



# Policymaker Working Group

**Regional Solicitation Evaluation**  
[metrocouncil.org](http://metrocouncil.org)



December 17, 2025

# Purpose of Today's Meeting

Need input today:

- Recommend Community Considerations weighting
- Provide final feedback on outstanding issues:
  - Regional Trails
  - Winter Maintenance
  - Carsharing/ Bikesharing



# Action Items

## Previous Actions

1. Approve application categories
2. Approve minimum/maximum awards
3. Approve category funding targets
4. Approve qualifying requirements



November TAB

## Upcoming Actions

1. Approve application criteria, measures, and scoring guidance
2. Approve score weighting
3. Approve overall solicitation package and release for public comments



January TAB

# Recent Updates (1)

- **Technical Steering Committee 11/25**
  - Consensus to conduct Active Transportation sales-tax solicitation biennially off-cycle (2026, then 2027, 2029, etc.).
  - Mixed input on reducing the 20% Community Considerations criteria percentage for the applications.
  - Proposal to just have the year-round maintenance requirements apply to the federal Regional Bike Facilities application and not the Active Transportation Local Bike Facilities application.
  - Proposed updates to Regional Bike Facilities and Bridge Connections applications.
  - Consensus to only have Community Considerations funding priority for 1 project per cycle and no funding priority in the two Safety categories.

# Recent Updates (1)

- **TAC 12/3**
  - Preview of upcoming December action items.
  - Discussion about year-round maintenance requirements and Regional Bike Facilities scoring.
  - Proposal to reduce Community Considerations to 10% of all scores.
- **Transportation Committee 12/8**
  - Supportive of maintaining 20% Community Considerations weighting.
- **Technical Steering Committee 12/12**
  - Mixed input on reducing the 20% Community Considerations criteria percentage for the applications. Half the group wanted to maintain the 20% and the other half wanted to reduce to 15% for all categories except Safety which they wanted to reduce to 10%.
  - General support for simplified cost estimates.
  - Some support for RBTN scoring Option 2 (as currently reflected in applications).
  - Some concern about year-round maintenance requirement on smaller agencies.

# Community Considerations Criterion



# Regional Direction



## Imagine 2050 + TPP Goal of Equity & Inclusion

- One of five regional goals: Equitable and inclusive region
- Regional Equity Framework:
  - People-centered, data-driven decision-making approach
  - Prioritized engagement with overburdened communities
  - Benefits to communities that go beyond harm mitigation

*Equity is at the core of our regional vision—every decision should improve outcomes for historically excluded communities.*

# 3 Proposed Measures



- 1. Community Data and Context**
  - Strong applications show a clear, nuanced understanding of the community.*
- 2. Community Need and Future Engagement**
  - Strong applications show how community needs were identified and future engagement is planned.*
- 3. Community Benefits**
  - Strong applications deliver meaningful benefits to nearby communities and reduce harms.*

## Scoring Details

- 5 ratings: Low, Medium-Low, Medium, Medium-High, High ratings, on 3 measures
- High ratings are a high bar - only those applications documenting full use of best practices
- Annual training required for scorers and available to all agency staff

# Feedback this Fall

| Sept-Oct<br>Comments   | 11/19 Policy<br>Working Group                                | 11/25 Technical<br>Steering<br>Committee                                  | 12/3 Technical<br>Advisory<br>Committee                    |
|--|--|---|--|
| Overall support for approach;<br>tweak it but keep the<br>fundamentals     | --   | --  | Concern that<br>applicants will be<br>lumped in the middle |
| Concerns about community<br>engagement wording and<br>timing               | Staff brought major<br>revisions that the group<br>supported | --  | --   |
| How should this criterion be<br>weighted across categories<br>(i.e., 20%)? | Mixed feedback; requests<br>input from TSC                   | Mixed feedback; seek<br>guidance today and from<br>Policymaker Work Group | County technical staff<br>recommended 10%<br>weighting     |
| Will funding priority benefit<br>too many projects?                        | Mixed feedback; requests<br>input from TSC                   | Recommendation for<br>additional limits                                   | --   |

# Topic #1: Scoring Recommendations



## Current Scoring Recommendation

- 20% of points for Community Considerations measures across all application categories
- Support shown by the Met Council's Transportation Committee on 12/8

