STP Shared Local Fund: Program Structure and Project Eligibility

February 28, 2017
Review

• New STP agreement calls for shared fund of approximately $40 m/year
• Meant for larger projects that Council allotments cannot readily fund
• Shared Fund Project Selection Committee oversees program
• CMAP staff to make recommendations on program design for the Shared Fund
Shared Fund Development Timeline

- **February 2018**
  - *Project eligibility and program structure*

- **April**
  - Draft selection criteria and scoring proposal

- **June**
  - Revised selection criteria and scoring proposal

- **Summer**
  - Council and partner feedback

- **September**
  - Committee approval

- **January 2019**
  - Call for projects
Today

- Goals and project types
- Establishing what is a regional project
- Running the call for projects
- Phase eligibility

Future meetings

- Project scoring system
- Supporting disadvantaged communities’ participation in STP-L program
Shared fund + active program management

- Active program management was the focus of January meeting, upcoming March meeting

- Shared fund will have active program management

- Goals of active program management for shared fund:
  - *Program projects that will be ready to obligate in programmed year*
  - *Build a pipeline of projects for future calls*
Considerations for priority project types

• Previously discussed Principles for Programming
• ON TO 2050 implementation
• Potential demand from currently unfunded local projects
• Leveraging and filling gaps between other fund sources
Previously discussed: Principles for programming

From agreement: “Make large and lasting contributions to regional priorities” specifically:

- Improve transportation system condition using asset management principles
- Support local planning priorities
- Improve transit access and service quality
- Improve infrastructure in areas of economic distress
- Reduce congestion
- Promote economic growth
- Support natural resources
- Improve safety
ON TO 2050 Mobility recommendations (draft)

- Harness technology to improve travel and anticipate future needs
- Make transit more competitive
- Leverage the transportation network for inclusive growth
- Eliminate traffic fatalities
- Improve the resilience of the transportation network
- Retain the region’s status as North America’s freight hub
- Fully fund the region’s transportation system
- Build regionally significant transportation projects
Potential demand

- Developed sample of unfunded projects
- Reviewed:
  - Councils’ TIP projects with funding in MYB/Future Fiscal Year
  - Unfunded applications from council calls for projects

Note: only projects $5 million and above included
Leveraging and filling gaps between other fund sources

- CMAQ – no new highway capacity, no maintenance projects
- TAP-L – only bicycle trails
- Invest in Cook -- could help engineer projects to ready them for STP Shared Fund or provide match
- IDOT local programs (HSIP, TARP, ITEP, etc.) – either narrowly focused or oversubscribed
- FTA programs – focused on transit state of good repair, stretched very thin
- STP local distribution – tends to be smaller projects
Staff recommendation- priority project types:

- Road reconstructions with complete streets
- Transit station reconstructions
- Bridge replacement and reconstruction
- Grade separations
- Road expansion with transit preference and/or ITS improvements
- Bus speed improvements
- Corridor-level or small area safety improvements
- Truck route improvements
Example of less-developed project type:

Truck route improvements

Table A.1 Identified Capital Improvements on the A/B Truck Route Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality / Agency</th>
<th>TIP ID or Project Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Type and Description</th>
<th>Truck Route Level</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bellwood</td>
<td>Mannheim Rd. Intersection Improvements (Butterfield Rd. and Warren Rd./ Prairie Path)</td>
<td>Mannheim Rd. and Butterfield Rd. and Mannheim Rd. and Butterfield Rd. intersections</td>
<td>Mannheim Rd. &amp; Butterfield Rd.: calm Butterfield Rd. - cut off access, Mannheim Rd. &amp; Warren Rd. (Prairie Path) - add signal</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellwood</td>
<td>Diverging Diamond Interchange Concept</td>
<td>I-290 at 25th Ave.</td>
<td>Signature street which includes pedestrian improvements, gateway elements, street lighting, and signage to make attractive.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bensenville</td>
<td>2017 Village St. Program – Downtown Phase I</td>
<td>York Rd.</td>
<td>Streetscape on York Rd.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Depends on exact location of project</td>
<td>1,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook County</td>
<td>Map ID 47</td>
<td>County Line Rd. from I-294 to North Ave.</td>
<td>New Roadway construction, pavement reconstruction, and intersection reconfiguration</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>32,646</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Plaines</td>
<td>03-09-0061</td>
<td>U.S. 14 at Broadway St.</td>
<td>Intersection/Interchange Improvement</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3,093</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Plaines</td>
<td>03-14-0004</td>
<td>Cumberland Circle</td>
<td>Convert traffic circle to modern roundabout; resurface and ADA improvements on Wolf Rd.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4,376</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What defines a “regional project” for the shared fund?

