

APPENDIX C: Financial Summary

Appendix C provides supporting details for the financial chapter of the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). It includes the following components:

- Historical and projected non-federal aid revenues
- Historical and projected funding revenues
- A list of illustrative projects
- The project selection methodology
- Implementation and monitoring

These elements are included to substantiate the fiscal constraint outlined in Chapter 8 and to explain the methodology used to determine which projects are incorporated into the plan.

In Chapter 8, federal funding sources were analyzed using historical data from 2021 through 2025. The current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for 2026–2029 was also included, as those funds have already been programmed for specific projects. Tables C.1A–C present the various funding sources utilized within the SIMPCO MPO region over time.

Table C.2 lists illustrative projects within the SIMPCO MPO area. Due to limited federal funding for roadway projects, not all proposed projects can be included in the fiscally constrained 2050 LRTP. These illustrative projects are considered potential future developments but currently lack a committed federal funding source. Instead, they are expected to be financed by the project sponsor. However, sponsors may pursue federal aid through applications to federal transportation programs. If federal funding is awarded, the 2050 LRTP must be amended to incorporate the project and allow it to proceed with federal support.

Table C.3 outlines how submitted projects were evaluated against the goals established in Chapter 1. Each project was assessed using the LRTP's evaluation criteria, and SIMPCO MPO staff assigned scores based on alignment with regional priorities. These scores were then averaged to produce a final ranking. This ranking system helps the MPO allocate limited federal funds to the highest-priority projects in the region.

Additionally, Appendix C describes how the transportation model was used to identify projects for inclusion in the LRTP. It also details the selection criteria for funding programs such as the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG), Carbon Reduction Program (CRP), and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). Projects seeking funding through STBG, CRP, or TAP must adhere to the selection processes established by the U.S. Department of Transportation, state DOTs, and the MPO.

Finally, Appendix C describes the implementation and monitoring process of the 2050 LRTP.

APPENDIX C: Financial Summary

Table C.1A: Historic Federal Funding, numbers in 1,000's - Iowa

IA Funding Source	2021			2022			2023			2024			2025			Total of totals	Average
	FA	State	Total	FA	State	Total	FA	State	Total	FA	State	Total	FA	State	Total		
CRP			\$ -			\$ -			\$ -			\$ -	\$ 660,000		\$ 660,000	\$ 660,000	\$ 132,000
PL	\$ 142,200		\$ 142,200	\$ 141,300		\$ 141,300	\$ 171,580		\$ 171,580	\$ 145,440		\$ 145,440	\$ 56,840		\$ 56,840	\$ 657,360	\$ 131,472
NHPP			\$ -	\$ 6,513,000		\$ 6,513,000	\$ 16,799,200		\$ 16,799,200	\$ 6,500,600		\$ 6,500,600	\$ 9,560,400		\$ 9,560,400	\$ 39,373,200	\$ 7,874,640
PRF		\$ 8,029,000	\$ 8,029,000	\$ 300,000		\$ 300,000	\$ 86,000		\$ 86,000	\$ 1,072,000		\$ 1,072,000		\$ 1,287,000	\$ 1,287,000	\$ 10,774,000	\$ 2,154,800
STBG	\$ 4,512,000		\$ 4,512,000		\$ 9,862,000	\$ 9,862,000	\$ 2,288,000		\$ 2,288,000	\$ 2,324,100		\$ 2,324,100	\$ 7,782,400		\$ 7,782,400	\$ 26,768,500	\$ 5,353,700
HBP			\$ -	\$ 1,450,000	\$ 762,000	\$ 2,212,000	\$ 738,400		\$ 738,400	\$ 1,500,000		\$ 1,500,000			\$ -	\$ 4,450,400	\$ 890,080
TAP*	\$ 127,000		\$ 127,000	\$ 605,999		\$ 605,999	\$ 287,000		\$ 287,000	\$ 269,000		\$ 269,000	\$ 261,000		\$ 261,000	\$ 1,549,999	\$ 310,000
ILL			\$ -			\$ -			\$ -			\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
HSIP			\$ -			\$ -	\$ 3,262,500		\$ 3,262,500	\$ 8,797,500		\$ 8,797,500	\$ 369,000		\$ 369,000	\$ 12,429,000	\$ 2,485,800

*Based on targets and statewide TAP award

Table C1.B - Table C.1A: Historic Federal Funding, numbers in 1,000's - Nebraska

NEB Funding Source	2021			2022			2023			2024			2025			Total of totals	Average
	FA	State	Total	FA	State	Total	FA	State	Total	FA	State	Total	FA	State	Total		
NHPP	\$ 16,834,000	\$ 2,750,000	\$ 19,584,000	\$ -	\$ 366,000	\$ 366,000	\$ 7,879,000	#####	\$ 9,869,000	\$ 7,879,000	\$ 1,973,000	\$ 9,852,000	\$ 9,050,000	\$ 2,262,000	\$ 11,312,000	\$ 50,983,000	\$ 10,196,600
STBG	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ 1,350,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 300,000
PL	\$ 64,600	\$ -	\$ 64,600	\$ 64,500	\$ -	\$ 64,500	\$ 71,000	\$ -	\$ 71,000	\$ 70,350		\$ 70,350	\$ 2,190		\$ 2,190	\$ 272,640	\$ 54,528
HSIP	\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,205,000	\$ 342,000	\$ 2,547,000			\$ -	\$ 2,607,000	\$ 521,400
TAP	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -			\$ -			\$ -	\$ 40,000		\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 8,000

Table C1.C: Historic Federal Funding, numbers in 1,000's - South Dakota

SD Funding Source	2021			2022			2023			2024			2025			Total of totals	Average
	FA	State	Total	FA	State	Total	FA	State	Total	FA	State	Total	FA	State	Total		
NHPP	\$ 1,601,000	\$ 198,000	\$ 1,799,000	\$ 2,209,000	\$ 337,000	\$ 2,546,000	\$ 5,028,000	\$ 621,000	\$ 5,649,000	\$ 2,678,000	\$ 590,000	\$ 3,268,000	\$ 16,663,000		\$ 16,663,000	\$ 29,925,000	\$ 5,985,000
STBG	\$ -	\$ 223	\$ 223	\$ -	\$ 232,000	\$ 232,000	\$ 256,000	\$ 279,000	\$ 535,000	\$ 257,000	\$ 278,000	\$ 535,000	\$ 341,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 416,000	\$ 1,718,223	\$ 343,645
PL	\$ 56,700	\$ -	\$ 56,700	\$ 57,300	\$ -	\$ 57,300	\$ 66,380	\$ -	\$ 66,380	\$ 68,376		\$ 68,376	\$ 73,100		\$ 73,100	\$ 321,856	\$ 64,371
HSIP	\$ 3,493,000	\$ 211,000	\$ 3,704,000	\$ 2,392,000		\$ 2,392,000	\$ 3,746,000	\$ 156,000	\$ 3,902,000	\$ 416,000		\$ 416,000	\$ 2,149,000	\$ 348,000	\$ 2,497,000	\$ 12,911,000	\$ 2,582,200
PS	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 18,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 208,000	\$ 226,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 286,000	\$ 57,200
IT	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ 832,000	\$ 208,000	\$ 1,040,000			\$ -			\$ -	\$ 1,040,000	\$ 208,000
LR	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ 22,365,000	#####	\$ 25,454,000	\$ 22,365,000	\$ 3,089,000	\$ 25,454,000	\$ 25,269,000	\$ 3,818,000	\$ 29,087,000	\$ 79,995,000	\$ 15,999,000
TAP	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -			\$ -	\$ 2,302,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 2,482,000	\$ 1,561,000	\$ 180,000	\$ 1,741,000	\$ 4,223,000	\$ 844,600
EM	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -			\$ -			\$ -	\$ 16,663,000		\$ 16,663,000	\$ 16,663,000	\$ 3,332,600

