



MEETING NOTICE

**The Corridor MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization)
Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) will meet
November 2, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.
Multipurpose Room – Hiawatha City Hall
101 Emmons Street, Hiawatha**

Chair: Nate Kampman – Cedar Rapids

Vice Chair: Seth Gunnerson – Cedar Rapids

TTAC Voting Members: Steve Gannon & Randy Burke - Linn County; Dick Ransom - Hiawatha; Shane Wicks – Fairfax; Kesha Billings & Dan Whitlow - Marion; Scott Pottorff - Ely; Jon Bogert – Palo; Kelli Scott - Robins; Ron Griffith, Daniel Gibbins, Dave Wallace, Doug Wilson, Matt Myers, Steve Hershner, & Jason Middlekauff - Cedar Rapids; Tom Peffer - Linn County Trails Association.

TTAC Non-voting Members: Cathy Cutler - Iowa DOT; Darla Hugaboom- FHWA; Mark Bechtel - FTA

AMENDED AGENDA

Roll Call

Public Comment Period

Action/Discussion Items

1. **Approve Minutes – July 6, 2017.** Attached.

Informational Items

2. **TIP Project Review Process (Bill Micheel)**
3. **TIP Application Changes (Bill Micheel)**
4. **Iowa DOT TAP Funding Changes (Bill Micheel)**
5. **Iowa DOT Performance Measures**

Report Items/Member Updates

Next Scheduled Meeting

- December 7, 2017 at 2:00 p.m. Multipurpose Room, Hiawatha City Hall, 101 Emmons Street



Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) Meeting Notes – July 6, 2017

Present: Nate Kampman, Matt Myers, Brad DeBrower for Jason Middlekauff, Doug Wilson, Scott Pottorff, Larry Scott for Tom Peffer, Steve Gannon, Ron Griffith, Jon Bogert, Shane Wicks, Brenna Fall for Dave Wallace, Daniel Gibbins, Cathy Cutler

Absent: Dan Whitlow, Randy Burke, Kesha Billings, Kelli Scott, Dick Ransom, Steve Hershner, Seth Gunnerson

Staff: Hilary Hershner, Brandon Whyte, Bill Micheel, Kelly Brockway, Ollie Yang, Anne Kroll

Nate Kampman called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

AGENDA

Action/Discussion Items

1. **Approve Minutes – April 6, 2017**

Doug Wilson made a motion to approve the minutes from April 6, 2017. Shane Wicks seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. **Transit Performance Measures**

Brandon Whyte stated that Transit Asset Management (TAM) targets are required by the DOT. On January 1, 2017 CR Transit set their targets and the DOT is requiring the MPO to approve those targets. Mr. Whyte shared the targets and stated that the targets are quantifying the quality of the busses. The TERM scale is the standard for which the targets are measured.

Kampman asked if the targets are aggressive. Brad DeBrower stated that they are aggressive, but can be maintained. Having MPO funding will keep bus replacements on schedule.

Wilson asked if the targets are the same as the national targets. DeBrower stated that the national targets were used as a template for these targets. Whyte stated that there will be no penalty from Federal Highway if the targets are not met. This process will help compare state and national targets.

Wilson made a motion to approve the Transit Performance Measures. Wicks seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Informational Items

3. **Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFC) Update**

Hilary Hershner stated that TTAC created a prioritized list of recommended CUFC roadways to the Iowa DOT at their December 1, 2016 meeting. The roadways on the list were Wright Brothers Boulevard SW between Cessna Place SW and I-30, U.S. 30 between Edgewood Road SW and C Street SW, and Edgewood Road SW between Wright Brothers Boulevard SW and U.S. 30. Those roadways were approved by the Iowa



DOT. H. Hershner reviewed the National Highway Freight Program (NHFP) funding which averages out to \$15.7 million per year from FY 2016 to FY 2020. NHFP funds are available for any projects on the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN), portions of interstate system not on the primary highway freight network, CUFCs, and Critical Rural Freight Corridors (CRFC). Ten (10) percent of NHFP funds can be used on the NHFN for intermodal or freight rail projects.

Matt Myers asked if the 2016 funding has been spent. H. Hershner stated that there has been no implementation or guidance to how those funds are spent or can be applied for. The Committee had other questions about the program, but they could not yet be answered. As soon as staff has more information for the Iowa DOT about the program it will be shared with TTAC.

