Traffic Management Technologies   
(Roadway System Management) –   
Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

May 8, 2023

Purpose: To fund traffic technology projects that reduce delay, emissions, and crashes.

Definition: An Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) or similar project that primarily benefits roadway users. Traffic Management Technology projects can include project elements along a single corridor, multiple corridors, or within a specific geographic area such as a downtown area. To be eligible, projects must make improvements to at least one A-minor arterial or non-freeway principal arterial. Projects that are more transit-focused must apply in the Transit Modernization application category.

# Examples of Traffic Management Technology Projects:

* Flashing yellow arrow traffic signals
* Traffic signal retiming projects
* Integrated corridor signal coordination
* Traffic signal control system upgrades
* New/replacement detectors
* Passive detectors for bicyclists and peds
* Other emerging ITS technologies
* New/replacement traffic mgmt. centers
* New/replacement traffic communication
* New/replacement CCTV cameras
* New/replacement variable message signs & other info improvements
* Incident management coordination
* Vehicle to Infrastructure Technology

# Scoring:

| Criteria and Measures | Points | % of Total |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy | **175** | **15%** |
| Measure A - Functional classification of project | 50 |  |
| Measure B - Regional Truck Corridor Study Tiers | 50 |  |
| Measure C - Integration within existing traffic management systems | 50 |  |
| Measure D - Coordination with other agencies | 25 |  |
| 1. Usage | **125** | **10%** |
| Measure A - Current daily person throughput | 85 |  |
| Measure B - Forecast 2040 average daily traffic volume | 40 |  |
| 1. Equity and Affordable Housing | **100** | **8%** |
| Measure A - Engagement | 30 |  |
| Measure B - Disadvantaged communities benefits and impacts | 40 |  |
| Measure C - Affordable housing access | 30 |  |
| 1. Infrastructure Age | **75** | **6%** |
| Measure A - Upgrades to obsolete equipment | 75 |  |
| 1. Congestion Reduction/Air Quality | **200** | **17%** |
| Measure A - Congested roadway | 150 |  |
| Measure B - Emissions and congestion benefits of project | 50 |  |
| 1. Safety | **300** | **25%** |
| Measure A - Crashes reduced | 75 |  |
| Measure B – Safety issues in project area | 225 |  |
| 1. Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections | **50** | **4%** |
| Measure A - Transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project elements and connections | 50 |  |
| 1. Risk Assessment | **75** | **6%** |
| Measure A - Risk Assessment Form | 75 |  |
| 1. Cost Effectiveness | **100** | **8%** |
| Measure A - Cost effectiveness (total points awarded/total project cost) | 100 |  |
| Total | **1,200** |  |

## Role in the Regional Transportation System and Economy (175 Points)

Tying regional policy (Thrive MSP2040) to the Regional Solicitation, this criterion measures the project’s ability to serve a transportation purpose within the regional transportation system and economy based on how well it fulfills its functional classification role, aligns with the Regional Truck Corridor Study, integrates with existing traffic management systems, and provides coordination across agencies. The project must be located on at least one non-freeway principal arterial or A-minor arterial.

1. MEASURE: Reference the functional classification(s) that the project would serve. Investment in a higher functionally classified roadway (i.e., the principal arterial system) serves a more regional purpose and will result in more points.

RESPONSE (Select one):

* The majority of the project funds will be invested on the principal arterial system: ☐ (50 points)
* The majority of the project funds will be invested on the A-minor arterial system: ☐ (25 points)
* The majority of the project funds will be invested on the collector or local system with some investment either on the principal arterial or A-minor arterial system: ☐ (0 points)

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

The scorer will assign points based on which of the above scores applies. Note that multiple applicants are able to score the maximum point allotment. If no applicant scores 50 points, the 25-point projects will be adjusted to 50 points, while the zero-point projects will remain at zero.