## Considerations

- Four of the Imagine 2050 goal areas have application categories devoted to their implementation. Community Considerations does not have a devoted application category, so its implementation comes in a consistent set of scoring measures used in all application categories.
- Designed so that community driven projects will score higher.
- Goes beyond projects to encourage organizational and systems change.
- Additional Met Council supports for scoring fairness and consistency:
  - Pilot testing and iteration
  - Training for applicants and scorers
  - Scoring committee facilitation and support

# Goal-Based Structure

## Safety

### Proactive Safety (All Modes):

Small Projects (HSIP)

Large Project (Reg Sol Federal Funding)

### Reactive Safety (All Modes):

Small Projects (HSIP)

Large Projects (Reg Sol Federal Funding)

## Dynamic and Resilient

### Bicycle/Pedestrian

*Federal Reg Sol Funding*

#### Regional Bike Facilities

*Reg Active Transportation Funding*

#### Local Bike Facilities

#### Local Pedestrian Facilities

#### Active Transportation Planning

### Transit

#### Transit Expansion (Including Microtransit)

#### Transit Customer Experience

#### Arterial Bus Rapid Transit

### Roadway

#### Roadway Modernization

#### Congestion Management Strategies

#### New Interchanges

#### Bridge Connections

## Environment

#### EV Charging Infrastructure

#### Travel Demand Management (TDM)

- *Base Funding*
- *Competitive*

## Regional Data

### Regional Modeling/Travel Behavior Inventory

The goal area, Our Region is Equitable and Inclusive, is being proposed as a scoring measure called Community Considerations.

# Topic #2: Community Considerations

## Funding Priority



**Funding Priority** = provide funding to those projects scoring High-High on the Community Considerations measures, and that are not otherwise funded under a proposed funding option

- Substitutes for not having a separate application category for this regional Goal
- Very difficult to achieve; Community Considerations scoring committee (includes all scorers) will agree and recommend
- Substitutes for bonus points as used in previous Solicitation design
- Meant to reward projects with very high community alignment and focus but that might otherwise be small in nature, unable to achieve high scoring under technical 80% of scoring
- No more than one priority project total for the entire solicitation
- No priority project from the Safety categories

# Application Changes and Updates



# Application Review Process

## Criteria, Measures and Score Weighting Development

- **Sep-Oct:** Revisions based on first round of technical review
- **Oct-Nov:** Revisions based on second round of technical review (included TAC and TAB)
- **November 20:** Info items at TAC Funding and Programming
- **December 3:** Info items at TAC
- **December 17:** Info items at TAB
- **December 11:** Full applications released as part of TAC F&P Packet
- **December 18:** Action items at TAC Funding and Programming
- **January 7:** Action items at TAC
- **January 21:** Action items at TAB and release for public comment

# Application Review

## TAC, Special Issue Working Group Review Oct - Nov

- **Regional Bike:** Comments on Identified Network Priorities measure raised concerns about score tiering. Current proposal reflects RBTN's status as the region's priority for bicycle investments.

|                  | Option 1                                      | Option 2   |
|------------------|---|--|
| <b>30 points</b> | RBTN Tier 1 Alignments                        | RBTN Tier 1 Alignments   |
| <b>25 points</b> | RBTN Tier 1 Corridors, RBTN Tier 2 Alignments | RBTN Tier 1 Corridors, RBTN Tier 2 Alignments, <b>Regional Trail</b> |
| <b>20 points</b> | RBTN Tier 2 Corridors, <b>Regional Trail</b>  | RBTN Tier 2 Corridors  |

- Large overlap between the RBTN and regional trails.
- Option 2 is currently shown in the draft applications with the note that it will be revisited once the RBTN Rural Connectors Study is completed. This effort will analyze the regional trails in the rural parts of the region for inclusion on the RBTN.

# Federal Funds

- **Year-round Maintenance:** The owner/operator of the facility must operate and maintain the project year-round for the useful life of the improvement. This includes assurance of year-round use of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities, per [FHWA direction established 8/27/2008 and updated 4/15/2019](#). Project sponsors of standalone bicycle and pedestrian projects or bicycle and pedestrian facilities that are part of a roadway project must include information on how the requirement to maintain facilities for year-round use will be met. This information may include **either** certifying that the agency will handle snow clearance **or** providing information on the agency's current snow removal policy, such as if property owners or a separate agency is responsible for snow and ice clearance.

