

Amendment 1 – June 23, 2011

Responses to Questions on the TOD Pilot Program Request for Applications (RFA)

A.

1. Can OPM clarify the role of the Regional Planning Organizations (RPOs) in this program?

Response: Since the TOD Pilot Program is a municipal grant program, it is entirely up to each participating municipality to coordinate with its respective RPO (i.e., Council of Governments, Council of Elected Officials, or Regional Planning Agency) on determining the appropriate role for the RPO in each grant proposal. RPO roles can range from passive support to active management and/or administration of the grant. Any such roles should be clearly delineated in the required Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), and may vary from proposal to proposal.

2. Can OPM provide a sample MOU between an applicant municipality and its RPO, as required by statute?

Response: Due to the potential variability in MOU content as noted in A.1., a sample MOU is not being provided.

3. Could OPM clarify what both parties are expected to commit to in the MOU?

Response: Section J of the Request for Applications identifies the seven core components of an MOU. In addition to these core components, the parties to an MOU should clarify their specific roles and responsibilities in managing the proposed project as noted in A.1. The MOU shall also incorporate each municipal grant proposal, either by reference or as an attachment.

B.

1. Is there any problem with us using the same consultant for both the application and the subsequent work should we be successful in obtaining the grant?

Response: Municipalities should consult with their legal counsel on all legal matters, as OPM cannot provide legal advice to municipalities. Certainly, it is a best practice for all municipalities to consider ethical appearance and possible competition issues in such deliberations with counsel and town officials. Although OPM does not believe that state statutes expressly prohibit municipalities from engaging the same consultant for different components of a project, it is possible that such prohibitions might be included in certain municipal charters or by-laws.

2. If we can use the same consultant for both elements, do we need to go through a public procurement process to use the consultant or can we include in our application a narrative explanation for why we think this particular consultant is able to provide us with more and better service because of the unique understanding of both our Town and of this particular planning process?

Response: Municipalities should consult with their legal counsel on all legal matters, as OPM cannot provide legal advice to municipalities. Certainly, it is a best practice for all municipalities to consider ethical appearance and possible competition issues in such deliberations with counsel and town officials. Specific requirements in the municipal charter or by-laws may require a municipality to go through a public procurement process. If after vetting this question with counsel it is determined that there are no prohibitions against such a practice, the applicant should provide a narrative explanation of the consultant's role for transparency purposes.

3. Can we request \$250,000 for the first phase of work and provide a menu of additional tasks that could be completed following the first phase should the first phase be successful and lead to the need for additional facilitation or implementation such as acquisition of land?

Response: Nothing precludes a municipality from requesting grant funds for different phases of a project, such as for eligible activities under both the TOD Planning Grants and TOD Facilitation Grants.

4. Along the same line, can or will the state exercise discretion to approve an application and reduce the amount awarded? For example, we request \$750,000 to complete several planning or facilitation tasks. The state reviews the application and approves a reduced amount of, say, \$250,000. Is that a scenario? I ask this to determine if we should submit an application that addresses all of our needs or do we have to prioritize.

Response: While the intent of Attachment A to this Request for Applications is to rate individual proposals in their totality, there may be limited instances when the state opts to exercise its discretion in awarding a particular element(s) of a project proposal. To the extent possible, municipalities should prioritize any discrete elements of their proposal.

5. Will the state provide a sample resolution to help ensure that the language in such a resolution is acceptable and contains any necessary information we may not be aware of?

Response: Yes. A sample resolution is below.

C.

1. Would you provide a definition of a "Facilitation Grant"?

Response: There is no formal definition of "Facilitation Grant" in the enabling legislation. However, Section 1 of the Request for Applications describes the types of activities that are eligible for TOD Facilitation Grant funding. In general, the intent of TOD Facilitation Grants is to bridge the gap between the end of planning activities and the start of construction activities for eligible TOD Pilot Projects. (Also, see response to C.2.)

2. Would construction projects, such as infrastructure construction, be considered an activity eligible for funding under a TOD Facilitation Grant?