Report Items/Member Updates

4. Website Update

Bill Micheel stated that the City of Cedar Rapids is hosting the MPO website until a new one is developed. The selection committee chose Virtual Atlantic for the new MPO website as well as the Grant Wood Trails website. Micheel stated that the new websites are scheduled to be functional in six (6) to nine (9) months, but it could take longer than that.

Scott, Gannon, Cutler, DeBrower, Myers, Kampman, and Wilson gave an update on projects or news within their jurisdictions. Wilson asked staff how the modeling is coming along. Micheel stated that staff has started data collection and that the modeling is the first step to updating the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The Committee discussed using updated traffic data for the modeling.

Wilson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Wicks seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 2:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne Kroll, Administrative Assistant II



2. Proposed TIP Project Application Review Changes

BACKGROUND

In preparation for the this Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) cycle, MPO staff has reviewed concerns and comments made by Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) and Policy Board members in the recent past regarding the TIP project application review process. The two primary concerns are:

1. Each TIP project application does not receive the level of technical review that is desired; and
2. A summary of technical information for each project application and an explanation of TTAC's vote is not relayed to Executive Committee and the full Policy Board.

Staff is proposing the following two changes to the TIP project application review process used by TTAC to address these concerns.

DETAILS

Staff is proposing the following changes to the TIP project application review process:

1. In lieu of the February TTAC meeting, staff is proposing holding three small group meetings to complete in-depth technical project application review by transportation mode. A small group will be formed to review Road, Trail, and Transit projects. Each modal small group will be made up of TTAC members with expertise and/or interest in that particular transportation mode. These small groups will not be making recommendations to the full TTAC regarding the projects. The focus of these small groups will be identifying technical issues or concerns related to individual project applications.

After each small group meeting, staff will produce a standardized report including the comments made by the small group including any technical issues identified for each project application. These reports will be provided to applicants so that revisions can be considered prior to the March TTAC meeting. Each report will also be provided to all TTAC members as a part of the March TTAC meeting packet. During the March and April meetings, TTAC will review and take action on the project applications.

2. Staff will provide the Executive Committee and the Policy Board with the reports for each project application. In addition, notes regarding any discussion TTAC had related to each project and the vote made by TTAC will be provided.

SUMMARY

The purpose of the proposed changes are to ensure that each project application receives the appropriate level of technical review and to ensure that Executive Committee and Policy Board members are provided with an appropriate amount of supporting information to accompany TTAC's recommendation. These proposed changes will not amend the voting structure of TTAC or the number of TTAC meetings required to make a recommendation for the TIP cycle. Staff will make a recommendation at the upcoming TTAC meeting regarding the roster of each small group, however, it should be noted that the roster should focus on technical expertise/interest and not on jurisdictional representation. Staff is interested in facilitating a discussion about these proposed changes and reaching a consensus amongst TTAC members regarding the implementation of them.



3. TIP Application Changes

Every year minor changes are made to the TIP funding application. Generally, changes focus on the amount of money available and minor adjustments to the amount of information required for the project review process.

Due to changes in the Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funding from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Iowa Department of Transportation (DOT) some significant changes are required this year.

Background

With the passage of the last federal transportation bill, FAST ACT, all federally allocated TAP funding is required to be allocated on a statewide basis. As such, the Iowa DOT has decided to swap their federal Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG – Statewide) funds with local TAP monies. This will allow MPO's to maintain local project selection, as STBG – Statewide does not require a statewide selection process. STBG – Statewide has broader discretion granted than TAP funding. Funding swapped in this way will now be called STBG – TAP. STBG – TAP will still only be able to be used on non-motorized projects.

Due to TAP funding not being allocated in federal fiscal year (FFY) 2021, a result of consideration regarding these new funding requirements, STBG – TAP will be allocated for FFY21 and for the new monies in FFY22.

As TAP and STBG –TAP are only allowed to be used in non-motorized projects these changes primarily affect trail projects. However, some changes to the overall form were made to maintain consistency in the review process.

Impacts

Positive impacts from this change are:

- Local control over project selection is maintained at the Policy Board level.
- Management of funding is much simpler.
- Clear and known funding targets will be maintained.
- More detailed project reviews will occur.

