

Chapter 9

Financial Analysis

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to financially quantify the transportation needs of the Iowa Northland Region identified in previous chapters of this document. A financial feasibility analysis examines reasonably available transportation resources and compares them to the cost of projects identified in the RTA planning process. “Reasonably available” transportation resources include funds authorized at the local, state, and federal levels which are likely to be accessible for the duration of the plan. A variety of funding sources are utilized for transportation improvements, as described in this chapter.

TRADITIONAL TRANSPORTATION REVENUE SOURCES

Local jurisdictions receive transportation revenue from multiple sources including the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Iowa Department of Transportation (Iowa DOT), and local funds. The RTA has the ability to program two federal funding sources: the Surface Transportation Program (STP) and the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). Other transportation related funding sources discussed here are primarily programmed by the Iowa DOT Commission or individual jurisdictions. *Table 9.1* provides an overview of funding sources available to RTA jurisdictions.

The Iowa DOT has compiled a Funding Guide to help local governments, organizations, and individuals with preliminary searches for funding assistance for multiple types of transportation projects. The most current version can be found at www.iowadot.gov/pol_leg_services/funding_guide.htm.

Federal Funding

Federal programs which have funded or could fund projects in the RTA include the following:

- Surface Transportation Program (STP) – This program is designed to address specific issues identified by Congress and provides flexible funding for projects to preserve or improve the condition and performance of a number of transportation facilities including any federal-aid highway or public road bridge. The Iowa DOT provides programming authority for allotments of STP funds to RPAs and MPOs. The flexible nature of STP funds allows them to be used for all types of transportation projects including roadway projects on federal-aid routes, bridge projects on any public road, transit capital improvements, Transportation Alternatives Program eligible activities, and planning activities.
- STP Highway Bridge Program (STP-HBP) – While the Highway Bridge Program was eliminated in MAP-21, a portion of Iowa’s STP will continue to be targeted directly to counties and dedicated specifically to county bridge projects. A portion of these funds are required to be obligated to off-system bridges. The remaining funds can be used on either on- or off-system bridges.

- Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) – This program combines funding from a number of programs in the previous authorization bill, SAFETEA-LU. TAP provides funding to expand travel choices and improve the transportation experience. TAP projects improve the cultural, historic, aesthetic, and environmental aspects of the transportation infrastructure. RPAs, MPOs, and the Iowa DOT receive allotments of TAP funds to program for eligible projects. Projects can include the creation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and the restoration of historic transportation facilities, among others.
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) – CMAQ provides flexible funding for transportation projects and programs tasked with helping to meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act. These projects can include those that reduce congestion and improve air quality.
- Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) – This is a core federal-aid program that funds projects with the goal of achieving a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on public roads. Portions of these funds are set aside for use on high-risk rural roads and railway-highway crossings.
- National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) – These federal funds are available to be used on projects that improve the condition and performance of the National Highway System (NHS) including some state and U.S. highways and interstates.

In addition to the funding sources listed above, the Iowa DOT administers several grant programs utilizing federal funding. Projects awarded grant funding must be documented in the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). These grant awards are distributed through a competitive process. State administered grant programs include the following:

- County and City Bridge – A portion of STP funding is dedicated to county and city bridge construction or replacement projects. Eligible projects need to be classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete. Projects are rated and prioritized by the Office of Local Systems with awards based upon criteria identified in the application process.
- Highway Safety Improvement Program - Secondary (HSIP - Secondary) – This program is being funded using a portion of Iowa's Highway Safety Improvement Program and funds safety projects on rural roadways.
- Iowa Clean Air Attainment Program (ICAAP) – ICAAP funds projects that are intended to maximize emission reductions through traffic flow improvements, reduced vehicle miles of travel, and reduced single occupancy vehicle trips. This program utilizes \$4,000,000 of Iowa's CMAQ apportionment.
- Federal Recreational Trails Program – This program provides federal funding for both motorized and non-motorized trail projects and is funded through a takedown from Iowa's TAP funding. The decision to participate in this program is made annually by the Iowa DOT's Transportation Commission.

State and Local Funding

The largest state transportation programs are funded through the Road Use Tax Fund (RUTF), which includes revenue from several sources, the largest being the state gas tax and new vehicle registration fees. Programs funded through the RUTF include the following:

- Municipal Funds – These funds are apportioned to and programmed by each city. The funding comes from RUTF and comprises about 20 percent of its total statewide.
- Secondary Road Fund – The Secondary Road Fund is distributed from the RUTF to each county for programming. These funds may be spent on construction, maintenance, salaries, equipment, etc. The secondary road network is defined as all public roads under a county’s jurisdiction that are not primary roads. The Secondary Road Fund has accounted for approximately 25 percent of the RUTF.
- Farm to Market (FM) – FM funds are distributed monthly to each county by the State. FM funds may only be used for construction on the FM network which includes trunk and trunk collector roads outside of metropolitan area boundaries. In the past, FM has accounted for roughly eight percent of the total RUTF.
- Primary Road Fund – These funds are programmed by the Iowa DOT Commission for use on any federal functionally classified primary road.
- Traffic Safety Improvement Program (TSIP) – TSIP is funded by one half of one percent of the RUTF. Cities, counties, and the Iowa DOT can apply for three types of projects. Site specific projects account for \$5-6 million per year, and a maximum of \$500,000 can be awarded to a project. The other two project types are traffic control devices and traffic safety studies; both programs have \$500,000 to distribute per year.

