2012-2016
Regional Service Improvement Plan

November 2012

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL MEMBERS

Susan Haigh	Chair
Roxanne Smith	District 1
Lona Schreiber	District 2
Jennifer Munt	District 3
Gary Van Eyll	District 4
Steve Elkins	District 5
James Brimeyer	District 6
Gary L. Cunningham	District 7
Adam Duininck	District 8
Edward Reynoso	District 9
John Đoàn	District 10
Sandy Rummel	District 11
Harry Melander	District 12
Richard Kramer	District 13
Jon Commers	District 14
Steven T. Chávez	District 15
Wendy Wulff	District 16

Metropolitan Council
390 North Robert Street
Saint Paul MN 55101

General phone	651.602.1000
TTY	651.291.0904
Email	*public.info@metc.state.mn.us*
Website	*www.metrocouncil.org*

Publication no. 30-12-031

On request, this publication will be made available in alternative formats to people with disabilities. Call the Metropolitan Council at 651.602.1140 or TTY 651.291.0904.

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

REGIONAL SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN DEFINITION

The Regional Service Improvement Plan (RSIP) identifies opportunities to improve transit service in the metropolitan area over the 2012-2016 period by expanding service coverage and increasing the frequency and span of service of the regular-route transit network.

The region's *2030 Transportation Policy Plan* identifies expansion of the regular-route transit system as a key element in achieving the regional goal of doubling transit ridership by 2030. This Regional Service Improvement Plan represents a milestone in this effort. By clearly identifying and evaluating service expansion projects, this plan will help clarify unmet transit needs and the best opportunities to meet those needs and advance regional transit goals.

The projects in the RSIP are prioritized to emphasize those having the best likelihood of success in achieving those regional goals. Not all the projects included in the plan are expected to perform equally against the broad range of evaluation factors used to rank projects. An important next step is to address the question of whether projects that do not rank well in this plan should receive investment of limited regional transit operating funds.

The plan is regional in scope. It reflects the ongoing coordination and common vision held by the region's seven transit service providers. Each provider has participated fully in this process, coming to consensus on an ambitious list of service expansion projects across the region.

PURPOSE

The *2030 Transportation Policy Plan* (TPP) recognizes that the "regular-route bus system will change and expand as population, congestion, and the cost of travel increase, as the region implements rail transit, and as customer needs change." Similarly, the TPP includes planned expansion of the region's transitway system.

Defining these changes to transit service and advocating for funding to implement the changes is an important role of the Metropolitan Council and all regional transit providers as well as other stakeholders, including local government, businesses, and residents. The RSIP is the region's tool for identifying and prioritizing these transit service improvements.

The RSIP also serves a role in determining where investment of regionally allocated operating funds for transit expansion would be most appropriate. The RSIP prioritizes regional expansion projects for consideration by funding decision-makers.

Finally, the RSIP provides a reasonable projection of future transit service to be included in the Regional Travel Demand Forecast Model. The Regional Travel Demand Forecast Model is used for determining future travel demand when planning for needs in the transportation system, including transitway investments.

The RSIP is not intended to be a complete transit improvement or investment plan. It is not a long-range plan; it does not include the entire regional transitway system; and it does not include nonservice investments such as vehicles, running ways, customer and support facilities, or technology enhancements.

It should also be noted that this RSIP is not a complete list of all transit service improvements in the region. All providers continually evaluate the service they provide and reinvest resources within existing budgets. Low-performing services are reduced or eliminated, freeing up resources to reinvest in service improvements on high demand routes elsewhere. The projects listed in this plan are those which transit providers are not currently able to fund within existing operating funding resources.

II. POLICY DIRECTION AND PROCEDURE

2030 TRANSPORTATION POLICY PLAN

The requirement for a Regional Service Improvement Plan is identified in the *2030 Transportation Policy Plan* under Policy 14, Strategy 14c:

> **Policy 14: Transit System Operations and Management:** The regional transit providers will promote innovation, efficiency, flexibility and greater diversity of options in operating and managing transit services.
>
> **Strategy 14c. Service Improvement Plan:** Every two years, regional transit providers in consultation with customers and stakeholders, will prepare a short-term Service Improvement Plan that identifies their priorities for transit service expansion over the following two to four years. The plans will be submitted to the Council, which will prepare a regional Service Improvement Plan.

REGIONAL SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN PROCEDURES

The process for developing the RSIP is outlined in the *Regional Service Improvement Plan Procedures* adopted by the Metropolitan Council in 2010 and shown in Appendix F. This document calls for the creation of a RSIP Review Committee and lays out a four-step process for the development of the RSIP:

1. Solicit two- to four-year Service Improvement Plans from all regional transit providers.
2. Review and combine service improvement projects into a single regional list.
3. Evaluate projects based on regional performance measures and other factors.
4. Prepare a categorized and prioritized list of projects to guide planning work and funding allocation decisions.

REGIONAL OPERATING REVENUE ALLOCATION PROCEDURE

The RSIP is also identified in the *Regional Operating Revenue Allocation Procedure*, adopted by the Metropolitan Council in 2010. This procedure outlines how the Metropolitan Council will allocate regional transit operating funding, including Regionally Allocated Motor Vehicle Sales Tax (MVST), for service preservation and expansion.

The top priority for Regionally Allocated MVST will be to preserve existing service. Once these needs are met, remaining Regionally Allocated MVST will be used to fund expansion projects that meet regional transit goals. The RSIP will be used as a screening tool for service expansion projects. Those providers that have projects that achieve a certain level of priority in the RSIP will be eligible for service expansion funding from Regionally Allocated MVST. For this purpose, the RSIP must prioritize projects to identify those that best support regional goals.

III. RSIP REVIEW COMMITTEE

The *Regional Service Improvement Plan Procedures* call for Council staff to convene a RSIP Review Committee to solicit, review, score and prioritize transit service expansion projects. This committee includes one representative from each suburban transit provider, two members from Metro Transit, one member from Metropolitan Transportation Services, and a staff liaison from the Metropolitan Council.

2011 RSIP Review Committee Members

In January 2011, Metropolitan Council staff appointed John Levin, Metro Transit's Director of Service Development, as chair of the committee and Cole Hiniker, MTS Planner, as staff to the committee. They in turn, solicited members from all the regional transit providers. The assigned committee was as follows:

- John Levin, Metro Transit, Chair
- Cyndi Harper, Metro Transit
- John Harper, Metropolitan Transportation Services
- Mike Abegg, Minnesota Valley Transit Authority
- Jane Kansier, City of Prior Lake
- Michael Leek, City of Shakopee
- Dave Jacobson, SouthWest Transit
- Bernie Maciej, Plymouth Metrolink
- Mike Opatz, Maple Grove Transit
- Cole Hiniker, Metropolitan Transportation Services, staff

Review Committee Meetings

The RSIP Review Committee met six times during 2011 and once in 2012 to discuss the following topics:

1. January 31, 2011
    - Kicked off process with an overview of RSIP purpose and procedure
2. February 23, 2011
    - Reviewed project solicitation information requirements, including ridership and cost estimation methodologies
3. March 30, 2011
    - Discussed project evaluation factors
    - Finalized project description forms
4. September 23, 2011
    - Distributed project proposals
    - Reviewed evaluation factors and point distribution
5. October 24, 2011
    - Overview of projects presented by providers
    - Reviewed preliminary evaluation tables for the subsidy, passenger per in-service hour, subsidy per passenger-express mile, congestion, capital facilities, and innovation categories
    - Began initial discussion of how to evaluate the benefits to low-income/minority populations and the disability community categories
6. November 22, 2011
    - Determined evaluation methodology for the benefits to low-income/minority populations and the benefits to the disability community categories
    - Reviewed proposed scores for each category
    - Discussed how to combine individual factors into an overall score
    - Outlined final report
7. January 30, 2012
    - Reviewed draft RSIP report

IV. EVALUATION FACTORS

COMMITTEE REVIEW OF EVALUATION FACTORS

The *Regional Service Improvement Plan Procedure* identifies the evaluation factors that are to be used to support the development of a prioritized service improvement project list. The Review Committee reviewed these evaluation factors and made minor modifications. Specifically, the committee removed one evaluation factor, added one evaluation factor and agreed upon the details of how each of the evaluation factors would be measured and scored.

The committee discussed the "Local Support" evaluation factor and chose not to include it in the overall project evaluation. The committee determined that any project submitted by a transit provider would have already gone through a process of establishing and determining whether there was support for the proposed improvements prior to submittal for the RSIP. In other words, the provider's inclusion of a project in their own plans was considered to be an adequate demonstration of local support for the project in the RSIP.

One evaluation factor not originally included in the RSIP procedure, subsidy per passenger express mile, was added based on requests from committee members for a measure that recognized the value of long-distance express routes. Subsidy per passenger express mile is determined by dividing the net service subsidy by the total number of passengers on board for each mile of nonstop express service. This measure balances the increased cost of long distance express service with the larger environmental, congestion, and customer benefits of carrying more people farther. Additional data was requested for each express service project to support the evaluation of this factor. In many cases, the passenger express miles value was approximated by multiplying the total service ridership by the non-stop express miles on the service.

EVALUATION FACTOR MEASUREMENT

The final evaluation factors used for prioritization were:

- Subsidy per passenger,
- Passengers per in-service hour,
- Subsidy per passenger express mile,
- Congestion mitigation,
- Capital facility coordination,
- Service to low-income and minority populations,
- Benefits for the disabled community, and
- Innovation.

For each factor, the committee agreed upon the criteria for assigning a rank of High, Medium or Low. The factors include a mix of quantitative measures and qualitative assessments, so the criteria for the ranks vary across the different factors.

Scoring of several of the quantitative factors is based on relative performance compared to regional system averages or regional route averages. For this evaluation, the *2010 Regional Route Performance Analysis* was used to provide these benchmarks.

Evaluation factors referencing demographic data use either 2000 Census block-group data (low-income and disabled populations) or 2010 Census block data (minority populations).

For the overall prioritization of projects, the committee agreed to apply weights to reflect the relative importance of each factor. Objective factors that are tied directly to route performance, such as passengers per in-service hour and subsidy per passenger, were weighted more heavily than qualitative and/or subjective measures such as innovation.

Table IV-1 provides a summary of the evaluation factors and the methodology used to score and weight each factor.

TABLE IV-1. RSIP EVALUATION FACTORS

Evaluation Factor	Measure	Weight
Subsidy per Passenger	Measured in proportion to regional averages for service type: High = Better than the regional **system** average* for service type Medium = Better than 130% of regional **route** average* for service type Low = Worse than 130% of regional **route** average* for service type	25 points
	• Weekday, Saturday and Sunday scores are assigned separately, then a combined score is determined. When scores differ by service day, the overall score is generally the weekday score. If, however, the weekday score is lower than weekend but close to the threshold between scores, the overall score may instead be the same as Saturday or Sunday.	
Passengers per In-Service Hour (Productivity)	Measured in proportion to regional standard for service type: High = Above regional **system** average* for service type Medium = Above regional average **standard** for service type Low = Below regional average **standard** for service type	25 points
	• Weekday, Saturday and Sunday scores are assigned separately, then a combined score is determined. When scores differ by service day, the overall score is generally the weekday score. If, however, the weekday score is lower than weekend but close to the threshold between scores, the overall score may instead be the same as Saturday or Sunday. • Dial-a-Ride service uses the small bus non-fixed route standard of 3.0 riders per in-service hour.	
Subsidy per Passenger Express Mile	Measured in proportion to the regional average for express routes. This factor only applies to peak express service. High = Better than the regional **system** average for express routes Medium = Better than 130% of the regional **route** average for express routes Low = Worse than 130% of the regional **route** average for express routes	10 points
	• Subsidy per passenger express mile is calculated as the net route subsidy divided by the total route ridership multiplied by the nonstop distance of the route. Nonstop distance equals combined distance of all nonstop route segments over 2 miles, with exceptions for online stations like I-35W & Lake Street. • 2010 system average is $0.24 per passenger express mile	
Congestion Mitigation	Measured based on an assessment of level and length of congested freeway segments served by the route. This factor will only apply to peak express service. Congestion score = High congestion miles x 3 + medium congestion miles x 2 + low congestion miles x 1. High = Combined AM/PM congestion score > 25 Medium = score > 10 Low = score < 10	10 points
	• Congestion map from 2010 MnDOT Congestion Report: http://www.dot.state.mn.us/congestionreport/CongestionReport2010.pdf	

Evaluation Factor	Measure	Weight
Capital Facility and Running Way Coordination	Measured based on committee review of project and required capital facilities. High = No capital facilities required, or all necessary capital facilities either constructed or fully funded and planned for construction before service begins. Medium = Facilities programmed, but funding and construction not yet completed Low = Required facilities not programmed • "Programmed" includes inclusion in a funded capital improvement program or the Transportation Improvement Program • "Capital facility" for this evaluation does not include vehicles	12 points
Benefits for Disabled Community	Measured based on comparison of population served by proposed service expansion to overall regional population, with adjustments for specific circumstances identified in the project documentation. High=Percentage of disabled persons within ¼ mile of boarding section of route exceeds regional average AND application describes extenuating circumstances Medium= Percentage of disabled persons within ¼ mile of boarding section of route exceeds regional average OR percentage of disabled persons within ¼ mile of boarding section of route is lower than regional average but application describes extenuating circumstances Low= Percentage of disabled persons within ¼ mile of boarding section of route is lower than regional average OR it is an express service with no local pick-up outside downtown. • Determine total population (age 5 and older) and disabled populations living within ¼ mile of the boarding section of a route. The regional average is 14.2% disabled.	8 points
Service to Minority and Low-Income Populations	Measured based on comparison of population served by proposed service expansion to overall regional population. High=Percentage of low-income and minority persons within ¼ mile of boarding section of route exceeds twice the regional average (200%) Medium= Percentage of disabled persons within ¼ mile of boarding section of route exceeds regional average (100-199%) Low= Percentage of disabled persons within ¼ mile of boarding section of route is lower than regional average; all express routes serving just a park and ride with no local section outside downtown • The regional average for low-income populations is 7.2% and the regional average for minority populations is 26.1%.	8 points
Innovation	High / Medium / Low based on recommendation of project sponsor and assessment by committee. Examples of service innovations include LRT and BRT lines, flex routes, high-frequency network improvements and projects collecting multiple service types into one location.	5 points

*The "regional system average" for subsidy per passenger is calculated as the total subsidy across all routes divided by the total number of passengers. The "regional route average" is calculated as the sum of the subsidy per passenger values for each route divided by the total number of routes. Both statistics will be calculated across all routes within a given route type (i.e. urban local, suburban local and express).

V. PROJECT SOLICITATION PROCESS

To ensure a standard format for project documentation, the Review Committee prepared project solicitation forms and instructions for providers to develop project submittals and document ridership and costs. For each project, providers were asked to include the following detailed information:

- Service provider
- Route/project number, name, or identification – *Projects not limited to a single route improvement*
- Proposed implementation year – *The initial solicitation is for projects to begin between 2012-2016*
- Route type and categorization – *Route types include express, suburban local, urban local/limited stop and other (such as highway bus rapid transit)*
- Project purpose – *Options include: increasing capacity, improving connectivity and coverage, developing new markets, and increasing service quality; projects may have multiple purposes*
- Description of the transit improvement – *Includes markets/destinations served and reason for the improvement; Improvement defined as anything that a provider considers to be a service expansion, not just service management (i.e. an added trip to address an existing overload is considered service management)*
- Capital facilities – *Includes existing and future capital investments planned with or required for the service and the funding status of capital requirements; does not include fleet expansion*
- Description of benefits to the low-income, minority, and disabled populations
- Description of congestion mitigation – *Applies only to express projects*
- Description of project innovation
- Map of new route or existing route with proposed changes
- Transit service and performance estimates – *New trips, platform hours, buses, ridership and costs*
  - Express route projects were requested to use the methodology outlined in the Park & Ride Plan to determine unmet demand and how proposed service helps would meet that demand.
  - Local route projects were advised to use a reasonable method for estimating ridership, considering ridership on similar routes in terms of density, land use, and service levels.

  At the committee's request, ridership estimation guidelines were prepared and a session was held regarding the use of the U.S. Census Bureau's Longitudinal Employment-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data and the methodology in the Park & Ride Plan.

  To determine project cost, the providers were asked to use fully allocated costs consistent with the data provided for the Regional Route Performance Analysis.
- Estimated fare revenue – *Defined as the number of estimated rides multiplied by the projected fare revenue per passenger, based on similar services*
- Planned or potential funding sources – *Includes examples such as Regionally Allocated MVST, Counties Transit Improvement Board funds or federal grants*

The project documentation forms were distributed in April 2011. The blank project documentation form, resource table, and directions are provided in Appendix A.

Originally, the submittals were requested to be due in late May 2011. This timeline was extended until early September 2011 due to the extended legislative session and state government shutdown.

VI. PROJECT SUMMARY

A total of 62 projects were submitted by the regional transit service providers, 60 regular-route bus projects, one light-rail transit (LRT) project, and one dial-a-ride project. Each provider submitted at least one project[1]. A summary of the submitted projects is provided in Table VII-1 below and in Appendix B. A complete of set of documentation for all projects is available as an addendum to this report.

Table VI-1 provides a summary of all the submitted projects. Not all of these projects are expected to be implemented. However, if they were, the submitted bus projects would represent an increase of approximately 1,800 daily hours of service. (This does not include the Green Line LRT service project.) If implemented, this would represent an increase of 14% over current regional regular-route bus service, require an additional 154 peak buses (15% increase) and attract an additional 9.8 million annual rides (13% increase) .

TABLE VI-1 – SUMMARY OF ALL PROJECTS BY PROVIDER

Service Provider	Proj-ects	Total Hours	Service Hours	Total Cost	Net Subsidy	Peak Buses	Annual Rides
Maple Grove	4	10,685	7,489	$814,580	$477,203	9	170,340
Metro Transit *	39	367,608	278,070	$37,470,046	$27,989,036	94	8,775,377
MVTA	13	64,550	39,560	$5,399,504	$3,951,217	35	597,903
Plymouth	3	5,855	5,855	$835,423	$570,886	8	104,550
Southwest	1	8,803	4,373	$1,094,427	$643,720	7	157,590
BlueXpress **	1	9,563	2,889	$784,125	$533,511	3	91,800
Subtotal Bus	**61**	**467,062**	**338,236**	**$46,398,105**	**$34,165,572**	**156**	**9,897,560**
Green Line LRT	1	66,726	54,643	$23,220,578	$15,890,773	13	9,682,019

* Includes Metropolitan Council contracted routes

** BlueXpress service is provided jointly by Prior Lake and Shakopee

There were four project purposes identified in the project documentation forms, with any one project potentially addressing more than one purpose. Of the 62 projects submitted:

- 24 projects would increase capacity to meet growing demand,
- 44 projects would improve connectivity and coverage,
- 26 projects would develop new markets, and
- 55 projects would improve the quality of service.

In general, projects in the RSIP represent three key service expansion opportunities for the region:

- **Implementation of regional LRT and BRT transitway service** – The Green Line LRT, Phase I of the Orange Line BRT (I-35W South corridor), and Phases I and II of the Red Line BRT (Cedar Ave corridor) as well as local services connecting to these transitways are included in the RSIP. New or expanded limited stop bus service in several of the corridors being studied for Rapid Bus (arterial BRT) is also included.

[1] Projects that would be contracted to a private provider funded by the Metropolitan Council are combined with Metro Transit's projects for the purpose of the RSIP. Although the Red Line BRT will be operated by MVTA, it is listed as a Metropolitan Council project since the Council, in cooperation with CTIB, is the lead agency in funding the project.

- **Expansion of the frequency, span, and coverage of the local route network** – Seven additional bus routes (Routes 2, 3, 4, 22, 62, 68 and 74) are proposed to meet the High Frequency Network standards of 15-minute service between 6 a.m. and 7 p.m. on weekdays and 9 a.m. and 6 p.m. on Saturdays. Several other routes would have frequency increases that do not rise to the level of the High Frequency Network but are still an improvement over existing service levels. Other routes would see a wider span of service, new weekend service, or new service in areas currently not served by transit.
- **Additional express service to meet growing demand at park and rides** – The RSIP is coordinated with the Regional Park-and-Ride Plan. Major park-and-ride capacity expansions are matched with proposed service expansion to meet growing ridership demand. The RSIP has also been coordinated with existing and requested Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) grants as well as the facility improvements programmed in the region.

The projects are geographically distributed throughout the region, although there is some concentration in St. Paul, where several service improvements are proposed in coordination with the Green Line LRT, and in the MVTA service area, where several service improvements are proposed in coordination with the Red Line BRT service. A map of the projects is provided in Appendix C.

VII. EVALUATION FACTOR SCORES

Using the evaluation factor measures and weights outline above, all projects were assigned a rank of High, Medium, or Low for each evaluation factor. The evaluation factor measures and ranks for each project are provided in Appendix D.