Options:

- Minimum project cost threshold
- Multi-jurisdictional applications
- Council support requirements
Option: minimum cost threshold

- **Positives:**
  - Simple and clear
  - Encourages larger projects
  - Encourages collaboration among municipalities

- **Challenges:**
  - Fairness for projects just under the cost threshold
  - Enabling equal access to funding for communities with smaller local allocations
Option: multi-jurisdictional requirement

- **Positives:**
  - Encourages collaboration among municipalities
  - More “programs of projects”

- **Challenges:**
  - Defining multi-jurisdictional (how many communities? Counties? IDOT? Transit agencies?)
  - Keeping projects coordinated and moving through process
Option: council support

- **Positives:**
  - Offers councils opportunity for additional local prioritization
  - Potentially fewer projects to evaluate at regional selection stage

- **Challenges:**
  - Could eliminate projects with high regional benefit
  - Differences between council selection processes
Staff proposal

- Minimum project cost: $5 million in total project cost
  OR
- Multijurisdictional: joint application from at least 3 local parties

Whether there is City/Council support should be a part of project scoring, not eligibility
Options for Program Structure

- Narrowly Tailored
- Rolling Focus
- Open Call
Option: Open Call, Wide Eligibility

- **Positives:**
  - Support all programming principles
  - Many potential projects
  - Easy for implementers to plan around

- **Challenges:**
  - Risks spreading resources thinly across many projects and goals
  - Complicated and time-consuming evaluation process
  - Difficult to emphasize/weight highest priority principles or project types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSP ID</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>A_Congested VHT for Heavy Trucks in Region (1000’s daily hours)</th>
<th>A_Congested VHT for Heavy Trucks in Corridor (1000’s daily hours)</th>
<th>Freight Needs</th>
<th>A_Greenhouse Gas Emissions (metric tons/day in 2050)</th>
<th>A_Development Pressure in Conservation Areas (count of new households)</th>
<th>A_Development Pressure in Scarce groundwater Areas (count of new households)</th>
<th>A_Impervious Area (area in acres)</th>
<th>Project Use by Residents of EDAs (% of VHT)</th>
<th>A_Fine Particulate Matter Emissions in EDAs (g/day in 2050)</th>
<th>A_In Access to Low Barrier Jobs for Economically Disconnected Areas</th>
<th>Economic Impact Due to Industry Clustering (30%)</th>
<th>Support of Infill Development</th>
<th>Benefit to Key Industries</th>
<th>Benefits to Areas with Industrial Vacancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>McHenry-Lake Corridor</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>N8</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I-290/I-53 Interchange Improvement</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I-294/I-57 Interchange Addition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option: Narrowly Tailored Program

- **Positives:**
  - Opportunity to make focused impact
  - Could emphasize projects that don’t have another dedicated funding source
  - Compare apples to apples in project evaluation

- **Challenges:**
  - Small universe of potential projects
  - Difficulty of reaching consensus on project type priority
  - Less flexibility

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completion of Regional Greenways and Trails Plan (30 points max)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population + Employment Density within Buffer Area [proxy for usage] (30 max)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Design Quality (30 max)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety/attractiveness rating improvement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0: Impassable barrier for walking and bicycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Arterial road with no bike/ped accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Arterial road with some bike/ped accommodation, including marked shared lanes, and collector streets with no accommodation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Low-speed, local streets with no bike/ped accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Unprotected bike lane; local and collector streets with full accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Trail or arterial sidepath, cycletrack, protected bike lane, or buffered bike lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bonus (10 max)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Proposal: Rolling Focus Program