Additional state funding sources for transportation projects include but are not limited to the following:

- State Recreational Trails – These funds are programmed by the Iowa DOT Commission based on applications from state and local government agencies and non-profit organizations.
- Revitalize Iowa’s Sound Economy (RISE) – RISE is a program designed by the state legislature in 1985 to help Iowa’s cities and counties compete economically. Projects often involve new construction to attract businesses to an area (Immediate Opportunity) or improve an industrial park (Local Development). State RISE projects are programmed by the Iowa DOT Commission. Cities and counties can apply to the Iowa DOT for the designated funds.
- Traffic Engineering Assistance Program (TEAP) – Traffic engineering consultants are retained by the Iowa DOT and are available to local governments as requested for candidate projects on a first-come/first-served basis.

Locally programmed transportation funds will vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Local funding sources for transportation projects include the following:

- Property Tax – Although tax levies vary from city to city, a significant portion of local transportation revenues usually comes from property tax assessments (general funds).

- General Obligation Bonds – General obligation bonds are debts incurred by cities or counties that are repaid through property tax revenues. These bonds can be issued for essential purposes including roads and bridges.
- Local Option Sales Tax (LOST) – Iowa Code provides that each County and City can vote to adopt up to a one percent local option sales tax. The revenues may be partially or completely dedicated to local street and highway funds. Black Hawk and Butler Counties have adopted a LOST.
- Tax Increment Finance Funding (TIFF) – TIFF is a method of reallocating property tax revenues which are produced as a result of an increase in taxable valuations above a base valuation figure within a tax increment area. Both cities and counties may create tax increment financing areas.

Table 9.1 – Federal, State, and Local Funding Sources for Transportation Projects

Funding Program	Eligible Projects		Source	
	Roads and Bridges	Trails / On-Road Acc.		
Federal	Surface Transportation Program (STP)	X	X	RTA
	STP Highway Bridge Program (STP-HBP)	X		Iowa DOT
	Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)		X	RTA
	Statewide TAP		X	Iowa DOT
	Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ)	X	X	FHWA
	Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	X		FHWA
	National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)	X		FHWA
	County and City Bridge	X		Iowa DOT
	Highway Safety Improvement Program - Secondary	X		Iowa DOT
	Iowa Clean Air Attainment Program (ICAAP)	X	X	Iowa DOT
	Federal Recreational Trails Program		X	Iowa DOT
State	Municipal Funds	X		Iowa DOT
	Secondary Road Fund	X		Iowa DOT
	Farm to Market (FM)	X		Iowa DOT
	Primary Road Fund	X		Iowa DOT
	Traffic Safety Improvement Program (TSIP)	X		Iowa DOT
	State Recreational Trails		X	Iowa DOT
	Revitalize Iowa's Sound Economy (RISE)	X		Iowa DOT
Local	Property Tax	X	X	City/County
	General Obligation Bonds	X	X	City/County
	Local Option Sales Tax (LOST)	X	X	City/County
	Tax Increment Finance Funding (TIFF)	X	X	City/County

FUNDING FOR ROAD, BRIDGE, AND NON-MOTORIZED PROJECTS

The majority of federal funding programs for transportation will pay for up to 80 percent of a project with a 20 percent local match required. Individual projects will be developed with various percentages of federal and local funding, and it is impossible at this point to predict what those percentages will be.

Local Funding for Projects

As discussed previously, local revenues for transportation come from several sources, with the Road Use Tax Fund (RUTF), property taxes, general obligation bonds, and local option sales taxes (LOST) generally being the largest sources. To determine a baseline of local revenues available for transportation, the City Street Finance Report was used for cities in the region, and County Farm to Market Receipts and Secondary Road Fund Receipts were used for the counties. Secondary Road Fund Receipts include local revenues from property taxes, LOST, and the RUTF.

Table 9.2 shows the history and projections for local non-federal aid revenues and operation and maintenance expenditures. The most recent fiscal years available, 2010-2014, were used for the analysis. The total revenue listed on the reports was used as the jurisdictions' revenue available for transportation expenditures. To calculate the total local revenue available for transportation expenditures in the RTA, the revenue for each jurisdiction was added together. During this time, there were wide fluctuations in revenue available to RTA jurisdictions. Thus, revenue was conservatively projected to increase two percent per year over the life of this plan.

Before constructing or reconstructing roads or non-motorized accommodations, an expense that must be factored into the local side of funding is the operation and maintenance of the existing system. To calculate this, operations and maintenance reports from the Iowa DOT were utilized, which are derived from the County Engineer Annual Reports and City Street Finance Reports. Operations and maintenance expenses were determined for each jurisdiction for 2010-2014. Similar to revenues, there were significant variations during the five-year time period. To be consistent with the inflation rate used for project costs, operation and maintenance costs were increased by four percent per year over the life of this plan.

Table 9.2 shows total roadway operations and maintenance expenditures for all jurisdictions in the RTA, but does not account for all costs needed to bring the road and bridge network to a state of good condition. The projected funding deficiency for federal aid eligible roads and bridges as well as non-motorized projects is shown in *Table 9.4*.

