



AGENDA

Peoria-Pekin Urbanized Area Transportation Study (PPUATS)

Technical Committee

Wednesday, January 15, 2020 at 9:00 am

456 Fulton St., Suite 420

Peoria, IL 61602

-
1. Call to Order
 2. Roll Call
 3. Public Comment
 4. Approval of Minutes, November 20, 2019 Meeting
 5. Recommend to Policy Committee November/December Financial Report – *Memo*
 6. Recommend to Policy Committee HSTP Urban Committee Appointments – *Memo*
 7. Recommend to Policy Committee TIP Amendments – IDOT – *Attachment*
 - a. Project S-20-41 Ramp Modification
 - b. Project S-20-42 Traffic Signals
 8. Recommend to Policy Committee TIP Amendment – Broadway Rd – *Attachment*
 9. Recommend to Policy Committee FY 2023-24 STBG Instructions & Criteria – *Memo*
 10. Updates
 - a. Long-Range Transportation Plan
 - b. IDOT Local Roads
 11. Other
 - a. Next meeting scheduled for February 19, 2020
 12. Adjournment

The MPO receives federal funding and may not discriminate against anyone on the basis of race, color, or national origin according to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For more information or to obtain a Title VI complaint form, call 309-673-9330.

Tri-County Regional Planning Commission strives to provide an environment welcoming to all persons regardless of physical or mental challenges, race, gender, or religion. Please call 309-673-9330 to request special accommodations at least two business days in advance.

MINUTES

Peoria-Pekin Urbanized Area Transportation Study (PPUATS)

Technical Committee

Wednesday, November 20, 2019 at 9:00 am

456 Fulton St., Suite 420

Peoria, IL 61602

1. Call to Order
Interim McLaren called the meeting to order at 9:00 am

2. Roll Call

Member	Present	Absent	Member	Present	Absent
Amy Benecke-McLaren, Peoria County	x		Dustin Sutton* Peoria Heights		x
Jeff Gilles, Peoria County	x		City of Washington		
Keith Munter, Peoria County*		x	Jon Oliphant, City of Washington*	x	
Craig Fink, Tazewell County	x		Patrick Meyer, Village of Bartonville	x	
Dan Parr, Tazewell County	x		Terrisa Worsfold, IDOT	x	
Conrad Moore, Woodford County	x		Karen Dvorsky* IDOT		x
Bill Lewis, City of Peoria	x		James Dillon., City of West Peoria		x
Nick Stoffer, City of Peoria	x		Henry Strube, Jr., City of West Peoria*		x
Stephen Letsky, City of Peoria	x		Craig Loudermilk, Village of Morton	x	
Jane Gerdes* City of Peoria		x	Frank Sturm, Village of Morton*		x
Andrea Klopfenstein* City of Peoria		x	Kenneth Coulter, City of Chillicothe	x	
Emily Ambroso* City of Peoria		x	Courtney Allyn, Village of Creve Coeur	x	
Michael Guerra, City of Peoria	x		Nick Standefer, CityLink		x
Josie Esker,* City of Peoria		x	Joe Alexander*, CityLink	x	
Rick Semonski, City of East Peoria		x	Gene Olson, MAAP		x
Ty Livingston, City of East Peoria	x		Eric Miller, TCRPC	x	
Mike Casey, Peoria Heights	x		Rich Brecklin, Village of Germantown Hills	x	

Staff: Ryan Harms, Hannah Martin and Ray Lees. Also, present: Ken Park-IDOT, Cindy Loos- Hanson, and Curtis Jones- IDOT

3. Public Comment- nothing to report
4. Approval of Minutes, September 18, 2019 Meeting
Livingston moved to approve the minutes of September 18, 2019 and Loudermilk seconded as amended. Motion carried. Fink mentioned that on number 8, bullet point 12, he did not make that statement and that in the paragraph starting with Resurfacing that should be another bullet point. Fink moved to amend, and Moore seconded. Motion carried.
5. Nomination of PPUATS Technical Chair
McLaren moved to nominate Ric Semonski as PPUATS Technical chair and Fink seconded. She mentioned she has talked to Ric and he agreed he would take chair position. Motion carried.
6. Nomination of PPUATS Technical Vice-Chair
McLaren mentioned to activate the nomination committee and to come up with a vice chair. The nomination committee is, McLaren, Fink, and Miller.
7. Recommend to Policy Committee September/October Financial Report – *Memo*
Gilles moved to recommend to Policy Committee September/October Financial Report and Oliphant seconded. Motion carried.
 - Miller updated the total budget for FY20 is \$825,194. As of the end of October 2019, PPUATS has used approximately 33% of its budget.
 - Letsky asked about the Bob Michel pedestrian study funds.
 - Miller replied that the \$90,000 that was going to be used for this has been put back in since the state projects includes the study.
8. Recommend to Policy TIP Amendments – IDOT FY 2020-22 Projects – *Memo*
Alexander moved to recommend to Policy TIP Amendments- IDOT FY 2020-22 Projects and Guerra seconded. Motion carried. Worsfold explained the proposed amendments for FY2020-23.
9. Recommend to Policy Committee FY 2023-24 STBG Instructions & Criteria – *Memo*
Fink moved to recommend to Policy Committee FY2023-24 STBG Instructions & Criteria and Coulter seconded.
 - Fink brought up Betsy Tracy comments from the STBG subcommittee of the modification suggested. “A jurisdiction that received funding for new roadways, existing roadways, or resurfacing in either FY21 or FY22 is not eligible to receive funding for resurfacing in FY23 of FY24 of the program continues.” She stated this may circumvent that by indication if you received one award you cannot receive another one. The best projects in the region should probably rise to the top in applications and scoring. This suggested change may block otherwise good projects from being submitted and completely scored.
 - Fink felt we need PE certification.
 - Stoffer asked if we will continue the PILOT program for another round?