# Active Transportation Funds

- Year-round Maintenance: The owner/operator of the facility must operate and maintain the project year-round for the useful life of the improvement. This includes assurance of year-round use of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities, per [FHWA direction established 8/27/2008 and updated 4/15/2019](#). All bicycle and pedestrian applications must include information on how the requirement to maintain facilities for year-round use will be met. This information may include **either** certifying that the agency will handle snow clearance **or** providing information on the agency's current snow removal policy, such as if property owners or a separate agency is responsible for snow and ice clearance.
- AT Work Group affirmed that they consider these requirements to apply to locally funded projects, so no major change suggested at this time.
- State Requirements: "Ability of a grantee to maintain the active transportation infrastructure following project completion."

# Year-Round Maintenance Qualifying Requirements Cont.

## 2050 TPP Guidance

2050 TPP Action 22F: Establish plans or processes to provide year-round maintenance on all transportation infrastructure. Provide technical assistance to support local maintenance efforts.

## USDOT Guidance on ADA: Maintenance

*What obligation does a public agency have regarding snow removal in its walkways?*

A public agency must maintain its walkways in an accessible condition, with only isolated or temporary interruptions in accessibility. 28 CFR §35.133. Part of this maintenance obligation includes reasonable snow removal efforts. (9-12-06)

*What day-to-day maintenance is a public agency responsible for under the ADA?*

As part of maintenance operations, public agencies' standards and practices must ensure that the day-to-day operations keep the path of travel on pedestrian facilities open and usable for persons with disabilities, throughout the year. This includes snow removal, as noted above, as well as debris removal, maintenance of accessible pedestrian walkways in work zones, and correction of other disruptions. ADAAG 4.1.1(4). (9-12-06)

# Carsharing and Bikesharing Eligibility

## Safety

### Proactive Safety (All Modes):

Small Projects (HSIP)

Large Project (Reg Sol Federal Funding)

### Reactive Safety (All Modes):

Small Projects (HSIP)

Large Projects (Reg Sol Federal Funding)

## Dynamic and Resilient

### Bicycle/Pedestrian

*Federal Reg Sol Funding*

#### Regional Bike Facilities

*Reg Active Transportation Funding*

#### Local Bike Facilities

#### Local Pedestrian Facilities

#### Active Transportation Planning

### Transit

#### Transit Expansion (Including Microtransit)

#### Transit Customer Experience

#### Arterial Bus Rapid Transit

### Roadway

#### Roadway Modernization

#### Congestion Management Strategies

#### New Interchanges

#### Bridge Connections

## Environment

#### EV Charging Infrastructure

#### Travel Demand Management (TDM)

- *Base Funding*
- *Competitive*

## Regional Data

### Regional Modeling/Travel Behavior Inventory

The goal area, Our Region is Equitable and Inclusive, is being proposed as a scoring measure called Community Considerations.

# Carsharing and Bikesharing Eligibility

| Project Cost  | Source Funding Eligibility   | Application Category Eligibility                           | Notes   |
|---|--|--|---|
| Carsharing expansion infrastructure and related program administration* | Federally eligible, expansion only, operations limited to 3 years of funding | TDM, shown as "local carsharing"                           | Max award of \$750k, total available \$1.2M (2026), \$2.2M (2028) |
| Carsharing and bikesharing outreach and marketing                       | Federally eligible   | TDM  | Max award of \$750k, total available \$1.2M (2026), \$2.2M (2028) |
| Bikeshare system planning   | Federal and AT Funding eligible  | AT Planning  | Max award of \$200k, total available \$2M                         |
| Bikesharing infrastructure  | Federal and AT Funding eligible  | TDM + Local Bike application (as part of a larger project) |   |

\*Carsharing was also funded in the past under the Unique Projects category with a \$4.5M max award, but this is no longer shown as a funding application category.

Question: Does this application and funding eligibility set up adequately cover carsharing and bikesharing? There is not adequate time to develop a new funding application category. However, funding could be set aside this cycle to allow time for a different category to be developed.