Challenges generated from this change include:

- The Iowa DOT must review each trail project prior to Policy Board review. They will provide comments and indicate whether the project is eligible. It is important to note the Corridor MPO has never had an ineligible project before and we do not anticipate that being an issue.
- Additional staff time will be required to process. MPO staff believes that this process can be incorporated without adding additional time to the review process, however, there will be more staff time used to prepare the TIP due to an additional review process from the Iowa DOT.
- More detailed project applications will require more work from applicants to prepare. However, the vast majority of these additional requirements will only affect trail projects.



Details

All new additions or changes to the TIP application are highlighted in yellow in the attached TIP application. More impactful changes are described below:

- FFY21 TAP funding will be allocated as STBG – TAP along with new monies from FFY22.
- Iowa DOT has established a new funding mechanism to better support STBG - TAP projects along Iowa Byways and near schools. STBG – TAP projects (trails) can now receive up to 30% of their project costs from the Iowa DOT if they are funded by their local MPOs by at least 50%. The additional funding will be allocated through a separate process and competitively statewide. This is an effort from the Iowa Transportation Commission to encourage Safe Routes to School and Iowa Byways projects.
- Map sizes are now constrained to 8.5 by 11 inches. This is a DOT requirement to standardize printing of project maps.
- A sketch plan is required. Previously the MPO required plan sets that included cross sections. This change standardizes the language used. No real difference in the detail of project drawings is expected. This is a change to standardize all drawings across funding sources.
- Digital photographs are now required (minimum of one). This is a DOT requirement so that they can visually understand the area in question. It is believed this will also aid the TTAC, Executive Committee, and Policy Board in reviewing projects.
- For all trail projects Iowa DOT form 240004 (10-17) is required. This is a more detailed application than the MPO previously had. This form includes a minority impact statement along with a more detailed narrative than previously required. Form 240004 (10-17) can be reviewed in the following pages. This will only be needed for trails and is a requirement of the Iowa DOT.

These changes to the TIP application have been approved by the Policy Board on October 19, 2017.

**APPLICATION FORM FOR
IOWA'S TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP) FUNDS**

General information

Regional planning affiliation (RPA)/
Metropolitan planning organization (MPO) _____

Eligible sponsor/
applicant agency _____

Contact person
(name and title) _____

Street address and/or
box number _____

City _____ State _____

Phone number _____ Email _____

If more than one agency or organization is involved in this project, please state the name, contact person, mailing address, and telephone number of the second agency. *(Attach an additional page if more than two agencies are involved.)*

Applicant agency _____

Contact person
(name and title) _____

Street address and/or
box number _____

City _____ State _____

Phone number _____ Email _____

Project information

Project title _____

Project description (Provide summary details of only the project scope that is the subject of the funding request. Do not provide details of completed or future phases of a larger project.)

If this project includes construction of a trail, what is the length of the trail in miles? _____

If this project includes land acquisition, how many acres? _____

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) project (All information required by Attachment B must be included with this application.)

If a construction project, is this project located within 2 miles of a primary or middle school (grades K-8)? Yes No

Iowa Byways project

Is this project located within a designated scenic or historic byway corridor? Yes No

If yes, has the project been endorsed by the appropriate byway board? Yes No

Will this project be open to the public? Yes No

Do you intend to charge a fee to users? Yes No If yes, how much will the fee be and how will the revenue be used?

Estimated project costs

Provide summary details of only the project scope that is the subject of the funding request. Do not provide details of completed or future phases of a larger project.

Right of way acquisition cost _____

Preliminary design/engineering cost _____

Utility relocation cost _____

Construction engineering cost _____

Construction cost _____

Indirect cost (if applicable) _____

Noninfrastructure cost (SRTS only) _____

Other (please specify) _____

Total cost _____ \$0.00

Iowa's TAP program funding request _____

Applicant match (20 percent minimum) _____

	Applicant match source	Amount	Assured or anticipated (date anticipated)
1.			
2.			
3.			

Are any state funds involved in this project? Yes No

If yes, please explain the source and conditions.

Are any other federal funds involved in this project? Yes No

If yes, please explain the source and conditions. (Please note here if you have previously been awarded funding for this project from the Statewide TAP program or from a Local Project TAP program administered by an MPO or RPA.)

Estimated project development schedule

Design	Start date _____	Completion date _____
Land acquisition	Start date _____	Completion date _____
Construction	Start date _____	Completion date _____
Noninfrastructure	Start date _____	Completion date _____

Has any part of this project been started? Yes No

If yes, please explain.

Documentation and narrative information

The following documents and narratives must be submitted with this application. In the upper right corner of each document or narrative write the corresponding letter shown below.