Table 9.2 – Recent History and Projections for Local Non-Federal Aid Revenues and Roadway Operation and Maintenance Expenditures

	Fiscal Year	Non-Federal Aid Revenues ¹	Expenditures		
			Operations Cost on Total Roadway System ²	Maintenance Cost on Total Roadway System ²	Other Local Projects and Debt Payments ³
History	2010	\$51,737,922	\$3,453,396	\$6,246,068	\$42,038,458
	2011	\$50,370,697	\$3,542,108	\$6,422,812	\$40,405,777
	2012	\$57,689,309	\$3,659,378	\$6,631,207	\$47,398,724
	2013	\$53,773,718	\$3,624,886	\$9,619,890	\$40,528,942
	2014	\$53,810,523	\$4,028,847	\$6,451,073	\$43,330,603
Projections	2015-2020	\$346,232,153	\$27,792,173	\$44,501,402	\$273,938,581
	2021-2030	\$676,817,327	\$63,652,632	\$101,921,908	\$511,242,788
	2031-2040	\$825,036,548	\$94,221,445	\$150,869,321	\$579,945,779
	Total	\$1,848,086,028	\$185,666,250	\$297,292,631	\$1,365,127,148

1. Revenues are forecast to increase at a conservative two percent per year.
2. Expenditures for operations and maintenance are forecast to increase at four percent per year.
3. The majority of this funding will go to other local projects and debt payments. This funding should not be assumed to be available for road, bridge, or non-motorized projects.

Federal and State Funding for Projects

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM AND TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM

The most consistent sources of federal funding for transportation improvements in the RTA under ISTEA, TEA-21, and SAFETEA-LU have been the Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Enhancement funds. These funds have been allocated to the RTA and distributed to jurisdictions based on an annual project selection process. The approval of MAP-21 has resulted in the consolidation and elimination of a number of federal aid programs.

At the RTA level, programming for the Surface Transportation Program remains relatively unchanged. However, the Transportation Enhancement Program, which had funded projects such as trails and scenic and historic transportation improvements, changed significantly. Funding for these types of projects is now available through the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). The types of projects eligible for this funding have also changed somewhat. In essence, the RTA Enhancement Program was transitioned to a Transportation Alternatives Program, though at a reduced funding level.

In addition to the switch from Enhancement to TAP, one of the decisions the Iowa DOT Commission made was to no longer have statewide competitive grant programs for Safe Routes to Schools, Enhancements, or Scenic Byways. Rather than continue statewide programs, this funding is also being distributed to metropolitan and regional planning agencies for programming. Additionally, the Commission chose to allow RPAs and MPOs to have flexibility with this funding,

meaning that it can be utilized for TAP-eligible projects and/or STP-eligible projects. This particular allocation of TAP funding is being called TAP Flex. The Commission did hold back a portion of TAP funding for statewide projects, and there are still statewide grant programs for Federal Recreational Trails and the Iowa Clean Air Attainment Program.

The end result of these changes is that the RTA has three pools of federal aid to program towards projects: STP, TAP, and TAP Flex. The TAP funding must be used on TAP-eligible projects, while the TAP Flex funding can be utilized for either STP- or TAP-eligible projects. Current annual funding targets are approximately \$2,208,000 for STP, \$131,000 for TAP, and \$100,000 for TAP Flex. At its March 20, 2013 meeting, the RTA Policy Board voted to allocate enough TAP Flex to the TAP Program to keep its annual funding target equal to what the Enhancement target had been, or \$184,000. For the purposes of this plan, it is assumed that this will continue to be the case.

Table 9.3 provides the funding history and revenue forecasts for STP and TAP funds. In the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), targets for FY 2016-2019 remain relatively constant with FY 2015 targets. Thus, revenue forecasts did not begin until FY 2020. STP projections are based on the average year-to-year change for the past 10 years, which equals \$33,944. This average is added to the target each year starting in FY 2020. This method is considered conservative as it results in a lower growth rate than a linear trend of the historical data. While the RTA has a funding history for RTA Enhancement, Statewide Enhancement, Federal Recreational Trails, and Safe Routes to School Programs, the TAP target is kept constant with the RTA's current target of \$184,000 per year, and no additional statewide federal funds are assumed for trails. This conservative approach is due to the funding program changes in MAP-21, as well as the uncertainty of future funding levels. This also makes the assumption that the RTA will continue to allocate enough TAP Flex to the TAP Program to keep its annual funding target at \$184,000.

HIGHWAY BRIDGE PROGRAM

The Highway Bridge Program (HBP) is no longer a stand-alone federal program under MAP-21, but the Iowa DOT Commission has elected to continue to allocate funding to HBP from the state's allotment of STP, and has continued to divide the program into city and county portions as it has been in the past. Each county in Iowa receives an annual allocation of HBP funding. Cities can submit bridges for consideration for HBP funding, and they are ranked at the statewide level based on the condition and traffic level of the bridge. If the bridge ranks high enough, the jurisdiction is offered up to \$1,000,000 in HBP funds to replace it. *Table 9.3* gives the 10-year history of city and county HBP funding and projects future funding at a constant rate using the annual average for each program. The amount of funding identified for these projections is considered the likely ceiling for this funding in the RTA.

COMPETITIVE STATE TRAILS FUNDING

While the federal grant programs administered by the Iowa DOT that may have funded trails have been eliminated or had funding reduced, there have consistently been two state grant programs that have funded trail projects in the RTA. These include the State Recreational Trails (SRT) Program, administered by the Iowa DOT, and the Resource Enhancement and Protection Program (REAP), administered by the Iowa DNR. *Table 9.3* gives the 10-year history of trail grants awarded in the RTA under these programs. Future funding is projected at a constant rate using the annual average. These projections are considered the RTA's likely ceiling for this type of funding, and are only targeted towards trail projects that would be competitive applications.

