

# LOCAL BICYCLE FACILITIES

## Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

**2050 TPP Goal:** Our Region is Dynamic and Resilient

### 2050 TPP Objectives or Policies:

People have better travel options beyond driving alone to meet their daily needs, with a focus on improving travel times, reliability, directness, and affordability.

People do not die or face life-changing injuries when using any form of transportation.

People can increase physical activity with more opportunities to walk, roll, or bike.

**Category Definition:** The Local Bicycle Facilities application category is intended to fund construction of and improvements to bicycle facilities that are identified in a local or regional plan. Projects may be identified as Regional Bicycle Transportation Network alignments or Regional Trails or may be local in nature.

## Scoring

Table 1: Scoring Criteria and Measures

| Criteria and Measures  |
|--|
| <b>1. Complete Streets</b><br>Measure A – Complete streets planning, design, and construction  |
| <b>2. Connection to Key Destinations</b><br>Measure A – Connection to key destinations<br>Measure B – Connection to K-12 Schools<br>Measure C – Active transportation demand |
| <b>3. Identified Gaps, Barriers, or Deficiencies</b><br>Measure A – Gaps, barriers, or deficiencies addressed  |
| <b>4. Safety</b><br>Measure A – Connection to existing safety planning efforts<br>Measure B – Safety improvements for people outside of vehicles                             |
| <b>5. Community Considerations</b><br>Measure A – Community data and context<br>Measure B – Community need and future engagement<br>Measure C – Community benefits           |
| <b>Total</b>   |

Selected projects in this category will be funded through the Regional Active Transportation Sales Tax, and as such, project selection must be based on:

1. Project's inclusion in a municipal or regional nonmotorized transportation system plan (see qualifying requirements);
2. Extent to which policies or practices of the political subdivision encourage and promote complete streets planning, design, and construction (see criterion 1);
3. Extent to which the project supports connections between communities and to key destinations within a community (see criterion 2);
4. Identified barriers or deficiencies in the nonmotorized transportation system (see criterion 3);
5. Identified safety or health benefits (see criterion 4);
6. Geographic equity in project benefits, with an emphasis on communities that are historically and currently underrepresented in local or regional planning (see criterion 5; project selection will also consider geographic equity); and
7. Ability of a grantee to maintain the active transportation infrastructure following project completion (see qualifying requirements).

The qualifying and scoring criteria for this category are designed to address these seven state requirements.

## Examples of Eligible Projects

Please note that this list is not exhaustive and is intended only to provide examples. For questions regarding project eligibility, see the qualifying requirements for this application category and contact the Metropolitan Council.

- Multiuse trails or shared-use paths
- On-street or separated bicycle facilities
- At-grade or grade-separated bicycle crossing improvements or connections
- Filling multiple gaps, improving multiple crossings, or making other similar improvements along a corridor
- Bikesharing infrastructure
- Elements that support bicycling (such as bike rack installation, bicycle repair stations, benches, wayfinding, etc.) may be included as part of a construction project, but are not eligible as standalone projects

## Application Criteria and Measures

### 1. Complete Streets

This criterion measures the extent to which the applicant encourages or promotes complete streets planning, design, and construction in direct response to one of the statutory funding requirements.

#### A. Complete Streets Planning, Design, and Construction

If applicable, provide a link to the applicant agency's complete streets policy, or another document that provides information on the agency's practices: \_

Additionally, provide a description of ways the agency encourages or promotes complete streets planning, design, and construction as part of its operations and how those practices will be applied to the project (400 words or less).

### Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may be rated at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria.

- **High:** The highest rated projects in this measure will be from agencies that have a strong adopted complete streets policy and show how the applicant generally encourages and promotes the use of complete streets principles as part of its operations. This may include citing specific requirements, practices, and examples. Agencies without an officially adopted complete streets policy may score highly with a strong narrative response that demonstrates how they employ similar practices as an organizational priority.
- **Medium-High**
- **Medium:** Mid-range projects in this measure may be from agencies that have an adopted complete streets policy, but the policy may lack specifics, or the agency does/may not make a good case for how they encourage and promote complete streets on a daily basis. This may include a lack of specific examples.
- **Medium-Low**
- **Low:** Agencies that do not have an adopted complete streets policy and make minimal effort to follow complete streets principles should be rated low.
- **Non-responsive/Not relevant:** Agencies that do not have an adopted complete streets policy and do not provide evidence for how the applicant generally follows complete streets principles should receive zero points for this measure.

## 2. Connection to Key Destinations

This criterion measures the project's ability to serve a transportation purpose by connecting users to key local destinations.