- Gilles said we cannot allocate
- Loudermilk commented there is no way we can prioritize.

Discussion was held on resurfacing prioritizing and chances of getting resurfacing funds.

- Guerra mentioned to change the regional significances for scoring.
- Harms reminded the subcommittee that East Peoria reduced the scope and cost of FY20 STBG project to only \$800,000 STBG funds. This leaves various options for the unprogrammed FY20 funds.
- Stoffer suggested on voting on programming of the 1st page
- Fink suggested to table until next month so to work out the scoring.
- Letsky asked to approve the STU finds of FY 21/22 projects as presented.

Fink moved to amend their motion of approving the STU funds of FY21/22 projects and Coulter seconded. Motion carried.

Fink motioned to defer and send the second half back to subcommittee for more clarification of FY22/24. Motion carried.

10. Recommend to Policy Committee FY 2020 Special Transportation Planning Studies – *Memo*
 Letsky moved to recommend to Policy Committee FY2020 Special Transportation Planning Studies and Fink seconded. Motion carried.

Harms explained the staff released a call for projects to all jurisdictions in the urbanized area. The 4 studies accepted are: Morton Bike Master Plan, Peoria Pavement Management Decision, Peoria County Regional Smart Mobility Plan- Phase II and Woodford County Asset Feasibility, Data Collection, and Management Project.

11. Updates

- a. Long-Range Transportation Plan

Harms explained the focus groups that are being held.

Spring of 2020 will have a recommendation to Policy for Call for Projects.

- b. IDOT Local Roads

Park updated the Multiyear programming is out and needs to be submitted by Friday, November 22, 2019.

Harms updated on the statewide MPO Illinois Highway System

12. Other

- a. Next meeting scheduled for January 15, 2019-ok

- b. Guerra mentioned that APWA has been losing money the past few years and is in discussion of maybe charging a small fee to attend. Miller said that the UPWP budget is going to be reviewed. We need to have skin in the game to attend. This is a valuable conference.

13. Adjournment

Letsky moved to adjourn at 10:30 am and Fink seconded. Motion carried.

Submitted by:

Eric Miller

Executive Director

Recorded and transcribed by Debbie Ulrich

DRAFT



MEMORANDUM

TO: PPUATS Technical Committee
FROM: Staff
SUBJECT: November & December 2019 Financial Report and Performance Report
DATE: January 15, 2020

Action needed by Technical Committee:

Recommend to Policy Committee approval of Nov/Dec 2019 Financial Report and Performance Report.

Background:

The total budget for FY20 is \$825,194. As of the end of October 2019, PPUATS has expended approximately 46% of its budget.

FY20 PL/FTA Budget – November & December 2019

	FY20	Nov-19	Dec-19	YTD	% USED YTD	REMAINING
Salaries	\$315,160	\$24,930	\$23,873	\$170,613	51%	\$160,796
Fringe Benefits	\$99,911	\$7,474	\$7,520	\$50,275	59%	\$34,534
TOTAL SALARIES	\$415,071	\$32,404	\$31,393	\$220,888	53%	\$195,329
INDIRECT COSTS	\$241,862	\$9,964	\$9,653	\$96,852	42%	\$135,772
Other Direct Costs						
Travel/Training/Conferences	\$15,000	\$856		\$7,717	51%	\$7,283
APWA Conference	\$7,500		\$7,500	\$7,500	100%	\$0
Computer Hardware & Software	\$30,000		\$500	\$15,950	64%	\$9,050
Contractual - Special Projects	\$90,000			\$0	0%	\$92,076
Audit	\$24,000	\$7,000	\$2,000	\$23,000	96%	\$1,000
Misc (Legal Notices, Printing)	\$1,761		\$276	\$532	11%	\$4,468
TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS	\$168,261	\$7,856	\$10,276	\$54,698	32%	\$113,878
TOTAL	\$825,194	\$50,225	\$51,322	\$372,438	46%	\$444,979

PPUATS Technical Committee

Page 2

January 15, 2020

PPUATS MONTHLY PERFORMANCE REPORT

November & December 2019

Management and Administration

- Hosted meetings of PPUATS Technical and Policy Committees
- Prepared financial records and developed drawdown request for IDOT funds
- Attended Peoria Chamber Transportation Committee meeting
- Attended Pekin Chamber Transportation Committee meeting
- Participated in monthly conference call of statewide HSTP Coordinators
- Attended CityLink Board meeting
- Participated in CityLink ADA Committee

