



STP Project Selection Committee

Annotated Agenda

Thursday, October 31, 2019

9:30 a.m.

Cook County Conference Room
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois

1.0 Call to Order **9:30 a.m.**

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

3.0 Approval of Minutes – September 5, 2019

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval

4.0 Local Distribution Formula

Staff will present options for incorporating improvement into the local distribution formula for discussion by the committee. The results of this discussion will be presented to the committee for action in November.

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

5.0 Evaluating the Lessons Learned

Having completed the first Shared Fund call for projects cycle it is important to evaluate the successes and lessons learned throughout the process in order to consider improvements for the next cycle. The discussion items below have the potential to change the focus of the overall program and to influence how applicants prepare for the next call for projects. Comments received throughout the process that are germane to these items have been compiled to inform discussion.

5.1 Program Goals

The development of the programming and project selection methodology for the STP-Shared Fund was driven by programming principles discussed during the development of the agreement between the Council of Mayors and City of Chicago, as well as through discussions and comments received throughout the development process. Prior to moving forward to the next programming cycle, staff requests the committee consider reaffirming these goals.

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

5.2 Rolling Focus

During the development of the Shared Fund methodology, staff proposed future calls for projects focus on targeted project types on a rolling basis. In order to provide

clarity for potential applicants to prepare for those future calls, staff will review the recommendation made in 2018 and comments received regarding rolling focus and eligible project types and will present options for consideration moving forward.

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

5.3 Completion of Phase 1 Engineering

For the FFY 2020-2024 call for projects, phase 1 engineering, or equivalent, was required to be substantially complete by June 1, 2019, three months after funding applications were due, in order for projects to be considered eligible. This lag in having an eligibility determination led to additional staff work during the evaluation process. Additionally, the definition of substantially complete is somewhat subjective, leading to uncertainty about the actual status of projects. Staff requests consideration of more clearly defined parameters and deadlines.

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

6.0 FFY 2021 – 2025 Local Programming Marks

Staff developed the performance-based programming marks according to the methodology contained in the memorandum of agreement between the Council of Mayors and City of Chicago, as described in the attached memo.

ACTION REQUESTED: Information

7.0 Proposed 2020 Meeting Dates

Staff requests approval of the proposed 2020 meeting dates below. These dates correspond with the CMAQ Project Selection Committee dates and are coordinated with the TIP amendment schedule to ensure that programming decisions are made ahead of TIP change due dates. All meetings will begin at 9:30 a.m.

| Proposed 2020 Meeting Dates | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Thursday, January 30 | Thursday, September 3 |
| Thursday, April 30 | Thursday, October 29 |
| Thursday, July 16 | |

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval

8.0 Other Business

9.0 Public Comment

This is an opportunity for comments from members of the audience. The amount of time available to speak will be at the chair's discretion.

10.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 21, 2019 at 9:30 a.m.

11.0 Adjournment

STP Project Selection Committee Members:

_____ Dan Burke

_____ John Donovan*

_____ Jesse Elam

_____ Lorri Newson*

_____ Kevin O'Malley

_____ Chad Riddle*

_____ Leon Rockingham

_____ Jeffery Schielke

_____ Jeffrey Sriver

_____ Eugene Williams

_____ John Yonan*

*Advisory



Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)
DRAFT
STP Project Selection Committee Meeting Minutes
September 5, 2019

- Committee Members Present:** Dan Burke – CDOT, John Donovan – FHWA, Jesse Elam – CMAP, Lorri Newson – RTA, Kevin O’Malley – CDOT, Chad Riddle – IDOT, Jeffery Schielke – Council of Mayors, Chris Snyder – Counties, Jeffrey Sriver – CDOT, Eugene Williams – Council of Mayors
- Others Present:** David Bennett, Elaine Bottomley, Stephanie Brown, Len Cannata, Steve Chirico, Mike Connelly, Jack Cruikshank, Karen Darch, Emily Daucher, Grant Davis, Kristi DeLaurentiis, Mike Einhorn, Jackie Forbes, Mike Fricano, Randall Jessen, Kendra Johnson, Emily Karry, Josh Klingenstein, Mike Klemens, Daniel Knickelbein, Doug Krieger, Jennifer Louden, Tara Orbon, Dan Persky, Allen Persons, Ryan Peterson, Leslie Phemister, David Seglin, Troy Simpson (via phone), Kyle Whitehead
- Staff Present:** Erin Aleman, Aidan Dixon, Teri Dixon, Kama Dobbs, Austen Edwards, Doug Ferguson, Lindsay Hollander, Stephanie Levine, Jen Maddux, Tim McMahon, Martin Menninger, Russell Pietrowiak, Todd Schmidt, Jeff Schnobrich, Gordon Smith, Matthew Stern, Tung Truong

1.0 Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:40 a.m. by Chairman Elam.

