



BOSTON REGION METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Richard A. Davey, MassDOT Secretary and CEO and MPO Chairman
Karl H. Quackenbush, Executive Director, MPO Staff

MEMORANDUM

DATE February 21, 2013
TO Boston Region MPO
FROM Alicia Wilson
RE Proposed New Criteria for MPO Evaluation of JARC and New Freedom Grant Proposals

MassDOT's 2013 solicitation period for several state and federal grant programs runs from January 31, to March 1, 2013. Each year, the Boston Region MPO staff helps solicit proposals in the Boston Region area for funding under the federal Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom programs. Staff evaluates the submittals and presents their finding to the MPO, which discusses the evaluations and makes recommendations to MassDOT on which projects to fund.

In 2008, the MPO developed criteria to use for this purpose. Those criteria, which have been utilized by MPO staff every year since they were developed, were based on an approach that used a point system. Applying those criteria to the different types of project proposals submitted has proven to be difficult.

This year, in order to improve the evaluations, MPO staff have developed a proposed new set of criteria (attached) to use in scoring proposals. These criteria are a synthesis of the 2008 MPO criteria, the criteria MassDOT's Rail and Transit Division currently uses to evaluate Section 5311(f) (Intercity Bus) project proposals, and new elements suggested by the MPO's recent study of JARC and New Freedom project effectiveness. The synthesized criteria relate to information requested in each of the grant application's three major components: applicant information, service information, and performance information. Information needed to determine if proposals meet the criteria should be available in applicant responses.

MPO staff also propose using an evaluation matrix (attached) that is similar to that used by MassDOT to score the proposals. This matrix scores according to the three categories of the criteria. Proposals are scored on applicable criteria only.

AW/aw

**Proposed 2013 MPO Criteria for Evaluation of
JARC and New Freedom Project Proposals**

Applicant Component
*Does the applicant report sufficient experience in managing projects to provide assurance of success?
*Has the applicant previously served the target populations?
Does the applicant report sufficient financial capability and resources to implement and successfully carry out the project?
Does the project leverage resources to the maximum possible extent?
Does the applicant demonstrate having the methods/resources to sustain service after the grant period? (Does not apply to planning projects.)
Service Component
*Does the project address a transportation gap and/or barrier identified in the Coordinated Public Transit/Human-Services Transportation Plan?
*Does the project establish, preserve, or improve mobility for a target population?
*Does the applicant adequately describe the specifics of the unmet need that will be fulfilled by the project?
*Is the project well-designed to meet the needs of the identified population?
*Is the service the result of a planning study?
Does the proponent adequately describe who is eligible and how eligibility will be determined?

*Key Criterion

(cont.)

**Proposed 2013 MPO Criteria for Evaluation of
JARC and New Freedom Project Proposals
(cont.)**

Service Component (cont.)
Does the project serve an unserved or special-needs population?
Does the proponent demonstrate that the proposed service does not overlap with existing service operated by another provider? (Operating projects only)
Does the project appear to be feasible as described?
Does the project provide for coordination with other agencies?
Does the project contain innovative ideas that could be applied elsewhere?
Does the applicant provide a well-defined operations plan? (Operating projects only)
Performance Component
*Would the proposed service achieve community, statewide, or regional benefits?
Does the project define the performance measures to be used in determining the success of the project?
Does the project describe an active effort aimed at improving the efficiency and/or effectiveness of public or special-needs transportation?

*Key Criterion

Proposed 2013 MPO Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Figures	Evaluation Categories	Weight	Evaluation Scores					
	Applicant Component	30	Does not meet any applicable criteria	Meets only one applicable criterion	Meets at least one key criterion	Meets all applicable criteria	Exceeds minimum requirements of all key criteria	Exceeds minimum requirements of all applicable criteria
			0	1	2	3	4	5
	Service Component	50	Does not meet any applicable criteria	Meets only one applicable criterion	Meets at least one key criterion	Meets all applicable criteria	Exceeds minimum requirements of all key criteria	Exceeds minimum requirements of all applicable criteria
			0	1	2	3	4	5
	Performance Component	20	Does not meet any applicable criteria	Meets only one applicable criterion	Meets at least one key criterion	Meets all applicable criteria	Exceeds minimum requirements of all key criteria	Exceeds minimum requirements of all applicable criteria
			0	1	2	3	4	5

Applicant Evaluation Score Totals (with sample scores shown)

	Evaluation Categories	Scorers		
	Totals by Evaluation Team Members	Applicant Component (Max. 150)	Scorer 1	Scorer 2
		50	100	150
Service Component (Max. 250)		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3
		150	200	150
	Performance Component (Max. 100)	Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3
		80	60	40
Totals	Total Score (Max. 500)	280	360	340
	Total Avg. Score (Max. 500)	326.66		

Only those criteria that apply are evaluated.