APPENDIX C: Financial Summary

Table C.2 Illustrative Projects

FY 2027-2040

Sponsor	Project Title	Project Description	Cost Est.	Local
Sioux City	Hamilton & Tri View Intersection	Reconstruct	\$ 4,300,000	\$ 4,300,000

FY 2030-2040

Sponsor	Project Title	Project Description	Cost Est.	Local
North Sioux City	Military Rd	Reconstruct/Widen	\$6,797,737	\$6,797,737
North Sioux City	Hwy 105	Overlay	\$2,163,434	\$2,163,434
North Sioux City	River Bend Park Rd	New Construction: Industrial Park access road	\$4,627,187	\$4,627,187
Sioux City	Douglas St.	Reconstruct: 24th to 29th St	\$6,689,566	\$6,689,566
Sioux City	19th Street	Reconstruction: Court St. to Floyd Blvd	\$4,554,598	\$4,554,598
Sioux City	Jennings St	35th to 36th St	\$1,850,305	\$1,850,305
Sioux City	38th St	Reconstruction: County Club Blvd Hamilton Blvd	\$4,554,598	\$4,554,598
Sioux City	Correctionville Rd. over Unnamed Creek (504670 RCB Culvert)	Culvert Replacement	\$700,000	\$700,000
Sergeant Bluff	Port Neal Rd	Reconstruction/Widen: School Zone from Warrior Rd north to Port Neal	\$3,629,445	\$3,629,445

APPENDIX C: Financial Summary

2041-2050

Sponsor	Project Title	Project Description	Cost Est.	Local
Sioux City	27th Street	Reconstruction: Court Street to Stone Park	\$14,242,300.43	\$14,242,300.43
Sioux City	West 3rd Street	Reconstruction: Hamilton Blvd to Perry Street	\$2,182,358.65	\$2,182,358.65
Sioux City	Talbot Road	New Construction/Paving: Military Road to Memorial Drive	\$41,631,339.72	\$41,631,339.72
Sioux City	Division Street	Reconstruction: Pueblo Ct to Outer	\$1,842,734.56	\$1,842,734.56
Sioux City	Buckwalter Dr	New Construction: Hamilton Blvd to Outer Drive	\$32,866,847.15	\$32,866,847.15
Sioux City	Garretson Ave	Morningside Ave to Hwy 20	\$41,631,339.72	\$41,631,339.72
Sioux City	46th St	New Construction: Buckwalter Drive to Rustin St	\$19,720,108.29	\$19,720,108.29
Sioux City	Dace Ave	Reconstruction: Gordon Dr to Dave to Floyd to Steuben	\$10,188,722.62	\$10,188,722.62
Sioux City	Division St	Reconstruction: 7th St to 11th St	\$10,955,615.72	\$10,955,615.72

APPENDIX C: Financial Summary

		Reconstruction: Hwy		
Sioux City	14th St	75 to Irene St	\$7,230,706.37	\$7,230,706.37

2041-2050

Sponsor	Project Title	Project Description	Cost Est.	Local
Sioux City	18th St	Reconstruction: Hwy 75 to Logan St	\$8,216,711.79	\$8,216,711.79
Sioux City	Seeger Ave	Reconstruction: S. St. Mary St. to S. St. Aubin St	\$5,258,695.54	\$5,258,695.54
Sioux City	Floyd Blvd: Viaduct with Hoeven Flyover to 3rd St.	Bridge Replacement: Dace to 4th St with Flyover to 3rd St	\$175,289,851.44	\$175,289,851.44
Sioux City	Burton St	New Construction/Reconstruction: W 4th St. to Military Rd	\$21,911,231.43	\$21,911,231.43
Sioux City	6th St. Underpass	New Bridge: Hwy 75 Pavonia St	\$65,733,694.29	\$65,733,694.29
Sioux City	Plum Creek Rd	New Construction: Plum Creek Rd to Riverside Blvd/IA 12	\$39,440,216.57	\$39,440,216.57
Sioux City	Park and Ride		\$87,644.93	\$87,644.93
Sioux City	Missouri River Ped Bridge	Pedestrian Bridge over Missouri River - Chris Laron Park (IA) to Scenic Park (NE)	\$32,866,847.15	\$32,866,847.15
North Sioux City	River Bend Park - West	Industrial Park Roads	\$14,877,726.14	\$14,877,726.14
North Sioux City	River Bend Park - East	Industrial Park Road	\$8,205,756.17	\$8,205,756.17

APPENDIX C: Financial Summary

North Sioux City	S. Derby Lane	Improvements to township section of S. Derby	\$5,959,854.95	\$5,959,854.95

Table C 3: Project Prioritization Based on Goal Ranking

Sponsor	Project Description	Location	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	Grand -Total	Rank
			14	15	8	25	11	-7	10	9	15	100	
2030 to 2040													
Sioux City	Hamilton Blvd	Intersection Tri view and Hamilton	14	15	7	25	8	0	10	6	15	100	1
Sioux City	Lakeport	Intersection Lakeport and Sergeant Road	9	15	7	25	9	0	8	9	15	97	2
Sioux City	West 19th Street	Hamilton Blvd to Helmer St	14	13	5	21	11	0	8	9	15	96	3
Sioux City	South Lewis Boulevard	Singing Hills to City Limits	12	14	6	22	9	0	8	9	14	94	4
Sergeant Bluff	Port Neal Road: Warrior Road to 1st Street 2030-2040	School Zone from Warrior Road north to Port Neal Road	14	13	5	17	9	2	12	4	10	86	5
Sergeant Bluff	South Lewis Blvd: Warrior Road Intersection to Recreation Complex Entrance 2030-2040	Intersection widening, sidewalk relocation, and traffic signalization; widen and reconstruct South Lewis Blvd north 1,350 feet.	14	13	5	15	9	1	12	4	10	83	6
Sioux City	Hamilton	W 15th to W 20th	12	10	5	25	6	0	6	6	12	82	7
Sioux City	Outer Drive	Hamilton Boulevard to Floyd Boulevard	10	9	3	20	9	0	7	9	14	81	8