Data Development and Maintenance

- Continued to maintain regional GIS data
- Continued development of regional pavement management system
- Continued regional GIS guardrail inventory
- Continued work on TCRPC/PPUATS website updates
- Responded to technical assistance requests for GIS

Long Range Planning

- Continued to implement Regional Bicycle Plan
- Met weekly for 2020-2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan development and coordination
- Held focus group meetings for 2020-2045 LRTP
- Continued development of 2020-2045 LRTP Call for Projects

Short Range Planning

- Evaluated project eligibility for FY20 Special Transportation Planning Studies
- Monitored and made administrative changes to TIP
- Hosted STBG Subcommittee meeting



MEMORANDUM

TO: PPUATS Technical Committee
FROM: Staff
SUBJECT: Urban HSTP Steering Committee Appointment
DATE: January 15, 2020

Action needed by Technical Committee:

Recommend that Policy Committee appoints an individual to serve on the Urban HSTP Steering Committee for a 3-year term.

Background:

Since 2007, Tri-County has convened regular meetings to guide the coordination strategy for Human Services Transportation in both the urbanized area and 7 surrounding rural counties. Counties appoint individuals to serve on the rural committee on 3-year terms. The MPO appoints individuals to serve on the urban committee for 3-year terms. The following people and organizations have been recommended by HSTP staff based on contributions or potential contributions to the HSTP process.

Urban HSTP Committee

Name	Title	Representing
Adam Duvall	Independent Living Coordinator	Advocates for Access

MEMORANDUM

TO: PPUATS Technical Committee

FROM: Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Process/Criteria Subcommittee

SUBJECT: FY23-24 STBG Process and Scoring Criteria

DATE: January 15, 2020

Background

At their September meeting, the PPUATS Technical Committee directed staff to assemble a subcommittee of Technical and Policy members to discuss and recommend process, instructions, and criteria for the FY23-24 STBG (formerly named STU) funding round. The subcommittee met at the offices of Tri-County Regional Planning Commission on October 16, 2019.

PPUATS Technical Reviewed the recommendation from this subcommittee at their November meeting. After discussion, the subcommittee was directed to reconvene and re-evaluate a portion of their recommendation. The subcommittee met again at the offices of Tri-County Regional Planning Commission on January 8, 2020.

Call to Order/Roll Call

Called to order at 9:00am. In attendance: Barry Logan (Policy), James Dillon (Policy), Tom O'Neill (Policy), Terrisa Worsfold, (Technical), Patrick Meyer (Technical), Craig Fink (Technical), Nick Stoffer (Technical); Conrad Moore (Woodford County), Craig Loudermilk (Village of Morton), Ric Semonski (City of East Peoria), Mike Guerra (City of Pekin); Betsy Tracy (FHWA); Eric Miller (staff), Hannah Martin (staff), Ryan Harms (staff).

Review of Meeting Summary – October 16, 2019 Meeting

A memo of the October 16, 2019 Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Process/Criteria Subcommittee was made available to all present. Harms summarized it orally as well. Fink noted that the memo shared via email inaccurately attributed comments made at the meeting. He provided a corrected version to those in attendance.

Review of Minutes – November 20, 2019 Technical Committee Meeting

At the November Technical Committee Meeting, the subcommittee's recommendations were reviewed and discussed. The recommendations coming from the October 16 meeting were as follows:

- Regarding the recently unobligated 2.1M FY20 STBG funds, the subcommittee agreed that \$693,000 of the unprogrammed FY20 STBG funds should go toward restoring FY21-22 projects to their requested funding amounts and the remaining funds should be incorporated into the FY23-24 funding round: \$1,125,600 going toward the traditional STBG program and \$281,400 toward the maintenance set-aside pilot program.

This recommendation was well-received by the Technical Committee. No further adjustment necessary.

- The subcommittee offered no changes to the FY23-24 New/Existing Roadway Instructions & Criteria.

- Regarding the Fy23/24 Resurfacing Set-Aside Pilot Program, three adjustments to eligibility and scoring criteria carried a recommendation from the subcommittee.
 - A. A modification to the maintenance set-aside General Eligibility requirements, specifically No. 8 (additions marked in **bold**):

*A jurisdiction that received funding for **new roadways, existing roadways, or** resurfacing in either FY21 or FY22 is not eligible to receive funding for resurfacing in FY23 or FY24 if the program continues.*

- B. Changes to the scoring criteria for maintenance set-aside applications (additions marked in **bold**, deletions ~~struck~~):

<u>Pavement Condition</u>	<u>Points</u>
Excellent (PCI 100-81)	0
Good (PCI 80-61)	30 40
Fair (PCI 60-41) *with add'l justification	20 40
Poor (PCI 40-21)	10 0
Very Poor (PCI 20-0)	0
<u>ADA Compliance</u>	<u>Points</u>
Road is currently ADA compliant	10
Jurisdiction commits to using local funds to make req'd ADA improvements	10
Neither of these	0

- C. A minor clarification to the maintenance set-aside Eligible Activities, specifically No. 2b (additions marked in bold):
 - 2. The following ... are eligible when done in conjunction with a resurfacing project:
 - b. Base repair, if the cost is 6% or less of the project

Recommendations B & C were well-received by the Technical Committee.

