November 8, 2012

In Reply Refer To:
HQI-IL

Secretary Ann Schneider
Secretary of Transportation
Illinois Department of Transportation
2300 South Dirksen Parkway
Springfield, IL 62764

Norman R. Stoner, P.E.
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
3250 Executive Park Drive
Springfield, IL 62703

Dear Secretary Schneider and Mr. Stoner:

Enclosed is the Final Report for the **Safe Routes to School Process Review**. The review identified resolutions through observations, recommendations, and best practices. This Final Report also reflects the resolutions that were discussed and agreed upon at the October 31, 2012 closeout meetings.

The review team would like to express our appreciation to all Illinois Department of Transportation Headquarters and District staff for their assistance and cooperation during this review.

Sincerely,

Greg Piland
Review Co-Coordinator
Federal Highway Administration

Roseanne Nance
Review Co-Coordinator
Illinois Department of Transportation

Enclosure

ecc: Mr. Bill Frey, Division of Highways, IDOT
      Mr. Aaron Weatherholt, Division of Highways, IDOT
      Mr. Justan Mann, Division of Highways, IDOT
      Ms. Priscilla Tobias
      Ms. Roseanne Nance

U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal Highway Administration

Federal Highway Administration Illinois Division

Process Review

Safe Routes to School

Final Report
November 8, 2012

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

ILLINOIS

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

In September 2005 the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) announced its funding of a new program, Safe Routes to School (SRTS). In January of 2006 the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) assigned an interim SRTS Coordinator within its Bureau of Design and Environment to begin designing and initiating its SRTS program. A permanent SRTS Coordinator was hired in September of 2006.

To date, $48.0 million has been apportioned to the State of Illinois and approximately $43 million has been awarded. Approximately $12.4 million of the apportioned funds have been obligated.

In May 2011, SRTS program management, along with the coordinator position, transferred within IDOT from the Bureau of Design and Environment (BDE) to the Bureau of Safety Engineering (BSE). Immediately following this move the SRTS Coordinator accepted a new position and an interim coordinator was appointed. In June 2012 the full-time coordinator position was filled by a staff member within BSE.

As a means to review, improve, and highlight Illinois' efforts with the SRTS program, the FHWA Illinois Division Office and IDOT agreed that a review of the program would be of benefit. A Process Review team was established and its observations, recommendations, and resolutions are defined in this report.

The Process Review team would like to acknowledge IDOT and the efforts of the first permanent SRTS Coordinator, Megan Holt-Swanson, and the Bureau of Design and Environment for developing and coordinating the Illinois SRTS initial program implementation. This was an entirely new program for Illinois and many new processes had to be defined. This included the development of an Illinois SRTS website, an on-line school travel plan and application system, and creation of a selection team for project reviews. The coordinator was personally responsible for coordinating the processing of the non-infrastructure grant agreements, obligating funds, and project reimbursements. Coordination to incorporate the SRTS infrastructure projects into the appropriate fiscal processes was also done with the Bureau of Local Roads and Streets (BLRS).

Due to the nature and size of the SRTS program, this review was categorized into five manageable and practical areas:
- Overall Program
- Application/school travel plan
- Selection
- Contracting
- Project implementation

U.S. Department
of Transportation

**Federal Highway
Administration**

Interviews were conducted with IDOT District personnel and SRTS project awardees in Districts one, four, and eight, IDOT Central Office staff in BDE, Bureau of Business Services (BOBS), BLRS, and staff from the Chicago Metropolitan Agency on Planning, Chicago Department of Transportation, and the Active Transportation Alliance.

From those interviews and reviews of pertinent documentation, 13 observations and recommendations were recorded. In general, the State of Illinois is meeting its requirements for management of this program. However, there were several critical procedural issues that were identified. As a result of this audit and the reassigning of the program to the IDOT BSE, these issues have been reviewed and many resolved.

It appears IDOT; BSE has made every effort to:
- Improve communications
- Streamline procedures
- Expedite contracting, reimbursements and implementation of projects
- Move towards effective evaluation of the program.

The SRTS processes are being instituted into the appropriate standard business areas throughout the Department. In addition, processes have been implemented that establish management and technical oversight.

All of these improvements will create the best possible environment to allow SRTS projects to be implemented and evaluated in a timely manner; therefore, substantially improving the ability of primary and middle school students to walk and bicycle to school safely.

Background

The SRTS is a Federal-aid program of the U.S. Department of Transportation's (DOT) FHWA that was launched in September 2005. The Program was created by Section 1404 of the *Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users Act* (SAFETEA-LU). Nationally, the SRTS program was originally funded at $612 million over five Federal fiscal years (FY 2005-2009) and is administered by State DOTs. As a result of extensions to SAFETEA-LU, the program is currently funded at approximately $1.1 billion through FY 11 (June 30, 2012). To date, total funds apportioned to Illinois is approximately $48.0 million.

The program provides funds to the States to improve the ability of primary and middle school students to walk and bicycle to school safely. The purposes of the program are to:

- Enable and encourage children, including those with disabilities, to walk and bicycle to school;
- Make bicycling and walking to school a safer and more appealing transportation alternative, thereby encouraging a healthy and active lifestyle from an early age;
- Facilitate the planning, development, and implementation of projects and activities that will improve safety and reduce traffic, fuel consumption, and air pollution in the vicinity (approximately two miles) of primary and middle schools (Grades K-8).

Each State administers its own program and develops its own procedures to solicit and select projects for funding. The program establishes two distinct types of funding opportunities: infrastructure projects (engineering improvements) and non-infrastructure activities (such as education, enforcement and encouragement programs). Federal SRTS requirements state that at least 10%, but not greater than 30%, of a state's total apportionment fund non-infrastructure projects. The remainder of the SRTS apportionment can fund infrastructure projects.

The Illinois SRTS law was passed August 8, 2005 (Attachment B1) and requires coordination with the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) and the Illinois State Police (ISP). This law also requires submittal of a report to the Illinois General Assembly (IGA) on March 30 of each year while the program is in existence that lists and describes the projects funded.

On January 24, 2006 IDOT assigned the program to the BDE and named an interim coordinator. A permanent coordinator was named September 1, 2006.

In order to effectively administer the program, IDOT set forth developing a series of web-based tools starting with an Illinois SRTS website, a School Travel Plan and an

application. The Illinois SRTS website provides a general overview of the program with links to other information. Applicants can log in to complete the School Travel Plan and their SRTS Application for funding. It also acts as a means for posting success stories, sharing new ideas and includes a question and answer section.

The School Travel Plan (Attachment B2) is a required component of the Illinois SRTS application process. It is a document which outlines a school community's intentions for making travel to and from school more sustainable and safe. A reference guide to assist communities in completing the travel plan was also developed (Attachment B3). The intent is for the travel plan to be created through a team-based process that identifies the barriers to active transportation and formulates a set of solutions to address them. It is developed in consultation with the community's stakeholders and can address a single school or several schools.

Once the School Travel Plan was completed and approved by IDOT, an application could be completed and submitted to IDOT. The on-line application system was designed and implemented to expedite and enhance the submittal process and to allow the review and evaluation of projects for scoring purposes. The Illinois Safe Routes to School Program – Funding Application Guidance document (Attachment B4) was also developed to explain the program requirements, eligibility, and application process.

There have been three funding cycles since IDOT established the program. Each funding cycle consists of the solicitation of applications, project selection and the award of funding.

