

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

---

For Iowa Region 9 Transportation Planning Area



**November 2023**

Prepared by:



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



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

---

for  
**Iowa Region 9  
Transportation Planning Area**

**November 2023**

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**

Kippy Breeden, Chair

David Adams	Drue Mielke
Dr. Brad Bark	Gary Moore
Ken Beck	Randy Moore
Richard “Quijas” Brunk	Jazmin Newton
Kimberly Callaway-Thompson	Dylan Parker
Matthew Carter*	Ross Paustian
Duane Dawson	Sangeetha Rayapati
Rick Dunn	Sally Rodriguez*
Reggie Freeman	Eileen Roethler
Robert Gallagher	Scott Sauer
Ralph H. Heninger	Rick Schloemer
Jerry Lack	William Stoermer
Michael Limberg	James Thompson
Mike Matson	Mike Thoms
John Maxwell	Tim Wise
Marcy Mendenhall	

Colonel Daniel Mitchell, Rock Island Arsenal Garrison – Ex-Officio Member

\* *Alternates for Small Town Representatives*

**Bi-State Regional Commission Staff**

Denise Bulat, Executive Director

Gena McCullough, Deputy Director

Sarah Bambas, Planner	Rich Keehner, MUNICES Project Manager
Carol Connors, Finance Manager	Kassie Keeney-McGurk, GIS Technician/Analyst
Maia Edmondson, GIS Analyst	David Kovarik, Planner
Kim Ellis, Accounting Technician	Peggi Merchie, Accounting Technician
Sarah Grabowski, Desktop Publisher	Ricky Newcomb, Senior Planner
Becky Grems, Accounting Technician	Jim Schmedding, Interactive Media Designer
Jill Henderson, Finance Manager	Bryan Schmid, Principal Planner
Nithin Kalakuntla, Transportation Engineer	Zachary Sutton, Planner



**Region 9 Transportation Policy Committee**

Scott Sauer, Board Member  
River Bend Transit

Dr. Brad Bark, Mayor<sup>2</sup>  
City of Muscatine

Jeff Sorensen, Board Member  
Muscatine County Board of Supervisors

Ross Paustian, Board Member<sup>2</sup>  
Scott County, Board of Supervisors

Michael Limberg, Mayor<sup>1,3</sup>  
City of Long Grove  
(Alternate: John Kostichek, City of Walcott)

Vacant<sup>4</sup>  
Iowa Division  
Federal Highway Administration

Dan Nguyen<sup>4</sup>  
Federal Transit Administration

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  
Executive Director  
River Bend Transit

Vacant  
Planning & Development Director  
Scott County

Brian Stineman<sup>2</sup>  
Public Works Director  
City of Muscatine

Angie Kersten<sup>1</sup>  
County Engineer  
Scott County

Jodi Royal-Goodwin  
Community Development Director  
City of Muscatine

Jeff Horne<sup>3</sup>  
City Administrator  
City of Wilton  
(Alternate: Lee Geertz, City of West Liberty)

Amy Fortenbacher  
Transit Supervisor  
City of Muscatine/MuscaBus

Vacant<sup>4</sup>  
Iowa Division  
Federal Highway Administration

Bryan Horesowsky  
County Engineer  
Muscatine County

Dan Nguyen<sup>4</sup>  
Federal Transit Administration

Eric Furnas  
Planning and Zoning Administrator  
Muscatine County

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

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

<sup>2</sup> Transportation Technical Committee Vice Chair

<sup>3</sup> Represents the staff of the cities under 5,000 in the non-urbanized areas of Muscatine and Scott Counties.

<sup>4</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.....	3
Geographic Distribution and Equity Balance .....	4
Geographic Targets for Programming Discussions .....	6
Project Selection Process .....	7
Awarded Projects .....	11



## 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 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) and Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) in 2022. These legislations are often used interchangeably. 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 under the current federal transportation act as part of a regional transportation planning process. These funds are available to the State of 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 are recommended 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 limited or special 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 IIJA, Iowa Region 9 has the ability to distribute federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) dollars. Under IIJA, STBG projects can vary from roads and bridges and can include trails/sidewalks along transportation facilities. Transit projects are also eligible. A systematic 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.