1. MEASURE: This measure relies on the results of the Regional Truck Corridor Study, which prioritized all principal and minor arterials based on truck volume, truck percentage of total traffic, proximity to freight industry clusters, and proximity to regional freight terminals. The truck corridors were grouped into tiers 1, 2, and 3, in order of priority. Use the 2021 Updated Regional Truck Corridors tiers to respond to this measure: [2021 Updated Regional Truck Corridors](https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/metrocouncilmts/viz/RegionalTruckCorridorStudy-PublicComment/Story). (50 points)

RESPONSE (Select one for your project, based on the updated 2021 Regional Truck Corridors):

* The majority of the project funds will be invested on either a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor: ☐ (50 Points) Miles (to the nearest 0.1 miles):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* A majority of the project funds will NOT be invested on a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor, but at least 10 percent of the funds will be invested on these corridors: ☐ (25 Points) Miles (to the nearest 0.1 miles) :\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* No project funds will be invested on a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor: ☐ (0 Points)

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

The scorer will assign points based on which of the scores applies. Note that multiple applicants can score the maximum point allotment. If no applicant scores 50 points, the 25-point projects will be adjusted to 50 points, while the zero-point projects will remain at zero.

1. MEASURE: Discuss how the proposed project integrates and/or builds on existing traffic management infrastructure (examples of systems include traffic signal systems, freeway management systems, and incident management systems). (50 Points)

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

The applicant will describe how the project would build on other infrastructure and management systems. Prioritizing projects that complement existing infrastructure and management methods, the scorer will award the full share of points to the project that best builds on other infrastructure and management systems. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion. This response is intended to be qualitative.

1. MEASURE: Demonstrate how the project provides or enhances coordination among operational and management systems and/or jurisdictions. (25 points)

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (25 Points)

The project that best provides or enhances coordination among operational and management systems and/or jurisdictions will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion.

## Usage (125 Points)

This criterion quantifies the project’s potential impact by measuring the current daily person throughput and future vehicular traffic that will be served by the project. These roadway users directly benefit from the project improvements.

1. MEASURE: Metropolitan Council staff will calculate the current daily person throughput at one location along the A-minor arterial or non-freeway principal arterial project length using the current average annual daily traffic (AADT) volume and average daily transit ridership. If more than one corridor or location is included in the project, then the applicant should select the corridor where the most investment is being made with the project. The applicant must identify the location along the project length and provide the current AADT volume from the [*MnDOT Traffic Mapping Application*](http://www.dot.state.mn.us/traffic/data/tma.html). Due to the potential timing issues with when a traffic count was taken relative to the COVID-19 pandemic (and resulting drop in traffic volumes), applicants may also use a historic AADT volume from the MnDOT Traffic Mapping Application (instructions under the Help Document). Reference the “Transit Connections” map for transit routes along the project. Ridership data will be provided by the Metropolitan Council staff, if public transit is currently provided on the project length. (85 points)

* Current Daily Person Throughput = (current average annual daily traffic volume x 1.30 vehicle occupancy) + average annual daily transit ridership (2022)

RESPONSE:

* Location:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Current AADT volume:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Existing transit routes at the location noted above:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Upload the “Transit Connections” map.

SCORING GUIDANCE (85 Points)

The project with highest current daily person throughput will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had a daily person throughput of 1,000 people and the top project had a daily person throughput of 1,500 people, this applicant would receive (1,000/1,500) \*85 points or 56 points.

1. MEASURE: Provide the forecast (2040) average daily traffic volume at the same location along the A-minor arterial or non-freeway principal arterial project length, as identified in the previous measure. The applicant may choose to use a county or city travel demand model based on the Metropolitan Council model to identify the forecast (2040) average daily traffic volume or have Metropolitan Council staff determine the forecast volume using the Metropolitan Council model and project location. Respond as appropriate to the use of one type of forecast model. (40 points)

RESPONSE:

* Use Metropolitan Council model to determine forecast (2040) ADT volume☐
* If checked, METC Staff will provide Forecast (2040) ADT volume ☐

OR

RESPONSE:

* Identify the approved county or city travel demand model to determine forecast (2040) ADT volume☐
* Forecast (2040) ADT volume: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

SCORING GUIDANCE (40 Points)

The applicant with the highest forecast (2040) ADT volume will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had a daily forecast of 28,000 vehicles and the top project had a daily forecast of 32,000 vehicles, this applicant would receive (28,000/32,000)\* 40 points or 35 points.

