



STIF-D/STN Application Selection Committee Scoring Guidance
September 2024

Contents

1. Purpose 1

2. Project Evaluation Timeline 1

3. General Scoring Guidance..... 1

4. Using Cognito Review Form 2

5. Key Scoring Considerations..... 2

6. Point Breakdown..... 3

7. Scoring Rubrics..... 7

8. Ranking Process Overview 12

1. Purpose

The purpose of this guidance document is both to describe the general parameters around application review and scoring and provide an overview of the timeline and scoring structure for this solicitation. This guidance aims to encourage consistent and fair evaluation of submitted project proposals.

2. Project Evaluation Timeline

Date (2024)	Item
Sep 05	STIF-D/STN applications are due
Sep 17	Application Selection Committee kick-off meeting
Sep 24	Application Selection Committee can access Project Review Form
Sep 24	Applications and Project Input Form sent to ACTs and QEs
Oct 22	Deadline for ACTs and QEs to provide input on projects
Oct 24	Application Selection Committee scores are due
Nov 4	Application Selection Committee meeting for funding recommendations
Nov 5	Second Application Selection Committee meeting (if needed)

3. General Scoring Guidance

Evaluators should incorporate the following into their review process:

- **Be Impartial** - Evaluators should use their experience and knowledge of Oregon’s transit network to inform project scoring. While we recognize that everyone has bias, evaluators should set aside biases related to direct self-interest or that are not directly related to transit and

transportation. Evaluators with known conflicts of interest as to specific applications must recuse themselves from evaluating those applications.

- **Be Consistent** – As much as possible, each evaluator should apply a consistent scoring approach across all applications. This is more important than attention to identical approaches across evaluators. For example, an evaluator that is particularly critical in their scoring on one or more selection criteria should apply that same scoring approach to each application to ensure the accuracy of project rankings. Use all applicant-submitted materials to provide the most accurate score possible based on your understanding the proposed project as submitted by the applicant.
- **Be Thorough** – Review the application in full before completing scoring. Reread application answers where necessary. Think critically about how proposed projects might achieve or fail to achieve the program objectives reflected in the selection criteria.

4. Using Cognito Review Form

Selection Committee Members will be given access to a [Cognito form](#) for application review on or before September 24, 2024. Each evaluator should log in to Cognito to access the review form. The review form is simple and intuitive, consolidating each submitted application in one form. Links to the application PDFs are imbedded in the form. Each evaluator will score every project submitted, excepting any abstentions due to conflicts of interest. If an evaluator has a conflict, they must mark the box labeled “I have a conflict of interest and will not be scoring this application” and the form will automatically collapse that scorecard. The form can be saved and completed over multiple sittings by clicking the “Save” button at the bottom right of the form. If you have technical difficulties while using the Cognito form, contact Brian Roth at Brian.Roth@odot.oregon.gov or by phone at 541-508-9862.

The review form includes a field for evaluators to provide comments or pose clarifying questions about a project. Do not use this field to provide unsolicited additional information about a project that is not included in the application text. Questions entered into this field will be posed to subject matter experts in advance of the Selection Committee meeting on November 4, 2024, and their responses will be shared with the group. Evaluators, notably RTCs, will also be able to provide contextual information about projects, upon request, at the Selection Committee meeting.

Remember that anything entered into a review form becomes part of the public record. Comments and questions should remain objective and professional.

5. Key Scoring Considerations

This section outlines key scoring considerations that should be followed during scoring that will likely be discussed by the Selection Committee meeting. These guideposts reflect the programmatic intent of this solicitation as derived from HB 2017, the selection criteria, and the federal and state rules relevant to this solicitation.

- **Evaluators should refer to the five selection criteria (Community Benefits, Equity, Climate Benefits, Safety, and Readiness to Proceed) in assessing proposed projects.**

Questions 47-91 on the application are specifically tied to each of the five selection criterion, but the entirety of a submitted application should be considered during scoring. Reference page 5 and pages 8-29 of the [STIF Discretionary and STN Program Application Instructions](#) for the instructions and examples that were provided to applicants to guide them in completing their applications. Use all the materials submitted by applicants to provide the most accurate score possible based on your understanding of the proposed project. Links to the selection criteria framework and program guidance are included in the Cognito review form.

