

**Survey Results: Scores and Comments from Respondents**  
**Draft for Presentation to the MPO, December 6, 2018**

	Median Score	Respondent 1	Respondent 2	Respondent 3	Respondent 4	Respondent 5	Respondent 6	Respondent 7	Respondent 8	Respondent 9
<b>Fatal Flaw</b>										
Do you have any comments on these proposed Fatal Flaw Analyses?			No negative comment. Should a fatal flaw be proposal too expensive?	No	How will the applicant be able to provide the positive impact on MPO air quality analysis - is this feasible? Agreed with Fatal Flaw 2 although very subjective but be cautious about biasing completely against newer ideas and players.				First question is vague - how is "positive impact" defined; and is the positive impact related to the outcome of improved air quality or on the analysis / modeling process?	Positive impact on AQ may be very, very small, but I don't think that should disqualify a project.
<b>General Criteria</b>										
Network or connectivity value	5	2	5	4	5	5	5	5	3	4
Alignment with MPO's and Community Transportation Program's goal of increasing use of non-automotive modes	4	3	4	3	5	5	4	4	5	5
Inclusion in or consistency with local or regional plans	4	4	3	5	3	4	4	5	5	2
Equity considerations or location in equity area	3	3	3	4	5	3	3	4	5	3
Coordination or cooperation between multiple entities	3	2	4	4	3	3	3	5	4	3
Usage projections	4	5	4	3	1	4	1	4	4	3
Other		The criteria should include some measure of cost-effectiveness, i.e., cost per rider/user, etc.	1) Readiness, at some point, will be relevant? 2) Local Champion: Not sure how to capture impact, but the "right" person may determine success / failure		Relying on projections seems unrealistic for this kind of initiative. This type of initiative is probably most important to analyze qualitative versus quantitatively. Most importantly, these projects should reduce SOV for anyone and improve access for TE populations if possible. Add criteria that gives extra consideration to services that are NOT closed to the general population.		Sub-criterion 3 under cooperation seems to be more about filling the network gap and more relevant to the first criterion related to network gaps more generally. Related to Criterion addressing plan consistency; this criterion should consider plans/ studies that explore projects specifically related to alternative modes of transportation such as bicycle plans, complete street plans, and/or last mile studies.			Since projects could vary quite a bit, I don't think failing to meet one or more criteria should disqualify any project. Of course, the projects that meet the most criteria will score much higher than others. Should we add a cost/benefit analysis without comparison to alternatives?
<b>Capital Criteria</b>										
Safety benefits	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	5	4
Cost-effectiveness over life cycle	3	4	3	5	3	4	3	4	2	3
Resilience to weather and environmental hazards	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	3	2	2
Other			MOBILITY as a criteria		Gaps/connectivity should also be discussed - best if connecting strong services or providing access to TE population		wondering if there is room for another criterion or sub-criterion that speaks to capital projects that will improve access to alternative modes of transportation. I.e. covered bike racks at a transit station or near a transit stop, covered waiting areas for transit. information kiosks/ technology that improves user's experience, and/or other components of a mobility hub.		Projected safety benefits for pedestrians and bicycle riders is a priority, but I am curious about how MPO can consider past performance data for similar treatments in similar locations to bring a level of rigor to our sincere hope that an intervention would produce the desired outcome.	Projects should not be rejected simply because they are in an ACEC. If depends upon whether they adversely affect the ACEC.
<b>Operating Criteria</b>										
Financial sustainability and realistic budget	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	4
Performance monitoring plan	4	5	3	5	5	4	4	4	5	2
Service plan	4	4	4	4	5	4	3	4	4	3
Other		Each project should be evaluated after each year to determine if it's meeting performance goals, and to determine if funding should continue.			We should approach funding operating very carefully and if possible to achieve greater chances of success commit to a longer step down period. It is unrealistic to think that this pot can fund many initiatives over multiple years of operation. Perhaps it could help bolster MassDOT's funds by supplementing their amount or length during the step down to help a project succeed if it seems strong in the first year. Add criteria that gives extra consideration to services that are NOT closed to the general population.					This looks good.
<b>Weighting</b>										
What percentage of the overall project score should be assigned to the general criteria?	40%	30%	40%	30%	50%	40%	70%	80%	40%	40%
What percentage of the overall project score should be assigned to the type-specific criteria?	60%	70%	60%	70%	50%	60%	30%	20%	60%	60%
<b>Other</b>										
Do you have any further questions or comments?		Funds should not be used to buy rolling stock or other equipment for operational projects - rolling stock/equipment should be leased or service should be obtained by contract.							Happy to discuss if helpful. Thanks!	