- **Positives:**
  - Balances targeted investment and support of multiple priorities
  - Provides opportunity to encourage priority project types that aren’t currently ready to apply
  - Transparency and the ability to plan ahead

- **Challenges:**
  - Establishing and communicating future program focuses with sufficient lead time for implementers
  - Predicting future regional needs
# Staff Proposal for rolling focus program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First call (2019)</th>
<th>second call (2021)</th>
<th>third call (2023)</th>
<th>fourth call (2025)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program years:</strong></td>
<td>2020-2024</td>
<td>2025-2026</td>
<td>2027-2028</td>
<td>2029-2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount</strong></td>
<td>$200M</td>
<td>$80M</td>
<td>$80M</td>
<td>$80M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus areas:</strong></td>
<td>Transit station</td>
<td>Truck route improvements</td>
<td>grade separation</td>
<td>truck route improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road reconstruction</td>
<td>Road expansion</td>
<td>Road reconstruction</td>
<td>Bridge replacement/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with complete streets</td>
<td>with transit</td>
<td>with complete streets</td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>facilities or ITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade separation</td>
<td>Bus speed improvements</td>
<td>Corridor/small area</td>
<td>Transit station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>area safety</td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge replacement/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation of rolling focus

- **Options:**
  - Only projects in focus areas are eligible for funding
  - At least $X$ projects per focus area
  - Target funding levels for each focus area
  - Additional priority given to projects in each focus area in the scoring system
Staff proposal

- First priority: projects in focus areas of call
- Second priority: projects in upcoming focus areas
Considerations for engineering eligibility

Should engineering be eligible for funding?

- **Positives:**
  - Locals may be reluctant to fund engineering for larger projects
  - Particularly challenging for low-capacity communities

- **Challenges:**
  - Requiring Phase I to be finished removes source of project delay in program and defines project scope/cost better
  - Consistency: other CMAP funding programs require local funding of Phase I
Phase eligibility

Staff proposal

- High need communities are eligible for Phase I funding

- Additional phases may not be programmed until phase I is complete

- Further discussion about ways to incentivize completion of phase I as part of active program management and evaluation methods
Evaluation approach should:

- Be quantitative and leverage available data
- Be transparent
- Tie to federal performance measures
- Incorporate qualitative information (ex: council support, ability to deliver project)
- Address cost effectiveness

Looking Ahead: Evaluation Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong></td>
<td>Number of accessible jobs, Increase in jobs, Number of low to moderate income persons, Existing transit ridership, Presence of transit deserts, Number of acres of vacant land, Traffic congestion/delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Project Buffer: ½ mile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Project Buffer: ¼ mile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Alternatives</strong></td>
<td>Number of existing jobs, Number of low to moderate income persons*, Number of bike/pedestrian crashes, Connections to bicycle trip generators, Miles of existing trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Project Buffer: ½ mile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Project Buffer: 1 mile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freight Transportation</strong></td>
<td>Increase in jobs, Proximity to industrial uses, Number of low to moderate income persons*, Number of accessible jobs, Number of acres of vacant industrialized land, Truck and/or train traffic count (IDOT or locally generated), Traffic congestion/delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Project Buffer: 1 mile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equal Access to Opportunity</strong></td>
<td>Number of low to moderate income persons*, Number of accessible jobs, Presence of transit deserts*, Transportation asset’s condition, Reduction in rail crossing delay*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer determined by project mode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintain and Modernize</strong></td>
<td>Increase in jobs, Number of low to moderate income persons*, Number of accessible jobs, Transportation asset’s condition, Segment fatalities and serious injuries, Number of acres of vacant land, Traffic congestion and delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Project Buffer: 1 mile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality and Injury Buffer: 100 ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invest in Transportation</strong></td>
<td>Leverage ratio, Availability of full funding for the requested project phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please refer to maps provided on the Invest in Cook homepage for visualizations of transit deserts and disadvantaged community locations.
Next steps

- Any additional thoughts/comments about topics discussed today?
- Any initial thoughts about evaluation measures?

Elizabeth Irvin
Eirvin@cmap.Illinois.gov
312-386-8669