

## **Memorandum**

To: Capital Area MPO Executive Board

From: CAMPO Staff

Date: May 27, 2020

Re: FFY 2022 LAPP Program

---

The next round of LAPP applications will be open in August 2020 and will be for the FFY 2022 project cycle. Staff has reviewed the issues brought up during the FFY 2021 cycle and provided recommendations to address those issues.

### **Issues addressed in this memo:**

- **Roadway Travel Time Savings Calculation**
- **Revisiting Submittal Reduction for Delayed Projects Policy**
- **Modal Submittal Cap**
- **Target Modal Investment Mix**
- **Transit Scoring**

### **Issue: Roadway Travel Time Savings Calculation (For Information Only- No Recommendation Needed)**

CAMPO Staff is enhancing the methodology in which Travel Time Savings for roadway projects is calculated in order to normalize specific data sets, including segment length, speed limits, etc.

### **Issue: Revisiting Submittal Reductions for Delayed Projects Policy**

The LAPP Program currently has a policy that holds jurisdictions accountable for prior year LAPP projects that are behind schedule. The policy states: *for applicants with prior projects that have not obligated funds, the applicant must reduce the number of allowable new applications per agency per mode by the number of that agency's prior LAPP projects (by mode) that did not meet authorization prior to the end of the federal fiscal year.*

This policy was initiated in the FFY2019 call for projects in response to several LAPP projects that had fallen behind their obligation schedule. This policy has been utilized in the following years; however, the program still observes a significant number of projects delayed beyond their applicant year.

**Staff Recommendation:** Revising this policy to affect *all* projects submitted by a jurisdiction, rather than limiting the restriction to projects in a specific mode. If a jurisdiction has more outstanding projects than they have submittals, the jurisdiction will still be allowed to submit one application. Example: Community A is eligible to submit three projects per mode based on population. Community A has two prior year bike/ped LAPP projects that do not have their funding authorization. The current policy would allow Community A to submit three roadway projects, one bike/ped project, and three transit projects. The proposed policy would allow Community A to submit one project per mode. If Community

A had three projects outstanding, the proposed policy would allow Community A to submit one project. To allow current LAPP awardees time to implement their existing projects before the rule change, staff recommends implementing this rule in the FFY2023 round of LAPP.

**Issue: Modal Submittal Cap**

The FFY2021 LAPP Investment Program included a roadway project that received 65% of the awarded roadway funding. Members of the LAPP Selection Panel and the LAPP Steering Committee have requested that the subject of the modal submittal cap be discussed for the FFY2022 round.

The current rule regarding the modal submittal cap is as follows: *LAPP applications will not be accepted for LAPP funds exceeding the modal target dollar figure as set by the target modal investment mix.*

The concern of having a single project draw down a significant portion of funding in each mode was discussed during the FFY2015 LAPP program development. The FFY2015 Steering Committee considered capping the maximum amount of federal funding a project could request at 50% of the target modal investment. The discussion around the notion of whether “the good of the many outweighs the good of the one” should be valued during project selection; for example, should the program fund 1 project that has a score of 74 points or 3 projects that all have scores of 72 points. Ultimately, it was decided that the policy should not change, because projects that are proven to have a higher merit (based on scoring) should have funding priority. The LAPP Selection Panel, which was established in the FFY2015 round, can review situations in which scoring could reflect the discussion point above. The Panel can provide a recommendation that prioritizes funding of lower-cost, lower-scoring projects in situations where this may seem appropriate. The CAMPO Executive Board must ultimately adopt this recommendation.

There have been 12 instances in which a single project earned 50% or higher of the awarded modal funding since the creation of LAPP in FFY2012 and the formalized scoring of transit projects in FFY2016.

The highest-occurring mode is transit with 5 instances, followed by bike/ped with 4, and roadway with 3.