Table 9.3 – Federal and State Funding Sources History and Projections

	Fiscal Year	Surface Transportation Program ¹	Enhancement/TAP ²	City Highway Bridge Program ³	County Highway Bridge Program ⁴	State Recreational Trails & REAP ⁵
History	2005	\$1,972,360	\$162,154		\$2,047,000	
	2006	\$1,465,499	\$132,561	\$766,520	\$1,610,000	\$30,413
	2007	\$1,392,961	\$132,506		\$1,832,000	
	2008	\$1,694,686	\$139,065		\$2,049,000	\$175,000
	2009	\$1,925,106	\$148,912	\$1,000,000	\$1,950,640	
	2010	\$2,282,169	\$160,166		\$2,033,897	\$250,000
	2011	\$2,451,097	\$169,578		\$2,299,984	
	2012	\$2,524,354	\$191,437	\$1,000,000	\$2,169,079	\$396,516
	2013	\$2,409,109	\$183,882		\$2,230,834	\$40,577
	2014	\$2,245,442	\$184,000	\$491,753	\$2,240,762	\$100,000
2015	\$2,281,211	\$184,000	\$896,000	\$2,256,537	\$285,906	
Projections	2016	\$2,255,797	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2017	\$2,255,000	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2018	\$2,255,000	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2019	\$2,255,000	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2020	\$2,288,944	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2021	\$2,322,888	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2022	\$2,356,832	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2023	\$2,390,776	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2024	\$2,424,720	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2025	\$2,458,664	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2026	\$2,492,608	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2027	\$2,526,552	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2028	\$2,560,496	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2029	\$2,594,440	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2030	\$2,628,384	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2031	\$2,662,328	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2032	\$2,696,272	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2033	\$2,730,216	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2034	\$2,764,160	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
	2035	\$2,798,104	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219
2036	\$2,832,048	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219	
2037	\$2,865,992	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219	
2038	\$2,899,936	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219	
2039	\$2,933,880	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219	
2040	\$2,967,824	\$184,000	\$377,661	\$2,065,430	\$116,219	
	Total (2016-2040)	\$64,216,861	\$4,600,000	\$9,441,525	\$51,635,750	\$2,905,475

1. STP projections are based on the average year-to-year change for the past 10 years, which equals \$33,944. This average is added to the target each year starting in FY 2020. FY 2016-2019 is consistent with the targets provided by the Iowa DOT.
2. The RTA TAP target is kept constant with the RTA’s current target of \$184,000 per year. This makes the assumption that the RTA will continue to allocate enough TAP Flex to the TAP Program to keep its annual funding target at \$184,000.
3. HBP City funding is projected at the RTA’s 10-year average of \$377,661 per year.
4. HBP County funding is projected at the RTA’s 10-year average of \$2,065,430 per year.
5. State trail grants are projected at the 10-year average of \$116,219.

Funding Deficiencies

As detailed in Chapters 3 and 5, assessments were conducted to estimate funding levels required to improve the region’s existing federal aid eligible road and bridge network to a state of good condition, and to implement the Regional Bicycle Accommodation Plan. Using conservative figures, it is estimated to cost roughly \$315 million to improve the federal aid eligible road and bridge network to a state of good condition. To fully implement the Regional Bicycle Accommodation Plan, an estimated \$32 million in funding would be needed. These figures do not factor in future maintenance costs for construction projects or infrastructure that is presently in good condition. *Table 9.4* compares these expense figures to the total projected state and federal funding outlined in *Table 9.3*. As shown, it is anticipated that the region will experience a significant transportation funding deficiency for federal aid eligible transportation projects over the life of this plan. Unless additional funding sources are identified, the region will face a struggle to successfully maintain the transportation network at a level that is safe, accommodating to all transportation modes, and does not significantly impede economic development.

Table 9.4 – Projected Funding Deficiency for Non-Motorized Projects and Federal Aid Eligible Roads and Bridges

	Projected Amount (2016-2040)
Expenses	
Federal Aid Eligible Road and Bridge Network (State of Good Condition)	\$315,000,000
Bicycle Accommodation Plan Implementation	\$32,000,000
Total Expenses:	\$347,000,000
Revenues	
Surface Transportation Program	\$64,216,861
Transportation Alternatives Program	\$4,600,000
City Highway Bridge Program	\$9,441,525
County Highway Bridge Program	\$51,635,750
State Grants	\$2,905,478
Total Revenues:	\$132,799,611
Total Expenses:	\$347,000,000
Total Revenues:	\$132,799,611
Funding Deficiency:	\$214,200,389

For transportation providers, identifying potential funding sources is a constant issue. MAP-21 greatly reduced the amount of funding available to Iowa for bus replacement. To compound the issue, operating costs have grown over the past several years and will likely continue to increase over the life of this plan. With the current federal funding picture looking less optimistic, the Regional Transit Commission (RTC) will likely face significant challenges with funding new vehicles, as an increasing percentage of the fleet will be beyond its useful life. RTC may have to look to other non-traditional funding sources to help fund replacement buses.

