

Multiuse Trails and Bicycle Facilities

Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

September 15, 2021

Purpose: To fund multiuse trail and bicycle facilities that increase the availability and attractiveness of bicycling, walking, or rolling by improving safety; reducing or eliminating user barriers; and improving the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN).

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	
2. Potential Usage	200	18%
Measure A - Existing population and employment within 1 mile	200	
3. Equity and <u>Affordable Housing-Performance</u>	120	11%
Measure A – Benefits and outreach to disadvantaged populations <u>Engagement</u>	70 <u>36</u>	
<u>Measure B – Equity population benefits and impacts</u>	<u>48</u>	
Measure BC – Housing Performance Score/ a <u>Affordable housing connection/access</u>	50	
4. 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	
5. Multimodal Facilities and Existing Connections	100	9%
Measure A - Transit or pedestrian elements of the project and connections	100	

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
6. Risk Assessment/Public Engagement	130	12%
Measure A - Risk Assessment Form	130	
7. Cost Effectiveness	100	9%
Measure A – Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost)	100	
Total	1,100	

1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (200 Points)

This criterion measures the project’s ability to serve a transportation purpose within the regional transportation system and economy through its inclusion within or direct connection to the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN), which is based on the Twin Cities Regional Bicycle System Study (2015).

- A. **MEASURE:** Reference the “Project to RBTN Orientation” map generated at the beginning of the application process. Draw the proposed trail on the map.

RESPONSE: (Select one, based on the “Project to RBTN Orientation” map):

- Tier 1, Priority RBTN Corridor (200 Points)
- Tier 1, RBTN Alignment (200 points)
- Tier 2, RBTN Corridor (175 Points)
- Tier 2, RBTN Alignment (175 Points)
- Direct connection to an RBTN Tier 1 Corridor or Alignment (150 Points)
- Direct connection to an RBTN Tier 2 Corridor or Alignment (125 Points)

OR

- Project is not located on or directly connected to the RBTN but is part of a local system and identified within an adopted county, city, or regional parks implementing agency plan. (50 Points)

Upload the “Project to RBTN Orientation” map used for this measure.

SCORING GUIDANCE (200 Points)

The applicant will receive the points shown in the above bullets based on the location of the project relative to the RBTN.

RBTN Projects (Tier 1/Tier 2 corridors and alignments)

To receive the available points associated with Tier 1 and Tier 2 corridors and alignments, a project must accomplish one of the following:

- Improve a segment of an existing Tier 1 or Tier 2 alignment beyond a simple resurfacing of the facility;
- Implement a currently non-existing segment of a Tier 1 or Tier 2 alignment within and along a Tier 1 or Tier 2 corridor; OR

- Connect directly to a specific Tier 1 or Tier 2 corridor or alignment of the RBTN.

Note: if connecting to a RBTN corridor, the project must connect to a roadway or to the planned terminus of a trail in a way that makes possible a future connection to a potential RBTN alignment for the corridor.

Projects that include both on-RBTN and off-RBTN improvements

Projects will be scored based on the proportion of the project that is within and along a RBTN corridor or along a designated RBTN alignment as shown on the Project to RBTN Orientation map. Specifically:

- Tier 1 projects with 50% or more of the project's length within and along a Tier 1 corridor or alignment will receive 200 points.
- Tier 2 projects with 50% or more of the project's length within and along a Tier 2 corridor or alignment will receive 175 points.
- A project with less than 50% of its length within and along a Tier 1 corridor or alignment will be considered a Tier 1 direct connection and will receive 150 points for providing the direct connection.
- A project with less than 50% of its length within and along a Tier 2 corridor or alignment will be considered a Tier 2 direct connection and will receive 125 points for providing the direct connection.
- A project with less than 50% of its length within and along a Tier 1 or Tier 2 corridor or along a Tier 1 or Tier 2 alignment, but with 50% or more of its length within and along a combined Tier 1/Tier 2 corridor or alignment will receive the number of points corresponding to the Tier level with the higher proportion of project length.

