



MEMORANDUM

To: STP Project Selection Committee

From: CMAP Staff

Date: April 4, 2024

Subject: FFY 2026 - 2030 Program Development: Methodology Discussion

Action Requested: Discussion

With each STP Shared Fund program development cycle, staff and the Project Selection Committee (PSC) seek to refine the scoring criteria to further the implementation of ON TO 2050 and align with the goals of the Shared Fund program. This memo presents staff's recommendations for the level of discussion expected over the next several months for each scoring criteria within the methodology. Staff is seeking confirmation from the committee for proceeding with the recommended level of discussion for each of the criteria and suggestions for any new criteria to discuss over the coming months.

The 2026 – 2030 program development cycle, which will begin in October 2024, will be the fourth cycle for the STP Shared Fund. Staff examined the application and funding history over the first three programming cycles to determine if any adjustments to the eligible project types may be warranted. As shown in the table below, the road expansion and road reconstruction project types receive the most interest from applicants and the bus speed improvement, bridge, and transit station projects receive the least interest. Although bridge and grade separation projects have had the highest success rates, with more than half of applications in each of these categories being funded, the most funded project types have been road reconstructions, and least funded have been bus speed improvements. Although no bus speed improvement projects have been funded with the Shared Fund, all five projects that have applied have actually been funded using CMAQ instead. Likewise, a fair number of bike/ped and transit station projects that were not selected for the Shared Fund have been funded through the CMAQ and/or TAP-L programs over the three cycles. With this information, staff has concluded that consideration of eliminating the bus speed improvement project type or modifying the category to make it more attractive to applicants, may be warranted.

		bike/ped barrier elimination	bridge rehab or reconstruction	bus speed improvement	corridor or small area safety	highway rail grade crossing	road expansion	road reconstruction	transit station	truck route improvement	total
2019	All apps	n/a	6	5	13	8	23	22	10	13	100
	Unique*	n/a	4	5	10	6	16	10	9	8	68
	Funded	n/a	2	0	1	3	2	4	3	2	17
	% Funded	n/a	50%	0%	10%	50%	13%	40%	33%	25%	25%
2021	All apps	17	4	3	15	8	25	36	3	6	117
	Unique*	4	1	2	8	2	16	19	2	0	54
	Funded	2	1	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	9
	% Funded	50%	100%	0%	25%	0%	0%	21%	0%	n/a	17%
2023	All apps	13	4	1	17	4	17	27	6	5	94
	Unique*	4	2	1	5	4	14	10	4	0	44
	Funded	1	1	0	3	3	5	6	0	0	19
	% Funded	25%	50%	0%	60%	75%	36%	60%	0%	n/a	43%
All	All apps	30	14	9	45	20	65	85	19	24	311
	Unique*	8	7	8	23	12	46	39	15	8	166
	Funded	3	4	0	6	6	7	14	3	2	45
	% Funded	38%	57%	0%	26%	50%	15%	36%	20%	25%	27%

*Excludes ineligible applications and all duplicates that scored lower in other categories

Through the first three cycles, the application of the scoring criteria has generally resulted in an overall program that is a mix of the best projects from each category. However, there is always room for improvement through refinement of the criteria. The table below presents staff's thoughts on each of the scoring criteria and recommends the level of committee discussion that should occur for each. For criteria recommended for no discussion, staff does not plan to present any proposed changes to the committee. For criteria recommended for "some" or "significant" discussion, staff will allocate time on upcoming meeting agendas to present recommendations for the committee's consideration. "Significant" discussion items may be scheduled for multiple agendas so that committee discussion can inform staff's direction for developing recommendations. Staff would also like to hear any other suggestions from the committee for other scoring criteria that should be researched by staff for committee discussion.

Scoring and Eligibility Criteria	Staff Comments	Recommended Discussion Level		
		None	Some	Significant
Eligibility				
Sponsors	No changes to methodology or application needed.	✓		
Project Types and Phases	In the last cycle, the scope of the Transit Station project type was expanded to include improvements to or addition of new transit yards and terminals. Staff recommends retaining these project types. Discussion of the scoring criteria for these projects is included below.	✓		
Project Cost and Match Requirements	No changes to methodology or application needed.	✓		
Inclusion in plans	Staff suggests adding “Safety Action Plans” to the list of acceptable plans.	✓		
Completion of preliminary engineering	This criterion has evolved each cycle since the Shared Fund program began. In 2022, the concept of the “degree of completion” of preliminary engineering was added, reducing the requirement to have engineering substantially complete, but limiting the eligible phases of work and eligibility for future cost increases based on the degree of completion. While it is too soon to know if these limits have had an impact on the timeliness of implementation and the accuracy of cost estimates, staff generally feels that the shift in policy added clarity to the requirements and made the Shared Fund more accessible to sponsors whose projects were not as far along in the engineering process. Therefore, staff suggests continuing with the current language for the upcoming programming cycle.	✓		
Minimum “need” scores	In the previous cycle, minimums were established for the “need” criteria for all project types. Projects that did not exceed the minimums were deemed ineligible for funding. Staff believes that these requirements made sense and when applied to the applications received, eliminated projects that were inappropriate for funding consideration. Therefore, staff suggests continuing this practice in the current cycle with no changes.	✓		

