

# TIP Prioritization Process & Program Administration



**JANESVILLE AREA**  
*Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)*

**[Janesville Area MPO Website](http://www.janesvillewi.gov)**  
**[www.janesvillewi.gov](http://www.janesvillewi.gov)**

May 23, 2022

## Selection Process for Projects Applying for Federal MPO Administered Funds and Administration of Funded Projects

### May 23, 2022

#### Introduction

The Janesville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is responsible for developing transportation plans and programming projects for the Janesville Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA). The Janesville MPA, which is synonymous with the study area for the *Janesville Area 2020-2050 Long Range Transportation Plan*, encompasses the 20-year urban area boundary, which includes the Cities of Janesville and Milton, and the parts of the Townships of Janesville, Harmony, LaPrairie, Milton, and Rock.

#### Federal Transportation Programs

The *Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act)* of 2015 funds a variety of transportation programs, three of which are of particular importance to the Janesville MPA and Rock County. First, is the Surface Transportation Program—Urban (STP-Urban), a formula-assured allocation of federal funds for transportation improvements along the federal-aid highway system in urban areas, which includes the Janesville MPA. Second, is the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), a statewide competitive grant program for funding specified alternative transportation (i.e., bicycle and pedestrian) projects, which enhance the transportation system. Third, is the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), another competitive, statewide grant program fun funding highway safety projects along corridors and intersections with a high crash history.

**STP-Urban (STP-Urban).** Improvements to collector and arterial roadways and other transportation improvements such as transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities are eligible to use this funding. Federal rules require the MPO (i.e., the Janesville Area MPO) to coordinate and approve priority listings for use of these funds.

**Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)** MAP-21 consolidated the following three programs under SAFETEA-LU: Safe Routes to School (SRTS), Transportation Enhancements (TE), and the Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities Program (BFPF).

For TAP, applicants can apply to WisDOT for funding for specific types of projects. MPOs make recommendations on project applications in urban areas to a WisDOT committee, which makes the final determination as to which projects receive funding. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has confirmed that the projects that fall within the following categories are eligible to receive TAP funding:

- Construction, planning, and design of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized forms of transportation. . . .
- Construction, planning, and design of infrastructure-related projects and systems that will provide safe routes for non-drivers. . . .
- Conversion and use of abandoned railroad corridors for trails for pedestrians, bicyclists, or other non-motorized transportation users.

- Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas.
- Community improvement activities, including
- Inventory, control, or removal of outdoor advertising;
- Historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities;
- Vegetation management practices in transportation rights-of-way to improve roadway safety, prevent against invasive species, and provide erosion control;
- Archaeological activities. . . .
- Any environmental mitigation activity. . . .
- The recreational trails program. . . .
- The Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program. . . .
- Planning, designing, or constructing boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.

The *FAST Act* requires federal funds be allocated to eligible projects through a prioritization process. Each funding source and its eligible projects are to be evaluated separately. While the prioritization process can be used for state funding sources, it is not required.

## 1. **Goals- *FAST Act, LRTP, TIP***

Key considerations within the TIP prioritization process are *FAST Act* planning factors, the goals and objectives of the MPO's *LRTP* and *TIP*, and the maximization of funding awarded to the Janesville Area MPO.

The overarching goal of the *Janesville Area 2020-2050 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)* is to develop and maintain an increasingly energy efficient transportation system which includes and integrates all modes of travel and provides for the safe and effective movement of people and goods, while optimizing the financial resources of the communities.

The primary goal of the *Janesville Area Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)* is to use existing transportation facilities and services to their full potential within the MPO planning boundary.

The *FAST Act* details 10 planning factors that form its core and guide its policies and initiatives for a continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive metropolitan transportation planning process

1. Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
2. Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users;
3. Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users;
4. Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and for freight;
5. 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;

6. Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
7. Promote efficient system management and operation;
8. Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system;
9. Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate impacts of surface transportation; and
10. Enhance travel and tourism.