- A. A **narrative** discussion of the project. Please **limit to five pages** in length. Your narrative should incorporate answers to the following questions.
1. What is the project? Provide a clear description of the concept of the proposed project, including such information as existing site conditions, trail length, number/acreage of parcels to be acquired, general construction activities planned, etc. For a nonconstruction project, provide a summary of the planned activities to be part of the project with a description of each. Remember to provide summary details of only the project scope that is the subject of the funding request. Do not provide details of completed or future phases of a project.
 2. Why is the project needed? Provide adequate project justification based on existing or estimated future use of the facility. If the project is a SRTS project, your discussion should address the existing hazards to walking or biking to school and how your project will mitigate these hazards.
 3. If your project is a trail or sidewalk project, how will it enhance connectivity to other existing transportation facilities or provide linkages with local amenities, activity nodes, or points of interest? This may include a description of how the project will assist older citizens, the economically disadvantaged, persons with disabilities, nondrivers, or other special populations or groups to access the transportation system.
 4. How does your project relate to the transportation system and what is its functional relationship, proximity, or impact to an existing or planned transportation facility? If this is a regional project, what is its value to your region and how will it be a functional addition to the transportation system and region as a whole if no additional development funds are received? If this is a statewide or multiregional project, assess the value of this project from a statewide or multiregional perspective.
 5. If this project is part of a larger multiphase project, how will your project complement the phases already completed or planned for the future? Keep in mind that the discussion of other completed or future phases of your project should not be the focus of your application or this narrative.
 6. How ready is your project to begin? For example, is all funding in place or are some initial steps completed (e.g., environmental studies, preliminary design)? If some parts of the project have already been started, describe how that head start will allow your project to move quickly once awarded.
 7. Are there environmentally sensitive or culturally significant areas that may be affected by your project? If so, how might those areas influence your project's ability to gain compliance with Section 106 or National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 requirements?
 8. To what degree will the proposed project fulfill the goals and/or priorities of the most recent MPO or RPA long-range transportation plan?
- B. A **detailed map** identifying the location of the project. The project scope should be clear and the map may also include other important information referred to in the narrative such as important transportation linkages, clearly marked completed or future project phases, etc. If the project is a SRTS project, the map shall indicate the K-8 school(s) to be served by the project, show a 2-mile radius of the school, identify neighborhoods served by the school, and hazards for children to walk or bike to school. More than one map may be submitted if the scope of the project is such that the desired detail is not feasible to be included on just one map. **Limit map sizes to no larger than 8.5-by-11-inches.**

- C. A **sketch plan** of the project, including cross section for bicycle or pedestrian facilities. If the cross section of your facility varies across the project (width, number of lanes, etc.) include a cross section for each situation and identify its location. (Required for construction projects only.)
- D. **Digital photographs (limit to five)** that will help to explain the existing site conditions of the proposed facility. It is not necessary to include photographs of all aspects or the entire route of a project. Photos submitted should be representative of the project as a whole or should support any particularly compelling or complex description included in the narrative provided in item A above.
- E. An **itemized breakdown** of the total project costs. This documentation does not need to be a detailed, line-item type estimate or formal engineer's opinion of probable cost. However, it must accomplish two objectives: 1) it must show the method by which the cost estimate was prepared; and 2) it must enable a reviewer to determine if the cost estimate is reasonable. The manner in which these objectives are achieved may vary widely depending on the type, scope, and complexity of the project. Absent a fully itemized list of costs, some general guidelines for possible methods of estimating each type of project cost are provided on Attachment A. The itemized breakdown should reflect costs in the planned project execution year estimated in your time schedule provided as part of item F below. It is preferable that this breakdown be provided by a licensed professional. If not, it is the responsibility of the applicant to explain the rationale and source of the assumptions used to develop the cost breakdown to allow a reviewer to have confidence in their accuracy.
- F. An estimated **time schedule** for the total project development. Local Project TAP program funded projects will be required to be programmed within the next four-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) window. Once programmed, a project funding agreement will be executed and projects will be required to submit a concept statement and initiate preliminary plans within the programmed year. Projects will be required to be let within two years of funds being available (programmed) to the project. Upon award and execution of a project funding agreement, projects that fail to make satisfactory progress may be terminated by the Iowa Department of Transportation.
- G. An **official endorsement** of the project from the authority to be responsible for the project's maintenance and operation. The authority must provide written assurance it will adequately maintain the completed project for its intended public use following project completion. For most construction projects, this will be a minimum of 20 years. The endorsement must also acknowledge the intent of the authority to provide the match funds required for the project. For cities, counties, or other political subdivisions, this should be in the form of a fully executed resolution by the elected body or board, as applicable.
- H. If applicable, a **letter of support** of the project from the scenic or heritage byway board. The board's letter should also address the project's relationship to the byway's intrinsic qualities, how the project will also have a statewide or multiregional impact, and whether the project is included in the byway's current corridor management plan.
- I. If applicable, the **items listed in Attachment B** shall be provided. If this project application is for a SRTS project, the applicant will complete and address the items provided in Attachment B, which are required only if the project is applying as a SRTS project. Failure to provide this information may result in the project not being considered as a SRTS project under the Statewide TAP program.
- J. A **narrative** discussing the public input process that was followed and the extent to which adjacent property owners and others have been informed of the proposed project and an assessment of their acceptance. As part of this narrative, also describe local and regional planning efforts related to the project, including whether it is listed in a long-range plan. Also include discussion of any partnerships among local organizations and stakeholders that this project may help to facilitate or how these entities or individuals have contributed to the development of the project concept or have committed financial or other support to the project.
- K. A **letter of support** from the Iowa DOT's district office if the project will include construction within Iowa DOT right of way.
- L. A completed **Minority Impact Statement**.

