

Staff Review Guidelines for JARC and New Freedom FFY2010 Funding Apportionment

OVERVIEW:

This document is a supplement to clarify the project review system approved by STAC for the competitive selection of 2010-2011 JARC and New Freedom projects. It is intended to describe the methodology and approach related to MARC staff's role in reviewing project applications and preparing the "Staff Review and Peer Voting Spreadsheet" for use by STAC.

As in previous competitive selection cycles, this spreadsheet will be provided to STAC for its use in developing project funding recommendations for MARC's Total Transportation Policy Committee.

PRIMARY REVIEW CRITERIA:

- **SUSTAINABILITY**

1. Coordination – Partnerships between agencies, municipalities, other transportation agencies, social service agencies and organizations, and/or the private sector are strongly encouraged. These partnerships can provide funding sources that sustain services if no federal funding is available. Applicants that demonstrate in-place partnerships will be viewed more favorably in the process.
2. Permanence – Applicants should identify reasonable funding sources available to sustain operation in future years. Projects with this information will be viewed more favorably over services that cannot identify funding sources to support longevity.

The goal of this competitive selection is to fund projects that can be sustained if federal funding is no longer available. Applicants must provide three-years of budget information for each project which documents action steps, as well as the expected outcomes in each year. If the JARC or New Freedom project is part of a larger project, please detail how it fits into the larger effort.

Level of Coordination with other agencies/government/organizations:

- CLARIFY – Project sustainability not clearly explained
- LOW – No budget provided **OR** no coordination or partnerships demonstrated
- MED– 3-year budget provided – coordination or partnerships demonstrated but not **documented**
- HIGH – Continued funding through documented partnerships and 3-year budget provided

- **SUPPORTIVE OF EXISTING LEVELS OF SERVICE COMMITMENT WITHOUT SUPPLANTING FINANCIAL SUPPORT**

Applicants must justify their need for funding by establishing their baseline level of service and levels of commitments as measured by trips, hours, jobs and financing.

Applicants must identify how their projects compare to the norms of alternative services being unavailable, inappropriate, and/or insufficient either on the temporal or the spatial service grid, thereby qualifying their project as having a greater need than others.

- CLARIFY –Proposed baseline level of service, level of commitment, and/or comparison with norms of alternative service is not clearly explained.
- LOW – Not Addressed
- MED – Proposed baseline level of service, level of commitment, and/or comparison with norms of alternative service is clearly explained **AND** project clearly demonstrates need.
- HIGH – Proposed baseline level of service, level of commitment, and/or comparison with norms of alternative service is clearly explained **AND** project clearly demonstrates greater need than others.

- **GOVERNMENTAL PARTNERSHIPS**

In an effort to create sustainable services, applicants are encouraged to partner with a municipality or county within the MARC boundary. A signed agreement between the partners — which details the planned project activities of both parties — must be in place and included in the application.

- CLARIFY – Governmental Partnerships not clearly explained
- LOW -- No Governmental Partnerships **OR** Not Addressed
- MED -- Government-sponsored with no identified partners
- HIGH –Documented partnership agreement(s) with local government(s) **OR** between local governments

- **COOPERATIVE OPERATIONS**

Applicants are encouraged to work with other providers to offer additional services between communities or service areas. This could be achieved through timed transfers or mutual exchange agreements. Efforts to link trips together should be documented in the application. Any required agreements should also be in place by the submission deadline and referenced in the application.

- CLARIFY – Cooperative operations not clearly explained
- LOW -- No cooperative operations addressed or demonstrated
- MED -- Informal cooperative operations demonstrated but not documented
- HIGH – Formal cooperative operations documented by agreement(s)

- **COMMUNITY – BASED**

Applicants must address ways in which the proposed service promotes the concept of community-based mobility as described in the Smart Moves service concept, and provides support for individuals with disabilities and low income. Community-based transportation refers to services designed by local

stakeholders to meet the specific mobility needs of the area. A community may be defined in many ways to include similar geographic areas, a population subgroup or a political subdivision. More information can be found on page 18 of Chapter 5 in Transportation Outlook 2040 or on the Smart Moves Web site at the following links: (Provide links to Outlook 2040 and Smartmoves)

- CLARIFY – Community-based connection is not clearly explained.
 - LOW – Not addressed
 - MED – Input from stakeholders, including users of the community served, is used to shape the design, implementation and management of the system **OR** the service targets a specific “community” (geographically and/or demographically) and is supported financially or otherwise by users and partnerships within this community.
 - HIGH – Input from stakeholders, including users of the community served, is used to shape the design, implementation and management of the system **AND** The service targets a specific “community” (geographically and/or demographically) and is supported financially or otherwise by users and partnerships within this community.
- **ANNUAL SERVICE DESCRIPTION**

Applicants should describe the proposed service with basic information on the operation and target population. The basic geographic service area and location should also be included. This includes descriptions of the characteristics of service, operations, organizational structure and administrative capacity for recordkeeping related to federal grants.

 - The staff response should state whether the information asked for is provided or not provided. The “Staff Comments” section on the Staff Review Matrix will be used to state what data is still missing.

SECONDARY REVIEW CRITERIA:

- **COST/FEASIBILITY**

Applicants should describe the project budget, resources, and institutional administrative support. Applicants should also include information about service costs, such as the cost per one-way segment of the trip, and any factors that explain the cost estimates, for example, servicing larger than standard wheelchairs, longer trips, etc.

- The staff response should state whether the information asked for is provided or not provided. The “Staff Comments” section on the Staff Review Matrix will be used to summarize cost/feasibility data **OR** state what data is missing.
- **SERVICE LEVELS**

Applicants should identify the average number of one-way passenger trips the program expects to provide per day, month and year. Or, applicants should quantify other productivity features that are not trip-centered.

*It should be noted whether level refers “trips” or “people served”

- The staff response should state whether the information asked for is provided or not provided. The “Staff Comments” section on the Staff Review Matrix will be used to summarize service level data **OR** state what data is missing.