



MEMORANDUM

To: STP Project Selection Committee

From: Douglas Ferguson, Senior Analyst

Date: January 29, 2026

Subject: FFY 2028 – 2032 Program Development: Methodology Discussion

Action Requested: Discussion

Purpose

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 six months for each scoring criteria within the methodology. The current methodology can be found in the [FFY 2026-2030 Program Application Booklet](#). Staff are seeking confirmation from the committee about proceeding with the recommended level of discussion for each of the criteria and committee suggestions for any new criteria to discuss over the coming months.

The 2028 – 2032 program development cycle, which will begin in October 2026, will be the fifth cycle for the STP Shared Fund. The table below shows the funding history of the different project types considered for the STP Shared Fund since the 2019 call for projects. With only eight (8) projects funded in the last cycle there were several categories that did not receive funding. Since the inception of the shared fund, applications for bridge projects and grade separation projects have been the most successful, with more than half of the submitted applications funded. In terms of the number of projects, more road reconstructions have been funded than any other project type, and this category represents the most applications submitted. Although the number of bus speed improvement project applications has been small, and none have been funded, staff do not recommend any changes to the eligible project categories.

		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%
2024/25	All apps	7	4	1	5	4	4	17	5	2	49
	Unique*	4	4	1	1	2	3	9	5	0	29
	Funded	1	3	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	8
	% Funded	25%	75%	0%	0%	100%	0%	22%	0%	0%	28%
All	All apps	37	18	10	50	24	69	102	24	26	360
	Unique*	12	11	9	24	14	50	48	20	8	166
	Funded	4	7	0	6	8	7	16	3	2	53
	% Funded	33%	64%	0%	25%	57%	14%	33%	15%	25%	32%

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

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 do 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 needed.	✓		
Project Types and Phases	As discussed above, staff recommend retaining all project types. Discussion of the scoring criteria for these projects is included below.	✓		
Project Cost and Match Requirements	No changes to methodology needed.	✓		
Inclusion in plans	No changes to the list of acceptable plans.	✓		
Completion of preliminary engineering	Staff recommend continuing with the current eligibility criteria for the upcoming programming cycle.	✓		
Minimum “need” scores	Two cycles ago minimums were established for the “need” criteria for all project types. Projects that did not exceed the minimums were deemed ineligible for funding. Staff believe that these requirements made sense and when applied to the applications received, eliminated projects that were inappropriate for funding consideration. Therefore, staff recommend continuing this practice in the current cycle with no changes.	✓		
Project Readiness				
Engineering and Land Acquisition	Criterion is straightforward, easy to understand and score.	✓		
Financial Commitment	Improvements in text were made in the last round that improved clarity. No changes are anticipated.	✓		
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 are needed.	✓		
Bus Speed Improvements	No changes to project category or the methodology are anticipated.	✓		

Scoring and Eligibility Criteria	Staff Comments	Recommended Discussion Level		
		None	Some	Significant
Corridor/small area safety improvements	With safety action plans completed throughout the region in the last year, new data sets are available, and staff are exploring ways to incorporate them into the methodology. Staff will also explore ways to expand the safety methodology as a potential planning factor.			✓
Rail-Highway grade crossing improvements	Criterion is straightforward, easy to understand and score. No changes to methodology are needed.	✓		
Road Expansion	No changes to methodology are needed. Updates to underlying data used in the scoring may be made by staff.	✓		
Road Reconstruction	No changes to methodology are needed. Updates to underlying data used in the scoring may be made by staff.	✓		
Transit Station, Yard, and Terminal Improvements	No changes to methodology are needed. Staff will continue to refine the descriptive text in the application booklet to add clarity.	✓		
Truck Route Improvements	Criterion is straightforward, easy to understand and score. No changes to methodology are needed.	✓		
Transportation Impact				
Jobs + Households (all project types)	With the last program cycle, this criterion was modified so that Jobs and Households would be scored independently. The jobs score is based upon the number of jobs within a project's travel shed indexed to the rest of the projects' job numbers. The households' score is derived from the ratio of households in a project's travel shed to the households in the project's area. While the scoring remains straightforward and provides significant gradation between projects, staff has continued to receive feedback from partner agencies 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 areas of the region. Staff are exploring some potential alternatives for discussion.		✓	

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 and with changes to federal guidelines, staff will take this as an opportunity to propose redefining this scoring.			✓
Complete Streets	As complete streets policies have become commonplace and project elements a regular occurrence in project scopes, staff will be exploring the potential to refine the focus and/or reduce the weight of this planning factor in the methodology. Two areas that have emerged for discussion are ADA transition planning and traffic safety planning. Staff will prepare options for committee discussion for incorporating ADA and Safety planning into this planning factor or elsewhere in the methodology.		✓	
Resilience	During the last cycle, the resilience score incorporated output data from the Transportation Resilience Improvement Plan (TRIP) for a flood and heat exposure score. This was used in conjunction with a score for the infrastructure used to address vulnerability. As TRIP was just being rolled out before the call for projects opened, staff have now had experience applying it and will propose modifications to the methodology based upon that experience.		✓	
Freight	Criterion is straightforward, easy to understand and score. No changes to methodology or application needed.	✓		
Transit Supportive Density	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
Subregional Priority				
Subregional Priority	No changes to the methodology or application needed.	✓		