Projects that have Earned 50% or Higher of Awarded Modal Funding					
FFY	Mode	Jurisdiction	Project	Percentage of Modal Mix	Local Match
2012	Bike/Ped	Raleigh	Creedmoor Road Improvements	55%	20%
2014	Roadway	Holly Springs	Main Street Extension	64%	20%
2015	Bike/Ped	Cary	White Oak Greenway	61%	50%
2016	Transit	Raleigh	Raleigh Bikeshare	91%	20%
2017	Transit	GoRaleigh	Computer Aided Dispatch	100%	20%
2018	Transit	GoRaleigh	CNG Fueling Station	66%	20%
2019	Roadway	Raleigh	Rock Quarry Road	64%	30%
2019	Bike/Ped	Raleigh	Blue Ridge Pedestrian	57%	22%
2019	Transit	GoCary	Downtown Multimodal Facility	62%	20%
2020	Transit	GoRaleigh	Bus Stops	100%	20%
2021	Roadway	Raleigh	Old Wake Forest North	65%	20%
2021	Bike/Ped	Rolesville	Main Street Improvements	57%	20%

In previous years, the LAPP Steering Committee has stressed a concern over diminished ability to fund secondary roadway projects through SPOT and the need for the LAPP program to help supplement local funding for those projects. The LAPP program has seen member jurisdictions submit larger roadway projects for consideration to bridge the SPOT funding gap and to help bolster local funds and/or bond projects. Projects that have been successful in such endeavors, whether above 50% of the modal investment target or not, were so based on the score of their project relative to its competitors.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff does not recommend changing this rule. The LAPP Steering Committee ultimately agreed that the score of the project should have a higher significance when considering funding, compared to the total cost. The LAPP Selection Panel would also have the opportunity to address situations in which this concern arises.

**Issue: Target Modal Investment Mix**

The Target Modal Investment Mix for the FFY2021 round of LAPP was 65% roadway, 27% bike/ped, and 8% transit.

**Staff Recommendation:** Keep the same Target Modal Investment Mix as the prior round of LAPP. In the past few years, CAMPO has seen an increased need for funding in all three modes of transportation eligible for LAPP; the Committee cannot justify moving priorities from one mode to another.

## FFY 2022 Recommended Target Modal Investment Mix



### **Issue: Transit Scoring**

A quantitative scoring procedure for LAPP transit projects was implemented in the FFY2016 LAPP cycle. Prior to FFY2016, transit providers in the MPO area would caucus to provide a joint recommendation to the TCC and Executive Board for transit projects proposed to utilize the target transit investment. The scoring criteria selected was based on current priorities and estimates of what types of projects were to be submitted to the Program.

Since the FFY2016 addition of formalized transit scoring, Wake Transit Tax District funding has become available, the Wake Transit Plan is being implemented, and transit coverage and service has increased in the Region. CAMPO Staff believes it is an appropriate time to check in on the LAPP scoring criteria to ensure the transit needs of the region are being accurately reflected through scoring criteria.