Recommendation A garnered significant opposition. Technical Committee members expressed concern about straying from project-based merit and regional significance and instead moving toward sub-allocation. Sub-allocation is not permitted in MPO programming of STBG funds.

The subcommittee was directed to address this concern and come back to the Technical Committee with an altered position on Recommendation A.

Discussion of Resurfacing Set-Aside and FY23/24 STBG Program

Harms opened discussion of the FY23/24 STBG Resurfacing Set-Aside Program with a reminder that the committee is meeting due to concern over the recommendation that disqualifies those communities who received either Resurfacing (20% pot) or Reconstruction (80% pot) funds to apply for either of those programs in the FY23/24 STBG Call for Projects. He asked for Betsy Tracy to also make her comments regarding concerns over sub-allocation to guide further discussion.

Tracy suggested that “maintenance” activities language should be replaced by “preservation” activities to more accurately communicate the purpose of these funds. She also vocalized concern that the possibility of moving opportunities around the region thru criteria would lean toward sub-allocation.

She reminded the subcommittee that Non-Urbanized areas receive sub-allocated amounts and other regions/MPOs handle these STBG funds differently. Peoria has already done a lot in past rounds to spread the funds, stretching them to enable multiple project awards from multiple communities.

Fink wanted to make a clarification regarding extra evaluations of roads with “fair” condition PCI values. If no licensed professional engineers (P.E.’s) are on staff, getting outside consultant P.E.’s should be required to certify that suggested preservation treatments in an application are appropriate. If a project sponsor has one or multiple P.E.’s involved in the application extra, outside consultant P.E. evaluations shouldn’t be required in the application process.

Fink then addressed the sub-allocation concerns. He attempted to summarize Tracy’s statements by suggesting criteria based on project qualities is the better route to go to avoid sub-allocation rather than a community’s award history. Harms asked if he would be suggesting something else. Fink agreed that we need to based on the Technical Committee reaction, but he still advocates for more access to preservation dollars.

Meyer introduced the idea of a “community significance score” based on a percentage of sq. yards in a project relative to the rest of a community’s total eligible sq. yards. Fink elaborated that 20 points would be taken from regional significance (currently a total 40 pts) to use for this new metric. He also shared a spreadsheet he prepared to show how this metric would have affected the last round (Fy21/22) of the resurfacing awards.

Meyer offered that if it seems unfair to larger communities, there’s still the 80% of STBG funds available in the New/Existing Roadway/Reconstruction program which they already have a better chance at winning.

Chairman Logan opined that locally significant and regionally significant could be seen as equal.

Guerra inquired as to whether the “rotation” eligibility stipulations would still be necessary given this new metric.

Meyer thought things should take care of themselves but also that a 2yr window from application & selection to funding availability is preferred over the 4 yr window that was seen in the last round.

Worsfold commented on the timing issue by sharing that IDOT only programs specific preservation projects up to 2 years out. Anything beyond that is “gray”, non-project specific funds intended for preservation activities.

Miller asked if there was a consensus on the “local significance” criteria suggestion. Stoffer adamantly opposed the change. Loudermilk thought it would be fine. Mayor Dillon commended the group for their work on this issue. Guerra offered that he could be okay with it.

Miller inquired about how this could potentially affect a jointly sponsored application. Such projects in the past were looked on favorably, receiving points in the criteria. How might this fit in with community-based data? After some discussion of jurisdiction transfer practices among communities in the region it was surmised that such a situation is less likely in the resurfacing/preservation activities than the larger existing roadway/reconstruction projects. However, if it were to occur, one could do a weighted average of both jurisdictions’ square footage and the project limits.

Miller asked for consensus on the timing of resurfacing programming. He suggested based on TIP process and application windows that if a 2yr lead time was used, selection for the next round would need to be complete by May 2021 for FY 23 funds. The committee settled on an August 2020 call projects for the FY23 and FY24 resurfacing program. That would give time for final decisions to be made by December 2020. A December date seemed favorable for the sake of local budget cycle coordination.

Loudermilk supported reducing the application-to-construction window from 4 to 2 years for the resurfacing program.

Lastly, Miller commented that disqualification based on previous awards still does not sit well with him.

Recommend to Technical Committee FY23-24 STBG Instructions & Criteria

Final positions on relevant criteria and eligibility matters are as follows:

Criteria:

Remove 20 points from Regional Significance and reallocate them to a new criterion, Sub-Regional Impact. The Sub-Regional Impact score is based on a project's impact on a community's STBG-eligible road system. It compares the square footage of road affected by the project to a community's total square footage¹ of roadways eligible for PPUATS STBG funds.

The proportion of project square-feet to total eligible square feet is multiplied by 100 to produce the Sub-Regional Impact score, with a maximum of 20 points for 20% and above. For example, a resurfacing project that covered 15% of a community's STBG-eligible roads would receive 15 points.

Eligibility:

Project sponsors receiving funds from FY21/22 Resurfacing cannot apply for FY23/24 Resurfacing.

