Regional Solicitation Unique Projects
Development Process – Meeting #5
**How are we going to operate?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE ACTIVE</td>
<td>Come prepared to engage (you all volunteered!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPECT OUR TIME</td>
<td>Limit the side chatter, stay focused on topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEEP AN OPEN MIND</td>
<td>Be considerate of others’ opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOW FOR EVERYONE</td>
<td>Don’t dominate the conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVE FUN</td>
<td>This is an exciting topic, let your creative side loose!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>Use Webex tools and Mentimeter to communicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS?</td>
<td>Will improve monitoring chat and hand raising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cole Hiniker
Host, me
Agenda

1. Recap of Recommendations to Date
2. Evaluation Metrics and Technical Committee Recommendations
3. Criteria Weighting Exercise
4. Next Steps
Recap of Recommendations to Date
## Recommendations to Date

### Two-Step Application Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique Projects</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopt unique projects draft application</td>
<td>September 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Solicitation public comment</td>
<td>Sept – Nov 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial project interest form due</td>
<td>November 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation w/ applicants</td>
<td>Nov – Jan 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Final Regional Solicitation</td>
<td>February 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications due</td>
<td>April 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>May – August 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project selection</td>
<td>Sept – Nov 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overlap public comment period with initial project interest form
Recommendations to Date

Evaluation Process

• First Step – Applicants provide:
  – Project title and description
  – List of project tasks or elements
  – Approximate budget and potential match sources
  – Description of project location or impacted areas
  – Brief description of how project will advance Unique Project goals: multiple responses with short word limit

• Staff review for eligibility and provide technical feedback to potential applicants

• Share information with Regional Solicitation Policy Work Group
Recommendations to Date

Evaluation Process

• Second Step – Applicants provide:
  – Detailed description of project, including documented need and approach
  – Detailed list of project elements
  – Line-item budget and confirmed match sources
  – Detailed description of project location and affected populations
  – Responses to criteria and metrics, both qualitative and quantitative

• Staff review for errors and provide technical input to evaluators
• Regional Solicitation Policy Work Group members evaluate metrics and rank projects
Recommendations to Date

Rules

- Minimum and maximum funding limits
  - Maximum Recommendation: no limit for this round, could be revisited for future solicitations
  - Minimum Recommendation: $500k to ensure cost-effectiveness for federal requirements

- Match requirements
  - Considered as part of scoring for partnerships and collaboration

- TDM innovation funding
  - Recommend keeping pot separate until TDM Study complete in 2023
Recommendations to Date

Evaluation Criteria

- Red text represents from technical feedback on the criteria titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Adverse Environmental Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Racial Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Multimodal Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Impact / Scalability (Expandability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships / Collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Metrics and Technical Committee Recommendations
Metrics Introduction

• Technical recommendation was to keep the questions qualitative in format but encourage applicants to use data and numbers to make their case; i.e., quantified answers likely get more points

• Within each criteria, the metrics are currently equally weighted
  – Do you agree with the relative importance of each metric for each of the criteria?
  – Should some be combined?
  – Should additional metrics be added?

• Are there additional considerations to add under any of the metrics that would help guide applicants and scorers?
How does the project reduce adverse environmental impacts of transportation?

• Improve air quality
  – Reduce single-occupant vehicle (SOV) trips
  – Access to charging stations
  – Reduce peak hour trips
• Contribution to climate change improvement
  – Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
• Reduce noise or light pollution
• Improve surface or ground water quality
  – Reduction in stormwater runoff; onsite stormwater management
• Other environmental improvements
  – Wildlife
  – Natural vegetation

How does the project improve racial equity?

• Improve connectivity and access for BIPOC communities
  – Connecting people to places, but also demonstrating an understanding of the places they want to go
  – Connecting communities where known gaps exist (document why connection is needed and source of info)
  – Outreach to, and involvement from these communities in project selection, development, or delivery.
• Removing barriers
  – Physical barriers being addressed (directly or indirectly)
  – Cultural barriers being addressed (language, etc.)
  – Engagement barrier being addressed (improving systemic outreach issues)
• Contributions to quality-of-life improvements
  – Placemaking
  – Safety
  – Job creation, economic development
  – Access to green space
  – Public health
Evaluation Metrics #2

How does the project support multimodal communities?

- Improve multiple non-SOV modes within the system (e.g., transit, biking, walking)
  - Creating interconnectivity between modes
  - Creating “bridges” that serve all modes
  - Multimodal trip planning
- Land use and development strategies that are conducive to multimodal transportation
  - Supporting growth of dense, mixed-use communities or neighborhoods
  - Reducing demand or need for parking
- Support first and last mile solutions for people connecting to places they need to go
  - Mobility hubs and centralized connections for multiple modes
  - Increasing shared trips/shared mobility

How is the project innovative?

- New approach to existing and/or emerging challenge(s)
  - Solving problems that have been a long-term challenge
  - New idea that hasn’t been piloted or deployed in Minnesota/Twin Cities/State/Upper Midwest or uses new technology
  - Leveraging connected and automated (CAV) vehicle technology
  - Integrating new technologies or practices into existing infrastructure
  - Risk assessment, mitigation strategy to management innovation/risks (and identify who mitigates)
Evaluation Metrics #3

How does the project have regional impact or how could it be expanded to more of the region?

• Regional impact
  – How many people does the project impact?
  – Percent of people (in a given community/area) impacted?
  – Project’s geographic reach

• Expandability
  – How can the idea be used regionwide?
  – Is it a replicable project (i.e., could it be adapted elsewhere)?
  – (Full credit if it already covers the whole region)

How does the project build partnerships or collaboration?

• Number of stakeholder groups that helped develop the project
  – How many involved in the project? (The more partners, the more points awarded)
  – Public/private (or 4P; Public, Private, Philanthropic, and People)
  – Percent or number of partners that are small/minority-owned business (DBE/TGB/MCUB).

• Match contribution
  – More points for high amount or percentage (e.g., % of partnership contributions compared to total dollar amount)
Questions?
Evaluation Criteria Weighting
Mentimeter Evaluation Metrics Discussion Exercise

www.menti.com
Code: 2851 8725
Meeting Reflection

• What worked?
• What didn’t work?
• Any meeting rules to add or revisit for next time?
Contact:

Cole Hiniker, Multimodal Planning Manager
612-743-2215
Cole.Hiniker@metc.state.mn.us