These ranks were then translated into points based on the rank and the weight of each factor. Projects receiving a High score for a factor were assigned three points times the weight for that factor; projects ranked Medium were assigned two points times the weight; and projects ranked Low were assigned one point times the weight. For example, a project scoring High in the category of subsidy per passenger would be assigned 75 points (25 weight x 3 points) while a project scoring Low would get 25 points (25 weight x 1 point).

The total points for each project were determined by adding the points for each individual evaluation factor that applies to that project. Since some of the evaluation factors only applied to certain types of routes, the total possible points is not the same for all projects. Therefore, the overall score is not based on total points, but on the percent of possible points that are earned by the project.

For the overall project rank, projects that earned at least 75 percent of the possible points were ranked High, projects that earned between 60 percent and 74.9 percent of possible points were ranked Medium, and projects that earned less than 60 percent of possible points were ranked Low.

A summary of the projects and rankings is shown in Table VII-1 and the detail project rankings are provided in Appendix E. Of the 62 projects that were scored (60 bus, one LRT and one dial-a-ride), 20 projects ranked High, 30 projects ranked Medium, and 12 projects ranked Low.

The outcome of this scoring process, including the individual evaluation factor ranks and weights, and the thresholds for determining overall project rank, achieve the result that any project that does not at least meet the minimum regional standards for subsidy per passenger for passengers per in-service hour received an overall rank of Low. All other projects received a rank of Medium or High, based not only on those two evaluation factors but also on all the other factors.

TABLE VII-1. PROJECT SUMMARY

Provider	Route	Route Type	Description	Year	Rank
Metro Transit	2	Urban Local	HFN Standard between Franklin/Hiawatha and Wash/Oak. Freq between Franklin/Hennepin and Oak/Wash will improve to 10 min between 5:30am-7pm on WK, 9am-6:30pm on SAT and 9am-6pm on SUN. Add new branch between Oak/Wash and Raymond LRT Station.	2014	High
Metro Transit	3	Urban Local	Improve WK to 10 min trunk, 20 min branch freq by extending "C" trips. On SAT and SUN, improve freq to 15min freq west of Snelling Ave, east of Rice St. & Como Ave; 30 min on Front and Maryland Ave.	2014	Medium
Metro Transit	4	Urban Local	Meet HFN Criteria daily of 15 min freq between 31st/Bryant and Hennepin/Washington on WK and SUN.	2015	Medium
Metro Transit	5	Urban Local	New limited stop Arterial BRT service on Chicago Ave: MOA-7th St Garage. Local route between MOA and 56th St, limited stop at streets with connecting routes north of 56th to HCMC. Replaces Route 5E, keep BCTC-HCMC and MOA-33rd/Lowry 30 min. local service.	2016	Medium
Metro Transit	10	Urban Local	Weekday: improve freq from 10 min. to 7.5 min. between 8am-4pm south of CHTC. Saturday: improve freq from 15 min to 10 min between 9am-6pm. Sunday: Improve frequency from 20 min to 15 min between 9am-6pm and extend service to Northtown until 11pm.	2013	High
Metro Transit	11	Urban Local	Midday and Saturday freq between 46th St Station and 2nd St NE/Lowry improves from 30 min to 15 min.	2015	Medium
Metro Transit	19	Urban Local	Improve frequency on SUN from 30 min to 15 min between 9am-6pm on Sunday.	2013	High
Metro Transit	22	Urban Local	Weekday: improve freq between 45th Ave/Lyndale and downtown Minneapolis from 20 min to 15 min between 6am-7pm to meet HFN standards. Saturday: improve freq between 45th Ave/Lyndale and downtown Minneapolis from 20 min to 15 min between 9am-6pm to meet HFN standards. Sunday: improve freq between 45th Ave/Lyndale and downtown Minneapolis from 30 min to 15 min between 12pm-6pm. Off-peak freq in south Mpls reduced from 20 min to 30 min.	2015	High
Metro Transit	23	Urban Local	Weekday: improve peak freq from 20 min to 15 min. Weekend: improve midday freq from 30 min to 20 min.	2013	Medium
Metro Transit	60	Urban Local	New loop route via University, Victoria, St Clair, Hamline, University, Snelling. 6am-8pm WK span of service. 8am-8pm SAT and SUN span of service. Connecting bus service for Central LRT.	2015	High
Metro Transit	61	Urban Local	Weekday: improve freq between 6am-7pm from 30 min to 15 min and between 7pm-10:30pm from 60 min to 30 min. Saturday: improve freq between 6am-8pm from 60 min to 30 min. Add Sunday service every 60 min between 6am-8pm.	2015	Medium
Metro Transit	62	Urban Local	Improve freq between California/Camelot and downtown St Paul between 6am-7pm on weekdays and 9am-6pm on Saturdays from 30 min to 15 min to meet HFN standards.	2014	High
Metro Transit	63	Urban Local	Extend route from Summit/Cretin to Univ./Emerald LRT Station via Cretin Ave and Desnoyer Park neighborhood. Off-peak freq improved from 30 min to 15 min on weekdays, from 30 min to 20 min on Saturday, and from 60 min to 30 min on Sunday.	2014	Medium
Metro Transit	65	Urban Local	Improve WK freq from 30 min to 15 min and weekend freq from 60 min to 30 min. Reroute south of Lake St to Grand Ave.	2014	Medium
Metro Transit	67	Urban Local	Extend route south of University Ave via Fairview Ave, Ford Pkwy to Highland Village. Provide Highland Park connection to CCLRT. Improve WK freq between 6am-7pm from 30 min to 15 min, weekend freq from between 9am-6pm from 60 min to 30 min. Widen span to start at 5am on SAT and 6am on SUN.	2014	Medium

TABLE VII-1. PROJECT SUMMARY (cont.)

Provider	Route	Route Type	Description	Year	Rank
Metro Transit	68	Urban Local	Improve freq between 14th/Jackson and 5th Ave/South St in South St Paul to 15 min between 6am-7pm on WK and between 9am-6pm on SAT.	2016	Medium
Metro Transit	74	Urban Local	Freq between Stillwater Ave/Nokomis Ave and 46th St LRT Station will be improved to 15 min between 6am-7pm (weekday) or 9am-6pm (Saturday) to meet HFN standards.	2015	Medium
Metro Transit	80	Urban Local	Improve freq to 30 min between 6:30am-9:30pm on WK, 6:30am-7:30pm on SAT, and 6:30am-7:30pm on SUN. Widen weekend span.	2015	Medium
Metro Transit	83	Urban Local	New route via W. 7th/Otto to Rosedale via Lexington, Hamline Ave to connect with LRT. 15 min peak/30 min offpeak on WK and SAT. 6am-11:30pm WK and 7am-7pm SAT span of service.	2014	High
Metro Transit	84	Urban Local	New Arterial BRT limited stop and shortline between Como and Edgcumbe. Improve freq to 10 min during peak periods and to 15 min in the midday and Saturday. Improve freq from 30 min to 15 min on Sunday. Ltd stop span of service is 6am-1am. Local service remains at 30 min freq.	2014	High
Metro Transit	87	Urban Local	Add weekday evening service between 7pm-11:30pm at 90 min freq to serve St. Paul campus night classes. Add Saturday service every 30 min between 7am-7pm.	2014	Medium
Metro Transit	110	Urban Local	New U of M-Longfellow direct service via 46th Ave, 42nd St, 34th St, 36th Ave, 25th St, 27th Ave, Franklin Ave, Riverside Ave, Washington Ave. 3 peak period trips.	2014	High
Metro Transit	535	Urban Local	Orange Line 35W South BRT Service. Extend service to Burnsville TS. Separate the existing 535 service to Knox P&R and Best Buy. Replace Route 146 with 7.5 min freq on Route 46 and Route 535. Weekend: 30 min freq 6am-10pm.	2016	Medium
Metro Transit	54 E. 7th St	Urban Local	New Arterial BRT limited stop service on the east side of St. Paul via E. 7th, Arcade, Maryland and White Bear Ave to Maplewood Mall. 15 min freq on WK between 6am-10pm, on SAT between 7am-10pm. SUN freq at 30 min between 7am-10pm.	2014	Low
Metro Transit	54 W. 7th St	Urban Local	Improve W. 7th St. Arterial BRT span and freq and connect with new limited stop service on the east side of St. Paul. Improve WK freq from 15 min to 7.5 min during peak.	2014	Medium
Met Council	Red Line BRT	Urban Local	Provide all-day, BRT service at 15 min frequency during the week and 30-min frequency on weekends between AVTS and Mall of America Transit Stations.	2012	Medium
MVTA	421	Suburban Local	Increase service span between 6am-6pm to 60 min on flex route in Burnsville and Savage.	2013	Medium
MVTA	440	Suburban Local	Improve freq from 90 min to 60 min all day.	2012	Low
MVTA	446	Suburban Local	Expand weekday local service to 60 min base and peak, 30 min reverse-peak. Widen span?	2012	Low
Metro Transit	515	Suburban Local	Improve WK and SAT evening freq to 15 min until 9:30PM (Southdale) to meet increased demand. SUNDAY: Improve freq from 20-30 min to 15 min from 11am-6pm(Southdale). Operate added trips via Longfellow Ave or VAMC	2013	High
Metro Transit	721	Suburban Local	Increase service from 60 min to 30 min between 9am-4pm.	2015	High
Metro Transit	723	Suburban Local	Improve frequency from 60 min to 30 min between 6am-8pm to meet growing demand for service to North Hennepin Community College.	2013	High

TABLE VII-1. PROJECT SUMMARY (cont.)

Provider	Route	Route Type	Description	Year	Rank
Maple Grove	788B	Suburban Local	New feeder route with timed transfer to the Route 780 at the Shepherd of the Grove church.	2012	High
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local	Suburban Local	Expand weekday local feeder service in the Cedar Avenue corridor to implement the Cedar Avenue Transitway IPU. 60 min freq-maybe 30 min freq in peak?	2012	Medium
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II	Suburban Local	First part of Stage 2 weekday local expansion for Cedar BRT project. 60 min freq-maybe some 30 min during peak?	2016	Low
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II weekend	Suburban Local	First part of Stage 2 weekend local/feeder expansion for Cedar BRT project. 60 min freq. Add weekend service to some existing weekday routes, as well as possible new services.	2015	Low
MVTA	Local Coverage	Suburban Local	Expand local routes to areas not currently served to meet MVTA's Service Investment Strategies. Assessment and prioritization needed. 60 min freq likely.	2015	Low
MVTA	Sunday	Suburban Local	Expand Sunday local service to level equal to current Saturday service. Add service on Route 441 and extend span on Routes 444 and 445. 60 min freq proposed.	2013	Medium
Metro Transit	250	Express	Increase peak and midday service for P&R expansion of 500 spaces, which opened in 2009. Peak period freq will increase from 5-8 min to 3-5 min, and two midday trips will be added to provide 90 min midday freq.	2014	Medium
Metro Transit	270	Express	Add 3 AM and 3 PM trips between Maplewood Mall and downtown Minneapolis (bypass Co C) for P&R growth.	2014	High
Metro Transit	275	Express	Add 4AM and 4PM trips to travel between downtown St Paul and new 35E/Co Rd 14 park and ride. Redirect current resources to travel between downtown St Paul and new 35E/Co Rd E park and ride in Vadnais Heights. Close Cub Foods Park and Ride.	2015	High
Metro Transit	376	Express	New Manning Ave P&R.-Minneapolis express. Ten round trips per CMAQ grant-four funded by grant.	2014	High
Metro Transit	386	Express	New Manning Ave Park & Ride - St. Paul express. Four round trips per CMAQ grant.	2014	Medium
BlueXpress	490	Express	Expansion of existing Route 490 to serve Marschall Road Transit Station using 3 coach buses. A bus-only ramp from the station to US Highway 169 will be constructed to facilitate the express service. Some trips may serve U of M and a midday trip may be added. New buses may also enhance reverse commute express service.	2015	Medium
Metro Transit	587	Express	Additional trips for new Edina P&R near Hwy 100/Eden. New branch via Vernon Ave and Lincoln Dr to replace Route 146.	2015	Medium
Metro Transit	673	Express	Improve service for 2006 P&R expansion, widen peak span. Deferred CMAQ grant. Add 4 AM and 4 PM trips at fringe of peak.	2015	High
Metro Transit	674	Express	Extend route to serve new Maple Plain Hwy 12 Park and Ride. CMAQ application. Four new trips each peak period serving Maple Plain. Improve freq in Long Lake and Wayzata.	2016	Low
Metro Transit	675	Express	East of Ridgedale, improve midday and early evening freq from 30 min to 15 min. Improve fringe of peak freq from 30 min to 15 min.	2015	Medium

TABLE VII-1. PROJECT SUMMARY (cont.)

Provider	Route	Route Type	Description	Year	Rank
Metro Transit	766	Express	Increase service for Noble P&R expansion/relocation. Add 8 SB and 8 NB trips to improve freq from 10 min to 7.5 min.	2013	High
Plymouth	772	Express	Increase service from 30 minutes to 15 minutes during am and pm peak period.	2012	Low
Plymouth	776	Express	Increase service from 30 minutes to 15 minutes during am and pm peak period.	2013	Low
Maple Grove	785	Express	Add express trips (4 inbound and 5 outbound) to the existing Route 785 to increase frequency and span of service. This corresponds with Parkway Station Phase 2 which adds 210 spaces and has been approved for final design.	2013	High
Maple Grove	786	Express	Add new express route serving the southwest and south portions of Maple Grove primarily operating along Bass Lake Road to serve new park & ride at 494/Bass Lake.	2015	Medium
Plymouth	790	Express	Increase service from 20 minutes to 10 minutes during am and pm peak period.	2014	Low
Southwest	169 Service	Express	New express service to downtown Mpls and U of M from new 300 stall park and ride at Pioneer Tr./Hennepin Townline Rd (near US 169) in Eden Prairie. 30 min AM peak freq, one midday and evening trip, 15 min PM peak freq. Other services could include reverse commute service to Golden Triangle and suburban circulator if warranted by demand. CMAQ application.	2016	Medium
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express	Express	Implement new Route 471 between Cedar Grove-downtown Mpls with 12 trips. Add 4 trips on existing Route 475 between Cedar Grove, downtown Mpls and U of M midday. Eliminate 2 trips on route 472 (as well as shortening of 8 other trips).	2012	Low
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express Stage II	Express	First part of Stage 2 expansion for Cedar BRT. Add trips on Routes 471, 475, 476 and 477 to compliment station-to-station service. Reduce freq by one-third.	2015	Low
MVTA	I-35W	Express	Provide funding for the new services that will begin in 2013 under an approved CMAQ grant. Improve existing Routes 464 and 465, including a new, more direct express route serving Savage Park & Ride. Improve freq on Route 464 from 30 min peak to 20-30 min with a faster schedule. Improve freq on Route 465 from 30 min peak/60 min off-peak to 15 min peak/30 min off-peak.	2013	Medium
MVTA	Rosemount Express	Express	Increase frequency and span of Weekday Express service between Rosemount and downtown Minneapolis as described in the approved CMAQ project application. Improve service from 2 trips each dir to 30 min peak period/15 min peak half-hour.	2013	Medium
MVTA	St Paul Express	Express	Increase freq and span of weekday Routes 480 and 484 per approved CMAQ application. Current freq is 30 min on Route 484 and 30 min on each Route 480 branch. Add 15 min peak-of-peak trunk freq from Blackhawk P&R and Eagan Transit Center.	2014	Medium
LRT	Green Line	LRT	LRT service replaces Route 50 and most of Route 16.	2014	High
Maple Grove	DAR	Dial-a-ride	Add 16 hours/2 vehicles of weekday MG Dial-A-Ride service	2013	Medium

DIAL-A-RIDE EVALUATION

Dial-a-ride service is an important aspect of the regional transit system, but its role and performance within the overall transit network is difficult to evaluate because it is intended to serve a complementary role to fixed-route local and express route services.

For this evaluation, the lone dial-a-ride service expansion project from Maple Grove Transit was evaluated along with the other fixed-route service projects to the extent possible. There were some changes required to the evaluation because of the different regional standards for dial-a-ride and fixed-route services. Because of the small number of dial-a-ride services with very different operating contexts, it is not practical to calculate a regional route average "subsidy per passenger" or "passengers per in-service hour" for dial-a-ride service. Similarly, while there is a regional "passengers per in-service hour" standard for small bus nonfixed routes, there is no regional "subsidy per passenger" performance standard for dial-a-ride. For this reason, dial-a-ride service was not evaluated against a "subsidy per passenger" standard and the scoring of the "passengers per in-service hour" evaluation factor was adjusted. These changes are reflected in the specific project evaluation scores.

Based on these complexities, the Review Committee members have agreed that further discussion is needed of how dial-a-ride service expansion should be considered in the context of the Regional Service Improvement Plan. Specifically, the need to expand dial-a-ride service will need to be considered from a regional perspective. To address this, the RSIP Committee requests that Metropolitan Council staff convene a discussion of dial-a-ride expansion planning. This discussion should address not only the need for expansion of dial-a-ride service in the context of fixed route service expansion, but also in the broader context of regional transit operations funding allocation.

VIII. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS

Table VIII-1 shows the total service cost, net subsidy and ridership for projects in the RSIP grouped by rank. Table VIII-2 shows this same information as a percentage of the total. These tables do not include the Green Line LRT project.

TABLE VIII-1. COST AND RIDERSHIP OF PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

Project Rank	Projects	Cost	Subsidy	Ridership	Subsidy/Passenger
High	19	$9,210,630	$5,612,087	3,149,885	$1.78
Medium	30	$29,980,552	$22,736,782	5,898,521	$3.85
Low	12	$7,206,923	$5,816,704	849,154	$6.85
Total	61	$46,209,038	$34,000,985	9,885,320	$3.45

TABLE VIII-2. PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS AS PERCENT OF TOTAL

Project Rank	Percent of Cost	Percent of Subsidy	Percent of Ridership
High	20%	16%	32%
Medium	65%	67%	60%
Low	16%	17%	9%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table VIII-3 shows the distribution of projects by provider, year of proposed service expansion and route type.

TABLE VIII-3. DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS BY PROVIDER, YEAR AND ROUTE TYPE

Provider	High	Medium	Low	Total
Metro Transit/Met Council	18	20	2	40
Maple Grove Transit	2	2	0	4
Minnesota Valley Transit Authority	0	6	7	13
Southwest Transit	0	1	0	1
Plymouth Metrolink	0	0	3	3
Prior Lake/Shakopee BlueXpress	0	1	0	1
Total	20	30	12	62

Proposed Implementation Year	High	Medium	Low	Total
2012	1	2	4	7
2013	6	6	1	12
2014	8	9	2	19
2015	5	9	3	17
2016	0	4	2	6
Total	20	30	12	62

Route Type	High	Medium	Low	Total
Urban Local	9	16	1	26
Suburban Local	4	3	5	12
Express	6	10	6	22
Light Rail Transit	1	0	0	1
Dial-a-Ride	0	1	0	1
Total	20	30	12	62

IX. Fleet Expansion Needs

Overall, the projects included in the 2012-2016 RSIP would require the addition of 156 peak buses. Using a standard spare ratio of 20%, this would require an additional 187 total buses. These would be a mix of standard buses, small buses, and larger articulated and coach buses. Exact fleet requirements will depend on which projects are implemented.

Given that regional bus storage and maintenance capacity is already nearly full, the addition of more than a few dozen buses to the fleet will likely also require the expansion of garage capacity. The exact nature and cost of this expansion will depend in part on what service improvements are implemented.

This plan does not project the capital cost for additional buses or capital and operating costs for additional bus storage and maintenance facilities

X. Metro Mobility and Transit Link Impacts

Projects that propose all-day service in a community currently served only during peak periods or not at all, as well as projects broadening the span of service, may have an impact on dial-a-ride services such as Metro Mobility and Transit Link.

Specifically, Metro Mobility's weekend span of service in Apple Valley, Blaine, Burnsville, Eagan, Spring Lake Park, and West St. Paul will need to be reviewed if various projects associated with the Red Line as well as Route 10 improvements are implemented. In addition, Transit Link customers along potential new fixed routes may no longer be eligible for service.

XI. 2012 Project Update

With transit service planning continuing on an ongoing basis, a plan such as this can only be a snapshot in time. As detailed in Section III above, the solicitation process for projects to include in the Regional Service Improvement Plan began in early 2011 and was completed later that year. Since that time, several changes have occurred that should be considered in the context of overall regional transit service expansion needs. Some projects have been implemented, while in other cases, subsequent planning efforts have changed the details of the service expansion or led to additional projects being added to expansion priorities.

Several examples of these changes are provided below. As this RSIP is used to inform regional decisions regarding funding of transit expansion projects, these changes should be considered. Some projects no longer require expansion funding for implementation while other projects that are not currently listed in the RSIP may be equally as deserving of funding as project already in the plan.