Project sponsors receiving funds from FY21/22 Reconstruction can apply for FY23/24 Resurfacing.

Project sponsors receiving funds from FY23/24 Reconstruction cannot apply for FY23/24 Resurfacing.

Other Notable Conclusions:

FY23/24 Resurfacing selection process will begin in August 2020

FY23/24 Reconstruction selection process will begin imminently upon final approval of the STBG programs by PPUATS Policy.

The subcommittee offered no changes to the FY23-24 New/Existing Roadway Instructions & Criteria.

Adjournment

Adjourned at 10:30am.

¹ Square footage of a system will be based on the most recently available IDOT's IRIS data.

DRAFT November 20, 2019

Surface Transportation Block Grant (STU)
New Roadways and Existing Roadways
Application Instructions & Selection Criteria

Fiscal Years 2023-24

Peoria-Pekin Urbanized Area Transportation Study (PPUATS)

Approved by the PPUATS Policy Committee **TBD**

Contents

Introduction	2
Purpose of this Document.....	2
Pilot Program.....	2
Project Requirements and Eligibility.....	3
General Requirements	3
Eligible Activities	3
Ineligible Activities	3
Submission Procedure	4
Schedule.....	4
Questions	4
Project Prioritization	5
Priorities	5
Selection Criteria	6

Introduction

The Peoria-Pekin Urbanized Area Transportation Study (PPUATS) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Peoria/Pekin urbanized area. One of the responsibilities of the MPO is to program federal Surface Transportation Urban (STU) funds allocated on an annual basis to the urbanized area through the Illinois Department of Transportation.

Congress passed the United States' most recent transportation funding bill, the *FAST Act*, in 2015. The *FAST Act* rebranded the STU program, combining it with other transportation funding programs to form the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Program. Despite the rebranding, STBG functions similarly to STU and provides federal dollars for regionally-significant transportation projects on Federal-Aid-eligible roadways. To help prevent confusion, PPUATS continues to refer to the program as "STU."

Purpose of this Document

PPUATS intends to direct the use of STU funds toward projects which will benefit the entire region, rather than projects which benefit only single communities or small parts of the urbanized area. Approximately \$5.77M total is available for New Roadway and Existing Roadway projects in FYs 23-24. This amount represents the estimated total FYs 23-24 STU allocation of \$6.93M, minus the \$1.44M Pilot Program Set-Aside.

This document explains the procedures for applying for funding and establishes the evaluation criteria PPUATS will use to guide project selection. It is important to note that the evaluation criteria are a guide to aid members with the selection process. Selection criteria and project scores are not meant to be the sole determinant in project selection. PPUATS may choose a lower scoring project based on funding availability, significant regional priority, severe safety concerns, or other non-quantitative factors.

Pilot Program

For the FYs 2021-22 Funding Years, PPUATS Policy established a Pilot Program to set aside 20% of the region's STU funds for resurfacing projects. PPUATS Policy established the program in response to the lack of state and local funds for road maintenance. Three (3) resurfacing projects received PPUATS STU funds through the FYs 21-22 Resurfacing Pilot Program.

As of the writing of these Instructions and Criteria, no resurfacing projects have been funded through the Pilot Program have received funding. As such, PPUATS Policy has had no opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the Pilot Program.

Instructions and Criteria for the Resurfacing Set-Aside Pilot Program may be found in a separate document, titled "Pilot Program for Resurfacing Projects."

Project Requirements and Eligibility

The following rules and requirements govern all New Roadway and Existing Roadway projects. Applicants with questions regarding these rules should contact PPUATS staff.

General Requirements

All project must meet these general requirements to be considered for STU funding.

1. Projects must be in the 20-Year Metropolitan Planning Area.
2. Roadways must have a Functional Classification of Minor Collector or above.
3. Projects must be listed in *Envision HOI: Heart of Illinois Long Range Transportation Plan*.
4. Projects must be ready to implement/construct by the programmed fiscal year.
5. Applicant must commit via resolution to provide a 30% local match at the time of application.
6. Only dues-paying members of PPUATS are eligible to apply for funding. Other local jurisdictions within the 20-Year Planning Boundary must be sponsored by a PPUATS member.
7. Applications must be submitted on-line.

Eligible Activities

The following activities (1) are eligible for STU funding and (2) may be counted toward a project's local match requirement.

1. Construction, reconstruction (defined as more than 50% removal and replacement), rehabilitation, or operational improvements of roadways.
2. Projects relating to intersections that have high accident rates and/or high levels of congestion.
3. Capital costs for transit projects eligible for assistance under Chapter 53 of Title 49,
4. Transportation alternatives, including recreational trails.

Ineligible Activities

The following activities (1) are **not** eligible for STU funding and (2) **cannot** be counted toward a project's local match requirement.

1. Engineering
2. Right-Of-Way Acquisition
3. Utility Relocation
4. All other activities otherwise eligible under 23 USC 133 Surface Transportation Block Grant Program

Submission Procedure

PPUATS will use the following procedure to solicit projects submissions, prioritize those submissions, and ultimately decide where the region’s FYs 23-24 STU funds should be used.