- **Applications should offer a clear, well-defined project with clear deliverables.**

Lack of clarity in project descriptions, including lack of clear project objectives and deliverables, can make project eligibility determinations less certain. It also makes it more difficult to judge how well a project satisfies the project selection criteria and raises questions about project readiness. Evaluators should score projects to the best of their ability using the information contained in the project application. Questions about project scope or deliverables may be raised in the comments section in the application scoring form.

- **Projects recommended for funding should reflect a wise use of state and federal funds.**

A key consideration in determining whether to recommend or prioritize a project for funding is whether funding the project is consistent with the Oregon Transportation Commission's investment priorities and would be a wise and defensible use of state and/or federal funds. The Selection Committee is tasked with prioritizing projects that best meet the objectives of the fund program as reflected in the Commission's selection criteria.

The Committee is under no obligation to recommend that a submitted project be fully funded or be funded at all, regardless of fund availability. The Committee should consider and be prepared to discuss whether it would be more consistent with statute, the OARs, and the Commission's investment priorities to withhold some discretionary funds for a future discretionary funding cycle. ODOT will not re-allocate any STIF discretionary funds for any other purpose.

Finally, funding a project might be an unwise use of state or federal funds and resources if the grant amount requested in an application does not appear to align with the proposed project. Award reduction may also be appropriate where the amount requested is inconsistent with service needs as identified in the applicant's Local Plan or known statewide public transportation system needs. Selection Committee members will be able to flag projects which have funding requests that are not in alignment with the project scope.

6. Point Breakdown

This table provides the number of points that are possible for each of the scored questions. The scoring form will have these point values incorporated into it. Applications that were submitted for both STIF Discretionary (Disc) and STIF Intercommunity (IC) and/or FTA Section 5311(f) (5311(f)) will have to be scored twice using the point scale for each fund.

Community Benefits (Disc 30%/STN 50%)				
Disc	IC	5311(f)	Q#	Question
5	5	5	47	Describe the need this project addresses. Please provide information to support these statements.
5	5	5	48	Describe how your agency determined this need existed, including any community engagement you conducted.
5	5	5	49	Describe the expected community benefits from this project.
5	5	5	50	If this project did not receive funding from this solicitation, what are the expected impacts?
5	5	5	51	Describe how this project supports positive health outcomes.
0	0	0	52	Does your project have the potential to increase the use of active transportation, including public transportation?
5	5	5	53	If you answered "Yes" in question 52, please describe how.

Community Benefit Scores for STN Applications				
Disc	IC	5311(f)	Q#	Question
	0	0	54	Select all that apply to your project.
	5	5	55	Describe how this project would improve each of the items you selected in question 54.
	1	1	56	Describe how this project implements technological innovations that improve efficiencies and support a seamless and easy to use Statewide Transit Network.
	1	1	57	Describe how this project develops service improvements and/or approaches that can be replicated statewide.
	1	1	58	Describe how this project improves infrastructure at interregional transit hubs.
	1	1	59	Describe how this project improves, maintains, or creates a transit stop that is served by two or more fixed route transportation service providers.
	1 for yes 0 for no	1 for yes 0 for no	60	If this is an intercity service, list the names of any other intercity transportation service such as other public transit services, nonprofit or for-profit transportation services, or passenger rail with which it shares stops.
	1 for yes 0 for no	1 for yes 0 for no	61	When the intercity service connects with other intercity or local transportation services or passenger rail is the layover time long enough for passengers to reliably transfer to another service?
	1 for yes 0 for no	1 for yes 0 for no	62	When the intercity service connects with other intercity or local transportation services or passenger rail is the layover time 60 minutes or less?
	1 for yes 0 for no	1 for yes 0 for no	63	Can riders make a round trip on the intercity transportation service in the same day and have at least three hours at their destination to conduct business?
			64	What is the service frequency of the intercity service?
	5	5		7 days/week
	4	4		6 days/week
	3	3		5 days/week
	2	2		4 days/week
	1	1		3 days/week
	0	0		Less than 3 days/week
	0	0		Service does not occur weekly
	0	0	65	Does the project provide benefits for the Statewide Transit Network that have not been addressed in the previous questions in this section?
	2	2	66	If you answered "Yes" in question 65, describe any additional project benefits.