### A. Connection to Key Destinations

Attach a map that clearly identifies key destinations within ½ mile of the project limits. Key destinations may include destinations important to the local community, including (but not limited to) banks, post offices, high-frequency transit stations, childcare centers, grocery stores, medical centers, office parks, pharmacies, places of worship, public libraries, public parks, schools, universities, or colleges. Other destinations may be included with an explanation as to their importance to the local community.

Upload that map, along with a written response (300 words or less) that highlights the key destinations served and their importance to the local community.

If the project does not directly serve any key destinations but facilitates an important connection to a destination more than ½ mile from the project, please explain.

### Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may be rated at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria.

- **High:** The highest rated projects in this measure will make a strong case about how the project will significantly increase access to key destinations. This may include providing new connections and/or improvements to existing connections. The narrative should also explain why the destinations are critical to the community and/or region.
- **Medium-High**

- **Medium:** Mid-range projects in this measure may minimally increase access to key destinations by only connecting to a few destinations and/or providing small improvements to existing connections. Differentiation among these projects should consider how many destinations are connected, the importance of the destinations to the community and/or region, and the level of increased access as provided in the narrative.
- **Medium-Low**
- **Low:** Projects that have minimal destinations within the project area or do not create safe connections to those destinations should receive minimal points for this criterion. Consider whether the project adds new connections and/or improves existing connections when making this assessment.
- **Non-responsive/Not relevant:** Projects that do not create any new connections, do not have any destinations within the project area, or do not provide adequate information should receive zero points for this measure.

### B. Connection to K-12 Schools

Projects that improve safe connections to K-12 schools are eligible for additional points as a way to continue implementing the principles of providing Safe Routes to Schools.

Select all that apply:

- ☐ This project provides a direct connection to a K-12 school by constructing improvements that directly border school property or provide direct access to school property. List the school(s): \_\_\_\_
- ☐ This project provides an indirect connection to a K-12 school by constructing improvements that come within ¼ mile of a K-12 school. List the school(s): \_\_\_\_
- ☐ This project does not provide a direct or indirect connection to a K-12 school.

#### Scoring Guidance

Consider the information provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the guidance provided below.

- **5 points:** Project provides a direct connection to a K-12 school.
- **3 points:** Project provides an indirect connection to a K-12 school
- **0 points:** Projects that are not within 1/4 mile of a K-12 school will receive zero points.

### C. Active Transportation Demand

Identify the project location's score on MnDOT's [\*Suitability for the Pedestrian and Cycling Environment \(SPACE\)\*](#) tool. This score measures the location's estimated latent demand for active transportation based on a variety of environmental, physical and demographic factors.

Use the SPACE tool to roughly draw the project alignment or location using the drawing tools. Then, upload a screenshot of the SPACE tool showing the calculated score.

#### Scoring Guidance

The applicant with the highest SPACE score will receive the full points available to this measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored showed a SPACE score of 50, and the top project had score of 75, this applicant would receive  $(50/75) * 5$  points, or 3.33 points.

### 3. Identified Gaps, Barriers, or Deficiencies

This criterion measures the project's contribution toward creating a connected, accessible, and comfortable active transportation network.

#### A. Gaps, Barriers, or Deficiencies Addressed

Projects will be scored based on a tiered system that prioritizes filling network gaps.

Select all that apply:

- ☐ This project fills a network gap or improves a barrier by constructing a new facility that connects to other existing facilities or a community destination and serves users of all ages and abilities.
- ☐ This project addresses a system barrier or deficiency by constructing crossing improvements or increasing separation from motor vehicles on an existing facility to increase comfort and safety on the bicycle system.
- ☐ This project constructs a new bicycle facility but does not currently connect to another existing bicycle facility.
- ☐ This project addresses a deficiency by improving the condition of an existing facility, but no additional improvements are anticipated.

Please provide a written response (300 words or less) that explains the ways this project addresses a gap, barrier, or deficiency on the existing system.

#### Scoring Guidance

Scoring for this measure will be based on the tiered system listed below. Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and score projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Scores will be based upon the scorer's discretion and the information provided in the written response, with the option to provide reduced points if the scorer does not believe the gap, barrier or deficiency cited is adequately addressed to a level that makes the facility comfortable for all ages and abilities. Projects that checked multiple boxes will receive the highest tier of points that is adequately supported by the applicant's response.

