



## 2020 Evaluation Criteria for the Minnesota Highway Freight Program

### Evaluation Criteria:

The information contained in this document serves as a guide to the scoring processes. Submitted projects will be evaluated based upon freight criteria, cost effectiveness, project readiness criteria.

There are two major categories in the Minnesota Highway Freight Program: **Roadway Projects** and **Intermodal Projects**. Within the **Roadway Projects** category there are three subcategories: **Safety Projects**, **Freight Mobility Improvements** and **First/Last Mile Connections**.

The tables below summarize the maximum number of points for each criteria under each category. The + sign indicates extra points can be awarded for the category or measure. Projects cannot exceed 1,000 points or the maximum points for any category.

### Roadway Freight Project Criteria

Freight Criteria	Main Measure	Category: Safety	Category: Freight Mobility	Category: First/Last Mile
Truck Volume	Heavy Commercial Annual Average Daily Traffic (HCAADT)	250	250	250
Safety	Crash rate reduction	350	100	100
Mobility	Truck Travel Time Reliability	100	350	150
Facility Access	Number of Trucks Entering and Exiting Project Area	+25	+25	200
<b>Other Criteria</b>	<b>Main Measure</b>			
Cost-Effectiveness	Divide amount of points awarded above by amount of requested funds	150	150	150
Project Readiness	Various measures	150	150	150

# Detailed Breakdown of Scoring:

## Truck Volume (HCAADT)

Truck volume is determined by the Heavy Commercial Annual Average Daily Traffic (HCAADT). The total number of points (250) is the same for each project category.

Truck Volume Ranges for Safety and Freight Congestion/Freight Efficiency Improvement	Percentage	Points
>4,000	100%	250
2,000 to 4,000	75%	190
1,000 to 2,000	50%	125
750 to 1,000	25%	60
<750	0%	0
Truck Volume Ranges for First/Last Mile	Percentage	Points
>1000	100%	250
500 to 1000	75%	190
250 to 500	50%	125
125 to 250	25%	60
<125	0%	0

## Safety

The Safety category score is indicated by crash rate reduction for safety, freight mobility improvement and first/last mile projects. The highest increase toward a freight safety improvement with sufficient explanation will receive the maximum points. Safety for truck parking projects are determined by rest area truck parking usage or in the case of a new facility will be based on demand for truck parking indicated by the 2019 Statewide Truck Parking Study. The total number of points depends on project category.

Measures	Safety Points	Freight Mobility Improvement Points	First/Last Mile Points
Crash rate reduction (scaled to top score)	350	100	100
Addresses a sustained crash location (Y/N) OR not sustained crash location, but addresses a safety issue identified in a statewide, MnDOT District or County safety plan (Y/N).	+50	+20	+20

Truck Parking or TPIMS Projects - Usage at Existing Rest Areas	Parking Points
At 70-100% capacity	350
At 50-70% capacity	245
At 30-50% capacity	175
At 20-30% capacity	105
At 0-20% capacity	0

New Truck Parking Site Demand*	Parking Points
Demand/Capacity Ratio >60	350
Demand/Capacity Ratio 40-60	250
Demand/Capacity Ratio 20-40	150
Demand/Capacity Ratio 0-20	0

\*Demand/Capacity ratio can be obtained from the Map Figure 35 located on page 55 of the 2019 Statewide Minnesota Truck Parking Study: <https://www.dot.state.mn.us/ofrw/freight/PDF/truckparking/final-report.pdf>

Weigh Station or Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Improvements	Weigh Station Points
Project at Class A or B facility, identified in Weight Enforcement Investment Plan	350
Project at Class C facility, identified in Weight Enforcement Investment Plan	250
Project at Class C, D, E or other facility, not identified in Weight Enforcement Investment Plan	150
Project at other location, not identified in plan or study	0

For more information on Weigh Station classification or identification of project type see Table 1.3 on page 15 of the draft 2018 Weight Enforcement Investment Plan: <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/ofrw/weightplan/pdf/WEIP.pdf>

## Mobility

Mobility is determined by the truck travel time reliability for safety and freight mobility projects. Projects will only receive full points if the application demonstrates that the project will substantially improve reliability at the project location or within the project corridor. Other measures are used to determine extra points for each category. The total number of points depends on the project category. An additional 50 points may be awarded to freight mobility projects that address a major freight bottleneck or barrier to freight movement such as in an interchange project. This amount is added to the base total but may not exceed the maximum 350 total within this category.

