

Action Transmittal

Transportation Advisory Board



Committee meeting date: January 21, 2026

Date: January 13, 2026

Action Transmittal: 2026-07

2026 Regional Solicitation Scoring Criteria and Measures Weighting

To: Transportation Advisory Board
From: Technical Advisory Committee
Prepared by: Steve Peterson, Senior Manager, 651-602-1819
Joe Barbeau, Planning Analyst, 625-602-1705

Requested action

Recommend approval of the weighting of criteria and scoring measures for the 2026 Regional Solicitation as shown in the attachment.

Recommended motion

Recommend approval of the weighting of the criteria and scoring measures for the 2026 Regional Solicitation for the purpose of release for public comment with one of two options for weighing the Community Considerations criterion as shown in Attachments 5 and 6:

- Attachment 5 (Funding & Programming Committee Recommendation):
 - Adjustment of the Community Considerations criterion downward from a total of 20% to 10% in the Safety application categories; setting each Community Considerations measure at one-third of the criterion; and
 - Adjustment of the Community Considerations criterion downward from a total of 20% to 15% in all other application categories; setting each Community Considerations measure at one-third of the criterion; and
 - Adjustment of another criterion and measure(s) in each application category upward by 10% in the Safety application categories and 5% in all other application categories.
- Attachment 6 (Policy Working Group Recommendation):
 - Adjustment of the Community Considerations criterion downward from a total of 20% to 15% in the Safety application categories; setting each Community Considerations measure at one-third of the criterion;
 - Adjustment of the People Outside of Vehicles criterion (and the Project-Based Pedestrian Safety Enhancement and Risk Element measure) upward from 20% to 25% in the Safety application categories;
- Direct the applicable special issue working groups to make a recommendation during the public comment period on how to reallocate any unallocated points.

Background and purpose

The proposed scoring criteria, measures, and weighting were generated through the Regional Solicitation Evaluation process. This process included Special Interest Working Groups comprised of technical staff with expertise in eight special topics, and these groups were responsible for developing the scoring recommendations. The Special Issue Working Groups' recommendations were then reviewed by the Regional Solicitation Technical Steering Committee and Policy Working Group and are now proceeding through the TAC recommendation process.

Relationship to regional policy

TAB develops and issues a Regional Solicitation for federal funding. The overall purpose of the Regional Solicitation Evaluation process was to update the structure, criteria, and measures to reflect the newly adopted Imagine 2050 Regional Development Guide and 2050 Transportation Policy Plan. The criteria and measures weighting proposed in this action transmittal reflects the recommendations of the Policymaker Work Group, Technical Steering Committee, and Special Interest Working Groups to implement the policy and direction of the 2050 plans in the Regional Solicitation.

Committee comments and action

At its December 18, 2025, meeting the TAC Funding & Programming Committee recommended the weighting of the scoring criteria and measures for the 2026 Regional Solicitation as shown in the attachment, but with a reduction in weighting for Community Considerations from 20% to 10% for the Safety application categories and from 20% to 15% for all other application categories.

Redistribution of the reduced score weighting among the Community Considerations measures and to measures that should be increased by the 10% for Safety and 5% for the other categories was not discussed or recommended as part of the motion. The rationale for the reduction was that at its December 12, 2025, meeting, the Regional Solicitation Technical Steering Committee had favored this redistribution, though it was countered that this was based on an informal vote of 7 to 5 in a meeting with incomplete attendance. In addition, the Regional Solicitation Policy Working group discussed this issue at its December 17, 2025, meeting and directed that the distribution should be 20% for the Community Considerations criterion, except for the Safety application categories, which the Policy Group directed should be at 15%. However, because the action transmittals had already been prepared and mailed for the Funding & Programming Committee for its meeting on December 18, 2025, this policy direction was not reflected in the materials mailed and the Funding & Programming Committee chose a different allocation as reflected in the motion.