- **25 points:** Project fills a network gap or barrier by constructing a new facility that connects to other existing bicycle facilities or a key community destination.
- **20 points:** Project addresses a system barrier or deficiency by constructing crossing improvements or increasing separation on an existing facility.
- **15 points:** Project constructs a new bicycle facility but does not currently connect to another existing facility.
- **10 points:** Project addresses a deficiency by improving facility condition but no additional improvements are anticipated.

### 4. Safety

This criterion measures the project's ability to promote safety for all users, including how the project responds to existing risks and makes use of proven safety countermeasures.

## A. Connection to Existing Safety Planning Efforts

Please select all of the following that apply:

- ☐ Project Location (or part of the location) is listed in the [Regional Safety Action Plan](#) on any of the following lists (note an online map is being developed and a link will be provided in final application):
  - Identified on Regional Top 25 Priority [lists](#) (reactive or proactive)
  - Identified on Regional High Injury Streets [maps](#)
  - Identified on County Top 10 priority lists (reactive or proactive)
  - Crash Risk Index >15 (for pedestrians, use the bicyclists' layers)
- ☐ Project location is not listed in a regional or local safety plan but provides a parallel or alternative route that will improve safety for people walking or biking.

Please describe and provide information on the ways the project will provide a safe alternative route (300 words or less).
- ☐ Location is listed in another safety plan that prioritizes reducing fatal and serious injury crashes.
  - Please describe and provide reference or link to the plan: \_\_

### Scoring Guidance

The project will be scored based on the scorer's discretion, using the following guidance:

- **High:** Project is identified in the regional safety action plan on either the regional top 25 or county top 10 lists or project provides a viable parallel or alternative route to a location listed.
- **Medium-High**
- **Medium:** Project location is identified in a regional safety action plan on High Injury Streets or Crash Risk Index, or project provides a viable parallel or alternative route to a location listed.
- **Medium-Low**
- **Low:** Project location is identified in a local (e.g. county or city) safety action plan, local or district Safe Routes to School plan, or project has a completed targeted study (e.g., NEPA document, corridor study, intersection study, ICE report, etc.) that identifies the specific safety measures needed to improve safety and those safety measures have been incorporated into the proposed project or project provides a viable parallel or alternative route to a location listed or project provides a viable parallel or alternative route to a location listed.
- **Non-responsive/Not relevant:** Projects that are not identified in the Regional Safety Action Plan or any local safety plan. This could also include projects that also have not completed a targeted study that defines an existing safety issue (e.g., NEPA document, corridor study, intersection study, ICE report, etc.).

## B. Safety Improvements for People Outside of Vehicles

Please provide a written response that explains how the project will mitigate existing risk factors noted above and any other steps taken to ensure the project promotes safety for all users. Please cite any specific proven safety countermeasures that will be part of the project's design or methods the project will use to promote safety for people outside of vehicles (600 words or less).

Consider the following when developing your response. Note that not all considerations are applicable to all projects, but please respond to those that are applicable.

- Will crossing distances or times between protected crossings for people outside of vehicles be increasing or decreasing? If so, how many locations will be affected? If increasing, what measures will be considered to recognize the increase in distance between crossing opportunities?
- Describe what measures are being used to reduce exposure and delay for people outside of vehicles.
- If grade separated pedestrian crossings are being added and increasing crossing times, describe any features that are included that will reduce the detour required of pedestrians and make the separated crossing a more appealing option.
- If mid-block crossings are restricted or blocked, explain why this is necessary and how pedestrian crossing needs and safety are supported in other ways.
- Describe how motorist speed will be managed in the project design, in both through-traffic and turning movements. Note any strategies or treatments being considered that are intended to help motorists drive slower or protect pedestrians and bicyclists if motorist speeds will increase.
- Consider these resources for safety improvements: [Regional Safety Action Plan's Programmatic Recommendations](#), [FHWA's Safe System Roadway Design Hierarchy](#), and [MnDOT's Traffic Engineering Countermeasures](#)

### Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may be rated at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria.

- **High:** The highest rated projects in this criterion will serve the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists with the greatest safety and least pedestrian and bicyclist delay, detour, or discomfort. Score projects higher if selected countermeasures are designed to be comfortably used by people of all ages and abilities. The highest scoring projects will provide frequent, safe, at-grade crossing opportunities to prioritize directness and convenience with safety. Score projects higher if design elements are included to help motorists drive slower. The response will include quantitative or qualitative metrics showing a high level of improvement using an established methodology.
- **Medium-High**
- **Medium:** Mid-range projects in this measure may make a strong case as to how the project improves the travel experience, safety, and security for people outside of vehicles but without quantitative data or using a less established methodology. These projects may require lengthy detours or elevation changes or have less frequent at-grade crossings that do not align well with destinations. Similarly, mid-range projects may have quantitative or qualitative data and an established methodology but only offer a small improvement to the multimodal experience.
- **Medium-Low**
- **Low:** Projects that make minimal improvement to the travel experience, safety and security for people outside of vehicles should receive low points in this measure. These projects may include motor vehicle design elements that raise concerns for pedestrian and bicyclist safety, such as increased vehicle speeds or increased crossing distances that would not be fully mitigated by any safety countermeasures for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- **Non-responsive/Not relevant:** Projects that do not improve the travel experience and safety for people outside of vehicles should receive zero points for this measure.