Scoring and Eligibility Criteria	Staff Comments	Recommended Discussion Level		
		None	Some	Significant
Project Readiness				
Engineering and Land Acquisition	Criterion is straightforward, easy to understand and score.	✓		
Financial Commitment	Some applicants continue to have trouble understanding this scoring. Staff will continue to refine the descriptive text in the application booklet to add clarity but recommends no changes to the criterion.	✓		
Need & Improvement				
Bicycle & Pedestrian Barrier Elimination	Criterion is straightforward, easy to understand and score. No changes to methodology or application needed.	✓		
Bridge Reconstruction or Rehabilitation	Criterion is straightforward, easy to understand and score. No changes to methodology or application needed.	✓		
Bus Speed Improvements	As noted earlier, staff would like to explore either eliminating this category from the shared fund or modifying the category to make it more attractive to applicants.			✓
Corridor/small area safety improvements	Changes were made to scoring in this category during the last cycle to add consideration of high-risk crash types (those that are speed-related and those involving vulnerable road users). These changes were successful in increasing gradation of need scores and elevating projects where high-risk crash types occur. Therefore, staff is not recommending consideration of additional changes this cycle. With safety action plans currently underway throughout the region, some data sets may be available prior to the next cycle and staff may propose methods for incorporating this data into the methodology.		✓	
Rail-Highway grade crossing improvements	Criterion is straightforward, easy to understand and score. No changes to methodology or application needed.	✓		
Road Expansion	No changes to methodology or application needed. Updates to underlying data used in the scoring may be made by staff.	✓		

Scoring and Eligibility Criteria	Staff Comments	Recommended Discussion Level		
		None	Some	Significant
Road Reconstruction	No changes to methodology or application needed. Updates to underlying data used in the scoring may be made by staff.	✓		
Transit Station, Yard, and Terminal Improvements	<p>No significant changes were made to station scoring, including bicycle and pedestrian access components, in the last cycle, however eligibility was extended to transit yard or terminal projects.</p> <p>Staff did observe that the “efficiency” improvement for yard or terminal projects that included a criterion for reduction in non-revenue trips did not capture reductions in the way that was intended because of the use of “trips” and would like to research other options, such as distance or time reductions, for committee discussion and consideration.</p>		✓	
Truck Route Improvements	Criterion is straightforward, easy to understand and score. No changes to methodology or application needed.	✓		
Transportation Impact				
Jobs + Households (all project types)	<p>The intent of this criterion is to rank projects by their "reach", rewarding those projects that are serving a larger population or providing access to more jobs, as well as projects that have a wider reach (larger travel sheds). While the scoring is straightforward and provides significant gradation between projects, staff has continued to receive feedback from the collar counties suggesting further examination of this criterion to ensure it is not a disadvantage to projects that rank well in the need, improvement, and planning factors categories but are located in the less dense collar counties. In 2022, staff presented a proposal and analysis for splitting this category into a “jobs” component and a “households” component. The committee ultimately decided not to make changes to this scoring criterion.</p>		✓	

Scoring and Eligibility Criteria	Staff Comments	Recommended Discussion Level		
		None	Some	Significant
Planning Factors				
Inclusive Growth	As the region continues to strive for equity in the transportation system, opportunities to refine this scoring may be discussed.		✓	
Complete Streets	<p>Changes to the methodology that focused more on project scope, and less on policy, during the last two cycles resulted in the elevation of more complete projects in the overall ranking.</p> <p>Over the course of the Shared Fund program, as well as the STP-Local programs, it has been observed that having points available to sponsors that have adopted policies has led to an increase in adoption of these policies in the region. With this in mind, and with the significant level of effort that is ongoing in the region to address ADA transition planning, staff would like to prepare options for committee discussion for incorporating ADA planning into this planning factor or elsewhere in the methodology.</p>		✓	
Resilience	<p>During the last cycle, the focus of this planning factor shifted from “green infrastructure” to “resilience”. For the most part, the scoring methodology for this updated criterion was successful in elevating projects that improve the region’s resilience. However minor changes to application workbook questions may be needed to provide staff with additional information about project scope to improve the relative scoring.</p> <p>In addition, data created for the Transportation Resilience Improvement Plan (TRIP) is expected to be available prior to the next cycle and staff will propose methods for incorporating this data into the methodology.</p>		✓	
Freight	Criterion is straightforward, easy to understand and score. No changes to methodology or application needed.	✓		

Scoring and Eligibility Criteria	Staff Comments	Recommended Discussion Level		
		None	Some	Significant
Transit Supportive Density	Criterion is straightforward, easy to understand and score. No changes to methodology or application needed.	✓		
Subregional Priority				
Subregional Priority	With adjustments made to this criterion in the last cycle to add requirements for justifying support of projects outside the geographic boundaries of a council/CDOT, concerns regarding the subjectivity of this category have been reduced significantly. Therefore, staff does not recommend any additional adjustments this cycle.	✓		