|  | **Denver (DRCOG)** | **Atlanta Regional Council (ARC)** | **Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)** | **Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission** **(DVRPC - Philadelphia)** | **Metropolitan Council (Minneapolis-St Paul)** | **Mid-America Regional Council (MARC - Kansas City)** | **Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission** **(MORPC - Columbus)** | **Mid-Region Council of Govts /****Mid-Region MPO (Albuquerque)** | **Puget Sound Regional Council** **(PSRC - Seattle)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.** **Approx. Annual STP & CMAQ Funding** | $65m | $99m | $230m | $63m (NJ STP figures include NJDOT funding swap) | $75m | $35m | $31m | $23m | $80m |
| **2.** **Sub-Regional Selection Process?** | No | No | Regional STP-Metro allocation is divided by geography. 5% off the top for projects that benefit the region (programmed by City of Chicago). Of the remaining, 45% goes to Chicago to program and 55% goes to suburban councils to program. Suburban council money is divvied up based on population | Funds/selection processes separated by state (Pennsylvania, New Jersey) | No | Yes, funds separated by state (Kansas, Missouri) | No | No | Two calls for projects; funds split 50/50 between both callsRegional * Applications limited by county
* Intended for regional, high priority projects
* Projects scored by staff, but the project rankings by the Regional Project Evaluation Committee (RPEC) take into consideration other factors (equity, cost effectiveness, etc)

County* Counties get allocations based on population
* Select projects for inclusion based on internal processes/criteria (as long as they are consistent with federal statute)
* Recommend projects to RPEC
 |
| **3.** **Considers Geographic Equity** | Yes | While there is no established equity policy, staff indicated that it is a consideration | Yes, in that STP-Metro and STP-County (STP funds allocated to state based on non-metro population) funds are partially allocated by population | Equity is not considered within each TIP, but tends to balance out over TIP; subcommittee members are very aware of how much they have gotten, according to staff | Equity not officially a factor and points drive project ranking. However, staff thinks it’s rare that a county gets nothing | According to staff, equity considered unofficially during project ranking process | Staff indicated that equity is not explicitly considered in project rankings | Equity is not an official factor in project selection, but staff indicated that cooperative project selection allows for subjectivity and that no counties have been completely left out of funding  | Staff indicated that equity is one of several factors used to rank projects submitted in the regional solicitation |
| **4.** **Special Project Selection Committee?** | No | No. Staff indicated that projects are selected by staff and recommended/approved by the standing Transportation and Air Quality Committee and Transportation Coordinating Committee | Suburban councils differ in their selection methods. Regional and CMAQ funds do not have a special committee; they are selected through the CMAP Transportation Committee  | No. Projects selected by each state’s technical committee  | Reviewed by TAC Funding and Programming Committee  | Yes. Each funding type has a subcommittee tasked with identifying selection criteria and a further work group tasked with project selection | Projects scored by staff and primary recommendations made by Attributable Funds Committee | No. The Transportation Program Technical Group is a standing committee | RPEC and Counties recommend projects to Transportation Policy Board which makes overall recommendation to PRSC’s Executive Board |
| **5.** **Project Selection Based Purely on Points?** | No | Very subjective ranking; points used as one factor in decision making process | For CMAQ: projects selected based on AQ cost benefit ranking | Decision making process includes points, but other considerations, too such as need, cost-effectiveness, etc | Projects selected by score within project types; politics comes in to play when deciding project type funding targets | Projects are scored by work group (CMAQ) or staff (STP) and ranking achieved by the subcommittee using scores, ”relevant project information and committee discretion” | Points used to guide decision making, with other considerations; however, staff indicated that the top scoring projects pretty much always get funded and the bottom ones almost never do | No. Transportation Program Technical Group reviews submitted projects based on subjective ‘qualitative information’ such as the project’s significance to the region; the local community; private sector involvement; land use; environmental justice and minority communities; and other pertinent information; as well as objective technical assessment score | No. Regional solicitation includes staff scoring of project as well as other factors |
| **6.** **Engineering Rigor in Application** | Yes | No  | For CMAQ: yes | Yes | Staff recommends that application is completed by engineering staff or consultant with PE capabilities | No | Yes | Yes | Point criteria for the regional call for projects do not appear to rely heavily on engineering methodologies (except, possibly, the air quality and climate change points which look at reductions in SOV, VMT, etc). Points awarded low, medium, high and applicants are asked to describe how their projects fulfill functions |
| **7.** **Solicit by Project Type or Funding Type?** | Project | Funding type; CMAQ and STP-M calls usually separate | Funding type | Funding type | * Project types
 | Projects solicited by funding type and further divided into project type subcategories (i.e., CMAQ projects could have been submitted as Alternative Fuels; Bike/Ped; Public Transportation; Traffic Flow; Outreach and other; or Diesel Retrofit) | Project type | Funding type | Funding type |
| **8.** **What Projects are in RTP before TIP?** | Capacity | All projects in the TIP must be depicted in RTP | Major capital projects in RTP are given a TIP ID in anticipation of programming | Regionally significant projects | Regionally significant projects | Regionally significant – capacity is ½ mile or larger; and minor arterial or higher; and transit is fixed guideway | All projects | Major projects | Capacity projects |
| **9.** **Are PE/Design Phases Eligible?** | Yes | Yes | For CMAQ: Phase I Engineering not eligible | Yes | No | Only construction phases of projects are eligible for STP money; all phases can be funded for CMAQ projects | Generally, only construction and ROW phases are funded | Yes | Yes |
| **10.** **Years Between Solicitations** | Four years | There are no set call for project dates; they solicit projects when substantial funds become available. Staff indicated that they are moving to a rolling application process | Most suburban councils do an open call, some do one every 3 years | Two years | Two years | Two years | Two years | RTP every 4 years, so every other TIP update synchronized with RTP update | Two years |
| **11.** **Other notes** |  | * Selection criteria vary from call to call. For example, the current call focuses on completing existing projects and deliverability
* The project selection process is not ratified by their Board
 | * STP-County are divided so that each county gets an equal share of 50% of the funds, with the rest divvied up by population
 | * New Jersey has a program whereby they swap DVRPC’s STP allocation with state funds. Staff stated that it is a dollar for dollar swap and that this allows for some flexibility in the types and locations of projects funded. Staff also indicated that recipients were happy with this arraignment
* Before most recent call for projects, staff led a TIP tour for technical committee members in order to show projects finished, under construction or that localities would like to see programmed; staff felt this was very successful in facilitating project selection process
 |  |  | * Only allocates funds to projects within Urbanized Areas (except for studies and ride-share programs)
* Projects must comply with Complete Streets policy
* CMAQ funds distributed by ODOT through a statewide call for projects, rather than MORPC. Scored by MORPC and selected projects submitted as applications to ODOT
* For applicants with multiple applications, they must submit their priorities, which are taken into account
 | * Only one out of five counties eligible for CMAQ funds
* Allocate STP-Metro for Albuquerque UA; and what they call STP-Small Urban for smaller UAs and STP-Rural (both the latter appear to be STP funds allocated to state based on non-metro population) for areas not in the UA. There is one call for projects with different processes for the different funds
* Encourages a ‘soft match’ by sponsors where they pay for pre-construction work and get reimbursed for all construction
 | * Not all MPO area within non-attainment for CMAQ funds
* Rural areas get a set aside as do “rural town centers and corridors,” areas that may not necessarily be designated “rural” by the Census Bureau. PRSC appears to receive non-MPO allocated state STP funds in addition to their STP-U allocation
 |