

**CENTRAL MINNESOTA AREA TRANSPORTATION PARTNERSHIP
 FY 2019 TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP)
 PROJECT REVIEW AND SCORE SHEET**

Proposed Project: 7th St. N & 5th St. N Infrastructure Imp.
Applicant: City of Sartell
Region: St. Cloud Area Planning Organization

Funds Awarded: \$199,176
ATIP Committee Ranking: 3
Total Points: 85

CRITERION	SCORE		
#1 - Identified in Plan			
20 - Specifically identified in multiple State, Regional or Local Plans 15 - Specifically identified in one State, Regional or Local Plan 10 - Consistent with multiple State, Regional or Local Plans	5 - Planning explanation / documentation is very limited 0 - No planning documentation provided to support the project		
COMMENTS: Well integrated into local and regional planning. Project supported by Safe Routes to School (SRTS)+A14 plan and comprehensive plan.	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; padding: 2px;">#1 Average¹</th> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">16</td> </tr> </table>	#1 Average ¹	16
#1 Average ¹			
16			
#2 - Connectivity			
20 - Completes an important gap or component of existing network and/or part of a existing network and/or part of a larger project or plan 10 - Furthers completion of an important gap or component of existing network and/or is part of a larger project or plan 0 - Does not assist in the completion of an important gap or component of existing network and/or part of a larger project or plan			
COMMENTS: Proposal indicates that landings and ramps will be constructed without sidewalk connections. If this is the case, proposal could have included additional information regarding new gaps that could be created.	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; padding: 2px;">#2 Average</th> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;">10</td> </tr> </table>	#2 Average	10
#2 Average			
10			
#3 - Grouping (15 Points Available)			
Historic / Scenic Environmental Scales			
Project will be scored based on the relationship to a mode of transportation, historical significance of the site, current/future use of the site and threat to the site if the project is not funded.			
COMMENTS: N/A			
Scenic Environmental (See above scale)			
Project will be scored based on the effectiveness of the turnout, overlook or viewing area and importance of the view. The project will also be scored based on the degree the project will preserve, rehabilitate or develop scenic or environmental resources or solve an environmental problem.			
COMMENTS: N/A			

Bike/Pedestrian Facilities			
15 - Provides direct access to multiple generators (school, park, public housing, senior housing, commercial center, or major employer) 10 - Provides access to an outlying area. Consider generators, including parks of regional significance, within 3 mi. by bike or 1 mi. by walk 5 - Provides access to outlying area where connections are 5+ miles by bike or more than 2+ miles by walk 0 - Project in isolated area with little or no development			
COMMENTS: Proposal provided good data on distances of walkers and bikers from school. While the proposed project addresses several gaps, it creates a few where only landings are being proposed. Proposal could have been enhanced by describing future plans to construct sidewalks in these areas.			#3 Average 12
#4 - Purpose (15 Points Available)			
15 - Commuting purpose and/or connects multiple destination points. Serves multiple major traffic generator, such as a school, park, public housing, senior housing, commercial center or major employer 10 - Commuting purpose and/or connects 2 destination points. Serves a major traffic generator, such as a school, park, public housing, senior housing, commercial center or major employer 5 - Serves a primarily recreational purpose 0 - Doesn't serve a transportation purpose			
COMMENTS: Primarily serves neighborhood and school area. Establishes connections by filling sidewalk gaps and establishes safe crossings but no evidence of future plan to build sidewalks.			#4 Average 13
#5 - Feasibility (15 Points Available)			
15 - Project design beyond scoping or preliminary engineering completed 10 - Detailed scoping study completed		0 - Scoping study lacked detail, identified significant project development changes, including permitting, or not completed	
COMMENTS: Engineering costs are not eligible, which was revised after project submittal. Proposal could have been enhanced if scoping study information was included, if complete.			#5 Average 10
#6 - Right of Way (15 Points Available)			
15 - Right of way has been acquired 10 - Requires interagency agreement/permit to construct		5 - Necessary funding for right of way has been acquired or designated 0 - Needed; acquisition hasn't begun/been successful	
COMMENTS: City owns right of way and no major issues are to be expected.			#6 Average 14
Regional Ranking 1	(100 Total Points Available) - Project Score		75
	(10 points - Ranked #1 by Region; 5 points - Ranked #2 by Region) Regional Points		10
	Total Project Points		85

¹ Average scores were rounded to whole numbers.