## **2. Objectives**

Within this context, the specific objectives of the project evaluation scoring are to consider the following criteria:

1. Consistency of project with existing area transportation plans (includes LRTP, Comprehensive Plans, TDP, etc.)
2. Preservation of the existing transportation system including
  - a. A roadway's current condition;
  - b. The functional classification;
3. Safety issues of roadways
4. Multimodal nature of roadways
5. Land use intensity and change
6. Climate Change and reducing greenhouse gas emissions
7. Planned Programming within TIP
8. Make objective preliminary recommendations to the TAC regarding prioritization

The objectives of the overall TIP prioritization process are to consider the following criteria:

1. Project Evaluation Scoring
2. Meet the goals of the FAST Act;
3. The needs of projects already underway;
4. The total cost of a project;
5. Safety improvements proposed as part of project;
6. Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements proposed as part of project;
7. Eligibility for alternative funding; and
8. Other factors, such as connectivity, public input, and community need.

## **3. STP-Urban Project Funding**

The Janesville Area MPO has historically used STP-Urban funds for street reconstruction or rehabilitation. The MPO shall continue to fund street projects as a priority due to regional need and availability of other funding sources for transit and bicycle/pedestrian-only projects. Local sponsors shall use STP-Urban funds for construction activities only, and shall only locally fund right-of-way acquisition and engineering design. The intent of funding construction-only activities is to stretch the federal dollars as far as possible.

#### 4. **Process**

In the spring of each year, the MPO requests projects to be included in the six-year period of the *TIP*. **Section 1.4** outlines the criteria the MPO staff uses to preliminarily rank the projects applying for each funding source. In addition to the ranking matrix, the information provided on the concept definition worksheet will be used to further refine Staff's initial project ranking. The Janesville Area Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviews the MPO Staff's preliminary project listing at the same time that they review the draft *TIP*. The results of the ranking act as guidance for the MPO staff and TAC, but do not dictate the final allocation of funding. Based on staff input and discussion at the meeting the TAC makes a recommendation to the Policy Board. Following the public review process, the MPO Policy Board meets to review the document. The Policy Board can then choose to send the document back to the TAC, amend the draft and/or approve the final *TIP*. Once approved the *TIP* will be sent to WisDOT for approval and inclusion in the *Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)*.

For any given allocation, if the funding allocation is greater than the total cost of the projects to be funded in a given year, the remaining allocation is carried over to the following year. If the total cost of the projects applying for the available funds is greater than the allocation, including any carryover funds, the lower ranked projects are typically moved to future years for ranking with all other projects in that given year.

#### 5. **Project Evaluation**

The scoring criteria were developed to support the objectives outlined in **Section 2**.

It is important to note that the scoring criteria provide below is not static and is expected to change as experience is gained through each iteration of the process. Further, emphasis areas stressed by the federal government or special preferences by local units of government will also change and inevitably lead to modifications. In addition to the criteria, project selection shall also account for geographic distribution of STP-Urban funds.

##### Project Evaluation

1. **Plan Consistency** - This criterion establishes project legitimacy within the overall transportation network. It rates projects higher when they conform in scope and timing to appropriate comprehensive or modal transportation plan element (local comprehensive plans, arterial plans, transit development and other transit plans, bicycle/pedestrian plans, regional long-range plan and related elements) and evidence good regional coordination.
  - a. 5 Direct Relationship
  - b. 3 Some Relationship
  - c. 0 No Relationship

##### 2. **Preserves Existing System**

###### Highway Projects

- a. **Pavement Conditions** – For existing highways, an indicator of pavement surface condition is based on the Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating Manual (PASER). Pavements with lower ratings have greater pavement distress and are scored higher.
  - i. 5 Rating of 1-2 (in very poor condition; full reconstruction)
  - ii. 5 Rating of 3-4 (significant aging; resurface or mill & overlay)