In the prior transportation act, the region had 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. This funding categorization has been discontinued. Table 1 no longer identifies the TAP Flex funds.

**Iowa Federal-Aid 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 was considered dollar for dollar, and noted as swapped funds in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). All regions in the State of Iowa were assumed to participate unless a region opted out of the program. As of FFY2023, all Iowa STBG funds under the programming responsibility of the Region 9 Transportation Policy Committee will no longer be swapped from federal to state dollars due to changes in the program. IIJA funds are subject to all federal requirements.

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

Balance Carried Over From 2023		2024	2025	2026	2027
STBG Target		\$1,735,971	\$1,770	\$1,803,000	\$1,837,000
<b>Total Available for Programming</b>		<b>\$2,431,319</b>	<b>\$4,201,319</b>	<b>\$5,994,319</b>	<b>\$6,021,319</b>
<b>Total Combined Programmed</b>		<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$10,000)</b>	<b>(\$1,810,000)</b>	<b>(\$1,910,000)</b>
<b>STBG Balance</b>	\$695,348	<b>\$2,431,319</b>	<b>\$4,191,319</b>	<b>\$4,184,319</b>	<b>\$4,111,319</b>
Obligated Funds	\$0	Solicitation of funds is anticipated in Fiscal Year 2024.			
<b>Funds Available for Programming Carrying Over</b>	\$1,630,507				
STBG Programmed Projects Remaining		Amount Debited/Federal Limit	Revised Program Year (FFY)	Year Approved (CY)/Year Programmed (FFY)	
Region 9 Planning – Annual Approval Cycle		\$0/\$0	Annually	Not programmed in FY24	
Muscatine-Grandview Avenue (Carver Intersection, Mississippi Drive/Main/Hershey Ave. to U.S. 61)		\$3,550,000/\$3,550,000	2021	2015/2021	
Muscatine County – F58: Durant Corporate Limits to Walcott Corporate Limits *		See Below	2023	2019/2023	
Scott County – F58: Durant Corporate Limits to Walcott Corporate Limits*		\$4,700,000/\$4,700,000	2023	2019/2023	
Scott County – F45/240 <sup>th</sup> Street (180 <sup>th</sup> – 210 <sup>th</sup> Avenues)		\$0/\$1,800,000	2026	2021/2025	
Muscatine County – F58 (Wilton east to Cedar County Line)		\$0/\$2,000,000	2027	2021/2025	

Source: Iowa DOT and Bi-State Regional Commission

\*\*Projects have been combined under Scott County’s administration

\*\* A call for projects with programming through FFY2027 is anticipated by the end of 2023 with programming of funds anticipated to occur in early 2024.

## ELIGIBILITY EXPLANATIONS

Candidate projects that are submitted for the STBG 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 Policy (e.g. minor collectors and Farm-To-Market designated road/bridges) when the policy is reinstated or for projects already historically programmed. 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.
  - Iowa DOT does not allow Federal-aid participation in consultant or right-of-way costs for STBG projects administered by the Local Systems Bureau. LPA projects administered by the Systems Planning Bureau will be allowed to request participation in these costs.

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/bil\\_stbg\\_implementation\\_guidance-05\\_25\\_22.pdf](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/stp/bil_stbg_implementation_guidance-05_25_22.pdf)

**Eligible Applicants and Project Sponsors.** 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 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/im/lpa-ims](https://iowadot.gov/local_systems/im/lpa-ims).

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). New projects will require an amendment to the Region 9 TIP and approval in the state TIP.

The Region 9 STBG project selection process requires a minimum total project cost of \$125,0000, based on matching requirements for STBG.

Transit and planning projects are eligible for the IJA program and are held to the same minimum project costs.

**Local Match.** 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.

## **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 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. It should be noted that in some circumstances, projects at the county level have benefited small communities which is not accounted for in this table.