2.0 Agenda Changes

There were no agenda changes or announcements.

3.0 Approval of Minutes

A motion by Mayor Schielke to approve the minutes of the July 18, 2019 meeting, as presented, seconded by Mr. O’Malley, carried.

4.0 Public Comment Summary and Recommended FFY 2020 – 2024 Active and Contingency Programs

Ms. Dobbs provided a summary of the over 500 public comments received. She stated that staff recommends approval of the active program of projects, as presented for public comment and recommends that all projects that are not included in the active program, but meet all eligibility criteria, be added to the contingency program. She explained that a TIP amendment encompassing the approved program would be prepared for CMAP Transportation Committee and MPO Policy Committee, and that upon final approval of the TIP Amendment, official notification of the status of projects would be sent to applicants.

Mr. Snyder requested confirmation that projects recommended for phase 1 engineering funding only would have to reapply for later phases in the future. Ms. Dobbs confirmed. Mr. Snyder asked if projects that were included in the contingency program that were recommended for CMAQ or TAP-L funding would remain in the contingency program. Ms. Dobbs stated that once the CMAQ and TAP-L programs were approved, those projects would be removed from the STP – Shared Fund contingency program. Mr. Sriver asked if projects in the contingency program could receive partial funding. Ms. Dobbs explained that if funds became available in the current federal fiscal year for contingency program projects, the available funds would be offered to each contingency project, in rank order, with the understanding that the project must be ready to obligate those funds as close to immediately as practical, before the end of the current FFY. If the highest ranked project was not in a position to obligate the available funds, those funds would then be offered to the next project in the program, until they could be used. Mr. Snyder asked if funds became available at different times, could those funds continue to be added to a single contingency project. Ms. Dobbs stated that if the project had not moved to obligation, it would probably make sense to add any additional funds that became available, however if the sponsor had already obligated the project, it may make more sense to fund the next project. Decisions such as these would be made by the project selection committee.

Mayor Schielke thanked staff for their efforts to develop a program of projects and stated he is proud of the program being considered. He noted that fine tuning of the process is expected, but stated that the process in place will help the region spend the funds that are allocated to us.

Mayor Schielke made a motion, seconded by Mayor Williams, to approve the staff recommendation.

Mr. O'Malley stated that this process is a step in the right direction and that he is a proponent of performance based programming. However, he noted that there are gaps in the process that will need to be addressed. Mr. Burke added that, with the third-highest ranked project not being funded for a reason that was not clearly stated in the

application materials, it is hard for Chicago to see the proposed program as equitable, however he understands the need to move forward.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Elam called for a roll call vote. All members present voted in favor of the motion to approve the staff recommendation, and the motion carried.

5.0 Evaluating the Lessons Learned

Ms. Dobbs provided a summary of the memo contained in the agenda packet and reviewed the proposed schedule for committee discussions of lessons learned throughout the program development process. She highlighted the need to discuss the overall goals of the program, rolling focus, and phase 1 completion in the near-term to give applicants ample time to prepare for the next call for projects.

Mr. Riddle noted that the schedule for project implementation in the first year of the program should be clarified and documented for the next call for projects. He stated that based on the timeline for TIP amendment approvals and IDOT reviews, it is likely that the first opportunity for letting any project selected for construction funding in the first year of the program would be in June. Mr. Snyder noted that for most projects, a June letting would mean that although federal funds would be obligated in that federal fiscal year, actual construction likely wouldn't begin until the following year.

Mr. Elam stated that staff would proceed with the schedule laid out in the memo.

6.0 Local Program Performance-Based Distribution Formula

Ms. Dobbs provided an update on the collection of performance data to be used to calculate the distribution of funds for the local programs. She stated that once the relative need is calculated, the percentages will be applied to the total funds available for the local programs to determine each council's and CDOT's programming marks for the upcoming local calls for projects. She noted that, as called for in the agreement between the Councils and CDOT, the calculations will be adjusted so that no Council receives less than \$3 million in any year, and that no council experiences a change in their programming mark that is larger than 10% higher or lower than their FFY 2017 mark for the first year, and no larger than 20% higher or lower in the second year. She stated the marks will be provided to the Council of Mayors Executive Committee at their October meeting, and to this committee at their next meeting.