1. Staff issues a Call for Projects for Fiscal Years 2023-24.
2. Staff reviews all received applications:
 - a. Evaluating them for eligibility (see Project Requirements and Eligibility);
 - b. To determine if all required information has been submitted; and
 - c. To verify the reasonableness of the points assigned under the Quantitative Criteria.
3. Each applicant makes a brief presentation at a PPUATS Technical Committee meeting. PPUATS Policy Committee members are encouraged to attend.
4. PPUATS establishes a Review Subcommittee to assign Regional Significance points, composed of Technical and Policy Committee members. They name a Chair, who serves as spokesperson for the subcommittee at Technical and Policy meetings. Staff keeps minutes of all meetings.
5. Staff tallies Quantitative and Regional Significance scores into final scores for each submitted project. Staff finds natural breaks in project scores to establish project “Tiers” (i.e. Tier 1, Tier 2).
6. Staff presents the final scores and tiers to the subcommittee. The subcommittee considers project scoring, available funding, and any other relevant information and recommends projects to the Technical Committee.
7. The Technical Committee considers the subcommittee’s recommendation and makes their own recommendation to the Policy Committee at a joint meeting of the two committees. Members of the public receive the opportunity to comment. The Policy Committee considers Technical’s recommendation and makes a final decision for STU funding.
8. PPUATS adopts their final project selection(s) into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the appropriate fiscal year(s).

Schedule

January 2020	Staff issues Call for Projects
February 2020	Applications due to staff, staff reviews project submissions
March-April 2020	Presentations to Technical Committee
April 2020	Subcommittee assigns Regional Significance scores, staff assigns project Tiers
May 2020	Subcommittee makes recommendation to Technical Committee, Technical develops recommendation to Policy Committee
June 2020	Policy Committee makes final decision

Questions

Potential applicants may contact Ryan Harms at rharms@tricityrpc.org with any questions regarding STU or the application process.

Project Prioritization

The over-arching goal of PPUATS is to direct the use of STU funds toward projects which are regionally significant. A regionally significant project is one that will benefit the entire region, instead of a single community or a small part of the urbanized area.

Priorities

Over the years, PPUATS has utilized several resources and spent countless hours to develop an objective project selection process. One essential resource remains the *FAST Act*, the Federal highway bill that enables the STU program. The goals of the *FAST Act*, listed below, are the foundation upon which PPUATS has built its STU selection process.

- **Safety** – To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.
- **Infrastructure Condition** – To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair
- **Congestion Reduction** – To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System
- **System Reliability** – To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system
- **Freight Movement and Economic Vitality** – To improve the National Highway Freight Network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development
- **Environmental Sustainability** – To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment
- **Reduced Project Delivery Delays** – To reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies' work practices.

Selection Criteria

The following scoring criteria are guides which will aid PPUATS with project prioritization for Existing Roadway and New Roadway project submissions, respectively. The criteria are organized by category.

Criteria in most categories are scored objectively, meaning that they are scored by matters-of-fact in the project application. For example, Average Daily Traffic is an objective criterion because we can measure it the exact same way for every project. Another example of an objective measure is Permeable Pavement; a project either includes permeable pavement or it does not.

Regional Significance criteria are the only ones scored differently. Regional Significance criteria are scored subjectively by the Review Subcommittee. The subcommittee will assign points for Regional Significance criteria based on narratives supplied by the applicants. These criteria address topics which are more difficult to measure, such as impacts on employment or proximity to important facilities. Definitions of all Regional Significance criteria may be found on the following page.

Existing Roadway Projects

Criterion	Points
Safety	
Crash Rate	10
Crash Severity	10
Subtotal Safety	20
Existing Conditions	
Average Daily Traffic	8
Volume/Capacity Ratio	7
Subtotal Existing Conditions	15
Multi-Modal	
Pedestrian	5
Bicycle	5
Transit	5
Freight	5
Subtotal Multi-Modal	20
Sustainability	
Roundabout or Road Diet	3
Permeable Pavement or Bioswales	2
Subtotal Sustainability	5
Regional Significance¹	
Regional Connector	8
Employment Center	8
Transportation Facility	8
Public Facility	8
Project Phasing Continuity	8
Subtotal Regional Significance	40
Total Available Points	100

New Roadway Projects

Criterion	Points
Local Priority	
Joint Project Bonus	15
Local Comprehensive Plan	15
Subtotal Local Priority	30
Multi-Modal	
Pedestrian Accommodations	5
Bicycle Accommodations	5
Transit	5
Freight Accommodations	5
Subtotal Multi-Modal	20
Sustainability	
Permeable Pavement	3
Bioswales	3
Roundabout	4
Subtotal Sustainability	10
Regional Significance¹	
Regional Connector	8
Employment Center	8
Transportation Facility	8
Public Facility	8
Project Phasing Continuity	8
Subtotal Regional Significance	40
Total Available Points	100

¹ Regional Significance Criteria Definitions

Regional Connector

Connects municipalities – the proposed project serves as a primary route between two municipalities, and/or Connects major roads – the proposed project serves as a primary link between arterials

Employment Center

Improves movement of employees and/or shopping patrons

Freight Transportation Facilities

The proposed project serves as a primary route for freight, such as manufacturing or warehouse facilities, airports, intermodal terminals, etc.