**Submitted Transit Projects Since FFY2016 Round of LAPP**

Year	Project	Applicant	CAMPO Cost	Funded (Y/N)	Project Purpose	Score
2016	Bus Stop Improvements	Triangle Transit	\$ 144,640	Y	Access to Transit	73
2016	Raleigh BikeShare Implementation	Raleigh	\$ 1,200,000	Y	Access to Transit	71.33333
2016	City of Raleigh/Wake County Paratransit Operations Facility	GoRaleigh	\$ 660,000	Y	Major Facilities	62.66667
2016	Poole Road Park and Ride	GoRaleigh	\$ 1,002,281	N	Access to Transit	57
2017	GoRaleigh Computer Aided Dispatch and Bus Tracking	GoRaleigh	\$ 1,336,192	Y	Operational Improvements	74
2017	GoRaleigh ART Call Center and Bus Stop Amenities	GoRaleigh	\$ 1,692,250	N	Access to Transit	16
2018	FFY18 Bus Stop Improvements	GoCary	\$ 400,000	Y	Access to Transit	58.5
2018	Transit Signal Priority Project	GoRaleigh	\$ 1,000,000	Y	Operational Improvements	48
2018	Compressed Natural Gas Fueling Station	GoRaleigh	\$ 2,760,000	Y	Other	39
2018	Poole Road Park and Ride	GoRaleigh	\$ 560,000	N	Access to Transit	38
2018	Navaho Drive Sidewalk Project	GoRaleigh	\$ 344,000	N	Access to Transit	34.5
2019	FY 19 New Bus Stop Sites	GoRaleigh	\$ 876,000	Y	Access to Transit	53
2019	Downtown Cary Multimodal Facility	GoCary	\$ 2,000,000	Y	Major Facilities	42.5
2019	Navaho Drive Sidewalk Project	GoRaleigh	\$ 352,600	Y	Access to Transit	40
2020	Downtown Cary Multimodal Facility	GoCary	\$ 2,000,000	N	Major Facilities	56
2020	GoRaleigh Bus Stop Sites	GoRaleigh	\$ 2,000,000	Y	Access to Transit	54
2020	Fuquay-Varina Downtown Bike Share Connection	Fuquay-Varina	\$ 498,000	N	Access to Transit	51.66667
2020	East Raleigh Transit Center	GoRaleigh	\$ 4,376,482	N	Major Facilities	44
2020	New Bus Stop Construction	GoTriangle	\$ 476,160	N	Access to Transit	38
2020	Downtown Apex Transfer Point	GoTriangle	\$ 197,600	N	Access to Transit	36.33333
2020	Raleigh Union Station Phase II: RUS Bus	GoTriangle	\$ 3,695,760	N	Major Facilities	29.5
2021	GoApex Route 1 Bus Stop Improvements	Apex	\$ 427,000	Y	Access to Transit	65.4
2021	Bus on shoulder on I540 and I40	GoTriangle	\$ 122,880	Y	Operational Improvements	55
2021	3 Sidewalk Connections to GoCary Transit Service	GoCary	\$ 1,020,534	Y	Access to Transit	53.4
2021	Improvements at 13 bus stops	GoTriangle	\$ 259,200	Y	Access to Transit	49.7
2021	Enhanced Transfer Points (6 site locations)	GoRaleigh	\$ 948,000	Y	Access to Transit	49
2021	East Raleigh Transit Center (Construction Funding only)	GoRaleigh	\$ 2,000,160	N	Major Facilities	47
2021	Bus Stop Improvements for Current and Existing Stops within the system.	GoRaleigh	\$ 1,167,936	N	Access to Transit	40.4
2021	Improvements to 2 Park-and-Ride lots	GoTriangle	\$ 251,200	N	Access to Transit	34.6

**Existing Transit Project Scoring**

***TRANSIT EFFECTIVENESS – Maximum 50 Points***

Effectiveness scores will be comprised of six elements, plus a multiplier. In each element, the applicant must describe how the project improves, enhances or benefits user experience, as follows:

***Safety & Security Concerns*** – Enhances safety and security of the system, rider or user. The proposed project must address a documented safety or security concern or policy. If the project sponsor effectively demonstrates improved safety and security resulting from the project, the project will receive 5 points.

*Rider Experience* – Enhances amenities that contribute to a more comfortable and convenient user experience. The proposed project must improve or enhance the rider experience. If the project sponsor effectively demonstrates enhanced comfort or convenience of the rider, the project will receive 5 points.

*Connectivity* – Directly connects the transit user with other modes, routes, systems, or destinations. The project directly serves riders and provides new connections between the transit system and other modes, routes, systems or destinations. To qualify for these points, the other modes, routes, systems, or destinations must be existing, under construction at the time of application, or obligated for federal or state construction funding at the time of application. The project will receive one point for each connection made by the project, up to a maximum of 10 points.

*Improves Facilities* – Improves facilities that contribute to the system’s state of good repair and/or supports improved operations and/or benefits users. The project will be scored based on the number of anticipated average daily ridership on the route(s) served by the improvement within 12 months of the improvement being completed. Scores will be awarded on scaled basis for all submitted projects with the top project receiving 10 points.