Equity (D 20%/STN 15%)				
Disc	IC	5311(f)	Q#	Question
0	0	0	67	What are the specific geographic boundaries of your transit service area? If you have a shapefile, file geodatabase, or REST service of your transit service area, please attach it to your application.
0	0	0	68	If the project serves more than one community (e.g. intercity bus), what are the geographic boundaries (e.g. city, county, and/or urban growth boundaries, etc.) of the primary beneficiaries of the service?
6	5	5	69	What engagement has your agency conducted or does it plan to conduct with disadvantaged communities or their representatives in the development of this project?
2	2	2	70	If such engagement is not important to the success of this project, please explain why.
10	6	6	71	How will disadvantaged communities benefit from this project?
2	2	2	72	How will disadvantaged communities be burdened by this project?

Climate Mitigation (D 20%/STN 15%)				
Disc	IC	5311(f)	Q#	Question
Scored by PTD staff				

Safety (D 20%/STN 10%)				
Disc	IC	5311(f)	Q#	Question
20	10	10	85	Describe the safety improvements or features funded by this project. In particular, how will the project improve the safety of vulnerable road users and transit riders?

Readiness to Proceed (D 10%/STN 10%)				
Disc	IC	5311(f)	Q#	Question
4	4	4	86	Describe why this project is realistic. How will you successfully implement the project and complete it on budget and within the grant agreement period?
1	1	1	87	If this project will last beyond the 2025-2027 biennium, describe the plan for ongoing funding including match. If not applicable, respond N/A.
1	1	1	88	Does this project depend on other funding sources including other discretionary grants whose outcomes are uncertain? If yes, please list those fund sources. If not applicable, type N/A.
1	1	1	89	If actual costs exceed the budgeted amount for the project, describe your contingency plans.
1	1	1	90	Describe how your project could be scaled down to receive a smaller amount of money than your desired request. If your project cannot be scaled down, write N/A.
2	2	2	91	Describe the process your agency has for creating and maintaining the public General Transit Feed Specification (GTFS) data that describe the service.

7. Scoring Rubrics

Below are the scoring rubrics. Use the scoring rubric that matches the number of points that are available for the question.

Questions worth 1 point

Score	Evaluation	Description
1	Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major and minor strengths, no more than a couple minor weaknesses, and no major weaknesses identified. Confidence that the solicitation requirements and goals will be met.
0	Not Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No strengths but many minor and major weaknesses identified. Extremely low probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.

Questions worth 2 points

Score	Evaluation	Description
2	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several major and minor strengths identified; few if any weaknesses and no major weaknesses. • Highest probability and confidence that the solicitation requirements and goals will be met, with a majority of the requirements and goals exceeded.
1	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of major and minor strengths, no more than a couple minor weaknesses, and no major weaknesses identified. • High probability and confidence that the solicitation requirements and goals will be met, with some of the requirements and goals exceeded.
0	Not Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No strengths but many minor and major weaknesses identified. • Extremely low probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.

Questions worth 3 points

Score	Evaluation	Description
3	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several major and minor strengths identified; few if any weaknesses and no major weaknesses. • Highest probability and confidence that the solicitation requirements and goals will be met, with a majority of the requirements and goals exceeded.
2	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of major and minor strengths, no more than a couple minor weaknesses, and no major weaknesses identified. • High probability and confidence that the solicitation requirements and goals will be met, with some of the requirements and goals exceeded.
1	Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few if any major strengths, a few minor strengths, no more than a couple minor weaknesses and no major weaknesses identified. • Acceptable probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.
0	Not Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No strengths but many minor and major weaknesses identified. • Extremely low probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.

Questions worth 4 points

Score	Evaluation	Description
4	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several major and minor strengths identified; few if any weaknesses and no major weaknesses. • Highest probability and confidence that the solicitation requirements and goals will be met, with a majority of the requirements and goals exceeded.
3	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of major and minor strengths, no more than a couple minor weaknesses, and no major weaknesses identified. • High probability and confidence that the solicitation requirements and goals will be met, with some of the requirements and goals exceeded.
2	Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few if any major strengths, a few minor strengths, no more than a couple minor weaknesses and no major weaknesses identified. • Acceptable probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.
1	Minimally Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No major strengths, few if any minor strengths, several minor weaknesses and one or more major weaknesses identified. • Low probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.
0	Not Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No strengths but many minor and major weaknesses identified. • Extremely low probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.