- iii. 3 Rating of 5-6 (surface aging; sealcoat with potential patching or thin overlay)
- iv. 1 Rating of 7 (slight wearing; recommended crack sealing)
- v. 0 Rating of 8-10 (no visible distress; NO action recommended)
- b. **New Facilities** - For new streets and highways, an evaluation is made of the criticality of the project to the overall functionality and efficiency of the existing network.
  - i. 5 Very Critical, needed to avoid lost opportunity relative to timing and cost of other programmed projects
  - ii. 3 Beneficial to the overall performance of the system
  - iii. 1 Some current need, more important to system performance in long term
  - iv. 0 No relationship to system performance
- c. **Traffic Operations Improvements.** Principally intersection channelization or signalization projects or improvements to corridor performance through access management.
  - i. 5 Very critical, eliminates major hindrance to system performance and safety
  - ii. 3 Beneficial to the overall performance of the system
  - iii. 1 Some current need, more important to system performance in long term
  - iv. No relationship to system performance
- d. **Utility to Overall System.** Roads with a higher functional classification score higher. STP dollars are only eligible for projects of Urban Collectors or higher.
  - i. 5 Urban Principal Arterial
  - ii. 3 Urban Minor Arterial
  - iii. 0 Urban Collector

**Non-highway projects.** An assumption is made that an increase in travel options improves the efficiency of the existing infrastructure.

- e. **Freight Operations**
  - i. 5 A project that improves operations of the existing freight transportation system
  - ii. 3 Beneficial to the overall performance of the system
  - iii. 1 Some current need, more important to system performance in long term
  - iv. 0 No relationship to system performance
- f. **Transit Improvements**
  - i. 5 A Project that provides or is an integral factor in providing a transit or paratransit option
  - ii. 3 A project that enhances a transit or paratransit option, thereby making a transit mode more attractive or paratransit needs, but does not impact the demand for SOV (single-occupant vehicle) travel
  - iii. 0 A project that inappropriately addresses transit or paratransit needs
- g. **Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements.** Projects can be categorized as either barrier crossing or corridor improvements and rated using the appropriate set of criteria.
  - i. **Barrier Crossing Improvements.** Provides facility over/under non-compatible route or natural feature
    - 1. **Spacing** (distance between facilities)
      - a. 5 2.01 miles or greater
      - b. 4 1.51 to 2 miles
      - c. 3 1.01 to 1.5 miles
      - d. 2 0.76 to 1 mile
      - e. 1 0.51 to 0.75 miles
      - f. 0 0.5 miles or less
    - 2. **Level of Use.** (origin/destination pairs)

- a. 5 Residential to multimodal transfer locations
  - b. 4 Residential to employment centers/schools/colleges
  - c. 3 Residential to commercial/recreational
  - d. 1 Residential to residential
  - e. 0 Recreational to recreational
- 3. User safety**
- a. 5 No potential at-grade crossing
  - b. 3 At-grade crossing possible' safety concerns remain
  - c. 0 Safe at-grade crossing is possible
- i. **Corridor Improvements.** Provides a bicycle and pedestrian route on or along a transportation route or natural feature. (Scores of criteria 1), 2), and 3) are averaged and rounded to the nearest integer.)
- a. **Spacing**
    - i. 5 No alternative parallel route available
    - ii. 3 Adjacent parallel route would be better option
    - iii. 0 Adequate parallel route already exists
  - b. **Level of Use.** (origin/destination pairs)
    - i. 5 Residential to multimodal transfer locations
    - ii. 5 Residential to employment centers/schools/colleges
    - iii. 3 Residential to commercial/recreational
    - iv. 1 Residential to residential
    - v. 0 Recreational to recreational
  - c. **User Safety.**
    - i. 5 Safety concerns addressed without compromising usefulness; promote increased use by all user groups
    - ii. 3 Safety measures may encourage increased use by some user groups, but discourage use by other user groups
    - iii. 0 Safety concerns cannot be adequately addressed
3. **Capacity.** This criterion is an indicator of corridor or intersection capacity problems. A higher existing volume to capacity ratio reflects greater capacity deficiency. Highway capacity standards developed by the Federal Highway Administration and WisDOT are used to determine the volume to capacity ratio. For new facilities the non-existent V/C ratio is replaced by the long-range plan projection year V/C ratio on the designed facility for rating purposes. Corridor based non-highway projects, those directly involving travel in a highway corridor, would be rated identically to highway projects using the highway V/C ratio. Noncorridor-based projects would use the alternate rating based on the appropriateness of their location, magnitude and size, and projected usage.
- a. **Corridor-based project**
    - i. 5 Greater than 1.00
    - ii. 4 0.80 – 1.00
    - iii. 3 0.60 – 0.79
    - iv. 2 0.40 – 0.59
    - v. 1 0.20 – 0.39
    - vi. 0 Less than .2
  - b. **Non-corridor-based projects**
    - i. 5 Very critical, needed to avoid lost opportunity relative to timing and cost of other programmed projects
    - ii. 3 Beneficial to the overall performance of the system
    - iii. 1 Some current need, more important to system performance in long term
    - iv. 0 No relationship to system performance safety