*Reliability Improvements* – Improves time reliability and reduces delays across the system. The project will be scored based on the following formula:  
 $(\text{travel time on the route after the improvement} - \text{travel time on the route before improvement}) * \# \text{ average daily ridership on the route anticipated 12 months after the improvement is completed}$ . Scores will be awarded on a scaled basis for all submitted projects with the top project receiving 10 points.

*Benefit / Cost* – This will be calculated using the total transit effectiveness score compared to the cost of the project to the LAPP program:  $\text{Transit Effectiveness} / \text{LAPP Cost}$ . Scores will be awarded on a scaled basis for all submitted projects, with the top project receiving 10 points. By utilizing the cost to the LAPP program as the cost factor, this will give priority to projects submitted with a higher local match that use less in LAPP funding to achieve the project.

*Transit Effectiveness Multiplier* – In order to direct LAPP funds toward highly effective solutions to current transportation problems, the effectiveness score of a submitted project will be multiplied by a project phase multiplier in order to determine its final score in this category. The multipliers are:

Construction, Capital, Maintenance, Operations Phase ...	100%
Right-of-Way or Land Acquisition Phase ...	50%
PE/NEPA Phase ...	10%

**PLANNING CONSISTENCY – Maximum 10 Points**

All new capital projects must be in the adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan as 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> decade projects or in the adopted components of the Wake Transit Work Plan. Transit infrastructure projects that are necessary for operational, safety or security improvements to existing facilities may be submitted. To further implementation of plan priorities, projects will be scored based on their horizon year in the document. The Transit Planning Consistency will be scored on the following scale:

- 2<sup>nd</sup> Horizon Year MTP Project... 5 Points
- 1<sup>st</sup> Horizon Year MTP Project / 1<sup>st</sup> Ten Years of Wake Transit Work Plan...10 Points

Transit Infrastructure projects to existing facilities that are necessary for operational, safety or security improvement will be scored as 1<sup>st</sup> Horizon year projects.

**LOCAL PRIORITY POINTS (1-10) – Maximum 10 Points Per Project**

Each applicant agency will have a maximum of 15 points to distribute across its transit project submittals. Each project must have at least one local priority point, and no project can have more than 10 local priority points. If an agency submits only one project, that agency forfeits 5 of its local priority points.

**PRIOR AGENCY FUNDING – Maximum 10 Points**

In an effort to ensure that LAPP funds are used equitably across the geography of the MPO, local agency sponsors will receive more points for having received fewer dollars per capita through LAPP in the preceding five years. Likewise, local agency sponsors that have received more dollars per capita from the LAPP in the past five years will receive fewer points. This will be scored on the following scale:

Prior LAPP Funding >= \$200 per capita	...	0 Points
< \$200 per capita	...	2 Points
< \$150 per capita	...	4 Points
< \$100 per capita	...	6 Points
< \$50 per capita	...	8 Points
= \$0 per capita	...	10 Points

Population estimates used for this criterion will be the certified estimates used to determine dues paid to the MPO by the local governments in the year of application. GoTriangle population estimates will be based on the remainder of the county estimates

outside of the municipal boundaries of established transit agencies. These estimates can be found in Appendix IV.

### **Total Possible Transit Score – 80 Points**

**Staff Recommendation:** Since the second FFY2022 LAPP Steering Committee Meeting in March 2020, CAMPO Staff has conducted interviews and received feedback from the region’s main transit providers, Wake Transit Community Funding Area recipients, and Steering Committee members. CAMPO has also researched practices in transit prioritization in MPOs and DOTs around the Country. This feedback has resulted in significant discussion on the purpose of LAPP for transit funding and ways to improve the program to meet those needs. This year, CAMPO proposes addressing the “low-hanging fruit” opportunities to improve scoring in the transit mode while continuing to research ways to improve scoring at a larger scale. The primary scoring criteria CAMPO proposes changing this year are:

1. Reliability Improvements Measure
2. Safety and Security Measure
3. Rider Experience Measure
4. Minimum Requirements for Bus Stop Improvements

#### **1) Reliability Improvements Measure:**

**Current approach:** Improves time reliability and reduces delays across the system. The project will be scored based on the following formula:

$(\text{travel time on the route after the improvement} - \text{travel time on the route before improvement}) * \#$   
average daily ridership on the route anticipated 12 months after the improvement is completed. Scores will be awarded on a scaled basis for all submitted projects with the top project receiving 10 points.