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

Jurisdictions Funded	2020 Population	Percent of RPA9 Population	Subtotals \$ Rcvd	Funding Rcvd 96-24	Percent of Funding	Years' Worth Based on Ave. Funding/Year*
Muscatine County – 43,235 Total	10,529	16.5%		\$11,130,500	29.5%	7.70
Scott County- 174,669 Total	14,591	22.8%		\$12,231,720	32.4%	8.46
City of Muscatine	23,797	37.2%		\$11,081,086	29.3%	7.67
Small Communities/Transit	15,031	23.5%		\$2,993,703	7.9%	2.07
Blue Grass	1,666	2.6%	\$1,095,000		2.9%	
Dixon	202	0.3%	\$197,499		0.5%	
McCausland	313	0.5%	\$404,700		1.1%	
West Liberty	3,858	6.0%	\$685,000		1.8%	
Wilton	2,924	4.6%	\$100,000		0.3%	
MuscaBus	n/a	n/a	\$424,200		1.1%	
River Bend Transit	n/a	n/a	\$87,304		0.2%	
Region (PL,PM,SUDAS)				\$322,224	0.9%	0.24
<b>Total</b>	<b>63,948</b>		<b>\$2,993,703</b>	<b>\$37,779,233</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>26.14</b>

*Note: Total Population is the sum of unincorporated Muscatine and Scott Counties and ALL small communities outside MPO minus City of Muscatine. Average annual funding per year \$1,445,202 for a 28 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. However, IADOT has established that jurisdictions with eligible roadways cannot be excluded from the evaluation process.

Table 3 provides the total miles of roadway by Federal Functional Classification by Jurisdiction for comparative purposes. By mileage, the counties have the greatest number of miles of eligible roadways while incorporated communities have a lesser number.

**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 in Scott County (Excluding MPO)	All Cities in Region 9 (Excluding MPO)
Interstate	22.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.96	8.96
Other Principal Arterial	24.86	66.57	28.21	3.13	37.7	40.83
Minor Arterial	13.50	50.91	20.00	5.27	22.43	27.70
Major Collector	101.41	92.02	14.50	3.10	31.35	34.45
Minor Collector (Rural)	64.66	111.80	0.00	3.16	7.06	10.22
Local	308.73	413.43	92.26	59.66	153.11	212.77
<b>Total Overall Mileage</b>	<b>535.59</b>	<b>734.43</b>	<b>154.97</b>	<b>74.33</b>	<b>260.6</b>	<b>334.93</b>
<b>Total Federally Eligible Mileage</b>	<b>139.77</b>	<b>209.50</b>	<b>62.71</b>	<b>11.50</b>	<b>91.48</b>	<b>102.98</b>

**GEOGRAPHIC TARGETS FOR PROGRAMMING DISCUSSIONS**

Region 9 transportation planning area is collectively provided funding as noted in Table 1 by the Iowa Department of Transportation to program STBG 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 estimated total funds disaggregated by the geographic areas within Region 9 by original distribution – two counties each one year’s worth of funds, City of Muscatine one and a half year’s worth of funds and other jurisdictions remaining portion, less planning funds. These targets are provided to aid general capital forecasting by the various jurisdictions, and should be considered to be illustrative.

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 Fund by Geographic Area**

Geographic Targets	2024	2025	2026	2027
STBG Target Total	<b>\$1,735,971</b>	<b>\$1,770,000</b>	<b>\$1,803,000</b>	<b>\$1,837,000</b>
Muscatine County	\$444,123	\$444,123	\$444,123	\$444,123
Scott County	\$444,123	\$444,123	\$444,123	\$444,123
City of Muscatine	\$666,185	\$666,185	\$666,185	\$666,185
Small Communities/Transit/DOT	\$171,540	\$205,569	\$238,569	\$272,569
Region (STBG-Planning)	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000

*Note: Table 4 assumes for STBG an annual average of funds for a 4 year time period (2024-2027) 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.*

**PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS**

A call for projects must be made at least 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 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. An evaluation checklist shown as Table 5 will be used by Bi-State Regional Commission to compile a summary of each project. Data not noted in the application will be determined from the most recent existing data available for traffic, crashes and pavement condition. The summary checklist is designed to supplement the application and support data-driven decision-making. This allows voting members of the Technical Committee the ability to score individual projects based relevant and uniform information. 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.