Response: As noted in C.1., Section 1 of the Request for Applications describes the types of activities that are eligible for TOD Facilitation Grant funding. Although construction activities are generally not encouraged, there may be limited instances when funding of construction is warranted to complete an eligible TOD Pilot Project. Section 1.(2).i. of the Request for Applications includes “Other activities as deemed appropriate” which allows for state discretion on a case-by-case basis.

3. Is the purpose of the MOU between the Municipality and the Regional Planning Organization to assure project compliance with regional planning commitment to TOD goals or is it intended to outline project management structure and responsibilities?

Response: The primary purpose of the MOU is to outline project management structure and responsibilities, although the parties to the MOU may also use the opportunity to promote other local and regional supporting actions.

D.

1. Does “facilitation” include design and/or construction?

Response: Project design is considered an eligible activity under the TOD Facilitation Grants. Please see response to C.2., regarding eligibility of construction activities.

E.

1. Both the municipal application and the Memorandum of Understanding with the Regional Planning Organization (RPO) must include a work plan and budget. Should this be interpreted as the RPO endorsing the municipal work plan and budget, or is the real intent for the RPO to present a regional summary of these issues?

Response: Please see responses to A.1., A.3., and C.3.

2. It is not clear what is being asked of the RPO by the MOU requirement. Perhaps provide a model format for all to follow?

Response: Please see response to A.2.

3. It would seem appropriate for the RPO to explain how the TOD proposals generated within its area do or do not conform to regional land use and transportation plans. But this key policy conformance certification or explanation is not included in the MOU.

Response: To expand upon the response to C.3., the parties to the MOU are encouraged to provide both a local and a regional context to support the proposal relative to the rating criteria.

4. Overall, there is confusion over the contents of the MOU. It duplicates the contents of local applications, whereas we think it would be more valuable to OPM as a statement of the strengths and weaknesses and regional aspects of the various TOD applications.

Response: Since this is a municipal grant program, municipalities are encouraged to coordinate with their respective RPO to produce proposals that further both local and regional goals.

F.

1. May activities involving traffic signals and timing, pedestrian safety improvements, streetscape enhancements, and bus stop enhancements be the main focus of a TOD Pilot proposal when they are complementary to activities that are currently underway including an intermodal parking garage and a transit-oriented, mixed-use incentive housing zone?

Response: In order to pass the Initial Screening Criteria, project proposals must meet the statutory definition of “Transit-Oriented Development.” Based on the description above, it does not appear that such a proposal would meet said definition which has a primary focus on “the development of residential, commercial and employment centers...” Furthermore, the types of activities described above can be funded by other existing state programs, and do not appear to warrant designation as a TOD Pilot Project.

2. Is it possible for a combination of planning & facilitation grant application - as it is early yet for us to determine which we may wish to pursue, as we may find that we don't need \$250 K for planning?

Response: Section *E* of the Request for Applications states that “A proposal that seeks both types of grants (i.e., TOD Planning Grant and TOD Facilitation Grant) shall be considered a single application for purposes of these funding limits.” The combined total amount of the planning and facilitation grant proposal must be between \$250,000 and \$1,000,000.

3. Would there be any restriction for Towns to submit multiple applications? (i.e. we may want to submit a joint application with other Towns, and we may want to submit a separate application)

Response: Nothing precludes a municipality from submitting multiple applications, assuming each application is for a discrete TOD project proposal and is within the stated funding limits.

G.

1. Based on the statutory description of TOD pilot projects, are communities with projects other than those identified as TOD pilot projects/strategic transportation projects eligible to submit for this grant if they do not have substantial funding secured or planning underway/completed?

Response: Yes. If an application is deemed to have met the Initial Screening Criteria described in Attachment A of the Request for Applications, it will be designated as an eligible TOD Pilot Project and will be scored in accordance with the Rating Criteria.

2. Would feasibility studies for expanding transit services done in conjunction with TOD planning activities be considered an eligible activity for the purposes of this grant?

Response: While such a feasibility study may be considered an eligible grant activity, not enough information is provided about the nature of the proposed expansion of transit services to determine whether or not it would meet the definition of “Transit-Oriented Development”.