For the purpose of this Plan, a rudimentary assessment was conducted to estimate funding levels required to improve RTC’s bus fleet to a state of good repair. At present, 14 of its 20 busses are beyond their useful life. At an estimated replacement cost of \$76,500 each, it would cost nearly \$1,100,000 to bring RTC’s vehicles to a state of good repair. Once again, this figure does not factor in future maintenance costs of vehicles presently in good condition. Without increased funding from the state or federal government, either local funding or fares will have to increase, or services may have to decrease.

Short-Term Transportation Projects

Table 9.5 provides a list of planned transportation projects from FY 2016-2019. This includes projects funded through the Surface Transportation Program (STP), National Highway Performance Program (NHPP), Surface Transportation Program – Highway Bridge Program (STP-HBP), State of Iowa Primary Road Fund (PRF), and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP).

Table 9.5 – Transportation Projects in the Iowa Northland Region, FY 2016-2019

Fiscal Year	Sponsor	Description	Total Cost (1,000s)	Federal Funding (1,000s)	Federal Source
'16-'19	INRTA – RPA 7	RPA 7 Planning and Programming	\$176	\$140	STP
2016	Waverly	16 th St SW from 4 th Ave SW to Meadow View Ln	\$400	\$200	STP
2016	Butler Co.	T-16 from IA-57 to C-51	\$1,850	\$800	STP
2016	Butler Co.	T-43 from Main St to 180 th St	\$625	\$500	STP
2016	Allison	Main St from IA-14 to 6th St; 6th St from Main St to Locust St; Locust St from 6th St to 7th St; 7th St from Locust St to IA-14	\$685	\$548	STP
2017	Bremer Co.	V-5C from Frederika to IA-93	\$1,500	\$1,200	STP
2017	Black Hawk Co.	D-17 from S Butler Rd to Cedar Falls City Limit	\$1,000	\$750	STP
2017	Black Hawk Co.	D-38 from 5 th St in Gilbertville to V-51/Canfield Rd	\$500	\$380	STP
2018	Buchanan Co.	V-62 from D-16 to C-66	\$1,100	\$550	STP
2018	Grundy Co.	T-55 from D-25 north 8.0 miles to IA-57	\$2,000	\$900	STP
2018	Denver	State St from US-63 to Prestein Dr	\$929	\$450	STP
2018	Black Hawk Co.	D-35 from Hudson City Limits to Grundy Co. Line	\$900	\$550	STP
2019	Black Hawk Co.	C-57 from US-218/IA-27 east 5.3 miles to US-63	\$1,325	\$600	STP
2019	Iowa DOT	IA-188 from Plainfield ECL east 6.8 miles to V-21	\$4,000	\$500	STP
2019	Independence	1st St E from Wapsi. River to 3rd Ave NE; 5th Ave NE to 0.3 miles east of 9th Ave SE	\$1,109	\$600	STP
2019	Greene	N 1st St from NCL southeast 0.63 miles to E Traer St	\$1,186	\$600	STP
2016	Black Hawk Co.	Burton Ave: From W. Dunkerton Rd. to W. Mt Vernon Rd.	\$220	\$176	STP-HBP
2016	Black Hawk Co.	C-66: From V-25 west 0.25 mi to bridge	\$320	\$256	STP-HBP
2016	Black Hawk Co.	Hammond Ave: D-35 south 0.8 miles	\$280	\$224	STP-HBP
2016	Bremer Co.	V-56: Over abandoned RR, from IA-3 south 1.1 miles	\$450	\$360	STP-HBP
2016	Bremer Co.	C-28: Over Wapsi Overflow	\$525	\$420	STP-HBP
2016	Sumner	3 rd St: Over drainage	\$773	\$618	STP-HBP
2016	Buchanan Co.	York Ave: Over Small Stream, from 250 th St north 0.15 miles	\$270	\$216	STP-HBP
2016	Buchanan Co.	235 th St: From W-40 west 0.75 miles	\$200	\$160	STP-HBP
2016	Buchanan Co.	100 th St: From Stanley east 1.1 miles	\$310	\$240	STP-HBP
2016	Buchanan Co.	W-35: Over Unnamed Creek	\$350	\$280	STP-HBP
2016	Buchanan Co.	W-35: Over Unnamed Creek, from 310 th St north 0.6 miles	\$350	\$280	STP-HBP
2016	Greene	East South St: Over Small Stream	\$515	\$412	STP-HBP

