

TDM Set-Aside FY 2018 and FY 2019 Evaluation Criteria

Approved by DRCOG Board of Directors October 2017

A. Scored by Project Review Panel

Criterion	Category	Specific Measure (if applicable)	Scoring	Points (Max)
1	Level of Innovation and Uniqueness (uniqueness of market geographic area, market population/demographics, project type)		1 - Does not reach new market or is continuation of existing service/project/campaign; very similar to past endeavors; serves a population comparable to those that have been served by past similar programs <range> 15 - Totally new (market/connections/project type) and unique, seed funding to test concept is critical; project reaches completely new area and/or serves/targets a new demographic; project is unlike anything tried in the region in the past	15
2	Project Readiness		1 - Sponsor just getting started, extensive additional coordination required (ie. right of way needs to be acquired, etc.) <range> 3 - Sponsor is ready to go and an experienced partner in TDM projects; coordination between agencies is strong; right of way has been acquired	3
3	Timing/Synergy of Project		1 - Benefits years out, undeveloped area, no link to roadway or transit project <range> 5 - Immediate benefits/link to major roadway/rapid transit project; project coincides with an immediate major construction project (traffic congestion) or opening of new rapid transit line/segment	5
4	Motor Vehicle Trip and VMT Reduction Potential (Based on attributes provided in application specific to infrastructure and to non-infrastructure projects)	Vehicle Trips, VMT	5 - Low 11 - Medium 22 - High **consider reliability and realism of attributes and assumptions used to reflect decreased VMT and improve air quality. Detailed calculation by applicant of trip & VMT reduction is optional.	22
5	Transit Service Relationship		1 - No relationship to transit <range> 10 - Direct promotion of transit through marketing, or subsidized transit fares OR infrastructure project directly serves and is proximate to transit. **Project directly promotes, incentivizes, or is located in proximity to transit.	10
6	Funding Effectiveness Potential	Project Cost/User Base	1 - Higher cost for smaller user base <range> 5 - Lower cost for larger user base **consider reliability and realism of assumptions used in the calculation of results	5
7	Other Factors		1 - Poor products, contract management, coordination, or project application form <range> 5 - Successful performance of Past Projects, clear/concise application, cooperation with Regional TDM Program	5

TOTAL PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

65

B. Measured/Scored by DRCOG Staff:

Max

8	User Base	Population, Employment	1 - Smaller user base Thresholds based on all projects submitted 5 - Larger user base	5
9	Environmental Justice Area	EJ Population (Minority, Low-Income)	1 - Does not serve any EJ area Thresholds based on all projects submitted 5 - Entirely in EJ area	5
10	Congestion Level in Project Area	Vehicle Hours of Delay/Square Miles	1 - Low (<) Thresholds based on all projects submitted 10 - High (>)	10
11	Serves DRCOG Designated Urban Centers (UCs)	Urban Centers: Existing and Emerging Dataset	1 - No Urban Centers Thresholds based on all projects submitted 5 - Strongly serves/focused on established UCs	5
12	Jurisdiction's TIP Metro Vision Points		From TIP Policy Document	5
13	Financial Partners		0 - no other financial partners 2 - one additional financial partner 3 - if two+ partners (must be identified in application as funding match partners)	2
14	Local Match		0 - Any "in-kind" 3 - All cash	3

TOTAL DRCOG STAFF REVIEW

35

TOTAL PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE

65

TOTAL

100