

## **Subcommittee issues discussion from December 7, 2011, full committee meeting**

Art Gough referred to the handout, which summarized the subcommittee's previous discussion at its June meeting. Other topical discussion was done previously by email. The subcommittee began because of various concerns that emerged after the most recent funding round. The subcommittee has not yet made any formal recommendations to the full committee.

Suggestions and concerns discussed at the full December committee meeting included:

### *Application limits*

- Limiting the number of applications in some form, different from the 105% cap on funding totals from any one jurisdiction that has been used in previous funding rounds. The round done in 2010 had more applications than the committee has seen in the past, which made the committee's review process even more challenging on a tighter timeline from MoDOT. A lower cap on applications could focus the committee's time.
- The \$500,000 maximum for a construction project could be either raised to \$1 million or eliminated. Projects submitted below that amount are often limited by local match issues. The possibility of receiving more funds for a project would help politically, with the LPA process since there would be fewer projects to keep on schedule, and would reduce projects that are split to get around the cap. Phasing can help spread the funding around to different and smaller communities.
- Applicants would need to know if there are changes to the criteria, and they may have some input.

### *Scoring procedure modifications*

- Scoring and sidewalk projects – This always seems to be an issue for the committee. Shared use paths effectively get double points for each mode, slanting the scoring toward those projects and disadvantaging sidewalk projects.
- Scoring equity for project types and community size
- How to more clearly distinguish between projects in the scores
- Use two screens in the scoring? Committee has adjusted scores a lot in the past and staff conducted field checks. This funding round was on a much shorter timeline, which limited what could be done.
- Presentations for project applications can sometimes better help explain a project, but the committee needs to balance the desire for presentations with the time involved since many committee members can't devote two or more full days to the evaluation process for presentations. Presentations still need time limits.
- Evaluation process – if committee members could have votes in the scoring process to help with projects that may be good projects but for whatever reasons don't score as well. Such a structure would make it more meaningful as a committee member, but a more subjective process would also need to be defensible at TTPC.