Truck Travel Time Reliability (scaled to top score)	Percentage	Safety Points	Freight Mobility Points
Project substantially improves reliability at project location	100%	100	350
Project minimally improves reliability at project location	50%	50	175
Project does not address reliability at project location	0%	0	0

Other Measures	First and Last Mile Points	Freight Safety Points	Freight Mobility Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removes a geometric or temporary (e.g. flooding) barrier to movement of freight, including OSOW loads</li> <li>Upgrades a roadway to 10-ton standards</li> </ul>	150	+20 May receive as a bonus in the Mobility score	+50 May receive as a bonus in the Mobility score

### Facility Access

Facility Access is determined by daily trucks entering and exiting a freight facility or industrial facilities. The projects that have the highest number of trucks will receive the maximum points with others scaled down to the lowest. The total number of points depends on the project category. The First and Last Mile Connections category will have the highest possible score for this criteria as it relates to directly to freight access benefits. The Safety and Freight Mobility categories may receive up to an additional 25 weighted points.

Measure	Safety	Freight Mobility	First/Last Mile
Daily trucks entering and exiting a freight facility or industrial area within the project boundaries (scaled to the top score)	+25 May receive as a bonus in the Facility Access score	+25 May receive as a bonus in the Facility Access score	200

### Other Criterion

#### Cost Effectiveness

Cost effectiveness is determined by dividing the number of freight transportation criteria points awarded by the amount of requested funds after the funds have been divided by 1,000. The total number of points (150) is the same for each project category.

#### Project Readiness

Project readiness is determined by several different measures. The total number of points (150) is the same for each project category.

Environmental Documentation	Percentage	Points
Document in progress; environmental impacts identified	100%	10
Environmental impacts identified	50%	5
Document not started	0%	0

Review of Section 106 Historic Resources	Percentage	Points
No known historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places are located in the project area, and project is not located on an identified historic bridge OR Historic/archeological review under way; determination of “no historic properties affected” or “no adverse effect” anticipated	100%	10
Historic/archeological review under way; determination of “adverse effect” anticipated	50%	5
Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological resources in the project area.	0%	0

<b>Review of Section 4f/6f Resources</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Points</b>
No Section 4f/6f resources located in or adjacent to the project OR Section 4f resources present within the project area, but no adverse effects	100%	10
Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely –coordination/documentation has begun	50%	5
Project impacts to Section 4f/6f resources likely – coordination/documentation has not begun	25%	2.5
Unsure if there are any impacts to Section 4f/6f resources in the project area	0%	0

<b>Environmental Justice and Equity</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Points</b>
EJ impacts identified and mitigated, outreach completed, communities engaged, project endorsed	100%	30
Environmental justice outreach completed, impacts identified and mitigated	80%	24
Environmental justice outreach began, impacts identified and study in progress	60%	18
Environmental justice outreach began	20%	6
No description or efforts started	0%	0

<b>Railroad Involvement</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Points</b>
No railroad involvement on project OR Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement is executed	100%	30
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; Agreement has been initiated	80%	24
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun	40%	12
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations not begun	0%	0

<b>Construction Documents/Plan</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Points</b>
Construction plans in progress; at least 30% completion	100%	10
Construction plans have not been started	0%	0

<b>Funding</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Points</b>
All funding sources are identified and confirmed	100%	30
All funding sources are identified and confirmed, but applicant is promising to “cover the balance” and will likely seek other competitive sources	80%	24
All funding sources are identified, but one is pending	50%	15
All funding sources are identified, but more than one is pending	20%	6
Not all funding sources are identified, a gap would remain if funded through NHFP	0%	0