Implemented Projects

While there is not currently funding available for transit service expansion in the region, all providers are able to continually evaluate the service they provide and reinvest resources within existing budgets. Specifically, low-performing service can be reduced, freeing up resources to invest in service improvements elsewhere. As many of the projects indentified in this RSIP are high-priority projects, several planned improvements have already been fully or partially implemented. These improvements have been offset by service reductions on other routes or service efficiencies elsewhere.

Specific examples of recent service improvements that are also identified in this RSIP include:

- Route 3 Saturday trunk frequency improvement
- Route 10 weekend frequency improvement
- Route 19 Sunday frequency improvement
- Route 68 evening frequency improvement
- Route 515 evening frequency improvement
- Route 721 midday frequency improvement
- Route 723 midday frequency improvement
- Route 675 midday frequency improvement

COMPLETED SERVICE PLANS

Since the solicitation for this RSIP, several service planning projects have been completed that have bearing on the service improvements that are included in his plan.

Central Corridor Transit Service Study: Improvements identified in the RSIP on routes 2, 3, 60, 62, 63, 65, 67, 68, 83, 84 and 87 were considered as part of the Central Corridor Transit Service Study. Staff review and public comment led to several changes to the plans initially proposed. The resulting recommended service plan, which is anticipated to be adopted in November 2012, results in a somewhat different set of route change recommendations.

Cedar BRT / Red Line Implementation: Planning for the implementation of Red Line BRT service has progressed through 2012, with start of operations now planned for spring 2013. The final service plan for the Red Line is expected to be similar to the project documented in the RSIP. Concurrent planning for associated local and express service in the Cedar Avenue corridor is also underway.

NEW PROJECTS

Regional providers are continually exploring opportunities to improve transit service. There are several additional service expansion proposals that were not included in this RSIP but which regional providers have now included in their service expansion plan. These include:

- TH 65/Central Avenue express bus service expansion to Minneapolis
- I-35E North express bus service expansion to downtown Saint Paul
- Local service improvements identified in the 2012 Minnetonka Transit Study

These service improvements are anticipated to be included in the next update to the RSIP.

APPENDIX A

Project Documentation Forms

Project Documentation Form Instructions

2012-2016 REGIONAL SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT DOCUMENTATION

PART A- PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Service Provider:

2. Project Name:

3. Year of Implementation: Select a year:

4. Service Type: Select a service type: If Other:

5. Project Purpose (select all that apply):

- ☐ Increase Capacity to Meet Growing Demand
- ☐ Improve Network Connectivity and Coverage
- ☐ Develop New Transit Markets
- ☐ Increase Service Quality (Frequency, Span of Service, Speed)

6. Briefly describe the proposed service improvement. Please attach a map of the route(s) with the proposed change(s) or the new route(s).

7. Describe any existing or future capital facilities or runningway investments associated with this service improvement, including funding status:

8. Explain how the project will benefit the disability community:

9. Describe how the project will benefit minority and/or low-income populations:

10. If applicable, explain how the project mitigates congestion:

11. Describe how the service improvement is innovative:

PART B- PROJECT COSTS/REVENUE

12. Document the methodology and assumptions used to determine ridership, cost and revenue estimates:

13. Identify planned or potential funding sources:

2012-2016 REGIONAL SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PROJECT DOCUMENTATION

Project Name:

	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday/Holidays	Annual Total
Average Revenue Per Passenger				
Current In-Service Hours (Daily)				0
New In-Service Hours (Daily)				0
Total In-Service Hours (Daily)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Current Platform Hours (Daily)				0
New Platform Hours (Daily)				0
Total Platform Hours (Daily)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Current Ridership (Daily)				0
New Ridership (Daily)				0
Total Ridership (Daily)	0	0	0	0
Current Annual Cost of Service				$0
New Annual Cost of Service				$0
Total Annual Cost of Service	$0	$0	$0	$0
Current Annual Fare Revenue	$0	$0	$0	$0
New Annual Fare Revenue	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total Annual Fare Revenue	$0	$0	$0	$0
Current Annual Subsidy	$0	$0	$0	$0
New Annual Subsidy	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total Annual Subsidy	$0	$0	$0	$0
Current Subsidy Per Passenger	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
New Subsidy Per Passenger	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Subsidy Per Passenger	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Current Passengers Per In-Service Hour	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
New Passengers Per In-Service Hour	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Passengers Per In-Service Hour	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Existing Peak Bus Requirement		NA	NA	NA
New Peak Bus Requirement		NA	NA	NA
Total Peak Bus Requirement	0	NA	NA	NA
Existing Trips Provided				0
New Trips Provided				0
Total Trips Provided	0	0	0	0

Formula-based cells calculate automatically

2012-2016 REGIONAL SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT DOCUMENTATION INSTRUCTIONS

The Regional Service Improvement Plan (RSIP) is mandated in the Metropolitan Council's Transportation Policy Plan. It will be used as a screening tool for service expansion projects to identify those that best support regional goals. Those providers that have projects that achieve a certain level of priority in the RSIP will be eligible for service expansion funding from Regionally Allocated Motor Vehicle Sales Tax (RA-MVST).

All service providers must complete the application, although a provider is not required to propose any service improvement projects. Any project that will be requesting funding from RA-MVST funds that may become available between 2012-2016 must submit an application. Any service improvement project within the 7-county metro is eligible. The applications will be reviewed and evaluated by the RSIP Review Committee, prioritized for implementation, and combined into a single list. Particular attention will be paid to the service level, cost estimates and ridership projections, as these values significantly influence the evaluation factors used to compare projects.

Please return an electronic version of the completed application to Cole Hiniker, Planner, Metropolitan Council at cole.hiniker@metc.state.mn.us. Applications must be received by ***4:30 p.m. on Friday, May 27, 2011*** for consideration.

<u>NARRATIVE PART A- PROJECT INFORMATION</u>

1. Service Provider: Name of transit provider submitting the project

2. Project Name: Route Number or Identification

3. Year of Implementation: Select a year from the drop-down menu

4. Service Type: Select a category from the drop-down menu. For other, please explain.

5. Project Purpose: Select one or more categories from the drop-down list

6. Describe the proposed improvement, including the proposed markets/destinations that the improvement will serve. Please attach a map of the route(s) with the proposed change(s) or the new route(s).

7. Please describe the following items for any proposed capital facility or running way improvements:
   - Funding status-fully funded, programmed, partially funded, or unfunded
   - Funding source(s) such as regional transit capital (RTC); local, regional, state or federal grants and bonds; local match requirements
   - Year of planned construction

- Whether the improvement is included in an adopted CIP

8. Please describe if the service improvement benefits the disability community. The definition of disability in this submittal is anyone with a disability of any type.

9. Explain if the project specifically benefits minority and/or low-income populations, such as serving low-income housing, entry level jobs or areas with a high percentage of minority or low-income populations.

10. The congestion mitigation category applies only to express routes or service improvements traveling on highways. Please document the length and level of congestion that the improvement bypasses, using MnDOT congestion maps or other source.

11. Please describe if the proposed service improvement is innovative.

NARRATIVE PART B -PROJECT COSTS/REVENUE

Please provide operational information related to the proposed route or service improvement. All providers should use the fully allocated cost methodology developed for the Regional Route Performance Analysis when determining operational expenses associated with a service improvement. Financial costs and revenues should be calculated using 2011 dollars. Ridership should be calculated at the time the service improvement reaches maturity (usually 12-24 months after implementation). Ridership projections for express services should be based on the five-step Park and Ride Demand Estimation Methodology outlined in the regional Park and Ride Plan, available online at http://www.metrocouncil.org/planning/transportation/ParknRide/ParknRidePlan.htm
Ridership projections for other routes can be based on comparable existing services and/or LEHD data, available online at http://lehd.did.census.gov/led/

PROJECT STATISTICS AND COSTS TABLE

Please provide projected operational information related to the proposed route or service improvement.

Please fill in the cells relevant for the days of service being proposed:

- Peak bus requirements do not apply to weekends. Please indicate whichever peak period has the higher requirement. This number should not include spares.
- In-Service Hours is defined as the amount of time when a vehicle starts in-service at the first scheduled pick-up point on a trip to the time the vehicle is out of service at the last scheduled drop-off time point on the same trip. It does not include deadhead, layover or recovery time.
- Platform Hours is defined as the time from when a vehicle starts from a garage to go into revenue service to the time it returns to the garage after completing its revenue service.

APPENDIX B

Summary of Projects

2012-2016 Regional Service Improvement Plan Projects

Provider	Route	Route Type	Description	Year	Increase Capacity to Meet Growing Demand	Improve Connectivity and Coverage	Develop New Markets	Increase Service Quality
Metro Transit	2	UrbLoc	HFN Standard between Franklin/Hiawatha and Wash/Oak. Freq between Franklin/Hennepin and Oak/Wash will improve to 10 min betw/ 5:30am-7pm on WK, 9am-6:30pm on SAT and 9am-6pm on SUN. Add new branch between Oak/Wash and Raymond LRT Station.	2014		X		X
Metro Transit	3	UrbLoc	Improve WK to 10" trunk, 20" branch freq by extending "C" trips. On SAT and SUN, improve freq to 15" freq west of Snelling Ave, east of Rice St. & Como Ave; 30" on Front and Maryland Ave.	2014		X		X
Metro Transit	4	UrbLoc	Meet HFN Criteria daily of 15 min freq between 31st/Bryant and Hennepin/Washington on WK and SUN.	2015		X		X
Metro Transit	5	UrbLoc	New limited stop Arterial BRT service on Chicago Ave: MOA-7th St Garage. Local route between MOA and 56th St, limited stop at streets with connecting routes north of 56th to HCMC. Replaces Route 5E, keep BCTC-HCMC and MOA-33rd/Lowry 30 min. local service.	2016		X		X
Metro Transit	10	UrbLoc	Weekday: improve freq from 10 min. to 7.5 min. between 8am-4pm south of CHTC. Saturday: improve freq from 15 min to 10 min between 9am-6pm. Sunday: Improve frequency from 20 min to 15 min between 9am-6pm and extend service to Northtown until 11pm.	2013	X	X		X
Metro Transit	11	UrbLoc	Midday and Saturday freq between 46th St Station and 2nd St NE/Lowry improves from 30 min to 15 min.	2015		X		X
Metro Transit	19	UrbLoc	Improve frequency on SUN from 30 min to 15 min between 9am-6pm on Sunday.	2013		X		X
Metro Transit	22	UrbLoc	Weekday: improve freq between 45th Ave/Lyndale and downtown Minneapolis from 20 min to 15 min between 6am-7pm to meet HFN standards. Saturday: improve freq between 45th Ave/Lyndale and downtown Minneapolis from 20 min to 15 min between 9am-6pm to meet HFN standards. Sunday: improve freq between 45th Ave/Lyndale and downtown Minneapolis from 30 min to 15 min between 12pm-6pm. Off-peak freq in south Mpls reduced from 20 min to 30 min.	2015		X		X
Metro Transit	23	UrbLoc	Weekday: improve peak freq from 20 min to 15 min. Weekend: improve midday freq from 30 min to 20 min.	2013		X		X
Metro Transit	60	UrbLoc	New loop route via University, Victoria, St Clair, Hamline, University, Snelling. 6am-8pm WK span of service. 8am-8pm SAT and SUN span of service. Connecting bus service for Central LRT.	2015		X	X	
Metro Transit	61	UrbLoc	Weekday: improve freq between 6am-7pm from 30 min to 15 min and between 7pm-10:30pm from 60 min to 30 min. Saturday: improve freq between 6am-8pm from 60 min to 30 min. Add Sunday service every 60 min between 6am-8pm.	2015		X		X
Metro Transit	62	UrbLoc	Improve freq between California/Camelot and downtown St Paul between 6am-7pm on weekdays and 9am-6pm on Saturdays from 30 min to 15 min to meet HFN standards.	2014		X		X
Metro Transit	63	UrbLoc	Extend route from Summit/Cretin to Univ/Emerald LRT Station via Cretin Ave and Desnoyer Park neighborhood. Off-peak freq improved from 30 min to 15 min on weekdays, from 30 min to 20 min on Saturday, and from 60 min to 30 min on Sunday.	2014		X	X	X
Metro Transit	65	UrbLoc	Improve WK freq from 30 min to 15 min and weekend freq from 60 min to 30 min. Reroute south of Lake St to Grand Ave.	2014		X	X	X
Metro Transit	67	UrbLoc	Extend route south of University Ave via Fairview Ave, Ford Pkwy to Highland Village. Provide Highland Park connection to CCLRT. Improve WK freq between 6am-7pm from 30 min to 15 min, weekend freq from between 9am-6pm from 60 min to 30 min. Widen span to start at 5am on SAT and 6am on SUN.	2014		X	X	X
Metro Transit	68	UrbLoc	Improve freq between 14th/Jackson and 5th Ave/South St in South St Paul to 15 min between 6am-7pm on WK and between 9am-6pm on SAT.	2016		X		X
Metro Transit	74	UrbLoc	Freq between Stillwater Ave/Nokomis Ave and 46th St LRT Station will be improved to 15 min between 6am-7pm (weekday) or 9am-6pm (Saturday) to meet HFN standards.	2015		X		X
Metro Transit	80	UrbLoc	Improve freq to 30 min between 6:30am-9:30pm on WK, 6:30am-7:30pm on SAT, and 6:30am-7:30pm on SUN. Widen weekend span.	2015		X		X
Metro Transit	83	UrbLoc	New route via W. 7th/Otto to Rosedale via Lexington, Hamline Ave to connect with LRT. 15 min peak/30 min offpeak on WK and SAT. 6am-11:30pm WK and 7am-7pm SAT span of service.	2014		X	X	X

Provider	Route	Route Type	Description	Year	Increase Capacity to Meet Growing Demand	Improve Connectivity and Coverage	Develop New Markets	Increase Service Quality
Metro Transit	84	UrbLoc	New Arterial BRT limited stop and shortline between Como and Edgecumbe. Improve freq to 10 min during peak periods and to 15 min in the midday and Saturday. Improve freq from 30 min to 15 min on Sunday. Ltd stop span of service is 6am-1am. Local service remains at 30 min freq.	2014		X		X
Metro Transit	87	UrbLoc	Add weekday evening service between 7pm-11:30pm at 90 min freq to serve St. Paul campus night classes. Add Saturday service every 30 min between 7am-7pm.	2014		X	X	X
Metro Transit	110	UrbLoc	New U of M-Longfellow direct service via 46th Ave, 42nd St, 34th St, 36th Ave, 25th St, 27th Ave, Franklin Ave, Riverside Ave, Washington Ave. 3 peak period trips.	2014		X	X	
Metro Transit	250	Express	Increase peak and midday service for P&R expansion of 500 spaces, which opened in 2009. Peak period freq will increase from 5-8 min to 3-5 min, and two midday trips will be added to provide 90 min midday freq.	2014	X			X
Metro Transit	270	Express	Add 3 AM and 3 PM trips between Maplewood Mall and downtown Minneapolis (bypass Co C) for P&R growth.	2014	X			X
Metro Transit	275	Express	Add 4AM and 4PM trips to travel between downtown St Paul and new 35E/Co Rd 14 park and ride. Redirect current resources to travel between downtown St Paul and new 35E/Co Rd E park and ride in Vadnais Heights. Close Cub Foods Park and Ride.	2015	X		X	X
Metro Transit	376	Express	New Manning Ave P&R.-Minneapolis express. Ten round trips per CMAQ grant-four funded by grant.	2014	X		X	
Metro Transit	386	Express	New Manning Ave P&R.-St. Paul express. Four round trips per CMAQ grant.	2014	X		X	
Metro Transit	515	SubLoc	Improve WK and SAT evening freq to 15 min until 9:30PM (Southdale) to meet increased demand. SUNDAY: Improve freq from 20-30 min to 15 min from 11am-6pm(Southdale). Operate added trips via Longfellow Ave or VAMC	2013		X		X
Metro Transit	535	UrbLoc	Orange Line 35W South BRT Service. Extend service to Burnsville TS. Separate the existing 535 service to Knox P&R and Best Buy. Replace Route 146 with 7.5 min freq on Route 46 and Route 535. Weekend: 30 min freq 6am-10pm.	2016		X	X	X
Metro Transit	587	Express	Additional trips for new Edina P&R near Hwy 100/Eden. New branch via Vernon Ave and Lincoln Dr to replace Route 146.	2015			X	
Metro Transit	673	Express	Improve service for 2006 P&R expansion, widen peak span. Deferred CMAQ grant. Add 4 AM and 4 PM trips at fringe of peak.	2015	X			X
Metro Transit	674	Express	Extend route to serve new Maple Plain Hwy 12 Park and Ride. CMAQ application. Four new trips each peak period serving Maple Plain. Improve freq in Long Lake and Wayzata.	2016			X	X
Metro Transit	675	Express	East of Ridgedale, improve midday and early evening freq from 30 min to 15 min. Improve fringe of peak freq from 30 min to 15 min.	2015		X		X
Metro Transit	721	SubLoc	Increase service from 60 min to 30 min between 9am-4pm.	2015				X
Metro Transit	723	SubLoc	Improve frequency from 60 min to 30 min between 6am-8pm to meet growing demand for service to North Hennepin Community College.	2013		X		X
Metro Transit	766	Express	Increase service for Noble P&R expansion/relocation. Add 8 SB and 8 NB trips to improve freq from 10 min to 7.5 min.	2013	X			X
Metro Transit	54 E. 7th St	UrbLoc	New Arterial BRT limited stop service on the east side of St. Paul via E. 7th, Arcade, Maryland and White Bear Ave to Maplewood Mall. 15 min freq on WK between 6am-10pm, on SAT between 7am-10pm. SUN freq at 30 min between 7am-10pm.	2014		X		X
Metro Transit	54 W. 7th St	UrbLoc	Improve W. 7th St. Arterial BRT span and freq and connect with new limited stop service on the east side of St. Paul. Improve WK freq from 15 min to 7.5 min during peak.	2014		X		X
Met Council	Red Line BRT	UrbLoc	Provide all-day, BRT service at 15 min frequency during the week and 30-min frequency on weekends between AVTS and Mall of America Transit Stations.	2012	X		X	X
BlueXpress	490	Express	Expansion of existing Route 490 to serve Marschall Road Transit Station using 3 coach buses. A bus-only ramp from the station to US Highway 169 will be constructed to facilitate the express service. Some trips may serve U of M and a midday trip may be added. New buses may also enhance reverse commute express service.	2015	X	X	X	X
LRT	Green Line	LRT	LRT service replaces Route 50 and most of Route 16.	2014	X	X	X	X
Maple Grove	785	Express	Add express trips (4 inbound and 5 outbound) to the existing Route 785 to increase frequency and span of service. This corresponds with Parkway Station Phase 2 which adds 210 spaces and has been approved for final design.	2013	X			X

Provider	Route	Route Type	Description	Year	Increase Capacity to Meet Growing Demand	Improve Connectivity and Coverage	Develop New Markets	Increase Service Quality
Maple Grove	786	Express	Add new express route serving the southwest and south portions of Maple Grove primariliy operating along Bass Lake Road to serve new p&r at 494/Bass Lake.	2015	X	X	X	
Maple Grove	788B	SubLoc	New feeder rooute with timed transfer to the Route 780 at the Shepherd of the Grove church.	2012			X	X
Maple Grove	DAR	Dial-a-ride	Add 16 hours/2 vehicles of weekday MG Dial-A-Ride service	2013	X			X
MVTA	421	SubLoc	Increase service span between 6am-6pm to 60 min on flex route in Burnsville and Savage.	2013		X	X	X
MVTA	440	SubLoc	Improve freq from 90 min to 60 min all day.	2012				X
MVTA	446	SubLoc	Expand weekday local service to 60 min base and peak, 30 min reverse-peak. Widen span?	2012		X		X
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express	Express	Implement new Route 471 between Cedar Grove-downtown Mpls with 12 trips. Add 4 trips on existing Route 475 between Cedar Grove, downtown Mpls and U of M midday. Eliminate 2 trips on route 472 (as well as shortening of 8 other trips).	2012	X			X
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express Stage II	Express	First part of Stage 2 expansion for Cedar BRT. Add trips on Routes 471, 475, 476 and 477 to compliment station-to-station service. Reduce freq by one-third.	2015	X	X	X	X
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local	SubLoc	Expand weekday local feeder service in the Cedar Avenue corridor to implement the Cedar Avenue Transitway IPU. 60 min freq-maybe 30 min freq in peak?	2012		X		X
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II	SubLoc	First part of Stage 2 weekday local expansion for Cedar BRT project. 60 min freq-maybe some 30 min during peak?	2016	X	X	X	X
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II weekend	SubLoc	First part of Stage 2 weekend local/feeder expansion for Cedar BRT project. 60 min freq. Add weekend service to some existing weekday routes, as well as possible new services.	2015		X	X	X
MVTA	I-35W	Express	Provide funding for the new services that will begin in 2013 under an approved CMAQ grant. Improve existing Routes 464 and 465, including a new, more direct express route serving Savage Park & Ride. Improve freq on Route 464 from 30 min peak to 20-30 min with a faster schedule. Improve freq on Route 465 from 30 min peak/60 min off-peak to 15 min peak/30 min off-peak.	2013	X			X
MVTA	Local Coverage	SubLoc	Expand local routes to areas not currently served to meet MVTA's Service Investment Strategies. Assessment and prioritization needed. 60 min freq likely.	2015		X	X	
MVTA	Rosemount Express	Express	Increase frequency and span of Weekday Express service between Rosemount and downtown Minneapolis as described in the approved CMAQ project application. Improve service from 2 trips each dir to 30 min peak period/15 min peak half-hour.	2013	X	X	X	X
MVTA	St Paul Express	Express	Increase freq and span of weekday Routes 480 and 484 per approved CMAQ application. Current freq is 30 min on Route 484 and 30 min on each Route 480 branch. Add 15 min peak-of-peak trunk freq from Blackhawk P&R and Eagan Transit Center.	2014	X			X
MVTA	Sunday	SubLoc	Expand Sunday local service to level equal to current Saturday service. Add service on Route 441 and extend span on Routes 444 and 445. 60 min freq proposed.	2013		X	X	X
Plymouth	772	Express	Increase service from 30 minutes to 15 minutes during am and pm peak period.	2012	X	X		X
Plymouth	776	Express	Increase service from 30 minutes to 15 minutes during am and pm peak period.	2013	X	X		X
Plymouth	790	Express	Increase service from 20 minutes to 10 minutes during am and pm peak period.	2014	X	X		X
Southwest	169 Service	Express	New express service to downtown Mpls and U of M from new 300 stall park and ride at Pioneer Trl/Hennepin Townline Rd (near US 169) in Eden Prairie. 30 min AM peak freq, one midday and evening trip, 15 min PM peak freq. Other services could include rev comm service to Golden Triangle and suburban circulator if warranted by demand. CMAQ application.	2016	X	X	X	X

