

■ Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Application Process

1. Application Schedule

- **July 15, 2016** – Letter of Intent Form to be submitted to the SDDOT. Letters must be emailed no later than 5 p.m., July 15, 2016.
- **July 15 -August 15, 2016** – Mandatory site meetings with those that submitted Letters of Intent.
- **September 30, 2016** – Deadline to submit applications due to the SDDOT. Applications must be emailed no later than 5 p.m., September 15, 2015.
- **November 1, 2016** – Deadline for Selection Committee to meet and make recommendations of project selection and funding.
- **November 2016 and beyond** – Projects must be approved for funding by the Transportation Commission and appropriate Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan action completed. Following which, agreements will be prepared with project sponsors.
- **Projects must be completed within three years.**

2. Letter of Intent

Every eligible entity must submit a Letter of Intent using the SDDOT TAP Letter of Intent form. The Letter of Intent form shall contain the contact information of the potential applicant, a brief description of the project, an estimated total cost of the project and an estimate of the funding to be requested, along with the agencies responsible for the matching funds. Letter of Intent forms must be submitted to be eligible for application for funding.

3. Mandatory Development Meeting

Following the submission of the Letter of Intent, each potential applicant will be scheduled for a mandatory development meeting with SDDOT staff, to include a site inspection, review and discussion on the eligibility of the project and an explanation of the application process and content. This meeting must be completed prior to the application deadline in order for the applicant to be approved to submit a formal application. The affected Area Engineer and a representative from FHWA is also in attendance at this meeting.

4. Application

Eligible entities that have submitted a Letter of Intent and have completed the Mandatory Development Meeting may submit an application using the form provided by the SDDOT prior to the application deadline. Responses shall be limited in length to the space provided on the form.

Information to be provided by the applicant shall include:

1. **Project and Contact Information** – Provide the project name and information for the person responsible for the application and the organization and person responsible for the project, if different from the applicant.
- **Project Type** – Indicate which of the eligible activities the project meets. Refer to the Eligible Activities section of this document for activity definitions.
- **Project Location** – Provide information where the proposed project is located and indicate property ownership. If the project is linear in nature, such as a sidewalk or bike path, please provide the approximate length.

- **Project Description** – Describe the project as concisely as possible. The application reviewer should be able to determine precisely what is being proposed in the first three sentences.
- **Project Relevancy to TAP Criteria** – Refer to the Application Scoring Criteria later in this document and provide the information requested. If a specific question is asked in the application, the applicant does not need to repeat the answer in the narrative sections.
- **Project Costs Form** – Complete the Project Costs Form attached.
- **Signature Page** – Signature Page to be signed by project sponsor.
- **Detailed Budget and Match to Be Provided** - Provide a budget prepared by an engineering firm or other relevant professional, including estimated cost of preliminary design, environmental review, construction cost, construction engineering, contingencies and/or non-infrastructure costs. Budget should indicate the amount of match that the applicant will be providing for the project. Minimum match required is 18.05 % of the total cost.
- **Detailed Map** – Provide a detailed map showing project location and termini.
- **Meeting Minutes** – Provide meeting minutes from public meetings if any have been held to discuss the project.
- **Letters of Support** – Attach letters of support from local citizens and organizations, as well as affected government agencies, including DOT Regional Engineer or County Highway Superintendent, if applicable.
- **Relevant Project Information** – If this project was identified in a planning study, master plan or multi-phased project, include the relevant part of those documents, as well as labeled project site photographs.
- **Resolution** – Attach the resolution recognizing the official action to sponsor this project.
- **Scope of Services** – Completed by the design consultant and submitted electronically as a word document
- **Scope of Work** – Completed by the design consultant and submitted electronically as a pdf form.
- **Submittal** –All letters of support, maps, photographs and other attachments should be scanned, in color if applicable, and submitted digitally along with the application.

5. Application Scoring Criteria

South Dakota TAP grant applications will be judged on how well they address the selection criteria. The criteria are listed below, with pointers on how to address those criteria, keeping in mind that each proposal is unique and the responses should be based primarily on the applicant’s research and knowledge of the specific project.