# Intermodal Project Criteria

Criteria	Main Measure	Points
Freight Volume	Amount of increase in volume	300
Freight Benefit	Economic benefit of increased freight moved	300
Cost Effectiveness	Divide amount of points awarded above by amount of requested funds	200
Project Readiness	Various measures	200

## Freight Volume

Freight volume is determined by the projected increase in freight cargo that will result from an intermodal improvement. The highest improvements in projected freight volume will receive the maximum points with others scaled to the highest volumes. It is expected that intermodal project submitters will explain with sufficient technical detail projected volume changes and provide external references such as technical documents as needed with the application. These references may exceed the page limit on the application to support the application.

## Freight Benefit

The freight benefit scoring criterion will be determined by a submitted benefit/cost ratio included in the details of the submitted application. The score will prioritize projects which identify and show benefit/cost ratios higher than 1.0. Those projects that do have a benefit/cost ratio higher than 1.0 will be scaled according to the highest ratio. Scoring committee members must have enough information to verify the reasonableness of the submitted ratio. If enough information is not submitted with the application, scoring committee members may identify a mathematical score lower than the maximum indicated below. The score be generally scored as follows:

Benefit/Cost Ratio	Percentage	Points
Benefit/Cost Ratio Higher than 1.0	10-100%	30-300
Benefit/Cost Ratio Less than 1.0	0%	0

## Cost Effectiveness

Cost effectiveness is determined by dividing the number of freight transportation criteria points awarded by the amount of requested funds after the funds have been divided by 1,000. The total number of points (200) is the same for each project category.

## Project Readiness

Project readiness is determined by several different measures. The total number of points (200) is the same for each project category.

<b>Environmental Documentation</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Points</b>
Document in progress; environmental impacts identified	100%	30
Environmental impacts identified	50%	20
Document not started	0%	0

<b>Environmental Justice and Equity</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Points</b>
EJ impacts identified and mitigated, outreach completed, communities engaged, project endorsed	100%	30
Environmental justice outreach completed, impacts identified and mitigated	80%	24
Environmental justice outreach began, impacts identified and study in progress	60%	16
Environmental justice outreach began	20%	6
No description or efforts started	0%	0

<b>Review of Section 106 Historic Resources</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Points</b>
No known historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places are located in the project area, and project is not located on an identified historic bridge OR Historic/archeological review under way; determination of "no historic properties affected" or "no adverse effect" anticipated	100%	20
Historic/archeological review under way; determination of "adverse effect" anticipated	50%	10
Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological resources in the project area.	0%	0

<b>Right-of-Way</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Points</b>
ROW, permanent or temporary easements not required OR ROW, permanent or temporary easements has/have been acquired	100%	30
ROW, permanent or temporary easements required, offers made	80%	24
ROW, permanent or temporary easements required, appraisals made	50%	15
ROW, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels identified	20%	6
ROW, permanent or temporary easements required, parcels not identified OR ROW, permanent or temporary easements identification has not been complete	0%	0

<b>Railroad, Port or Airport Involvement</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Points</b>
Railroad, Port, Airport concur with project and letter of support submitted OR Railroad, Port or Airport Right-of-Way or other Agreement is executed	100%	30
Railroad, Port or Airport Agreement or other agreement required; Agreement has been initiated	80%	24
Railroad, Port or Airport Right-of-Way Agreement or other agreement required; negotiations have begun	40%	12
Railroad, Port or Airport Right-of-Way Agreement or other agreement required; negotiations not begun	0%	0

<b>Construction Documents/Plan</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Points</b>
Construction plans in progress; at least 60% completion	100%	20
Construction plans in progress; at least 30% completion	50%	10
Construction plans have not been started	0%	0

Funding	Percentage	Points
All funding sources are identified and confirmed	100%	40
All funding sources are identified and confirmed, but applicant is promising to "cover the balance" and will likely seek other competitive sources	80%	32
All funding sources are identified, but one is pending	50%	20
All funding sources are identified, but more than one is pending	20%	8
Not all funding sources are identified, a gap would remain if funded through NHFP	0%	0