Note: If no projects meet the above criterion for 200 points, the top scoring project(s) will be adjusted to 200 points and all other project scores will be adjusted proportionately. Due to tiered scoring, it is possible that multiple projects will receive the maximum allotment of 200 points.

2. Potential Usage (200 Points)

This criterion quantifies the project’s potential usage based on the existing population and employment adjacent to the project. Metropolitan Council staff will calculate the potential usage of the project using the Metropolitan Council model.

- A. **MEASURE:** Reference the “Population Summary” map generated at the beginning of the application process. Report the existing population and employment within one mile, as depicted on the “Population Summary” map.

RESPONSE: (Data from the “Population Summary” map):

- Existing Population within 1 Mile (Integer Only, 100 Points): _____
- Existing Employment within 1 Mile (Integer Only, 100 points): _____

Upload the “Population Summary” map used for this measure.

SCORING GUIDANCE (200 Points)

The applicant with highest population will receive the full 100 points, as will the applicant with the highest number of jobs. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points for population and jobs, respectively. As an example for population, projects will score equal to the existing population within 1 mile of the project being scored divided by the project with the highest population within 1 mile multiplied by the maximum points available for the measure (100). For example, if the application being scored had 1,000 people within 1 mile and the top project had 2,000 people, this applicant would receive $(1,000/2,000)*100$ points or 50 points.

- A. Existing population: 100 Points
- B. Existing employment: 100 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.

The highest-scoring application for this measure will be adjusted to receive the full 200 points. Remaining projects will receive a proportional share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 100 points and the top project had 180 points, this applicant would receive $(100/180)*200$ points or 111 points.

3. ~~Equity and Affordable Housing Performance~~ (120 Points)

This criterion addresses the ~~Council’s role in advancing equity~~Council’s role in advancing equity by examining how a project directly ~~provides benefits to,~~ or impacts (~~positively~~positive and ~~negatively~~Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) populations,~~negative~~) low-income populations, people ~~of color, people~~ with disabilities, youth, ~~older adults, and residents of affordable housing 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~~.

~~A. MEASURE: Socio-Economic Equity~~

~~A. Sub-measure: Equity Population-Engagement (0 to 3630 points). This measure is a qualitative scoring measure.~~

)-A successful project is ~~one that is~~ the result of active engagement of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, ~~people of color,~~ persons with disabilities, youth, older adults, and residents in affordable housing. ~~and the elderly.~~ Engagement should occur prior to and during ~~projecta~~ 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.

i. ~~Describe and map the location of any~~ Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, ~~people of color,~~ disabled populations, youth, or older adults ~~the elderly~~ within a ½ mile of the proposed project. ~~Describe how these~~ populations relate to regional context. Location of affordable housing will be addressed in Measure C.

ii. Describe how Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, persons with disabilities, youth, older adults, and residents in affordable housing ~~specific populations~~ were engaged ~~and provided outreach to,~~ whether through community planning efforts, project needs identification, or during the project development process.

iii. Describe the progression of engagement activities in this project. A full response should answer these questions:

1. ~~What~~ Describe what engagement methods and tools were used?
2. How did you engage ~~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?
3. ~~What;~~ techniques did you use to reach ~~out to~~ populations traditionally not involved in community engagement related to transportation projects?
4. How were the project's purpose and need identified?
5. How was the community engaged as the project was developed and designed?
6. How did you provide multiple opportunities for of Black, Indigenous, ~~;~~ feedback from these populations identifying potential positive and People of Color populations, low-income populations, persons with disabilities, youth, older adults, and residents in affordable housing to engage at different points of project development?
7. How did engagement influence the project plans or ~~negative elements of the proposed project through engagement, study recommendations?~~ How did you share back findings with community and re-engage to assess responsiveness of these changes?
- 1-8. ~~_____;~~ or plans that provide feedback from populations that may be impacted by the proposed project. If applicable, relevant, describe how will NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities? ~~;~~

(Limit ~~2,800~~ 1,400 characters; approximately ~~400~~ 200 words):

SCORING GUIDANCE (0 to 36 points)

Each application will be qualitatively scored based on the available points and will receive the number of points awarded.