Funding cycle details:

Cycle	Opened	Awarded	Funds
1	March 2007	March 2008	$8.3M
2	September 2008	August 2009	$13.0M
3	October 2010	January 2012	$21.7M
		Total:	$43.0M

The IDOT established contract language for selected non-infrastructure and infrastructure project agreements. The non-infrastructure grant agreements include education, encouragement, enforcement, marketing, training, and safety programs. The infrastructure projects include construction of sidewalks, signing, marking, signalization, and other constructible improvements. Since these infrastructure projects are of the same nature as typical highway projects, they are processed as construction contracts/agreements rather than grants.

U.S. Department
of Transportation

**Federal Highway
Administration**

In July 2009 the Illinois Office of Internal Audit conducted its own review of the Illinois SRTS program (Attachment A1), and the final report was submitted to IDOT Secretary Gary Hannig on July 14, 2009. The following are their two material findings and one observation, and the corresponding IDOT responses:

- Finding 1: Inadequate Documentation of Costs
    - IDOT Response: IDOT agreed and committed to more closely review all billing to ensure adequate documentation is included.
- Finding 2: IDOT does not have Procedures to Monitor Sub recipients
    - IDOT Response: IDOT agreed and committed to developing a monitoring process and to develop procedures for on-site review of selected projects.
- Observation: SRTS Coordinator's Salary not paid with SRTS Grant
    - IDOT Response: IDOT disagreed. IDOT chose to exercise the flexibility that federal guidance allows payment of the coordinator with state funding, thus maximizing their SRTS funding on project related activities.

In May 2011, SRTS program management along with the Coordinator position transferred within IDOT from BDE to BSE. Immediately following this move the SRTS Coordinator accepted a new position and an interim coordinator was appointed. In June 2012 the full-time coordinator position was filled by a staff member within BSE.

Of the $48.0 million apportioned to the State of Illinois, approximately $43 million has been awarded and $12.4 million has been obligated. The remaining funds are being used for administrative purposes, such as approved funding adjustments.   Refer to Attachment B5 for a summary of project contract details.

Purpose and Scope of Review:

Purpose of Review: The purpose of this review was to evaluate the effectiveness and general implementation of the SRTS program. This review encompassed the overall program including the application, selection, contracting processes, and project implementation.

Scope of Review: The general program implementation was reviewed by assessing the processes and procedures that were in place for each funding cycle regarding the application, selection and contracting of SRTS projects. Interviews were conducted with personnel in the IDOT offices of BDE, BOBS, BLRS and Bureau of Information Processing (BIP).

Project implementation was evaluated by the review team selecting a sample of SRTS infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects that were awarded to applicants within the past four years. Interviews and field reviews were conducted with SRTS project personnel from not-for profit, city and county agencies as well as IDOT personnel in Districts One, Four and Eight.

Team Members

Mr. Greg Piland	Co-Coordinator	FHWA, Safety Specialist
Ms. Roseanne Nance	Co-Coordinator	IDOT, Bureau of Safety Engineering
Ms. Heidi Liske		FHWA, Transportation Engineer
Mr. Greg Lupton		IDOT, Bureau of Local Roads
Ms. Lauren Niepert		FHWA, Fiscal Technician
Ms. Betsy Tracy		FHWA, Transportation Planning Specialist
Mr. Todd Hill	Temporary	IDOT, Bureau of Design and Environment

Observations and Recommendations

1. Overall Program

Observation 1a: The Grant Recovery Act (GRA) was amended February 16, 2011 to add Section 4.2, which suspended all "grants" covered by the GRA, unless specifically excluded by the General Assembly. The SRTS non-infrastructure projects are impacted because they are considered grants; however infrastructure projects are treated as regular construction projects and not impacted by this legislation at this time. If SRTS non-infrastructure projects are not exempted from this legislation, non-infrastructure projects will be suspended indefinitely. Projects that are mid-implementation would also be affected by this legislation and the ability to reimburse the recipient would be lost. In addition, the federally required non-infrastructure project minimum expenditure of 10% of the State's allocated SRTS program could not be met; therefore, Federal funds would be lost. Legislation to extend the deadline for exemptions from June 30, 2012, to January 1, 2013, was signed by the Governor on June 30, 2012.

Recommendation 1a: In order for continued funding, an exemption for the non-infrastructure SRTS projects needs to be requested by the Department and approved by the General Assembly prior to January 1, 2013.

Resolution 1a: The Department has submitted a request for an exemption to the General Assembly and is awaiting its approval. The IDOT submitted proposed legislation for exemption

Observation 1b: A requirement of the SRTS program is that each project recipient completes a Student Travel Tally and Parent Survey prior to and immediately following the completion of the SRTS project. Information acquired from them is required in the application process so the baseline tallies and surveys were mostly completed. However, there was no verification that the tallies and surveys required after project completion were done, nor was there any analysis to verify the effectiveness of projects.

Recommendation 1b: Verify that any required documentation and submissions have been completed. Analysis should also be conducted to establish effectiveness of project countermeasures.

Resolution 1b: Contact is being made with the National Center for SRTS to determine the most efficient method of monitoring and utilizing the data from the Student Travel Tallies and Parent Surveys. This data will be used to measure adherence to the survey requirements as well as measure effectiveness of implemented countermeasures.

Professional services are being solicited to aid in the identification, development and analysis of evaluation methods related specifically to the effectiveness of the implemented countermeasures and the overall program.

Observation 1c: The SRTS program is open to school districts, not-for-profit agencies and other parties not always knowledgeable of State and Federal procedures, procurement requirements and basic engineering processes. This lack of Federal and State process knowledge contributes to the quality of applications and increases the risk for delays in project implementation and delivery.

There were many comments regarding unfamiliarity with these processes, which often resulted in the need for funding or scope changes of selected projects. It also appears that some non-infrastructure grantees were unaware of procurement requirements and procedures, such as the requirement for minimum of three bids for certain project purchases. There appeared to be minimal verification of whether appropriate procurement processes had been followed or not.

Although it is required that an applicant involves an engineer in the application process, it was not always evident this coordination took place and that a reasonably accurate engineering review was performed.

Recommendation 1c: Procedures, procurement requirements, and engineering processes should be clearly communicated to applicants and grantees starting with the application process and continuing through the project's completion. Such information must be communicated in an understandable manner that will assist atypical stakeholders implement their projects. Examples of key information packages include State/Federal requirements, procurement process, Americans with Disability Act (ADA) requirements, Right of Way information, pertinent manuals and policies, typical cost summaries and estimating examples. Furthermore, it must be verified that procurement processes are being adhered to.

Resolution 1c: Recognizing that many applicants are not familiar with or do not fully understand the numerous State and Federal requirements and processes, resources already available throughout the department are being reviewed for potential use to help provide assistance. Identifying and developing other potential tools, such as estimating guidelines, will be developed to assist atypical applicants in defining project requirements and costs. Vital areas of the contract language are now being emphasized and communicated very clearly to the grantees, including procurement procedures. Adherence to all elements of the contract language is being monitored through project closeout.

2. Application Process

The School Travel Plan

The School Travel Plan is an online document that is a required component of any Illinois SRTS application; however, is not actually part of the application itself. The travel plan is required to be completed, submitted to and approved by the SRTS Coordinator prior to submitting the actual SRTS application. The coordinator would work with applicants throughout this process. It appears that *all* School Travel Plans were ultimately approved.