At its January 7, 2026, meeting, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended that the Transportation Advisory Board approve the weighting of the criteria and scoring measures for the 2026 Regional Solicitation for the purpose of release for public comment with one of two options for weighing the Community Considerations criterion as shown in Attachments 5 and 6:

- Funding & Programming Committee Recommendation (Attachment 5):
 - Adjustment of the Community Considerations criterion downward from a total of 20% to 10% in the Safety application categories; setting each Community Considerations measure at one-third of the criterion; and
 - Adjustment of the Community Considerations criterion downward from a total of 20% to 15% in all other application categories; setting each Community Considerations measure at one-third of the criterion; and
 - Adjustment of another criterion and measure(s) in each application category upward by 10% in the Safety application categories and 5% in all other application categories.
- Policy Working Group Recommendation (Attachment 6):
 - Adjustment of the Community Considerations criterion downward from a total of 20% to 15% in the Safety application categories; setting each Community Considerations measure at one-third of the criterion;
 - Adjustment of the People Outside of Vehicles criterion (and the Project-Based

Pedestrian Safety Enhancement and Risk Element measure) upward from 20% to 25% in the Safety application categories;

- Direct the applicable special issue working groups to make a recommendation during the public comment period on how to reallocate any unallocated points.

Discussion included concern about the proportion of level of points assigned to a qualitative category, how a qualitative category would be scored, discomfort with recommending less than 100% of point distribution within scoring categories; the connection of the Community Considerations criterion to long-range planning; and the desires of the Policymaker Working Group and Metropolitan Council.

Routing

| To | Action Requested | Date Completed (Scheduled) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| TAC Funding & Programming Committee | Review and recommend | December 18, 2025 |
| Technical Advisory Committee | Review and recommend | January 7, 2026 |
| Transportation Advisory Board | Review and approve | January 21, 2026 |

Attachment 5: Funding & Programming Committee Recommendation

F&P: Safety

| Criteria and Measures | Proactive | Reactive |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| Connection to Existing Safety Planning Efforts | 30 | 20 |
| Connection to existing safety planning efforts | 30 | 20 |
| Expected System Risk Reduction in Fatal or Serious Injury Crashes | 15 | - |
| Crash Modification Factor (CMF) | 15 | - |
| Expected Reduction in Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes | - | 35 |
| Crashes reduced (Benefit/Cost ratio) | - | 35 |
| Fatal and Serious Injury Crash History | 15 | 5 |
| 10-year crash history of fatal and serious injury crashes | 15 | 5 |
| Improvements for People Outside of Vehicles | 20 | 20 |
| Project-based pedestrian safety enhancements and risk elements | 20 | 20 |
| Community Considerations | 20 10 | 20 10 |
| Community data and context | 6.6 3.3 | 6.6 3.3 |
| Community need and future engagement | 6.7 3.3 | 6.7 3.3 |
| Community benefits | 6.7 3.3 | 6.7 3.3 |
| <i>Subtotal</i> | 100 90 | 100 90 |
| <i>Uncommitted</i> | 10 | 10 |

F&P: Regional Bicycle Facilities

| Criteria and Measures | Regional Bicycle Facilities |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Regional Bicycle Priorities | 30 |
| Identified network priorities | 30 |
| Connection to Key destinations | 10 |
| Connection to key destinations | 10 |
| All Ages & Abilities Design | 20 |
| Facility type | 10 |
| Design features and roadway crossings | 10 |
| Safety | 20 |
| Connection to existing safety planning efforts | 5 |
| Safety improvements for people outside of vehicles | 15 |
| Community Considerations | 20 15 |
| Community data and context | 6.67 5 |
| Community need and future engagement | 6.67 5 |
| Community benefits | 6.67 5 |
| <i>Subtotal</i> | 100 95 |
| <i>Uncommitted</i> | 5 |

F&P: Transit

| Criteria and Measures | Expansion | Cust Exp ¹ |
|--|---------------|-----------------------|
| Service/Facility Provided Must be Effective for Transit Market Area | 30 | - |
| Transit Market Area Alignment | 10 | - |
| Regional Transit Performance Guidelines | 20 | - |
| Ridership | 20 | 20 |
| New annual riders | 20 | - |
| Total existing annual riders | - | 20 |
| Access to Transit Facilities | - | 15 |
| Multimodal connections and ADA accessibility | - | 15 |
| New Coverage | 10 | - |
| New service hours by population within service area | 10 | - |
| Access to Transit Facilities | - | 15 |
| Multimodal connections and ADA accessibility | - | 15 |
| Connection to Key Destinations | 10 | - |
| Connection to key destinations | 10 | - |
| Safety and Security | - | 15 |
| Safety and security for transit riders and people accessing transit facilities | - | 15 |
| Transit Needs-based Determination | 10 | - |
| Demographic and roadway delay/reliability data | 10 | - |
| Customer Comfort and Ease of Use | - | 15 |
| Comfort for transit riders and overall ease of use of the transit system | - | 15 |
| Community Considerations | 20 15 | 20 15 |
| Community data and context | 6.67 5 | 6.67 5 |
| Community need and future engagement | 6.67 5 | 6.67 5 |
| Community benefits | 6.67 5 | 6.67 5 |
| Subtotal | 100 95 | 100 95 |
| Uncommitted | 5 | 5 |

