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
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
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