

# Surface Transportation Block Grant- Iowa Federal-Aid Swap Program Guidance Manual

---

for  
**Iowa Region 9**  
**Transportation Planning Area**

**September 2014**

*Technical Corrections made June 2021*

This report was prepared in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration; the Illinois Department of Transportation; and the Iowa Department of Transportation. The contents of this report reflect the views of the author who is responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the Illinois Department of Transportation, the Iowa Department of Transportation, or the Federal Highway Administration. This report does not constitute a standard, specification or regulation. In accordance with federal law and policy, Bi-State Regional Commission is prohibited from discriminating on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, religion, sex, and familial status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.)



1504 Third Avenue, Third Floor  
Rock Island, IL 61201  
Phone: (309) 793-6300 • Fax: (309) 793-6305  
Website: <http://www.bistateonline.org>



**Bi-State Regional Commission**

Robert Gallagher, Chair

Ken Beck	Mike Matson
Kippy Breeden	John Maxwell
Diana Broderson	Marcy Mendenhall
Richard “Quijas” Brunk	Gary Moore
Matthew Carter*	Randy Moore
Duane Dawson	Jazmin Newton
Jeff Deppe	Marty O’Boyle
Rick Dunn	Dylan Parker
Reggie Freeman	Sangeetha Rayapati
Ralph H. Heninger	Eileen Roethler
Dave Holmes	Santos Saucedo
Sean Johnson*	Scott Sauer
Shawn Kendall	Rick Schloemer
Brinson Kinzer	Elizabeth Sherwin
Jerry Lack	William Stoermer
Nathaniel Lawrence	James Thompson
Michael Limberg*	Mike Thoms
	Mike Waldron

Colonel Todd Allison, Rock Island Arsenal Garrison – Ex-Officio Member

\* *Alternates for Small Town Representatives*

**Bi-State Regional Commission Staff**

Denise Bulat, Executive Director

Gena McCullough, Assistant Executive Director/Planning Director

Gus Benson, GIS Analyst	Peggi Merchie, Accounting Technician
Robert Burke, Planning Assistant	Ricky Newcomb, Planner
Christine Cary, MUNICES Project Manager	Michael Saponaro, Data Services Senior Planner
Carol Connors, Finance/Human Resource Specialist	Jim Schmedding, Interactive Media Designer
Sarah Grabowski, Desktop Publisher	Bryan Schmid, Senior Planner
Kassie Keeney-McGurk, GIS Analyst	Sharon Van Hook, Accounting Clerk
Brandon Melton, Senior Planner	Freddy Vasquez, Planner
Katelyn Miner, Planner	Chong Qing Wu, Transportation Engineer

**Region 9 Transportation Policy Committee**

Scott Sauer, Board Member  
River Bend Transit

Diana Broderson, Mayor<sup>2</sup>  
City of Muscatine

Jeff Sorensen, Board Member<sup>1</sup>  
Muscatine County Board of Supervisors

John Maxwell, Board Member  
Scott County, Board of Supervisors

John Kostichek, Mayor<sup>3</sup>  
City of Walcott  
(Alternate: Michael Limberg, City of Long Grove)

Sam Shea<sup>4</sup>  
Iowa Department of Transportation

<sup>1</sup> Chairman Region 9 Transportation Policy Committee

<sup>2</sup> Vice Chair Region 9 Transportation Policy Committee

<sup>3</sup> The mayors of the cities under 5,000 in the non-urbanized areas of Muscatine and Scott Counties caucused for a representative.

<sup>4</sup> Ex-officio Non-Voting Members

**Region 9 Technical Committee**

Randy Zobrist<sup>1</sup>  
Executive Director  
River Bend Transit

Brian Stineman  
Public Works Director  
City of Muscatine

Jodi Royal-Goodwin  
Community Development Director  
City of Muscatine

Amy Fortenbacher  
Transit Supervisor  
City of Muscatine/MuscaBus

Pat Lynch  
City Engineer  
City of Muscatine

Keith White  
County Engineer  
Muscatine County

Chris Mathias  
Planning & Development Director  
Scott County

Angie Kersten  
County Engineer  
Scott County

Elliot Pennock  
Assistant County Engineer  
Scott County

Jeff Horne<sup>2</sup>  
City Administrator  
City of Wilton

(Alternate: Lee Geertz, City of West Liberty)

Sam Shea<sup>3</sup>  
Iowa Department of Transportation

<sup>1</sup> Transportation Technical Committee Chair

<sup>2</sup> Represents the staff of the cities under 5,000 in the non-urbanized areas of Muscatine and Scott Counties.