Sponsor	Project Description	Location	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	Grand -Total	Rank
			14	15	8	25	11	-7	10	9	15	100	
2030 to 2040													
North Sioux City	Northshore Dr. Reconstruction	North Sioux City	14	15	3	15	11	0	3	3	15	80	9
Sioux City	Floyd Boulevard	4th Street to 33rd Street	14	10	5	20	7	0	5	6	13	80	9
Sergeant Bluff	Sergeant Square Drive from First Street south to Bluffs Boulevard 2030-2040	Intersection of Sergeant Square Drive and First Street south 1,100 feet to Bluff's Blvd	14	12	5	17	6	1	9	2	10	76	10
Sioux City	Morningside Avenue	Peters Ave to Jay Avenue	11	12	5	17	6	0	5	6	11	73	11
Sioux City	Morningside Avenue	Transit Ave. to Peters Ave	11	12	5	17	6	0	5	6	11	73	11
Sioux City	18th Street Viaduct	Floyd Blvd to Steuben Street	10	6	5	23	8	0	7	3	5	67	12
Dakota City	Pine Street. From D Avenue to Hwy 77	Roth Industrial Park	10	10	3	15	7	3	7	0	10	65	13
Sioux City	Correctionville Road over Unnamed Creek (504670 RCB Culvert)		6	10	3	11	8	0	7	3	10	58	14
Sioux City	War Eagle Drive Bridge over Railroad		6	10	3	11	8	0	7	3	10	58	15
Sioux City	Larson Park Rd. Bridge		6	10	3	11	8	0	7	3	10	58	15
Sioux City	Douglas St. (24th to 29th)		9	9	4	9	6	0	1	6	12	56	16
Dakota City/South Sioux City / Dakota County	Dakota Avenue - Front of Tyson Foods	Dakota Avenue	10	10	2	15	7	0	7	0	5	56	16
Sioux City	Rebecca St.	W. 30th St. to W. Clifton St.	8	9	1	6	4	0	6	7	14	55	17

Sponsor	Project Description	Location	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	Grand-Total	Rank
			14	15	8	25	11	-7	10	9	15	100	
2030 to 2040													
North Sioux City	S. Derby Lane	Big Sioux Township/Possibly in NSC in Future	14	5	2	10	7	0	3	3	10	54	18
Sioux City	Hawkeye Drive - Not in SIMPCO List	18th Street to 28th Street	10	9	2	14	4	0	5	0	10	54	18
Sioux City	41st Street Connection to 46th Street	New roadway from 41st St. to 46th St. east of Hwy. 75	11	8	3	11	11	0	2	7	0	53	19
Sioux City	Morningside Avenue	S Lakeport to City Limits	8	6	2	12	4	0	2	4	13	51	20
North Sioux City	River Bend Park Road	North Sioux City	14	3	2	10	7	0	3	3	5	47	21
North Sioux City	River Bend Park - East	North Sioux City	14	3	2	10	7	0	3	3	0	42	22
North Sioux City	River Bend Park - West	North Sioux City	14	3	2	10	7	0	3	3	0	42	22
South Sioux City	West Side Trail	Hwy 77 and 25th St	3	10	3	10	4	0	7	0	5	42	22
North Sioux City	Hwy. 105 Overlay	North Sioux City	13	0	5	10	0	0	3	0	10	41	23
North Sioux City	Military Rd. Reconstruction	North Sioux City	13	3	5	0	7	0	3	0	10	41	23
Sioux City	7th Street	6th St. to Lewis Blvd.	8	8	3	3	2	0	1	4	12	41	23

Woodbury County	Southbridge Interchange: New interchange on 1-29	Southbridge Interchange	10	3	3	10	7	0	7	0	5	40	24
Sioux City	19th Street	Court St. to Floyd Blvd	8	7	2	2	2	0	1	4	12	38	25
Sergeant Bluff	South Lewis Blvd Trail Loop Phase 1 2030-2040	New Trail - South Lewis Blvd from Warrior Road Intersection to 220th Intersection	3	12	3	0	8	1	5	6	0	38	25
Sergeant Bluff	South Lewis Blvd Pedestrian Crossing Bridge 2030-2040	School Zone at Topaz and Port Neal east to the Sergeant Bluff Recreation Complex Warrior Road north to Port Neal Road	3	12	3	0	8	1	5	6	0	38	25
Sioux City	Jennings St.	35th to 36th St.	8	5	2	2	2	0	1	4	12	36	26
Sioux City	38th Street	Country Club Blvd. to Hamilton Blvd.	7	5	2	2	2	0	1	4	12	35	27
Sioux City	Hoeven Drive	11th Street to 28th Street	9	2	2	10	2	0	3	3	0	31	28
Woodbury County	Old Hwy 141-SCL Sioux limits to MPO boundary	Old Hwy 141-SCL Sioux limits to MPO boundary	10	3	3	0	4	0	3	0	10	23	29
Woodbury County	Old Hwy 75: SCL Sgt Bluff to 260th Street Intersection	Old Hwy 75: SCL Sgt Bluff to 260th Street Intersection	10	3	3	0	4	0	3	0	10	23	29

Sponsor	Project Description	Location	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	Grand -Total	Rank
			14	15	8	25	11	-7	10	9	15	100	
2030 to 2040													
Dakota Dunes	Sioux Point TAP	West Side of Sioux Point Rd Dakota Dunes, SD	3	2	2	0	0	0	3	6	5	21	30
Sioux City/Dakota Dunes	Dakota Dunes Ped Bridge	Pedestrian Bridge that will expand the Big Sioux River from Riverside Park to Dakota Dunes.	3	2	2	0	0	0	3	6	5	21	30
Plymouth Co	County Rd C-80	From K-22 east 3.425 mi to Hwy 75	4	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	10	21	30

Sponsor	Project Description	Location	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	Grand-Total	Rank
			14	15	8	25	11	-7	10	9	15	100	
2041 to 2050													
Sioux City	Floyd Boulevard Viaduct with Hoeven Flyover to 3rd Street	Dace to 4th with Flyover to 3rd Street	14	11	5	25	10	0	9	9	10	93	1
Sergeant Bluff	South Lewis Blvd: 1st Street to South Ridge Road	From 200 feet north of First Street intersection north to Ridge Road	14	13	5	15	12	3	12	4	10	88	2
Sergeant Bluff	Old Lakeport Road: 1st Street to Warrior Road	North 300 feet of Intersection of 1st Street south to 300 feet south of intersection at Warrior Road	14	13	5	15	11	-9	12	6	10	77	3
Sioux City	Floyd Boulevard	Outer Drive to 46th	9	10	3	14	6	0	6	8	14	70	4
Sioux City	Midtown East/West Connector	Floyd Blvd to Hamilton Blvd	9	10	7	12	11	0	8	9	2	68	5
Sioux City	Dace Ave.	Gordon Dr. to Dace to Floyd To Steuben	8	10	3	11	9	0	6	8	11	66	6
Sioux City	W 4th Street	Market to Wesley Parkway	8	9	1	7	4	0	6	8	14	57	7