## Equity and Affordable Housing (100 Points)

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

1. MEASURE: Engagement (0 to 30 points). This measure is a qualitative scoring measure.

A successful project is the result of active engagement of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, persons with disabilities, youth, older adults, and residents in affordable housing. Engagement should occur prior to and during project development, with the intent to provide direct benefits or solve an expressed transportation issue, while also limiting and mitigating any negative impacts.

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

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

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

* 1. What engagement methods and tools were used?
  2. How did you engage specific communities and populations likely to be directly impacted by the project?
  3. What techniques did you use to reach populations traditionally not involved in community engagement related to transportation projects?
  4. How were the project’s purpose and need identified?
  5. How was the community engaged as the project was developed and designed?
  6. How did you provide multiple opportunities for of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, persons with disabilities, youth, older adults, and residents in affordable housing to engage at different points of project development?
  7. How did engagement influence the project plans or recommendations? How did you share back findings with community and re-engage to assess responsiveness of these changes?
  8. If applicable, how will NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities?

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (0 to 30 Points)

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

1. MEASURE: Disadvantaged Communities Benefits and Impacts (0 to 40 points). This measure is a qualitative scoring measure.

Successful projects are designed to provide direct benefits to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, persons with disabilities, youth, older adults. All projects must mitigate potential negative benefits as required under federal law. Projects that are designed to provide benefits go beyond the mitigation requirement to proactively provide transportation benefits and solve transportation issues experienced by Disadvantaged communities. Benefits to residents of affordable housing are addressed in Measure C.

Describe the project’s benefits to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, children, people with disabilities, youth, and older adults. Benefits could relate to:

* + pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements;
  + public health benefits;
  + direct access improvements for residents or improved access to destinations such as jobs, school, health care, or other;
  + travel time improvements;
  + gap closures;
  + new transportation services or modal options;
  + leveraging of other beneficial projects and investments;
  + and/or community connection and cohesion improvements.

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

Acknowledge and describe any negative project impacts to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, children, people with disabilities, youth, and older adults. Describe measures to mitigate these impacts. Unidentified or unmitigated negative impacts may result in a reduction in points.

Below is a list of potential negative impacts. This is not an exhaustive list.

* Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
* Increased speed and/or “cut-through” traffic.
* Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
* Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (0 to 40 Points)

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

1. MEASURE: Affordable Housing Access (0 to 30 points)**.** This measure is a qualitative scoring measure.

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

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

* specific direct access improvements for residents
* improved access to destinations such as jobs, school, health care or other;
* new transportation services or modal options;
* and/or community connection and cohesion improvements.

This is not an exhaustive list. Since residents of affordable housing are more likely not to own a private vehicle, higher points will be provided to roadway projects that include other multimodal access improvements. A full response will support the benefits claimed, identify benefits specific to residents of affordable housing, identify benefits addressing a transportation issue affecting residents of affordable housing specifically identified through engagement, and substantiate benefits with data.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (0 to 30 points)

The project that best provides meaningful improvements to access to affordable housing units will receive the full 30 points. Multiple projects may receive the highest possible score of 30 points based on this assessment. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion.