<sup>3</sup> Ex-officio Non-Voting Members

Note: Each jurisdiction has one vote, except for ex-officio members.



## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
Surface Transportation Block Grant Program Funding.....	1
Eligibility Explanations.....	2
Geographic Distribution and Equity Balance .....	4
Geographic Targets for Programming Discussions .....	5
Project Selection Process .....	6
Awarded Projects .....	9



## **INTRODUCTION**

The Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) was authorized as part of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) federal transportation act. MAP-21 was enacted on July 6, 2012 and subsequently continued in the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. Each federal fiscal year, the Region 9 planning area (RPA9) is designated by the Iowa Department of Transportation to receive a portion of the STBG funds, formerly the Surface Transportation Program (STP) as part of a regional transportation planning process. These funds are available to the State Iowa for related surface transportation projects and can be used to fund public transit through flexible funding regulations.

Programming of these funds is the responsibility of the Bi-State Regional Commission. The Commission has, in turn, delegated the authority for programming these STBG funds to the Region 9 Transportation Policy Committee. The Policy Committee has directed the Region 9 Transportation Technical Committee to develop and implement a process through which candidate projects for STBG funding are submitted as needed, then evaluated in priority manner that is inclusive of eligible applicants and transparent to the public. The resulting advisory prioritization assists the Policy Committee in determining which projects should be selected to receive STBG funding in a given selection round. The Policy Committee reserves the right to select projects to receive STBG funding as deemed necessary for the transportation system at any time. There may be circumstances where the STBG evaluation process may not apply.

The Technical Committee periodically reviews the procedure for the technical evaluation and advisory prioritization. This document shall define the methodology that reflects the nomenclature and essence of the current transportation act.

## **SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM FUNDING**

Under MAP-21 and continued in the FAST Act, Iowa Region 9 has the ability to distribute federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) dollars. Under FAST, STBG projects could vary from roads and bridges and can include trails/sidewalks along transportation facilities. Transit projects are also eligible. A qualitative process is used to prioritize Iowa Region 9 STBG projects and outlined in this manual. Projected STBG funding for the region is detailed in Table 1 at the time of publication, and subject to Federal funding availability.

Additionally, the region has a category identified as "TAP Flex" funds that are available to fund either Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside or Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) eligible projects. Table 1 also identifies the TAP Flex funds available.

**Iowa Federal-Aid Swap Policy.** In 2017, the State of Iowa gave the Department of Transportation the ability to exchange federal Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) funds for state funding from the state sources of motor vehicle fees and fuel taxes. The exchange is considered dollar for dollar, and must be noted as swapped funds in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). All regions in the State of Iowa are assumed to participate unless a region opts out of the program. All Iowa STBG funds under the programming responsibility of the Region 9 Transportation Policy Committee will be swapped from federal to state dollars, participating in the Iowa Federal-Aid Swap Policy program. Swap funds are subject to all the requirements under this state policy.

**Table 1**  
**Region 9 Federal Aid-Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG-Swap) Funds**

	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
STBG Target		\$1,480,902	\$1,453,000	\$1,453,000	\$1,453,000
TAP Flex Target		\$63,240	\$63,000	\$63,000	\$63,000
Total Available for Programming		\$3,758,372	\$5,264,372	\$2,070,372	\$3,576,372
Total Combined Programmed		(\$10,000)	(\$4,710,000)	(\$10,000)	(\$10,000)
STBG & TAP Flex Combined Balance	\$2,214,230	\$3,748,372	\$554,372	\$2,060,372	\$3,566,372

Source: Iowa DOT and Bi-State Regional Commission (Revised 6/2021 per IADOT quarterly STBG funding history report)

- \* TAP Flex can be transferred to the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Set Aside fund balance for projects programmed under the TA Set-Aside Program. Programming will occur concurrently with STBG to allow flexing the funds to TA Set-Aside if programmed as such by the Region 9 Policy Committee. If that occurs, the transferred funds will be deducted from the combined balance in this table.