**Reason to address now:** The intended effect of this scoring criterion was to have a cascading arrangement of scores based on the scaled value of travel-time savings. Since most projects do not have travel-time savings, most projects receive 0 points for this criterion, while 1 or 2 projects in a given round receive 10 points. This results in minimal variability in scoring for the projects. Accurately scoring these projects has also raised issues, since a lack of standardization for calculating the travel time savings for reliability improvement projects create difficulty in fairly scoring each improvement.

**Proposed approach:** Change reliability improvements from a quantitative formula to a tiered score based on impact by project type. This would allow more variation in scoring compared to the scaled cascading model that is currently in place. This would also allow for more consistency and clarity when scoring this criterion. High Impact projects would receive 10 points, medium impact projects would receive 5 points, low impact projects would receive 1 point, and no impact projects would receive 0 points for the criteria.



Primary Project Types	Secondary Project Types	Reliability Improvements
Admin/Maintenance Facilities	All	Low Impact (1 pt.)
Customer Facilities	Bus Stop/ Shelter Improvements	Low Impact (1 pt.)
Customer Facilities	Transit Centers/ Stations	Medium Impact (5 pts.)
Customer Facilities	Bike/Ped Access Infrastructure	Low Impact (1 pt.)
Infrastructure Improvements	Bus on Shoulder	High Impact (10 pts.)
Technology/Equipment	Administrative	Low Impact (1 pt.)
Technology/Equipment	Operations Support	Medium Impact (5 pts.)
Technology/Equipment	Onboard Systems — ITS/Communications	High Impact (10 pts.)
Technology/Equipment	Onboard Systems — Safety	No Impact (0 pts.)
Technology/ITS	Signal Coordination/Priority Systems	High Impact (10 pts.)

## **2) Safety and Security Concerns Measure:**

**Current approach:** Enhances safety and security of the system, rider or user. The proposed project must address a documented safety or security concern or policy. If the project sponsor effectively demonstrates improved safety and security resulting from the project, the project will receive 5 points.

**Reason to address now:** The intention of the current scoring method is to award projects that address a safety and security issue. Since most transit projects submitted to CAMPO can justify having a safety and/or security component, these points are usually awarded to all projects and does not increase competition and variability between projects. The types of projects funded through LAPP have a significant opportunity to affect the safety and security of the transit network and its users.

**Proposed approach:** Change scoring criterion from binary (yes/no) evaluation to tiered evaluation based on impact by project type. This would allow for variation in the scoring, increasing the competition in this criterion. This tiered approach scoring for safety and security is consistent with how many other MPOs and DOTs address this subject. High impact projects would receive 5 points, medium impact projects would receive 3 points, low impact projects would receive 1 point, and no impact project would receive 0 points.

Primary Project Types	Secondary Project Types	Safety and Security
Admin/Maintenance Facilities	All	Low Impact (1 pt.)
Customer Facilities	Bus Stop/ Shelter Improvements	Medium Impact (3pts.)
Customer Facilities	Transit Centers/ Stations	High Impact (5 pts.)
Customer Facilities	Bike/Ped Access Infrastructure	Medium Impact (3 pts.)
Infrastructure Improvements	Bus on Shoulder	Low Impact (1 pt.)
Technology/Equipment	Administrative	Low Impact (1 pt.)
Technology/Equipment	Operations Support	Medium Impact (3 pts.)
Technology/Equipment	Onboard Systems — ITS/Communications	Medium Impact (3 pts.)
Technology/Equipment	Onboard Systems — Safety	High Impact (5 pts.)
Technology/ITS	Signal Coordination/Priority Systems	Low Impact (1 pt.)

### **3) Rider Experience Measure:**

**Current approach:** Enhances amenities that contribute to a more comfortable and convenient user experience. The proposed project must improve or enhance the rider experience. If the project sponsor effectively demonstrates enhanced comfort or convenience of the rider, the project will receive 5 points.