Once the travel plan was approved, the applicant could move forward with their application and it seemed that the approved travel plan was no longer a key factor in the process. However, it appears that certain portions of the approved travel plan would appear in the scorer's view during the scoring portion.

Overall, the parties that were interviewed agreed that the SRTS travel plan process provides a good mechanism for stakeholder collaboration and kickoff to the program, which resulted in many applications for funding. The review team appreciates the intent and spirit of the requirement for a School Travel Plan. It was evident that this document has assisted in improving communications and planning efforts in the communities involved in this process. However, the review team identified some aspects of the School Travel Plan as challenges.

Observation 2a: Project applicants interviewed noted that the School Travel Plan was cumbersome, time-consuming and difficult to complete, including several technical computer-related glitches. However, once the process was completed it was considered a useful exercise that built relationships within the communities involved with the program.

Review and approval of the School Travel Plan was done solely by the SRTS coordinator and took a substantial amount of the coordinator's time. Even though many applicants commented that the coordinator did an excellent job and was very helpful and responsive, it was a large responsibility for one person. It was also the first step in the process for possible selection for funding. Utilizing a one-person review affords the opportunity for unintentional bias, and a clear separation of duties was not apparent.

The School Travel Plan was not required to be utilized by the reviewers when scoring/selecting applications. No validation existed to verify the school travel plan and application were in agreement with each other.

Recommendation 2a: Eliminate the School Travel Plan and incorporate relevant portions of it into the application process. The intent is that the integrated parts can still

be used by an applicant as a general planning tool. Assessment can be done objectively through a transparent computerized application system eliminating the one-person review process, reducing concern of possible bias, and ensuring a clear separation of duties.

Resolution 2a: A review is currently underway to determine how best to incorporate vital elements of both the previous School Travel Plan and the SRTS Application into one application process. This process will be supported by the new Grant Management System (GMS) and will be developed to present a more cohesive and comprehensive picture of the overall plan, as well as individual projects included in that plan.

On-line Application

Observation 2b: Generally, the on-line SRTS application process is a good tool that has many advantages. It allows a one-stop shop for completing and submitting the information. However, many people commented it was generally not user-friendly. The feedback from applicants included remarks such as downloading and printing are difficult, not enough room in the blanks for descriptions, not compatible with all software, computer program timed out frequently, and the application takes a long time to fill out.

Recommendation 2b: Review the current SRTS online application and make efforts to streamline. Make it more user-friendly (intuitive) and reduce duplication with other parts of the process.

Resolution 2b: Design and technical issues communicated about the on-line application process have been reviewed and are being addressed as a new on-line application process is being developed. The new process will be more user-friendly and streamlined from a technical perspective and will be designed to allow a more intuitive experience for the applicant by providing project specific guidance tools and an environment to manage their community's SRTS program.

Observation 2c: The application process does not identify or maintain the relevance between projects or the preferred priority of projects within a single application. As a result, the following scenarios were observed:

- An encouragement (non-infrastructure) project was funded, but the associated construction (infrastructure) project was not selected.
- An encouragement (non-infrastructure) project and a construction (infrastructure) project were both selected, but construction will not be completed in time for the encouragement program participants to utilize it.

- Two infrastructure projects were submitted under an application, one for sidewalk segments and one for ADA-compliant ramps. The sidewalk segment project was selected and the ramp project was not.
- An applicant submitted two non-related projects, with only one being selected. Since the applicant's preferred project was not selected, they dropped the selected project.

Recommendation 2c: Revise the application process to account for prioritization and sequencing needs.

Resolution 2c: The revised application process in the new GMS system will be developed to allow for prioritization, relevance, and phasing of projects, both independently and as they relate to each other.

Observation 2d: Requests for applications for the three funding cycles occurred on March 1, 2007, September 29, 2008, and October 1, 2010. During the applicant interviews, the desire for a predictable application and funding cycle was evident.

Recommendation 2d: Establish a consistent solicitation cycle for application submittals.

Resolution 2d: Proposed timelines have been developed to implement a consistent funding cycle schedule and are under review. Initiation of a future funding cycle is dependent upon: 1) the Grants Recovery Act exception (see Section 1a above), and 2) the new Federal transportation bill, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21)

Observation 2e: Components of the application are useful to multiple people throughout a project's duration. Currently, access to the application by all parties does not exist. The application needs to be accessible during all stages, including project selection, project development, financial authorization, and project close-out.

Recommendation 2e: Make the application and all other pertinent SRTS program documents available to appropriate entities.

Resolution 2e: An external SharePoint site has been created and all pertinent SRTS information is being made available to appropriate staff. The external site also allows for personnel outside of the Department to have access. Access has been given to all of the IDOT Districts, BLRS, Office of Planning and Programming and FHWA.

3. Selection Process:

In the 2007 cycle, 625 infrastructure projects were reviewed by two committees and 417 non-infrastructure projects were reviewed by one committee. Each committee was comprised of three individuals, and only one or two members were engineers. Each member scored their assigned projects, and the task proved to be quite burdensome for the members. The scoring process was revised for the 2008 funding cycle to include committee discussions and a required approval by an additional team comprised of an ISBE and an ISP staff member. It is important to note it appears no engineers participated on these review committees. Projects were then ranked by their average score and awarded per available funding.

A similar review structure was utilized for the 2010 funding cycle under the implementation of BSE. This cycle was a hybrid of the process used in the 2008 cycle and additional objective scoring measures that were developed by BSE and BIP (Attachment 3.1) applied to each project. These measures were based on specific Federal guidelines and incorporated weighted formulas which were developed using statistical data for each school from the ISBE reporting site. For this cycle, the State Safety Engineer reviewed all projects that were recommended for approval by the review committees.

Observation 3: During the applicant interviews, it was stated the delay between the application deadline and award announcement was too long.

Cycle	Closed	Awarded	Duration
1	June 30, 2007	March 1, 2008	9 months
2	December 15, 2008	August 5, 2009	7 months
3	December 15, 2010	January 24, 2012	13 months

In Cycle 3, the timeframe for the award was possibly extended due to the loss of the full-time coordinator and the shifting of responsibilities to a different bureau. Basic scoring criteria were provided and were helpful to the review team; however the comments from scoring committee members indicated it was time-consuming, too subjective, inconsistent, and a burdensome quantity of projects to review. The review processes contributed to the lengthy duration between scoring and project award. Additionally, SRTS awards must be approved by the Governor's office. As with similar programs, this additional approval can create further delay to the announcement of awards.

Recommendation 3: The selection process should be accelerated in order to expedite and improve project delivery and improve obligation rates. It is suggested the selection process should be completed within six months of the application closing date and the announcements be made within the following month. Look to areas of documenting processes, refining the scoring and selection process, utilizing appropriate staff and ensuring efficient coordination with the Governor's office to achieve a six-month timeframe.

Resolution 3: Processes have been defined and are being documented to provide a more efficient selection process. Having clearly defined and documented procedures for each step will minimize any confusion of the steps involved. Application scoring will be switched from manual reviews to an automated formula-based system that will address objectives and requirements of the Federal and State SRTS guidelines. After each project is scored, they will be reviewed by the IDOT Districts and also ranked by the Central Safety Committee. This will streamline the process and put the reviews in the hands of the experts. The proposed timeline indicates a six-month time period from the application closing date to the announcement of awards. This approach will eliminate inconsistency across the program and ensure technical review by appropriate personnel.