*Projects that will utilize Iowa's Federal-Aid Swap policy in 2019. Moving forward, it is assumed that all eligible STBG projects will utilize Iowa's Federal-Aid Swap policy, and that only STBG dollars will be planning dollars (due to being ineligible to use the Swap Policy).*

*A call for projects with programming through FFY2025 is anticipated in spring 2021 with programming of funds anticipated to occur in mid-2021.*

## ELIGIBILITY EXPLANATIONS

Candidate projects that are submitted for the STBG-Swap technical evaluation must meet the following requirements:

- The project must be consistent with the adopted Iowa Region 9 Long Range Transportation Plan.
- The project must be on the National Highway System or Federal-Aid road(s) except bridge or tunnel projects; projects described in 23 U.S.C 133 (b)(4)-(11); transportation alternatives or as approved by the Secretary of Transportation; or roads eligible under the Iowa Federal-Aid Swap Policy (e.g. minor collectors and Farm-To-Market designated road/bridges). Eligible activities include those outlined:
  - The project must be a permanent improvement. Temporary construction is defined as work that must be essentially replaced in the immediate future. Staged construction is considered permanent rather than temporary so long as future stages build onto rather than replace previous work.
  - Noise barriers, lighting projects, drainage projects, fences, landscaping, etc., are ineligible for funding unless included as part of a larger roadway construction, safety, capacity, or bikeway/walkway construction project that would qualify under the above criteria.

- The project must be structurally capable of handling all anticipated vehicles of legal load limit.
- Street/highway projects must provide for level of service “D” or higher on traffic forecasts developed in accordance with the adopted long-range transportation plan.
- Pedestrian/bicycle projects must meet one or more of the following location criteria: (a) be along a federal-aid route, (b) provide a means of crossing a controlled access federal-aid route, or (c) shift non-motorized traffic that would have normally used a federal-aid highway route to an adjacent route in the corridor. Ordinary sidewalk construction is not eligible as a separate project.
- The jurisdiction submitting a project for STBG funding consideration must be able to implement (defined as obligated or let) the project within five years from the fiscal year the project is awarded funds with notation of the date it is approved by the Policy Committee for programming. (For example, a project being awarded funds from Fiscal Year 2020, would be expected to be authorized or let no later than 2025.)
- The total project cost of an eligible project must be no less than \$125,000 or no less than \$100,000 in federal share.
- Transit projects are eligible for STBG funds, and will be evaluated as standalone projects not subject to the noted technical ranking process.

Any project not meeting these requirements will not be considered in the technical evaluation of STBG candidate projects. Details on the federal STBG Program can be found at this link for further details on eligibility and funding requirements:

<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/stp/160307.cfm>

**Eligible Applicants and Project Sponsors.** While FAST authorizes a number of eligible entities, the Iowa Region 9 Transportation Planning Area has identified the following as eligible applicants in the Region 9 Area solicitations:

- Local and state governments
- Transit agencies

Non-eligible project sponsors may partner with an eligible sponsor in applying for funds if the eligible sponsor is the lead on the project.

**Eligible and Minimum Project Costs.** Only certain costs are eligible for reimbursement through the STBG-Swap Program. Projects are awarded by Bi-State Regional Commissions’ delegated authority, the Region 9 Transportation Policy Committee. Projects are administered through the local sponsor under the rules of the Iowa Department of Transportation and require a funding agreement before proceeding. Refer to the Instructional Memorandums to Local Public Agencies website for specific requirements:

[https://iowadot.gov/local\\_systems/publications/im/imtoc.pdf](https://iowadot.gov/local_systems/publications/im/imtoc.pdf).