Sponsor	Project Description	Location	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	Grand -Total	Rank
			14	15	8	25	11	-7	10	9	15	100	
2041 to 2050													
Sergeant Bluff	South Lewis Blvd: South Ridge Road to North City Limits	From intersection of South Ridge Road north to North City Limits; Widen at West Ridge Road 300 feet each way	14	5	4	10	4	1	9	0	10	57	7
Sioux City	27th Street	Court Street to Stone Park	9	9	3	11	5	0	2	7	10	56	8
Sioux City	Correctionville Road	Fairmount Street to City Limits	6	4	2	9	5	0	5	9	13	53	9
Sergeant Bluff	8th Street: Harbor Drive to South Lewis Blvd	From intersection of Harbor Drive east to UPRR at South Lewis Blvd	10	5	2	10	3	1	9	1	10	51	10
Sergeant Bluff	First Street from Old Lakeport Road to East City Limits	Intersection replacement, traffic signalization, and widen road 2,500 feet east to city limits	10	12	4	10	4	-9	6	3	10	50	11
Sioux City	Glen Ellen Rd.	Insignia Circle to Hwy 20	8	8	3	14	11	0	1	4	0	49	12
Sioux City	Stueben Street over Drainage Ditch	Between 11th Street and 18th Street	11	0	2	18	0	0	0	0	14	45	13

Sponsor	Project Description	Location	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	Grand -Total	Rank
			14	15	8	25	11	-7	10	9	15	100	
2041 to 2050													
Sioux City	Burton Street	W 4th Street to Military Road	9	7	2	11	3	0	3	2	8	45	13
Sioux City	West 3rd Street	Hamilton Blvd to Perry Street	9	11	0	0	4	0	2	5	11	42	14
Sergeant Bluff	South Lewis Blvd Trail Loop Phase 2	New Trail - Intersection of South Lewis Blvd and 220th Street, West 3,200 feet Along Dogwood Trail and Drainage Ditch to Port Neal Road	3	12	3	0	8	1	5	6	0	38	15
Sioux City	Talbot Road	Military Road to Memorial Drive	8	6	2	7	2	0	1	2	9	37	16
Sioux City	Division St.	7th St. to 11th St.	8	6	3	3	2	0	2	2	11	37	16
Sioux City	Division Street	Pueblo Ct to Outer	4	7	1	3	2	0	1	5	13	36	17
Sioux City	6th Street Underpass	Hwy 75 and Pavonia St.	3	3	2	14	4	0	3	2	5	36	17
Sioux City	14th Street	Hwy 75 to Irene St.	8	5	3	2	2	0	2	2	11	35	18

Sponsor	Project Description	Location	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	Grand -Total	Rank
			14	15	8	25	11	-7	10	9	15	100	
2041 to 2050													
Sioux City	18th Street	Hwy 75 to Logan St.	8	5	3	2	2	0	2	2	11	35	18
Sioux City	Seeger Ave.	S. St. Mary's St. to S. St. Aubin St.	8	4	3	1	2	0	2	2	11	33	19
Woodbury County	Correctionville Road ECL Sioux City to MPO boundary	Correctionville Road ECL Sioux City to MPO boundary	10	3	3	0	4	0	3	0	10	33	20
Woodbury County	Old Lakeport Road-SCL Sioux City to Sgt Bluff city limit	Old Lakeport Road-SCL Sioux City to Sgt Bluff city limit	10	3	3	0	4	0	3	0	10	33	20
Woodbury County	D51: Port Neal road to Old hwy 75	D51: Port Neal road to Old hwy 75	10	3	3	0	4	0	3	0	10	33	20
Sioux City	Buckwalter Drive - Not in SIMPCO List	Hamilton Boulevard to Outer Drive	7	6	2	7	5	0	1	2	1	31	21
Sioux City	Plum Creek Road	Plum Creek Road to Riverside Blvd/IA-12	4	4	3	5	5	0	3	3	0	27	22
Sioux City	Orleans Avenue	Morningside Avenue to Glen Ellen Rd	3	2	2	6	1	0	0	0	1	15	23
Sioux City	Garretson Avenue	Morningside Avenue to Highway 20	7	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	23

Sponsor	Project Description	Location	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	Grand -Total	Rank
			14	15	8	25	11	-7	10	9	15	100	
2041 to 2050													
Sioux City	West Street	Stone Park Boulevard to City Limits	3	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	24
Sioux City	46th Street	Buckwalter Drive to Rustin Street	2	2	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	9	25

Transportation Model and Project Selection

Beyond project ranking, transportation modeling plays a critical role in selecting projects. These models simulate how people and vehicles move through a transportation network helping planners forecast future travel demand, assess infrastructure performance, and evaluate the potential impacts of proposed improvements.

The SIMPCO MPO transportation model informs project selection in several key ways:

- **Forecasting Travel Demand:** By analyzing factors such as population growth, land use and economic trends, the model predicts future travel patterns and highlights areas where infrastructure upgrades will be most needed.
- **Scenario Analysis:** Various project alternatives are simulated to determine which options perform under different future conditions.

By leveraging demand forecasts and scenario testing, SIMPCO MPO staff provided data-driven insights to guide the selection of projects included in the 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan.

Surface Transportation Block Grant, Carbon Reduction Program, & Transportation Alternative Program Process

Iowa projects seeking Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG), Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) and Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds must follow the selection criteria outline below.

The SIMPCO MPO staff evaluates and scores each project based on these criteria. The resulting scores serve as a key tool for the MPO Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) when developing its funding recommendations.

The MPO Policy Board makes the final funding decisions by considering both the project scores and the TTC's recommendation, ensuring a balanced and transparent selection process.

After the Policy Board approves the projects, the Iowa DOT conducts a final review to confirm eligibility and compliance with state and federal requirements. Only after this review and approval can a project proceed to implementation.

Iowa STBG/CRP Process

A. Application. Iowa members and organizations within the Metropolitan Planning Area will be informed when requests for STBG/CRP applications are being requested and their deadline. Members will receive an application by mail or email format. Other agencies can request an application by contacting the SIMPCO office. Applications will also be available on SIMPCO's website: www.simpco.org. While agencies or organizations may apply for STBG/CRP, they must be sponsored by an Iowa MPO member to be awarded funding. All applications must be received by the application deadline so that staff has an appropriate amount of time for project evaluation. Applications are typically sent out in January and due back to staff in February. Any application received past its deadline will be considered for the following year's application cycle.

B. Qualifying Criteria.

a. STBG

To be eligible as a Surface Transportation Block Grant activity, any project or area served by the project must fit one or more of the following categories:

- Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, preservation, or operational improvements for highways, including construction
- Replacement, rehabilitation, preservation, protection and application of environmentally acceptable, minimally corrosive anti-icing and deicing compositions for bridges and tunnels on public roads of all functional classifications
- Construction of a new bridge or tunnel at a new location on a Federal-aid highway.