The award of Iowa's TAP program funds; any subsequent funding or letting of contracts for design, construction, reconstruction, improvement, or maintenance; or the furnishing of materials shall not involve direct or indirect interest, prohibited by Iowa Code 314.2, 362.5, or 331.342, of any state, county, or city official, elective or appointive. Any award of funding or any letting of a contract in violation of the foregoing provisions shall invalidate the award of funding and authorize a complete recovery of any funds previously disbursed.

Certification

To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information included in this application is true and accurate, including the commitment of all physical and financial resources. This application has been duly authorized by the participating local authority. I understand that the attached **official endorsement(s)** binds the participating authority to assume responsibility for adequate maintenance of any new or improved facilities.

I understand that, although this information is sufficient to secure a commitment of funds, an executed contract between the applicant and the Iowa DOT is required prior to the authorization of funds.

Representing the _____

Typed name and title

Minority Impact Statement

Pursuant to 2008 Iowa Acts, HF 2393, Iowa Code 8.11, all grants applications submitted to the State of Iowa that are due beginning Jan. 1, 2009, shall include a Minority Impact Statement. This is the state's mechanism for requiring grant applications to consider the potential impact of the grant project's proposed programs or policies on minority groups.

Please choose the statement(s) that pertains to this grant application. Complete all the information requested for the chosen statement(s). Submit additional pages as necessary.

- The proposed grant project programs or policies could have a disproportionate or unique **positive** impact on minority persons.
Describe the positive impact expected from this project.

Indicate which groups are impacted.

- Women Persons with a disability Blacks Latinos Asians
 Pacific Islanders American Indians Alaskan Native Americans Other _____

- The proposed grant project programs or policies could have a disproportionate or unique **negative** impact on minority persons.
Describe the negative impact expected from this project.

Present the rationale for the existence of the proposed program or policy.

Provide evidence of consultation with representatives of the minority groups impacted.

Indicate which groups are impacted.

- Women Persons with a disability Blacks Latinos Asians
- Pacific Islanders American Indians Alaskan Native Americans Other _____

The proposed grant project programs or policies are **not expected to have** a disproportionate or unique impact on minority persons.

Present the rationale for determining no impact.

I hereby certify that the information on this form is complete and accurate, to the best of my knowledge.

Name _____

Title _____

Definitions

"Minority Persons," as defined in Iowa Code 8.11, means individuals who are women, persons with a disability, Blacks, Latinos, Asians or Pacific Islanders, American Indians, and Alaskan Native Americans.

"Disability," as defined in Iowa Code 15.102, subsection 7, paragraph "b," subparagraph (1):

b. As used in this subsection:

(1) "*Disability*" means, with respect to an individual, a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of the individual, a record of physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of the individual, or being regarded as an individual with a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of the individual.