Scoring Criteria		Points Possible
Project Type: See page 1 of the application. Award the full points possible based on the eligible activity selected on the application.		Varies
• Bike/Pedestrian/Non-Motorized Facility		10
• Safe Routes for Non-Drivers		10
• Conversion and Use of Railroad Corridors for Trails		8
• Turnouts, overlooks, and view areas		10
• Community Improvement Activities		
▪ Inventory, control, or removal of outdoor advertising		2
▪ Preservation of Historic Bridges		10

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities other than bridges 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Archaeological activities relating to impacts from implementation of an eligible transportation project. 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Mitigation Activity 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stormwater management, pollution prevention, wetland mitigation, habitat development, etc. 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Living snow fences 	10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe Routes to School Infrastructure Project 	10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe Routes to School Non-infrastructure Project 	8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning, design or construction of boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of- way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways 	1
Transportation Relevance: See Questions A.1 through A.3 of the application. Award 0 – 15 total points based on how the project addresses the following criteria:	0-15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project provide a safe alternative to vehicular travel for the community or region? • Does the project provide a safe transportation route connecting pedestrians, bicyclists, non-drivers or mobility challenged travelers to daily needs, goods and services? This could be connections to school, senior centers, shopping, government services, employment or other daily needs. • Is the project close to other transportation routes? Is it located in or near a roadway corridor or transit bus stop or route? Does it provide a link to other pedestrian or bicycle facilities? 	
Compatibility with Relevant State, Regional and Local Planning See Questions B.1 through B.4. Award 0 – 10 total points based on how the project addresses the following criteria:	0-10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project compatible with relevant state, regional and local planning? Is the project identified in community or transportation master plans? Does the application cite specific references to regional or local plans? • If the project requires coordination with other entities, is there information or letters of support showing that coordination has occurred? This might include programmatic agreements or coordination with other agencies, such as the State Historic Preservation Office, the Department of Transportation or the Department of Game, Fish and Parks. • Is the project a stand-alone projects or part of larger “joint development” project? Projects being constructed as part of a larger project (roadway, park, etc.) may be given higher priority. • If the project is within one of the state’s metropolitan planning areas (MPO), does the project have MPO support or comply with MPO planning efforts? 	
Project Feasibility See questions C.1 through C.6 and D.1. Award 0 – 10 total points based on how the project addresses the following criteria:	0-10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project appear ready to go without any obvious pit falls? For example, the project has been planned and coordinated with land owners, railroad and other agencies. • Is the project free of any environmental concerns? Are there apparent wetland, archeological, endangered species or other adverse impacts? • Is the project free of any contingencies that could delay the project? • Is the applicant knowledgeable of the future maintenance needs and committed to maintaining the project? 	

Community Support See questions E.1 through E.4. Award 0 – 10 total points based on how the project addresses the following criteria:	0-10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it apparent the community has been very involved in the planning of the project? • Is there demonstrated strong community support through letters of support, attendance at public meetings, etc.? Note: Applicants are encouraged to get personalized letters from community members, as opposed to the standard letters from the City, School, Chamber, etc. • Does the community show a track record of support for similar projects? • Is the committed or anticipated local match greater than 18.05%? 	
Projected Use and Public and Social Value See question F.1. Award 0 – 10 total points based on how the project addresses the following criteria:	0-10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What level of public usage will this project receive? Are there an estimated number of students or community residents projected to use the project? • Is there a reasonable perceived value to the public or social value? • Will this project significantly impact the transportation opportunities for the projected user groups? 	
Economic Conditions and Impact See questions H.1 and I.1. Award 0 – 5 total points for existing designated disadvantaged status and 0-5 points for projected economic impact, based on the following criteria:	0-10 Total
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this project within a disadvantaged area or will it improve transportation options for an underserved population 	0-5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a reasonable expectation for this project to improve the economic vitality within the project’s community, region or state? 	0-5
Safety and Connectivity See question J.1 through J.3. Award 0 – 15 total points based on how the project addresses the following criteria:	0-15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was this project designed to address safety concerns for pedestrian and bicycle travelers? Will the project improve transportation corridor safety for multiple transportation modes? • Do the starting and stopping points for the project link logical beginning and ending points? Does the project provide a safe route and connectivity to multiple destinations? • Does the project start and stop at a safe location? • If the project is requesting funding for Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure elements, will they promote safe use of the project corridor? 	
Ordinances and Design See question K.1 through K.2. Award 0 – 10 total points based on how the project addresses the following criteria:	0-10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project sponsor have a snow removal ordinance? • Do they require sidewalks in new developments? • Do they require property owners to maintain existing sidewalk and, if so, has it been enforced? If not, do they have a plan to enforce maintenance in the future? • If design exceptions are requested, are they reasonable and justified requests? 	