4. Contracting Process

The IDOT established contract language for selected non-infrastructure and infrastructure projects. The non-infrastructure contracts include education, encouragement, enforcement, marketing, training and safety programs. The coordinator was personally responsible for the processing of each individual grant document, coordinating with BOBS-Grant Unit, and coordinating the obligation of funds and processing invoices with the BLRS's Preliminary Engineering-Agreements Unit. Due to procedural changes within BDE in September 2008, these fiscal responsibilities, previously handled by other Units, were then completed by the SRTS coordinator. Currently, contracts are processed by BSE in coordination with the BOBS-Grant Unit.

The SRTS infrastructure projects were handled through the appropriate IDOT District Offices and the Central Office-BLRS. These projects include construction of sidewalks, signing, marking, signalization, and other constructible improvements. Since these infrastructure projects are of the same nature as typical highway projects, they are processed as construction contracts/agreements rather than grants. At that point of the project cycle, BLRS assumed general management and oversight of the infrastructure SRTS projects; however, the overall program oversight remained the responsibility of the SRTS coordinator.

Observation 4a: Projects awarded were not being monitored for compliance with program requirements and contract language. Compliance examples include:
- Grantees must enter into an agreement within one year from project award.
- Non-infrastructure projects are contracted for one year from the execution date (date IDOT signs contract).
- Infrastructure projects are allowed three years to be completed from award.

These timelines were not being monitored and requirements were not enforced. Numerous contract date extensions were necessary to allow the grantee to complete their projects and many projects will not be completed within the respective timeframes required by contract. .

Recommendation 4a: Awarded infrastructure and non-infrastructures projects should be monitored for compliance with established program requirements, contract language, and deadlines.

Resolution 4a: Expedited administrative and tracking processes now in place will eliminate past difficulties in meeting these requirements. Pro-active communication with the applicants and enforcement of proper contract language will be key practices to help keep projects on schedule. Quarterly reports are now being required of all projects and will be monitored to ensure that the project is moving forward. If a project isn't moving forward, identify what resolutions can be implemented to get it underway.   The past SRTS practices have been reviewed by BSE and revised to improve efficiency, tracking and documentation. Specific inherent responsibilities have been identified across IDOT and relevant duties dispersed to those areas of responsibility. Specific project issues are being tracked and addressed to provide a timely resolution.

Observation 4b: Infrastructure project joint agreements are taking three months or more to process by the IDOT Central Office.

Recommendation 4b: Reduce processing time once agreements reach Central Office to no more than one month.

Resolution 4b: Discussion with BLRS to see what can be done and refer to the observations and recommendations of the 2012 process review "IDOT's Agreement Processing and Phase 1 Approval Process for Local Projects". A process Review is on-going".

5. *Project Implementation*

Observation 5a: Numerous comments were made regarding the lack of flexibility from IDOT to consider/allow changes in project scope and budget. Numerous projects changes were needed because of lack of proper planning, experience with Federal requirements and/or lack of basic engineering knowledge. This occasionally results in, for example, improper design of ADA improvements, illogical termini, or minimal consideration of safety attributes, such as a grass buffer between the roadway and sidewalk. In a few instances, such issues have resulted in the withdrawal of projects.

Recommendation 5a: Require review of infrastructure projects at District Coordination Meetings and implement a process to allow scope and funding changes that incorporates approvals/denials through IDOT BSE with concurrence from FHWA.

Resolution 5a: Infrastructure projects are now required to be reviewed at district coordination meetings attended by the grantee, district personnel, and FHWA personnel. Processes are also now in place to allow a grantee to request a change in scope or funding through the district. These processes take into account Federal and State objectives and guidelines as well as funding availability. Concurrence from both the District and FHWA engineers is required prior to final approval by the State Safety Engineer.

Observation 5b: Federal regulations require that 10% of all SRTS awarded must be non-infrastructure projects. Projects awarded to date are still below the 10% threshold.

Recommendation 5b: Efforts should be taken to consistently achieve and maintain the 10% requirement for the non-infrastructure projects to effectively use all apportioned funds. Since these funds do not lapse, this recommendation is merely a reminder to the State that it cannot spend more than 90% of its SRTS funds on infrastructure projects.

Resolution 5b: BSE is implementing a process by which appropriated funds may be tracked on a project-by-project basis to allow monitoring of awarded and expended funds. This will help to continue to meet the 10% non-infrastructure threshold.

Appendices

Attachment A1

Illinois Office of Internal Audit
Safe Routes to School Audit Report

For copy, contact Federal Highways (217) 492-4645

Attachment B1 – Illinois SRTS Law

Public Act 094-0493

HB0744 Enrolled   LRB094 07462 NHT 37625 b
    AN ACT concerning school students.

    **Be it enacted by the People of the State of Illinois,
represented in the General Assembly:**

    Section 5. The Department of Transportation Law of the
Civil Administrative Code is amended by adding Section 2705-317
as follows:

    (20 ILCS 2705/2705-317 new)
    Sec. 2705-317. Safe Routes to School Construction Program.
    (a) Upon enactment of a federal transportation bill with a
dedicated fund available to states for safe routes to schools,
the Department, in cooperation with the State Board of
Education and the Department of State Police, shall establish
and administer a Safe Routes to School Construction Program for
the construction of bicycle and pedestrian safety and
traffic-calming projects using the federal Safe Routes to
Schools Program funds.
    (b) The Department shall make construction grants
available to local governmental agencies under the Safe Routes
to School Construction Program based on the results of a
statewide competition that requires submission of Safe Routes
to School proposals for funding and that rates those proposals
on all of the following factors:
        (1) Demonstrated needs of the grant applicant.
        (2) Potential of the proposal for reducing child
    injuries and fatalities.
        (3) Potential of the proposal for encouraging
    increased walking and bicycling among students.
        (4) Identification of safety hazards.
        (5) Identification of current and potential walking
    and bicycling routes to school.
        (6) Consultation and support for projects by
    school-based associations, local traffic engineers, local
    elected officials, law enforcement agencies, and school
    officials.
        (7) Proximity to parks and other recreational
    facilities.
    With respect to the use of federal Safe Routes to Schools

Program funds, prior to the award of a construction grant or the use of those funds for a Safe Routes to School project encompassing a highway, the Department shall consult with and obtain approval from the Department of State Police and the highway authority with jurisdiction to ensure that the Safe Routes to School proposal is consistent with a statewide pedestrian safety statistical analysis.

(c) On March 30, 2006 and each March 30th thereafter, the Department shall submit a report to the General Assembly listing and describing the projects funded under the Safe Routes to School Construction Program.

(d) The Department shall study the effectiveness of the Safe Routes to School Construction Program, with particular emphasis on the Program's effectiveness in reducing traffic accidents and its contribution to improving safety and reducing the number of child injuries and fatalities in the vicinity of a Safe Routes to School project. The Department shall submit a report to the General Assembly on or before December 31, 2006 regarding the results of the study.

(e) The Department, the State Board of Education, and the Department of State Police may adopt any rules necessary to implement this Section.

Section 99. Effective date. This Act takes effect upon becoming law.

Effective Date: 8/8/2005

Attachment B2 – School Travel Plan

For copy, contact Federal Highways (217) 492-4645

Attachment B3 – Travel Plan Reference Guide
&
Illinois School Travel Plan Worksheet

For copy, contact Federal Highways (217) 492-4645

Illinois Safe Routes to School Program

Funding Application Guidance
(updated September 17, 2010)

PURPOSE

The purpose of this guidance is to explain the requirements, eligibility, and application process of the Illinois Safe Routes to School Program.