Ms. Dobbs continued by reporting that, per the agreement, the relative need percentages used in the distribution formula remain in effect for five years and that after that time, the need will be re-calibrated based on updated performance data. The agreement also calls for consideration of an improvement factor as part of the first re-calibration. The method for applying this factor must be approved by the project selection committee by December 31, 2019. She stated that staff has some ideas for the committee to consider,

but would like discuss those with the planning liaisons and CDOT staff before the next project selection committee meeting. At that next meeting, staff will present options for the committee's consideration. Mr. Elam noted that later on the agenda, staff is proposing adding an additional committee meeting in November in order to allow ample discussion of the formula changes in October, for approval consideration in November.

Mayor Schielke made a motion, seconded by Mayor Williams, to revise the committee's meeting schedule to include meetings on both October 31, 2019 and November 21, 2019. The motion carried.

Mr. Davis asked if structure condition was one of the factors. Ms. Dobbs stated that it is. Ms. DeLaurentiis asked if the performance factors would be updated, or just the data. Mr. Elam clarified that the factors are laid out in the agreement, with the data required to be updated at least every five years, but that any improvement factors are yet to be determined, and those will be the topic of discussion at the meetings just approved.

7.0 Other Business

There was no other business.

8.0 Public Comment

Mike Connelly, CTA, stated that he applauds the committee for passing this program for the region. He stated that we all work together and will fail or succeed together. This is a good program that reflects a regional attitude.

Mayor Schielke recalled the evolution from a local focus to regional cooperation that began under Mayor Daley with the formation of the Metropolitan Mayors Caucus focusing on the commonality of purpose across the region.

9.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for October 31, 2019.

10.0 Adjournment

On a motion by Mayor Schielke, seconded by Mayor Rockingham, the meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

Comments related to program goals and award limits and rolling focus and eligible project types

The comments below that relate to program goals and award limits and rolling focus and eligible project types were extracted from the previously published [Detailed log of comments, responses, and potential actions](#) (September 26, 2018), [Individual program comments](#) (September 5, 2019), and an October 3, 2019 [letter](#) from the DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference to the STP Project Selection Committee. These extracted comments are being re-posted to inform “lessons learned” discussion about reaffirming program goals and the consideration of enacting rolling focus for future calls for projects.

| Program Goals and Award Limits |
|---|
| <p><u>DMMC 8/13/18:</u> The focus on regional goals, while providing some benefit, may result in geographic inequity and dilute local priorities.</p> |
| <p><u>CDOT 8/19/19:</u> CMAP’s call for FFY 2020-2024 STP-Shared applications states the program’s intent is to fund “important regional projects that address regional performance measures and the goals of ON TO 2050.” We agree wholeheartedly with this goal. However, we are concerned the current staff recommended program passes up high scoring regionally important projects in favor of lower scoring projects. Upon discussion with CMAP staff, CDOT has come to understand this inconsistency between the goals and recommendations is due to CMAP programming policies that were intended to promote full funding of projects at the amounts and in the years requested. While these policies may have merit, they were not written in the call for projects and were not clear to multiple applicants and members of the Project Selection Committee. Specifically, CDOT is concerned with the unwritten policy to effectively disqualify any project that requested more than \$40M in a given year and to not consider partial funding of projects.</p> <p>In the interest of maintaining an open and transparent project selection process, it is important to ensure the performance-based metrics agreed upon are followed to the maximum extent possible. This will help fulfil the primary goal of the STP-Shared program to fund important regional projects.</p> |
| <p><u>DMMC 10/3/19:</u> The Shared Fund should provide the funds needed to close funding gaps, and applicants should be rewarded for committing more than the locally required funding match.</p> |
| <p><u>MCCOM 5/21/18:</u> MCCOM requests that the PSC designate a maximum amount of STP funding awarded to the City of Chicago or a single suburban council in each shared funds call for projects. As noted in our Council’s letter dated July 19, 2017, McHenry’s repeated request of Advance Funding demonstrates that our yearly allotment has not met the needs of our area for several years. A maximum award amount per council would promote geographic equity and further ONTO205’s goal of “leveraging the transportation network to promote inclusive growth”.</p> |

DMMC 8/13/18:

There should be a maximum award size; either maximum dollar amount or share of available funds.

DMMC 10/3/18:

Consider a cap on funding of large projects. Given the demand for funding across the region as demonstrated in the first call, a cap on funding of large projects would guarantee that one project does not take the entire funding in a given year and helps ensure that local agencies are financially committed to submitted projects.