No projects are authorized to expend monies without coordination with the Iowa DOT. Awarded projects must also be included in the Region 9 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

The Region 9 STBG project selection process requires a minimum total project cost of \$125,000, based on matching requirements for Iowa Federal-Aid Swap.

Transit and planning projects would remain federalized and require an 80/20 match. They are not eligible for the Swap program. Actual federal funds applied to a project will not exceed 80 percent of the total project costs, or the maximum award amount, whichever is less.

**Local Match.** Project sponsors who are awarded funds can receive up to 100 percent of eligible project costs for the Swap Program or up to the maximum approved federal grant award based matching requirements. The Transportation Policy Committee will have discretion to determine whether matching funds will be required for Swap projects. Federal funds cannot be used to match Swap funds. Other state funds are eligible for use as match with Swap funds.

## GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION AND EQUITY BALANCE

Region 9 was formed in 1995, and as part of the transportation planning programming process, the regional partners agreed to a geographic equity balance where each participating county was targeted to receive approximately one year’s worth of funds, the City of Muscatine would receive one and a half years’ worth of funds, and other jurisdictions would compete for the balance of funds during a five-year transportation bill. Projects were selected in an evaluation process and ranked under this funding framework to support flexibility, distribution of funds over 2-3 years, and be inclusive of larger and small eligible jurisdictions, DOT, and transit. With changes in the length of transportation bills and continuing resolutions, the equity balance evolved to examine funding distribution over time relative to population. Table 2 is a history of funding distribution within Region 9 from the beginning.

**Table 2  
Region 9 Historical Review of Surface Transportation Programming (1996-2024)**

Jurisdictions Funded	2010 Population	Percent of RPA9 Population	Subtotals \$ Rcvd	Funding Rcvd 96-24	Percent of Funding	Years' Worth Based on Ave. Funding/Year*
Muscatine County -						
42,745 Total	11,030	17.3%		\$9,230,500	29.8%	7.92
Scott County-						
165,224 Total	15,130	23.7%		\$7,631,720	24.7%	6.55
City of Muscatine	22,886	35.8%		\$10,615,424	34.3%	9.11
Small Communities/ Transit	14,801	23.2%		\$3,128,705	10.1%	2.69
Blue Grass	1,452	2.3%	\$1,095,000		3.5%	0.00
Dixon	247	0.4%	\$192,501		0.6%	0.00
McCausland	291	0.5%	\$404,700		1.3%	0.00
West Liberty	3,736	5.9%	\$665,000		2.2%	0.00
Wilton	2,802	4.4%	\$260,000		0.8%	0.00
MuscaBus	n/a	n/a	\$424,200		1.4%	0.00
River Bend						
Transit	n/a	n/a	\$87,304		0.3%	0.00
Region (PL,PM, SUDAS)				\$317,065	100.0%	0.27
<b>Total</b>	<b>63,847</b>		<b>\$3,128,705</b>	<b>\$30,923,414</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>26.54</b>

Total Population is the sum of unincorporated Muscatine and Scott Counties and ALL small communities outside MPO minus the City of Muscatine. Average annual funding per year is \$1,039,710 for a 24-year period. In reality, there are fewer eligible roads within the jurisdiction of smaller communities. They have fewer resources to provide matching funds under the federal funding matching requirements of no less than 20% non-federal match. With the implementation of the Federal Aid Swap Policy, jurisdictions can receive up to 100% of exchanged funds depending on the guidelines set by the Region 9 Policy Committee. Iowa DOT has established that no jurisdictions with eligible roadways can be excluded from the evaluation process. Table 3 provides the total miles of roadway by Federal Functional Classification by Jurisdiction