## 5. Community Considerations

See separate Community Considerations criteria document.



# LOCAL PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

## Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

**2050 TPP Goal:** Our Region is Dynamic and Resilient

### 2050 TPP Objectives or Policies:

- People have better travel options beyond driving alone to meet their daily needs, with a focus on improving travel times, reliability, directness, and affordability.
- People do not die or face life-changing injuries when using any form of transportation.
- People can increase physical activity with more opportunities to walk, roll, or bike.

**Category Definition:** The Local Pedestrian Facilities application category is intended to fund construction of and improvements to pedestrian-focused facilities that improve mobility, safety or accessibility for pedestrians in local communities.

## Scoring

Table 1: Scoring Criteria and Measures

| Criteria and Measures  |
|--|
| <b>1. Complete Streets</b><br>Measure A – Complete streets planning, design, and construction  |
| <b>2. Connection to Key Destinations</b><br>Measure A – Connection to key destinations<br>Measure B – Connection to K-12 Schools<br>Measure C – Active transportation demand |
| <b>3. Identified Gaps, Barriers, or Deficiencies</b><br>Measure A – Gaps, barriers, or deficiencies addressed  |
| <b>4. Safety</b><br>Measure A – Connection to existing safety planning efforts<br>Measure B – Safety improvements for people outside of vehicles                             |
| <b>5. Community Considerations</b><br>Measure A – Community data and context<br>Measure B – Community need and future engagement<br>Measure C – Community benefits           |
| <b>Total</b>   |



Selected projects in this category will be funded through the Regional Active Transportation Sales Tax, and as such, project selection must be based on:

1. Project's inclusion in a municipal or regional nonmotorized transportation system plan (see qualifying requirements);
2. Extent to which policies or practices of the political subdivision encourage and promote complete streets planning, design, and construction (see criterion 1);
3. Extent to which the project supports connections between communities and to key destinations within a community (see criterion 2);
4. Identified barriers or deficiencies in the nonmotorized transportation system (see criterion 3);
5. Identified safety or health benefits (see criterion 4);
6. Geographic equity in project benefits, with an emphasis on communities that are historically and currently underrepresented in local or regional planning (see criterion 5; project selection will also consider geographic equity); and
7. Ability of a grantee to maintain the active transportation infrastructure following project completion (see qualifying requirements).

The qualifying and scoring criteria for this category are designed to address these requirements.

### Examples of Eligible Projects

Please note that this list is not exhaustive and is intended only to provide examples. For questions regarding project eligibility, see the qualifying requirements for this application category and contact the Metropolitan Council.

- Sidewalk construction (single corridor or areawide improvements)
- At-grade pedestrian crossing improvements
- Filling multiple gaps, improving multiple crossings, or making other similar improvements along a corridor
- ADA improvements
- Streetscape improvements that encourage walking

## Application Criteria and Measures

### 1. Complete Streets

This criterion measures the extent to which the applicant encourages or promotes complete streets planning, design, and construction in direct response to one of the statutory funding requirements.

#### A. Complete Streets Planning, Design, and Construction

If applicable, provide a link to the applicant agency's complete streets policy, or another document that provides information on the agency's practices: \_

Additionally, provide a description of ways the agency encourages or promotes complete streets planning, design, and construction as part of its operations and how those practices will be applied to the project (400 words or less).

### Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may score at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria.

- **High:** The highest rated projects in this measure will be from agencies that have a strong adopted complete streets policy and show how the applicant generally encourages and promotes the use of complete streets principles as part of its operations. This may include citing specific requirements, practices, and examples. Agencies without an officially adopted complete streets policy may score highly with a strong narrative response that demonstrates how they employ similar practices as an organizational priority.
- **Medium-High**
- **Medium:** Mid-range projects in this measure may be from agencies that have an adopted complete streets policy, but the policy may lack specifics, or the agency does not cite evidence for how they encourage and promote complete streets on a daily basis. This may include a lack of specific examples.
- **Medium-Low**
- **Low:** Agencies that do not have an adopted complete streets policy and make minimal effort to follow complete streets principles should be rated low.
- **Non-responsive/Not relevant:** Agencies that do not have an adopted complete streets policy and do not provide evidence for how the applicant generally follows complete streets principles should receive zero points for this measure.

