Chicago Metropolitan
Agency for Planning

MEMORANDUM

To:	**STP Project Selection Committee**
From:	CMAP Staff
Date:	February 3, 2022
Re:	STP Shared Fund Methodology: Scoring Criteria Discussion Proposal

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 2024 – 2028 program development cycle, which will begin in January 2023, will be the third cycle for the STP Shared Fund. Through the first two cycles, most of the scoring criteria have been successful in elevating the projects that do the most in their category to meet the program's goals to the highest rank within each application cycle. 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.

In addition to the current scoring criteria, staff suggests scheduling discussions about incorporating sustainability and/or resilience into the overall methodology and about ways in which inclusion of electric vehicle (EV) infrastructure could be incorporated. 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 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.	✓		
Transportation Impact				
Jobs + Households (all project types)	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, it may have an unintended consequence of being a disadvantage to projects that rank well in the need, improvement, and planning factors categories but are located in the less dense collar counties. Staff would like to conduct some analyses of the outcomes of this scoring and discuss potential adjustments.			✓
Need & Improvement				
Bicycle & Pedestrian Barrier Elimination	Minor changes to application workbook questions may be needed to provide staff with additional information about project scope	✓		
Bridge Reconstruction or Rehabilitation	Minor changes to application workbook questions may be needed to provide staff with additional information about project scope	✓		
Bus Speed Improvements	Minor changes to application workbook questions may be needed to provide staff with additional information about project scope	✓		
Corridor/small area safety improvements	Stronger correlation between the types of crashes occurring within the project corridor/area and the scope of improvements for this project type should be considered. The scoring methodology for determining need results in absolute points (0, 5, 10, 15, or 20), which is different than all other need scores. This can give an advantage or disadvantage to this project type in the overall total scoring. Consideration of alternative ways to define need should occur. Minor changes to application workbook questions may be needed to provide staff with additional information about project scope for improvement scoring.			✓
Rail-Highway grade crossing improvements	Consideration of updating the underlying data used in the 2019 Grade Crossing Prioritization should be given, however the scoring methodology likely needs no changes.	✓		
Road Expansion	No changes to methodology or application needed.	✓		
Road Reconstruction	No changes to methodology or application needed.	✓		

Scoring Criteria	Staff Comments	Recommended Discussion Level		
		None	Some	Significant
Transit Station Improvements	In addition to clarifying language in the description of this category to align with FTA terminology regarding the types of station assets that are associated with "passenger facilities", minor changes to application workbook questions may also add clarity.	✓		
Truck Route Improvements	Significant changes to the methodology in the category during the last cycle improved the scoring. No further changes to methodology or application are needed.	✓		
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	Changes to the methodology that focused more on project scope, and less on policy, during the last cycle resulted in the elevation of more complete projects in the overall ranking. No further changes to the methodology are needed for this cycle.	✓		
Green Infrastructure	Discussion of a shift from equally weighted policy and elements components to focus more on elements and the long-term sustainability of projects is recommended.		✓	
Freight	Significant changes to the methodology during the last cycle that focused the scoring on planning for and regulating freight, instead of the volume of trucks improved the scoring results. No further changes to the methodology are needed for this cycle.	✓		
Transit Supportive Density	No changes to methodology are needed.	✓		
Subregional Priority				
Subregional Priority	Concerns regarding the subjectivity of this category remain, particularly in instances when a subregion identifies projects outside of their geographic borders as a priority. Considering the characteristics of the region, which include people travelling significant distances between their homes and their jobs, it is not unrealistic for improvement priorities to lie outside of political boundaries. However, discussion of strengthening the justification for priority identification utilizing data about travel behavior is desired.			✓