**Table 3  
Region 9 Federal Functional Classification in Miles by Jurisdiction**

Functional Classification	Scott County (Excluding MPO area and cities)	Muscatine County (Excluding all cities)	City of Muscatine	All Cities in Muscatine County (Excluding City of Muscatine)	All Cities (Excluding MPO)
Interstate	22.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.96
Other Principal Arterial	24.86	66.57	28.21	3.13	40.83
Minor Arterial	13.50	50.91	20.00	5.27	27.70
Major Collector	101.41	92.02	14.50	3.10	34.45
Minor Collector (Rural)	64.66	111.80	0.00	3.16	10.22
Local	308.73	413.43	92.26	59.66	212.77
<b>Total</b>	<b>535.59</b>	<b>734.43</b>	<b>154.97</b>	<b>74.33</b>	<b>334.93</b>

## GEOGRAPHIC TARGETS FOR PROGRAMMING DISCUSSIONS

Region 9 transportation planning area is collectively provided funding as noted in Table 1 on page 2 by the Iowa Department of Transportation to program STBG-Swap funds for the purpose of improving the region’s transportation system, and to notify the public of the programming through additions of projects into the Transportation Improvement Program. For planning purposes, Table 4 illustrates an estimate of the total funds disaggregated by the geographic areas within Region 9. These targets are provided to aid general capital forecasting by the various jurisdictions, and should be considered to be flexible for programming project dollars in lesser or greater amounts than an annual target. Table 4 is meant to provide a benchmark to help quantify the geographic equity distribution on an annual basis for a 4-year period. In some programming rounds, jurisdictions submitting projects may receive more or less than the targets referenced because projects are selected from those submitted during a particular 2-3 year funding round, are deemed necessary for the regional transportation system, and contribute to the Region 9 Long Range Transportation Plan goals and objectives.

**Table 4**  
**Estimate of Total STBG-Swap Fund by Geographic Area**

Geographic Targets	2022	2023	2024	2025	22-25 Total	22-25 Average/Year
<b>STBG-SWAP Target Total</b>	<b>\$1,480,902</b>	<b>\$1,453,000</b>	<b>\$1,453,000</b>	<b>\$1,453,000</b>	<b>\$5,839,902</b>	<b>\$1,459,976</b>
Muscatine County	\$364,994	\$364,994	\$364,994	\$364,994	\$1,459,976	\$364,994
Scott County	\$364,994	\$364,994	\$364,994	\$364,994	\$1,459,976	\$364,994
City of Muscatine	\$547,491	\$547,491	\$547,491	\$547,491	\$2,189,963	\$547,491
Small Communities/ Transit/DOT	\$172,497	\$172,497	\$172,497	\$172,497	\$689,988	\$172,497
Region (STBG-Planning)	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$40,000	\$10,000
<b>STBG TAP Flex Target Total</b>	<b>\$63,240</b>	<b>\$63,000</b>	<b>\$63,000</b>	<b>\$63,000</b>	<b>\$252,240</b>	<b>\$63,060</b>
Muscatine County	\$15,765	\$15,765	\$15,765	\$15,765	\$63,060	\$15,765
Scott County	\$15,765	\$15,765	\$15,765	\$15,765	\$63,060	\$15,765
City of Muscatine	\$23,648	\$23,648	\$23,648	\$23,648	\$94,590	\$23,648
Small Communities/ Transit/DOT	\$7,883	\$7,883	\$7,883	\$7,883	\$31,530	\$7,883

Table 4 assumes for STBG-Swap an annual average of funds for a 4-year time period (2019-2022) and targets one year’s worth of funds to both counties, a year and half to the City of Muscatine (set aside to support the transportation planning process through Bi-State Regional Commission), and a remaining amount based on the annual Region 9 total target for small communities, transit, and in the event of a Department of Transportation request. A similar assumption is used for the TAP Flex funds less a set-aside for transportation planning.

### PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

A call for projects must be made 30 days in advance of the programming of funds as identified in the Region 9 Public Participation Plan. A memorandum will be sent to the communities, counties, Technical Committee, and Regional Transportation Advisory Group for notification of solicitation of projects within Region 9.