Public Facility

The proposed project serves as a major connector to a school, medical center, government facility, library, etc.

Project Phasing Continuity

The proposed project is a supplementary phase of a project previously funding through STU funds.

DRAFT January 10, 2020

Surface Transportation Block Grant (STU)
Preservation Set-Aside Pilot Program
Application Instructions & Selection Criteria

Fiscal Years 2023-24

Peoria-Pekin Urbanized Area Transportation Study (PPUATS)

Approved by the PPUATS Policy Committee **TBD**

Contents

Introduction	2
Purpose of this Document.....	2
Project Requirements and Eligibility.....	3
General Requirements	3
Eligible Activities	3
Ineligible Activities	4
Submission Procedure	5
Schedule	5
Questions	5
Project Prioritization and Selection Criteria	6

Introduction

The Peoria-Pekin Urbanized Area Transportation Study (PPUATS) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Peoria/Pekin urbanized area. One of the responsibilities of the MPO is to program federal Surface Transportation Urban (STU) funds allocated on an annual basis to the urbanized area through the Illinois Department of Transportation.

Congress passed the United States' most recent transportation funding bill, the *FAST Act*, in 2015. The *FAST Act* rebranded the STU program, combining it with other transportation funding programs to form the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Program. Despite the rebranding, STBG functions similarly to STU and provides federal dollars for regionally significant transportation projects on Federal-Aid-eligible roadways. To help prevent confusion, PPUATS continues to refer to the program as "STU."

Beginning in the FYs 2021-22 Funding Years, PPUATS Policy established a Pilot Program to set aside 20% of the region's STU funds for resurfacing projects. PPUATS Policy established the program in response to the lack of state and local funds for road preservation. Three (3) resurfacing projects received PPUATS STU funds through the FYs 21-22 Resurfacing Pilot Program.

As of the writing of these Instructions and Criteria, no resurfacing projects have been funded through the Pilot Program have received funding. As such, PPUATS Policy has had no opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the Pilot Program.

Purpose of this Document

PPUATS intends to direct the use of STU funds toward projects which will benefit the entire region, rather than projects which benefit only single communities or small parts of the urbanized area. Approximately \$1.44M total is available for Preservation projects in FYs 23-24. This amount represents twenty percent (20%) of the estimated total FYs 23-24 STU allocation of \$6.93M.

This document explains the procedures for applying for funding and establishes the evaluation criteria PPUATS will use to guide project selection. It is important to note that the evaluation criteria are a guide to aid members with the selection process. Selection criteria and project scores are not meant to be the sole determinant in project selection. PPUATS may choose a lower scoring project based on funding availability, significant regional priority, severe safety concerns, or other non-quantitative factors.

Project Requirements and Eligibility

The following rules and requirements govern all Preservation Set-Aside Pilot Program projects. Applicants with questions regarding these rules should contact PPUATS staff.

General Requirements

All projects must meet these general requirements to be considered for Preservation Set-Aside funding.

1. Projects must be located in the 20-Year Metropolitan Planning Area.
2. Roadways must have a Functional Classification of Minor Collector or above.
3. Projects must be ready to implement/construct by the programmed fiscal year.
4. Applicant must commit via resolution to provide at least 20% local match at the time of application.
5. Only dues-paying members of PPUATS are eligible to apply for funding; other local jurisdictions within the 20-Year Planning Boundary must be sponsored by a PPUATS member.
6. The maximum amount that can be applied for any one project is \$720,000.
7. A jurisdiction cannot receive funding from both the Pilot Program for Resurfacing and the “regular STU” allocation in the two-year funding round.
8. A jurisdiction that received funding for resurfacing in either FY21 or FY22 is not eligible to receive funding for resurfacing in FY23 or FY24. Those jurisdictions are:
 - a. City of Peoria (Allen Road, FY21)
 - b. City of Pekin (Parkway Drive, FY22)
 - c. Tazewell County (Broadway Road, FY22)
9. Applications must be submitted on-line.

Eligible Activities

The following activities (1) are eligible for STU preservation funding and (2) may be counted toward a project’s local match requirement.

1. Resurfacing, defined as adding a new layer of asphalt over existing pavement on driving lanes, parking lanes, turn lanes, and/or shoulders in order to extend the life of the roadway.
2. The following activities are eligible when done in conjunction with a resurfacing project:
 - a. Milling
 - b. Base repair, if the cost is 6% or less of the project
 - c. Crack filling/sealing
 - d. Manhole/valve adjustments
 - e. Striping

Ineligible Activities

The following activities (1) are **not** eligible for STU preservation funding and (2) **cannot** be counted toward a project's local match requirement.

