

APPENDIX C: SELECTION CRITERIA GUIDE

The attached series of tables categorize the specific criteria that will be used to assess the applications in accordance to:

- Eligibility (Table 1)
- Consistency with the HSTP (Table 2)
- Project Readiness/Ability to Implement (Table 3)
- Sustainability (Table 4)
- Need (Table 5)
- Efficiency (Table 6)

The Criteria Guide matches the criteria to those questions in the application that are primarily designed to elicit information specific to each criterion. The set of evaluation criteria was developed based on the federal requirements and on the goals set forth in Section 4.3 of the Human Services Transportation Plan (HSTP).

Each criterion has a point value as shown in the tables. The relative point values among the various criteria were based on local input, including the input of the HSTP Project Advisory Committee. For most of these criteria, a project is awarded the full point value or zero. For the remaining criteria there is a sliding scale of points, depending either on the degree to which a criterion is met or based on a comparison of the projects or project elements. Each element of a project will be evaluated and ranked separately in accordance with the selection criteria.

TABLE 1: Project Eligibility Screening Criteria	Relevant Application Questions	Relevance to Type of Project	Point Value of Criteria
1. Proposed project addresses unmet needs of welfare recipients, eligible low-income persons and other individuals in urbanized areas seeking employment or employment-related activities in suburban areas (JARC) OR addresses unmet transportation needs of persons with disabilities seeking integration into the workforce and full participation in society (New Freedom).	2, 3, 4 and 7	All	Eligible / Not Eligible
2. Project application identifies and addresses an unmet need identified in Human Services Transportation Plan (HSTP). This should include (1) a description of the project (2) identification of the unmet needs (which is/are addressed by the project), (3) how the project will address the unmet need(s), e.g., in terms of serving new riders, a new area, a new day and/or times, a higher frequency, less advance notice, more driver assistance, etc.; and (4) an estimated quantification of benefits. Any additional obligations, e.g., the provision of ADA complementary paratransit as a result of implementing a new fixed bus route in a previously unserved area, should be noted.	2 and 11	All	Eligible / Not Eligible
3. Local Match will be supplied.	30 and 31	All	Eligible / Not Eligible
4. Project is consistent with FTA guidelines on eligible JARC and New Freedom projects and activities.	All	All	Eligible / Not Eligible

TABLE 2: HSTP Consistency Criteria	Relevant Application Questions	Relevance to Type of Project	Point Value of Criteria
5. Project employs one or more strategies that provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional service/linkage/coordination = 20 points • Multi-county service/linkage/coordination = 10 points • Multi-municipality (but intra-county) service = 5 points • No service/linkage/coordination beyond municipality or program = 0 points 	10 and 11	All	0, 5, 10 or 20
6. Project employs one or more strategies included in the HSTP or otherwise demonstrates innovation.	10 and 11	All	0 or 20
7. Project replicates strategy proven successful elsewhere within the region.	10 and 11	All	0 or 20

8. Project utilizes, or provides access to, non-duplicative public transportation resources. Points will not be awarded to a proposed project that duplicates an existing service. Points may be awarded if a proposed project duplicates a portion of the service but otherwise meets a specific unmet need not addressed by the existing service. Points will be awarded for a proposed project that utilizes all or part of existing services or provides access to these services, i.e., a shuttle service to a Metra station.	10, 11, 19, 20, 21 and 24	All	0 or 20
9. Project utilizes or coordinates with existing public and private human service agency transportation providers; or reflects partnerships with non-transit entities and/or private non-profit / for-profit operators.	10	All	0 or 20

TABLE 3: Project Readiness / Ability to Implement Criteria	Relevant Application Questions	Relevance to Type of Project	Point Value of Criteria
10. Project starts providing services within a short time-frame. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 6 months =20 Points • 6-12 months=10 Points • longer than a year=0 Points 	12	All	0, 10 or 20
11. Agency and/or agency contractor(s) qualifications and experience (including key personnel) demonstrate that they have managed similar projects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have experience with similar projects = 5 Points • Have managed projects funded through federal grants = 5 Points 	14, 15 and 16	All	0, 5 or 10