H.

1. What are the expectations of OPM with regard to the role of regional planning organizations in this application process?

Response: Please see response to A.1.

2. What are the expectations of OPM with regard to the role of RPOs in implementation of the pilot projects?

Response: OPM does not have any expectations with regard to the role of RPOs in implementing the pilot projects. The purpose of the MOU is for the applicant municipality and the RPO to delineate any specific roles in administering or implementing the project. OPM is required by the authorizing legislation to only monitor compliance with the MOU. Actual grant awards will be between the Department of Transportation and the selected TOD Pilot Project municipalities.

3. Could you give more description of the required MOU between the RPO and the project applicants within each region? What is the format to be? What is the purpose of this document? Does this document somehow formalize the role of the RPOs in this program? Who is to draft the MOU – the applicants or the RPO? Is there only one MOU signed per region – between the RPO and all applicants? Or are there multiple MOUs signed between the RPO and each applicant?

Response: Please see responses to A.1., A.2., A.3., and C.3. Drafting the MOU is the joint responsibility of the applicant municipalities and their respective RPO. It is preferred that there be only one MOU per region, which includes all applicant municipalities. However, it is recognized that special circumstances could call for more than one MOU (see response to J.10.).

4. Our understanding of the intent of the Act of 2007 is that this funding was to provide resources related to the New Britain BRT line, the existing commuter rail lines, and the proposed New Haven-Hartford-Springfield commuter rail line. Given this, should more weight be given to named towns in the evaluation criteria?

Response: Any project proposal that meets the Initial Screening Criteria as outlined in Attachment A of the Request for Applications will be designated as an eligible TOD Pilot Project. All such designated projects shall then be scored relative to the Rating Criteria and associated weights. The authorizing legislation (CGS Sec. 13b-79II, subsections (c) and (d)) does not assign additional weight to either subsection.

5. Are the RPOs to provide comments on the applications and if so, what is to be the nature, format and timing of RPO comments?

Response: Please see response to E.3. and E.4.

I.

1. Can “other activities as deemed appropriate” include construction of improvements recommended by previous studies concerning TOD development such as the “Regional Intermodal Transportation Center Master Plan and Efficiency Study” regarding New London that was funded by the CT DOT and sponsored and managed by the Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments?

Response: Please see response to C.2.

2. Can “environmental assessments and brownfield remediation” include internal building environmental issues such as an analysis of the presence of lead paint and asbestos and other environmental concerns affecting the adaptive building reuse for TOD?

Response: While internal building environmental issues may be deemed to be eligible activities for a TOD Facilitation Grant, not enough information is provided about the nature of the proposed adaptive building reuse to determine whether or not it would meet the definition of “Transit-Oriented Development”.

3. What constitutes a “TOD Zone” or “TOD Overlay Zone”? Can existing Incentive Housing Zones or Central Business District Zones qualify?

Response: For purposes of this Request for Applications, a “TOD Zone” is considered to be the area “within one-half mile or walking distance of public transportation facilities”, as referenced in the statutory definition of “Transit-Oriented Development”. A “TOD Overlay Zone” is a special zoning district, not unlike an Incentive Housing Zone or Central Business District Zone, which has been formally designated by the municipality in their zoning regulations. There can certainly be overlap among these types of special zoning districts, although each such district has its own unique characteristics and requirements. Therefore, a TOD Overlay Zone would need to be independently approved by the local zoning authority.

4. Can an application include several elements or related smaller projects compiled together (e.g., water and sewer assessment related to redevelopment of upper story spaces)?

Response: Please see responses to B.3., B.4., F.2. and F.3.

J.

1. Can the RPO be designated in the MOU as the administrator for a municipal activity, and/or as the administrator for one application for multiple municipalities?

Response: Please see response to A.1 and A.3.

2. Will OPM provide a template budget and MOU prior to the application deadline?

Response: Please see response to A.2.

3. (RFA, J., (1), (2), (5)) Can one application contain two or more municipal projects, e.g.; one being facilitation the other being a planning project, with each project having an independent workplan, Budget & timeline?