1. Hot-in-place resurfacing, slurry seal, chip seal, asphalt reclamation, fog seal
2. Base repair not performed in conjunction with a resurfacing project
3. Base repair, if the cost is more than 6% of the project
4. Repair or construction of sidewalks, curbs, ramps, traffic signals, regulatory signage (e.g. stop signs), whether or not required by the Americans with Disabilities Act
5. Manhole reconstruction
6. Engineering
7. Right-Of-Way Acquisition
8. Utility Relocation

Submission Procedure

PPUATS will use the following procedure to solicit projects submissions, prioritize those submissions, and ultimately decide where the region’s FYs 23-24 STU funds should be used.

1. Staff issues a Call for Projects for Fiscal Years 2023-24.
2. Staff reviews all received applications:
 - a. Evaluating them for eligibility (see Project Requirements and Eligibility);
 - b. To determine if all required information has been submitted; and
 - c. To verify the reasonableness of the points assigned under the Quantitative Criteria.
3. Each applicant makes a brief presentation at a PPUATS Technical Committee meeting. PPUATS Policy Committee members are encouraged to attend.
4. PPUATS establishes a Review Subcommittee to assign Regional Significance points, composed of Technical and Policy Committee members. They name a Chair, who serves as spokesperson for the subcommittee at Technical and Policy meetings. Staff keeps minutes of all meetings.
5. Staff tallies Quantitative and Regional Significance scores into final scores for each submitted project. Staff finds natural breaks in project scores to establish project “Tiers” (i.e. Tier 1, Tier 2).
6. Staff presents the final scores and tiers to the subcommittee. The subcommittee considers project scoring, available funding, and any other relevant information and recommends projects to the Technical Committee.
7. The Technical Committee considers the subcommittee’s recommendation and makes their own recommendation to the Policy Committee at a joint meeting of the two committees. Members of the public receive the opportunity to comment. The Policy Committee considers Technical’s recommendation and makes a final decision for STU funding.
8. PPUATS adopts their final project selection(s) into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the appropriate fiscal year(s).

Schedule

August 2020	Staff issues Call for Projects
September 2020	Applications due to staff, staff reviews project submissions
October 2020	Presentations to Technical Committee
October 2020	Subcommittee assigns Regional Significance scores; staff assigns project Tiers
November 2020	Subcommittee makes recommendation to Technical Committee, Technical develops recommendation to Policy Committee
December 2020	Policy Committee makes final decision

Questions

Potential applicants may contact Ryan Harms at rharms@tricityrpc.org with any questions regarding STU Preservation Set-Aside Pilot Program or the application process.

Project Prioritization and Selection Criteria

The following scoring criteria are guides which will aid PPUATS with project prioritization for Existing Roadway and New Roadway project submissions, respectively. The criteria are organized by category. Criteria in most categories are scored objectively, meaning that they are scored by matters-of-fact in the project application. For example, Average Daily Traffic is an objective criterion because we can measure it the exact same way for every project.

Regional Significance criteria are the only ones scored differently. Regional Significance criteria are scored subjectively by the Review Subcommittee. The subcommittee will assign points for Regional Significance criteria based on narratives supplied by the applicants. These criteria address topics which are more difficult to measure, such as impacts on employment or proximity to important facilities. Definitions of all Regional Significance criteria may be found on the following page.

Preservation Set-Aside Pilot Program

Criterion	Points
Pavement Condition¹	
Excellent	0
Good	40
Fair (with justification)	40
Poor	0
Very Poor	0
Subtotal Pavement Condition	40
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	
>10,000	20
6,000 - 9,999	14
3,000 - 5,999	8
<3,000	2
Subtotal ADT	20
Sub-Regional Significance²	
Calculated based on square feet of project area	20
Subtotal Sub-Regional Significance	20
Regional Significance³	
Regional Connector	4
Employment Center	4
Transportation Facility	4
Public Facility	4
Project Phasing Continuity	4
Subtotal Regional Significance	20
Total Available Points	100

¹ Pavement Condition	Pavement Condition Index (PCI)
Excellent	81-100
Good	61-80
Fair	41-60
Poor	21-40
Very Poor	0-20

² Sub-Regional Significance

The Sub-Regional Impact score is based on a project’s impact on a community’s STBG-eligible road system. It compares the square footage of road affected by the project to a community’s total square footage of roadways eligible for PPUATS STBG funds.

The proportion of project square-feet to total eligible square feet is multiplied by 100 to produce the Sub-Regional Impact score, with a maximum of 20 points for 20% and above. Examples are below.

- A project that covered 15% of a community’s STBG-eligible roads would receive 15 points.
- A project that covered 20% of a community’s STBG-eligible roads would receive 20 points.
- A project that covered 3% of a community’s STBG-eligible roads would receive 3.
- A project that covered 38% of a community’s STBG-eligible roads would receive 20 points.

³ Definition of Regional Significance

Regional Connector

Connects municipalities – the proposed project serves as a primary route between two municipalities, and/or Connects major roads – the proposed project serves as a primary link between arterials

Employment Center

Improves movement of employees and/or shopping patrons

Freight Transportation Facilities

The proposed project serves as a primary route for freight, such as manufacturing or warehouse facilities, airports, intermodal terminals, etc.

Public Facility

The proposed project serves as a major connector to a school, medical center, government facility, library, etc.

Project Phasing Continuity

The proposed project is a supplementary phase of a project previously funding through STU funds