B. MEASURE ~~Sub-measure:~~ Equity Population Benefits and Impacts (0 to 4840 points). This measure: ~~A successful project is~~ a qualitative scoring measure.

~~Successful projects are~~ one that has been designed to provide direct benefits to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, ~~people of color,~~ persons with disabilities, youth, ~~older adults, 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. Benefits to residents of affordable housing are addressed in Measure C.

~~(0 to 40 points)~~ Describe the project's benefits to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, ~~people of color,~~ children, people with disabilities, youth, and older adults~~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; 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):~~

- 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.

This is not an exhaustive list. A full response will support the benefits claimed, identify benefits specific to Equity populations residing or engaged in activities near the project area, identify benefits addressing a transportation issue affecting Equity populations specifically identified through engagement, and substantiate benefits with data.

Acknowledge and describe (0 points) Describe any negative project impacts to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, people of color, children, people with disabilities, youth, and older adults. Describe and the elderly created by the project, along with measures that will be taken to mitigate these them. Negative impacts. Unidentified or unmitigated negative impacts may that are not adequately mitigated can result in a reduction in points.

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

Below is a list of potential negative impacts. ~~This 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.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (0 to 48 points)

Each application will be qualitatively scored based on the available points and will receive the number of points awarded.

- ~~B. **MEASURE:** Affordable Housing Access (0 to 36 points). Displacement of residents and businesses.~~
- ~~C. Mitigation of temporary construction/implementation impacts such as dust; noise; reduced access for travelers and to businesses; disruption of utilities; and eliminated street crossings.~~
- ~~D. Other~~
- C. **Sub-measure: Bonus Points (0 to** This measure is a qualitative scoring measure.

Describe any affordable housing developments—existing, under construction, or planned—within ½ mile of the proposed project. The applicant should note the number of existing subsidized units, which will be provided on the Socio-Economic Conditions map. Applicants can also describe other types of affordable housing (e.g., naturally-occurring affordable housing, manufactured housing) and under construction or planned affordable housing that is within a half mile of the project. If applicable, the applicant can provide self-generated PDF maps to support these additions. Applicants are encouraged to provide a self-generated PDF map describing how a project connects affordable housing residents to destinations (e.g., childcare, grocery stores, schools, places of worship).

Describe the project’s benefits to current and future affordable housing residents within ½ mile of the project. Benefits must relate to affordable housing residents. Examples may include:

- specific direct access improvements for residents
- improved access to destinations such as jobs, school, health care or other;

- new transportation services or modal options;
- and/or community connection and cohesion improvements.

This is not an exhaustive list. A full response will support the benefits claimed, identify benefits specific to residents of affordable housing, identify benefits addressing a transportation issue affecting residents of affordable housing specifically identified through engagement, and substantiate benefits with data.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (36 points)
The project that best provides meaningful improvements to access to affordable housing units will receive the full 36 points. Multiple projects may receive the highest possible score of 36 points based on this assessment. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion.

E.D. BONUS POINTS (0 TO 25 POINTS ABOVE THE TOTAL CRITERION

POINTS):points) Those projects that score at least 80% of the maximum total points available through Measures A, B, sub-measures 1 and C2 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:

- ~~25 points to projects within an Area of Concentrated Poverty with 50% or more people of color~~
- ~~20 points to projects within an Area of Concentrated Poverty~~
- 15 points to projects within census tracts with the percent of population in poverty or population of color above the regional average percent
- 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 (0 to 2570 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 in Measures A, B, and C (, i.e.g., 96., 40 points for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Roadway applications), the

project will receive Bonus points as described ~~under sub-measure 3~~. If an applicant qualifies for Bonus points it ~~may~~ will result in ~~an a Socio-Economic-Equity and Affordable Housing~~ score of more than the total points available.