Response: Please see response to F.2.

4. Are there any limitations or differences in weighting on the leveraging of funding over time? Specifically, will the value of leverage in an application be rated differently based upon when that leverage may be available? For instance, if a DECD, DEP, EPA, FTA, or other grant award period is not expected to begin until the mid-point of the work plan, or even after and/or dependent upon the completion of the TOD Pilot activity, will such leverage be weighted differently than if the leverage is available at the commencement of the TOD Pilot activity?

Response: The timing/availability of funds for leveraging purposes is a factor in the Rating Criteria as noted in Attachment A of the Request for Applications, as it will affect the Timeline to Implementation.

5. If two or more municipalities apply together and one of those municipalities is a Town form of government whereby a Town Meeting Constitutes its legislative body, and the other municipality(ies) is a City governed by a Council, do all municipal partners in the proposed activity also have until the September 15, 2011 to complete and file their Certified Resolutions, or are only those municipalities where a Town Meeting Constitutes a legislative body given a later date for Certification?

Response: While the added time was specifically provided to accommodate those towns where a Town Meeting constitutes the legislative body, this provision is also extended to any other town that cannot meet the August 4, 2011 Certified Resolution and MOU requirements.

6. Is there any limit to the number of applications submitted by a municipality? For example, can a municipality submit one application, and another in partnership with one or more municipalities?

Response: Please see response to F.3.

7. (RFA, I., (2)) In order for an application for TOD Facilitation Grant to be eligible, must a TOD Plan, Station Area Plan or overlay zone already have been developed?

Response: No.

8. Will different types of Facilitation Activities that otherwise meet all criteria be weighted differently based upon the type of facilitation activity proposed? In other words, within that category are any activities considered priorities over other types of activities?

Response: That determination will be at the discretion of the review panel.

9. (RFA, Attachment A, II, C.) How will proposed planning activities be scored relative to “Economic & Market Viability” as such analysis will likely not yet have taken place prior to a Planning Activity? Will Planning Proposals by their very nature be ranked lower than Facilitation activities do to an inability to gain points under these criteria?

Response: Applications for both TOD Planning Grants and TOD Facilitation Grants will be evaluated on the same criteria. As indicated in the rating guidelines, “The applicant should describe the economic and market viability of TOD in the proposed project area, as well as the viability of their specific project proposal.” Because of the nature of TOD Planning Grants, the “proposed project area” is effectively the broader “TOD Zone” (see response to I.3.). Actual scoring and selection of TOD Pilot Projects will be dependent upon the number and quality of applications received for both types of grants.

10. (Part V, Transit-Oriented Development, Sec. 13b-79//, (d) (2)) – Since the TOD statute contemplates projects that may include “...one or more regional planning agencies” that are “designated projects” what will be the requirements and process for the MOU? Will all planning agencies need to be parties to the MOU? Would municipalities need to enter into an MOU with another region if that region’s planning agency is administering the multi-regional activity? Finally, will additional points be awarded for multi-regional approaches?

Response: Please see response to A.1. and H.3. For a proposed project that includes two or more planning regions, it is recommended that a separate MOU be developed for all the participating municipalities and RPOs.

11. (Part V, Transit-Oriented Development, Sec. 13b-79//, (j) (2)) – The TOD statute states under this section that in regard to Memoranda of Understanding once submitted to OPM “...shall be reviewed for compliance by said office (OPM) not later than sixty days after submission. The Office of Policy & Management shall inform the applicant of any deficiency in such memoranda of understanding and shall provide the applicant with another opportunity to apply.” In light of this requirement and that the RFA contemplates award by October 6, 2011, how will OPM handle deficiencies in the MOU of a successful application? Also, will defects with MOUs be discounted during the rating process?

Response: Please see responses to A.1., A.2., A.3. and C.3. The primary purpose of the MOU is to outline project management structure and responsibilities. OPM will use the sixty day review period to address any compliance issues associated with those elements of the MOU. The MOU must also incorporate municipal grant proposals into the MOU, either by reference or as an attachment. Because this is a competitive grant program, the actual grant proposals cannot be modified after the August 4, 2011 submission date. Applications that pass the Initial Screening Criteria will then be scored relative to the Rating Criteria, and any “deficiency” with an individual grant proposal will be factored into its total score.