# Next steps



## Next steps:

1. Second Round of Info Items
  - TAC – December 3
  - TAC Planning – December 11
  - TAB – December 17
2. Second Package of Action Items to Release for Public Comment – Dec/Jan
  - TAC F&P – December 18
  - TAC - January 7
  - TAB – January 21
3. Public outreach on the entire application package begins – Jan/Feb
4. Committee and Council approval post-public comment – Feb/March/April
5. Call for projects – Spring 2026
6. Project selection – End of 2026

# Reference Material: Criteria Weighting



# Goal-Based Structure

## Safety

### Proactive Safety (All Modes):

Small Projects (HSIP)

Large Project (Reg Sol Federal Funding)

### Reactive Safety (All Modes):

Small Projects (HSIP)

Large Projects (Reg Sol Federal Funding)

## Dynamic and Resilient

### Bicycle/Pedestrian

*Federal Reg Sol Funding*

#### Regional Bike Facilities

*Reg Active Transportation Funding*

#### Local Bike Facilities

#### Local Pedestrian Facilities

#### Active Transportation Planning

### Transit

#### Transit Expansion (Including Microtransit)

#### Transit Customer Experience

#### Arterial Bus Rapid Transit

### Roadway

#### Roadway Modernization

#### Congestion Management Strategies

#### New Interchanges

#### Bridge Connections

## Environment

#### EV Charging Infrastructure

#### Travel Demand Management (TDM)

- *Base Funding*
- *Competitive*

## Regional Data

### Regional Modeling/Travel Behavior Inventory

The goal area, Our Region is Equitable and Inclusive, is being proposed as a scoring measure called Community Considerations.

# Safety Categories

| Criteria and Measures  | Proactive   | Reactive    |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| Connection to Existing Planning Efforts  | 30%         | 20%         |
| Expected Reduction/System Risk Reduction in Fatal or Serious Injury Crashes (5-year) | 15%         | 35%         |
| Fatal and Serious Injury Crash History (10-year)                                     | 15%         | 15%         |
| Improvements for People Outside of Vehicles  | 20%         | 20%         |
| Community Considerations   | 20%         | 20%         |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>100%</b> | <b>100%</b> |

# Bicycle/Pedestrian Categories

| Criteria and Measures                       | Regional Bike | Local Bike  | Local Ped   | AT Planning |
|---|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Regional Bicycle Priorities                 | 30%           |             |             |             |
| Connection to Key Destinations*             | 10%           | 30%         | 30%         |             |
| All Ages & Abilities Design                 | 20%           |             |             |             |
| Safety*                                     | 20%           | 20%         | 20%         | 30%         |
| Complete Streets*                           |               | 5%          | 5%          |             |
| Identified Gaps, Barriers, or Deficiencies* |               | 25%         | 25%         |             |
| Proposed Project Description                |               |             |             | 50%         |
| Community Considerations*                   | 20%           | 20%         | 20%         | 20%         |
| <b>Total</b>                                | <b>100%</b>   | <b>100%</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>100%</b> |

\* Direct connection to legislative requirements

# Transit Categories

| Criteria and Measures  | Expansion | Customer Experience |
|--|-----------|---------------------|
| <b>Service/Facility Provided Must be Effective for Transit Market Area</b> | 30%       |                     |
| <b>New Ridership/Ridership Affected</b>                                    | 20%       | 20%                 |
| <b>New Coverage</b>  | 10%       |                     |
| <b>Connections to Key Destinations</b>                                     | 10%       |                     |
| <b>Transit Needs-based Determination</b>                                   | 10%       |                     |
| <b>Existing Transit Service</b>  |           | 15%                 |
| <b>Access to Transit Facilities</b>  |           | 15%                 |
| <b>Safety and Security</b>   |           | 15%                 |
| <b>Customer Comfort and Ease of Use</b>                                    |           | 15%                 |
| <b>Community Considerations</b>  | 20%       | 20%                 |
| <b>Total</b>   | 100%      | 100%                |

# Roadway Categories

| Criteria and Measures                                 | Modernization | Congestion Management | New Interchanges | Bridge Connections |
|---|---------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Multimodal/Complete Streets Connections               | 40%           | 10%                   | 10%              | 15%                |
| Safety  | 30%           | 20%                   | 30%              | 10%                |
| Freight   | 5%            | 5%                    | 5%               | 5%                 |
| Natural Systems Protection and Restoration            | 5%            | 5%                    | 5%               | 5%                 |
| Anticipated Delay Reduction                           |               | 15%                   | 10%              |                    |
| Regional Priorities for Reliability & Excessive Delay |               | 25%                   | 20%              |                    |
| System Resilience                                     |               |                       |                  | 45%                |
| Community Considerations                              | 20%           | 20%                   | 20%              | 20%                |
| Total   | 100%          | 100%                  | 100%             | 100%               |