Fiscal Year	Sponsor	Description	Total Cost (1,000s)	Federal Funding (1,000s)	Federal Source
2016	Chickasaw Co.	B-22: Over Small Stream, from 110 th St west 0.1 miles	\$600	\$480	STP-HBP
2016	Conrad	H Ave: Over Wolf Creek, from 330 th St north 0.5 miles	\$710	\$568	STP-HBP
2016	Grundy Co.	G Ave: From 160 th St north 0.3 miles	\$650	\$540	STP-HBP
2017	Black Hawk Co.	Bridge Expansion Join Repairs – Various Locations	\$250	\$200	STP-HBP
2017	Bremer Co.	Midway Ave: Over Crane Creek	\$325	\$260	STP-HBP
2017	Butler Co.	Camp Comfort Rd: NW Corner Sec 29 south 0.1 miles	\$350	\$280	STP-HBP
2017	Butler Co.	Liberty Ave: Over Small Stream, from 245 th St north 0.1 mi.	\$150	\$120	STP-HBP
2017	Chickasaw Co.	B-54: Over East Wapsipinicon River	\$1,000	\$800	STP-HBP
2017	Grundy Co.	R Ave: From IA-175 north 0.125 miles to J-13	\$264	\$211	STP-HBP
2017	Grundy Co.	T-37: From M Ave 0.25 miles north of Marshall Co. Line	\$650	\$520	STP-HBP
2018	Bremer Co.	Kildeer Ave: Over Quarter Section Run	\$400	\$320	STP-HBP
2018	Buchanan Co.	D-16: From Isaac Ave 0.1 miles west	\$240	\$192	STP-HBP
2018	Buchanan Co.	Dugan Ave: Over Lime Creek, from Benton Co. Line north 0.8 miles	\$450	\$360	STP-HBP
2018	Butler Co.	Pearl Ave: Over Alry Creek, from 180 th St south 0.3 miles	\$450	\$360	STP-HBP
2018	Butler Co.	265 th St: Over Freddeke Creek, from Sinclair Ave west	\$350	\$280	STP-HBP
2018	Butler Co.	Forest Ave; From IA-57 to 310 th St	\$450	\$360	STP-HBP
2018	Grundy Co.	R Ave: Over tributary of Black Hawk Creek, NW S36 T89 R16	\$350	\$280	STP-HBP
2019	Black Hawk Co.	C-57: From US-63 east 2.5 miles	\$320	\$256	STP-HBP
2019	Iowa DOT	IA-3: Over Buck Creek, from V-56 east 0.6 miles	\$2,111	\$1,689	STP-HBP
2019	Butler Co.	T-63: Over West Fork Cedar River, from 302 nd St/Willow Ave north 0.6 miles	\$1,500	\$1,200	STP-HBP
2019	Iowa DOT	IA-3: West Fork Cedar River, 0.8 miles east of T-16	\$2,340	\$1,872	STP-HBP
2019	Bremer Co.	310 th St: Over Two Mile Creek	\$300	\$240	STP-HBP
2019	Chickasaw Co.	310 th St: Over Dry Run	\$600	\$480	STP-HBP
2019	Grundy Co.	I Ave: From 120 th St north 0.125 miles	\$300	\$240	STP-HBP
2019	Grundy Co.	300 th St: Over Wolf Creek, from IA-14 west 1.5 miles	\$264	\$211	STP-HBP
2019	Grundy Co.	D-35: Over tributary of Black Hawk Creek, Ctr S34 T88 R15	\$350	\$280	STP-HBP
2016	Fredericksburg	Plum Creek Trail: 600' S of Matke Ave to 100' S of US-18	\$249	\$199	TAP
2017	Buchanan CCB	Amish Trail: From C-57 to 125 th St west of Fontana Lake	\$278	\$220	TAP
2018	Allison	SRTS: Cherry St/IA-3 NW through town to 4 th St/Birch ST	\$168	\$83	TAP
2018	Butler CCB	Rolling Prairie Trail: In City of Dumont from Main St to Cedar Ave	\$126	\$101	TAP
2019	Independence	1 st St West Trail: From 20 th Ave SW east to the Liberty Trail	\$270	\$145	TAP
2019	Butler CCB	Rolling Prairie Trail: In City of Bristow from Elm St to ECL	\$141	\$112	TAP
2016	Iowa DOT	IA-93: US-63 to Sumner	\$2,166	\$0	PRF
2016	Iowa DOT	IA-14: Beaver Creek Overflow north of Parkersburg	\$137	\$0	PRF
2017	Iowa DOT	US-218: Erosion Control, C-57 Interchange	\$342	\$0	PRF
2017	Iowa DOT	IA-281: Buck Creek, 0.6 miles west of V-62	\$244	\$0	PRF
2017	Iowa DOT	IA-57: Phelps Creek, 0.3 miles east of IA-14	\$857	\$0	PRF
2017	Iowa DOT	IA-346: Etter Creek, 3.6 miles west of US-63	\$592	\$0	PRF
2019	Iowa DOT	IA-3: Ditch, 0.2 miles west of US-218	\$260	\$0	PRF
2019	Iowa DOT	IA-14: Iowa Northern RR, 1.0 miles north of C-13	\$250	\$0	PRF
2019	Iowa DOT	IA-175: Stream, 0.4 miles west of T-53	\$685	\$0	PRF
2016	Buchanan Co.	D-22, Jesup ECL east to Frost Ave	\$625	\$500	HSIP
2016	Grundy Co.	Intersection of T-19/D-17	\$16	\$15	HSIP

Long-Term Transportation Projects

ROADS AND BRIDGES

Recent highway corridor projects have significantly improved the region's connectivity to the rest of Iowa and the nation. One of these projects is the completion of the four-lane US-63 from Waterloo to New Hampton which was upgraded from a two-lane facility. Completed in 2012, this project has provided a direct connection between Bremer and Chickasaw Counties and the Waterloo/Cedar Falls metropolitan area, effectively reducing travel times and providing economic opportunities throughout the region. Another project that has positively affected the region is the completion of the four-lane, freeway-design US-20 west of Cedar Falls to Interstate 35. This link has provided more expeditious travel to Interstate 35 which connects to central Iowa, Kansas City, Missouri, and Minneapolis, Minnesota. Planned future improvements to US-20 in western Iowa, and potential improvements east of Dubuque in Illinois where it is currently a two-lane facility, could also impact traffic in the region. A completely upgraded facility could make US-20 a comparable option to other east-west routes such as Interstate 80 in central Iowa and Interstate 90 in southern Minnesota. This could result in a significant increase in traffic on US-20 in the region.