6. Transportation Alternatives Advisory Committee

The TAP Advisory Committee will be appointed by the SDDOT. The committee will review and score all applications and make project funding recommendations. The Area Engineer in which a project is located is also provided an opportunity to score that project. A committee member, who is connected in any way to a pending application, will not be allowed to vote on that application. SDDOT will have ultimate decision making power for project submission to the South Dakota Transportation Commission for their review and approval. Federal Highway Administration staff will serve as an advisory member on this committee.

The committee this year consisted of a representative from each of the following groups:

- Association of County Commissioners,
- Municipal League,
- SD Cultural Heritage Office,
- LTAP

2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Applications and Recommendations Class 1 Cities

Location	Project	Overall Cost	Requested Funding	Local Match	% Match	Recommended Funding	Local Match	Overall Cost	% Match
Aberdeen	15th Avenue Trail from Dakota Street North to Second Street North	\$527,220	\$400,000	\$127,220	24.13%	\$400,000	\$127,220	\$527,220	24.13%
Piedmont	Piedmont Sidewalk Improvement Project	\$264,250	\$216,553	\$47,697	18.05%	\$216,553	\$47,697	\$264,250	18.05%
Mitchell Tech	MTI Shared Use Paht Phase II	\$537,000	\$400,000	\$137,000	25.51%	\$0			
Current Subtotal - Class 1 Cities		\$1,328,470	\$1,016,553	\$311,917		\$616,553	\$174,917	\$791,470	
						Funds Available	\$1,120,873		
						Balance	\$504,320		

2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Applications and Recommendations Rural Communities

Location	Project	Overall Cost	Requested Funding	Local Match	% Match	Recommended Funding	Local Match	Overall Cost	% Match
CRST	No Heart Pathway Extension Phase II & III	\$495,338	\$395,671	\$99,667	20.12%	\$395,671	\$99,667	\$495,338	20.12%
Custer	Custer Sidewalk Project - Mickelson Trail to Custer Public School	\$633,507	\$400,000	\$233,507	36.86%	\$400,000	\$233,507	\$633,507	36.86%
Armour	Armour Safe Routes to School Phase III	\$247,000	\$202,416	\$44,584	18.05%	\$202,417	\$44,584	\$247,000	18.05%
Sisseton	Sisseton Pedestrian Trail Expansion Eighth Avenue West	\$295,648	\$236,518	\$59,130	20.00%	\$0			
Standing Rock	Bullhead Multi-Use Pathway	\$197,080	\$161,507	\$35,573	18.05%	\$0			
Hot Springs	Intersection Pedestrian Improvements - US385 Reconstruction	\$400,000	\$320,000	\$80,000	20.00%	\$0			
Faulkton	Faulkton Safe Routes to School	\$133,328	\$106,662	\$26,666	20.00%	\$0			
Garretson	Garretson - Pedestrian Trail from Frank Ave. to Palisades Park Phase 1	\$484,310	\$377,762	\$106,548	22.00%	\$0			
Colome	Colome Safe Travel Sidwalk Project from School to Football Field	\$75,000	\$61,463	\$13,538	18.05%	\$0			
Sisseton Whapeton Oyate	Enemy Swim Pathway Project	\$404,904	\$331,818	\$73,085	18.05%	\$0			
Current Subtotal - Small Cities		\$3,366,114	\$2,593,817	\$772,297		\$998,088	\$377,758	\$1,375,845	
						Funds Available	\$1,022,284		
						Balance	\$24,197		

Recommended Projects

Updated 1/14/16 JDO