# Environment Categories

| Criteria and Measures  | TDM  |
|--|------|
| Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Reduction                       | 30%  |
| Connection to Jobs, Educations, and Opportunity/Destinations | 25%  |
| Project Effectiveness Evaluation                             | 20%  |
| Innovation   | 5%   |
| Community Considerations                                     | 20%  |
| Total  | 100% |

# Proactive Safety

| Criteria and Measures   | %    |
|---|------|
| <b>1. Connection to Existing Safety Planning Efforts</b><br>Measure A – Connection to existing safety planning efforts  | 30%  |
| <b>2. Expected System Risk Reduction in Fatal or Serious Injury Crashes</b><br>Measure A – Crash Modification Factor(s) (CMFs) for proposed project                 | 15%  |
| <b>3. Fatal and Serious Injury Crash History</b><br>Measure A – 10-year crash history of fatal and serious injury crashes   | 15%  |
| <b>4. Improvements for People Outside of Vehicles</b><br>Measure A – Project-Based Pedestrian Safety Enhancements and Risk Elements                                 | 20%  |
| <b>5. Community Considerations</b><br>Measure A – Community Data and Context<br>Measure B – Community Needs and Future Engagement<br>Measure C – Community Benefits | 20%  |
| <b>Total</b>  | 100% |

# Reactive Safety

| Criteria and Measures   | %    |
|---|------|
| <b>1. Expected Reduction in Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes</b><br>Measure A – 5-year crashes reduced (Benefit/Cost ratio)   | 35%  |
| <b>2. Connection to Existing Safety Planning Efforts</b><br>Measure A – Connection to existing safety planning efforts  | 20%  |
| <b>3. Fatal and Serious Injury Crash History</b><br>Measure A – 10-year crash history of fatal and serious injury crashes   | 5%   |
| <b>4. Improvements for People Outside of Vehicles</b><br>Measure A – Project-Based Pedestrian Safety Enhancements and Risk Elements                                 | 20%  |
| <b>5. Community Considerations</b><br>Measure A – Community Data and Context<br>Measure B – Community Needs and Future Engagement<br>Measure C – Community Benefits | 20%  |
| <b>Total</b>  | 100% |

# Regional Bike Facilities (Federally Funded)

| Criteria and Measures   | %    |
|---|------|
| <b>1. Regional Bicycle Priorities</b><br>Measure A – Identified network priorities  | 30%  |
| <b>2. Connection to Key Destinations</b><br>Measure A – Connection to key destinations  | 10%  |
| <b>3. All Ages &amp; Abilities Design</b><br>Measure A – Facility type<br>Measure B – Design features and roadway crossings   | 20%  |
| <b>4. Safety</b><br>Measure A – Connection to existing safety planning efforts<br>Measure B – Safety improvements for people outside of vehicles                    | 20%  |
| <b>5. Community Considerations</b><br>Measure A – Community Data and Context<br>Measure B – Community Needs and Future Engagement<br>Measure C – Community Benefits | 20%  |
| <b>Total</b>  | 100% |

# Local Bike Facilities

## (Active Transportation Regional Sales Tax Funded)

| Criteria and Measures  | %  |
|--|--|
| <b>1. Complete Streets*</b><br>Measure A – Complete streets planning, design, and construction   | 5%   |
| <b>2. Connection to Key Destinations*</b><br>Measure A – Connections to key destinations<br>Measure B – Connection to K-12 schools<br>Measure C – Active transportation demand | 30%  |
| <b>3. Identified Gaps, Barriers, or Deficiencies*</b><br>Measure A – Gaps, barriers or deficiencies addressed  | 25%  |
| <b>4. Safety*</b><br>Measure A – Connection to existing safety planning efforts<br>Measure B – Safety improvements for people outside of vehicles                              | 20%  |
| <b>5. Community Considerations</b><br>Measure A – Community Data and Context<br>Measure B – Community Needs and Future Engagement<br>Measure C – Community Benefits            | 20%  |
| <b>Total</b>   | <i>* Direct connection to legislative requirements</i> |
|  | 100%   |