An ongoing initiative that will impact the region involves upgrading a portion of US-218 in Black Hawk and Bremer Counties to a fully controlled-access highway. US-218 was originally opened as a partial controlled-access facility from Cedar Falls to Waverly in 1995. This segment is designated as a part of the Avenue of Saints which is a four-lane route linking St. Paul, Minnesota to St. Louis, Missouri. Completion of this stretch of US-218 resulted in substantial traffic growth as well as significant safety and operational issues. In 2005, the Iowa DOT initiated a Corridor Study to identify potential safety improvements and options for access control. Three projects that were identified include the construction of interchanges at the intersections of US-218 and C-50 in Janesville, C-57 north of Cedar Falls, and 260th Street north of Janesville. As part of the proposed and completed improvements, all at-grade intersections within the corridor will be permanently closed. Construction of the interchange at C-50 was completed in 2012. Construction of the C-57 interchange began in 2015 and is anticipated to be complete by 2016. While funding has not been identified for the interchange at 260th Street, it is anticipated that this project will be constructed within the life of this Plan.

A focus area that has been a priority for the Iowa Northland Region involves IA Hwy 150 from US-20 in Independence to IA Hwy 3 in Oelwein. This corridor has been of particular concern due to the significant growth in truck and automobile traffic over the past two decades. IA Hwy 150 serves as a north to south link to the Commercial and Industrial Highway Network. At present, the segment of IA Hwy 150 in downtown Independence carries on average 12,400 vehicles per day. The corridor is not capable of handling additional traffic and acts as a bottleneck for truck traffic. In 2000, realizing the importance of this corridor, the Iowa Northland Regional Transportation Authority in partnership with Upper Explorerland programmed STP funds for a corridor study. Unfortunately, the study was halted due to a shortage of funding at the state level. The IA Hwy

150 corridor remains a priority for the region. As funds become available, a corridor study may be revisited.

NON-MOTORIZED

Over the past three decades, the Iowa Northland Region has taken a proactive approach to trail development. These efforts have been strengthened by the expansive trail system in the Waterloo/Cedar Falls metropolitan area as well as the availability of abandoned rail corridors. As with all modes of transportation, the amount of funding for non-motorized transportation falls well short of the demand. Though regional funding is available, it is limited in its ability to fund larger construction projects. Over the years, the RTA has competed for statewide resources for which the demand is intense. This has delayed the completion of critical trail connections throughout the region.

In the past, the RTA has been able to assist with the acquisition and subsequent conversion of abandoned rail corridors into recreational trails. Examples include segments of the Rolling Prairie Trail in Butler and Bremer Counties, the Cedar Valley Nature Trail in Black Hawk and Buchanan Counties, and the Pioneer Trail in Grundy County. This Plan identifies the need to improve and expand on these rail-to-trail corridors. Long-range projects include paving the Rolling Prairie Trail from Allison west to the Butler County line, and paving the remaining 9.5 miles of the Cedar Valley Nature Trail in Black Hawk and Buchanan Counties.

Though offering unique and universally accommodating routes, abandoned rail corridors are limited in their availability and location and are not a viable option in every part of the region. Additionally, the construction of separated off-road trails can be cost prohibitive and financially burdensome for smaller communities. Accordingly, the 2040 Regional Bicycle Accommodation Plan relies heavily on incorporating on-road accommodations such as paved shoulders and on-road bicycle routes. Ultimately, each jurisdiction will have the responsibility of deciding what type of non-motorized accommodation to provide.

As part of the Regional Bicycle Accommodation Plan update, INRCOG staff conducted public input meetings at four locations in the region. Priority projects that were identified include completing the segment of the Rolling Prairie Trail from Shell Rock to Waverly, and connecting the Waterloo/Cedar Falls metropolitan trail system to the Rolling Prairie Trail through Janesville and Waverly. The former rail corridor alignment that the RPT would have utilized between Shell Rock and Waverly is no longer in place. It was determined that a paved shoulder along IA-3 would be the most accommodating and feasible alternative for non-motorized travel. To connect the Waterloo/Cedar Falls metropolitan trail system to the Rolling Prairie Trail, it was determined that a combination of on-road bicycle routes, paved shoulders, and off-road trails would be required. The route identified would utilize an interchange constructed at the intersection of US-218 and 260th Street north of Janesville. As mentioned previously, it is anticipated that this interchange will be constructed within the life of this Plan.

TAP and STP Project Selection Process

The passage of MAP-21 requires that projects to be funded through TAP be selected using a competitive project selection process. The goal of such is to increase transparency, openness, objectivity, and to improve overall project quality. Working with the FHWA, the Iowa DOT established that, at a minimum, one of two project selection processes must be met for TAP project selection: applications scored based on defined criteria using quantitative methods, or applications ranked based on defined criteria using qualitative methods. The RTA TAP and Technical Committees opted to utilize a project ranking process. The Policy Board adopted project eligibility and ranking criteria for projects submitted for TAP funds at the February 26, 2014 meeting, which are outlined below. Potential project sponsors are notified each year when TAP projects are solicited. Each jurisdiction with candidate project(s) must submit them prior to the TAP Committee meeting. New projects applying for TAP funding must meet the following requirements:

- Commitment of local sponsor (city or county) to maintain project for 20 years
- Ability to obligate funds in year programmed
- TAP funding may not be used for engineering or architectural related services during design or project construction
- Minimum total project cost of \$100,000 (\$80,000 federal) with 20 percent match and minimum federal aid participation level of 40 percent
- Must be eligible for TAP funds under MAP-21. Regional TAP projects should be limited to capital improvements in the following specific areas:
 - Multi-use, non-motorized trails and essential support facilities and on-road improvements to enhance bicycle/pedestrian use
 - Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations associated with a federal aid roadway project
 - Historic preservation of transportation structures with preference given to their functional use
 - Aesthetic and environmental enhancements to public roadways
 - Pedestrian improvements related to routes to schools or safety issues

Projects that would be competitive at the state level may be programmed for Regional TAP funds, but should compete for statewide or other funding sources (e.g., Resource Enhancement and Protection, State Recreational Trails Program, etc.) whenever appropriate. Should sufficient other funding be awarded, RTA TAP funds will be returned to the program to be reallocated. Projects that do not meet these guidelines but are eligible under MAP-21 guidelines are allowed to be submitted, but require a significant extenuating circumstance in order for them to be considered for funding. This determination is at the discretion of the TAP Committee.

TAP projects submitted are ranked and recommended for funding based on criteria. Project sponsors are asked to identify which criteria their project relates to, and provide a brief description of the relationship. The project criteria are as follows:

- Jurisdiction Ability to Complete Project
 - Ability to meet federal requirements
 - Ability to meet programming timelines
- Project Readiness
 - Status of matching funds
 - Public acceptance of project
 - Right of way constraints
- Relationship to Transportation System
 - Ability to enhance safety
 - Connectivity to existing facilities
 - Enhancement to existing transportation system
 - Inclusion in state, regional, and local plans
 - Associated benefits
 - Environmental and social impacts
 - Regional economic development impact
 - Regional tourism impact
 - Sustainability elements of project
- Other
 - Cost in relation to public benefit
 - Involvement of multiple jurisdictions
 - Predicted usage relative to population

Projects are ranked at the TAP Committee meeting via a comparison process. As part of the application process, each project sponsor is asked to document which criteria their project relates to, and each sponsor is given a chance to present their project at the meeting. All projects are directly compared to each other, with a priority being chosen from each pair. Each time a project is chosen as the priority, it receives a point. Once all projects are compared, points are totaled, which enables the creation of a ranked priority list for funding. Projects are ranked by entities present at the meeting. Entities are allowed to vote on rankings as follows:

- Each county shall have up to two votes from different departments (engineering, conservation, economic development, etc.)
- Each city shall have one vote
- Silos & Smokestacks shall have one vote
- INRCOG and the Iowa DOT will not vote, but will provide staff recommendations if requested

Once ranked, projects are recommended for funding based upon the rankings and the time and funding constraints of the TAP program. The TAP Committee has the discretion to recommend projects in a different order than the rankings if adequate justification to do so exists. Once a fiscally constrained program has been achieved, projects are recommended to the Technical Committee for inclusion in the draft TIP.

For project submittal and selection for STP funds, each jurisdiction with candidate project(s) must submit them prior to the Technical Committee meeting. At the meeting, existing and candidate TIP projects are reviewed, and the Committee chooses which projects to include in the draft TIP based on the quality of projects and fiscal constraint. Roadway projects must be consistent with the goals and objectives identified in the most recent Long Range Transportation Plan. Jurisdictional need is considered, as well as the availability of alternative funding for such projects. General agreement is reached after the group has balanced the overall costs to the estimated transportation benefits of proposed projects. The RTA does not currently rank or score STP projects. However, the RTA did adopt Funding Equity Guidelines in 2006 which outline selection criteria and funding ranges for each jurisdiction. The process currently used builds consensus among the Committee and has worked well over the years.

The Policy Board adopted guidelines for the consideration of projects for STP funding at the February 26, 2014 meeting, which are outlined below. Potential project sponsors are notified each year when STP projects are solicited. STP-HBP projects are programmed by the RTA in the TIP, but their selection is done at either the county or state level. State bridges to receive funding are selected by the Iowa DOT. City bridge projects are selected by the Iowa DOT based on a priority points ranking system at the statewide level. County projects are selected by each individual county based on its methodology.

New projects applying for STP funding must meet the following requirements:

- Must be on federally functionally classified routes that are Major Collectors or above
- Ability to obligate funds in year programmed
- STP funding may not be used for engineering or architectural related services during design or project construction
- For construction projects, minimum total project cost of \$100,000 (\$80,000 federal) with 20 percent match and minimum federal aid participation level of 40 percent
- Must be eligible for STP funds under MAP-21. STP funding should be limited to the following types of improvements:
 - Major new construction, reconstruction, or resurfacing of roadways or bridges
 - Regional planning and planning studies
 - Transit capital purchases
 - Projects eligible under the RTA's TAP guidelines

Projects that would be competitive for grants at the state level may be programmed for Regional STP funds, but should compete for statewide or other funding sources (e.g., ICAAP, State Recreational Trails Program, etc.) whenever appropriate. Should sufficient other funding be awarded, RTA STP funds will be returned to the program to be reallocated.

Projects that do not meet these guidelines but are eligible under MAP-21 STP guidelines are allowed to be submitted, but require a significant extenuating circumstance in order for them to be considered for funding. This determination is at the discretion of the Technical Committee.