ABOUT SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) was established in August 2005 as a Federal-Aid program through the passage of SAFETEA-LU, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users. Through 2009, a total of $612 million was allocated to provide funds to states to substantially improve the ability of primary and middle school students (grades Kindergarten through 8th) to walk and bicycle to school safely. Illinois received $23.7 million through SAFETEA-LU. In 2010, an additional $7.5 million was allotted as a result of the extension of SAFETEA-LU through December 2010.

SRTS funds projects and programs that enable, encourage and make safe walking and bicycling to school. Over the last 40 years, the level of walking and bicycling to school among school-aged children has dropped from approximately half of all students to fewer than fifteen percent. This decline in active transportation has negatively impacted schools and children. Schools currently experience massive traffic congestion, unsafe conditions and decreased air quality. Additionally, a growing trend of sedentary lifestyles in children has been linked to a variety of health issues including respiratory disease, diabetes and obesity.

SRTS uses a multidisciplinary approach to improve conditions for the walk or bike to school. The program has three main goals:

1. to enable and encourage children, including those with disabilities, to walk and bicycle to school
2. to make bicycling and walking to school a safer and more appealing transportation alternative, thereby encouraging a healthy and active lifestyle from an early age; and

3. to facilitate the planning, development, and implementation of projects and activities that will improve safety and reduce traffic, fuel consumption, and air pollution in the vicinity (within 2 miles) of primary and middle schools (grades K-8).

Safe Routes to School utilizes the five basic program components, known as the "5 E's", that comprehensively address obstacles and create solutions:

> *Engineering* – Creating operational and physical improvements to the infrastructure surrounding schools that reduce speeds and potential conflicts with motor vehicle traffic, and establish safer and fully accessible crossings, walkways, trails and bikeways.

> *Education* – Teaching children about the broad range of transportation choices, instructing them in important lifelong bicycling and walking safety skills, and launching driver safety campaigns in the vicinity of schools.

> *Enforcement* – Partnering with local law enforcement to ensure traffic laws are obeyed in the vicinity of schools (this includes enforcement of speeds, stopping for pedestrians in crossings, and proper walking and bicycling behaviors), and initiating community enforcement such as crossing guard programs.

> *Encouragement* – Using events and activities to promote walking and bicycling.

> *Evaluation* – Monitoring and documenting outcomes and trends through the collection of data, including the collection of data before and after the intervention(s).

ILLINOIS SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROGRAM

The Illinois Safe Routes to School Program is administered by the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) and funds both **infrastructure** (engineering) and **non-infrastructure** (education, encouragement, enforcement and evaluation) initiatives. A detailed list of eligible projects and activities in both the infrastructure and non-infrastructure categories appears later in this guide.

Key features of the Illinois SRTS Program include:

> *SRTS projects are funded at 100% with no local match required.*

> *SRTS is a reimbursement program.* Project sponsors are responsible for supplying the up-front cost of the project and will be reimbursed by IDOT.

> *Between 70% and 90% of funds will support infrastructure projects. 10% to 30% of funds will support non-infrastructure programs.*

> *Each school district is limited to one infrastructure and one non-infrastructure application. If a school district encompasses more than one municipality, the school district will have to select a single municipality to partner with on the infrastructure application, or develop an intergovernmental agreement that describes proposals covering multiple municipalities. Conversely, if a municipality is served by more than one single school district, the municipality may partner with each school district for one of each type of application.*

> *INFRASTRUCTURE applications may include up to 3 separate projects, with a funding limit of $250,000 for the entire application (all projects combined). The minimum for any single*

infrastructure project is $2,000. Infrastructure projects must be sponsored by a municipality, county, township, park district or similar entity. Infrastructure projects MAY NOT be sponsored by a school or school district.

➤ *NON-INFRASTRUCTURE applications may include up to 3 separate projects, with a funding limit of $100,000 for the entire application (all projects combined). The minimum for any single non-infrastructure project is $2,000. Any government entity, school district or non-profit organization may sponsor a non-infrastructure application.*

➤ *All applications require an approved Illinois School Travel Plan (see next section).*

➤ *Only those projects and programs included in the corresponding School Travel Plan and listed with the funding source SRTS Funding, Current Cycle are eligible for funding.*

➤ *Applications are accepted only through an online application process. The online application form is available at www.dot.il.gov/saferoutes.*

ILLINOIS SCHOOL TRAVEL PLAN

A completed *Illinois School Travel Plan* must be submitted to and approved by IDOT in advance of any funding application. The *Illinois School Travel Plan* is a separate process that outlines a school or community's intentions for making travel to and from school more sustainable and safe. It uses an online form, accessible only through the Illinois Safe Routes to School website. Schools and communities create their own unique *Illinois School Travel Plan* and submit it in advance of any funding request. *School Travel Plans must receive approval from the Illinois Department of Transportation before the online application process may be accessed.* Visit the web site for complete instructions on completing and submitting the *Illinois School Travel Plan.*

All projects and programs in the *Illinois School Travel Plan* will correspond directly to an application from the same school or community. Once a School Travel Plan has been completed for a particular applicant, the online system will automatically fill in certain fields of a corresponding application. This will eliminate the need to repeat some of the work accomplished in the *Plan.* Likewise, any projects and activities for which funding is being sought must be included in a pre-existing School Travel Plan. **You do not have to seek funding for all strategies outlined in the School Travel Plan –** only for those activities you wish to implement immediately.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Grade Levels: Safe Routes to School projects must focus on students in grades Kindergarten through 8th grade. Public grade schools, middle and jr. high schools and grade centers that serve these ages are eligible. High schools and early childhood centers (that serve only pre-school children) are not eligible.

Private Schools: Private and parochial schools may also apply for SRTS projects. Infrastructure projects

that serve private school locations are allowed as long as they are located on the public right-of-way. This may include projects on private land that have public access easements. Non-infrastructure activities are also allowed at private and parochial schools. See the Federal Highways Administration's SRTS guidance for more details (http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/saferoutes/srtsguidance.htm).

Application sponsors:

Infrastructure applications may be sponsored ONLY by the associated municipality or other roadway jurisdiction. School districts and municipalities must work together to determine the most beneficial improvements to best enable safe walking and bicycling for students.

Non-infrastructure applications may be sponsored by any of the following entities:

- School districts
- Political subdivisions (municipalities, counties, townships)
- Metropolitan planning organizations / regional planning commissions
- Councils of government
- Local, regional and state agencies (health departments, police departments)
- Non-profit organizations (PTA/PTO, community organization, health association, etc.)

For the purpose of the application, the group who will be administering the project(s) must apply as the Sponsoring Agency. A single Sponsoring Agency will be responsible for administering all project components of the application. The Sponsoring Agency will act as the fiscal agent for all projects and will put forth the initial funds for the project. Funds will be reimbursed through the Illinois Department of Transportation.

Project scale: Projects may serve schools at several different jurisdictional levels:

- Single school level
- Multiple schools in close proximity (2 miles)
- School district level
- City or municipal
- County
- Regional
- Statewide

EVIDENCE OF CONSULTATION

Resolutions of Support and Administration and Letters of Support must be obtained for all Safe Routes to School applications in order to be eligible for SRTS funds.