"*Disability*" does not include any of the following:

- (a) Homosexuality or bisexuality.
- (b) Transvestism, transsexualism, pedophilia, exhibitionism, voyeurism, gender identity disorders not resulting from physical impairments or other sexual behavior disorders.
- (c) Compulsive gambling, kleptomania, or pyromania.
- (d) Psychoactive substance abuse disorders resulting from current illegal use of drugs.

"State Agency," as defined in Iowa Code 8.11, means a department, board, bureau, commission, or other agency or authority of the State of Iowa.

REQUEST FOR IOWA'S TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP) FUNDS

ATTACHMENT A

Itemized breakdown of total project costs guidelines.

Construction costs

These may be based on historical averages for entire projects of similar size and scope. Examples include:

- Typical cost per mile of trail (e.g., \$XXX,XXX per mile for moderate terrain and limited number of structures).
- Typical cost per square foot of bridge deck.
- Typical cost per square foot of new or renovated building space.
- Typical cost per lineal foot of sidewalk.

Design/Inspection costs

These may be estimated based on the following typical percentages of construction costs, such as:

- 8 to 10 percent for preliminary up through final design and letting activities.
- 12 to 15 percent for construction inspection activities.

Right of way acquisition costs

These may be estimated based on:

- Impact and description of impact.
- Typical cost per square foot for permanent right of way.
- Typical cost per square foot for temporary easements.

Utility and railroad costs

These may be estimated based on:

- Impact and description of impact.
- Typical cost per linear foot of relocated or reconstructed facility (i.e., track, pipe, electrical lines).
- Typical cost per installation (i.e., railroad switches, utility poles, transformers, control boxes).

Indirect costs

If indirect costs are involved (e.g., wages):

- Estimated hours.
- Estimated hourly rate, salary.
- Estimated fringe, direct.
- Other direct cost estimate.
- Other indirect cost estimate.

REQUEST FOR IOWA'S TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM (TAP) FUNDS

ATTACHMENT B

For Safe Routes to School (SRTS) projects only.

1. Provide the following information about the affected school and student population. (To answer items f, g, h, and i below, use the data collection forms, tips, and instructions provided at <http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/data-central/data-collection-forms> to gather the necessary data. **Do not** send your survey forms with this application.)
 - a) School name
 - b) Grades of students at school
 - c) Number of students at school
 - d) Number of K-8 students at school
 - e) Distance eligibility for riding a bus (radius) in miles
 - f) Number of K-8 students who currently walk to school
 - g) Number of K-8 students who currently bicycle to school
 - h) Number of K-8 students currently driven to school
 - i) Number of K-8 students currently bused to school
 - j) Number of K-8 children eligible for busing
 - k) Number of K-8 students who attend this school and live within 2 miles of the school

2. A narrative discussing your plans for evaluating the success of the project. The SRTS program goal is to enable and encourage more children to walk and bicycle to school. How will you measure your success? What method will you use to determine whether more children are walking and bicycling to school? What are your specific user goals for this project? Your plans for measurement should minimally include using the student survey forms provided at <http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/data-central/data-collection-forms> **to gather before and after figures for the number of K-8 students who are:**
 - a) Walking to school.
 - b) Bicycling to school.
 - c) Driven to school.
 - d) Bused to school.



4. Iowa DOT TAP Funding Changes

Background

With the passage of the last federal transportation bill, FAST ACT, all federally allocated TAP funding is required to be allocated on a statewide basis. As such, the Iowa DOT has decided to swap their federal Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG – Statewide) funds with local TAP monies. This will allow MPO's to maintain local project selection, as STBG – Statewide does not require a statewide selection process. STBG – Statewide has broader discretion granted than TAP funding. Funding swapped in this way will now be called STBG – TAP. STBG – TAP will still only be able to be used on non-motorized projects.

On October 9, 2017 Iowa DOT released new funding guidance regarding the use of STBG – TAP dollars. These changes were made to insure timely completion of projects.

Details

Significant changes can be summarized in two categories: project development and programing constraints:

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

- Agreements with the DOT will be sent to project sponsors just prior to the program year (if not requested by the sponsor before) and will be required to be executed within 60-90 days of receipt.
- Submission of a concept statement and development of preliminary plans are required within Year 1.
- Letting of the project is required within Year 2.
- Failure of the above may be grounds for cancellation of a project.
- Due to the above, it is important that agencies program the projects in a realistic accomplishment year.