- Inspection and evaluation of bridges and tunnels and training of bridge and tunnel inspectors and inspection and evaluation of other highway assets.
- Capital costs for transit projects including vehicles and facilities (publicly or privately owned) that are used to provide intercity passenger bus service.
- Carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs, including electric vehicle and natural gas vehicle infrastructure
- Bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways
- Highway and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs
- Highway and transit research and development and technology transfer programs
- Capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control facilities and programs, including advanced truck stop electrification systems
- Surface transportation planning programs
- Transportation alternatives
- Transportation control measures in the Clean Air Act
- Development and establishment of management systems.
- Environmental mitigation efforts
- Intersection projects that have safety and/or congestion problems
- Infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems capital improvements.
- Environmental restoration and pollution abatement
- Control of noxious weeds and aquatic noxious weeds and establishment of native species
- Projects and strategies designed to support congestion pricing
- Recreational trails projects
- Construction of ferry boats and ferry terminal facilities
- Development and implementation of a State asset management plan for the National Highway System
- Construction and operational improvements for any minor collector if-
 - o the minor collector and the project to be carried out are in the same corridor and in proximity to a National Highway System route;
 - o the construction or improvements will enhance the level of service on the National Highway System route and improve regional traffic flow; and
 - o the construction or improvements are more cost-effective, as determined by a benefit-cost analysis, than an improvement to the National Highway System route.
- Workforce development, training, and education activities
- Privately-owned, or majority-privately owned, ferry boats and terminal facilities that, as determined by the Secretary, provide a substantial public transportation benefit or otherwise meet the foremost needs of the surface transportation system;
- Wildlife crossing structures, and projects and strategies designed to reduce the number of wildlife-vehicle collisions;
- The addition or retrofitting of structures or other measures to eliminate or reduce crashes involving vehicles and wildlife;

- Projects eligible under 23 U.S.C 130 and installation of safety barriers and nets on;
- Maintenance and restoration of existing recreational trails;
- Installation of electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure and vehicle-to-grid infrastructure;
- Installation and deployment of current and emerging intelligent transportation technologies;
- Planning and construction of projects that facilitate intermodal connections between emerging transportation technologies, such as magnetic levitation and hyperloop;
- Protective features, including natural infrastructure, to enhance resilience of an eligible transportation facility;
- Measures to protect an eligible transportation facility from cybersecurity threats;
- Conducting value for money analyses or similar comparative analyses of public-private partnerships;
- [Up to 5% of STBG apportionment] rural barge landing, docks, and waterfront infrastructure in a rural community or Alaska Native village that is off the road system;
- Projects to enhance travel and tourism;
- Replacement of low-water crossing with a bridge not on a Federal-aid highway;
- Capital projects for the construction of a bus rapid transit corridor or dedicated bus lane; and
- [Up to 15% of STBG apportionment] may be used on otherwise STBG-eligible projects or maintenance activities on roads functionally classified as rural minor collectors or local roads, ice roads, or seasonal roads, may be transferred to the Appalachian Highway System Program or the Denali Access System Program.

NOTE: This list is exclusive; a project must fit into one of the categories to be eligible for Surface Transportation Block Grant Program funds. For a full list of eligible items and criteria, please refer to: <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/stp/>

For the listing of new eligibilities, go to:

<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/stbg.cfm>

b. CRP

To be eligible as a Carbon Reduction Program activity, any project or area served by the project must fit one or more of the following categories:

- a project described in section 149(b)(4) to establish or operate a traffic monitoring, management, and control facility or program, including advanced truck stop electrification systems;
- A project described in 23 U.S.C. 149(b)(4) to establish or operate a traffic monitoring, management, and control facility or program, including advanced truck stop electrification systems;

- A public transportation project eligible for assistance under 23 U.S.C. 142 (this includes eligible capital projects for the construction of a bus rapid transit corridor or dedicated bus lanes as provided for in BIL Section 11130 (23 U.S.C. 142(a)(3));
- A [transportation alternatives project](#) as described in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) as in effect prior to the enactment of the FAST Act,³ including the construction, planning, and design of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other nonmotorized forms of transportation;
- A project described in section 23 U.S.C. 503(c)(4)(E) for advanced transportation and congestion management technologies;

See <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/infrastructure-investment-and-jobs-act/ta.cfm>

- A project for the deployment of infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems capital improvements and the installation of vehicle-to-infrastructure communications equipment, including retrofitting dedicated short-range communications (DSRC) technology deployed as part of an existing pilot program to cellular vehicle-to-everything (C-V2X) technology;
- A project to replace street lighting and traffic control devices with energy-efficient alternatives;
- Development of a carbon reduction strategy (as described in the Carbon Reduction Strategies section above);
- A project or strategy designed to support congestion pricing, shifting transportation demand to nonpeak hours or other transportation modes, increasing vehicle occupancy rates, or otherwise reducing demand for roads, including electronic toll collection, and travel demand management strategies and programs;
- Efforts to reduce the environmental and community impacts of freight movement;
- A project to support deployment of alternative fuel vehicles, including—
 - o (i.) the acquisition, installation, or operation of publicly accessible electric vehicle charging infrastructure or hydrogen, natural gas, or propane vehicle fueling infrastructure; and
 - o the purchase or lease of zero-emission construction equipment and vehicles, including the acquisition, construction, or leasing of required supporting facilities;
- A project described under 23 U.S.C. 149(b)(8) for a diesel engine retrofit;
- Certain types of projects to improve traffic flow that are eligible under the CMAQ program, and that do not involve construction of new capacity; (23 U.S.C. 149(b)(5) and 175(c)(1)(L)); and
- A project that reduces transportation emissions at port facilities, including through the advancement of port electrification.

Other projects that are not listed above may be eligible for CRP funds if they can demonstrate reductions in transportation emissions over the project's lifecycle. Consistent with the CRP's goal of reducing transportation emissions, projects to add general-purpose lane capacity for single occupant vehicle use will not be eligible absent analyses demonstrating emissions reductions over the project's lifecycle. For example, the following project types may be eligible for CRP funding:

Sustainable pavements and construction materials

Sustainable pavements technologies that reduce embodied carbon during the manufacture and/or construction of highway projects could be eligible for CRP if a lifecycle assessment (LCA) demonstrates substantial reductions in CO₂ compared to the implementing Agency's typical pavement-related practices. The [LCA Pave Tool](#) can be used to assess the CO₂ impacts of pavement material and design decisions.

Climate Uses of Highway Right-of-Way

Projects including alternative uses of highway right-of-way (ROW) that reduce transportation emissions are also eligible. For example, renewable energy generation facilities, such as solar arrays and wind turbines, can reduce transportation emissions. And, biologic carbon sequestration practices along highway ROW to capture and store CO₂ may demonstrate potential for substantial long-term transportation emissions reductions. [State DOTs Leveraging Alternative Uses of the Highway Right-of-Way Guidance](#) provides information on these practices.