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

<b>Name of Project/Jurisdiction:</b> _____		_____
<b>PROJECT INVESTMENT</b>		<b>Review</b>
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 or County FYP: Yes or No Resolution or Letter of Local Match Commitment: 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
Project supports asset management and system preservation	Improves or enhances pavement condition, facility condition or replaces existing asset.	Existing pavement surface ____ Existing pavement condition
<b>PUBLIC SAFETY</b>		
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

On completion of the review of the applications and checklist, Bi-State Regional Commission staff will provide copies of each application, checklist and scoring form to Technical Committee members. Table 6 illustrates a sample scoring form and key. One form will be used to rank the number of projects received from the solicitation of projects.

Technical Committee members based on the voting allowed by jurisdiction will score projects relative to the number of projects submitted. For example, three projects are submitted and would be ranked compared to each other. The project evaluated as the best meeting the project review criteria would be given the highest score, and the project that met the least number of criteria would be given the lowest score. In a three-project selection process, the highest score would be three and the lowest a 1. The scoring form will be tailored to the

number of projects received, and a scoring key will be provided on the form so each jurisdiction and project are identified for scoring purposes.

Technical Committee members will submit scoring sheets to Bi-State Regional Commission staff who will compile total scores of the projects. The totals will be presented to the Technical Committee for a recommendation to the Policy Committee.

The recommendation will then be conveyed to the Policy Committee for consideration. The Policy Committee will consider the recommendation at a subsequent meeting. 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 limited or special circumstances where the STBG evaluation process may not apply.

**Table 6**  
**STBG RANKING**      RANKING JURISDICTION \_\_\_\_\_

Category	Category Weight	Low Score				High Score				Score SCR
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
<b>PROJECT INVESTMENT</b>	2									
Local Investment and support in the project		—	—	—	—					
Regional Investment in the project		—	—	—	—					
Project readiness for letting		—	—	—	—					
Project supports asset management and system preservation		—	—	—	—					
<b>PUBLIC SAFETY</b>	2									
Project improves an identified transportation safety concern of the area		—	—	—	—					
Project reduces current and/or future congestion		—	—	—	—					
Project creates additional transition or emergency space (i.e. wider shoulder, turn-out lane)		—	—	—	—					
Project enhances the area around it		—	—	—	—					
<b>ECONOMIC IMPACT</b>	1									
Project directly influences job expansion or retention		—	—	—	—					
Project improves general commercial/industrial travel through the region		—	—	—	—					

Project is a link to a corridor or downtown improvement program				
<b>TRANSPORTATION NETWORK SUPPORT</b>	1			
Project improves transit, pedestrian, or bicycle safety and/or use within the area		—	—	—
Project improves the interaction between different modes of travel		—	—	—

\_\_\_ Total

Total points available cannot exceed total number of projects submitted (for example “4” in this case). The higher point score – the higher the rank, the better the project.

Sample Key

Muscatine County Road = MC Y14

Muscatine County Road = MC X34

Scott County Bridge = SC 5B

Scott County Bridge = SC 5C

**AWARDED PROJECTS**

Awarded projects will be required to proceed through the federal-aid 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, Buy America, to name a few. STBG 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. 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 date 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 2024 would be expected to be authorized or let no later than 2029. Awarded projects not proceeding to implementation within the 5 years must request an extension from the Policy Committee or return the funds to the Region 9 STBG balance for reprogramming.

Changes in scope of work from the original awarded application will be require the approval of the Policy Committee.



# Appendix





**SAMPLE 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 email. Contact Bi-State staff if the file size prevents direct e-mail, for a file sharing option. Information must be clear, concise, and accurate. Photocopies of this form may be used or requested in an electronic format in a compatible 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 [DATE]** to:  
Attn: Gena McCullough, Deputy Director  
Bi-State Regional Commission  
1504 Third Avenue  
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  
Zach Sutton at (309) 793-6300, extension 1127, [zsutton@bistateonline.org](mailto:zsutton@bistateonline.org)

## REQUEST FOR REGION 9 SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM (STBG) 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:\_\_\_\_) \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Federal Fund Request \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Applicant Match (20% match minimum) \$ \_\_\_\_\_

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

Are any 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 with clear termini/location, 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 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. Specify route and termini in the map title.
- 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 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