For infrastructure applications, the following endorsements are required:

1. One **Resolution or Letter of Support** must come from the sponsoring municipal, county, regional or state roadway authority for any affected roadways. If more than one jurisdiction is involved (e.g. both county and local roads), resolutions from all jurisdictional authorities are required. The sponsoring governmental unit will be responsible for project administration, including timely bid letting and oversight of design and construction.

2. A second **Resolution or Letter of Support** must be obtained from the School District for all infrastructure projects.

3. If the project will be located along or on a state route, you must also submit a **Letter of Allowance** from your local IDOT District. This letter must state that the Department will allow this project to be constructed if it is chosen for Safe Routes to School funding.

For non-infrastructure applications:

1. One **Resolution or Letter of Support** must be obtained from the School District for all non-infrastructure projects.

2. A second **Resolution or Letter of Support** must be obtained from any agency/organization involved in implementation of non-infrastructure projects (e.g. police departments for enforcement programs, etc.)

Optional for all applications: Additional letters of support from other project partners (PTAs/PTOs, Local School Councils, non-profit organizations, public health agencies) may accompany any application. Since the application process is online, **Resolutions** and **Letters of Support** must be in electronic form and uploaded as attachments to the online application. The upload feature may be found on the last page of the application. Resolutions or Letters that are submitted by mail, email, or any means other than through the online application system will not be considered.

ELIGIBLE PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES

Only the projects and programs identified in the School Travel Plan will be eligible for funding. In other words, if an application seeks funding for something that was not included in the corresponding *School Travel Plan,* the application will not be considered. The online application process can accommodate requests for up to three separate projects or programs.

Following is a list of fundable activities through the Illinois Safe Routes to School Program:

Eligible Infrastructure Projects: (must be located within 2-miles of a school)

- **Sidewalk Improvements**
  - New Sidewalk
  - Sidewalk Repair
  - Sidewalk Gap Closure
  - Sidewalk Widening
  - Sidewalk Curb
  - Sidewalk Curb Ramp

- **Traffic Calming/Speed Reduction**
  - Roundabout/Traffic Circle
  - Bulb-out
  - Speed Bump/Hump/Table
  - Raised Crossing
  - Median Refuge/Center Crossing
  - Narrowed Traffic Lane
  - Chicane
  - Choker
  - Lane Reductions
  - Full/Half Street Closure
  - Automated Speed Enforcement

-
Traffic Control Devices
  - New/Upgraded Traffic Signal
  - New Pavement Markings
  - New Traffic Striping
  - In-Roadway Crossing Light
  - Flashing Beacons
  - Vehicle Speed Feedback Sign
  - Bike Sensitive Signal Actuation Devices
  - Pedestrian Activated Signal Upgrades
  - Pedestrian Countdown Signals

- **Traffic Diversion**
  - Separation of bicycles and pedestrians from traffic adjacent to school facilities
  - New/Revised Pick-up/Drop-off Zone
  - Traffic diversion away from school zone or designated route to school

- **Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossing Improvements**
  - Crossing
  - Median Refuge
  - Raised Crossing
  - Sight Distance Improvements
  - Pedestrian Bridge
  - Pedestrian Tunnel

- **On Street Bicycle Facilities**
  - New/Upgraded Bike Lane
  - Widened Outside Lanes/Shoulders
  - Geometric Improvements
  - Turning Lanes
  - Channelization
  - Roadway Realignment
  - Traffic Signs
  - Pavement Markings

- **Off Street Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities**
  - Exclusive Multi-Use Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail that is separated from the roadway

- **Secure Bicycle Parking Facilities**
  - Bike Racks
  - Bike Lockers
  - Designated Area with Safety Lighting
  - Covered Bike Shelter

Within this set of fundable infrastructure projects, the following costs are reimbursable through the Safe Routes to School Program:

> **Preliminary Engineering 1/ Environmental Evaluation**
> **Preliminary Engineering 2**
> **Right of Way Acquisition**
> **Construction**
> **Construction Engineering**

Both in-house and consultant engineering and construction staff time is reimbursable in these categories. If you are unsure as to whether a certain project or activity is eligible, consult a traffic planning or engineering professional, or contact the Illinois Department of Transportation.

Eligible Non-Infrastructure Activities:

- **Enforcement**
  - o Costs for additional equipment needed for enforcement activities
  - o Crossing guard training programs
  - o Parent or student patrol programs
  - o Lower speed limits in school vicinity
  - o Speed feedback trailers or signs

- **Education**
  - o Creation of educational materials
  - o Bicycle and pedestrian and pedestrian safety curricula, materials and trainers.
  - o Teach pedestrian and bicycle safety skills to students and parents
  - o Organize a bicycle rodeo to teach on bike skills
  - o Teach personal safety skills to students and parents
  - o Teach the health, environmental and sustainable transportation benefits of walking and bicycling to students
  - o Educate parents and caregivers about safe driving procedures at the school
  - o Training, including SRTS training workshops that target school and community level audience

- **Encouragement**
  - o SRTS promotional campaigns and materials
  - o Modest rewards for SRTS contests and programs
  - o Incentive programs that encourage safe walking and bicycling over time
  - o Walking School Bus programs
  - o Bike Train programs
  - o International Walk to School Day or other special event
  - o Walking/biking mileage clubs
  - o Park-and-walk program
  - o Neighborhood Watch initiative
  - o Community safe driving awareness and education campaigns
  - o Safety and educational tokens that also advertise the program

- **Evaluation**
  - ○ Costs for data gathering, analysis and evaluation reporting at the local project level.
  - ○ Photocopying, duplication and printing costs
  - ○ Mailing costs
  - ○ Counting the number of students who walk and bicycle to and from school *(will be mandated for funded projects – federal reporting)*
  - ○ Tracking the number of crashes within 2 miles of school
  - ○ Measuring parent/guardian perceptions of safety *(will be mandated for funded projects – federal reporting)*

While we have attempted to include all possible Safe Routes to School projects within this list, please contact the SRTS coordinator for guidance if you would like to pursue a project that is not listed here.

Within this set of fundable non-infrastructure projects, the following costs are reimbursable through the Safe Routes to School Program:

1. **Equipment and Supplies**
2. **Educational Materials**
3. **Promotions, Incentives or Publicity**
4. **Planning and Evaluation**
5. **Associated Education and Training**
6. **Printing and Copying**
7. **Consultant Services**

INELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

Recurring and operational costs, such as salaries and overhead, will not be funded. **Expenses for existing, expanding or new program staff time are considered operational expenses and not eligible for SRTS funding.** However, in-house engineering and construction personnel are eligible to be funded.

The use of funds for projects that reorganize pick-up and drop-off primarily for the convenience of drivers rather than to improve child safety and/or walking and bicycling access is not permitted. School bus safety programs and improvements to school bus stops are not eligible for this funding.

SUPPLEMENTAL SUPPORTING MATERIALS

You may wish to attach additional materials that support or provide extra information related to your proposed project. This may include photos or designs of the affected area(s), school

wellness policies, survey results, walking audit findings, event photographs, speed studies, etc. The last page of the application contains the feature for directly uploading these materials. While this is optional, inclusion of additional materials that help support your proposal may benefit the likelihood of your application being funded.

FUNDING LEVELS

Between 70% and 90% of total SRTS funds will support infrastructure projects. Between 10% and 30% of funds will support non-infrastructure programs. The actual division of funds will be determined according to the number and types of proposals that are submitted.

