



MEMORANDUM

To: STP Project Selection Committee

From: CMAP Staff

Date: August 4, 2022

Re: STP Shared Fund Methodology – Eligible Project Types

Purpose: Staff requests committee discussion of this proposal for incorporating commuter rail yard and terminal improvements into the Transit Station Improvements project category

Action Requested: Discussion

At the June committee meeting, staff provided a summary of research regarding the potential addition of commuter rail yard expansion and improvement projects as an eligible shared fund project type. Based on committee concerns regarding the potential for added project types to dilute the overall program, staff worked with Metra and CTA staff to develop a proposed method for incorporating this project type into the existing transit station improvements category. This means that transit yard and terminal improvements will be directly compared with transit station improvements.

In keeping asset conditions as the primary focus for evaluation to determine need and improvement within the transit station improvement project type, staff proposes to also focus primarily on asset condition for the additions to the methodology, which are attached. In addition, regulatory compliance, such as ADA accessibility at yards and terminals, is recommended as part of the evaluation of need for yards and terminals. Finally, when assessing the potential improvements to the system from changes to yards and terminals, the degree of increased storage capacity and the degree of reduction in running empty trains from a yard or terminal to a route's first passenger station are proposed.

Transit station, yard, or terminal improvements

Our region's aging transit infrastructure has a profound impact on not only transit ridership, but also on the ability to operate transit service. This infrastructure includes the stations utilized by riders to access transit services, and the yards and terminals where train sets are stored, configured, and maintained.

Existing Condition/Need

The existing condition/need score for these projects has three parts: asset condition, compliance, and bike/ped access, as summarized in the table below and described in more detail following the table.

| <u>Project Scope</u> | <u>Asset Condition</u> | <u>Compliance</u> | <u>Bike/Ped Access</u> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Transit station reconstruction/rehab only</u> | <u>100%</u> <u>Cost-weighted average TERM score of station components</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>N/A</u> |
| <u>Bike/ped access to transit station only</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>75%</u> <u>Percentage of roads within station area with no sidewalk</u> <u>25%</u> <u>Bicycle parking infrastructure</u> |
| <u>Station and bike/ped access improvements</u> | <u>50%</u> <u>Cost-weighted average TERM score of station components</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>37.5%</u> <u>Percentage of roads within station area with no sidewalk</u> <u>12.5%</u> <u>Bicycle parking infrastructure</u> |
| <u>Commuter rail yard and/or terminal improvements only</u> | <u>80%</u> <u>Cost-weighted average TERM condition rating scale of yard/terminal components</u> | <u>20%</u> <u>Level of compliance with ADA, FTA, IDOT, and other code requirements</u> | <u>N/A</u> |

Proposed revisions to STP Shared Fund Application Booklet. Underlined text indicates an addition, ~~stricken~~ text indicates a deletion.

For project scopes which include only reconstruction/rehab of ~~the~~a station, with no bike/ped access changes, the existing condition score will be the cost-weighted average [Transit Economic Requirements Model \(TERM\)](#) condition rating scale of station components, subtracted from the maximum value of 5, and scaled from a 5-point scale to a 20-point scale.

For project scopes which include only bike/ped access improvements, with no station improvements, 75% of the score will be the percentage of roads in the station area with no sidewalk, scaled to 15 points. Station area is defined as within ½ mile of the station. The percentage will be determined from CMAP's [Sidewalk Inventory](#) data. Data for all CTA and Metra rail station data and select CTA and Pace bus terminals and transfer points is summarized [here](#). Locations not included in the summary will be evaluated individually if an application is received. An additional 5 points (25% of the need score) will be awarded if the station does not have any bicycle parking infrastructure at the station or a bike-sharing dock(s) within the station area.

For projects that include both station improvements and bike/ped access improvements, the existing condition score will be calculated using the above methods, then each score will be multiplied by 50% and the two scores added together.

For projects that include improvements to the rail yard or terminal, including relocation of an existing facility, 80% of the existing condition score will be the cost-weighted average TERM condition rating scale of the yard/terminal components to be improved, subtracted from the maximum value of 5, and scaled from a 5-point scale to a 16-point scale.

Compliance, which includes meeting ADA, FTA, IDOT, and other code requirements, will be scored as shown below.

| <u>Level of Compliance</u> | <u>Score</u> |
|------------------------------------|--------------|
| <u>Critical compliance failure</u> | <u>4</u> |
| <u>Critical compliance risk</u> | <u>3</u> |
| <u>Major compliance exception</u> | <u>2</u> |
| <u>Minor compliance exception</u> | <u>1</u> |
| <u>No compliance exception</u> | <u>0</u> |

If the project scope does not address the compliance deficiencies, a score of 0 will be assigned for this criterion.