~~F. —~~ **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 length or population of the project in each jurisdiction. 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 sewer 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: _____~~
- ~~• Length of Segment within each City/Township: _____~~
- ~~• Percent of total funds to be spent 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):~~

4. Deficiencies and Safety (250 Points)

This criterion addresses the project's ability to overcome barriers or system gaps through completion of a [Critical Bicycle Transportation Link](#), or through implementing new or improved Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossings or Major River Bicycle Barrier Crossings (MRBBC) as defined in the 2040 TPP. In addition to providing critical links, projects will be scored on their ability to correct deficiencies and improve the overall safety/security of an existing facility or expand safe biking opportunities with a future multiuse trail or bicycle facility.

Note: 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.

A. **MEASURE:** Bikeway Network Gaps, Physical Barriers, and Continuity of Bicycle Facilities. (100 Points)

Note: For this criterion, applications will be given the higher of the Part 1 and Part 2 scores as described below. Applicants are encouraged to complete both Parts 1 and 2. If applicants for projects involving Tier 1 regional barriers or Major River Bicycle Barrier Crossings **choose not to complete Part I, it is recommended that they first confirm with Council staff** the Tier 1 or MRBBC status of the project location.

PART 1: Qualitative assessment of project narrative discussing how the project will close a bicycle network gap, create a new or improved physical bike barrier crossing, and/or improve continuity and connections between jurisdictions. Specifically, describe how the project would accomplish the following: **Close a transportation network gap, provide a facility that crosses or circumvents a physical barrier, and/or improve continuity or connections between jurisdictions.**

Bike system gap improvements may include the following:

- Providing a missing link between existing or improved segments of a local transportation network or regional bicycle facility (i.e., regional trail or RBTN alignment);
- Improving bikeability to better serve all ability and experience levels by:
 - Providing a safer, more protected on-street facility or off-road trail;
 - Improving safety of bicycle crossings at busy intersections (e.g., through signal operations, revised signage, pavement markings, etc.); OR
 - Providing a trail adjacent or parallel to a highway or arterial roadway or improving a bike route along a nearby and parallel lower-volume neighborhood collector or local street.

Physical bicycle barrier crossing improvements include grade-separated crossings (over or under) of rivers and streams, railroad corridors, freeways and expressways, and multi-lane arterials, or enhanced routes to circumvent the barrier by channeling bicyclists to existing safe crossings or grade separations. Surface crossing improvements (at-grade) of major highway and rail barriers that upgrade the bicycle facility treatment or replace an existing facility at the end of its useful life may also be considered as bicycle barrier improvements. (For new barrier

crossing projects, distances to the nearest parallel crossing must be included in the application to be considered for the full allotment of points under Part 1).

Examples of continuity/connectivity improvements may include constructing a bikeway across jurisdictional lines where none exists or upgrading an existing bicycle facility treatment so that it connects to and is consistent with an adjacent jurisdiction's bicycle facility.

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

PART 2: Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvements and Major River Bicycle Barrier Crossings

DEFINITIONS:

Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvements include crossings of barrier segments within the "Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas" as updated in the 2019 Technical Addendum to the Regional Bicycle Barriers Study and shown in the RBBS online map (insert link to forthcoming RBBS Online Map). Projects must create a new regional barrier crossing, replace an existing regional barrier crossing at the end of its useful life, or upgrade an existing barrier crossing to a higher level of bike facility treatment, to receive points for Part 2.

Major River Bicycle Barrier Crossings include all existing and planned highway and bicycle/pedestrian bridge crossings of the Mississippi, Minnesota and St. Croix Rivers as identified in the 2018 update of the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan. Projects must create a new major river bicycle barrier crossing, replace an existing major river crossing at the end of its useful life, or upgrade the crossing to a higher level of bike facility treatment, to receive points for Part 2.