Funding levels are as follows:

> ➤ Infrastructure applications may not exceed $250,000, for all projects combined.
> ➤ The lower limit for individual infrastructure projects is $2,000.
> ➤ Non-infrastructure applications may not exceed $100,000, for all projects combined.
> ➤ The lower limit for individual non-infrastructure projects is $2,000.

REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Selected projects are required to comply with a variety of Federal and State requirements in order to proceed. Below is a listing of key requirements that will be the responsibility of the applicant.

> ➤ ADA: Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) includes all infrastructure requirements and making program materials available in alternative formats.

> ➤ TIP: Safe Routes to Schools funds must be programmed in a metropolitan or regional planning organization's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

> ➤ MUTCD: Signage, striping and pavement marking projects must follow Illinois DOT design and signage standards as outlined in the Manual on Universal Traffic Control Devices.

> ➤ NEPA: Except in unusual circumstances, most SRTS infrastructure projects will fall under categorical environmental exclusions that recognize construction of bicycle and pedestrian lanes, paths, and facilities as not involving significant environmental impacts. Where exclusions do not apply, projects are expected to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Please contact your IDOT District Local Roads office if you have questions about NEPA and your project.

> ➤ Title 23: Safe Routes to School program must comply with Davis Bacon prevailing wage rates, competitive bidding, and other contracting requirements, even for projects not located within the right-of-way of a federal-aid highway.

PROJECT SELECTION AND SCORING

The IDOT Safe Routes to School Implementation Committee will organize and distribute copies of the applications for review and evaluation. Each project in the application is scored individually. This may result in your receiving funding for one, two or three projects within the application. While entire applications may not be funded, individual projects will be fully funded at the level requested in the project description.

The review committee(s) will utilize the following selection criteria for project evaluation, which is based off of the criteria set forth in Illinois Public Act 94-493:

1. Contact Information Sheet = 2 points
2. General Project Focus = 3 points
3. Demonstration of Need = 6 points
4. Project Detail and Cost Estimate = 15 points
5. Hazards and Barriers = 8 points
6. Potential for Improving Walking and Bicycling = 15 points
7. Consultation and Support = 1 point

Official notification of awards (Notice of Award) will be made by IDOT via the regular mail. After this notification has been received, it is the responsibility of the project sponsor to contact the Department to initiate the agreement process. The applicable District Local Roads office, in conjunction with the IDOT central office Bureau of Local Roads and Streets, will administer infrastructure agreements. The IDOT Bureau of Design and Environment's central office in Springfield, IL, in conjunction with the IDOT Bureau of Business Services, will administer non-infrastructure agreements.

Sponsors have one year from the date of the Notice of Award to have an agreement in process or executed with IDOT. Funds awarded to sponsors who have not initiated the process within this timeframe will be subject to rescission. Rescinded funds will be re-allocated in the next funding cycle.

Attachment B5 – SRTS Project Status

Summary - All Funding Cycles - Non-Infrastructure

	Awards Unclaimed	Projects Contracted	*Projects Closed Out	**Projects Not Closed Out - 0% Funds Expended	**Projects Not Closed Out - Under 50% Funds Expended	**Projects Not Closed Out - Over 50% Funds Expended
Projects Awarded - 204	91	113	58	35	6	14
$3,009,290	$1,555,533	$1,405,793				

1st Funding Cycle (2007) - Non-Infrastructure

	Awards Unclaimed	Projects Contracted	*Projects Closed Out	**Projects Not Closed Out - 0% Funds Expended	**Projects Not Closed Out - Under 50% Funds Expended	**Projects Not Closed Out - Over 50% Funds Expended
Projects Awarded - 71	9	62	48	10	1	3
$750,090	$79,400	$678,785				

2nd Funding Cycle (2008) - Non-Infrastructure

	Awards Unclaimed	Projects Contracted	*Projects Closed Out	**Projects Not Closed Out - 0% Funds Expended	**Projects Not Closed Out - Under 50% Funds Expended	**Projects Not Closed Out - Over 50% Funds Expended
Projects Awarded - 57	7	50	10	24	5	11
$817,929	$68,511	$693,359				

3rd Funding Cycle (2011) - Non-Infrastructure

	Awards Unclaimed	Projects Contracted	*Projects Closed Out	**Projects Not Closed Out - 0% Funds Expended	**Projects Not Closed Out - Under 50% Funds Expended	**Projects Not Closed Out - Over 50% Funds Expended
Projects Awarded - 76	75	1	0	1	0	0
$1,441,271	$1,407,622	$33,649				

* Job Completion Notice has been sent

** Job Completion Notice has not been sent

Summary - All Funding Cycles - Infrastructure

	*Awards Undaimed	*Awards - Contracts Pending	*Projects Contracted	*Projects Completed
Projects Awarded - 307	7	147	68	24

1st Funding Cycle (2007) - Infrastructure

	*Awards Undaimed	*Awards - Contracts Pending	*Projects Contracted	*Projects Completed
Projects Awarded - 41	5	0	14	11

2nd Funding Cycle (2008) - Infrastructure

	*Awards Undaimed	*Awards - Contracts Pending	*Projects Contracted	*Projects Completed
Projects Awarded - 113	2	0	44	13

3rd Funding Cycle (2011) - Infrastructure

	*Awards Undaimed	*Awards - Contracts Pending	*Projects Contracted	*Projects Completed
Projects Awarded - 153	0	147	10	0

* Includes data received from Districts 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 9 only.

Projects Completed - Physical completion as reported by the Districts.

Attachment B6 – Scoring Measures

Safe Routes to School – Scoring Analysis

In the effort to define the best means to enable the first round of scoring to be an objective, automatic score, the team evaluated the Federal and State laws and guidelines and the criteria necessary to calculate a score. Discussions are continuing on the points to award for various sections and additional criteria may be defined as we refine the requirements for the process. Points will be awarded based on a variety of criteria:

The 5 E's – applicants will receive points for developing a comprehensive approach that addresses multiple E's. Points will be awarded up to a maximum to be determined by the Administrator.

Hazards and Barriers – applications will include safety hazards and barriers that are defined in the Federal and State law as being eligible for programs funds. Applicants will select the hazard(s)/barrier(s) appropriate to the situation. Corresponding counter measures will display and the applicant will select the counter measures to include in their overall plan. They will need to make decisions regarding how to fund the counter measures and which ones to submit for funding in the current funding cycle.

Involvement of the Community – applicants will be asked to document the involvement of the community (including school associations, local traffic engineers, local police, city and school officials).

Inclusion in a larger Safety Plan – applicants will be asked if the SRTS plan is part of a larger, comprehensive safety plan and if it is, provide information on that plan.

Program Accessible to Diverse Participants – to ensure that the program is accessible, various criteria will be evaluated. First, applications are segregated into Urban and Rural according to state guidelines. This ensures that like applicants are being evaluated together. School enrollment data will be downloaded into the database from the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) to ensure the consistency of the data.

Economically Challenged:
  The number of low income students is available from ISBE. This number is then calculated as a percentage of the overall enrollment for the school. Points will be awarded based on the percentage. The range for awarding the points needs to be defined.

Physically Challenged:
  The number of students with disabilities is available from ISBE. This number is then calculated as a percentage of the overall enrollment for the school. Points will be awarded based on the percentage. The range for awarding the points needs to be defined.

Maximize Impact of the Funds

One of the goals is to support programs that maximize the effect and impact of using the funds.

Multiple Schools:

The team is considering awarding points if the plan impacts more than one school thus gaining a greater impact for the funds.