K.

1. Is the content of the MOU merely the checklist of the items in sec. J or something else?

Response: Please see responses to A.1., A.2., A.3 and C.3.

2. Who signs the MOU for the RPO, Chairman, Executive Director or a combination of both or someone else?

Response: Depending on the individual RPO's governance structure, the signing authority can be either the Chairman or the Executive Director, or both.

Sample Resolution Authorizing the Chief Executive Officer of a Municipality to Apply for a TOD Planning and/or Facilitation Grant(s) and to Enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Regional Planning Organization

Certified Resolution of the Legislative Body
(To be completed by the City or Town Clerk)

Transit-Oriented Development Pilot Program

The Legislative Body of the Town/City of _____ met on _____ and adopted a resolution by the vote of _____ to _____ which:

- (1) authorizes submission of the _____ (title of the planning and/or facilitation grant proposal(s)), in accordance with the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Pilot Program Request for Applications;
- (2) authorizes the Town/City of _____ to enter into and, if necessary, to amend a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the _____ (name of Regional Planning Organization), or any successor organization, which incorporates the requirements outlined in the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Pilot Program Request for Applications, as well as identifies any other specific responsibilities that the Town/City chooses to delegate to the Regional Planning Organization in administering the grant, if awarded, as agreed to by the parties; and
- (3) authorizes the individual serving as _____ (Mayor, First Selectman or Town Manager), or their successor(s), to sign the grant application, to negotiate the terms and conditions of the MOU, to sign the MOU on behalf of the Town/City of _____, and to sign any other documents associated with administering the grant, if awarded, including any amendments thereto. Such grant application is attached to and made a part of this record.

Attested to by:

Name: _____

Title: _____
(City/Town Clerk)

Date: _____

Request for Applications

Transit-Oriented Development Pilot Program

On February 24, 2011, the State Bond Commission approved the allocation of five million dollars (\$5,000,000) for the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Pilot Program, which was previously authorized under Section 67 of [Public Act 07-7](#) of the June Special Session (the Act).

The Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT) and the Office of Policy and Management (OPM) hereby jointly issue this Request for Applications (RFA) in order to generate a pool of prospective transit-oriented development pilot projects for consideration of funding under this competitive grant program. ConnDOT and OPM, in consultation with the Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD), the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), the Connecticut Development Authority (CDA), and the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority (CHFA), shall review applications and select TOD Pilot Program grant recipients in accordance with the provisions of this RFA and the rating criteria established in Attachment A incorporated herein.

A. What is “Transit-Oriented Development”?

Section 13b-79kk of the Connecticut General Statutes defines “Transit-Oriented Development” as “the development of residential, commercial and employment centers within one-half mile or walking distance of public transportation facilities, including rail and bus rapid transit and services, that meet transit supportive standards for land uses, built environment densities and walkable environments, in order to facilitate and encourage the use of those services.”

B. What are the goals of the TOD Pilot Program RFA process?

- (1) To identify which proposals best meet the definition of “Transit-Oriented Development” and the rating criteria established in Attachment A of this RFA, in order to be awarded grants under the TOD Pilot Program; and
- (2) To identify which proposals include TOD-related elements that might be suitable for other state agency-administered programs in the future.

C. What types of grants are available?

- (1) TOD Planning Grants; and
- (2) TOD Facilitation Grants.

Activities eligible for funding under both types of grants are summarized in Section I of this RFA.

D. Who may submit an application?

Only Connecticut municipalities (i.e., cities and towns) may apply for TOD Planning Grants and/or TOD Facilitation Grants.

E. What are the funding limits?

Grant awards under this program shall be not less than two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000) and not more than one million dollars (\$1,000,000). A proposal that seeks both types of grants (i.e., TOD Planning Grant and TOD Facilitation Grant) shall be considered a single application for purposes of these funding limits. Nothing in this RFA shall preclude two or more municipalities from submitting a joint application, such as to combine their individual proposals to attain the minimum grant level.