Improvement

The raw improvement score for these projects has three parts: asset condition, ~~and bike/ped access~~, and efficiency as summarized in the table below and described in more detail following the table.

| <u>Project Scope</u> | <u>Asset Condition</u> | <u>Bike/Ped Access</u> | <u>Efficiency</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Transit station reconstruction/rehab only</u> | <u>The difference in cost-weighted average TERM score of station components before and after project</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>N/A</u> |
| <u>Bike/ped access to transit station only</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>75%</u> <u>Percentage of new plus improved sidewalk within station area</u> <u>25%</u> <u>Bicycle parking infrastructure added</u> | <u>N/A</u> |
| <u>Station and bike/ped access improvements (the greater of the asset condition or bike/ped access score)</u> | <u>100%</u> <u>The difference in cost-weighted average TERM score of station components before and after project</u> | <u>75%</u> <u>Percentage of new plus improved sidewalk within station area</u> <u>25%</u> <u>Bicycle parking infrastructure added</u> | <u>N/A</u> |
| <u>Commuter rail yard and/or terminal improvements only</u> | <u>75%</u> <u>The difference in cost-weighted average TERM score of yard/terminal components before and after project</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>12.5%</u> <u>The increase (%) in the vehicle (train set) storage capacity before and after the project</u> <u>12.5%</u> <u>The reduction in non-revenue trips (based on schedules in effect on the date of application)</u> |

Proposed revisions to STP Shared Fund Application Booklet. Underlined text indicates an addition, ~~stricken~~ text indicates a deletion.

For project scopes which only include reconstruction/rehab of ~~the~~a station, with no bike/ped access changes, the raw improvement score will be the difference in cost-weighted average Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) condition rating scale of station components before and after the project, scaled to 20 points. The raw scores will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness.

For project scopes which only include bike/ped access improvements, with no station improvements, 75% of the raw improvement score (15 points) will be the % of new plus improved sidewalk added within the station area, scaled to 15 points. The total possible linear feet of new plus improved sidewalk is two times the total linear feet of roadway in the station area. If either bicycle parking infrastructure or a bike-sharing dock is added where none previously existed, an additional 5 points (25% of the raw score) will be added to the raw improvement score. The raw scores will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness.

In order to incentivize doing more within a single project, for projects that include both station improvements and bike/ped access improvements, the raw improvement score will be calculated using the above methods, and the higher of the two scores will be used in the cost effectiveness calculation. The cost effectiveness of all projects within the transit station category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20

For project scopes which include rehab/improvement or relocation of a rail yard or terminal, 75% of the raw improvement score will be for improvements to asset condition, defined as the difference in the cost-weighted average TERM condition rating scale of station components before and after the project, scaled to 15 points. In the case of relocations, the existing yard or terminal facility must be removed or fully abandoned in order to receive any points for asset condition improvements. The remaining 25% of the score will be for efficiency improvements. Up to 2.5 points will be added to the raw improvement score for the percent increase in vehicle storage capacity created from the project. Up to 2.5 additional points will be added for the percent decrease in non-revenue trips as a result of the project. Efficiency improvement points will be calculated based on the operational schedule in effect on the closing date of the call for projects. The sum of the raw scores will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness.

Eligible project types

While STP has very broad eligibility in comparison to other funding sources (for example, CMAQ, TAP, and HSIP), the STP Shared Fund is targeted toward specific priority project types. Applications will only be evaluated as the project type(s) selected by the applicant, and must demonstrate need in the selected category and include scope elements that address that need.

The table below provides additional guidance to assist applicants with choosing the appropriate application category. The table is not intended to be all-inclusive and applicants should contact their Planning Liaison or CMAP staff for project-specific guidance.

[Condensed to show only rows with changes]

| Project Type | Need(s) to be addressed | Example scope elements to address needs |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Transit Station Improvements | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Station asset condition• Gaps in bicycle and pedestrian access to station• <u>Commuter rail yard or terminal asset condition</u>• <u>Commuter rail compliance or storage deficiencies</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rehab, repair, or replace station building, boarding platforms, and other station fixtures• Complete direct connection of sidewalk network to station• Complete direct connection of bicycle network to station• Install bike paring or bike-sharing at station• <u>Rehab, repair, or replace yard or terminal assets (platforms, switches, signals, crew facilities, etc.)</u>• <u>Relocate existing commuter rail yard</u> |

Proposed revisions to STP Shared Fund Application Booklet. Underlined text indicates an addition, ~~stricken~~ text indicates a deletion.