A sample application is included in Appendix A of this manual. One reproducible copy will be requested of each applicant. Applications will include a narrative describing the project, map/sketch plans, breakdown of project costs, timeline, endorsement by the submitting jurisdiction, public input process as appropriate, and minority impact statement. The application itself is modeled from the Iowa Department of Transportation application, so project information is consistent and can more easily move into the state’s project development process once a project is awarded funds through the STBG-Swap programming process. If information for county projects is contained in the state’s projects database system (TPMS) and accessible to Bi-State Regional Commission, then these items can be referenced in the application.

Bi-State Regional Commission staff will review applications for completeness and provide copies of the applications to the Technical Committee for review. The evaluation checklist on the following page will be used by Bi-State Regional Commission to compile a summary for discussion to allow voting members of the Technical Committee to develop a consensus

recommendation on programming of the targeted funds. Consideration will be given to consistency with the Region 9 Long Range Transportation Plan; ability of the project to support the State of Iowa transportation performance measures through reduction in fatalities and serious injuries; maintaining the eligible transportation assets in a state of good repair; and improving system reliability for movement of people and goods.

The recommendation will be conveyed to the Policy Committee for consideration. The Policy Committee will consider the recommendation at a subsequent meeting. Table 5 illustrates the evaluation criteria explanation and review checklist.

**Table 5  
Region 9 STBG Program – Evaluation Criteria Explanation And Review Checklist**

Name of Project/Jurisdiction: _____		
PROJECT INVESTMENT		Review
Local investment and support in the project	Identified in a Capital Improvement Program or supported with local resolution from the submitting jurisdiction. Match commitment if necessary. Letters of support (optional). Public input on the project.	CIP: Yes or No Resolution: Yes or No Letters: Yes or No Public Input/Involvement: Yes or No (e.g. in other local plan)
Regional investment in the project	Identified in a regional, or state plan and cited in the application. Is it consistent with the RPA9 Long Range Transportation Plan.	Plan- List RPA9 LRTP consistent: Yes or No
Project readiness for letting	Applicant identifies reasonable timeline and expected or requested project letting by Fiscal Year timeframe and/or estimated construction start. Expected to be less than five years from project award and programming of funds. Status of engineering and design.	Timeline_ Yes or No Within 5 Years: Yes or No Readiness: PE, CE, ROW: Yes or No, each
PUBLIC SAFETY		
Project improves an identified transportation safety concern of the area	Improves or enhances transportation safety by reducing fatalities or severe injuries through appropriate countermeasures, and/or providing alternatives mode choice for transit, pedestrians, bicyclists, and other forms of non-motorized transportation.	# of crashes # of fatalities # of serious injuries # non-motorizes crashes, if applicable Countermeasure(s):
Project reduces current and/or future congestion	Improves travel time in a corridor or along a route through capacity improvements, access management, intelligent transportation system technologies, or other means.	Information on traffic operations provided: Yes or No Other:

**Table 5 (continued)**

<b>PUBLIC SAFETY</b>		
Project creates additional transition or emergency space	Designed in compatibility and connection with the existing street/roadway network with consideration of multiple users, regardless of ability. Allowance for shoulders, parking, or bicycle lanes. Paved shoulder may be another example.	Buffer elements: Yes or No
Project enhances the area around it	Is consistent with the surroundings and context of the area (downtown, residential, rural, etc.), related to how and who will use the facility.	Note setting:
<b>ECONOMIC IMPACT</b>		
Project directly influences job expansion or retention	Improves access to jobs and benefits economic development for the region. Provides connectivity between residential areas and employment centers.	Note tie to jobs if applicable.
Project improves general commercial/industrial travel through the region	Improves mobility and travel time in a corridor or improves ease of access to a corridor.	Identified freight route or serves local industry/commerce?
Project is a link to a corridor or downtown improvement program	Identified in a local, regional, or state plan related to corridor travel, downtown improvement, or economic development and cited in the application.	Critical corridor? Major arterial or above?
<b>TRANSPORTATION NETWORK SUPPORT</b>		
Project improves transit, pedestrian, or bicycle safety and/or use within the area	Supports mobility and active lifestyles and benefits community health.	Improves personal traveler mobility: Yes or No
Project improves the interaction between different modes of travel	The project provides a connection to existing facilities and/or fills a gap between facilities or modes of transportation.	Connectivity: Yes or No
Evaluation Summary: <input type="checkbox"/> Meets all criteria (100%) <input type="checkbox"/> Substantially meets criteria (>50%) <input type="checkbox"/> Partially meets criteria (>25%, <50%) <input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet criteria (≤25%)		

Evaluation summary for prioritizing projects for discussion will be assessed as meets all criteria, substantially meets (>50%), partially meets (>25%, <50%) or does not meet the criteria (≤25%) in Table 5.