Mode Shift

Projects that maximize the existing right-of-way for accommodation of nonmotorized modes and transit options that increase safety, equity, accessibility, and connectivity may be eligible. Projects that separate motor vehicles from pedestrians and bicyclists, match vehicle speeds to the built environment, increase visibility (e.g., lighting), and advance implementation of a Safe System approach and improve safety for vulnerable road users may also be eligible. Micromobility and electric bike projects, including charging infrastructure, may also be eligible.

States should work with the FHWA on eligibility questions for specific projects. The [CMAQ Emissions Calculator Toolkit](#) is an available resource for estimating the CO₂ emissions benefits of certain projects.

NOTE: For a full list of eligible items and criteria, please refer to:

https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/crp_fact_sheet.cfm

Funds from CRP can be “flexed” to FTA to fund transit projects.

For title 23 funds that are flexed to FTA, section 104(f) of title 23, U.S.C., allows funds made available for transit projects or transportation planning to be transferred to FTA and administered in accordance with chapter 53 of title 49, U.S.C., except that the Federal share requirements of the original fund category continue to apply (See 23 U.S.C. 104(f)(1)). The use of Federal-aid funding on transit and transit-related projects can provide an equitable and safe transportation network for travelers of all ages and abilities, including

those from marginalized communities facing historic disinvestment. FHWA encourages recipients to consider using funding flexibility for transit or multimodal-related projects and to consider strategies that: (1) improve infrastructure for nonmotorized travel, public transportation access, and increased public transportation service in underserved communities; (2) plan for the safety of all road users, particularly those on arterials, through infrastructure improvements and advanced speed management; (3) reduce single-occupancy vehicle travel and associated air pollution in communities near high-volume corridors; (4) offer reduced public transportation fares as appropriate; (5) target demand-response service towards communities with higher concentrations of older adults and those with poor access to essential services; and (6) use equitable and sustainable practices while developing transit-oriented development.

Projects must have an assured local (non-federal funds) match of at least 20 percent of the estimated total cost of the proposed project.

The BIL continues the requirement of a non-federal match of at least 20 percent of project costs. Assurance of this required local match, addressed in the STBG/CRP Application, by the proposer indicates a necessary level of support by the project sponsor to immediately proceed with project development and implementation.

Projects must be submitted through/by counties or incorporated cities.

All BIL federal funds received by the State of Iowa will be received and disbursed by the Iowa Department of Transportation (Iowa DOT). Through BIL, projects within smaller cities and towns vary in their eligibility for federal aid. STBG/CRP Program funds are available as a reimbursement program administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Reimbursement will be received from federal highway funds for the federal portion (up to 80 percent of total expenditures) of those expenditures for the project.

Projects must be proposed on eligible roads.

The STBG/CRP provides flexible funding that may be used by States and localities for projects on any Federal-aid highway, including the National Highway System (NHS), bridge projects on any public road, transit capital projects, and intracity and intercity bus terminals and facilities. Applicants should refer to the Federal Functional Classification map available at the county engineer's office, the Siouxland Interstate Metropolitan Planning Council office, and the Iowa Department of Transportation Northwest Iowa Transportation Center in Sioux City to check eligibility.

- C. Priority Criteria/Scoring.** Once projects have been submitted to staff, these projects will be evaluated and scored according to the qualifying and priority criterion which is listed in the TIP. Once scored, staff will compile project information, scoring, and recommendation into a memo provided to both the Transportation Technical Committee and Policy Board for review. Although SIMPCO staff recommends projects based on the qualifying and priority criteria, the Transportation Technical Committee and Policy Board are not required to grant funds to the projects based on recommendation. Each of the following thirteen criteria explains its

importance to the application and provides the applicant with the amount of weight given in the application review. Each priority is directly related to questions on the application.

1. Is this project currently in the Long Range Transportation Plan (Question 1) - 10 points

2. Comprehensive Design (Question 2) - 6 points

It is the intent that all federal functional classified roads receiving federal transportation funds shall be reviewed to consider that they are designed and built in a safe and comprehensive manner so that all users including pedestrians, bicyclists, users of mass transit, people with disabilities, the elderly, and motorized vehicles can travel safely and independently throughout the transportation network.

3. The degree to which the proposed project fulfills the intent of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) - 5 points

It is important to implement quality projects. Relative to the IJJA/BIL, quality is defined by the declaration of policy included as the act. Legislation links transportation plans, programs, and projects to the goals of preserving community quality and protecting the environment. Surface Transportation Block Grant/Carbon Reduction Program should provide leadership by example for this new direction in federal transportation policy.

4. Projects with an assured local (non-federal funds) match in excess of 20 percent (Question 4) - 5 points

The demand for Surface Transportation Block Grant Program and Carbon Reduction Program funds far exceeds the amount made available to Iowa. Providing a modest incentive for proposers to exceed the minimum required local (non-federal funds) match (20 percent) will enable leveraging implementation of more projects in more locations throughout the state. Providing equitable access to Surface Transportation Block Grant Program and Carbon Reduction Program funds for underserved communities is also a concern. Therefore, the maximum local (non-federal funds) share is capped at 50 percent. Point distribution is as follows.

Percent match:	20%	Points	2
	30%		3
	40%		4
	50%		5

5. Projects with components which have already been funded and/or implemented from other funding sources, especially projects for which proposed Surface

Transportation Block Grants and Carbon Reduction Program would complete a larger project, concept, or plan (Question 5) - 5 points

There may be a number of larger projects that are missing a key or final element. Funding these missing elements with Surface Transportation Block Grant Program and Carbon Reduction Program funds would provide additional benefits to funded projects.

6. Projects that have already gone through a statewide, regional, and/or local priority setting process (Question 6) - 5 points

In some cases, the proposed project has already been included in the list of priorities for the locality, region, or the state, but was not completed due to funding limitations. There appears to be a number of very good projects that have gone through one or more of these processes but remain unfunded or underfunded because of limitations on the availability of funding in these programs.

7. Projects which demonstrate a regional impact including tourism, the environment, and economic development (Question 7) - 15 points

Surface Transportation Block Grant Program and Carbon Reduction Program funds are federal funds. The amount of funds is limited and is probably not sufficient to fund projects in every local community. For example, priority will be given to projects that benefit more than one neighborhood, community, or county, or are recognized as being of regional or interregional significance.

8. Project development status, at time of application, with regards to the federal and other processing requirements appropriate to the proposed project (Question 8) - 3 points

All projects funded with federal funds administered by the FHWA are required to be processed following rules established by the FHWA. The precise process a project must follow varies. For example, a project to develop a plan may merely have to follow the consultant selection process, whereas a major project, entailing extensive land acquisition and significant environmental impacts, may entail a number of steps including the writing of a federal environmental impact statement and holding numerous public meetings and hearings. Projects, which have reached successive milestones in the development process appropriate for the project, will be awarded points based on how far in the process they have been developed. The farther a project has been developed, the more certain is its implementation and the more reliable is its estimated cost.

