STP Shared Local Fund:
Project Evaluation Criteria

May 2, 2018
Shared Fund Development Timeline

February
- Project eligibility and program structure

April
- Draft selection criteria and scoring proposal

June
- Revised selection criteria and scoring proposal

Summer
- Council and partner feedback

September
- Committee approval

January 2019
- Call for projects
Today

- Review: project types and program structure
- Draft evaluation proposal
Revised eligible project types:

- Road reconstructions
- Transit station condition improvements
- Bridge replacement and reconstructions
- Highway/rail grade crossing improvements
- Road expansions
- Bus speed improvements
- Corridor-level or small area safety improvements
- Truck route improvements
Revised proposed project eligibility

- Minimum project cost: $5 million in total project cost
  OR
- Multijurisdictional: joint application from at least 3 local partners
  - At least one municipality
  - Other potential partners - Forest Preserve, Pace, IDOT, county, etc.
  - Partners must demonstrate financial or in-kind project involvement (more than just a “letter of support”)
- If selected, project should then have funding to proceed (shared fund would not leave funding gaps)

Councils give points in project evaluation to indicate support
Revised proposed rolling focus

- **Goals:**
  - Balance targeted investment and support of multiple priorities
  - Provide opportunity to encourage priority project types that aren’t currently ready to apply
  - Be transparent, flexible and facilitate the ability to plan ahead
## Revised staff proposal for rolling focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program years:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update based on outcome of first call for projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus areas:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade crossing improvements</td>
<td>Road expansion</td>
<td>truck route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Road reconstruction</td>
<td>Bridge replacement/reconstruction</td>
<td>improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bus speed improvements</td>
<td>Corridor/small area safety improvements</td>
<td>Transit station improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL FOCUS AREAS ELIGIBLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program years:**
- 2020-2024
- 2025-2026
- 2027-2028
- 2029-2030
Proposed phase eligibility

- High need communities are eligible for Phase I funding (need defined same as LTA program)
- Additional phases may not be programmed until Phase I is complete
Proposed Evaluation Methods

- Leverage available data and analysis
- Be transparent and clear
- Tie to federal performance measures
- Incorporate qualitative information (ex: council support, ability to deliver project)
- Have “family resemblance” to CMAQ, TAP, Council methodologies
Evaluation Method Examples

CMAQ evaluation categories:

- Air Quality Benefit ($ per KG VOC/PM 2.5 reduction)
- Transportation Impact Criteria
- Regional Priorities

TAP evaluation categories:

- Completion of Regional Greenways and Trails Plan
- Market for Facility
- Safety and Attractiveness
- Bonus for phase II and ROW completion
Suburban Councils have published methods for ranking projects

- Generally 100-point scales considering road volume, pavement condition, etc.

STP Agreement:
“The City and Council agree that each individual subregional council and the City shall establish its own points-based methodology for selecting projects and that a minimum of 25% of those points shall be allocated to regional priorities”
Proposed evaluation components

- Project readiness: 25 points
- Transportation impact: 50 points
- Regional priorities: 25 points
- **Bonus: Council/CDOT support**
Proposed evaluation component: project readiness

25 total points:

- Engineering completion and ROW acquisition (10 points)
- Financial commitments (5 points)
- Inclusion in local/agency plans (10 points)
Proposed engineering completion and ROW acquisition score

Phase 2 complete: +5 points
ROW complete/not needed: +5 points

Total 10 points
## Proposed financial commitment score

**STP request is …**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 20% of project cost (after match requirement)</td>
<td>5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%-40%:</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%-60%:</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%-80%:</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-100%:</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example:**

Total Project Cost

- 19% of cost after local match = 5 points
Proposed financial commitment score

STP request is …

less than 20% of project cost (after match requirement): 5 points
20%-40%: 4 points
40%-60%: 3 points
60%-80%: 2 points
80%-100%: 1 point

Example:
Total Project Cost

local match
fund source A
Shared fund request 63% of cost after local match = 2 points
Proposed inclusion in local/agency plans score

Examples: CIP, ITS plan, local comprehensive plan, transit ADA plan, RTA strategic plan…

Plan offers support for project type: 3 pts
Plan identifies specific project: +7 pts

Total 10 points
Proposed evaluation component: transportation impact

50 total points:

- Existing condition/need (20 points)
- Population/Job benefit (10 points)
- Improvement (20 points)
Proposed existing condition/need score

Total points: 20

Each project type has a different measure of existing condition/need, indexed to a 20 point scale

Examples:

- transit stations - Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) scale
- grade crossings - grade crossing screening level I ranking
- road reconstruction/expansion - highway needs score
- bridge reconstruction - national bridge inventory
- corridor safety improvements - potential for safety improvement score
Proposed population/job benefit score

Total points: 10

Calculate households and jobs in project’s “travel shed”

Similar to RSP evaluation of arterials

Examples of travel sheds:
Proposed improvement score

Total points: 20

Each project type has a different improvement measure tied to existing condition/need, indexed to a 20 point scale

Examples:

- improvement to TERM scale
- improvement to grade crossing screening level I scoring components
- improvement to highway needs score
- improvement to potential for safety improvement score
Proposed evaluation component: regional priorities

Total: 25 points

All projects evaluated for inclusive growth benefits

Project types evaluated for selection of following:

- Complete streets
- Green infrastructure
- Multimodal freight movement
- Transit supportive density
- Reinvestment
Proposed evaluation component: regional priorities

Example draft regional priority evaluation categories by project type

**Road reconstruction:**
- Inclusive growth (10)
- Complete streets (10)
- Multimodal freight movement (5)

**Transit station:**
- Inclusive growth (10)
- Transit supportive density (10)
- Green infrastructure (5)

**Road expansion:**
- Inclusive growth (10)
- Complete streets (10)
- Multimodal freight movement (5)

**Grade crossing:**
- Inclusive growth (10)
- Complete streets (10)
- Green infrastructure (5)
## Inclusive growth evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of project users from disadvantaged communities:</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%-10%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%-20%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%-30%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%-40%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%-50%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% or more</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed example plan priority score:

Complete Streets

Sponsor has policies supporting complete streets: +2 points

Sponsor has adopted complete streets ordinance: +3 points

Project has complete streets components: +5 points

Total 10 points
Bonus: Council/CDOT support

Options:

• Each council and CDOT gets 25 points to allocate to projects
  – No project may receive more than 15 of a council/CDOT’s points

• Each council and CDOT rank top 3 projects
  – First rank receives 15 points
  – Second rank receives 10 points
  – Third rank receives 5 points
Final discussion items and next steps

• Is 25 points sufficient for planning factors for shared fund?

• Potential updated name for shared fund

• Scheduling meetings with PLs/stakeholders about methodology details

• Updated proposal to committee in advance of June 27th meeting