

# 2018 TIP Development Process

## TIP Handbook Updates

- October Meeting Summary
- Investment Strategy
- TIP Policies
- Project Prioritization

## October Meeting Summary

- INDIVIDUAL PROJECT FUDNING - No project funding cap. Let project prioritization take care of the concern.
- COST INCREASES - Project will receive no more than 20% increase in funding. Based of original amount. Funding increase set aside.
- INITIAL COST ESTIMATES – Studies should be used to provide better estimates. Higher priority.

# Investment Strategy

MPOs can influence how federal transportation funds are spent through earmarking a portion of these funds to support specific regional priorities

**\$5,830,804**

## Investment Strategy *Groups*

Encourage the use of STP funds for smaller, quicker-implementation projects

- *project delivery*

Encourage investment in priority focus areas

- *safety, operations, bike/ped*

Control amount of funding in an area

- *preservation (bridges, overlay)*
- *congestion (capacity)*

Expedite project delivery and being more responsive to needs by not requiring a TIP amendment for each project

- *flex, emergency*

# Investment Strategy

## *Groups*

### Safety

- \$500,000 annual set-aside
- MPO staff identifies projects
- Staff works with FHWA to develop %100 federal funded projects

### Bike/Ped/Transit

- \$500,000 annual set-aside
- “Call for projects”. Competitive based on stand alone evaluation and selection process

### Studies/Projects

- \$400,000 annual set-aside
- Identified by LPAs or MPO staff
- Reactive funds

# Investment Strategy

## *Area of focus*

### Nashville MPO

- Bicycling and walking (15%)
- Transit projects (10%)
- Intelligent transportation systems and operations projects (5%)
- Multimodal roadway safety and capacity projects (70%)

### Jackson MPO

- Capacity deficiency
- Traffic operational improvements
- Pavement management
- Bridge repairs

### Des Moines Area MPO

- Roadway category (60%)
- Bridge category (15%)
- System preservation & optimization category (10%)
- Transit category (10%)
- Flex category (5%)
- TAP (allocation)

### Puget Sound Regional Council

- Bicycling and walking
- Projects supporting rural towns
- Preserving the existing system (bridge, highways)
- Studies

# Investment Strategy

*Potential Priority Focus Areas*

## Safety\*

- Guardrails
- Signs /striping
- Rail crossings

## Maintenance Preservation

- Overlay
- Reconstruction
- Bridges

## Transit

- Transit stop
- Pull-outs

## Bike/Ped\*

- Independent
- Sidewalk
- Pathways
- Crosswalks

## ITS

- Message boards

## Expansion

- Capacity
- New roads

## TDM

- HOV lane
- Park and ride lot
- Employer program

## Operations

- Turn lanes
- Traffic calming
- Signals
- Roundabout

## Economic Development

## Performance Goals

Safety (fatalities, injuries, bike/pedestrian)

Infrastructure Condition (pavement and bridges)

Congestion Reduction (annual hours of excessive delay)

System Reliability (miles of reliable travel time conditions)

Freight Movement and Economic Vitality (miles of reliable travel time conditions for trucks)

Environmental Sustainability

Reduced Project Delivery Delays



# Policies/Guidelines

# Policies & Guidelines

## Drainage

Limit the percentage of drainage in a project

## Street Overlays

Only for improvements to safety for bikes, pedestrians or improved traffic channelization

## Special Match Credit

PE

ROW

## Complete Streets Policy

requires both new and reconstruction roadway projects utilizing FHWA federal transportation funds to include measures to accommodate bicycles, pedestrians.

# Policies & Guidelines

## Maximum Project Cost

- \$3,000,00
- Large projects could be phased or have other funding sources identified (e.g. Popp's Extension)

## Project Cost Scale

- Less than \$1,500,000 (Score: 5)
- \$1,500,000 and \$3,000,000? (Score 0)
- Greater than \$3,000,00 (-10, -20, ?)

## Cost Increases

- Max 20% of original amount

1. Is there a need to add groups to the STP process?
2. What about bridges and overlays?
3. Flex or reactive funding?
4. Additional funds in groups?

# Project Prioritization

## TIP Evaluation and Prioritization Process

Score

### Economic Vitality

Does this project generate new economic development and create new demand?

5

### Safety and Security

Above average crash rate

5

### Mobility, Accessibility & Connectivity

Service to a specific land use.

Localized corridor (not on a mobility corridor).

Mobility corridor.

0 – 3 – 5

Is this project located on an identified freight corridor?

5

Is this project on a roadway with fixed route transit service?

5

### Quality of life

This project reduces and/or slow traffic on roads with excessive average speeds.

5

### System Management & Preservation

Is this a traffic operations project? (Score 5)

5

## TIP Evaluation and Prioritization Process

Score

### Reliability

Project addresses existing congestion identified in the CMP or the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan?

5

### Storm water

This project mitigates reoccurring storm water impacts to a roadway

5

### Project Readiness

No right-of-way required.

5

Preliminary engineering completed.

5

Project is not considered a Categorical Exclusion (CE)

-5

### Plan Consistency

Is this project included in the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan?

5

Is this project included in a local, regional or state plan or study?

5

## TIP Evaluation and Prioritization Process

Score

### Traditionally Underserved Community Impacts

Positive or negative impact

5

-5

### Cost Sharing

Would this project utilize MPO's STP funds of less than 80% of the overall project cost?

5

### Public Concerns

Significant negative comments about this project were received

-5

### Federal Participation Cost

Under \$1,500,000?

5

\$1,500,000 to \$3,000,000?

0

Greater than \$3,000,000?

-20

### Pedestrian and Bike Mobility

To what extent does this project utilize bicycle/pedestrian measures listed in the MPO projects toolbox?

5 to 10

### Demand Management

Is this a travel demand management project?

5

### Essential Services

Is this project within a ¼ mile of an essential service?

5



TIP Evaluation and Prioritization Process  
*(Bike/Ped Projects)*

Score

**Regional Significance**

The project is intended to service a specific land use.

0

The project is on a localized corridor (not on a mobility corridor).

3

The project improves a mobility corridor.

5

**Project Readiness**

No right-of-way required.

5

Preliminary engineering completed.

5

No utility relocation required.

5

**Plan or Study Priority**

Is this project included in a local, regional or state plan or study?

5

**Ability to Expand / Extend Adjacent Network**

Project connects to existing sidewalks, pathways, etc.

5

**Transit Access**

Is this project on a roadway with fixed route transit service?

5

**Environmental and Traditionally Underserved Community Impacts**

Project is located in or near a traditionally underserved communities. (Score:

5



# MPO Planning Factors

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Economic Vitality</b>            | Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency   |
| <b>Safety</b>                       | Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users  |
| <b>Security</b>                     | Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users  |
| <b>Mobility &amp; Accessibility</b> | Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and for freight   |
| <b>Environment</b>                  | Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns |
| <b>Connectivity</b>                 | Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight   |
| <b>Operations</b>                   | Promote efficient system management and operation   |
| <b>Preservation</b>                 | Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system  |
| <b>Resiliency</b>                   | Improving transportation system resiliency and reliability  |
| <b>Storm water</b>                  | Reducing (or mitigating) the stormwater impacts of surface transportation   |
| <b>Tourism</b>                      | Enhancing travel and tourism  |