# Local Pedestrian Facilities

## (Active Transportation Regional Sales Tax Funded)

| Criteria and Measures  | %    |
|--|------|
| <b>1. Complete Streets*</b><br>Measure A – Complete streets planning, design, and construction   | 5%   |
| <b>2. Connection to Key Destinations*</b><br>Measure A – Connections to key destinations<br>Measure B – Connection to K-12 schools<br>Measure C – Active transportation demand | 30%  |
| <b>3. Identified Gaps, Barriers, or Deficiencies*</b><br>Measure A – Gaps, barriers or deficiencies addressed  | 25%  |
| <b>4. Safety*</b><br>Measure A – Connection to existing safety planning efforts<br>Measure B – Safety improvements for people outside of vehicles                              | 20%  |
| <b>5. Community Considerations</b><br>Measure A – Community Data and Context<br>Measure B – Community Needs and Future Engagement<br>Measure C – Community Benefits            | 20%  |
| <b>Total</b>   | 100% |

# Active Transportation Planning

## (Active Transportation Regional Sales Tax Funded)

| Criteria and Measures  | %    |
|--|------|
| <b>1. Proposed Project*</b><br>Measure A – Project identification<br>Measure B – Complete streets planning, design, and construction | 50%  |
| <b>2. Safety*</b><br>Measure A – Safety improvements for people outside of vehicles  | 30%  |
| <b>3. Community Considerations*</b><br>Measure A – Community Considerations  | 20%  |
| <b>Total</b>   | 100% |

\* Direct connection to legislative requirements

# Transit Expansion

| Criteria and Measures   | %    |
|---|------|
| <b>1. Service/Facility Provided Must be Effective for Transit Market Area</b><br>Measure A – Transit Market Area Alignment<br>Measure B – Regional Transit Performance Guidelines | 30%  |
| <b>2. New Ridership</b><br>Measure A – New annual riders  | 20%  |
| <b>3. New Coverage</b><br>Measure A – New service hours by population within service area   | 10%  |
| <b>4. Connections to Key Destinations</b><br>Measure A – Connection to key destinations   | 10%  |
| <b>5. Transit Needs-based Determination</b><br>Measure A – Demographic and roadway delay/reliability data.  | 10%  |
| <b>6. Community Considerations</b><br>Measure A – Community Data and Context<br>Measure B – Community Needs and Future Engagement<br>Measure C – Community Benefits               | 20%  |
| <b>Total</b>  | 100% |

# Transit Customer Experience

| Criteria and Measures   | %    |
|---|------|
| <b>1. Ridership Affected</b><br>Measure A – Total existing annual riders  | 20%  |
| <b>2. Transit Service</b><br>Measure A – Travel times and/or reliability of existing transit service  | 15%  |
| <b>3. Access to Transit Facilities</b><br>Measure A – Multimodal connections to and ADA accessibility   | 15%  |
| <b>4. Safety and Security</b><br>Measure A – Safety and security for transit riders and people accessing transit facilities   | 15%  |
| <b>5. Customer Comfort and Ease of Use</b><br>Measure A – Comfort for transit riders and overall ease of use of the transit system                                  | 15%  |
| <b>6. Community Considerations</b><br>Measure A – Community Data and Context<br>Measure B – Community Needs and Future Engagement<br>Measure C – Community Benefits | 20%  |
| <b>Total</b>  | 100% |

# Roadway Modernization

| Criteria and Measures  | %    |
|--|------|
| <b>1. Multimodal/Complete Streets Connections</b><br>Measure A – New or improved multimodal connections (transit, bicycle, pedestrian, TDM elements)                                 | 40%  |
| <b>2. Safety</b><br>Measure A – Connection to existing safety planning efforts<br>Measure B – Safety improvements for people outside of vehicles<br>Measure C – Safe System approach | 30%  |
| <b>3. Freight</b><br>Measure A – Connection to Regional Truck Corridor Study tiers   | 5%   |
| <b>4. Natural Systems Protection and Restoration</b><br>Measure A - Flood mitigation, stormwater treatment, other environmental benefits, etc.                                       | 5%   |
| <b>5. Community Considerations</b><br>Measure A – Community Data and Context<br>Measure B – Community Needs and Future Engagement<br>Measure C – Community Benefits                  | 20%  |
| <b>Total</b>   | 100% |