1. BONUS POINTS (0 TO 25 POINTS ABOVE THE TOTAL CRITERION POINTS): Those projects that score at least 80% of the maximum total points available through Measures A, B, and C will be awarded bonus points based on the geographic location of the project. These points will be assigned as follows, based on the highest-scoring geography the project contacts:
   * 25 points to projects within an Area of Concentrated Poverty
   * 15 points to projects within census tracts with the percent of population in poverty or population of color above the regional average percent
   * 10 points for all other areas

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

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

* Project is located in an Area of Concentrated Poverty: ☐
* Project’s census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color (Regional Environmental Justice Area): ☐
* Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population in poverty or populations of color (Regional Environmental Justice Area): ☐

SCORING GUIDANCE (0 to 25 Points)

If the applicant receives at least 80% of the available points in Measures A, B, and C (e.g., 80 points for the Roadway applications) the project will receive Bonus points as described. If an applicant qualifies for Bonus points it may result in an Equity and Affordable Housing score of more than the total points available.

## Infrastructure Age (75 Points)

This criterion will assess the degree to which functionally obsolete infrastructure elements are being replaced and improved.

1. **MEASURE**: Describe how various equipment will be improved or replaced as part of this project relative to its age and whether it is functionally obsolete.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (75 Points)

The project that best provides for stewardship of public funds and resource by replacing functionally obsolete equipment and finding cost-effective solutions to upgrade viable equipment will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion.

## Congestion Reduction/Air Quality (200 Points)

This criterion measures the project’s ability to make improvements in congested corridors using speed data from the Congestion Management Process Plan. The project will also be measured based on its ability to reduce emissions.

MEASURE: Council staff will provide travel speed data to compare the peak hour travel speed in the project area to free flow conditions on the “Level of Congestion” map. If more than one corridor or location is included in the project, then the applicant should select the corridor on which the most investment is being made with the project. The applicant must identify the corridor as part of the response. (150 Points)

RESPONSE:

* Corridor:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Corridor Start and End Points:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Free-Flow Travel Speed:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Peak Hour Travel Speed:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Percentage Decrease in Travel Speed in Peak Hour Compared to Free-Flow (online calculation):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Upload the “Level of Congestion” map used for this measure.

SCORING GUIDANCE (150 Points)

The applicant with the most congestion (measured by the largest percentage decrease in peak hour travel speeds relative to free flow conditions) will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the points. For example, if the application being scored showed a 5% decrease of travel speeds in the peak hour relative to free flow conditions and the top project had a 10% reduction, this applicant would receive (5/10)\*150 points, or 75 points.

1. MEASURE: Discuss how the project will reduce emissions and congestion. The applicant should focus on any reduction in CO, NOX, and VOC. Projects on roadways that provide relief to congested, parallel principal arterial roadways should reference the current MnDOT Metro Freeway Congestion Report and discuss the systemwide emissions and congestion impact of the proposed improvements.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

The project that is most likely to reduce emissions and congestion will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion.

## Safety (300 Points)

This criterion addresses the project’s ability to correct deficiencies and improve the overall safety of an existing or future roadway facility. It will assess the project’s monetized safety benefits.

1. MEASURE: Calculate the reduction in the total number of crashes due to improvements on the A-minor arterial or non-freeway principal arterial made by the project. The applicant must base the estimate of crash reduction on the methodology consistent with the latest MnDOT Metro District Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) application ([www.dot.state.mn.us/stateaid/trafficsafety.html](http://www.dot.state.mn.us/stateaid/trafficsafety.html)). Applicants should focus on the crash analysis for reactive projects.

Crash data must be obtained for the project length for calendar years 2020 through 2022. Crash data should include all crash types and severities, including pedestrian and bicycle crashes.

Only crashes contained within the Minnesota Department of Public Safety’s database can be used. If the agency submitting the application has access to MnCMAT, crash data from that system can be used as part of the submittal. MnCMAT data will be reviewed by MnDOT to ensure accuracy. Crash data can also be obtained from MnDOT if an agency does not have access to MnCMAT. MnDOT Metro District Traffic Office will provide a crash listing, upon request. Applicants should request crash data from MnDOT as early as possible. The applicant must then attach a listing of the crashes reduced and the HSIP Benefit/Cost (B/C) worksheet ([www.dot.state.mn.us/stateaid/trafficsafety.html](http://www.dot.state.mn.us/stateaid/trafficsafety.html)) that identifies the resulting benefit associated with the project. As part of the response, please detail and attach the crash modification factor(s) used from FHWA’s Crash Modification Factors Clearinghouse: <http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/>. As part of the Regional Solicitation Before & After Study, Phase 2 (2021), a list of commonly used crash modification factors was created. Applicants have the option to use these crash modification factors (posted on the Metropolitan Council’s Regional Solicitation website, under Application Resources) or find a more appropriate one on FHWA’s Clearinghouse.

