

**APPENDIX A**  
**FULL COMMUNITY CONNECTIONS REVIEW SURVEY RESULTS**

**Table A-1  
Project Proponent Survey Results**

Response Number	How would you rate the experience of applying for the MPO's Community Connections Program?	How would you rate the clarity of the MPO's development process for the Community Connections Program pilot funding round?	How would you rate MPO staff's responsiveness to questions and concerns?	How would you rate the Community Connections Program application in terms of how much work it takes to complete?	How would you rate the Community Connections Program application in terms of the amount of information and data it asks for?	Do you have any other feedback on the application process for the Community Connections Program? Please limit your feedback to the application phase alone.
1	4	6	10	Just enough work	Just enough information	The MPO should think carefully about categorizing projects as construction, implementation, community engagement, etc. - separating the application into two distinct types of projects seemed to lead to more confusion than it was worth. Perhaps a one year and two year option for implementation/ engagement and physical construction, respectively, could be a better option. *see MAPC Accelerating Climate Resiliency Grant*
2	5	4	7	Just enough work	Just enough information	The application process was fairly ease. The communication and inclusion of the person that submitted the application was my concern.
3	8	8	10	Just enough work	Just enough information	Sandy Johnson has been extremely helpful!
4	8	8	10	Just enough work	Just enough information	Our organization was thrilled to have an opportunity to apply for funding to further our mobility goals. Program staff were particularly helpful throughout the process.
5	10	10	10	Just enough work	Just enough information	
6	10	9	10	Just enough work	Just enough information	Being able to ask questions during the application process was very valuable and improved our ability to respond to the information requested.
7	10	6	10	Just enough work	Just enough information	I'm not entirely clear on what question #2 above is asking. In terms of clarity, were scores shared with applicants? It seemed like we applied, projects were presented to the MPO, and then we found out we were accepted. This was great (thank you for your help through the process!), but I'm not sure I understood how those decisions were made.

**Table A-2  
Staff Survey Results**

Staff Member	To what extent do you feel that the Community Connections pilot round, and the projects funded, fulfill the goals of the program and of the MPO?	How do you feel about the scoring process for the Community Connections Program? Possible topics include: 1) Does the CC Program application provide sufficient information for scoring projects? Too much information? 2) Based on your experience reviewing applications (if any), do the criteria for CC application evaluation provide for accurate scoring of projects? 3) Are any types of projects unfairly favored or disfavored?	Do you have any other feedback on the scoring process?	In your opinion, should the CC Program seek to fund small capital projects, or focus on "operating" projects like shuttles?	Do you have an opinion on whether the CC Program should have a cap on individual project cost? There is \$2 million/year programmed in the TIP.
1	7	Information is sufficient for scoring.			
2	9	I don't know as much about the details of the scoring process, as I didn't score any projects directly, but I would say that there's value in the criteria for the CC program complementing/reflecting the broader TIP criteria. It also does seem like transit operating projects are favored in the scoring system, so looking for ways to rectify this is probably worthwhile. On the information required, I think it's important that we request just enough to properly score the project, but not so much information that the application feels burdensome or is difficult to complete for municipalities with fewer resources.	I do think it's important that we do our best to create synergy between the more formal TIP project intake/scoring process and that of the CC program. Ideally, all six of our investment programs would equally be seen as different but related parts of a whole. We have a decent amount of work to do to make this happen, but I think it's essential for the long-term sustainability of both this program and the Transit Modernization program.	If we can figure out a way to fund small capital projects easily and sustainably, then I do think there's a lot of value in doing this. I think the idea of using MAPC's procurement process as a way to do this is compelling and should be explored. I also think that small capital projects like bikeshare expansions or small transit station access improvements are high-impact but low-cost projects and could become hallmarks of the CC program if they can be done. These are great opportunities for the MPO to make a lasting impact in more communities across the region and would be valuable opportunities to better tell the MPO's story (whenever we get to the branding/marketing revamp through our strategic planning process).	I don't think we necessarily need to have a hard cap on project cost. We have \$2 million allocated to the program per year, but that doesn't mean that we can't go over that amount if other TIP projects move around and funding becomes available. We could just add or emphasize language in the application about having a desire to fund multiple projects a year and that cost will be taken into account when selecting projects for funding.
3	8	I think that, in some cases, there was a lot of information to wade through. However, in other cases, the proponent would ignore portions of the questions so there wouldn't be information for grading a project. I would say the differences between how proponents responded to the questionnaire was the trickiest part of grading the CC applications.	I remember that it seemed as though certain types of projects scored much better or worse but I can't remember why... Sorry this isn't helpful. I've forgotten too much about the scoring process, unfortunately.	Small capital projects seem more straightforward, but both could be very beneficial to a community in need of transportation assistance. So... I don't have a strong opinion either way.	I don't know if it feels necessary to cap the cost of an individual project. I imagine if there was a year without many applicants but one really great, expensive project, we could entertain a pricier option.

Staff Member	To what extent do you feel that the Community Connections pilot round, and the projects funded, fulfill the goals of the program and of the MPO?	How do you feel about the scoring process for the Community Connections Program? Possible topics include: 1) Does the CC Program application provide sufficient information for scoring projects? Too much information? 2) Based on your experience reviewing applications (if any), do the criteria for CC application evaluation provide for accurate scoring of projects? 3) Are any types of projects unfairly favored or disfavored?	Do you have any other feedback on the scoring process?	In your opinion, should the CC Program seek to fund small capital projects, or focus on "operating" projects like shuttles?	Do you have an opinion on whether the CC Program should have a cap on individual project cost? There is \$2 million/year programmed in the TIP.
4	10	Some language in CC project application is less specific than the scorecard, like for the 'Maintenance budget and plan' category as well as the two resiliency/environmental criteria. Program seems to favor operating projects. Point scale could be refined, perhaps equal intervals for certain items.	Greater coordination with other project evaluators and GIS team for next round.	Both types of projects have value. But if i had to choose, I'd probably pick small capital projects.	No cap. But some sort of strategy needed if proponent asks for a ridiculous sum of money.