

STP Project Selection Committee Update

Project Selection Committee

August 22, 2018

Summer Feedback

- **Combined presentations: APM and Shared Fund**
- **Draft Shared Fund Program Guidelines/Application Booklet**
 - Eligibility and scoring criteria
- **Draft Active Program Management Guidelines**
 - Applies to shared fund and local programs
- **Audiences**
 - Councils/Council committees
 - Sub-regional “Workshops”

Comment Summary through 8/21

- **Six letters and conversations at various meetings**
- **Shared Fund: eligibility, individual evaluation measures, other**
- **Active Program Management: extensions, contingency programs**
- **Other general comments:**
 - Evaluate programs over time to ensure goals being met
 - Concerned that geographic equity is not a goal/part of scoring
 - One commenter suggested elimination of road expansion category
 - One commenter suggested MPO should program 100% of funds
 - Request for access to data behind scoring, when available
 - Many questions/clarifications requested

Shared Fund Update

Comments on eligibility

- **Questions about eligibility of non-municipal sponsors (ex: IDOT, Counties, Service Boards, etc.) to apply on their own for the shared fund**
- **Concerns about ability for small communities to compete given minimum cost threshold. Request to add category for “low population communities”**

Comments on eligibility

- **Several comments on eligible project types:**
 - Bicycle/pedestrian/rail grade separations, regional trail gaps, and rail track improvements proposed as additional project types
 - One comment proposed eliminating roadway expansions
 - One proposed accepting applications of all types allowed under federal law
- **Concerns about rolling focus. Requests to eliminate categories or rolling focus altogether**

Comments on project readiness evaluation

- Requested a “sliding scale” of eligibility for phase 1 engineering based on community need
- Concerns about sponsor ability to secure additional funding (for financial commitment score)
- Questions and requests for clarification on what counts/does not count as a “local planning document”

Comments on transportation impact evaluation

- **Proposal that projects that score high in multiple project type categories receive additional points**
- **Concerns that population/jobs benefit methodology disadvantages less urban sponsors**

Comments on planning factor evaluation

- **Additional explanation and guidance requested for planning factors**
- **Concerns that inclusive growth factor is weighted too highly, and/or should only measure income, not race**
- **Comments that specific point values for categories were too high or too low**

Other shared fund comments

- **Proposal for councils/CDOT to award bonus points after other scores are tabulated rather than before**
- **Requests for a dollar amount or percent limit of available funds awarded to individual projects, individual councils/CDOT, and/or individual sponsors**

Active Program Management Update

Comments on Active Program Management Policies

- **Concerns about difficulties in managing contingency program**
- **Requests that extensions of obligation deadlines be longer than 6 months**

Next Steps

- **September: STP PSC finalizes proposal based on summer feedback**
- **Programming cycle begins with call for shared fund projects in January 2019 and local program projects in January 2020**
- **2019: Council methodology updates to include Active Program Management and Regional Planning Factors to be completed by September 2019**
- **2019: Data collection, allotments, and methodology for recalibrating distribution to account for improved performance**

Thank you

CMAP Staff Contacts:

Kama Dobbs
kdobbs@cmmap.illinois.gov
312-386-8710

Active Program Management

Elizabeth Irvin
eirvin@cmmap.illinois.gov
312-386-8669

Shared Fund