## 2. Connection to Key Destinations

This criterion measures the project's ability to serve a transportation purpose by connecting users to key local destinations.

### A. Connection to Key Destinations

Attach a map that clearly identifies key destinations within ½ mile of the project limits. Key destinations may include destinations important to the local community, including (but not limited to) banks, post offices, high-frequency transit stations, childcare centers, grocery stores, medical centers, office parks, pharmacies, places of worship, public libraries, public parks, schools, universities, or colleges. Other destinations may be included with an explanation as to their importance to the local community.

Upload that map, along with a written response (300 words or less) that highlights the key destinations served and their importance to the local community.

If the project does not directly serve any key destinations but facilitates an important connection to a destination more than ½ mile from the project, please explain.

### Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may be rated at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria.

- **High:** The highest rated projects in this measure will make a strong case about how the project will significantly increase access to key destinations. This may include providing new

connections and/or improvements to existing connections. The narrative should also explain why the destinations are critical to the community and/or region.

- **Medium-High**
- **Medium:** Mid-range projects in this measure may minimally increase access to key destinations by only connecting to a few destinations and/or providing small improvements to existing connections. Differentiation among these projects should consider how many destinations are connected, the importance of the destinations to the community and/or region, and the level of increased access as provided in the narrative.
- **Medium-Low**
- **Low:** Projects that have minimal destinations within the project area or do not create safe connections to those destinations should receive minimal points for this criterion. Consider whether the project adds new connections and/or improves existing connections when making this assessment.
- **Non-responsive/Not relevant:** Projects that do not create any new connections, do not have any destinations within the project area, or do not provide adequate information should receive zero points for this measure.

### B. Connection to K-12 Schools

Projects that improve safe connections to K-12 schools are eligible for additional points as a way to continue implementing the principles of providing Safe Routes to Schools.

Select all that apply:

- ☐ This project provides a direct connection to a K-12 school by constructing improvements that directly border school property or provide direct access to school property. List the school(s): \_\_
- ☐ This project provides an indirect connection to a K-12 school by constructing improvements that come within ¼ mile of a K-12 school. List the school(s): \_\_
- ☐ This project does not provide a direct or indirect connection to a K-12 school.

### Scoring Guidance

Consider the information provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the guidance provided below.

- **5 points:** Project provides a direct connection to a K-12 school.
- **3 points:** Project provides an indirect connection to a K-12 school
- **0 points:** Projects that are not within 1/4 mile of a K-12 school will also receive zero points.

### C. Active Transportation Demand

Identify the project location's score on MnDOT's [Priority Areas for Walking \(PAWS\)](#) Tool. This score measures the location's relative priority for pedestrian improvements based on a variety of environmental, physical and demographic factors.

Use the PAWS tool to identify the highest score in the project area. PAWS scores will be verified as part of the scoring process.

Highest PAWS score: \_\_\_\_\_

### *Scoring Guidance*

The applicant with the highest PAWS score will receive the full points available to this measure. Remaining projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored showed a PAWS score of 10, and the top project had score of 15, this applicant would receive  $(10/15) \times 5$  points, or 3.33 points. Rounded to the nearest integer, this application would receive 3 points.

### **3. Identified Gaps, Barriers, or Deficiencies**

This criterion measures the project's contribution toward creating a connected, accessible, and comfortable active transportation network.

#### **A. Gaps, Barriers, or Deficiencies Addressed**

Projects will be scored based on a tiered system that prioritizes filling network gaps.

Select all that apply:

- ☐ This project fills a network gap or improves a barrier by constructing a new facility that connects to other existing facilities or a community destination and serves users of all ages and abilities.
- ☐ This project addresses a system barrier or deficiency by constructing crossing improvements or increasing separation from vehicles on an existing facility to increase comfort and safety on the active transportation system.
- ☐ This project constructs a new facility but does not currently connect to another existing facility.
- ☐ This project addresses a deficiency by improving the condition of an existing facility, but no additional improvements are anticipated.

Please provide a written response (300 words or less) that explains the ways this project addresses a gap, barrier, or deficiency on the existing system.