- Right of way acquired? = 1**
- Environmental assessment completed/approved? = 1**
- Project design completed? = 1**

9. Projects where there is a need to coordinate with another jurisdiction in the programming and/or implementation process (Question 9) – 0 points

10. Project Average Annual Daily Traffic and the projected Average Annual Daily Traffic (Question 10) – 0 points

11. Project Federal Functional Classification (Question 11) - 10 points

Local = 2.5

Minor Arterial = 7.5

Collector = 5.0

Major Arterial = 10.0

12. Project Iowa Department of Transportation Sufficiency Rating(s) and Volume to Capacity Ratio(s) (Question 12) - 18 points

Sufficiency Rating

100 - 86 = 1

70 - 56 = 3

85 - 71 = 2

55 & below = 4

Volume to Capacity Ratio

.10 - .39 = 3.5

.70 - .99 = 10.5

.40 - .69 = 7.0

1.0 = 14.0

13. Project Accident Rate (Question 13) - 8 points

.01 - .50 = 2

.51 - 1.00 = 4

1.01 - 2.00 = 6

2.01 + = 8

The following questions only apply to CRP applications.

14. Projects that are consistent with the Iowa DOT Carbon Reduction Strategy:

<https://iowadot.gov/iowainmotion/files/2024-carbon-reduction-strategy.pdf>

(Question 14) – 5 points

15. Projects that will cut transportation emissions. (Question 15) – 5 points

Transportation emissions means carbon dioxide emissions from on-road highway sources of those emissions within a State.

POSSIBLE TOTAL POINTS STBG: 90 CRP: 100

- D. Transportation Technical Committee Recommendation.** The Transportation Technical Committee will review the recommendations from staff, may discuss significance of projects, and hear any input from Transportation Technical Committee members, organizations, agencies or the public. A funding recommendation from the Transportation Technical Committee will then be presented to the Policy Board. This process is typically done in March.
- E. Policy Board Action.** The Policy Board will receive projects scores along with recommendations from staff, the Transportation Technical Committee recommendation, any discussion on significance of projects, and any further input from members, organizations, agencies or the public. At that point, the Policy Board will make a final decision for the Iowa STBG or CRP funds. Projects will be selected within limitations of funding or “target amounts” that is calculated by the Iowa Department of Transportation.
- F. Transportation Improvement Program.** Selected projects are then included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The draft TIP is reviewed by the Policy Board in the spring and the final TIP is approved during the month of July and submitted to the Iowa DOT for approval, after which it is submitted to FHWA as part of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for federal approval. After the project has federal authorization, approved project applicants must work with the Iowa DOT to ensure all Federal regulations are being met regarding project design and construction. If a project requires a TIP amendment or administrative modification, the applicant must follow the process as outlined in the Public Participation Plan and TIP.

Nebraska

- 1. Application.** Nebraska members and organizations within the Metropolitan Planning Area will complete a copy of the DR Form 530 for STBG funds.
- 2. SIMPCO approval.** Once the DR Form 530 is completed by a member, it must be submitted to the SIMPCO MPO Executive Director for an approval signature. The MPO approval will be based on the status of the STBG quarterly report that the Nebraska Department of Transportation shall send to the MPO that reports the Urban STBG funds available for Nebraska members to utilize.

- 3. Nebraska Department of Transportation Approval.** After SIMPCO approval, the application will be sent for the Nebraska DOT to review. Once the project has been approved by the Nebraska DOT, both SIMPCO and the Nebraska member will receive a project Control Number.
- 4. Transportation Improvement Program.** Selected projects are then included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The draft TIP is reviewed by the Policy Board in the spring and the final TIP is approved during the month of July and submitted to the Nebraska DOT for approval, after which it is submitted to FHWA as part of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for federal approval. After the project has federal authorization, approved project applicants must work with the Nebraska DOT to ensure all Federal regulations are being met regarding project design and construction. If a project requires a TIP amendment or administrative modification, the applicant must follow the process as outlined in the Public Participation Plan and TIP.

South Dakota

- 1. STBG Resolution and TAP Application.** South Dakota members submit a Resolution to the South Dakota Department of Transportation (DOT) to request STBG. SIMPCO requests a copy of the resolution to have on file when sent to the South Dakota DOT.
- 2. South Dakota Department of Transportation Approval.** Once the project has been approved by the South Dakota DOT, both SIMPCO and the South Dakota member will receive a project Control Number.
- 3. Transportation Improvement Program.** Selected projects are then included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The draft TIP is reviewed by the Policy Board in the spring and the final TIP is approved during the month of July and submitted to the South Dakota DOT for approval, after which it is submitted to FHWA as part of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for federal approval. After the project has federal authorization, approved project applicants must work with the South Dakota DOT to ensure all Federal regulations are being met regarding project design and construction. If a project requires a TIP amendment or administrative modification, the applicant must follow the process as outlined in the Public Participation Plan and TIP.

Iowa TAP Process

- 1. Application.** Iowa members and organizations within the Metropolitan Planning Area will be informed when requests for TAP applications are made and their deadline. Members will receive an application by mail or email format. Other agencies can request an application by contacting the SIMPCO office. Applications will also be available at all times on the Iowa DOT website: <https://iowadot.gov/transportation-development/local-systems/grant-programs/transportation-alternatives>

The following is a checklist of things that must be included in a TAP application for it to be valid:

- Application Form (Parts A – F)
 - Part A – Project Sponsor Information

- Part B – Project Information
- Part C – Project Costs and Matching Funds
- Part D – Project Development Milestones
- Part E – Safe Routes to School Project Information (if applicable)
- Part F – Narrative Questions
- Required Attachments
 - Detailed Map
 - Sketch Plan
 - Digital Photographs
 - Itemized Breakdown of Project Costs
 - Official Endorsement (Resolution)
 - Byway Organization Letter of Support (if applicable)
 - Iowa DOT Letter of Consent to Submit (if applicable)
- Part G: Checklist and Certification
- Minority Impact Statement

All applications must be received by the application deadline so that staff have an appropriate amount of time for project evaluation. Applications are sent out in January and due back in February. Any application received past its deadline will be considered for the following year's application cycle.

2. Eligibility requirements.

Eligible applicants and project sponsors include:

- Local governments
- Regional transportation authorities
- Transit agencies
- Natural resource or public lands agencies
- Tribal governments
- School district, local education agency, or school
- A nonprofit entity
- Any other local or regional governmental entity with responsibility for or oversight of transportation or recreational trails
- A State, at the request of an eligible entity listed above

Once all applications have been received by SIMPCO staff, applications will be sent to the Iowa DOT for an eligibility check. The Iowa DOT will then return confirmation of eligibility and provide any comments on the application back to SIMPCO.