# Congestion Management Strategies

| Criteria and Measures  | %    |
|--|------|
| <b>1. Anticipated Delay Reduction</b><br>Measure A – Cost effectiveness of delay reduced   | 15%  |
| <b>2. Regional Priorities for Reliability &amp; Excessive Delay</b><br>Measure A – 2050 TPP map for Reliability<br>Measure B – 2050 TPP map for Excessive Delay<br>Measure C – Intersection Mobility and Safety Study priorities | 25%  |
| <b>3. Safety</b><br>Measure A – Connection to existing safety planning efforts<br>Measure B – Safety improvements for people outside of vehicles<br>Measure C – Safe System approach   | 20%  |
| <b>4. Multimodal/Complete Streets Connections</b><br>Measure A – New or improved multimodal connections (transit, bicycle, pedestrian, TDM elements)   | 10%  |
| <b>5. Freight</b><br>Measure A - Connection to Regional Truck Corridor Study tiers   | 5%   |
| <b>6. Natural Systems Protection and Restoration</b><br>Measure A - Flood mitigation, stormwater treatment, other environmental benefits, etc.   | 5%   |
| <b>7. Community Considerations (3 Measures – see previous applications)</b>  | 20%  |
| <b>Total</b>   | 100% |

# New Interchanges

| Criteria and Measures  | %    |
|--|------|
| <b>1. Anticipated Delay Reduction</b><br>Measure A – Cost effectiveness of delay reduced   | 10%  |
| <b>2. Regional Priorities for Reliability &amp; Excessive Delay</b><br>Measure A – 2050 TPP map for Reliability<br>Measure B – 2050 TPP map for Excessive Delay                      | 20%  |
| <b>3. Safety</b><br>Measure A – Connection to existing safety planning efforts<br>Measure B – Safety improvements for people outside of vehicles<br>Measure C – Safe System approach | 30%  |
| <b>4. Multimodal/Complete Streets Connections</b><br>Measure A – New or improved multimodal connections (transit, bicycle, pedestrian, TDM elements)                                 | 10%  |
| <b>5. Freight</b><br>Measure A - Connection to Regional Truck Corridor Study tiers   | 5%   |
| <b>6. Natural Systems Protection and Restoration</b><br>Measure A - Flood mitigation, stormwater treatment, other environmental benefits, etc.                                       | 5%   |
| <b>7. Community Considerations (3 Measures – see previously applications)</b>  | 20%  |
| <b>Total</b>   | 100% |

# Bridge Connections

| Criteria and Measures   | %    |
|---|------|
| <b>1. System Resilience</b><br>Measure A – Detour length<br>Measure B – Detour impact<br>Measure C – Bridge posting for load restrictions                           | 45%  |
| <b>2. Multimodal/Complete Streets Connections</b><br>Measure A – New or improved multimodal connections (transit, bicycle, pedestrian, TDM elements)                | 15%  |
| <b>3. Safety</b><br>Measure A – Safety improvements for people outside of vehicles  | 10%  |
| <b>4. Freight</b><br>Measure A – Connection to Regional Truck Corridor Study tiers  | 5%   |
| <b>5. Natural Systems Protection and Restoration</b><br>Measure A - Flood mitigation, stormwater treatment, other environmental benefits, etc.                      | 5%   |
| <b>6. Community Considerations</b><br>Measure A – Community Data and Context<br>Measure B – Community Needs and Future Engagement<br>Measure C – Community Benefits | 20%  |
| <b>Total</b>  | 100% |

# Travel Demand Management (TDM)

| Criteria and Measures   | %    |
|---|------|
| <b>1. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Reduction</b><br>Measure A – Average weekday users and miles shifted to non-single occupancy vehicle travel or trip reduction    | 30%  |
| <b>2. Connection to Jobs, Educations, and Opportunity</b><br>Measure A – Connections to jobs, education and other opportunities                                     | 25%  |
| <b>3. Project Effectiveness Evaluation</b><br>Measure A – Plan and methods to evaluate project outcomes   | 20%  |
| <b>4. Innovation</b><br>Measure A - Completely new, new to the region or serving new communities  | 5%   |
| <b>5. Community Considerations</b><br>Measure A – Community Data and Context<br>Measure B – Community Needs and Future Engagement<br>Measure C – Community Benefits | 20%  |
| <b>Total</b>  | 100% |