

Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Planning

Consolidated Grant Project Ranking

Best practices and WSDOT guidance

Linda Howell, Community Liaison

April 2018

Agenda, part 2

- The WSDOT Consolidated Grant Program
 - Eligibility
 - Applicant
 - Project
 - Match
 - Timeline
- WSDOT evaluator criteria
- Regional ranking
 - Sample ranking team
 - Sample ranking criteria
 - Best practices from peers

Consolidated Grant Program

State funds

Rural Mobility Grant Program – Funding to support rural and small urban areas statewide.

Paratransit/Special Needs Grant Program – Funding to sustain and expand services to those with special transportation needs.

Federal funds (allocated annually by FTA)

- **5310** – Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program
- **5311** – Rural Area Formula Program
- **5339** – Bus and Bus Facilities Formula Program

Consolidated grant timeline

July 9, 2018	Application published (NOFA)
July – August	Application trainings in the regions
August 18-22	Workshop at Public Transportation Conference in Tri-Cities
September 14	Application due to WSDOT
September – November	Internal review by WSDOT staff
December 7	Revisions due to WSDOT. Final due date.
December 31, 2018	2018 CPT-HSTP and ranking sheet due to WSDOT

2019-21 Consolidated Grants

Eligible organization type

Organization Type	FTA 5310 ¹	FTA 5311	FTA 5339 ²	Special Needs Competitive	Rural Mobility Competitive
Small Urban Public Transit	X	X			
Rural Public Transit	X	X	X		X
Nonprofit Organizations	X	X	X	X	X
Private For-Profit Transportation Providers		X			
Tribal Governments	X	X	X	X ³	X
Other General or Local Governments	X	X	X	X ³	X

2019-21 Consolidated Grants

Eligible project type

Submit separate applications for each project and each project type:

- sustaining operations -2 or 4 year
- expanding operations
- capital projects
- planning
- mobility management

Match requirements

Project Type	Federal Share	Match Share
Operating	50%	50%
Capital	80%	20%
Mobility Management	80%	20%
Planning	80%	20%

Evaluator criteria

- Establish/preserve/improve public transportation services
- Address a recognized need within the community
- Reflects coordination effort
- Local commitment
- Appears to be feasible
- Connects to other systems and/or modes
- Defines specific performance measures

(continued)

Evaluator criteria, continued

- Effort to improve efficiency and effectiveness
- Experience managing transportation projects and grants
- Sufficient financial capability and resources
- Good faith effort to utilize DBEs
- State of good repair
- Complies with state rules regarding alternative fuels

Regional ranking

- Scoring implications

Evaluator score	Regional ranking	Final score
85	A (50 points)	135
48	B (25 points)	73
95	C (12 points)	107
60	A (50 points)	110

- Role of HSTP committee
- Composition of ranking team

Regional ranking

- Ranking criteria
 - Preservation
 - Expansion
 - Meet the greatest need
 - Coordination
 - Effectiveness
 - Cost efficiency
 - Paratransit (over fixed route)
 - Operating (over capital)
 - Congestion mitigation and greenhouse gas reduction

Regional ranking

Ranking process examples

1. Presentation → scoresheet
2. Mini-application → score
3. Discussion → consensus

Decide on both criteria and process in advance of scoring meeting.

Regional ranking

Peer best practices

- Developing criteria to evaluate projects
- Process for ranking projects

Regional planning boundaries