PROGRAMMING CONSTRAINTS:

- Funding within the 4-year TIP timeframe may be advanced to earlier years of the TIP. This should be done only for projects that are ready to move forward with development and authorization.
- Balance accrual: STBG - TAP balance accrual, as tracked on the quarterly reports, will be limited to a maximum of four years. On September 30, 2020 DOT staff will determine the amount of STBG – TAP funding allocated for the previous four years. If an MPO's outstanding balance (monies unallocated and allocated to projects; monies not spent yet) exceeds the previous four years summation of funding, either new STBG – TAP funding to the MPO will not be awarded or existing funding allocated to projects will be reallocated elsewhere in the state.
- The DOT cautions, "This means if you have a balance in excess of four years of funding, you should plan to award the excess to projects that can reach authorization between now and the end of FFY2020."



New tap funding mechanism

Additionally the DOT has established a new funding mechanism to better support Iowa's Byways and Safe Routes to School Projects. Per DOT STBG - TAP guidance, all MPO funded projects that utilize STBG - TAP funds and have more than 50% MPO funding are eligible to receive up to 30% Statewide TAP funds (usually \$1,000,000 per year) on a competitive basis. This 30% funding cannot be used to offset the local 20% matching funds. STBG - TAP projects must be located along a statewide byway or show a positive benefit for a local school. This is an effort from the Iowa Transportation Commission to encourage Safe Routes to School and Iowa Byways projects.

Impacts

The new project development requirements will require an increased speed in project completion from our local communities. Currently very few projects are being completed within these timeframes. Project development will need to be increased, or more shovel ready projects should be selected for funding.

Regarding programming constraints, MPO staff believes that the ability to move STBG – TAP monies up to earlier FFYs is a huge improvement that will allow some projects to start the development process a year or more in advance.

The cap on STBG – TAP spending is a significant change to previous policy from the DOT, the impacts of not spending enough of our funding have the potential to significantly lower the number of projects completed IF projects are not developed quickly. However, given the new emphasis to complete projects faster and the ability to move project-funding forward (STBG – TAP projects only), MPO staff believes we should be able to be under this cap by September 30, 2020.

Lastly, MPO staff anticipates that a similar cap on STBG projects and faster project development requirements will be required future years. Again, currently the above rules only apply to STBG – TAP projects (some but not all trail projects).

Regarding the additional funding opportunity provided by the DOT to support Byways and Safe Routes to School, MPO staff believes our MPO is aggressively positioned to utilize these funds. Possessing several Iowa Byways and ample trail funding, competitive opportunities for MPO trail projects can be found along Byways and Schools. MPO staff will work with member communities to apply for this additional funding opportunity.



5. Iowa DOT Performance Measures

Background

The Iowa DOT submitted its Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) annual report to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in September of this year. This report includes the State’s 2014-2018 safety targets for the performance measures established in 23 § 490.207.

Per 23 § 490.209, each MPO must establish 2014-2018 safety targets for the five performance measures within 180 days of the State, by February 27, 2018. For each performance measure, the MPO will need to choose one of two options:

- 1) Support the State’s target by agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute toward the accomplishment of the State DOT safety target for that performance measure; or
- 2) Set a quantifiable target for that performance measure for the MPO.

MPO targets would be for all public roadways within the MPO’s planning area boundary, regardless of functional classification or ownership. MPO’s that establish their own targets for fatality rate or serious injury rate will need the report the VMT methodology and estimate used in developing the rate for the target.

Details

The Iowa DOT’s safety targets and performance measures are outlined in the table below:

Performance Measures	Five Year Rolling Averages	
	2012-2016 Baseline	2014-2018 Target
Number of Fatalities	345.4	367.9
Fatality Rate*	1.063	1.080
Number of Serious Injuries	1529.0	1562.2
Serious Injury Rate*	4.707	4.587
Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	144.2	150.7

*Rates are per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT)

Staff Recommendation/Next Steps

Staff recommends adopting the Iowa DOT’s safety targets and performance measures, including the safety targets and performance measures in the forthcoming update to the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), and focus on these safety targets when reviewing the project selection scoring criteria during the update to the LRTP.



Smarter Transportation, Better Community

101 First Street SE
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401
319.286.5041
corridormpo@corridormpo.com
www.corridormpo.com

If the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) makes a recommendation during the November meeting, the adoption process for safety targets and performance measures will follow the schedule below:

1. November 2nd, 2017 – TTAC recommendation
2. December 13th, 2017 – Executive Committee recommendation
3. January 18th, 2018 – Policy Board adoption