2012-2016 Regional Service Improvement Plan Projects

			Proposed Additional Weekday											Current Weekday										
Provider2	Route	Year	In-Service Hours	Platform Hours	Trips	Peak vehicles	Ave Daily Rides	Cost	Fare per pass	Fare Revenue	Subsidy	Subsidy /Pass	PPISH	In-Service Hours	Platform Hours	Trips	Peak vehicles	Ave Daily Rides	Cost	Fare per pass	Fare Revenue	Subsidy	Subsidy /Pass	PPISH
Metro Transit	2	2014	15.8	19.2	65	1	1,264	$2,132	$0.80	$1,011	$1,120	$0.89	80.0	104.9	141.5	154	9	8,190	$15,707	$0.80	$6,552	$9,155	$1.12	78.1
Metro Transit	3	2014	34.3	45.0	60	3	1,200	$4,996	$0.80	$960	$4,036	$3.36	35.0	181.1	256.7	231	21	10,279	$28,500	$0.80	$8,223	$20,277	$1.97	56.8
Metro Transit	4	2015	0.6	1.0	2	0	20	$111	$1.09	$22	$89	$4.46	33.3	178.7	228.4	150	16	6,833	$25,357	$1.09	$7,448	$17,909	$2.62	38.2
Metro Transit	5	2016	79.2	99.0	129	4	2,076	$10,991	$0.76	$1,578	$9,413	$4.53	26.2	283.6	365.6	252	22	16,673	$40,589	$0.76	$12,671	$27,917	$1.67	58.8
Metro Transit	10	2013	18.0	24.0	32	0	800	$2,664	$0.88	$704	$1,960	$2.45	44.4	166.9	222.0	188	15	8,336	$24,646	$0.88	$7,336	$17,311	$2.08	50.0
Metro Transit	11	2015	16.0	20.8	21	0	550	$2,309	$1.04	$572	$1,737	$3.16	34.4	97.4	127.1	94	10	4,062	$14,105	$1.04	$4,224	$9,881	$2.43	41.7
Metro Transit	22	2015	9.0	12.0	12	0	400	$1,332	$0.87	$348	$984	$2.46	44.4	163.9	201.8	121	14	6,177	$22,399	$0.87	$5,374	$17,025	$2.76	37.7
Metro Transit	23	2013	17.7	24.0	36	1	540	$2,664	$0.88	$475	$2,189	$4.05	30.5	55.7	78.2	92	5	1,764	$8,685	$0.88	$1,552	$7,133	$4.04	31.7
Metro Transit	60	2015	20.4	28.0	56	2	672	$3,109	$1.12	$753	$2,356	$3.51	32.9	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	61	2015	70.6	90.0	60	6	2,100	$9,992	$1.02	$2,142	$7,850	$3.74	29.7	98.9	132.1	150	7	4,192	$14,666	$0.93	$3,899	$10,767	$2.57	42.4
Metro Transit	62	2014	17.9	26.0	52	2	780	$2,887	$0.90	$702	$2,185	$2.80	43.6	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	63	2014	25.7	33.0	24	0	720	$3,664	$0.92	$662	$3,001	$4.17	28.0	82.9	106.0	73	9	2,707	$11,763	$1.02	$2,761	$9,001	$3.33	32.7
Metro Transit	65	2014	27.8	36.0	48	2	720	$3,997	$0.98	$706	$3,291	$4.57	25.9	38.3	60.1	74	3	1,529	$6,667	$0.90	$1,376	$5,291	$3.46	39.9
Metro Transit	67	2014	74.6	90.3	64	4	2,336	$10,025	$0.99	$2,313	$7,712	$3.30	31.3	101.1	128.1	109	10	4,259	$14,224	$0.92	$3,918	$10,306	$2.42	42.1
Metro Transit	68	2016	19.0	25.5	34	2	680	$2,831	$0.96	$653	$2,178	$3.20	35.8	37.3	49.5	58	4	1,314	$5,493	$0.98	$1,288	$4,206	$3.20	35.2
Metro Transit	74	2015	8.6	11.0	8	0	280	$1,221	$0.89	$249	$972	$3.47	32.6	55.9	71.0	68	5	1,724	$7,886	$0.99	$1,707	$6,179	$3.58	30.8
Metro Transit	80	2015	8.2	11.0	22	0	264	$1,221	$0.91	$240	$981	$3.72	32.2	88.6	115.5	91	9	3,263	$12,819	$0.96	$3,132	$9,687	$2.97	36.8
Metro Transit	83	2014	52.9	64.5	86	6	1,290	$7,161	$1.12	$1,445	$5,716	$4.43	24.4	129.6	162.6	122	12	5,024	$18,055	$0.89	$4,471	$13,584	$2.70	38.8
Metro Transit	84	2014	34.4	43.0	95	5	1,419	$4,774	$0.76	$1,078	$3,695	$2.60	41.3	13.9	21.9	38	2	445	$1,184	$0.91	$405	$779	$1.75	31.9
Metro Transit	87	2014	3.7	4.5	6	0	90	$500	$1.12	$101	$399	$4.43	24.3	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	110	2014	3.1	6.0	6	1	204	$666	$1.33	$271	$395	$1.94	65.8	93.7	132.8	143	8	3,977	$14,743	$0.76	$3,023	$11,721	$2.95	42.4
Metro Transit	535	2016	33.7	42.2	81	5	1,244	$4,685	$1.10	$1,368	$3,317	$2.67	36.9	31.6	41.2	52	0	760	$1,139	$1.12	$851	$287	$0.38	24.0
Metro Transit	54 E. 7th St	2014	66.4	83.0	55	5	1,436	$9,215	$0.93	$1,335	$7,879	$5.49	21.6	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	54 W. 7th St	2014	32.8	41.0	52	6	835	$4,552	$0.93	$777	$3,775	$4.52	25.5	42.2	84.4	61	15	1,973	$9,367	$2.54	$5,011	$4,355	$2.21	46.8
Met Council	Red Line BRT	2012	57.3	76.0	56	6	1,373	$6,911	$1.03	$1,414	$5,496	$4.00	24.0	28.8	54.6	36	11	1,310	$6,062	$2.56	$3,354	$2,708	$2.07	45.5
MVTA	421	2013	4.2	6.2	11	1	44	$446	$1.26	$55	$390	$8.87	10.5	5.4	10.2	7	3	209	$598	$2.31	$483	$115	$0.55	38.7
MVTA	440	2012	5.8	9.2	7	0	43	$603	$1.74	$75	$528	$12.28	7.5	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
MVTA	446	2012	2.8	2.0	2	0	19	$193	$1.26	$24	$169	$8.92	6.9	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	515	2013	3.1	4.0	8	0	120	$444	$0.82	$98	$346	$2.88	38.7	56.8	84.3	130	5	1,810	$9,357	$0.82	$1,484	$7,873	$4.35	31.9
Metro Transit	721	2015	5.6	8.0	15	0	225	$888	$0.89	$200	$688	$3.06	40.2	51.1	78.6	77	7	1,338	$8,726	$1.10	$1,472	$7,254	$5.42	26.2
Metro Transit	723	2013	13.9	19.4	30	1	405	$2,154	$0.92	$373	$1,781	$4.40	29.1	8.8	15.9	12	4	316	$1,765	$2.57	$812	$953	$3.02	35.9
Maple Grove	788B	2012	2.1	3.2	8	1	135	$268	$0.00	$0	$268	$1.99	64.3	11.9	18.4	27	4	599	$2,037	$2.48	$1,486	$552	$0.92	50.3
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local	2012	4.2	6.0	6	1	55	$418	$1.26	$69	$349	$6.35	13.1	5.3	8.5	6	2	129	$944	$2.51	$324	$620	$4.81	24.3
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II	2016	40.6	58.0	61	7	265	$4,415	$2.75	$730	$3,685	$13.91	6.5	58.8	78.2	56	8	1,551	$8,685	$1.64	$2,544	$6,141	$3.96	26.4
MVTA	Local Coverage	2015	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	19.5	28.0	37	4	628	$741	$0.89	$559	$182	$0.29	32.2
MVTA	Sunday	2013	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0	13.9	18.8	34	1	545	$527	$0.88	$480	$48	$0.09	39.3
Metro Transit	250	2014	15.8	29.4	21	7	500	$3,264	$2.54	$1,270	$1,994	$3.99	31.6	48.4	82.9	69	14	2,150	$9,207	$2.31	$4,967	$4,240	$1.97	44.4
Metro Transit	270	2014	4.9	9.0	6	3	240	$999	$2.56	$614	$385	$1.60	49.0	9.2	18.4	15	5	535	$1,911	$2.53	$1,354	$557	$1.04	58.2
Metro Transit	275	2015	5.5	9.1	8	3	240	$1,010	$2.31	$554	$456	$1.90	43.6	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	376	2014	8.7	18.0	12	6	540	$1,998	$2.50	$1,350	$648	$1.20	62.1	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	386	2014	7.0	14.5	8	3	260	$1,610	$2.28	$593	$1,017	$3.91	37.1	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
BlueXpress	490	2015	11.3	37.5	12	3	360	$3,075	$2.73	$983	$2,092	$5.81	31.8	4.6	6.6	12	1	19	$437	$1.26	$17	$420	$22.12	4.1
Metro Transit	587	2015	5.6	10.2	8	2	230	$1,132	$2.57	$591	$541	$2.35	41.1	14.2	18.3	17	4	69	$1,610	$1.74	$64	$1,546	$22.40	4.9
Metro Transit	673	2015	5.6	8.0	16	0	200	$888	$2.48	$496	$392	$1.96	35.7	29.3	39.9	37	4	267	$2,819	$1.26	$218	$2,601	$9.74	9.1
Metro Transit	674	2016	8.4	13.5	8	3	134	$1,499	$2.51	$336	$1,162	$8.67	16.0	18.8	37.4	24	6	466	$2,786	$2.25	$1,026	$1,760	$3.78	24.8
Metro Transit	675	2015	26.9	35.0	35	2	710	$3,886	$1.64	$1,164	$2,721	$3.83	26.4	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	766	2013	8.0	16.9	16	4	640	$1,876	$2.31	$1,478	$398	$0.62	80.0	14.8	26.0	19	3	247	$2,239	$2.75	$555	$1,684	$6.82	16.7
Plymouth	772	2012	5.8	5.8	12	2	100	$771	$2.44	$244	$527	$5.27	17.2	4.2	6.0	6	1	55	$418	$2.75	$69	$349	$6.35	13.1
Plymouth	776	2013	6.1	6.1	10	2	100	$825	$2.60	$260	$565	$5.65	16.4	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Maple Grove	785	2013	5.4	10.7	9	3	245	$1,063	$2.53	$620	$443	$1.81	45.4	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Maple Grove	786	2015	5.9	11.7	8	3	240	$1,122	$2.53	$607	$515	$2.14	40.9	3.9	7.1	4	1	46	$772	$2.75	$110	$662	$14.39	11.8
Plymouth	790	2014	11.0	11.0	18	4	210	$1,680	$2.54	$533	$1,147	$5.46	19.0	20.6	36.4	23	7	745	$3,567	$2.75	$1,818	$1,749	$2.35	36.2
Southwest	169 Service	2016	17.2	34.5	21	7	618	$4,292	$2.86	$1,767	$2,524	$4.08	36.0	8.4	8.4	13	4	302	$1,116	$2.44	$737	$379	$1.25	36.0
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express	2012	9.7	18.3	14	3	183	$1,657	$2.25	$411	$1,246	$6.81	18.9	14.4	14.4	14	5	321	$1,940	$2.60	$835	$1,105	$3.44	22.3
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express Stage II	2015	25.7	45.0	33	9	376	$4,168	$2.75	$1,033	$3,134	$8.34	14.6	14.8	14.8	22	9	493	$2,252	$2.54	$1,252	$1,000	$2.03	33.3
MVTA	I-35W	2013	35.2	61.8	45	5	735	$5,133	$2.33	$1,710	$3,423	$4.66	20.9	28.3	62.5	30	9	658	$5,125	$2.73	$1,796	$3,329	$5.06	23.3
MVTA	Rosemount Express	2013	7.7	14.3	8	4	208	$1,386	$2.75	$573	$813	$3.91	27.2	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
MVTA	St Paul Express	2014	9.8	19.3	12	5	287	$1,737	$2.75	$789	$947	$3.30	29.4	322.7	429.7	339	36	23,559	$47,705	$0.77	$18,140	$29,565	$1.25	73.0
LRT	Green Line	2014	154.3	187.8	224	10	32,390		$0.77	$24,940			209.9	322.7	429.7	339	36	23,559	$47,705	$0.77	$18,140	$29,565	$1.25	73.0
Maple Grove	DAR	2013	16.0	16.0	NA	2	48	$741	$2.00	$96	$645	$13.45	3.0	42.5	42.5	NA	5	128	$1,969	$2.00	$256	$1,713	$13.38	3.0
Total			**1247.4**	**1715.6**	**1874**	**167**	**64,398**	**$160,250**	**$1.03**	**$66,518**	**$118,672**	**$1.84**	**51.6**											

Unk.= Unknown, not able to determined based on the project documentation form or to be determined at a future date

2012-2016 Regional Service Improvement Plan Projects-Saturdays

			Proposed Additional Saturday											Current Saturday										
Provider2	Route	Year	In-Service Hours	Platform Hours	Wk Equiv Platform Hours	Trips	Ave Daily Rides	Cost	Fare per pass	Fare Revenue	Subsidy	Subsidy /Pass	PPISH	In-Service Hours	Platform Hours	Wk Equiv Platform Hours	Trips	Ave Daily Rides	Cost	Fare per pass	Fare Revenue	Subsidy	Subsidy /Pass	PPISH
Metro Transit	2	2014	28.7	40.1	8.0	90	2,167	$4,452	$0.75	$1,625	$2,827	$1.30	75.5	65.5	85.5	17.1	103	3,747	$9,494	$0.75	$2,810	$6,684	$1.78	57.2
Metro Transit	3	2014	30.4	40.5	8.1	36	1,440	$4,496	$0.89	$1,282	$3,215	$2.23	47.3	68.9	91.0	18.2	76	3,312	$10,099	$0.89	$2,948	$7,152	$2.16	48.1
Metro Transit	5	2016	69.6	87.0	17.4	77	1,819	$9,659	$0.74	$1,346	$8,313	$4.57	26.1	237.3	302.9	60.6	199	11,015	$33,628	$0.74	$8,151	$25,477	$2.31	46.4
Metro Transit	10	2013	20.2	27.0	5.4	36	538	$2,998	$0.79	$425	$2,573	$4.78	26.7	97.2	136.6	27.3	121	5,383	$15,162	$0.79	$4,253	$10,909	$2.03	55.4
Metro Transit	11	2015	23.0	28.0	5.6	30	520	$3,109	$0.86	$447	$2,661	$5.12	22.6	73.2	93.5	18.7	81	2,354	$10,380	$0.86	$2,024	$8,356	$3.55	32.2
Metro Transit	22	2015	15.8	24.0	4.8	22	350	$2,664	$0.77	$270	$2,395	$6.84	22.2	115.7	141.8	28.4	89	4,210	$15,738	$0.77	$3,242	$12,496	$2.97	36.4
Metro Transit	23	2013	14.2	18.7	3.7	28	336	$2,076	$0.84	$282	$1,794	$5.34	23.7	43.1	56.9	11.4	75	1,072	$6,311	$0.84	$900	$5,411	$5.05	24.9
Metro Transit	54 E. 7th St	2014	58.4	73.0	14.6	33	1,259	$8,104	$0.83	$1,045	$7,059	$5.61	21.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	60	2015	17.5	24.0	4.8	48	550	$960	$0.90	$495	$465	$0.85	31.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	61	2015	32.6	43.5	8.7	29	725	$4,829	$0.89	$645	$4,184	$5.77	22.2	31.9	43.4	8.7	29	896	$4,818	$0.89	$797	$4,021	$4.49	28.1
Metro Transit	62	2014	12.6	18.0	3.6	36	540	$1,998	$0.72	$389	$1,610	$2.98	42.9	27.5	43.1	8.6	67	1,205	$4,785	$0.72	$868	$3,917	$3.25	43.8
Metro Transit	63	2014	18.9	24.0	4.8	18	450	$2,664	$0.81	$365	$2,300	$5.11	23.8	69.9	88.5	17.7	74	2,440	$9,825	$0.81	$1,976	$7,849	$3.22	34.9
Metro Transit	65	2014	9.3	12.0	2.4	24	360	$1,332	$0.93	$335	$997	$2.77	38.7	9.0	11.6	2.3	22	242	$1,291	$0.93	$225	$1,066	$4.41	26.9
Metro Transit	67	2014	50.3	59.4	11.9	45	1,170	$6,595	$0.84	$983	$5,612	$4.80	23.3	22.3	27.1	5.4	27	584	$3,006	$0.84	$491	$2,516	$4.31	26.2
Metro Transit	68	2016	20.6	26.3	5.3	35	700	$2,920	$0.87	$609	$2,311	$3.30	34.0	59.5	75.9	15.2	64	2,051	$8,423	$0.87	$1,784	$6,639	$3.24	34.5
Metro Transit	74	2015	33.7	45.0	9.0	36	1,260	$4,996	$0.75	$945	$4,051	$3.22	37.4	104.4	128.1	25.6	97	3,186	$14,216	$0.75	$2,390	$11,827	$3.71	30.5
Metro Transit	80	2015	3.7	5.0	1.0	10	120	$485	$0.80	$96	$389	$3.24	32.4	15.4	24.3	4.9	42	268	$1,309	$0.80	$214	$1,095	$4.08	17.4
Metro Transit	83	2014	29.5	36.0	7.2	48	720	$1,440	$0.90	$648	$792	$1.10	24.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	84	2014	28.0	35.0	7.0	57	1,246	$3,886	$0.75	$935	$2,951	$2.37	44.5	75.0	105.0	21.0	123	3,697	$11,655	$0.75	$2,773	$8,882	$2.40	49.3
Metro Transit	87	2014	28.1	36.0	7.2	48	500	$1,440	$0.90	$450	$990	$1.98	17.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	515	2013	1.5	2.0	0.4	4	60	$222	$0.77	$46	$176	$2.93	40.0	47.3	71.8	14.4	113	1,628	$7,966	$0.77	$1,254	$6,712	$4.12	34.4
Met Council	Red Line BRT	2012	25.7	32.0	6.4	30	721	$3,254	$1.03	$743	$2,511	$3.48	28.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II weekend	2015	12.4	16.0	3.2	15	84	$1,160	$2.65	$240	$920	$10.95	6.8	62.5	82.0	16.4	76	1,263	$8,587	$2.65	$867	$7,720	$6.11	20.2
MVTA	Local Coverage	2015	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
LRT	Green Line	2014	140.9	173.3	34.7	204	16,519	$60,308	$0.67	$11,068	$49,240	$2.98	117.2	177.3	233.6	46.7	191	12,082	$25,934	$0.67	$8,095	$17,839	$1.48	68.1
Total			725.6	925.8	185.2	1039	34,154	$136,048	$0.75	$25,712	$110,336	$3.23	47.1											