3. Scoring.

These projects will be evaluated and scored by SIMPCO staff according to the following qualifying and priority criterion:

a. Regional impact (10 points)

How the project will serve residents of the region, including impacts to quality of life, utility of the transportation system, and tourism.

b. Connectivity (10 points)

How the project aligns with current transportation alternative infrastructure, for example, the completion of trail linkages within or adjacent to the community. How the project connects residents to local or regional destinations.

c. Currently in the LRTP (10 points)

Whether or not the proposed project is included in the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan.

d. Alignment with other planning documents (10 points)

How well the proposed project relates to goals, objectives, or values of other plans at the local, regional, or state level.

e. Safety (10 points)

How the proposed project addresses the safety of all users such as those who walk, bike, drive, ride transit, or travel by other modes.

f. Federal-aid Highway project development capacity (10 points)

Does the project sponsor have previous experience with the federal-aid highway project development process, an understanding of the process, and staff capacity to successfully deliver the project? Does the sponsor have previous experience administering other federal awards or delivering other complex projects?

g. High-need areas (5 points)

Does the project impact high-need areas such as low-income, transit-dependent, or other areas? How will the proposed project improve the overall mobility of these areas and how has this population been engaged in the planning for the proposed project?

h. Accessibility (5 points)

What efforts have been made to go beyond compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 to ensure the proposed project will be accessible and usable by individuals with disabilities?

i. Long-term maintenance plan (5 points)

What arrangements have been made to continue operation and maintenance of the proposed project after the project is complete?

j. Assured local match greater than 20% (15 points)

- i. 21-30% (3 points)
- ii. 31-40% (6 points)
- iii. 41-50% (9 points)
- iv. 51-60% (12 points)
- v. 60% or more (15 points)

k. Project readiness (10 points)

What is the current development status of the proposed project? Have any steps been completed (land acquisition, design and engineering, etc.)? Will the project proceed without delay upon award of funding?

Once scored, staff will compile project information, scoring, and recommendation into a memo provided to both the Transportation Technical Committee and Policy Board for review. Although SIMPCO staff recommends projects based on the qualifying and priority criteria, the Transportation Technical Committee and Policy Board are not required to grant funds to the projects based on recommendation.

- 4. Transportation Technical Committee Recommendation.** The Transportation Technical Committee will review the recommendations from staff, may discuss significance of projects, and hear any input from Transportation Technical Committee members, organizations, agencies or the public. A funding recommendation from the Transportation Technical Committee will then be presented to the Policy Board. This process is typically done in March.
- 5. Policy Board Action.** The Policy Board will receive projects scores along with recommendations from staff, the Transportation Technical Committee recommendation, any discussion on significance of projects, and any further input from members, organizations, agencies or the public. At that point, the Policy Board will make a final decision for the Iowa TAP funds. Projects will be selected within limitations of funding or “target amounts” that is calculated by the Iowa Department of Transportation. After approval SIMPCO staff will send award letters to the sponsors of the selected projects, informing them of the next steps.
- 6. Transportation Improvement Program.** Selected projects are then included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The draft TIP is reviewed by the Policy Board in the spring and the final TIP is approved during the month of June and submitted to the Iowa DOT for approval, after which it is submitted to FHWA as part of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for federal approval. After the project has federal authorization, approved project applicants must work with the Iowa DOT to ensure all Federal regulations are being met regarding project design and construction. If a project requires a TIP amendment or administrative modification, the applicant must follow the process as outlined in the Public Participation Plan and TIP.

Nebraska

- 1. Application.** Nebraska members and organizations within the Metropolitan Planning Area will complete TAP Intent to Apply Form, TAP Draft Application Form, and a TAP Final Application Form. The Transportation Alternatives applications can be found on the Nebraska DOT website at: <https://dot.nebraska.gov/business-center/lpa/projects/tap/>.
- 2. SIMPCO approval.** Once the TAP Final Application Form is completed by a member, it must be submitted to the MPO Transportation Planning Director for an approval signature.
- 3. Nebraska Department of Transportation Approval.** After SIMPCO approval, the application will be sent for the Nebraska DOT to review. Once the project has been approved by the Nebraska DOT, both SIMPCO and the Nebraska member will receive a project Control Number.
- 4. Transportation Improvement Program.** Selected projects are then included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The draft TIP is reviewed by the Policy Board in the spring and the final TIP is approved during the month of July and submitted to the Nebraska DOT for approval, after which it is submitted to FHWA as part of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for federal approval. After the project has federal authorization, approved project applicants must work with the Nebraska DOT to ensure all Federal regulations are being met regarding project design and construction. If a project requires a TIP amendment or administrative modification, the applicant must follow the process as outlined in the Public Participation Plan and TIP.

South Dakota

- 1. STBG Resolution and TAP Application.** South Dakota members complete an application provided by the South Dakota DOT by September 30th of each year for TAP funds. SIMPCO requests a copy of the TAP application to have on file when sent to the South Dakota DOT. The TAP applications for South Dakota can be found on the South Dakota DOT website at: <https://dot.sd.gov/programs-services/programs/transportation-alternatives>
- 2. South Dakota Department of Transportation Approval.** Once the project has been approved by the South Dakota DOT, both SIMPCO and the South Dakota member will receive a project Control Number.
- 3. Transportation Improvement Program.** Selected projects are then included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The draft TIP is reviewed by the Policy Board in the spring and the final TIP is approved during the month of July and submitted to the South Dakota DOT for approval, after which it is submitted to FHWA as part of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for federal approval. After the project has federal authorization, approved project applicants must work with the South Dakota DOT to ensure all Federal regulations are being met regarding project design and construction. If a project requires a TIP amendment or administrative modification, the applicant must follow the process as outlined in the Public Participation Plan and TIP.

Implementation and Monitoring

The SIMPCO MPO staff will conduct an annual review to verify that programmed projects align with the goals and objectives outlined in the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). This review occurs during the development of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

If discrepancies are identified, the LRTP will be amended as necessary to maintain consistency between the two documents. This ensures that planning and programming efforts remain coordinated and responsive to regional priorities.

The typical progression of projects following a structured path:

1. Identification in the LRTP – Projects are first included in the LRTP based on long-term regional needs and goals.
2. Programming in the TIP – Once funding is secured, selected projects move into the TIP for short-term implementation.

All projects listed in the TIP must demonstrate alignment with the LRTP's goals and performance measures. In addition, SIMPCO MPO will ensure compliance with federal performance-based planning and programming requirements as outline in 23 CFR Part 450. This process supports transparency, accountability, and compliance with federal and state regulations while advancing the region's transportation vision.

Stakeholder engagement and public participation are integral to the implementation and monitoring process. SIMPCO MPO will:

- Engage Local Jurisdictions and Agencies – Coordinate with city, county, and state transportation agencies to ensure projects reflect regional priorities and funding opportunities.

- Solicit Public Input – Provide opportunities for public comment during the development and amendment of both the LRTP and TIP through public meetings, online platforms, and outreach campaigns.
- Maintain Transparency – Publish draft and final versions of planning documents on the MPO website and distribute notices through multiple channels to keep stakeholders informed.
- Respond to Feedback – Incorporate relevant comments and concerns into project selection and prioritization, ensuring community needs are addressed.

This collaborative approach ensures that transportation planning remains transparent and aligned with the region's long-term vision.