## **AWARDED PROJECTS**

Awarded projects will be required to proceed through the federal-aid or Swap project development process as appropriate for construction, transit, or planning funds, beginning with contact with the respective Department of Transportation District and will be subject to certain federal and/or state laws and regulations related to public involvement, real estate, environmental regulations, conforming to ADA, DBE, wage, competitive bidding and permitting requirements, to name a few. Swap funds will require coordination with the Iowa DOT. An award letter will be used to notify the local jurisdiction of the award amounts and expectations in working with the Department of Transportation to proceed through the project development process. The letter will be sent to the Chief Elected Official or Board Representative and to the appropriate Technical Committee representative. Awarded projects are expected to be included in the Iowa Region 9 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and may require an amendment through the RPA9 Transportation Policy Committee.

The availability of funds is subject to the type of budget authority authorized for federal STBG funds and the State of Iowa's ability to exchange federal for state funds under the Swap Program. The time period established in legislation determines when funds must be obligated. It will be important for projects to be timely in carrying out the project development process to prevent lapsing of these funds if the State Department of Transportation cannot carry balances for the STBG program as a whole.

As noted above, awarded projects are expected to be let within 5 years of the designated fiscal year for which the project is programmed. The start data of the 5 years begins with the fiscal year of funds awarded to the project with a notation of the date of approval by the Policy Committee. For example, a project being awarded funds from Fiscal Year 2020 would be expected to be authorized or let no later than 2025. Awarded projects not proceeding to implementation within the 5 years must request an extension by the Policy Committee or return the funds to the Region 9 pool for reprogramming.

Changes in scope of work from the original awarded application will be required to be approved by the Policy Committee.



# Appendix





**APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS  
FOR  
REGION 9 SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM (STBG)  
FUNDING**

This application form shall be used to submit a Region 9 STBG project proposal. Project eligibility requirements are attached and/or referenced in the application and will need to comply with Federal-aid requirements for transportation projects. STBG scoring criteria explanation is also attached.

1. One electronic PDF copy which is reproducible, must be submitted, by the stated deadline, by e-mail. Contact Bi-State staff if the file size prevents direct e-mail, for file sharing option. Information must be clear, concise, and accurate. Photocopies of this form may be used or requested in an electronic format. Additional pages may be attached if the space provided is inadequate. [*This application is modeled from the Iowa Department of Transportation statewide application for consistency and will become part of the documentation for the project development process if a project is awarded funds.*]
2. All information submitted as part of this application, as well as any additional information requested by the Bi-State Regional Commission staff, will be used to evaluate the application.
3. Submit the completed application and all attachments by **4:30 p.m. on 7/16/2021** to:

Attn: Gena McCullough, Asst. Executive Director/  
Planning Director  
Bi-State Regional Commission  
1504 Third Avenue  
Third Floor  
Rock Island, IL 61201  
(309) 793-6300 (General Phone)  
(309) 793-6305 (Fax)  
[gmccullough@bistateonline.org](mailto:gmccullough@bistateonline.org)

If there are questions related to the application process, contact:

Gena McCullough noted above or (309) 793-6300, extension 1146  
Katelyn Miner at (309) 793-6300, extension 1145, [kminer@bistateonline.org](mailto:kminer@bistateonline.org)

## REQUEST FOR REGION 9 SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT-SWAP PROGRAM (STBG-SWAP) FUNDS

### General Information

---

Applicant Agency: \_\_\_\_\_ e-Mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person (Name & Title): \_\_\_\_\_

Complete Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Street Address and/or Box No.