Unk.= Unknown, not able to determined based on the project documentation form or to be determined at a future date

2012-2016 Regional Service Improvement Plan Projects-Sundays

			Proposed Additional Sunday											Sunday Existing										
Provider2	Route	Year	In-Service Hours	Platform Hours	Wk Equiv Platform Hours	Trips	Ave Daily Rides	Cost	Fare per pass	Fare Revenue	Subsidy	Subsidy /Pass	PPISH	In-Service Hours	Platform Hours	Wk Equiv Platform Hours	Trips	Ave Daily Rides	Cost	Fare per pass	Fare Revenue	Subsidy	Subsidy /Pass	PPISH
Metro Transit	2	2014	38.5	50.6	10.1	100	2,455	$5,618	$0.82	$2,013	$3,605	$1.47	63.8	53.4	73.0	14.6	87	2,534	$8,099	$0.82	$2,078	$6,021	$2.38	47.4
Metro Transit	3	2014	29.6	36.0	7.2	36	900	$3,997	$0.79	$711	$3,286	$3.65	30.4	58.3	70.2	14.0	68	2,200	$7,791	$0.79	$1,738	$6,053	$2.75	37.7
Metro Transit	4	2015	9.0	10.0	2.0	36	200	$1,110	$0.95	$190	$920	$4.60	22.2	83.5	104.5	20.9	74	2,520	$11,604	$0.95	$2,394	$9,210	$3.65	30.2
Metro Transit	5	2016	41.6	52.0	10.4	52	1,087	$5,773	$0.75	$815	$4,958	$4.56	26.1	171.6	220.3	44.1	145	7,688	$24,458	$0.75	$5,766	$18,692	$2.43	44.8
Metro Transit	10	2013	17.6	24.0	4.8	38	450	$2,664	$0.79	$356	$2,309	$5.13	25.5	66.5	95.0	19.0	94	3,530	$10,547	$0.79	$2,789	$7,758	$2.20	53.1
Metro Transit	19	2013	22.3	29.2	5.8	33	916	$3,242	$0.76	$696	$2,546	$2.78	41.1	47.7	64.4	12.9	84	2,620	$7,151	$0.76	$1,991	$5,160	$1.97	55.0
Metro Transit	22	2015	16.0	30.0	6.0	24	330	$3,331	$0.77	$254	$3,077	$9.32	20.6	92.7	115.4	23.1	73	2,996	$12,812	$0.77	$2,307	$10,505	$3.51	32.3
Metro Transit	23	2013	11.3	15.3	3.1	23	276	$1,699	$0.82	$226	$1,472	$5.33	24.4	43.1	57.8	11.6	75	812	$6,414	$0.82	$666	$5,748	$7.08	18.9
Metro Transit	54 E. 7th St	2014	35.2	44.0	8.8	22	752	$4,885	$0.93	$699	$4,186	$5.57	21.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	60	2015	17.5	24.0	4.8	48	500	$960	$0.90	$450	$510	$1.02	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	61	2015	32.6	43.5	8.7	29	725	$4,829	$0.89	$645	$4,184	$5.77	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	63	2014	17.6	22.5	4.5	18	450	$2,498	$0.84	$378	$2,120	$4.71	25.6	29.7	37.5	7.5	36	1,236	$4,163	$0.84	$1,038	$3,125	$2.53	41.6
Metro Transit	65	2014	12.0	16.0	3.2	32	320	$1,776	$0.96	$307	$1,469	$4.59	26.7	5.7	7.6	1.5	14	129	$847	$0.96	$124	$723	$5.61	22.6
Metro Transit	67	2014	36.7	42.2	8.4	32	836	$4,685	$0.84	$702	$3,983	$4.76	22.8	17.0	20.1	4.0	20	342	$2,235	$0.84	$287	$1,948	$5.69	20.1
Metro Transit	80	2015	12.0	16.0	3.2	32	256	$1,552	$0.88	$225	$1,327	$5.18	21.3	7.3	11.5	2.3	20	147	$623	$0.88	$129	$494	$3.36	20.1
Metro Transit	84	2014	20.8	26.0	5.2	38	745	$2,887	$0.81	$603	$2,283	$3.06	35.8	36.4	51.1	10.2	64	1,855	$5,673	$0.81	$1,503	$4,171	$2.25	51.0
Metro Transit	535	2016	36.3	50.9	10.2	66	800	$4,030	$2.67	$2,136	$1,894	$2.37	22.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Met Council	Red Line BRT	2012	25.7	32.0	6.4	30	647	$3,254	$1.03	$666	$2,588	$4.00	25.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	$0	$0.00	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	515	2013	5.8	7.5	1.5	14	210	$833	$0.74	$155	$677	$3.23	36.2	32.0	49.0	9.8	77	1,002	$5,437	$0.74	$741	$4,695	$4.69	31.3
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II weekend	2015	12.4	16.0	3.2	15	84	$1,040	$2.65	$215	$825	$9.82	6.8	62.5	82.0	16.4	76	1,146	$7,033	$2.65	$970	$6,063	$5.29	18.3
MVTA	Local Coverage	2015	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.
MVTA	Sunday	2013	18.7	26.6	5.3	26	411	$2,399	$1.25	$496	$1,903	$4.63	22.0	43.8	55.4	11.1	50	735	$4,634	$1.25	$474	$4,160	$5.66	16.8
LRT	Green Line	2014	137.4	169.4	33.9	199	9,717	$58,951	$0.70	$6,802	$52,149	$5.37	70.7	116.2	152.8	30.6	128	7,110	$16,964	$0.70	$4,977	$11,987	$1.69	61.2
Total			606.6	783.7	156.7	943	23,067	$122,012	$0.86	$19,743	$102,269	$4.43	38.0											

Unk.= Unknown, not able to determined based on the project documentation form or to be determined at a future date

2012-2016 Regional Service Improvement Plan Projects-Annual

			Proposed Additional Annual									Annual Existing								
Provider2	Route	Year	In-Service Hours	Platform Hours	Trips	Ridership	Cost	Fare Rev	Subsidy	Subsidy /Pass	PPISH	In-Service Hours	Platform Hours	Trips	Ridership	Cost	Fare Rev	Subsidy	Subsidy /Pass	PPISH
Metro Transit	2	2014	7,754	9,916	27,055	577,394	$ 1,100,874	$ 459,129	$ 641,746	$1.11	74.5	33,253	44,763	49,672	2,430,266	$4,969,533	$1,937,410	$3,032,123	$1.41	70.2
Metro Transit	3	2014	12,048	15,669	19,260	433,080	$ 1,739,572	$ 352,681	$ 1,386,891	$3.20	35.9	53,145	74,251	66,801	2,920,969	$8,243,291	$2,350,999	$5,892,292	$2.12	52.5
Metro Transit	4	2015	675	835	2,598	16,700	$ 92,702	$ 16,579	$ 76,123	$4.56	24.7	57,343	73,798	48,990	2,106,923	$8,193,076	$2,254,249	$5,938,827	$2.96	36.0
Metro Transit	5	2016	26,228	32,785	39,915	687,014	$ 3,639,791	$ 519,608	$ 3,120,182	$4.54	26.2	94,610	121,756	83,018	5,270,299	$13,517,373	$3,989,513	$9,527,861	$1.89	54.8
Metro Transit	10	2013	6,660	8,916	12,236	258,076	$ 989,854	$ 222,240	$ 767,614	$2.97	38.7	54,171	69,218	59,684	2,610,336	$7,684,582	$2,253,477	$5,431,106	$2.09	51.2
Metro Transit	11	2015	5,276	6,760	6,915	167,290	$ 750,495	$ 169,114	$ 581,381	$3.48	31.7	32,466	42,168	32,358	1,248,698	$4,681,458	$1,266,660	$3,414,798	$3.01	37.5
Metro Transit	19	2013	1,293	1,694	1,914	53,128	$ 188,023	$ 40,377	$ 147,646	$2.78	41.1	32,391	46,524	52,640	1,824,542	$5,165,072	$1,518,155	$3,646,917	$2.01	56.1
Metro Transit	22	2015	4,045	6,048	5,596	139,340	$ 671,449	$ 117,492	$ 553,957	$3.98	34.5	53,188	65,526	39,717	1,967,823	$7,274,674	$1,672,737	$5,601,937	$2.91	36.6
Metro Transit	23	2013	5,907	7,980	11,970	171,180	$ 885,917	$ 148,979	$ 736,938	$4.31	29.0	18,945	26,252	31,710	552,660	$2,914,519	$481,285	$2,433,234	$4.67	28.7
Metro Transit	60	2015	7,127	9,780	19,560	228,960	$ 391,200	$ 243,763	$ 147,437	$0.64	32.1	0	0	0	0	$0	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	61	2015	21,590	27,735	18,490	615,250	$ 3,079,140	$ 617,188	$ 2,461,952	$4.00	28.5	22,798	29,287	20,123	736,877	$3,251,421	$745,558	$2,505,863	$3.52	31.9
Metro Transit	62	2014	5,220	7,566	15,132	226,980	$ 839,977	$ 199,228	$ 640,750	$2.82	43.5	11,840	18,692	24,558	486,079	$2,075,175	$423,175	$1,652,000	$3.35	42.4
Metro Transit	63	2014	8,557	10,968	8,100	233,100	$ 1,217,667	$ 209,790	$ 1,007,877	$4.32	27.2	31,138	39,443	33,731	1,284,613	$4,378,906	$1,162,152	$3,216,754	$2.55	41.0
Metro Transit	65	2014	8,269	10,732	15,344	220,880	$ 1,191,467	$ 215,155	$ 976,311	$4.42	26.7	10,310	13,667	16,746	355,136	$1,517,255	$347,254	$1,170,000	$3.75	32.0
Metro Transit	67	2014	23,767	28,563	20,516	705,008	$ 3,171,053	$ 681,559	$ 2,489,494	$3.53	29.7	16,400	20,669	19,904	489,824	$2,294,672	$477,395	$1,817,277	$4.01	28.5
Metro Transit	68	2016	5,916	7,870	10,490	209,800	$ 873,739	$ 198,132	$ 675,607	$3.22	35.5	28,361	36,943	29,665	1,025,601	$4,101,356	$963,683	$3,137,673	$3.12	35.8
Metro Transit	74	2015	3,945	5,145	3,912	136,920	$ 571,198	$ 112,686	$ 458,512	$3.35	34.7	42,079	53,054	39,982	1,562,908	$5,890,077	$1,350,377	$4,539,701	$3.05	36.6
Metro Transit	80	2015	2,979	3,993	7,986	88,408	$ 387,321	$ 79,319	$ 308,002	$3.48	29.7	4,769	7,526	13,034	135,937	$729,974	$121,914	$608,060	$4.91	28.0
Metro Transit	83	2014	15,024	18,320	24,426	366,390	$ 732,780	$ 402,120	$ 330,660	$0.90	24.4	0	0	0	0	$0	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	84	2014	11,434	14,293	29,393	469,847	$ 1,586,809	$ 358,596	$ 1,228,213	$2.61	41.1	31,131	43,587	50,026	1,284,425	$4,839,051	$979,157	$3,859,894	$3.05	40.6
Metro Transit	87	2014	2,405	3,020	4,026	48,950	$ 120,780	$ 49,104	$ 71,676	$1.46	20.4	8,058	10,506	13,260	193,800	$420,240	$217,056	$203,184	$0.73	16.8
Metro Transit	110	2014	791	1,530	1,530	52,020	$ 169,861	$ 69,187	$ 100,674	$1.94	65.8	0	0	0	0	$0	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	535	2016	12,587	16,360	27,915	407,820	$ 1,637,989	$ 590,844	$ 1,047,145	$2.57	32.4	13,031	20,043	19,635	341,190	$2,225,174	$375,309	$1,849,865	$5.42	26.2
Metro Transit	54 E. 7th St	2014	22,010	27,513	17,017	475,264	$ 3,054,493	$ 435,449	$ 2,619,045	$5.51	21.6	0	0	0	0	$0	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	54 W. 7th St	2014	8,364	10,455	13,260	212,925	$ 1,160,714	$ 198,020	$ 962,694	$4.52	25.5	32,457	43,470	50,026	1,378,370	$4,826,051	$1,264,324	$3,561,727	$2.56	42.8
Met Council	Red Line BRT	2012	17,439	22,900	17,580	425,133	$ 2,120,173	$ 437,887	$ 1,682,286	$3.96	24.4	0	0	0	0	$0	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
MVTA	421	2013	1,067	1,577	2,805	11,220	$ 113,665	$ 14,090	$ 99,575	$8.87	10.5	1,173	1,670	3,060	4,845	$111,432	$4,270	$107,162	$22.12	4.1
MVTA	440	2012	1,471	2,355	1,785	10,965	$ 153,714	$ 19,056	$ 134,659	$12.28	7.5	3,608	4,658	4,335	17,595	$410,586	$16,374	$394,213	$22.40	4.9
MVTA	446	2012	706	519	510	4,845	$ 49,316	$ 6,114	$ 43,203	$8.92	6.9	7,459	10,179	9,435	68,085	$718,314	$55,715	$662,599	$9.73	9.1
Metro Transit	515	2013	1,205	1,559	3,060	45,900	$ 173,080	$ 36,508	$ 136,573	$2.98	38.1	18,800	28,072	43,492	604,322	$3,116,565	$486,662	$2,629,903	$4.37	32.1
Metro Transit	721	2015	1,428	2,040	3,825	57,375	$ 87,720	$ 51,064	$ 36,656	$0.64	40.2	5,897	8,479	11,855	182,570	$364,580	$159,377	$205,203	$1.30	29.8
Metro Transit	723	2013	3,545	4,947	7,650	103,275	$ 212,721	$ 95,013	$ 117,708	$1.14	29.1	4,488	6,050	10,974	167,812	$260,133	$148,249	$111,884	$0.79	36.5
Maple Grove	788B	2012	536	816	2,040	34,425	$ 68,344	$ -	$ 68,344	$1.99	64.3	0	0	0	0	$0	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local	2012	1,071	1,530	1,530	14,025	$ 106,653	$ 17,629	$ 89,025	$6.35	13.1	0	0	0	0	$0	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II	2016	10,353	14,790	15,555	67,575	$ 1,125,840	$ 186,089	$ 939,751	$13.91	6.5	1,071	1,530	1,530	14,025	$106,653	$17,629	$89,025	$6.35	13.1
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II weekend	2015	1,364	1,760	1,650	9,240	$ 120,640	$ 24,950	$ 95,690	$10.36	6.8	6,872	9,021	8,360	132,144	$854,422	$101,357	$753,065	$5.67	19.2
MVTA	Local Coverage	2015	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	0	0	0	0	$0	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
MVTA	Sunday	2013	1,085	1,543	1,508	23,838	$ 139,142	$ 28,768	$ 110,374	$4.63	22.0	2,540	3,213	2,900	42,630	$268,771	$27,512	$241,259	$5.66	16.8
Metro Transit	250	2014	4,029	7,497	5,355	127,500	$ 832,317	$ 323,850	$ 508,467	$3.99	31.6	10,761	21,522	15,555	503,115	$2,389,372	$1,277,912	$1,111,460	$2.21	46.8
Metro Transit	270	2014	1,250	2,295	1,530	61,200	$ 254,791	$ 156,672	$ 98,119	$1.60	49.0	7,344	13,923	9,180	334,050	$1,545,731	$855,168	$690,563	$2.07	45.5
Metro Transit	275	2015	1,403	2,321	2,040	61,200	$ 257,576	$ 141,372	$ 116,204	$1.90	43.6	1,377	2,601	1,785	53,295	$288,711	$123,111	$165,600	$3.11	38.7
Metro Transit	376	2014	2,219	4,590	3,060	137,700	$ 509,582	$ 344,250	$ 165,332	$1.20	62.1	0	0	0	0	$0	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Metro Transit	386	2014	1,785	3,698	2,040	66,300	$ 410,496	$ 151,164	$ 259,332	$3.91	37.1	0	0	0	0	$0	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
BlueXpress	490	2015	2,889	9,563	3,060	91,800	$ 784,125	$ 250,614	$ 533,511	$5.81	31.8	7,225	15,938	7,650	167,790	$1,306,875	$458,067	$848,808	$5.06	23.2
Metro Transit	587	2015	1,428	2,601	2,040	58,650	$ 288,763	$ 150,731	$ 138,033	$2.35	41.1	2,244	4,106	3,060	80,580	$616,613	$207,091	$409,522	$5.08	35.9
Metro Transit	673	2015	1,428	2,040	4,080	51,000	$ 226,481	$ 126,480	$ 100,001	$1.96	35.7	3,035	4,692	6,885	152,745	$520,906	$378,808	$142,098	$0.93	50.3
Metro Transit	674	2016	2,142	3,443	2,040	34,170	$ 382,186	$ 85,767	$ 296,420	$8.67	16.0	1,352	2,168	1,530	32,895	$240,636	$82,566	$158,069	$4.81	24.3
Metro Transit	675	2015	6,860	8,925	8,925	181,050	$ 990,854	$ 296,922	$ 693,932	$3.83	26.4	17,386	22,846	17,162	431,441	$2,536,385	$694,330	$1,842,055	$5.21	22.8
Metro Transit	766	2013	2,040	4,310	4,080	163,200	$ 478,441	$ 376,992	$ 101,449	$0.62	80.0	12,342	21,140	17,595	548,250	$2,346,907	$1,266,458	$1,080,450	$1.97	44.4
Plymouth	772	2012	1,484	1,484	3,060	25,500	$ 196,658	$ 62,220	$ 134,438	$5.27	17.2	2,147	2,147	3,315	77,010	$284,512	$187,904	$96,608	$1.25	35.9
Plymouth	776	2013	1,556	1,556	2,550	25,500	$ 210,319	$ 66,300	$ 144,019	$5.65	16.4	3,659	3,659	3,570	81,855	$494,767	$212,823	$281,944	$3.44	22.4
Maple Grove	785	2013	1,377	2,729	2,295	62,475	$ 271,067	$ 158,061	$ 113,006	$1.81	45.4	2,346	4,692	3,825	136,425	$487,287	$345,155	$142,132	$1.04	58.2
Maple Grove	786	2015	1,497	2,984	2,040	61,200	$ 286,102	$ 154,836	$ 131,266	$2.14	40.9	0	0	0	0	$0	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
Plymouth	790	2014	2,815	2,815	4,590	53,550	$ 428,445	$ 136,017	$ 292,428	$5.46	19.0	3,774	3,774	5,610	125,715	$574,365	$319,316	$255,049	$2.03	33.3
Southwest	169 Service	2016	4,373	8,803	5,355	157,590	$ 1,094,427	$ 450,707	$ 643,720	$4.08	36.0	0	0	0	0	$0	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express	2012	2,474	4,675	3,570	46,665	$ 422,553	$ 104,765	$ 317,788	$6.81	18.9	4,781	9,541	6,120	118,830	$710,412	$261,556	$448,856	$3.78	24.9
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express Stage II	2015	6,554	11,475	8,415	95,880	$ 1,062,757	$ 263,494	$ 799,264	$8.34	14.6	3,774	6,630	4,845	62,985	$571,015	$141,574	$429,441	$6.82	16.7
MVTA	I-35W	2013	8,976	15,759	11,475	187,425	$ 1,308,962	$ 436,000	$ 872,962	$4.66	20.9	0	0	0	0	$0	$0	$0	$0.00	0.0
MVTA	Rosemount Express	2013	1,951	3,655	2,040	53,040	$ 353,406	$ 146,035	$ 207,370	$3.91	27.2	1,003	1,815	1,020	11,730	$196,813	$28,164	$168,649	$14.38	11.7
MVTA	St Paul Express	2014	2,491	4,913	3,060	73,185	$ 442,855	$ 201,298	$ 241,557	$3.30	29.4	5,245	9,269	5,865	189,975	$909,562	$463,690	$445,872	$2.35	36.2
LRT	Green Line	2014	54,643	66,726	79,270	9,682,024	$ 23,220,444	$ 7,329,809	$ 15,890,635	$1.64	177.2	98,248	130,583	103,801	7,048,189	$14,497,336	$5,335,413	$9,161,923	$1.35	70.4
Maple Grove	DAR	2013	4,080	4,080	NA	12,240	$ 189,067	$ 24,480	$ 164,587	$13.45	3.0	10,838	10,838	NA	32,640	$502,210	$65,280	$436,930	$13.39	3.0
Total			392,878	533,712	590,024	19,579,584	$ 69,618,549	$ 19,562,342	$ 50,056,207	$2.56	49.8									

Unk.= Unknown, not able to determined based on the project documentation form or to be determined at a future date

APPENDIX C

Map of Projects

Twin Cities 2012-2016 Regional Service Improvement Plan

Note: RSIP items not shown on map include:
- MGT Dial-a-Ride Service

- Orange Line BRT
- Red Line BRT
- Urban Local
- Suburban Local
- Express
- Rapid Bus/Arterial BRT
- Green Line LRT

2011-11-10

APPENDIX D

Project Rank by Evaluation Factor

SUBSIDY PER PASSENGER

	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday
	System Average		
Urban Local	$ 2.44	$ 2.91	$ 3.13
Suburban Local	$ 4.63	$ 4.17	$ 4.25
Express	$ 3.06	$ 4.65	$ 4.65
	130% of Route Average		
Urban Local	$ 4.76	$ 5.36	$ 5.60
Suburban Local	$ 11.39	$ 7.67	$ 5.82
Express	$ 7.33	$ 7.67	$ 7.67

When scores for Weekday, Saturday, and Sunday are different, overall score is generally the weekday score.