Multiple commenters 7/18/19 – 8/16/19:

Partial funding of projects should not be considered for the FFY 2020 – 2024 program, however it should be discussed for future calls. Considerations mentioned included potential for delayed implementation if full funding isn't secured, conflict with the goal of filling funding gaps, and potential for increased local contributions if partial funding is available.

Rolling Focus and Eligible Project Types

NWMC 8/3/18:

We believe that the Project Selection Committee should remain open to modifying the “rolling focus” of subsequent calls based on the regional demand for certain project types in previous calls.

DMMC 8/13/18:

Proposed rolling focus should not be enacted until a study of the effectiveness of the first round of funding is completed.

NW Council Transportation Committee 8/16/18:

Limiting STP, a program with broad federal eligibility, to eight project types seems like enough focus, without the need for a further rolling focus. If additional focus is needed, the results of the first call for projects should be used to inform that focus.

NW Council 8/21/18:

It is premature to formalize the focus of the second through fourth calls for projects. Focusing on a specific subset of projects in these calls prevents municipalities from responding to specific transportation needs at a given point in time. The project selection process should allow for a broad, multi-faceted program rather than limiting its focus.

NWMC 8/31/18:

The current proposal for the rolling focus of calls for projects in 2021, 2023, and 2025 should be abandoned in favor of an open call in each year within the eight eligible project areas. Solidifying the focus for each call for projects now unnecessarily restricts flexibility and may set false expectations if the focus ends up changing in later years. Additionally, the decision to include only eight eligible project types will already lead to a narrowly focused group of applications. Eliminating the rolling focus will provide the region with the necessary flexibility to respond to transportation needs while also providing sponsoring communities with adequate time to prepare their projects for each call. At the very least, we advise against setting the 2021 (and perhaps subsequent) focus areas based on the initial call for projects,

since it may be difficult for project sponsors to create a substantial list of projects that meets the readiness requirements for applying to the shared fund (i.e. having phase I engineering completed without knowing the focus well in advance).

DMMC email 9/5/18:

Line 55: The proposed rolling focus is unchanged. CMAP added purported justification for the rolling focus – limited funds in future cycles.

Lake Council 9/12/18:

The LCCOM supports the staff proposal regarding the rolling focus that was discussed at the August 22nd STP Project Selection Committee. Specifically, the LCCOM supports that the initial call for projects will be open to all project types listed in the draft STP (FFY2020-2024) Program Application Booklet and that the proposed rolling focus is re-evaluated after the initial call for projects. The LCCOM requests that any proposed changes narrowing the focus areas to be a subset of all initial project types be released for public comment alongside the draft program for the STP Shared Fund in the summer of 2019.

DMMC 10/3/19:

DMMC is opposed to “rotating categories” for future Shared Fund cycles. This most recent Call for Projects saw seven of the eight eligible categories receive applications for funding, demonstrating the need for funding a variety of project types at each Call. Allowing applications in all categories gives project sponsors the flexibility to consider various projects and does not force an arbitrary timeframe on needed projects.

DMMC Trans Tech/Trans Pol 7/26/18:

Should interstate/tollway “accessibility” be a project type (i.e. new/improved interchanges)?

Active Transportation Alliance 8/10/18:

The road expansion category should be eliminated.

DMMC 8/13/18:

All federally permitted project eligibilities should be included in the first call for projects.

Active Transportation Alliance 8/16/19:

Work with stakeholders across the region to assess ways to better use STP and other funding sources to fund projects that enhance the frequency of transit service, speed, and reliability, and thereby increase transit ridership.

Active Transportation Alliance 8/16/19:

Add walking and bicycling projects as an eligible project type for the STP Shared Fund.

Metropolitan Planning Council 8/16/19:

Given the extensive and urgent needs for better quality and safer bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in the region, we find the exclusion of bicycle and pedestrian projects as eligible projects to be a major issue. There is no shortage of significant bicycle and pedestrian needs in this region to connect significant network gaps, including projects that exceed the \$5 million project cost threshold.