#### 4. Safety

- a. **Segment Crash Rates.** Based on guidance from WisDOT this measure is scored by the average crash rates per 100 million vehicle miles driven.
  - i. 5 Greater than 280
  - ii. 3 150-279
  - iii. 0 Less than 149
- b. **Segment Crash Rates Compared to State.** This compares the segment crash rates to published state averages by facility type. Safety improvements to segments that have higher rates than the state standard will help the MPO accomplish overall performance goals.
  - i. 5 greater than 50% more than state averages
  - ii. 3 within +/- 50% of statewide averages
  - iii. 0 less than -50% of state averages
- c. **High Accident Locations.** Intersections defined as any location with crashes greater than or equal to 5 in one year
  - i. 5 Greater than or equal to 5
  - ii. 2 1 – 4
  - iii. 0 No accidents

#### 5. Multimodal

- a. **Multimodal Corridors** This criterion emphasizes projects that address needs of all appropriate modes (vehicular, transit, pedestrian, bicycle, freight) or TDM actions in the corridor.
  - i. 5 In a multimodal corridor, the project addresses the needs of all three or more modes.
  - ii. 3 In a multimodal corridor, at least two modes are addressed, though not all listed modes are addressed.
  - iii. 1 In a multimodal corridor, only one mode, other than vehicular, is addressed.
  - iv. 0 Project is not in a multimodal corridor, or is in a multimodal corridor and only the vehicular mode is addressed.
- a. **Multimodal Nodes** This criterion emphasizes the value of linking transportation modes with simple, efficient transfer between modes. This includes links or nodes where roadways, off-road bicycle/pedestrian trails, bus stops, micro-mobility stations, airports, train and/or multimodal stations occur within a project boundary. This does not include consideration of corridors that run within a roadway or parallel (ie. Sidewalks).
  - i. 5 Three or more mode transfer points or linkages
  - ii. 3 Two or more mode transfer points or linkages
  - iii. 0 Only one mode is considered.

#### 6. Land Use Impact. An indicator in changes in land use intensity.

- a. **Land Use Intensity** Projects that directly serve areas that are experiencing increased land use intensification (redevelopment of existing areas leading to an increased density of residential, commercial, or industrial land uses; new development presenting need for increased access) score higher than those not undergoing significant development.
  - i. 5 New or Re-development within ¼ mile of, or likely to indirectly serve, development project increasing land use intensity significantly
  - ii. 3 Re-development within ¼ mile of, or likely to indirectly serve, project occurring but not significantly impacting land use intensity
  - iii. 0 No significant development is occurring within ¼ mile of project
- b. **Land Use Changes** Projects that are adjacent to areas undergoing development that are related to the timing of development projects score higher than those without timing concerns.
  - i. 5 Very critical, needed to avoid lost opportunity relative to timing and cost of nearby development projects
  - ii. 3 Beneficial to the success of the development project