### *Scoring Guidance*

Scoring for this measure will be based on the tiered system listed below. Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and score projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Scores will be based upon the scorer's discretion and the information provided in the written response, with the option to provide reduced points if the scorer does not believe the gap, barrier or deficiency cited is adequately addressed to a level that makes the facility comfortable for all ages and abilities. Projects that checked multiple boxes will receive the highest tier of points that is adequately supported by the applicant's response.

- **25 points:** Project fills a network gap or barrier by constructing a new facility that connects to other existing facilities or a key community destination.
- **20 points:** Project addresses a system barrier or deficiency by constructing crossing improvements or increasing separation on an existing facility.

- **15 points:** Project constructs a new facility but does not currently connect to another existing facility.
- **10 points:** Project addresses a deficiency by improving facility condition, but no additional improvements are anticipated.

### 4. Safety

This criterion measures the project's ability to promote safety for all users, including how the project responds to existing risks and makes use of proven safety countermeasures.

#### A. Connection to Existing Safety Planning Efforts

Please select all of the following that apply:

- ☐ Project Location (or part of the location) is listed in the [Regional Safety Action Plan](#) on any of the following lists (note an online map is being developed and a link will be provided in final application):
  - Identified on Regional Top 25 Priority [lists](#) (reactive or proactive)
  - Identified on Regional High Injury Streets [maps](#)
  - Identified on County Top 10 priority lists (reactive or proactive)
  - Crash Risk Index >15 (for pedestrians, use the bicyclists' layers)
- ☐ Project location is not listed in a regional or local safety plan but provides a parallel or alternative route that will improve safety for people walking or biking.
  - Please describe and provide information on the ways the project will provide a safe alternative route (300 words or less).
- ☐ Location is listed in another safety plan that prioritizes reducing fatal and serious injury crashes.
  - Please describe and provide reference or link to the plan: \_\_

#### Scoring Guidance

The project will be scored based on the scorer's discretion, using the following guidance:

- **High:** Project is identified in the regional safety action plan on either the regional top 25 or county top 10 lists or project provides a viable parallel or alternative route to a location listed.
- **Medium-High**
- **Medium:** Project location is identified in a regional safety action plan on High Injury Streets or Crash Risk Index, or project provides a viable parallel or alternative route to a location listed.
- **Medium-Low**
- **Low:** Project location is identified in a local (e.g. county or city) safety action plan, local or district Safe Routes to School plan, or project has a completed targeted study (e.g., NEPA document, corridor study, intersection study, ICE report, etc.) that identifies the specific safety measures needed to improve safety and those safety measures have been incorporated into the proposed project or project provides a viable parallel or alternative route to a location listed or project provides a viable parallel or alternative route to a location listed.
- **Non-responsive/Not relevant:** Projects that are not identified in the Regional Safety Action Plan or any local safety plan. This could also include projects that also have not completed a targeted study that defines an existing safety issue (e.g., NEPA document, corridor study, intersection study, ICE report, etc.).

## B. Safety Improvements for People Outside of Vehicles

Please provide a written response that explains how the project will mitigate existing risk factors noted above and any other steps taken to ensure the project promotes safety for all users. Please cite any specific proven safety countermeasures that will be part of the project's design or methods the project will use to promote safety for people outside of vehicles (600 words or less).

Consider the following when developing your response. Note that not all considerations are applicable to all projects, but please respond to those that are applicable.

- Will crossing distances or times between protected crossings for people outside of vehicles be increasing or decreasing? If so, how many locations will be affected? If increasing, what measures will be considered to recognize the increase in distance between crossing opportunities?
- Describe what measures are being used to reduce exposure and delay for people outside of vehicles.
- If grade separated pedestrian crossings are being added and increasing crossing times, describe any features that are included that will reduce the detour required of pedestrians and make the separated crossing a more appealing option.
- If mid-block crossings are restricted or blocked, explain why this is necessary and how pedestrian crossing needs and safety are supported in other ways.
- Describe how motorist speed will be managed in the project design, in both through-traffic and turning movements. Note any strategies or treatments being considered that are intended to help motorists drive slower or protect pedestrians and bicyclists if motorist speeds will increase.
- Consider these resources for safety improvements: [Regional Safety Action Plan's Programmatic Recommendations](#), [FHWA's Safe System Roadway Design Hierarchy](#), and [MnDOT's Traffic Engineering Countermeasures](#)

### Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may be rated at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria.