City

State

Zip

Daytime Phone

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

Applicant Agency: \_\_\_\_\_ e-Mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person (Name & Title): \_\_\_\_\_

Complete Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Street Address and/or Box No.

City

State

Zip

Daytime Phone

### Project Information

---

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Description(including length, if applicable) required: \_\_\_\_\_

If this project includes land acquisition, how many acres? \_\_\_\_\_

### Region 9 Narrative

---

The following information is specifically requested to be addressed in the narrative portion of this application. Refer to page 3 of this application, Item A. for the narrative section of the application. If the applicable information is already available in the State's transportation database system (TPMS), these items can be referenced, and if Bi-State Regional Commission has access, e.g. County Roads Program.

- Provide a description of the project, including discussion of funding and project readiness.
- Explain the estimated time of letting that is expected for the project if awarded.
- What is the economic impact of the project to Region 9 and in the vicinity of the project?
- List all modes of transportation impacted by this proposed project.
- Is the project replacing existing capital assets? (list the age, condition and estimated value of the existing assets.)

Iowa Region 9 Surface Transportation Block Grant Program Evaluation Manual

- Explain whether the project impacts traffic, system reliability, public safety and how.
- What is the traffic volume, or ridership? Does the project reduce current or future congestion and how?

**Project Costs (An itemized breakdown is requested to be included on an attached sheet):**

Total Cost (Year of Expenditure:\_\_\_\_) \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Alternatives Fund Request \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Applicant Match (No Minimum Required) \$ \_\_\_\_\_

	Match Source	Amount	Assured or Anticipated (Date Anticipated)
1.			
2.			
3.			

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

If yes, please explain the source and conditions \_\_\_\_\_

**Estimated Project Development Schedule:**

Design Start Date \_\_\_\_\_ Completion Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Land Acquisition Start Date \_\_\_\_\_ Completion Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Construction Letting Date \_\_\_\_\_ Completion Date \_\_\_\_\_

Has any part of this project been started? Yes No

If yes, explain \_\_\_\_\_

Will this project be open to the public? Yes No

Do you intend to charge a fee to users? Yes No

If yes, how much? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

What will it be used for? \_\_\_\_\_

**Required Documentation and Narrative Information**

---

The following documents and narratives must be attached to this application. In the upper right-hand corner of each document or narrative, write the corresponding letter shown below.

- A. A NARRATIVE assessing existing conditions (traffic, crashes, system reliability, etc.), outlining the concept of the proposed project, and providing adequate project justification. Surface transportation projects must have a direct relationship to the multi-modal transportation system, either as it exists or as it is planned. Assess your project in regard to the transportation system relative to its functional relationship, proximity, or impact to an existing or planned transportation facility. Assess the value of this project from a statewide, regional and/or local perspective and how it will be a functional addition to the transportation system and the state as a whole if no additional development funds are received. Refer to the evaluation criteria in Table 5 of the Region 9 STBG-Swap Program Guidance Manual as part of the evaluation process for criteria explanation and as part of the consensus decision-making.
- B. A MAP identifying the location of the project.
- C. A TIME SCHEDULE for the total project development. There should be an indication of estimated timeframe of letting or construction/start in relation to the potential programmed year of funding that is awarded/available. To support project readiness, documentation should include supporting information of the project identified in a capital improvement program or resolution/statement by the jurisdiction supporting project timing and readiness.
- D. Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Goal. If yes, note percentage.

The award of RPA9 STBG-Swap funds; any subsequent funding or letting of contracts for design, construction, reconstruction, improvement, or maintenance; and the furnishing of materials for this project shall not involve direct or indirect interest of any state, county, or city official, elective or appointive per the respective state code of conduct. Any award of funding or any letting of a contract in violation of the foregoing provisions shall invalidate the award and authorize a complete recovery of any funds previously disbursed.

**Certification**

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

I understand that, although this information is sufficient to secure a commitment of funds through the Bi-State Regional Commission Region 9 Transportation Policy Committee, an executed contract between the applicant and the respective state Department of Transportation is required prior to the authorization of funds.

Representing the \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Typed Name and Title

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date