**Reason to address now:** Similar to safety and security concerns, CAMPO wishes to address the rider experience measure to expand the scoring variation from either 5 points or 0 points. Since most projects can justify their project improves the rider experience, most projects receive 5 points for this criterion. Changing the way this measure is scored would allow more competition and variation between scores.

**Proposed approach:** Change scoring criterion from binary (yes/no) evaluation to tiered evaluation based on impact by project type. This would allow for variation in the scoring, increasing the competition in this measure. High impact projects would receive 5 points, medium impact projects would receive 3 points, low impact projects would receive 1 point, and no impact projects would receive 0 points.



NC Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

Primary Project Types	Secondary Project Types	Rider Experience
Admin/Maintenance Facilities	All	Low Impact (1 pt.)
Customer Facilities	Bus Stop/ Shelter Improvements	High Impact (5 pts.)
Customer Facilities	Transit Centers/ Stations	High Impact (5 pts.)
Customer Facilities	Bike/Ped Access Infrastructure	High Impact (5 pts.)
Infrastructure Improvements	Bus on Shoulder	High Impact (5 pts.)
Technology/Equipment	Administrative	Low Impact (1 pt.)
Technology/Equipment	Operations Support	Medium Impact (3 pts.)
Technology/Equipment	Onboard Systems — ITS/Communications	High Impact (5 pts.)
Technology/Equipment	Onboard Systems — Safety	Low Impact (1 pt.)
Technology/ITS	Signal Coordination/Priority Systems	Medium Impact (3 pts.)

Combined Proposed Tiered Scoring for Reliability Improvements, Safety and Security, and Rider Experience				
Primary Project Types	Secondary Project Types	Reliability Improvements	Safety and Security	Rider Experience
Admin/Maintenance Facilities	All	Low Impact (1 pt.)	Low Impact (1 pt.)	Low Impact (1 pt.)
Customer Facilities	Bus Stop/ Shelter Improvements	Low Impact (1 pt.)	Medium Impact (3 pts.)	High Impact (5 pts.)
Customer Facilities	Transit Centers/ Stations	Medium Impact (5 pts.)	High Impact (5 pts.)	High Impact (5 pts.)
Customer Facilities	Bike/Ped Access Infrastructure	Low Impact (1 pt.)	Medium Impact (3 pts.)	High Impact (5 pts.)
Infrastructure Improvements	Bus on Shoulder	High Impact (10 pts.)	Low Impact (1 pt.)	High Impact (5 pts.)
Technology/Equipment	Administrative	Low Impact (1 pt.)	Low Impact (1 pt.)	Low Impact (1 pt.)
Technology/Equipment	Operations Support	Medium Impact (5 pts.)	Medium Impact (3 pts.)	Medium Impact (3 pts.)
Technology/Equipment	Onboard Systems — ITS/Communications	High Impact (10 pts.)	Medium Impact (3 pts.)	High Impact (5 pts.)
Technology/Equipment	Onboard Systems — Safety	No Impact (0 pts.)	High Impact (5 pts.)	Low Impact (1 pt.)
Technology/ITS	Signal Coordination/Priority Systems	High Impact (10 pts.)	Low Impact (1 pt.)	Medium Impact (3 pts.)

#### **4) Minimum Requirements for Bus Stop Improvements**

LAPP currently does not have minimum requirements set in place for bus stop improvement projects. To maintain consistent levels of expectations for all bus stop improvement projects, CAMPO proposes imposing minimum requirements for these projects. If an applicant's local policy has stricter requirements for these criteria, the applicant should follow their local policy. Bus stop improvements should at a minimum:

- Identify all bus stops with clear signage
- Ensure new bus stops are accessible and meet the federal Americans with Disabilities (ADA) standards, where practical.
- Upgrade existing bus stops to meet federal ADA standards, where practical.
- Provide passenger amenities such as shelters and benches, depending on the level of passenger activity. Generally speaking, stops with more than 25 daily passenger boardings or more will be equipped with a shelter.