If weekday score is lower than Saturday, Sunday, but is close to the threshold, overall score may be same as Saturday or Sunday.

Subsidy

Provider	Route	RouteType	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual
Metro Transit	2	UrbLoc	$0.89	$1.30	$1.47	$1.11
Metro Transit	3	UrbLoc	$3.36	$2.23	$3.65	$3.20
Metro Transit	4	UrbLoc	$4.46	$0.00	$4.60	$4.56
Metro Transit	5	UrbLoc	$4.53	$4.57	$4.56	$4.54
Metro Transit	10	UrbLoc	$2.45	$4.78	$5.13	$2.97
Metro Transit	11	UrbLoc	$3.16	$5.12	---	$3.48
Metro Transit	19	UrbLoc	---	---	$2.78	$2.78
Metro Transit	22	UrbLoc	$2.46	$6.84	$9.32	$3.98
Metro Transit	23	UrbLoc	$4.05	$5.34	$5.33	$4.31
Metro Transit	60	UrbLoc	$0.55	$0.85	$1.02	$0.64
Metro Transit	61	UrbLoc	$3.74	$5.77	$5.77	$4.00
Metro Transit	62	UrbLoc	$2.80	$2.98	---	$2.82
Metro Transit	63	UrbLoc	$4.17	$5.11	$4.71	$4.32
Metro Transit	65	UrbLoc	$4.57	$2.77	$4.59	$4.42
Metro Transit	67	UrbLoc	$3.30	$4.80	$4.76	$3.53
Metro Transit	68	UrbLoc	$3.20	$3.30	---	$3.22
Metro Transit	74	UrbLoc	$3.47	$3.22	---	$3.35
Metro Transit	80	UrbLoc	$3.13	$3.24	$5.18	$3.48
Metro Transit	83	UrbLoc	$0.88	$1.10	---	$0.90
Metro Transit	84	UrbLoc	$2.60	$2.37	$3.06	$2.61
Metro Transit	87	UrbLoc	$0.88	$1.98	---	$1.46
Metro Transit	110	UrbLoc	$1.94	---	---	$1.94
Metro Transit	535	UrbLoc	$2.67	$2.07	$2.37	$2.57
Metro Transit	54 E. 7th St	UrbLoc	$5.49	$5.61	$5.57	$5.51
Metro Transit	54 W. 7th St	UrbLoc	$4.52	---	---	$4.52
Met Council	Red Line BRT	UrbLoc	$4.00	$3.48	$4.00	$3.93
MVTA	421	SubLoc	$8.87	---	---	$8.87
MVTA	440	SubLoc	$12.28	---	---	$12.28
MVTA	446	SubLoc	$8.92	---	---	$8.92
Metro Transit	515	SubLoc	$2.88	$2.93	$3.23	$2.98
Metro Transit	721	SubLoc	$0.64	---	---	$0.64
Metro Transit	723	SubLoc	$1.14	---	---	$1.14
Maple Grove	788B	SubLoc	$1.99	---	---	$1.99
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local	SubLoc	$6.35	---	---	$6.35

Subsidy Score

Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Overall
High	High	High	**High**
Medium	High	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	High	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	Low	**Medium**
---	---	High	**High**
Medium	Low	Low	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
High	High	High	**High**
Medium	Low	Low	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	---	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	High	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	---	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	---	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
High	High	---	**High**
Medium	High	High	**High**
High	High	---	**High**
High	---	---	**High**
Medium	High	High	**High**
Low	Low	Medium	**Low**
Medium	---	---	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	---	---	**Medium**
Low	---	---	**Low**
Medium	---	---	**Medium**
High	High	High	**High**
High	---	---	**High**
High	---	---	**High**
High	---	---	**High**
Medium	---	---	**Medium**

Provider	Route	RouteType	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Overall
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II	SubLoc	$13.91	---	---	$13.91	Low	---	---	**Low**
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II weekend	SubLoc	---	$10.95	$9.82	$10.36	---	Low	Low	**Low**
MVTA	Local Coverage	SubLoc		---	---		---	---	---	**Low**
MVTA	Sunday	SubLoc	---	---	$4.63	$4.63	---	---	Medium	**Medium**
Metro Transit	250	Express	$3.99	---	---	$3.99	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
Metro Transit	270	Express	$1.60	---	---	$1.60	High	---	---	**High**
Metro Transit	275	Express	$1.90	---	---	$1.90	High	---	---	**High**
Metro Transit	376	Express	$1.20	---	---	$1.20	High	---	---	**High**
Metro Transit	386	Express	$3.91	---	---	$3.91	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
BlueXpress	490	Express	$5.81	---	---	$5.81	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
Metro Transit	587	Express	$2.35	---	---	$2.35	High	---	---	**High**
Metro Transit	673	Express	$1.96	---	---	$1.96	High	---	---	**High**
Metro Transit	674	Express	$8.67	---	---	$8.67	Low	---	---	**Low**
Metro Transit	675	Express	$3.83	---	---	$3.83	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
Metro Transit	766	Express	$0.62	---	---	$0.62	High	---	---	**High**
Plymouth	772	Express	$5.27	---	---	$5.27	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
Plymouth	776	Express	$5.65	---	---	$5.65	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
Maple Grove	785	Express	$1.81	---	---	$1.81	High	---	---	**High**
Maple Grove	786	Express	$2.14	---	---	$2.14	High	---	---	**High**
Plymouth	790	Express	$5.46	---	---	$5.46	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
Southwest	169 Service	Express	$4.08	---	---	$4.08	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express	Express	$6.81	---	---	$6.81	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express Stage II	Express	$8.34	---	---	$8.34	Low	---	---	**Low**
MVTA	I-35W	Express	$4.66	---	---	$4.66	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
MVTA	Rosemount Express	Express	$3.91	---	---	$3.91	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
MVTA	St Paul Express	Express	$3.30	---	---	$3.30	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
LRT	Green Line	LRT	$1.25	$2.98	$5.37	$2.15	High	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Maple Grove	DAR	Paratransit	$13.45	---	---	$13.45	N/A	---	---	**N/A**

PASSENGER PER IN-SERVICE HOUR (PRODUCTIVITY)

	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday
	System Average		
Urban Local	43.6	38.9	37.1
Suburban Local	17.9	22.5	22.4
Express	34.7		
	Standard		
Urban Local	20	20	20
Suburban Local	9	9	9
Express	20	20	20
Dial-a-Ride	3	3	3

PPISH

Provider	Route	RouteType	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual
Metro Transit	2	UrbLoc	80.0	75.5	63.8	74.5
Metro Transit	3	UrbLoc	35.0	47.3	30.4	35.9
Metro Transit	4	UrbLoc	33.3	0.0	22.2	24.7
Metro Transit	5	UrbLoc	26.2	26.1	26.1	26.2
Metro Transit	10	UrbLoc	44.4	26.7	25.5	38.7
Metro Transit	11	UrbLoc	34.4	22.6	---	31.7
Metro Transit	19	UrbLoc	---	---	41.1	41.1
Metro Transit	22	UrbLoc	44.4	22.2	20.6	34.5
Metro Transit	23	UrbLoc	30.5	23.7	24.4	29.0
Metro Transit	60	UrbLoc	32.9	31.4	28.6	32.1
Metro Transit	61	UrbLoc	29.7	22.2	22.2	28.5
Metro Transit	62	UrbLoc	43.6	42.9	---	43.5
Metro Transit	63	UrbLoc	28.0	23.8	25.6	27.2
Metro Transit	65	UrbLoc	25.9	38.7	26.7	26.7
Metro Transit	67	UrbLoc	31.3	23.3	22.8	29.7
Metro Transit	68	UrbLoc	35.8	34.0	---	35.5
Metro Transit	74	UrbLoc	32.6	37.4	---	34.7
Metro Transit	80	UrbLoc	32.2	32.4	21.3	29.7
Metro Transit	83	UrbLoc	24.4	24.4	---	24.4
Metro Transit	84	UrbLoc	41.3	44.5	35.8	41.1
Metro Transit	87	UrbLoc	24.3	17.8	---	20.4
Metro Transit	110	UrbLoc	65.8	---	---	65.8
Metro Transit	535	UrbLoc	36.9	23.4	22.0	32.4
Metro Transit	54 E. 7th St	UrbLoc	21.6	21.6	21.4	21.6
Metro Transit	54 W. 7th St	UrbLoc	25.5	---	---	25.5
Met Council	Red Line BRT	UrbLoc	24.0	28.1	25.2	24.7
MVTA	421	SubLoc	10.5	---	---	10.5
MVTA	440	SubLoc	7.5	---	---	7.5
MVTA	446	SubLoc	6.9	---	---	6.9
Metro Transit	515	SubLoc	38.7	40.0	36.2	38.1
Metro Transit	721	SubLoc	40.2	---	---	40.2
Metro Transit	723	SubLoc	29.1	---	---	29.1
Maple Grove	788B	SubLoc	64.3	---	---	64.3
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local	SubLoc	13.1	---	---	13.1
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II	SubLoc	6.5	---	---	6.5

PPISH Score

Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Overall
High	High	High	**High**
Medium	High	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	Low	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
High	Medium	Medium	**High**
Medium	Medium	---	**Medium**
---	---	High	**High**
High	Medium	Medium	**High**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	High	---	**High**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	---	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	---	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	---	**Medium**
Medium	High	Medium	**High**
Medium	Low	---	**Medium**
High	---	---	**High**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	---	---	**Medium**
Medium	Medium	Medium	**Medium**
Medium	---	---	**Medium**
Low	---	---	**Low**
Low	---	---	**Low**
High	High	High	**High**
High	---	---	**High**
High	---	---	**High**
High	---	---	**High**
Medium	---	---	**Medium**
Low	---	---	**Low**

Provider	Route	RouteType	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Annual	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Overall
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II weekend	SubLoc	---	6.8	6.8	6.8	---	Low	Low	**Low**
MVTA	Local Coverage	SubLoc								**Low**
MVTA	Sunday	SubLoc	---	---	22.0	22.0	---	---	Medium	**Medium**
Metro Transit	250	Express	31.6	---	---	31.6	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
Metro Transit	270	Express	49.0	---	---	49.0	High	---	---	**High**
Metro Transit	275	Express	43.6	---	---	43.6	High	---	---	**High**
Metro Transit	376	Express	62.1	---	---	62.1	High	---	---	**High**
Metro Transit	386	Express	37.1	---	---	37.1	High	---	---	**High**
BlueXpress	490	Express	31.8	---	---	31.8	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
Metro Transit	587	Express	41.1	---	---	41.1	High	---	---	**High**
Metro Transit	673	Express	35.7	---	---	35.7	High	---	---	**High**
Metro Transit	674	Express	16.0	---	---	16.0	Low	---	---	**Low**
Metro Transit	675	Express	26.4	---	---	26.4	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
Metro Transit	766	Express	80.0	---	---	80.0	High	---	---	**High**
Plymouth	772	Express	17.2	---	---	17.2	Low	---	---	**Low**
Plymouth	776	Express	16.4	---	---	16.4	Low	---	---	**Low**
Maple Grove	785	Express	45.4	---	---	45.4	High	---	---	**High**
Maple Grove	786	Express	40.9	---	---	40.9	High	---	---	**High**
Plymouth	790	Express	19.0	---	---	19.0	Low	---	---	**Low**
Southwest	169 Service	Express	36.0	---	---	36.0	High	---	---	**High**
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express	Express	18.9	---	---	18.9	Low	---	---	**Low**
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express Stage II	Express	14.6	---	---	14.6	Low	---	---	**Low**
MVTA	I-35W	Express	20.9	---	---	20.9	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
MVTA	Rosemount Express	Express	27.2	---	---	27.2	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
MVTA	St Paul Express	Express	29.4	---	---	29.4	Medium	---	---	**Medium**
LRT	Green Line	LRT	209.9	117.2	70.7	174.6	High	High	High	**High**
Maple Grove	DAR	Paratransit	3.0			3.0	Medium	---	---	**Medium**

SUBSIDY PER PASSENGER EXPRESS MILE (new portion only)

HIGH	.24 or less	(<System Average)
MEDIUM	.25-.67	(<130% of Route Average)
LOW	.68 or more	(>130% of Route Average)

Provider	Route	Annual Passengers	Trip Exp Miles	Annual Subsidy	PXM	Subsidy PXM	
Metro Transit	250	127,500	13.9	$508,467	1,772,250	$0.29	Medium
Metro Transit	270	61,200	11.7	$98,119	716,040	$0.14	High
Metro Transit	275	61,200	7.8	$116,204	477,360	$0.24	High
Metro Transit	376	137,700	20.4	$165,332	2,809,080	$0.06	High
Metro Transit	386	66,300	11.2	$259,332	742,560	$0.35	Medium
BlueXpress	490	91,800	24.2	$533,511	2,221,560	$0.24	High
Metro Transit	587	58,650	7.4	$138,066	434,010	$0.32	Medium
Metro Transit	673	51,000	7.2	$100,001	367,200	$0.27	Medium
Metro Transit	674	34,170	10.9	$297,269	372,453	$0.80	Low
Metro Transit	675	181,050	4.7	$693,932	850,935	$0.82	Low
Metro Transit	766	163,200	9.1	$101,449	1,485,120	$0.07	High
Plymouth	772	25,500	7.3	$134,438	186,150	$0.72	Low
Plymouth	776	25,500	11.5	$144,019	293,250	$0.49	Medium
Maple Grove	785	62,475	18.4	$113,006	1,149,540	$0.10	High
Maple Grove	786	61,200	16	$131,266	979,200	$0.13	High
Plymouth	790	53,500	9.5	$292,428	508,250	$0.58	Medium
Southwest	169 Service	157,590	17.2	$643,720	2,710,548	$0.24	High
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express	46,665	14.6	$317,788	681,309	$0.47	Medium
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express Stage II	95,880	17	$799,264	1,629,960	$0.49	Medium
MVTA	I-35W	187,425	17.3	$872,962	3,242,453	$0.27	Medium
MVTA	Rosemount Express	53,040	22.3	$207,370	1,182,792	$0.18	High
MVTA	St Paul Express	73,185	11.8	$241,557	863,583	$0.28	Medium

CONGESTION MITIGATION

High = Combined AM/PM congestion score > 25, Medium = score > 10, Low = score < 10
Congestion score = High congestion miles x 3 + medium congestion miles x 2 + low congestion miles x 1
Based on MnDOT 2010 Congestion Report

		AM			PM						
Project	Congested Freeways	Miles of High Congestion	Miles of Medium Congestion	Miles of Low Congestion	Miles of High Congestion	Miles of Medium Congestion	Miles of Low Congestion	AM Score	PM Score	Total Score	**Ranking**
250	I-35W North	1.0	5.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	1.0	15.5	12.5	28.0	**High**
270	Hwy 36/I-35W North	1.0	5.5	2.5	3.5	3.0	0.5	16.5	17.0	33.5	**High**
275	I-35E North	0.5	3.5	3.5	1.0	2.0	1.5	12.0	8.5	20.5	**Medium**
376	I-94 East	3.5	8.0	4.0	2.0	5.5	3.0	30.5	20.0	50.5	**High**
386	I-94 East	2.0	2.0	2.0	0.5	2.5	0.0	12.0	6.5	18.5	**Medium**
490	Hwy 169/I-394	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	0.5	1.0	12.0	5.0	17.0	**Medium**
587	Hwy 100/I-394	1.0	3.0	2.5	0.0	2.5	0.5	11.5	5.5	17.0	**Medium**
673	I-394	1.5	2.5	3.0	0.0	1.5	2.0	12.5	5.0	17.5	**Medium**
674	I-394	1.5	2.5	4.5	0.0	1.5	2.5	14.0	5.5	19.5	**Medium**
675	I-394	1.5	2.5	4.5	0.0	1.5	2.5	14.0	5.5	19.5	**Medium**
766	I-94 North	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	**Low**
772	I-394	1.5	2.5	4.5	0.0	1.5	2.5	14.0	5.5	19.5	**Medium**
776	I-394	1.5	2.5	4.5	0.0	1.5	2.5	14.0	5.5	19.5	**Medium**
785	I-694/I-94	0.0	2.5	2.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	7.0	1.0	8.0	**Low**
786	I-694/I-94	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	2.0	1.0	3.0	**Low**
790	I-394/Hwy 169	1.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.0	0.5	10.5	10.0	20.5	**Medium**
169 Service	Hwy 169/I-394	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.0	0.5	1.0	8.5	5.0	13.5	**Medium**
Cedar BRT Express	I-35W South/ Hwy 77	1.0	5.5	6.0	4.5	0.0	1.0	20.0	14.5	34.5	**High**
Cedar BRT Express Stage II	I-35W South/ Hwy 77	1.0	5.5	**6**	4.5	0.0	1.0	20.0	14.5	34.5	**High**
I-35W	I-35W South	2.5	1.0	4.0	5.0	1.0	0.5	13.5	17.5	31.0	**High**
Rosemount Express	I-35W South/ Hwy 77	1.0	5.5	6.0	4.5	0.0	1.0	20.0	14.5	34.5	**High**
St Paul Express	I-35E South	0.0	0.5	3.0	0.0	0.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	7.0	**Low**

CAPITAL FACILITY COORDINATION

High = No capital facilities required, or all necessary capital facilities either constructed or fully funded and planned for construction before service begins.
Medium = Facilities programmed, but funding and construction not yet completed
Low = Required facilities not programmed

Provider	Route	Route Type	Facility Need	Funding Status	Constuction Status	Ranking
Metro Transit	2	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	3	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	4	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	5	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	10	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	11	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	19	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	22	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	23	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	60	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	61	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	62	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	63	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	65	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	67	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	68	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	74	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	80	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	83	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	84	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	87	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	110	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	535	UrbLoc	Lake Street Station - 35W	Unknown	Unknown	Low
Metro Transit	54 E. 7th St	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	54 W. 7th St	UrbLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Met Council	Red Line BRT	UrbLoc	Stations, Bus-only Shoulders, Station improvements	Complete	2012 Completion Scheduled	High
MVTA	421	SubLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
MVTA	440	SubLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
MVTA	446	SubLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	515	SubLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	721	SubLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	723	SubLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Maple Grove	788B	SubLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local	SubLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II	SubLoc	Multiple Cedar BRT Investments	Incomplete	N/A	Low
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II weekend	SubLoc	Multiple Cedar BRT Investments	Incomplete	N/A	Low
MVTA	Local Coverage	SubLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
MVTA	Sunday	SubLoc	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	250	Express	None	N/A	N/A	High
Metro Transit	270	Express	Maplewood Mall Expansion	CMAQ/ Complete	2012 Completion	High
Metro Transit	275	Express	Lino Lakes 35E New Facility	Ch 152/Complete	2013	High
Metro Transit	376	Express	Manning Ave New Facility	CMAQ/ Complete	2014	High
Metro Transit	386	Express	Manning Ave New Facility	CMAQ/ Complete	2014	High

Provider	Route	Route Type	Facility Need	Funding Status	Constuction Status	Ranking
BlueXpress	490	Express	P&R modifications and bus-only ramp	Incomplete/ Chp 152	Unknown	High
Metro Transit	587	Express	New Edina P&R	Unknown	Unknown	Low
Metro Transit	673	Express	Co Rd 73 Expansion	CMAQ/ Complete	Complete	High
Metro Transit	674	Express	Maple Plain P&R	Ch 152, RTC, Henn Co/Complete	2012	High
Metro Transit	675	Express	Co Rd 73 Expansion	CMAQ/ Complete	Complete	High
Metro Transit	766	Express	Noble Ave Expansion	CMAQ/ Complete	2013	High
Plymouth	772	Express	None	N/A	N/A	High
Plymouth	776	Express	None	N/A	N/A	High
Maple Grove	785	Express	None	N/A	N/A	High
Maple Grove	786	Express	Bass Lake Rd New P&R	Unknown	Unknown	Low
Plymouth	790	Express	None	N/A	N/A	High
Southwest	169 Service	Express	New 169 P&R	Unknown/ CMAQ App	2015 Construction Start	Low
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express	Express	None	N/A	N/A	High
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express Stage II	Express	Multiple Cedar BRT Investments	Unknown/ CMAQ App	N/A	Low
MVTA	I-35W	Express	None	N/A	N/A	High
MVTA	Rosemount Express	Express	Rosemount P&R	CMAQ/ Complete	2012 Completion?	High
MVTA	St Paul Express	Express	None	N/A	N/A	High
LRT	Green Line	LRT	LRT	Complete	2014 Completion	High
Maple Grove	DAR	Paratransit	None	N/A	N/A	High

BENEFITS TO DISABLED COMMUNITY

High = Percentage of disabled persons within ¼ mile of boarding section of route exceeds regional average of 14.2%**AND** application describes specific benefit
Medium = Percentage of disabled persons within ¼ mile of boarding section of route exceeds regional average of 14.2%**OR** Percentage of disabled persons within ¼ mile of boarding section of route is lower than regional averegage**AND** application described specific benefit
Low = Percentage of disabled persons within ¼ mile of boarding section of route is lower than regional average of 14.2%**OR** Express route with no local pick-up outside downtown.