Projects that construct new or improve existing Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossings or Major River Bicycle Barrier Crossings will be assigned points as follows:

- Tier 1 Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Area segments & any Major River Bicycle Barrier Crossings: (100 Points)
- Tier 2 Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Area segments: (75 Points)
- Tier 3 Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Area segments: (50 Points)
- Crossings of non-tiered Regional Bicycle Barrier segments: (25 Points)
- No improvements to barrier crossings (0 Points)

Projects that improve crossings of multiple regional bicycle barriers receive bonus points (except Tier 1 & MRBBCs) : (+15 Points)

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

Project scores for Criterion 4.A will be the **higher of the Part 1 and Part 2 sub-scores**, to be determined as follows:

Part 1 (Qualitative Assessment): The project that best closes a bicycle network gap, provides a facility that crosses or circumvents a physical barrier, and/or improves continuity or connections between jurisdictions will receive the full 100 points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer's discretion. Multiple projects may receive the highest possible score of 100

points based on this assessment. Projects should be compared and rated irrespective to the assigned scores they may receive under Part 2.

OR

Part 2: (Quantitative Assignment): Scorer will assign points based on the project's standing in relation to the Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas and Major River Bicycle Barrier Crossings as follows:

- Tier 1 Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Area segments & Major River Bicycle Barrier Crossings (100 points)
- Tier 2 Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Area segments (75 Points)
- Tier 3 Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Area segments (50 Points)
- Crossings of non-tiered Regional Bicycle Barriers (i.e., barrier segments that are outside of the Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas) (25 Points)

- For projects that do not create or improve a regional or major river bicycle barrier crossing, Part 2 is not applicable and the score for Part 1 will be used as the project score for this measure.

Projects that improve crossings of multiple Regional Bicycle Barriers will receive 15 bonus points in addition to their Tier 2, Tier 3, or non-tiered regional barrier segment-based points. (This does not apply to Tier 1 barrier crossings or MRBBC projects which already receive the maximum points possible.)

- B. **MEASURE:** Discuss how the project will correct existing deficiencies or address an identified safety or security problem on the facility. The applicant should also include any available project site-related safety data (e.g. crash data, number of conflict points to be eliminated by the project by type of conflict (bicyclist/pedestrian, bicyclist/vehicle, pedestrian/vehicle, and vehicle/vehicle)) to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem. Where available, use of local crash data for the project length is highly encouraged. If the agency submitting the application has access to MnCMAT, crash data from that system can be used as part of the submittal. Crashes involving bicyclists and pedestrians should be reported for the latest available 10-year period. As part of the response, demonstrate that the project improvements will reduce the crash potential and provide a safer environment (by referencing crash reduction factors or safety studies) and/or correct a deficiency. (150 Points)

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

MULTIUSE TRAILS/BICYCLE FACILITIES SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)

The applicant will receive the points shown below, based on the magnitude of the deficiencies or safety issues and the quality of the improvements, as addressed in the response. The scorer will first place each project into one of the two categories below based on whether crash data is cited as part of the response. The project with the most extensive improvements will receive the full points for each category. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points as listed below.

- A. For applicants that provide actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data to demonstrate the magnitude of the existing safety problem only. Project also demonstrates that the project will reduce the crash potential and provide a safer environment and/or correct a deficiency. The project that will reduce the most crashes will receive 150 points. The other projects in this category will receive a proportional share between 76 and 150 points (i.e., a project that reduces one-half of the crashes of the top project would receive 125 points): 76 to 150 Points
- B. For applicants that do not provide actual bicycle and pedestrian crash data. However, the applicant demonstrates the project’s ability to reduce the risk for bicycle and pedestrian crashes with the reduction of modal conflict points (bike/pedestrian, bike/vehicle, pedestrian/vehicle, and vehicle/vehicle), safety improvements that address these modal conflicts, or the project’s ability to correct deficiencies. The top project will receive 100 points while other projects will receive a portion of the 100 points based on the quality of the project and response: 0 to 100 Points

5. Multimodal Elements and 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.

- A. **MEASURE:** Discuss any transit or pedestrian elements that are included as part of the project and how they improve the travel experience, safety, and security for users of these modes. Applicants should make sure that new multimodal elements described in the response are accounted for as part of the cost estimate form earlier in the application. Also, describe the existing transit and pedestrian connections. Furthermore, address how the proposed bikeway project safely integrates all modes of transportation (i.e., bicyclists, transit, pedestrians, and vehicles). Applicants should note if there is no transit service in the project area and identify supporting studies or plans that address why a mode may not be incorporated in the project.