TABLE 4: Sustainability Criteria	Relevant Application Questions	Relevance to Type of Project	Point Value of Criteria
12. Project is sustainable past identified project period. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant-identified sources have committed to continue their levels of funding and have stated that their levels of support may increase if project is successful = 10 Points • Applicant has in place plans to monitor and evaluate project = 10 Points 	13, 31 and 32	All	0, 10 or 20
13. Project applications include letters of support from key stakeholders	Letters Submitted	All	0 or 10

TABLE 5: Need Criteria	Relevant Application Questions	Relevance to Type of Project	Point Value of Criteria
14. Project provides a new service (1) where or when no other existing similar service is available; and (2) that links high concentrations of target population with key destinations, activity centers, or key sector employers (and/or concentrations of employers) where no such link previously was provided and at appropriate travel times.	11, 19 and 24	New Service	0 or 20
15. Project expands on an existing successful pilot project or otherwise provides continued operating funding for a service which is already in operation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing project achieved projected ridership = 20 points • Ridership has increased (compared to pre-project ridership) or has met other significant objectives = 10 points 	11, 17, 18 and 24	Existing / Expanded Service	0, 10 or 20
16. Severity of need addressed by the project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No such service/linkage/coordination currently exists in area = 20 points • Service/linkage/coordination exists but not in time period = 10 points • Service/linkage/coordination exists for area/time period but not for specific trip purposes and/or specific programs = 10 points • Service/linkage/coordination exists for area/time period and for most trip purposes/programs, but does not accommodate riders requiring high-level of service and/or same-day service = 10 points 	10, 11, 20, 21 and 24	All	0, 10 or 20
17. Project promotes likely economic opportunities for persons with disabilities and/or persons with low income.	2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 24	All	0 or 20
18. Estimated number of entry level/lower wage jobs accessed as a result of the project (JARC) OR persons with disabilities served as a result of the project (New Freedom). Rail, transit (fixed-route and flex) projects and paratransit projects will be ranked separately. Highest number gets 20 points, next highest 18 points, lowest gets 2 points. If more than 10 applications, those ranked lower all get 0 points.	7, 8 and 9	All	Max 20 (relative ranking by service type)
19. Project also addresses unmet needs of older adults.	7, 8 and 9	All	0 or 20

TABLE 6: Efficiency Criteria	Relevant Application Questions	Relevance to Type of Project	Point Value of Criteria
20. Operations cost ranking on service output – measured in cost per vehicle service hour or the equivalent. For operational projects only ; rail, bus (fixed-route, flex, shuttle) projects and paratransit projects will be ranked separately. Lowest unit cost gets 20 points, next lowest 18 points, etc. If more than 10 applications, those ranked lower all get 0 points.	22 and 23	Operating	Max 20 (relative ranking by service type)
21. Ranking of cost efficiency improvements – measured in terms of reduced cost per trip. For non-operating projects that have a direct impact on operations cost; Rail, transit (fixed-route and flex) projects and paratransit projects will be ranked separately. Highest reduction of unit cost gets 20 points, next highest 18 points, etc. If more than 10 applications, those ranked lower all get 0 points.	25	Non- Operating	Max 20 (relative ranking by service type)
22. Operations cost ranking on service consumed – measured in cost per trip. For operational projects only ; rail, bus (fixed-route, flex, shuttle) projects and paratransit projects will be ranked separately. Lowest unit cost gets 20 points, next lowest 18 points, etc. If more than 10 applications, those ranked lower all get 0 points.	22	Operating	Max 20 (relative ranking by service type)
23. Ranking of other cost/benefits – measured in terms of cost per severity of need addressed, using point values from Criterion 16. For non-operating projects only ; Rail, transit (fixed-route and flex) projects and paratransit projects will be ranked separately. Lowest unit cost gets 20 points, next lowest 18 points, etc. If more than 10 applications, those ranked lower all get 0 points.	11, 20, 21 and 24	Non- Operating	Max 20 (relative ranking by service type)