Methodology: Determine total population (5 and older) and disabled populations living within 1/4 mile of boarding section of a route. If the buffer touches any part of the blockgroup then the entire blockgroup is included. Use 2000 blockgroup census data.

Provider	Route	Route Type	Total Aged 5+ Population	Disabled Population	Percent Disabled	Initial Rank	Application Upgrade	Final Rank	Comments
Metro Transit	2	UrbLoc	78,039	13,877	17.8%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	3	UrbLoc	81,353	14,892	18.3%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	4	UrbLoc	44,687	7,118	15.9%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	5	UrbLoc	96,563	19,520	20.2%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	10	UrbLoc	73,390	14,647	20.0%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	11	UrbLoc	74,054	15,761	21.3%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	19	UrbLoc	55,125	11,586	21.0%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	22	UrbLoc	87,339	17,481	20.0%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	23	UrbLoc	58,316	8,874	15.2%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	60	UrbLoc	37,324	5,812	15.6%	Medium	X	High	New coverage
Metro Transit	61	UrbLoc	97,474	18,566	19.0%	Medium	X	High	AccessAbility
Metro Transit	62	UrbLoc	31,657	6,797	21.5%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	63	UrbLoc	45,017	6,564	14.6%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	65	UrbLoc	51,437	8,967	17.4%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	67	UrbLoc	28,743	3,519	12.2%	Low		Low	
Metro Transit	68	UrbLoc	55,204	11,358	20.6%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	74	UrbLoc	81,316	15,784	19.4%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	80	UrbLoc	42,660	8,214	19.3%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	83	UrbLoc	53,687	8,844	16.5%	Medium	X	High	New coverage
Metro Transit	84	UrbLoc	52,292	7,124	13.6%	Low		Low	
Metro Transit	87	UrbLoc	40,052	4,978	12.4%	Low		Low	
Metro Transit	110	UrbLoc	28,526	4,192	14.7%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	535	UrbLoc	54,308	11,143	20.5%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	54 E. 7th St	UrbLoc	50,191	10,768	21.5%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	54 W. 7th St	UrbLoc	27,702	5,928	21.4%	Medium		Medium	
Met Council	Red Line BRT	UrbLoc	44,494	5,655	12.7%	Low		Low	
MVTA	421	SubLoc	36,638	5,552	15.2%	Medium		Medium	
MVTA	440	SubLoc	48,900	5,389	11.0%	Low		Low	
MVTA	446	SubLoc	36,552	3,216	8.8%	Low	X	High	ProAct Industries
Metro Transit	515	SubLoc	36,978	6,791	18.4%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	721	SubLoc	25,522	4,876	19.1%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	723	SubLoc	42,045	6,700	15.9%	Medium		Medium	
Maple Grove	788B	SubLoc	17,676	1,307	7.4%	Low		Low	
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local	SubLoc	151,887	18,020	11.9%	Low		Low	
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II	SubLoc	178,804	21,816	12.2%	Low		Low	
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II weekend	SubLoc	151,887	18,020	11.9%	Low	X	High	Expanded coverage
MVTA	Local Coverage	SubLoc	0	0	0.0%	Low	X	Medium	Expanded coverage
MVTA	Sunday	SubLoc	114,452	14,412	12.6%	Low	X	High	Expanded coverage
Metro Transit	250	Express	12,712	1,914	0.0%	Low	P&R Exp only	Low	
Metro Transit	270	Express	6,264	1,101	0.0%	Low	P&R Exp only	Low	
Metro Transit	275	Express	4,055	558	0.0%	Low	P&R Exp only	Low	
Metro Transit	376	Express	4,055	558	0.0%	Low	P&R Exp only	Low	

Provider	Route	Route Type	Total Aged 5+ Population	Disabled Population	Percent Disabled	Initial Rank	Application Upgrade	Final Rank	Comments
Metro Transit	386	Express	4,055	558	0.0%	Low	P&R Exp only	Low	
BlueXpress	490	Express	4,275	261	6.1%	Low		Low	
Metro Transit	587	Express	18,947	1,830	9.7%	Low		Low	
Metro Transit	673	Express	10,233	1,452	0.0%	Low	P&R Exp only	Low	
Metro Transit	674	Express	22,499	2,655	11.8%	Low		Low	
Metro Transit	675	Express	20,803	2,955	14.2%	Medium		Medium	
Metro Transit	766	Express	2,166	204	9.4%	Low		Low	
Plymouth	772	Express	25,078	2,971	11.8%	Low		Low	
Plymouth	776	Express	27,646	2,368	8.6%	Low		Low	
Maple Grove	785	Express	7,203	628	8.7%	Low		Low	
Maple Grove	786	Express	13,682	834	6.1%	Low		Low	
Plymouth	790	Express	23,640	2,229	9.4%	Low		Low	
Southwest	169 Service	Express	8,618	685	0.0%	Low	P&R Exp only	Low	
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express	Express	27,587	3,290	0.0%	Low	P&R Exp only	Low	
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express Stage II	Express	76,819	8,662	0.0%	Low	P&R Exp only	Low	
MVTA	I-35W	Express	74,990	10,611	14.1%	Low		Low	
MVTA	Rosemount Express	Express	33,532	3,565	10.6%	Low		Low	
MVTA	St Paul Express	Express	80,260	10,269	12.8%	Low		Low	
LRT	Green Line	LRT	57,182	11,625	20.3%	Medium		Medium	
Maple Grove	DAR	Paratransit	62,291	5,173	8.3%	Low		Low	

BENEFITS TO LOW-INCOME/MINORITY POPULATIONS

High: 200% or higher of regional average for minority **or** low-income populations (14.4% for Low-Income and 52% for Minority)
Medium: 100-199% of regional average for minority **or** low-income populations (7.3-14.3% for Low-Income and 26.1-51.9% for Minority)
Low: Less than regional average for minority **and** low-income populations(0-7.2% for Low-Income and 0-26% for Minority)

Methodology: Determine total population, minority population and low-income population living within 1/4 mile of boarding section of a route. If the buffer touches any part of the block or blockgroup then the entire block or blockgroup is included. Use 2000 blockgroup census data for low-income and 2010 block census data for minority.

Provider	Route	Route Type	Total Population	Low-Income	Low-Income Percentage	Low-Income Rank	Total Block Population	Minority Population	Minority Percentage	Minority Rank	Overall Rank
Metro Transit	2	UrbLoc	82,951	20,290	24.5%	High	82,790	28,525	34.5%	Medium	High
Metro Transit	3	UrbLoc	98,375	17,672	18.0%	High	89,268	28,165	31.6%	Medium	High
Metro Transit	4	UrbLoc	47,837	6,460	13.5%	Medium	47,803	9,210	19.3%	Low	Medium
Metro Transit	5	UrbLoc	108,168	18,992	17.6%	High	108,465	36,830	34.0%	Medium	High
Metro Transit	10	UrbLoc	78,830	9,355	11.9%	Medium	79,080	17,340	21.9%	Low	Medium
Metro Transit	11	UrbLoc	81,582	16,553	20.3%	High	81,154	26,698	32.9%	Medium	High
Metro Transit	19	UrbLoc	61,939	13,022	21.0%	High	61,421	25,090	40.8%	Medium	High
Metro Transit	22	UrbLoc	98,211	19,483	19.8%	High	96,344	37,563	39.0%	Medium	High
Metro Transit	23	UrbLoc	62,914	5,938	9.4%	Medium	62,566	14,052	22.5%	Low	Medium
Metro Transit	60	UrbLoc	40,406	6,110	15.1%	High	40,406	10,117	25.0%	Low	Medium
Metro Transit	61	UrbLoc	112,631	18,693	16.6%	High	105,821	27,253	25.8%	Low	Medium
Metro Transit	62	UrbLoc	35,845	6,324	17.6%	High	35,471	12,485	35.2%	Medium	High
Metro Transit	63	UrbLoc	48,279	5,581	11.6%	Medium	48,683	5,166	10.6%	Low	Medium
Metro Transit	65	UrbLoc	56,375	6,431	11.4%	Medium	55,647	12,802	23.0%	Low	Medium
Metro Transit	67	UrbLoc	31,025	2,348	7.6%	Medium	31,058	3,272	10.5%	Low	Medium
Metro Transit	68	UrbLoc	60,645	7,247	11.9%	Medium	60,525	14,818	24.5%	Low	Medium
Metro Transit	74	UrbLoc	89,194	11,487	12.9%	Medium	89,236	21,862	24.5%	Low	Medium
Metro Transit	80	UrbLoc	46,823	4,987	10.7%	Medium	46,568	12,825	27.5%	Medium	Medium
Metro Transit	83	UrbLoc	60,129	5,953	9.9%	Medium	57,743	9,203	15.9%	Low	Medium
Metro Transit	84	UrbLoc	60,869	4,607	7.6%	Medium	56,413	6,499	11.5%	Low	Medium
Metro Transit	87	UrbLoc	50,547	3,385	6.7%	Low	42,901	5,532	12.9%	Low	Low
Metro Transit	110	UrbLoc	30,265	2,451	8.1%	Medium	30,482	5,720	18.8%	Low	Medium
Metro Transit	535	UrbLoc	59,581	8,431	14.2%	Medium	59,326	9,786	16.5%	Low	Medium
Metro Transit	54 E. 7th St	UrbLoc	55,761	8,234	14.8%	High	55,828	14,175	25.4%	Low	Medium
Metro Transit	54 W. 7th St	UrbLoc	30,283	3,990	13.2%	Medium	30,551	7,341	24.0%	Low	Medium
Met Council	Red Line BRT	UrbLoc	48,579	1,550	3.2%	Low	48,517	4,257	8.8%	Low	Low
MVTA	421	SubLoc	40,524	1,637	4.0%	Low	40,392	5,603	13.9%	Low	Low
MVTA	440	SubLoc	53,146	1,293	2.4%	Low	52,863	5,790	11.0%	Low	Low
MVTA	446	SubLoc	39,844	1,056	2.7%	Low	40,055	4,595	11.5%	Low	Low
Metro Transit	515	SubLoc	40,581	2,413	5.9%	Low	40,828	9,081	22.2%	Low	Low
Metro Transit	721	SubLoc	28,207	2,048	7.3%	Medium	28,019	6,390	22.8%	Low	Medium

Provider	Route	Route Type	Total Population	Low-Income	Low-Income Percentage	Low-Income Rank	Total Block Population	Minority Population	Minority Percentage	Minority Rank	Overall Rank
Metro Transit	723	SubLoc	45,925	2,651	5.8%	Low	45,851	14,239	31.1%	Medium	Medium
Maple Grove	788B	SubLoc	19,323	435	2.3%	Low	19,544	1,357	6.9%	Low	Low
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local	SubLoc	165,351	5,365	3.2%	Low	165,575	24,155	14.6%	Low	Low
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II	SubLoc	195,474	6,741	3.4%	Low	195,897	30,864	15.8%	Low	Low
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II weekend	SubLoc	165,351	5,365	3.2%	Low	165,575	24,155	14.6%	Low	Low
MVTA	Local Coverage	SubLoc	0	0	0.0%	Low	0	0	0.0%	Low	Low
MVTA	Sunday	SubLoc	124,337	5,071	4.1%	Low	124,358	18,721	15.1%	Low	Low
Metro Transit	250	Express	13,970	924	6.6%	Low	13,848	136	1.0%	Low	Low
Metro Transit	270	Express	6,677	233	3.5%	Low	6,707	808	12.0%	Low	Low
Metro Transit	275	Express	7,522	255	3.4%	Low	7,509	170	2.3%	Low	Low
Metro Transit	376	Express	4,401	140	3.2%	Low	4,438	81	1.8%	Low	Low
Metro Transit	386	Express	4,401	140	3.2%	Low	4,438	81	1.8%	Low	Low
BlueXpress	490	Express	4,819	106	2.2%	Low	4,819	826	17.1%	Low	Low
Metro Transit	587	Express	20,079	689	3.4%	Low	19,988	727	3.6%	Low	Low
Metro Transit	673	Express	10,720	409	3.8%	Low	10,664	274	2.6%	Low	Low
Metro Transit	674	Express	24,082	540	2.2%	Low	24,025	1,094	4.6%	Low	Low
Metro Transit	675	Express	21,806	1,068	4.9%	Low	21,763	2,358	10.8%	Low	Low
Metro Transit	766	Express	2,383	15	0.6%	Low	2,492	514	20.6%	Low	Low
Plymouth	772	Express	26,783	724	2.7%	Low	26,682	2,736	10.3%	Low	Low
Plymouth	776	Express	30,133	676	2.2%	Low	30,256	3,729	12.3%	Low	Low
Maple Grove	785	Express	7,834	150	1.9%	Low	7,903	90	1.1%	Low	Low
Maple Grove	786	Express	15,102	367	2.4%	Low	15,277	1,625	10.6%	Low	Low
Plymouth	790	Express	25,431	600	2.4%	Low	25,490	3,321	13.0%	Low	Low
Southwest	169 Service	Express	9,178	170	1.9%	Low	9,148	317	3.5%	Low	Low
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express	Express	29,698	980	3.3%	Low	29,551	4,928	16.7%	Low	Low
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express Stage II	Express	83,543	2,134	2.6%	Low	83,321	11,264	13.5%	Low	Low
MVTA	I-35W	Express	81,880	3,287	4.0%	Low	81,669	10,656	13.0%	Low	Low
MVTA	Rosemount Express	Express	36,293	791	2.2%	Low	36,333	2,369	6.5%	Low	Low
MVTA	St Paul Express	Express	86,736	3,124	3.6%	Low	86,826	14,984	17.3%	Low	Low
LRT	Green Line	LRT	63,027	15,525	24.6%	High	63,120	25,390	40.2%	Medium	High
Maple Grove	DAR	Paratransit	67,455	1,188	1.8%	Low	67,758	9,675	14.3%	Low	Low

INNOVATION

Provider	Route	Route Type	Points	Ranking	Comment
Metro Transit	2	UrbLoc	1	Medium	HFN
Metro Transit	3	UrbLoc	1	Medium	HFN
Metro Transit	4	UrbLoc	1	Medium	HFN
Metro Transit	5	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	10	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	11	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	19	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	22	UrbLoc	1	Medium	HFN
Metro Transit	23	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	60	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	61	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	62	UrbLoc	1	Medium	HFN
Metro Transit	63	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	65	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	67	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	68	UrbLoc	1	Medium	HFN
Metro Transit	74	UrbLoc	1	Medium	HFN
Metro Transit	80	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	83	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	84	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	87	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	110	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	535	UrbLoc	2	High	Hwy BRT
Metro Transit	54 E. 7th St	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	54 W. 7th St	UrbLoc	0	Low	No response
Met Council	Red Line BRT	UrbLoc	2	High	Hwy BRT
MVTA	421	SubLoc	1	Medium	Flex route
MVTA	440	SubLoc	1	Medium	Flex route
MVTA	446	SubLoc	0	Low	Reverse commute, feeder route
Metro Transit	515	SubLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	721	SubLoc	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	723	SubLoc	0	Low	No response
Maple Grove	788B	SubLoc	0	Low	No response
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local	SubLoc	0	Low	Overall Cedar BRT goals are innovative
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II	SubLoc	0	Low	Overall Cedar BRT goals are innovative
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II weekend	SubLoc	0	Low	Overall Cedar BRT goals are innovative
MVTA	Local Coverage	SubLoc	0	Low	Flex may be appropriate
MVTA	Sunday	SubLoc	0	Low	Overall Cedar BRT goals are innovative
Metro Transit	250	Express	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	270	Express	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	275	Express	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	376	Express	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	386	Express	0	Low	No response
BlueXpress	490	Express	1	Medium	Consolidate multiple service types at one location
Metro Transit	587	Express	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	673	Express	0	Low	No response

Provider	Route	Route Type	Points	Ranking	Comment
Metro Transit	674	Express	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	675	Express	0	Low	No response
Metro Transit	766	Express	0	Low	No response
Plymouth	772	Express	0	Low	30 min freq, 35% p&r utilization
Plymouth	776	Express	0	Low	Standees
Maple Grove	785	Express	0	Low	Coach buses, state-of-the art facility
Maple Grove	786	Express	0	Low	No response
Plymouth	790	Express	0	Low	Meet future demands
Southwest	169 Service	Express	0	Low	LEED facility
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express	Express	0	Low	Overall Cedar BRT goals are innovative
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express Stage II	Express	0	Low	Overall Cedar BRT goals are innovative
MVTA	I-35W	Express	0	Low	Overall 35W BRT goals are innovative
MVTA	Rosemount Express	Express	0	Low	Overall Cedar BRT goals are innovative
MVTA	St Paul Express	Express	0	Low	Reinvents established service model
LRT	Green Line	LRT	2	High	LRT
Maple Grove	DAR	Paratransit	0	Low	Dial-a-Ride scheduling and dispatching software is state-of-the art

