (more points equate to less project risk) will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 40 points and the top project had 70 points, this applicant would receive (40/70)\*50 points or 29 points.

## Cost Effectiveness (100 Points)

This criterion will assess the project’s cost effectiveness based on the total annual TAB-eligible project cost and total points awarded.

1. MEASURE: This measure will calculate the cost effectiveness of the project. Metropolitan Council staff will divide the total number of points awarded in the previous criteria by the total annual TAB-eligible project cost.

Estimate and provide the annualized capital cost of the project and the annual operating cost of the project; the sum of these cost components equals the total annual project cost. The annualized project cost is derived from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidelines on useful life.

Total annual project cost is the lump sum total project cost divided by the FTA “years of useful life” as listed here. As noted in the useful life table, operating costs should also be annualized. If the project has two or more components with differing years of useful life, annualize each component. If the project type is not listed in the document, use most similar project type or provide supporting documentation on useful life value used.

Applicants should include all operating and capital costs associated with implementing the entire project, even though the applicant may only be applying for part of these costs as part of the solicitation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Type | Years of Useful Life |
| Operating funds | 3 |
| Passenger Automobile/Sedan/Minivan | 4 |
| Medium Duty Transit Buses | 5 |
| Heavy Duty Transit Buses | 12 |
| Over-the-Road Coach Buses | 14 |
| Park & Ride – Surface Lot | 20 |
| Park & Ride – Structured | 50 |
| Transit Center/Station/Platform | 70 |
| Transit Shelter | 20 |
| Light Rail Vehicles | 25 |
| Commuter Rail Vehicles | 25 |
| Land Purchase | 100 |

RESPONSE: (This measure will be calculated after the scores for the other measures are tabulated by the Scoring Committee):

* Total Annual Operating Cost: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Total Annual Capital Cost of Project:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Total Annual Project Cost:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Assumptions Used (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Points Awarded in Previous Criteria: \_\_\_\_\_\_ (entered by Metropolitan Council staff)
* Cost effectiveness = total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible annual project cost

|  |
| --- |
| SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)The applicant with the most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the top project received .0005 points per dollar and the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, this applicant would receive (.00025/.0005)\*100 points or 50 points.The scorer for this measure will also complete a reasonableness check of the total project cost that is used for this measure. The scorer may follow up with the applicant to clarify any questions. Up to 50 percent of points awarded for this measure can be deducted if the scorer does not believe that the cost estimate is reasonable. |

TOTAL: 1,100 POINTS