- **High:** The highest rated projects in this criterion will serve the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists with the greatest safety and least pedestrian and bicyclist delay, detour, or discomfort. Score projects higher if selected countermeasures are designed to be comfortably used by people of all ages and abilities. The highest scoring projects will provide frequent, safe, at-grade crossing opportunities to prioritize directness and convenience with safety. Score projects higher if design elements are included to help motorists drive slower. The response will include quantitative or qualitative metrics showing a high level of improvement using an established methodology.
- **Medium-High**
- **Medium:** Mid-range projects in this measure may make a strong case as to how the project improves the travel experience, safety, and security for people outside of vehicles but without quantitative data or using a less established methodology. These projects may require lengthy detours or elevation changes or have less frequent at-grade crossings that do not align well with destinations. Similarly, mid-range projects may have quantitative or qualitative data and an established methodology but only offer a small improvement to the multimodal experience.
- **Medium-Low**

- **Low:** Projects that make minimal improvement to the travel experience, safety and security for people outside of vehicles should receive low points in this measure. These projects may include motor vehicle design elements that raise concerns for pedestrian and bicyclist safety, such as increased vehicle speeds or increased crossing distances that would not be fully mitigated by any safety countermeasures for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- **Non-responsive/Not relevant:** Projects that do not improve the travel experience and safety for people outside of vehicles should receive zero points for this measure.

### 5. Community Considerations

See separate Community Considerations criteria document.



# ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

## Prioritizing Criteria and Measures

**2050 TPP Goal:** Our Region is Dynamic and Resilient

### 2050 TPP Objectives or Policies:

- People have better travel options beyond driving alone to meet their daily needs, with a focus on improving travel times, reliability, directness, and affordability.
- People do not die or face life-changing injuries when using any form of transportation.
- People can increase physical activity with more opportunities to walk, roll, or bike.

**Category Definition:** The Active Transportation Planning application category intends to help communities establish plans to identify and prioritize future investments in active transportation and ensure eligibility for future active transportation infrastructure funding.

## Scoring

Table 1: Scoring Criteria and Measures

| Criteria and Measures   |
|---|
| <b>1. Proposed Planning Effort</b><br>Measure A – Project identification (including connection to key destinations; gaps, barriers, or deficiencies addressed)<br>Measure B – Complete streets planning, design, and construction |
| <b>2. Safety</b><br>Measure A – Safety improvements for people outside of vehicles  |
| <b>3. Community Considerations</b><br>Measure A – Community Considerations  |
| <b>Total</b>  |

Selected projects in this category will be funded through the Regional Active Transportation Sales Tax, and as such, project selection must be based on:

1. Project's inclusion in a municipal or regional nonmotorized transportation system plan (see qualifying requirements);
2. Extent to which policies or practices of the political subdivision encourage and promote complete streets planning, design, and construction (see criterion 1B);
3. Extent to which the project supports connections between communities and to key destinations within a community (see criterion 1A);
4. Identified barriers or deficiencies in the nonmotorized transportation system (see criterion 1A);
5. Identified safety or health benefits (see criterion 2);
6. Geographic equity in project benefits, with an emphasis on communities that are historically and currently underrepresented in local or regional planning (see criterion 3; project selection will also consider geographic equity); and
7. Ability of a grantee to maintain the active transportation infrastructure following project completion (see qualifying requirements).

The qualifying and scoring criteria for this category are designed to identify planning projects that will address these requirements.

### Examples of Eligible Projects

Please note that this list is not exhaustive and is intended only to provide examples. For questions regarding project eligibility, see the qualifying requirements for this application category and contact the Metropolitan Council.

- Active transportation plans
- Pedestrian system plans
- Bicycle system plans
- Safe Routes to School plans
- Comprehensive planning support
- Other systems-level plans related to active transportation

### Application Criteria and Measures

#### 1. Proposed Planning Effort

This criterion measures the project's ability to help the community fulfill the eligibility requirements for infrastructure funds by developing and adopting a nonmotorized plan that includes identified future infrastructure projects.

##### A. Project Identification (including connection to key destinations; gaps, barriers, or deficiencies addressed)

Please provide a written response (600 words or less) that details the desired work plan and approach for the proposed planning effort.

In your response, please provide the following information:

- Identify the proposed study area, the agency that will approve or adopt the plan, how the applicant will utilize the plan once adopted;
- How the proposed plan will identify future active transportation projects for implementation;
- How the proposed plan will support connections between communities and to key destinations within the community;
- How the proposed plan will identify and address barriers or deficiencies in the nonmotorized transportation system.

#### Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may score at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria.