Benefit:

Federal and State Guidelines include the potential for improvement and the potential for impact as factors to consider. Potential for Improvement determines the potential for increasing the number of students who walk or bike to school. Potential for Impact determines the potential for making it safer for the students who currently walk or bike to school. Both calculations are based on looking at the number of students who currently walk or bike and the number of students who live within walking or biking distance of the school. Both calculations will have a maximum number of points available that the Administrator will define.

Potential for Improvement – as an example use 20 points as the maximum
(1-(number of students who walk + number of students who bike) / (number of students who live less than 1.5 miles from school)) * 20

Example: students who walk = 115   students who bike = 41
Students within 1.5 miles of school = 425

Calculation = (1-(115 + 41)/425) * 20 = 12.66 rounded would be 13 points to award

Potential for Impact – as an example use 25 points as the maximum
(number of students who walk + number of students who bike) / (number of students who live less than 1.5 miles from school)) * 25

Example: students who walk = 115   students who bike = 41
Students within 1.5 miles of school = 425

Calculation = (115 + 41)/425) * 25 = 9.18 rounded would be 9 points to award

Potential for Reducing Child Injuries and Fatalities:

The team is working on the calculation for awarding points in this category. The information to be used in the crash will be extracted from the Safety Data Mart and will involve the number of people in crashes within a 2 mile radius of the selected school(s). The calculation will be based on the enrollment of the selected schools and will include weighted factors for the number of children involved in the crash as a passenger, pedestrian or bicyclist. An additional weighting will be added if the children was fatally injured. The calculation will be compared against an average for child pedestrian crash rates to determine if extra points should be awarded.

Proximity of Parks:

Two points will be awarded if the school is within a 2 mile radius of a park or public recreation facility.

Current and Potential Routes:
Points will be awarded if the team has identified potential walking and biking routes and has planned to share them with the community. The expectation is that the route information will be uploaded to the site to allow review.

Scoring Round 1:

The above criteria will be used to calculate scores for the submitted counter measures. The system will separate the counter measures by Infrastructure and Non-Infrastructure and Urban and Rural. Within those categories, the counter measures will be sorted based on the Round 1 score. Using the award amounts defined by the Administrator for each category, the system will be able to indicate which counter measures would receive funding if the rankings do not change. This will provide the information to be sent to the next step in the evaluation process for final review, ranking and award.

Flow Charts

Proposed Overall Process for Safe Routes to School Program

Proposed Overall Process for Safe Routes to School Program

DRAFT

```
        ┌────────────────────────────┐
        │  Announce Funding Cycle    │
        └────────────────────────────┘
                      │
                      ▼
           ┌────────────────────┐
           │    Application     │
           └────────────────────┘
                      │
                      ▼
           ┌────────────────────┐
           │     Completed      │
           │     Submitted      │
           └────────────────────┘
                      │
                      ▼
           ┌────────────────────┐
           │      Scoring       │
           │      Criteria      │
           │      Applied       │
           └────────────────────┘
                      │
                      ▼
           ┌────────────────────┐
           │     SRTS Fund      │
           └────────────────────┘
                      │
                      ▼
```

Infrastructure ◄─── Infrastructure or Non-Infrastructure ───► Non-Infrastructure

| Appropriate IDOT District Offices | | Bureau of Safety Eng. |

Rankings Recommendations sent to Central Safety Committee for approval. BSE sends to FHWA for approval.

Award Announcements

Page 2

Page 2

Infrastructure ← Infrastructure or Non-Infrastructure → Non-Infrastructure

Infrastructure:

Notification to Infrastructure Awardees

↓

Infrastructure Awardee/Contractee contacts District BLRS office.

↓

Engineering Agreement & Joint Funding Agreement sent to District Office

↓

Preliminary Engineering Agreement

↓

Engineering Agreement

↓

Local Agency Agreement

↓

Executed

↓

Federal Requirement (NEPA)

↓

Construction Engineering & Construction

↓

Page 3

Non-Infrastructure:

Notification to Non-Infrastructure Awardees

↓

Agreement-Contract/Draft Partial Execution   FHWA Authorization

↓

Contract Execution Notice to Proceed COD's/Obligation

↓

Over $25K Yes or No?

Yes → FFATA/IL Grant Reporting

No ↓

Reimbursements/ Invoices Submitted/ Invoices Processed

↓

Notice of Final Invoice

↓

Project Completion Report/Required Documentation Evaluate Overall Program/Closeout-BFM 336 form/De-obligate balance

↓

Before/After Analysis

```
                              ┌──────────┐
                              │  Page 3  │
                              └────┬─────┘
                              ┌────▼─────┐
                              │  Audit   │
                              └────┬─────┘
                          ┌────────▼─────────┐
                          │ To OPP – Set up COD │
                          └────────┬─────────┘
                          ┌────────▼─────────┐
                          │  Right-of-Way    │
                          │  Certification   │
                          └────────┬─────────┘
```

State Letting

- Local Agency submits PS&E, plans & specifications/prepares estimates of cost
- IDOT/BD&E Engineer of Estimates review & approve
- BD&E Engineer of Estimates consults with District to resolve differences
- Project Support Unit prepares & assembles proposals
- Advertisement for Bids
- Issuance of proposals and plans
- Award/Execution of Contracts

Local Let Projects

- District submits request to Central BLRS/Local Agency submits proposal to District for Central BLRS approval
- Central BLRS notifies District when project may be advertised
- District attends local letting to ensure compliance with IDOT procedures/Central BLRS concurs in award
- District approves executed contract & forwards one copy to Central BLRS
- Central BLRS prepares estimate & project agreement

Local Day Labor Projects

- Local Agency prepares a Local Agency Assessment & submits to District
- District forwards assessment & recommendations to Central BLRS
- Central BLRS reviews & approves all projects under $100,000. All projects over $100,000 forwarded to Deputy Director of Hwys. for approval
- Local Agency submits PS&E to District/District completes & submits to Central BLRS
- Federal authorization requested/Advertisement for FHWA authorization
- IDOT approval → Unit Prices Agreement
- Central BLRS prepares estimate & award reports

┌──────────┐
│ Page 4 │
└──────────┘

-39-

```
                        ┌─────────────┐
                        │   Page 4    │
                        └──────┬──────┘
                               ▼
                    ┌────────────────────┐
                    │  BCM pays invoices  │
                    └──────────┬─────────┘
                               ▼
                    ┌────────────────────┐
                    │ Final Invoice-all invoices
                    │ & supplemental
                    │ documentation
                    └──────────┬─────────┘
                               ▼
                    ┌────────────────────┐
                    │ State Job Completion
                    │ Form-Notify appropriate
                    │ office of completion
                    └──────────┬─────────┘
                               ▼
                    ┌────────────────────┐
                    │ IDOT audits invoices, closes
                    │ out COD & submits final
                    │ voucher to FHWA
                    └──────────┬─────────┘
                               ▼
                    ┌────────────────────┐
                    │ Consultant completes
                    │ Engineering Payment Report
                    │ & submits to District/District
                    │ submits to BLRS with final
                    │ invoice
                    └──────────┬─────────┘
                               ▼
                    ┌────────────────────┐
                    │ Audits/Project Closeout
                    └──────────┬─────────┘
                               ▼
                    (  Post-project evaluation  )
```

Report prepared by:

The Federal Highway Administration, Illinois Division and
The Illinois Department of Transportation