This measure requests the monetized safety benefit of the project. The cost of the project is scored in the Cost Effectiveness criterion.

RESPONSE:

* Crash Modification Factors Used (Limit 700 characters; approximately 100 words): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Rationale for Crash Modifications Selected (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Project Benefit ($) from B/C ratio: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Total Fatal (K) Crashes: \_\_\_\_\_\_
* Total Serious Injury (A) Crashes: \_\_\_\_\_\_
* Total Non-Motorized Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes: \_\_\_\_\_\_
* Total Crashes: \_\_\_\_\_\_
* Total Fatal (K) Crashes Reduced by Project: \_\_\_\_\_\_
* Total Serious Injury (A) Crashes Reduced by Project: \_\_\_\_\_\_
* Total Non-Motorized Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes Reduced by Project: \_\_\_\_\_\_
* Total Crashes Reduced by Project: \_\_\_\_\_\_

Upload Crash Modification Factors and B/C Worksheet.

SCORING GUIDANCE (75 Points)

The applicant with the highest dollar value of benefits will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had safety benefits of $11,000,000 and the top project had safety benefits of $16,000,000, this applicant would receive (11,000,000/16,000,000)\* 75 points or 52 points.

1. MEASURE: Discuss how the project will improve safety issues in the project area. As part of the response, the applicant may want to reference the project relative to County Highway Safety Plan or similar planning documents and what the project will specifically do to improve the safety issue.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (225 Points)

The project that will provide the most safety benefits and alleviate identified safety concerns will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion.

## Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections (50 Points)

This criterion measures how the project improves the travel experience, safety, and security for other modes of transportation, and addresses the safe integration of these modes. The Transportation Policy Plan requires that explicit consideration of all users of the transportation system be considered in the planning and scoping phase of roadway projects.

1. MEASURE: Describe how the project positively affects the multimodal system.

* Discuss any bicycle, pedestrian, or transit elements that are included as part of the project and how they improve the travel experience, safety, and security for users of these modes. Applicants should make sure that new multimodal elements described in the response are accounted for as part of the cost estimate form earlier in the application. Applicants should note if there is no transit service in the project area and identify supporting studies or plans that address why a mode may not be incorporated in the project (e.g., a bicycle system plan that locates bikeway facilities on a lower-volume parallel route).
* Describe how the proposed multimodal improvements positively affect identified alignments in the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) or along a regional trail, if applicable.
* Describe how the proposed multimodal improvements either provide a new, or improve an existing Major River Bicycle Barrier Crossing (MRBBC) as defined in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan (TPP) or how they provide a new or improved crossing of a Regional Bicycle Barrier with respect to the tiered Regional Bicycle Barrier Crossing Improvement Areas as defined in the TPP and Technical Addendum to the Regional Bicycle Barriers Study (May 2019), if applicable.
* Discuss the existing bicycle, pedestrian, and transit connections and how the project enhances these connections.
* Discuss whether the project implements specific locations identified as being deficient in a completed ADA Transition Plan.

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (50 Points)

The project that most positively affects the multimodal system will receive the full points. Remaining projects will receive a share of the full points at the scorer’s discretion. The project score will be based on the quality of the improvements, as opposed to being based solely on the number of modes addressed. Points can be earned for incorporating multimodal project elements, positively affecting identified alignments in the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (RBTN) regional trail, Major River Bicycle Barrier Crossing, or Regional Bicycle Barrier, for making connections with existing multimodal systems, or helping to implement an ADA Transition Plan. Projects do not need all of these elements to be awarded all of the points. Multimodal elements for rural roadway projects may include wider shoulders that will be used by bicyclists and pedestrians.