Questions worth 5 points

Score	Evaluation	Description
4-5	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several major and minor strengths identified; few if any weaknesses and no major weaknesses. • Highest probability and confidence that the solicitation requirements and goals will be met, with a majority of the requirements and goals exceeded.
3	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of major and minor strengths, no more than a couple minor weaknesses, and no major weaknesses identified. • High probability and confidence that the solicitation requirements and goals will be met, with some of the requirements and goals exceeded.
2	Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few if any major strengths, a few minor strengths, no more than a couple minor weaknesses and no major weaknesses identified. • Acceptable probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.
1	Minimally Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No major strengths, few if any minor strengths, several minor weaknesses and one or more major weaknesses identified. • Low probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.
0	Not Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No strengths but many minor and major weaknesses identified.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extremely low probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.
--	--	---

Questions worth 6 points

Score	Evaluation	Description
5-6	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several major and minor strengths identified; few if any weaknesses and no major weaknesses. Highest probability and confidence that the solicitation requirements and goals will be met, with a majority of the requirements and goals exceeded.
3-4	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of major and minor strengths, no more than a couple minor weaknesses, and no major weaknesses identified. High probability and confidence that the solicitation requirements and goals will be met, with some of the requirements and goals exceeded.
2-3	Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few if any major strengths, a few minor strengths, no more than a couple minor weaknesses and no major weaknesses identified. Acceptable probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.
1	Minimally Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No major strengths, few if any minor strengths, several minor weaknesses and one or more major weaknesses identified. Low probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.
0	Not Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No strengths but many minor and major weaknesses identified. Extremely low probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.

Questions worth 10 points

Score	Evaluation	Description
8-10	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several major and minor strengths identified; few if any weaknesses and no major weaknesses. • Highest probability and confidence that the solicitation requirements and goals will be met, with a majority of the requirements and goals exceeded.
5-7	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of major and minor strengths, no more than a couple minor weaknesses, and no major weaknesses identified. • High probability and confidence that the solicitation requirements and goals will be met, with some of the requirements and goals exceeded.
3-4	Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few if any major strengths, a few minor strengths, no more than a couple minor weaknesses and no major weaknesses identified. • Acceptable probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.
1-2	Minimally Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No major strengths, few if any minor strengths, several minor weaknesses and one or more major weaknesses identified. • Low probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.
0	Not Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No strengths but many minor and major weaknesses identified. • Extremely low probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.

Questions worth 20 points

Score	Evaluation	Description
16-20	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several major and minor strengths identified; few if any weaknesses and no major weaknesses. • Highest probability and confidence that the solicitation requirements and goals will be met, with a majority of the requirements and goals exceeded.
11-15	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of major and minor strengths, no more than a couple minor weaknesses, and no major weaknesses identified. • High probability and confidence that the solicitation requirements and goals will be met, with some of the requirements and goals exceeded.
6-10	Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few if any major strengths, a few minor strengths, no more than a couple minor weaknesses and no major weaknesses identified. • Acceptable probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.
1-5	Minimally Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No major strengths, few if any minor strengths, several minor weaknesses and one or more major weaknesses identified. • Low probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.

0	Not Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No strengths but many minor and major weaknesses identified. • Extremely low probability that the solicitation requirements will be met.
---	----------------	---

8. Ranking Process Overview

This section provides an overview of the project scoring and ranking structure for this solicitation.

Evaluators will score each application based on the five selection criteria. Each question will be scored based on the number of points that have been assigned to it and the funding type for which the applicant applied. The scoring form requires that a score be entered for each criterion.

After the evaluators submit their scores, ODOT will apply the predetermined weights for each criterion score under the STIF Discretionary Program or the STN Program or both where the project was submitted for consideration under more than one fund source. Those weighted criterion scores are then totaled to provide a total project score. These totaled scores will be used to create evaluator rankings for each project under each fund/program. Finally, an average rank score will be created by averaging the scores for each project with the highest and lowest project scores removed.

After the scoring period has ended but prior to the Selection Committee meeting(s) in November, PTD staff will re-confirm fund eligibility, and projects will be considered for each source of funding for which they are eligible. Once a project has been awarded funding from one of the available funding sources, it will be removed from consideration for the other sources of funds in this solicitation.

In their November meeting(s), the Selection Committee will finalize a ranked list of projects recommended for funding under each fund source. The finalized ranked list of projects will be recommended to the Public Transportation Advisory Committee in December.