F. What constitutes a complete application?

In order to apply for a grant under this program, a municipality must provide all of the following:

- (1) A formal written proposal submitted by the chief executive officer of the municipality, as outlined in Section *H* of this RFA;
- (2) A fully executed memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the municipality and the respective regional planning organization (RPO), as required by the Act and outlined in Section *J* of this RFA; and
- (3) Certified Resolutions of the municipality's legislative body authorizing the chief executive officer of the municipality to:
 - a. Apply for a TOD Planning Grant and/or a TOD Facilitation Grant for a specific project(s); and
 - b. Enter into an MOU with the respective RPO, as required by the Act.

G. What are the key milestone dates?

- (1) June 9, 2011 (4:00 p.m.) – Deadline to submit written questions on the RFA.
- (2) June 23, 2011 – Deadline for OPM to post responses to RFA questions on its website.
- (3) August 4, 2011 (4:00 p.m.) – Deadline for municipalities to submit formal written proposals and associated Certified Resolutions. Municipalities that need additional time to complete the Certified Resolution requirement, especially those where a Town Meeting constitutes the legislative body, must submit a draft resolution along with their formal written proposal on August 4, 2011. In order for the application to be deemed complete, Certified Resolutions must be received by no later than 4:00 p.m. on September 15, 2011. In no event shall the content of any proposal be modified after August 4, 2011.
- (4) August 4, 2011 (4:00 p.m.) – Deadline for municipalities to submit fully executed MOUs and associated Certified Resolutions. Municipalities that need additional time to execute their MOUs and complete the Certified Resolution requirement, especially those where a Town Meeting constitutes the legislative body, must submit a draft MOU and a draft resolution along with their formal written proposal on August 4, 2011. In order for the application to be deemed complete, fully executed MOUs and Certified Resolutions must be received by no later than 4:00 p.m. on September 15, 2011.
- (5) October 6, 2011 – Deadline for OPM approval of MOUs.
- (6) October 6, 2011 – Deadline for ConnDOT and OPM to designate eligible TOD Pilot Projects.
- (7) October 13, 2011 – Deadline for ConnDOT and OPM to complete the rating and selection of TOD Pilot Projects and to announce grant awards.

H. What is the format for the written proposal?

- (1) A narrative description of current conditions in the existing or proposed TOD zone (i.e., transportation facilities, parking, employment, residential, commercial/retail, brownfields, building vacancy rate, parking spaces, zoning regulations, etc.);
- (2) A statement of the municipality's vision for future housing and economic development in the existing or proposed TOD zone to support access to and ridership on the existing or planned public transportation system;
- (3) A detailed description of the proposal (e.g., work plan, budget, site map, etc.) and how it relates to both the existing conditions and the future vision;
- (4) A timeline for implementing the specific grant proposal and, to the extent possible, an estimate of the time needed to advance the proposed project to full build-out (i.e., construction);
- (5) A description of how the proposal will support transit use and ridership growth; and

- (6) A brief assessment of what is considered to be the most critical hurdle(s) to overcome in order to realize the municipality's vision, and to what extent, if any, state agencies might be needed to facilitate a coordinated solution.

Note: Formal written proposals should be no more than 10 pages in length, excluding necessary attachments.

I. What activities are eligible for funding under each grant?

(1) TOD Planning Grants are eligible for:

- a. Completion of a TOD plan or station area plan of development;
- b. Development or adoption of a TOD overlay zone; or
- c. Preparation of a development strategy and selection of a preferred development approach.

(2) TOD Facilitation Grants are eligible for:

- a. Implementation of a TOD plan and overlay zone;
- b. Market analysis to determine the economic viability of a project;
- c. Financial assessment and planning related to implementation of a TOD plan;
- d. Analysis of the economic benefits, revenue or expense projections of a project;
- e. Preparation of environmental assessments and plans for brownfield remediation;
- f. Preparation of infrastructure studies and surveys;
- g. Preparation of requests for development proposals;
- h. Preparation of development or joint development agreements; or
- i. Other activities as deemed appropriate.