## Risk Assessment (75 Points)

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

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

RESPONSE (Complete Risk Assessment):

Please check those that apply and fill in anticipated completion dates for all projects New/expanded transit service projects will receive full credit for items 2-5 but must fill out item 1. Transit vehicle purchases will receive full credit.

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

Projects that have been through a public process with residents and other interested public entities are more likely than others to be successful. The project applicant must indicate that events and/or targeted outreach (e.g., surveys and other web-based input) were held to help identify the transportation problem, how the potential solution was selected instead of other options, and the public involvement completed to date on the project. The focus of this section is on the *opportunity for public input* as opposed to the quality of input. NOTE: A written response is required and failure to respond will result in zero points.

100%  Multiple types of targeted outreach efforts (such as meetings or online/mail outreach) specific to this project with the general public and partner agencies have been used to help identify the project need.

50%  At least one meeting specific to this project with the general public has been used to help identify the project need.

50%  At least online/mail outreach effort specific to this project with the general public has been used to help identify the project need.

25%  No meeting or outreach specific to the project was conducted, but the project was identified through meetings and/or outreach related to a larger planning effort.

0%  No outreach has led to the selection of this project.

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

1. **Layout (25 Percent of Points)**

Layout includes proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries. A basic layout should include a base map (north arrow; scale; legend;\* city and/or county limits; existing ROW, labeled; existing signals;\* and bridge numbers\*) and design data (proposed alignments; bike and/or roadway lane widths; shoulder width;\* proposed signals;\* and proposed ROW). An aerial photograph with a line showing the project’s termini does not suffice and will be awarded zero points.

\*If applicable

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

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

75%  For projects where MnDOT trunk highways are impacted and a MnDOT Staff Approved layout is required. Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted local jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties), and layout review and approval by MnDOT is pending. **A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.**

50%  Layout completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. **A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.**

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

0%  Layout has not been started

1. **Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (15 Percent of Points)**

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

Project is located on an identified historic bridge:

1. **Right-of-Way (25 Percent of Points)**

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

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

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

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

1. **Railroad Involvement (15 Percent of Points)**

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

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

SCORING GUIDANCE (75 Points)

The applicant with the most points on the Risk Assessment (more points equate to less project risk) will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had 40 points and the top project had 70 points, this applicant would receive (40/70)\*75 points or 43 points.

## Cost Effectiveness (100 Points)

This criterion will assess the project’s cost effectiveness based on the total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls) and total points awarded in the previous 8 criteria.

1. MEASURE: Calculate the cost effectiveness of the project. Metropolitan Council staff will divide the number of points awarded in the previous criteria by the TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls). If a project has been awarded other outside, competitive funding (e.g., state bonding, Transportation Economic Development Program, Minnesota Highway Freight Program), project sponsors may reduce the total project cost for the purposes of this scoring measure by the amount of the outside funding award.

* Cost effectiveness = total number of points awarded in previous criteria/total TAB-eligible project cost (not including noise walls)

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

* Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (automatically calculated)
* Enter amount of Noise Walls: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Enter amount of any outside, competitive funding (attach documentation of award): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Points Awarded in Previous Criteria: \_\_\_\_ (entered by Metropolitan Council staff)

SCORING GUIDANCE (100 Points)

The applicant with the most points (i.e., the benefits) per dollar will receive the full points for the measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the top project received .0005 points per dollar and the application being scored received .00025 points per dollar, this applicant would receive (.00025/.0005)\*100 points or 50 points.

The scorer for this measure will also complete a reasonableness check of the total project cost that is used for this measure. The scorer may follow up with the applicant to clarify any questions. Up to 50 percent of points awarded for this measure can be deducted if the scorer does not believe that the cost estimate is reasonable.

TOTAL: 1,200 POINTS