- iii. 0 No timing concerns or no development project within ¼ mile of project

## 7. Climate Change

- a. **Air Quality Improvement** Projects that include designed efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality. This includes reductions in traffic flow interruptions among other design elements.
  - i. 5 Long-term reduction of greenhouse gas emissions
  - ii. 3 Short-term reduction of greenhouse gas emissions
  - iii. 0 No obvious reduction of greenhouse gas emissions
- b. **Mode Shift** Projects that present opportunities to shift transportation modes away from single-occupancy vehicles and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
  - i. 5 Significant mode shift opportunity
  - ii. 3 Moderate mode shift opportunity
  - iii. 0 No mode shift opportunity

- 8. **Planned Programming.** An indicator of capital improvement planning, prioritizing, and scheduling by local communities. Projects in the TIP for three to five years which have progressed from out-year to within the 4-year TIP calendar are scored higher than projects appearing in the TIP for only one or two years. To be eligible for consideration in the TIP, projects must be included in a multi-year capital improvement program adopted by the sponsoring jurisdiction.
  - a. 5 Five Years or More
  - b. 4 Four Years
  - c. 3 Three Years
  - d. 2 Two Years
  - e. 1 One Year
  - f. 0 New to TIP

EX. Prioritization Scorecard		Project 1	Project 2	Project 3	Project 4
		Street 1	Street 2	Street 3	Street 4
Street Name		Rock County	Janesville	Milton	Milton
Sponsor		Rock County	Janesville	Milton	Milton
<b>1 - Plan Consistency</b>					
1a	Present in adopted plans (LRTP, TDP, Comp Plan, etc.)	0	0	3	0
<b>2 - Preserves Existing System</b>					
<b>Roadway Projects</b>					
2a	Pavement Conditions	3	3	5	5
2b	New Facilities	0	0	0	0
2c	Traffic operations Improvements	0	0	0	0
2d	Utility to System (Functional Classification)	3	3	0	0
<b>Non Roadway Projects</b>					
2e	Freight Operations	0	0	0	0
2f	Transit Improvements	0	0	0	0
2g	Bike Ped Barrier - Spacing	0	0	0	0
2h	Bike Ped Barrier - Level of Use	0	0	0	0
2i	Bike Ped Barrier - User Safety	0	0	0	0
2j	Bike Ped Corridor - Spacing	0	0	0	0
2k	Bike Ped Corridor - Level of Use	0	0	0	0
2l	Bike Ped Corridor - User Safety	0	0	0	0
<b>3 - Capacity</b>					
3a	Corridor-Based	0	0	0	0
3b	Non-Corridor-Based	5	5	0	5
<b>4 - Safety</b>					
4a	Segment Crash Rates	3	5	5	3
4b	Segment Crash Rates Comparison	0	3	3	5
4c	High Accident Locations	3	5	3	0
<b>5 - Multimodal</b>					
5a	Multimodal Corridors	5	0	0	0
5b	Multimodal Nodes	5	0	3	0
<b>6 - Land Use</b>					
6a	Land Use Intensity	0	0	0	0
6b	Land Use Change Timing	0	0	0	0
<b>7 - Climate Change</b>					
7a	Air Quality Improvement	0	0	0	0
7b	Mode Shift	3	0	0	0
<b>8 - Planned Programming</b>					
8a	Length of time in TIP	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Score</b>		30	24	22	18
<b>Ranking</b>		1	2	2	4

## **6. MPO Oversight of Federal Funds**

Regulations under the *FAST Act* require federal funds to be expended within a program timeframe. Project delay may result in loss of funding for the project or loss of funding in subsequent allocations. The MPO takes an active role with local sponsors of federal funds to monitor the status of projects and prevent communities from losing federal funds due to project delay.

Local jurisdictions utilizing TAP, HSIP, or STP-Urban funds for a project must notify the MPO if the project or any phase of the project schedule changes.