APPENDIX E

Overall Project Ranks

2011 RSIP Overall Project Scores and Rank by Project

Provider	Project ID	Route Type	Subsidy per Passenger		Passengers per In-Sevice Hour (PPISH)		Congestion Mitigation (Express)		Capital Facility Coordination		Benefits for Disabled Community		Service to Low-income and Minority Populations		Innovation		Subsidy per Passenger Express Mile (Express)		Final Score	Possible Score	Percent of Possible	0.75 / 0.6
			Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Points	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score				
Rank Weight			**25**		**25**		**10**		**12**		**8**		**8**		**5**		**10**					
Metro Transit	2	UrbLoc	High	75	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	High	24	Medium	10			236	249	94.8%	High
Metro Transit	3	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	High	24	Medium	10			186	249	74.7%	Medium
Metro Transit	4	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Medium	10			178	249	71.5%	Medium
Metro Transit	5	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	High	24	Low	10			186	249	74.7%	Medium
Metro Transit	10	UrbLoc	Medium	50	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	10			203	249	81.5%	High
Metro Transit	11	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	High	24	Low	10			186	249	74.7%	Medium
Metro Transit	19	UrbLoc	High	75	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	High	24	Low	10			236	249	94.8%	High
Metro Transit	22	UrbLoc	Medium	50	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	High	24	Medium	10			211	249	84.7%	High
Metro Transit	23	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	10			178	249	71.5%	Medium
Metro Transit	60	UrbLoc	High	75	Medium	50			High	36	High	24	Medium	16	Low	10			211	249	84.7%	High
Metro Transit	61	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	High	24	Medium	16	Low	10			186	249	74.7%	Medium
Metro Transit	62	UrbLoc	Medium	50	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	High	24	Medium	10			211	249	84.7%	High
Metro Transit	63	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	10			178	249	71.5%	Medium
Metro Transit	65	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	10			178	249	71.5%	Medium
Metro Transit	67	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Low	8	Medium	16	Low	10			170	249	68.3%	Medium
Metro Transit	68	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Medium	10			178	249	71.5%	Medium
Metro Transit	74	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Medium	10			178	249	71.5%	Medium
Metro Transit	80	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	10			178	249	71.5%	Medium
Metro Transit	83	UrbLoc	High	75	Medium	50			High	36	High	24	Medium	16	Low	10			211	249	84.7%	High
Metro Transit	84	UrbLoc	High	75	High	75			High	36	Low	8	Medium	16	Low	10			220	249	88.4%	High
Metro Transit	87	UrbLoc	High	75	Medium	50			High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10			187	249	75.1%	High
Metro Transit	110	UrbLoc	High	75	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	10			228	249	91.6%	High
Metro Transit	535	UrbLoc	High	75	Medium	50			Low	12	Medium	16	Medium	16	High	10			179	249	71.9%	Medium
Metro Transit	54 E. 7th St	UrbLoc	Low	25	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	10			153	249	61.4%	Medium
Metro Transit	54 W. 7th St	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	10			178	249	71.5%	Medium
Met Council	Red Line BRT	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Low	8	Low	8	High	10			162	249	65.1%	Medium
MVTA	421	SubLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Low	8	Medium	10			170	249	68.3%	Medium
MVTA	440	SubLoc	Low	25	Low	25			High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Medium	10			112	249	45.0%	Low
MVTA	446	SubLoc	Medium	50	Low	25			High	36	High	24	Low	8	Low	10			153	249	61.4%	Medium
Metro Transit	515	SubLoc	High	75	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	Low	8	Low	10			220	249	88.4%	High
Metro Transit	721	SubLoc	High	75	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	10			228	249	91.6%	High
Metro Transit	723	SubLoc	High	75	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	10			228	249	91.6%	High
Maple Grove	788B	SubLoc	High	75	High	75			High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10			212	249	85.1%	High
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local	SubLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10			162	249	65.1%	Medium
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II	SubLoc	Low	25	Low	25			Low	12	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10			88	249	35.3%	Low
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II weekend	SubLoc	Low	25	Low	25			Low	12	High	24	Low	8	Low	10			104	249	41.8%	Low
MVTA	Local Coverage	SubLoc	Low	25	Low	25			High	36	Medium	16	Low	8	Low	10			120	249	48.2%	Low
MVTA	Sunday	SubLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	High	24	Low	8	Low	10			178	249	71.5%	Medium
Metro Transit	250	Express	Medium	50	Medium	50	High	30	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	Medium	20	212	309	68.6%	Medium
Metro Transit	270	Express	High	75	High	75	High	30	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	High	30	272	309	88.0%	High
Metro Transit	275	Express	High	75	High	75	Medium	20	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	High	30	262	309	84.8%	High
Metro Transit	376	Express	High	75	High	75	High	30	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	High	30	272	309	88.0%	High
Metro Transit	386	Express	Medium	50	High	75	Medium	20	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	Medium	20	227	309	73.5%	Medium
BlueXpress	490	Express	Medium	50	Medium	50	Medium	20	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Medium	10	High	30	212	309	68.6%	Medium
Metro Transit	587	Express	High	75	High	75	Medium	20	Low	12	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	Medium	20	228	309	73.8%	Medium
Metro Transit	673	Express	High	75	High	75	Medium	20	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	Medium	20	252	309	81.6%	High
Metro Transit	674	Express	Low	25	Low	25	Medium	20	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	Low	10	142	309	46.0%	Low
Metro Transit	675	Express	Medium	50	Medium	50	Medium	20	High	36	Medium	16	Low	8	Low	10	Low	10	200	309	64.7%	Medium
Metro Transit	766	Express	High	75	High	75	Low	10	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	High	30	252	309	81.6%	High
Plymouth	772	Express	Medium	50	Low	25	Medium	20	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	Low	10	167	309	54.0%	Low
Plymouth	776	Express	Medium	50	Low	25	Medium	20	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	Medium	20	177	309	57.3%	Low
Maple Grove	785	Express	High	75	High	75	Low	10	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	High	30	252	309	81.6%	High
Maple Grove	786	Express	High	75	High	75	Low	10	Low	12	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	High	30	228	309	73.8%	Medium
Plymouth	790	Express	Medium	50	Low	25	Medium	20	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	Medium	20	177	309	57.3%	Low
Southwest	169 Service	Express	Medium	50	High	75	Medium	20	Low	12	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	High	30	213	309	68.9%	Medium
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express	Express	Medium	50	Low	25	High	30	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	Medium	20	187	309	60.5%	Medium
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express Stage II	Express	Low	25	Low	25	High	30	Low	12	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	Medium	20	138	309	44.7%	Low
MVTA	I-35W	Express	Medium	50	Medium	50	High	30	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	Medium	20	212	309	68.6%	Medium
MVTA	Rosemount Express	Express	Medium	50	Medium	50	High	30	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	High	30	222	309	71.8%	Medium
MVTA	St Paul Express	Express	Medium	50	Medium	50	Low	10	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	10	Medium	20	192	309	62.1%	Medium
LRT	Green Line	LRT	Medium	50	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	High	24	High	10			211	249	84.7%	High
Maple Grove	DAR	Paratransit	N/A	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Low	8	-	5			165	249	66.3%	Medium

2011 RSIP Overall Project Scores and Rank by Rank

			Subsidy per Passenger		Passengers per In-Sevice Hour (PPISH)		Congestion Mitigation (Express)		Capital Facility Coordination		Benefits for Disabled Community		Service to Low-income and Minority Populations		Innovation		Subsidy per Passenger Express Mile (Express)					
Provider	Project ID	Route Type	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Score	Weighted Score	Final Score	Possible Score	Percent of Possible	
Rank Weight			25		25		10		12		8		8		5		10					
Metro Transit	2	UrbLoc	High	75	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	High	24	Medium	10			236	249	94.8%	High
Metro Transit	19	UrbLoc	High	75	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	High	24	Low	5			231	249	92.8%	High
Metro Transit	110	UrbLoc	High	75	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	5			223	249	89.6%	High
Metro Transit	721	SubLoc	High	75	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	5			223	249	89.6%	High
Metro Transit	723	SubLoc	High	75	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	5			223	249	89.6%	High
LRT	Green Line	LRT	Medium	50	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	High	24	High	15			216	249	86.7%	High
Metro Transit	270	Express	High	75	High	75	High	30	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	High	30	267	309	86.4%	High
Metro Transit	376	Express	High	75	High	75	High	30	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	High	30	267	309	86.4%	High
Metro Transit	84	UrbLoc	High	75	High	75			High	36	Low	8	Medium	16	Low	5			215	249	86.3%	High
Metro Transit	515	SubLoc	High	75	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	Low	8	Low	5			215	249	86.3%	High
Metro Transit	22	UrbLoc	Medium	50	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	High	24	Medium	10			211	249	84.7%	High
Metro Transit	62	UrbLoc	Medium	50	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	High	24	Medium	10			211	249	84.7%	High
Metro Transit	275	Express	High	75	High	75	Medium	20	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	High	30	257	309	83.2%	High
Maple Grove	788B	SubLoc	High	75	High	75			High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5			207	249	83.1%	High
Metro Transit	60	UrbLoc	High	75	Medium	50			High	36	High	24	Medium	16	Low	5			206	249	82.7%	High
Metro Transit	83	UrbLoc	High	75	Medium	50			High	36	High	24	Medium	16	Low	5			206	249	82.7%	High
Metro Transit	673	Express	High	75	High	75	Medium	20	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	Medium	20	247	309	79.9%	High
Metro Transit	766	Express	High	75	High	75	Low	10	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	High	30	247	309	79.9%	High
Maple Grove	785	Express	High	75	High	75	Low	10	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	High	30	247	309	79.9%	High
Metro Transit	10	UrbLoc	Medium	50	High	75			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	5			198	249	79.5%	High
Metro Transit	3	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	High	24	Medium	10			186	249	74.7%	Medium
Metro Transit	535	UrbLoc	High	75	Medium	50			Low	12	Medium	16	Medium	16	High	15			184	249	73.9%	Medium
Metro Transit	87	UrbLoc	High	75	Medium	50			High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5			182	249	73.1%	Medium
Metro Transit	5	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	High	24	Low	5			181	249	72.7%	Medium
Metro Transit	11	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	High	24	Low	5			181	249	72.7%	Medium
Metro Transit	61	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	High	24	Medium	16	Low	5			181	249	72.7%	Medium
Metro Transit	587	Express	High	75	High	75	Medium	20	Low	12	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	Medium	20	223	309	72.2%	Medium
Maple Grove	786	Express	High	75	High	75	Low	10	Low	12	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	High	30	223	309	72.2%	Medium
Metro Transit	386	Express	Medium	50	High	75	Medium	20	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	Medium	20	222	309	71.8%	Medium
Metro Transit	4	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Medium	10			178	249	71.5%	Medium
Metro Transit	68	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Medium	10			178	249	71.5%	Medium
Metro Transit	74	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Medium	10			178	249	71.5%	Medium
MVTA	Rosemount Express	Express	Medium	50	Medium	50	High	30	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	High	30	217	309	70.2%	Medium
Metro Transit	23	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	5			173	249	69.5%	Medium
Metro Transit	63	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	5			173	249	69.5%	Medium
Metro Transit	65	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	5			173	249	69.5%	Medium
Metro Transit	80	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	5			173	249	69.5%	Medium
Metro Transit	54 W. 7th St	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	5			173	249	69.5%	Medium
MVTA	Sunday	SubLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	High	24	Low	8	Low	5			173	249	69.5%	Medium
BlueXpress	490	Express	Medium	50	Medium	50	Medium	20	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Medium	10	High	30	212	309	68.6%	Medium
MVTA	421	SubLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Low	8	Medium	10			170	249	68.3%	Medium
Southwest	169 Service	Express	Medium	50	High	75	Medium	20	Low	12	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	High	30	208	309	67.3%	Medium
Met Council	Red Line BRT	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Low	8	Low	8	High	15			167	249	67.1%	Medium
Metro Transit	250	Express	Medium	50	Medium	50	High	30	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	Medium	20	207	309	67.0%	Medium
MVTA	I-35W	Express	Medium	50	Medium	50	High	30	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	Medium	20	207	309	67.0%	Medium
Maple Grove	DAR	Paratransit	N/A	50	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Low	8	Low	5			165	249	66.3%	Medium
Metro Transit	67	UrbLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Low	8	Medium	16	Low	5			165	249	66.3%	Medium
Metro Transit	675	Express	Medium	50	Medium	50	Medium	20	High	36	Medium	16	Low	8	Low	5	Low	10	195	309	63.1%	Medium
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local	SubLoc	Medium	50	Medium	50			High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5			157	249	63.1%	Medium
MVTA	St Paul Express	Express	Medium	50	Medium	50	Low	10	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	Medium	20	187	309	60.5%	Medium
Metro Transit	54 E. 7th St	UrbLoc	Low	25	Medium	50			High	36	Medium	16	Medium	16	Low	5			148	249	59.4%	Low
MVTA	446	SubLoc	Medium	50	Low	25			High	36	High	24	Low	8	Low	5			148	249	59.4%	Low
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express	Express	Medium	50	Low	25	High	30	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	Medium	20	182	309	58.9%	Low
Plymouth	776	Express	Medium	50	Low	25	Medium	20	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	Medium	20	172	309	55.7%	Low
Plymouth	790	Express	Medium	50	Low	25	Medium	20	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	Medium	20	172	309	55.7%	Low
Plymouth	772	Express	Medium	50	Low	25	Medium	20	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	Low	10	162	309	52.4%	Low
MVTA	Local Coverage	SubLoc	Low	25	Low	25			High	36	Medium	16	Low	8	Low	5			115	249	46.2%	Low
MVTA	440	SubLoc	Low	25	Low	25			High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Medium	10			112	249	45.0%	Low
Metro Transit	674	Express	Low	25	Low	25	Medium	20	High	36	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	Low	10	137	309	44.3%	Low
MVTA	Cedar BRT Express Stage II	Express	Low	25	Low	25	High	30	Low	12	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5	Medium	20	133	309	43.0%	Low
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II weekend	SubLoc	Low	25	Low	25			Low	12	High	24	Low	8	Low	5			99	249	39.8%	Low
MVTA	Cedar BRT Local Stage II	SubLoc	Low	25	Low	25			Low	12	Low	8	Low	8	Low	5			83	249	33.3%	Low

APPENDIX F

Regional Service Improvement Plan Procedure

Adopted by the Metropolitan Council
September 2010

Regional Service Improvement Plan (RSIP) Procedures

September 2010

I. Definition

The Regional Service Improvement Plan (RSIP) is a document that identifies all regional opportunities to increase transit service to maintain quality of service on existing routes and expand frequency, span and coverage to develop new transit markets. The RSIP is prioritized to identify those projects that have the highest likelihood of success in achieving regional goals for transit service.

II. Purpose

The *2030 Transportation Policy Plan* notes that the "regular route bus system will change and expand as population, congestion and the cost of travel increase, as the region implements rail transit and as customer needs change." Defining these changes to the bus system, and advocating for funding to implement the changes is an important role of the Metropolitan Council and all regional transit providers as well as other stakeholders including local government, businesses and residents.

The Regional Service Improvement Plan is an important tool to document and prioritize the region's opportunities to improve the transit system in the near term. There are two specific requirements that have bearing on the process for generating the RSIP and the content of the plan.

1. Transportation Policy Plan Requirement for RSIP

The RSIP is required by the *2030 Transportation Policy Plan* in Strategy 14c.

Policy 14: Transit System Operations and Management: The regional transit providers will promote innovation, efficiency, flexibility and greater diversity of options in operating and managing transit services.

Strategy 14c. Service Improvement Plan: Every two years, regional transit providers in consultation with customers and stakeholders, will prepare a short-term Service Improvement Plan that identifies their priorities for transit service expansion over the following two to four years. The plans will be submitted to the Council, which will prepare a regional Service Improvement Plan.

2. Use of RSIP to Support Distribution of Allocated MVST

The Regional Transit Operating Revenue Allocation Procedures includes use of the RSIP in the distribution of Regionally Allocated Motor Vehicle Sales Tax (MVST). The top priority for Regionally Allocated MVST will be to preserve existing service and to fund committed service expansion. Once these needs are met, remaining Regionally Allocated MVST will be used to expand the transit system by increasing service on existing routes to meet growing demand, improving service frequency, span and coverage to attract new riders and adding new routes. The RSIP is used as a screening tool for service expansion projects. Those providers that have projects that achieve a certain level of priority in the RSIP will be eligible for service expansion funding from Regionally Allocated MVST. For this purpose, the RSIP must rank projects to identify those that best support regional goals.

III. RSIP Procedure

Development of the RSIP will be a four step process:

1. Solicit two- to four-year Service Improvement Plans from all regional transit providers
2. Review and combine service improvement projects into a single regional list
3. Evaluate projects based on regional performance measures and other factors
4. Prepare a categorized and prioritized list of projects to guide planning work and funding allocation decisions

Step 1: Solicitation

Service Improvement Plans (SIPs) will be solicited by the Metropolitan Council from all regional transit entities that receive State General Fund and/or MVST funding through the Metropolitan Council and that are directly responsible for planning service to be implemented with that funding.

The individual provider SIPs should include a detailed list of all suggested service improvements for the next two to four years.

Each project should include the following detail information:

- Route number
- Brief description of the improvement including markets/destinations served and reason for the improvement.
- Description of any existing capital facilities or future capital investments that are planned with or required for the service change (e.g., park & ride, transit center, transitway, etc.)
- Any support for the service change, including relationship to regional and local plans
- Any opposition to the service change
- A map of the existing route with proposed change or a map of the new route

- Route type (urban local, suburban local, express)
- Proposed month and year of implementation

For weekday, Saturday and Sunday:
- Number of new bus trips to be provided
- Number of additional AM peak, PM peak and midday buses required
- Number of new in-service hours and platform hours required
- Current ridership per trip and total daily ridership (for existing routes)
- Estimated new ridership as a result of the service improvement
- Estimated total cost of service, estimated fare revenue and estimated subsidy. Include cost and revenue estimation factors used such as cost per hour, fare revenue per passenger, etc.
- Other secured or potential funding sources for the specific service (i.e. CTIB, CMAQ, JARC, private)
- Identification of impacts on required ADA service area and service levels.
- Calculated estimated subsidy per passenger and passengers per in-service hour

Step 2: Review and Combine Project Lists

Project Review

All SIP projects will be reviewed by a regional RSIP Review Committee convened by Metropolitan Council with one representatives from each suburban transit provider in addition to two from Metro Transit and one from Metropolitan Transportation Services. Particular attention will be paid to the service level and cost estimates for each project as well as the ridership projections. These elements have a significant influence on the factors that will be used to evaluate projects and compare them with one another. Any discrepancies or concerns with the SIP projects will be discussed with the individual transit providers so they can be resolved and the SIP submission adjusted if necessary.

Combined Project List

Metropolitan Council staff will combine all regional projects into a single list. Projects will be categorized by route type and project purpose.

Route Type
- Express
- Urban Local / Limited Stop
- Suburban Local (including transitway connections)

Project Purpose
- Increase capacity to meet growing demand
- Increase quality of service (frequency, span, speed)
- Improve network connectivity and coverage
- Develop new transit markets

Step 3: Project Evaluation

Projects will be evaluated by the Review Committee in order to support development of a prioritized service improvement project list. The evaluation factors will include a combination of both quantitative measures and qualitative assessments of the proposed service improvements. Each project will be assigned a score of High, Medium or Low for each evaluation factor and then an overall score based on the combination (but not necessarily mathematical average) of the individual factors.

The following table identifies the specific evaluation factors, applicable to the proposed service improvement, and the definition of High, Medium and Low scores.

Factor	**Measure**
Subsidy per Passenger	Measured in proportion to regional averages for service type: High = Better than the regional system average* for service type Medium = Better than 130% of regional route average* for service type Low = Worse than 130% of regional route average for service type
Passengers per In-Service Hour	Measured in proportion to regional standard for service type: High = Above regional system average for service and vehicle type Medium = Above regional average standard for service and vehicle type Low = Below regional average standard for service and vehicle type
Congestion Mitigation	High / Medium / Low = Assessment of level and length of congested freeway segments served by the route. Primarily associated with commuter express routes. This factor primarily applies to peak commuter service.
Capital Facility and Running Way Coordination	High = All necessary capital facilities planning, funded, and constructed in coordination with service change Medium = Facilities programmed, but funding and construction not yet secured Low = Required facilities not programmed
Benefits for ADA community	High / Medium / Low based on recommendation of project sponsor and assessment of review committee.
Service to Minority and Low Income Populations	High / Medium / Low = Level of overall transit service improvement to minority and low-income populations, including provision of reverse commute service. Consistency with Title VI requirements
Local Support	High / Medium / Low = Level of demonstrated local support for the service project, including identification in local plan, support from local government, businesses and residents, etc.
Innovation	High / Medium / Low based on recommendation of project sponsor and assessment of review committee.

* The “regional system average” for subsidy per passenger is calculated as the total subsidy across all routes divided by the total number of passengers. The “regional route average” is calculated as the sum of the subsidy per passenger values for each route divided by the total number of routes. Both statistics will be calculated across all routes within a given route type (i.e., urban local, suburban local, and express.)

Step 4: Prioritized List of Projects

Based on the evaluation, the overall project list will be organized into High, Medium and Low priority projects. The prioritized list will indicate which proposed service improvements have the greatest potential to meet regional goals of increasing transit ridership, operating efficient transit service, and growing the overall transit system. This summary will also include the resource requirements and costs of each project to allow for assessment of funding capacity during the allocation of regional transit operating funds.

Regional Transit Performance Standards
2030 Transportation Policy Plan, Page G-10

Transit Performance Standards

The primary performance standards to measure service performance are Subsidy per Passenger and Passengers per In-Service Hour. Performance standards are used to evaluate the relative productivity and efficiency of the services provided. To be responsible and dynamic, a transit system must consistently measure and adjust service in unproductive routes and address insufficient service in productive areas. The use of two regional performance standards provides better insight into the operational and financial performance of individual routes and services.

Revision of Transit Performance Standards

The Metropolitan Council will complete a review of these transit performance standards. Working with regional transit providers, the Council will review and potentially modify the standards listed below. Following this review and potential revision, all providers will review their transit service annually based on the regional transit performance standards. Providers will annually submit their performance reviews to the council for inclusion in a regional service performance review.

Table G-12: Passenger Subsidy

Threshold No.	Level of Subsidy per Passenger Performance	Monitoring Goal	Possible Action
1	20 to 35% over peer average	For Quick Review	Minor Modifications
2	36 to 60% over peer average	For Intense Review	Major Changes
3	More than 60% over peer average	For Significant Change	Restructure/ Eliminate

Subsidy per Passenger

Subsidy or net cost is the difference between the total cost of providing service minus revenue from passenger fares. Subsidy per passenger represents the net cost divided by the number of passengers using the service. This standard identifies services that are not operating within regional efficiency ranges and focuses corrective actions for those services. Subsidy thresholds are determined by calculating the non-weighted subsidy per passenger average within each service classification plus fixed percentage deviations from that average.

Table G-13: Passengers per In-Service Hour

Type of Service	Average Passengers per In-Service Hour	Minimum Passengers per In-Service Hour
Light Rail Transit	≥70	≥50
Big Bus Fixed Route – All Day	≥20	≥15
Big Bus Fixed Route – Peak Only	≥20	N/A
Small Bus Fixed Route	≥9	≥5
Small Bus Non-Fixed Route	≥3	≥2
Other/Rideshare/Shared Ride Taxi	≤2	N/A

Passengers per In-Service Hour

The passenger per in-service hour standard establishes a minimum threshold of performance for light rail transit, big bus fixed route service, small bus fixed route service and paratransit operations. Passengers per in-service hour represents the total passengers carried divided by the in-service time. This measure is most often calculated at the route level, but can also be used less formally at a route segment or trip level.

Page G-10 Metropolitan Council **2030 TRANSPORTATION** *Policy Plan* G