RESPONSE: (400 words or less):

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The project with the most comprehensive enhancements to the travel experience and safe integration of other modes, as addressed in the required response, will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion. The project score will be based on the quality of the improvements, as opposed to being based solely on the number of modes addressed. Projects that include the transit or pedestrian elements as part of the project should receive slightly more points than existing or planned multimodal facilities on parallel routes, consistent with the supporting plans and studies.

6. Risk Assessment (130 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 checklist in the required Risk Assessment.

- A. **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.).

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 will receive full credit for items 2-5 but must fill out item 1. or Transit vehicle purchases will receive full credit.

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. The focus of this section is on the opportunity for public input as opposed to the quality of input. NOTE: A written response is required and failure to respond will result in zero points.

~~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% Multiple types of targeted outreach efforts (such as meetings or online/mail outreach) 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 online/mail outreach effort specific to this project with the general public ~~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 selection of this project.

RESPONSE (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words). Describe the type(s) of outreach selected for this project (i.e., online or in-person meetings, surveys, demonstration projects), the method(s) used to announce outreach opportunities, and how many people participated. Include any public website links to outreach opportunities.:

2. Layout (25 Percent of Points)

Layout ~~should~~ includes proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries. A basic layout should include a base map (north arrow; scale; legend;* city and/or county limits; existing ROW, labeled; existing signals;* and bridge numbers*) and

design data (proposed alignments; bike and/or roadway lane widths; shoulder width;* proposed signals;* and proposed ROW). An aerial photograph with a line showing the project's termini does not suffice and will be awarded zero points.

*If applicable

100% Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties/~~MnDOT that the project goes through~~ or agencies that maintain the roadway(s)). If a MnDOT trunk highway is impacted, approval by MnDOT must have occurred to receive full points. **A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.**

100% A layout does not apply (signal replacement/signal timing, stand-alone streetscaping, minor intersection improvements). Applicants that are not certain whether a layout is required should contact Colleen Brown at MnDOT Metro State Aid – colleen.brown@state.mn.us.

75% For projects where MnDOT trunk highways are impacted and a MnDOT Staff Approved layout is required. Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted local jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties), and layout review and approval by MnDOT is pending. 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.**

25% Layout has been started but is not complete. A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.

0% Layout has not been started

3. ~~Anticipated date or date of completion:~~ _____

4.3. Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (15 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:

5.4. Right-of-Way (25 Percent of Points)

100% Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, [and MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit](#) either not required or all have been acquired

50% Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, [and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit](#) required, plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete

25% Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, [and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit](#) required, parcels identified

0% Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, [and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit](#) required, parcels not all identified

~~Anticipated date or date of acquisition~~ _____

6.5. Railroad Involvement (15 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 _____

SCORING GUIDANCE (130 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 proportional 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 $(40/70) \times 130$ points or 74 points.

7. Cost Effectiveness (100 Points)

This criterion will assess the project’s cost effectiveness based on the total TAB-eligible project cost and total points awarded in the previous 6 criteria.

- A. **MEASURE:** This measure will calculate the cost effectiveness of the project. Metropolitan Council staff will divide the number of points awarded in the previous criteria by the TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls).
- Cost effectiveness = total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls)

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

- Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form): _____ (automatically calculated)
- Enter amount of Noise Walls: _____
- Points Awarded in Previous Criteria: _____ (entered by Metropolitan Council staff)

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