¹ Transit Customer Experience

F&P: Roadways

| Criteria and Measures | Mod ² | CMS ³ | Bridge | Interchange |
|--|------------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Multimodal/Complete Streets Connections | 40 | 10 | 15 | 10 |
| New or improved multimodal connections | 40 | 10 | 15 | 10 |
| System Resilience | - | - | 45 | - |
| Detour length | - | - | 15 | - |
| Detour impact | - | - | 15 | - |
| Bridge posting for load restrictions | - | - | 15 | - |
| Anticipated Delay Reduction | - | 15 | - | 10 |
| Cost effectiveness of delay reduced | - | 15 | - | 10 |
| Regional Priorities for Reliability & Excessive Delay | - | 25 | - | 20 |
| 2050 TPP map for Reliability | - | 10 | - | 10 |
| 2050 TPP map for Excessive Delay | - | 10 | - | 10 |
| Intersection Mobility and Safety Study priorities | - | 5 | - | - |
| Safety | 30 | 20 | 10 | 30 |
| Connection to existing safety planning efforts | 10 | 10 | - | 10 |
| Safety for people outside of vehicles | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| Safe System approach | 10 | 5 | - | 10 |
| Freight | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Regional Truck Corridor Study tiers | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Natural Systems Protection and Restoration | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Flood, stormwater, other environmental benefits | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Community Considerations | 20 15 | 20 15 | 20 15 | 20 15 |
| Community data and context | 6.67 5 | 6.67 5 | 6.67 5 | 6.67 5 |
| Community need and future engagement | 6.67 5 | 6.67 5 | 6.67 5 | 6.67 5 |
| Community benefits | 6.67 5 | 6.67 5 | 6.67 5 | 6.67 5 |
| Subtotal | 100 95 | 100 95 | 100 95 | 100 95 |
| Uncommitted | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |

² Modernization

³ Congestion Management Strategies

F&P: Environment

| Criteria and Measures | TDM ⁴ |
|---|------------------|
| Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Reduction | 30 |
| Average weekday users and miles shifted to non-SOV vehicle travel or trip reduction | 30 |
| Connections to Jobs, Educations, and Opportunity | 25 |
| Connections to jobs, education, and other opportunities | 25 |
| Project Effectiveness Evaluation | 20 |
| Plan and methods to evaluate project outcomes | 20 |
| Innovation | 5 |
| Completely new, new to the region, or serving new communities | 5 |
| Community Considerations | 20 15 |
| Community data and context | 6.67 5 |
| Community need and future engagement | 6.67 5 |
| Community benefits | 6.67 5 |
| <i>Subtotal</i> | 100 95 |
| <i>Uncommitted</i> | 5 |

⁴ Travel Demand Management

Attachment 6: Policy Working Group Recommendation

PWG: Safety

| Criteria and Measures | Proactive | Reactive |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| Connection to Existing Safety Planning Efforts | 30 | 20 |
| Connection to existing safety planning efforts | 30 | 20 |
| Expected System Risk Reduction in Fatal or Serious Injury Crashes | 15 | - |
| Crash Modification Factor (CMF) | 15 | - |
| Expected Reduction in Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes | - | 35 |
| Crashes reduced (Benefit/Cost ratio) | - | 35 |
| Fatal and Serious Injury Crash History | 15 | 5 |
| 10-year crash history of fatal and serious injury crashes | 15 | 5 |
| Improvements for People Outside of Vehicles | 20 25 | 20 25 |
| Project-based pedestrian safety enhancements and risk elements | 20 25 | 20 25 |
| Community Considerations | 20 15 | 20 15 |
| Community data and context | 6.6 5 | 6.6 5 |
| Community need and future engagement | 6.7 5 | 6.7 5 |
| Community benefits | 6.7 5 | 6.7 5 |
| Total | 100 | 100 |

