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Reaffirming goals
Use data-driven, performance-based project selection methods
Help region/state achieve federal performance targets and the goals of ON TO 2050
Provide assistance to disadvantaged communities
Leveraging and filling gaps between other fund sources
Ensure projects are obligated in a timely manner
Transparency
Review

Data-driven

Performance targets/goals

Assistance to disadvantaged

Fill funding gaps

Timely obligations

Transparency
Rolling focus
Recommended to

Balance targeted investment and support of multiple priorities

Provide opportunity to encourage priority project types

Be transparent, flexible and facilitate the ability to plan ahead
Applications* and funded projects, by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Expansion</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Area Safety</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Route</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Station</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Crossings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Speed Improvement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Applications are counted by the category that was determined to be the highest scoring, and includes projects that were evaluated for the Shared Fund that requested only CMAQ and/or TAP funding.
Options

Implement rolling focus as proposed in 2018

Implement rolling focus with revisions to areas/years

Incorporate focus areas into scoring

Continue with an open call for FFY 22-26 cycle, and revisit need for rolling focus after that cycle
# 2018 Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus areas:</td>
<td>ALL FOCUS AREAS ELIGIBLE</td>
<td>Grade crossing improvements</td>
<td>Road expansion</td>
<td>Truck route improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road reconstruction</td>
<td>Bridge replacement/reconstruction</td>
<td>Road reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus speed improvements</td>
<td>Corridor/small area safety improvements</td>
<td>Transit station improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Considerations

Additional project types

Impacts of councils targeting certain project types in local programs
Phase 1 Engineering
For transit station improvement projects, the sponsor must demonstrate that sufficient engineering and/or architectural work has been completed to establish accurate costs and a clear scope.
Issues with policy

Leaves too much room for interpretation

Transit vs. highway

Eligibility isn’t established until evaluation is nearly complete
Staff proposal

IDOT design approval or completion of NEPA (FONSI/ROD) prior to submitting application

• Purpose and need, scope, and reasonable cost estimate are critical for evaluation of projects

• Eliminates extra evaluation and scoring