- **High:** The highest rated projects in this measure will provide a well thought-out project approach that addresses all the required information. It is clear this project will lead to a final document that will promote a safe, accessible active transportation system for users of all ages and abilities.
- **Medium-High**

- **Medium:** Mid-range projects in this measure may provide fewer details or speak in more generalities about the desired outcomes of the project. These responses may address some, but not all, of the required information.
- **Medium-Low**
- **Low:** Low-rated projects will provide few details about the project approach and may not provide all of the required information.
- **Non-responsive/Not relevant:** Projects that do not adequately address any of the required information beyond identifying the study area and agency should receive zero points.

### B. Complete Streets Planning, Design, and Construction

One of the goals of the sales tax program is for agencies to promote and support complete streets planning and design. Please provide a written response (400 words or less) outlining how the plan will encourage or promote a complete streets approach to planning, design and construction. In your response, please outline the community's current policy and practices (if applicable), or detail how the plan will aid in the improvement of complete streets practices in the community. Please outline any specific desired outcomes from the planning process that would promote complete streets practices (such as an adopted complete streets policy, design guidelines, etc.).

#### Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may score at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria.

- **High:** The highest rated projects in this measure will provide a clearly thought-out approach to using the planning efforts to promote or improve complete streets practices within the agency.
- **Medium-High**
- **Medium:** Mid-range projects may lack specifics or may provide only general examples of how the agency will incorporate complete streets.
- **Medium-Low**
- **Low:** Projects that provide minimal details should receive a low rating for this measure.
- **Non-responsive/Not relevant:** Projects that do not have a complete streets policy and make no attempt to follow complete streets principles should receive zero points.

## 2. Safety

This criterion measures the project's ability to promote safety for all users, including how the plan addresses existing risks and makes use of proven safety countermeasures.

### A. Safety Approach for People Outside of Vehicles

Please provide a written response (600 words or less) that identifies any existing known safety challenges in the study area impacting people outside of vehicles, and how the project will approach improving those conditions.

If safety conditions are currently unknown, please provide information on how the plan will analyze, identify, and document known safety challenges and seek to identify potential solutions.

Consider the following:

- The agency's current approach to safety for bicyclists and pedestrians, and how the plan may help promote and encourage safety at all levels of planning, design, and construction;

- Safety stakeholders that will be identified, considered and engaged in the planning process (including emergency services, schools, and other community groups);
- How the plan will identify and incorporate potential safety recommendations;
- Related planning efforts that will be incorporated or built upon through this plan (such as a regional or local safety action plan).

### Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may score at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria.

- **High:** The highest rated projects in this measure will clearly identify an understanding of including safety at all levels of the planning process and define clear steps for ensuring safety is adequately addressed throughout the plan.
- **Medium-High**
- **Medium:** Mid-range projects in this measure may provide an understanding of the importance of safety for people outside of vehicles but not define clear steps the plan will take.
- **Medium-Low**
- **Low:** Projects that provide minimal details should receive a low rating for this measure.
- **Non-responsive/Not relevant:** Projects that do not identify ways the project will assess existing safety risk factors or address safety in project recommendations should receive zero points.

## 3. Community Considerations

The Community Considerations criterion will seek to award points to projects that demonstrate an understanding of the importance of community-centered planning, and a commitment to advancing community benefits through the planning process.

*See the Community Considerations Reference Document for additional background information on the Community Considerations criteria.*

### A. Community Considerations

Please provide a written response (400 words or less) about how the project will promote community engagement and the distribution of community benefits.

Consider the following:

- **Community Data and Context:** How will the project advance the community's understanding of the specific communities near or adjacent to the project, and how will this inform the planning process?
- **Community Need and Future Engagement:** How will the planning effort incorporate community engagement, and how will the feedback received inform the planning process?
- **Community Benefits:** How will the planning process seek to ensure that project benefits address the identified transportation needs of the communities?

### Scoring Guidance

Consider the information and narrative provided by the applicant and rate projects based on the benchmarks provided below. Projects may score at any point along the scale based on their performance against the stated criteria.

- **High:** The highest rated projects in this measure will clearly identify a planning process that utilizes community engagement best practices, supports a strong understanding of the surrounding community and its transportation needs, and a process that will prioritize an equitable distribution of benefits that directly responds to community needs. These projects will identify approaches and engagement activities that go above and beyond in an effort to lead to equitable planning outcomes.
- **Medium-High**
- **Medium:** Mid-range projects in this measure will identify a planning process that follows general best practices but does not go above and beyond.
- **Medium-Low**
- **Low:** Projects that provide minimal details or generally describe a project approach without providing specifics should receive a low rating for this measure.
- **Non-responsive/Not relevant:** Projects that do not identify ways the project will assess existing safety risk factors or address safety in project recommendations should receive zero points.