PWG: Regional Bicycle Facilities

| Criteria and Measures | Regional Bicycle Facilities |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Regional Bicycle Priorities | 30 |
| Identified network priorities | 30 |
| Connection to Key destinations | 10 |
| Connection to key destinations | 10 |
| All Ages & Abilities Design | 20 |
| Facility type | 10 |
| Design features and roadway crossings | 10 |
| Safety | 20 |
| Connection to existing safety planning efforts | 5 |
| Safety improvements for people outside of vehicles | 15 |
| Community Considerations | 20 |
| Community data and context | 6.67 |
| Community need and future engagement | 6.67 |
| Community benefits | 6.67 |
| Total | 100 |

PWG: Transit

| Criteria and Measures | Expansion | Cust Exp ⁵ |
|--|------------|-----------------------|
| Service/Facility Provided Must be Effective for Transit Market Area | 30 | - |
| Transit Market Area Alignment | 10 | - |
| Regional Transit Performance Guidelines | 20 | - |
| Ridership | 20 | 20 |
| New annual riders | 20 | - |
| Total existing annual riders | - | 20 |
| Access to Transit Facilities | - | 15 |
| Multimodal connections and ADA accessibility | - | 15 |
| New Coverage | 10 | - |
| New service hours by population within service area | 10 | - |
| Access to Transit Facilities | - | 15 |
| Multimodal connections and ADA accessibility | - | 15 |
| Connection to Key Destinations | 10 | - |
| Connection to key destinations | 10 | - |
| Safety and Security | - | 15 |
| Safety and security for transit riders and people accessing transit facilities | - | 15 |
| Transit Needs-based Determination | 10 | - |
| Demographic and roadway delay/reliability data | 10 | - |
| Customer Comfort and Ease of Use | - | 15 |
| Comfort for transit riders and overall ease of use of the transit system | - | 15 |
| Community Considerations | 20 | 20 |
| Community data and context | 6.67 | 6.67 |
| Community need and future engagement | 6.67 | 6.67 |
| Community benefits | 6.67 | 6.67 |
| Total | 100 | 100 |

⁵ Transit Customer Experience

PWG: Roadways

| Criteria and Measures | Mod ⁶ | CMS ⁷ | Bridge | Interchange |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------|-------------|
| Multimodal/Complete Streets Connections | 40 | 10 | 15 | 10 |
| New or improved multimodal connections | 40 | 10 | 15 | 10 |
| System Resilience | - | - | 45 | - |
| Detour length | - | - | 15 | - |
| Detour impact | - | - | 15 | - |
| Bridge posting for load restrictions | - | - | 15 | - |
| Anticipated Delay Reduction | - | 15 | - | 10 |
| Cost effectiveness of delay reduced | - | 15 | - | 10 |
| Regional Priorities for Reliability & Excessive Delay | - | 25 | - | 20 |
| 2050 TPP map for Reliability | - | 10 | - | 10 |
| 2050 TPP map for Excessive Delay | - | 10 | - | 10 |
| Intersection Mobility and Safety Study priorities | - | 5 | - | - |
| Safety | 30 | 20 | 10 | 30 |
| Connection to existing safety planning efforts | 10 | 10 | - | 10 |
| Safety for people outside of vehicles | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| Safe System approach | 10 | 5 | - | 10 |
| Freight | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Regional Truck Corridor Study tiers | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Natural Systems Protection and Restoration | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Flood, stormwater, other environmental benefits | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Community Considerations | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Community data and context | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 |
| Community need and future engagement | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 |
| Community benefits | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 | 6.67 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

⁶ Modernization

⁷ Congestion Management Strategies

PWG: Environment

| Criteria and Measures | TDM ⁸ |
|---|------------------|
| Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Reduction | 30 |
| Average weekday users and miles shifted to non-SOV vehicle travel or trip reduction | 30 |
| Connections to Jobs, Educations, and Opportunity | 25 |
| Connections to jobs, education, and other opportunities | 25 |
| Project Effectiveness Evaluation | 20 |
| Plan and methods to evaluate project outcomes | 20 |
| Innovation | 5 |
| Completely new, new to the region, or serving new communities | 5 |
| Community Considerations | 20 |
| Community data and context | 6.67 |
| Community need and future engagement | 6.67 |
| Community benefits | 6.67 |
| <i>Total</i> | 100 |

⁸ Travel Demand Management