J. What are the MOU requirements?

The MOU must incorporate each grant proposal submitted by a municipality or municipalities within a planning region, and shall include the following:

- (1) A work plan for each proposal;
- (2) A budget for each proposal;
- (3) Anticipated work products for each proposal;
- (4) A regional-scale map depicting any existing or proposed TOD zones;
- (5) A time frame for completion for each proposed TOD Planning Grants and/or TOD Facilitation Grants;
- (6) The identity of the administering entity for each prospective grant recipient; and
- (7) The identity of the participating municipalities and regional planning organization(s).

K. How will proposals be rated and selected?

Proposals that meet the definition of "Transit-Oriented Development" and are part of a complete application shall be rated and selected in accordance with the criteria and weighting set forth in Attachment A of this RFA.

L. To whom must applications and related questions be submitted?

Applications and any questions related to this RFA shall be submitted in writing to: Mr. Daniel Morley, Office of Policy and Management, 450 Capitol Avenue MS# 54ORG, Hartford, CT 06106-1379, as well as in a Portable Document File (PDF) to: Daniel.Morley@ct.gov.

Attachment A

Transit-Oriented Development Pilot Program

Criteria and Weighting

I. INITIAL SCREENING CRITERIA

- A. Did the applicant submit a complete application in accordance with the key milestone dates noted in Section G of this RFA?
- B. Does the proposal meet the definition of “Transit-Oriented Development”, in accordance with Section 13b-79kk of the Connecticut General Statutes?

Any application that does not pass the Initial Screening Criteria will not be rated.

II. RATING CRITERIA

Each application that passes the Initial Screening Criteria will be designated as an eligible TOD Pilot Project and reviewed and scored on a 10-point scale relative to the following rating criteria and associated weights:

| RATING CRITERIA | SCORE | WEIGHT | VALUE |
|---|------------|--------|------------|
| A. Local & Regional Supporting Actions | 0.0 – 10.0 | 15% | 0.0 - 1.5 |
| B. Leverages Other Funding | 0.0 – 10.0 | 20% | 0.0 - 2.0 |
| C. Economic & Market Viability | 0.0 – 10.0 | 20% | 0.0 - 2.0 |
| D. Timeline to Implementation | 0.0 – 10.0 | 10% | 0.0 - 1.0 |
| E. Supportive of Transit & State C&D Plan | 0.0 – 10.0 | 35% | 0.0 - 3.5 |
| TOTAL SCORE | | | 0.0 – 10.0 |

Guidelines for Rating Eligible TOD Pilot Projects

A. Local & Regional Supporting Actions

The applicant should provide evidence of local and regional commitment to advancing TOD goals and their specific proposal(s). Any actions previously taken in support of TOD goals and proposal-specific objectives should be provided. Such actions can include, but are not limited to, zoning that encourages an appropriate scale for housing density and mixed uses to support alternative modes of travel other than automobile, property assembly, remediation activities, CEDS, etc.

B. Leverages Other Funding

The applicant should indicate if the TOD funds requested will help leverage other past or future proposed public or private funding to provide a larger economic and development impact. These can include, but are not limited to, investments or financial commitments made by private, municipal, state, federal or non-governmental organizations.

C. Economic & Market Viability

The applicant should describe the economic and market viability of TOD in the proposed project area, as well as the viability of their specific project proposal. This should include, but is not limited to, an assessment of the proposed project's potential to progress as envisioned, and to ultimately be successful.

D. Timeline to Implementation

The applicant should provide a realistic project schedule or timeline that includes, but is not limited to, the amount of time needed to implement the planning and/or facilitation grant and, to the extent possible, an estimate of the time needed to advance the project to full build-out (i.e., construction).

E. Supportive of Transit & State C&D Plan

The applicant should: 1) Describe the transit-supportive qualities of the proposed project, including how the proposal will encourage use of the transit system and help grow ridership; and 2) Describe how the proposed project supports key elements of related state plans; in particular, Growth Management Principles #1-3 of the [Conservation & Development Policies Plan for Connecticut \(State C&D Plan\)](#).