DUPAGE MAYORS AND MANAGERS CONFERENCE

an association of municipalities representing 1,000,000 people

1220 Oak Brook Road
Oak Brook, Illinois 60523
(630) 571-0480
Fax: (630) 571-0484
www.dmmc-cog.org

Founded June 19, 1962

MEMBER MUNICIPALITIES

Addison
Aurora
Bartlett
Bensenville
Bloomingdale
Bolingbrook
Burr Ridge
Carol Stream
Clarendon Hills
Downers Grove
Elmhurst
Glen Ellyn
Glendale Heights
Hanover Park
Hinsdale
Itasca
Lemont
Lisle
Lombard
Naperville
Oak Brook
Roselle
Schaumburg
Villa Park
Warrenville
Wayne
West Chicago
Westmont
Wheaton
Willowbrook
Winfield
Wood Dale
Woodridge

October 3, 2019

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) STP Project Selection Committee
233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 800
Chicago, IL 60606

The DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference (DMMC) thanks CMAP for the opportunity to comment on the STP Shared Fund process and commends CMAP staff for their hard work in putting together this year's Shared Fund Program. DMMC reiterates its support for the stated purpose of the Shared Fund, to fund regionally significant projects that are selected with merit-based scoring criteria. Now that the first round of programming projects is nearly complete, DMMC offers the following comments for consideration when evaluating the process and in anticipation of the Call for Projects that will open in 2021:

- DMMC submitted comments opposed to partial funding during this first cycle and remains opposed to offering partial funding to project applicants. The Shared Fund should provide the funds needed to close funding gaps, and applicants should be rewarded for committing more than the locally required funding match.
- DMMC requests that the Committee consider a cap on funding of large projects. DMMC's local STP allows no more than 50 percent of available funding to be awarded to one project in a year. Given the demand for funding across the region as demonstrated in the first Call, a cap on funding of large projects would guarantee that one project does not take the entire funding in a given year and helps ensure that local agencies are financially committed to submitted projects.
- DMMC is opposed to "rotating categories" for future Shared Fund cycles. This most recent Call for Projects saw seven of the eight eligible categories receive applications for funding, demonstrating the need for funding a variety of project types at each Call. Allowing applications in all categories gives project sponsors

the flexibility to consider various projects with each Call for Projects and does not force an arbitrary timeframe on needed projects.

- Finally, DMMC asks the Committee to consider the impact of Council Bonus Points on the overall scoring process. While it is important for Councils to have the ability to indicate local support for projects, Bonus Points should not overshadow the established scoring criteria and demonstrated impact that a project will have on the region.

DMMC thanks the Committee for their hard work throughout the creation and implementation of the Shared Fund and looks forward to working together before the next Call for Projects opens in January 2021.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "STEVE CHIRICO". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "S" and a stylized "C".

Steve Chirico
President, DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference
Mayor, City of Naperville



Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive
 Suite 800
 Chicago, Illinois 60606
 312 454 0400
 www.cmap.illinois.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: Subregional Planning Liaisons and CDOT staff

Cc: Council of Mayors Executive Committee, STP Project Selection Committee

From: CMAP Staff

Date: October 18, 2019

Re: FFY 2021 – 2025 Local STP programming marks

In accordance with the terms of the Surface Transportation Program (STP) agreement between the Council of Mayors and City of Chicago, CMAP staff has prepared programming marks for the subregional councils and City of Chicago for federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2021 through 2025 (Table 1). The allotment each year is conservatively assumed to be the same as the FFY 2020 allotment to the CMAP region (\$144,709,745), adjusted each year to account for the STP-Shared Fund set-aside, and is subject to adjustment prior to the beginning of each FFY based on the actual amount of federal funds allotted to the CMAP region.

Table 1. FFY 2021-2025 STP-L Programming Marks

| Council | FFY 21 | FFY 22 | FFY 23 | FFY 24 | FFY 25 |
|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Central | \$3,000,000 | \$3,000,000 | \$3,000,000 | \$3,000,000 | \$3,000,000 |
| Chicago | \$57,483,991 | \$53,874,994 | \$52,251,747 | \$52,251,747 | \$52,251,747 |
| DuPage | \$12,178,598 | \$12,681,337 | \$12,235,052 | \$12,235,052 | \$12,235,052 |
| Kane/Kendall | \$9,008,966 | \$8,656,711 | \$8,325,415 | \$8,325,415 | \$8,325,415 |
| Lake | \$8,148,133 | \$7,819,790 | \$7,512,406 | \$7,512,406 | \$7,512,406 |
| McHenry | \$3,879,276 | \$3,669,512 | \$3,480,707 | \$3,480,707 | \$3,480,707 |
| North Central | \$3,890,830 | \$3,680,745 | \$3,491,619 | \$3,491,619 | \$3,491,619 |
| North Shore | \$4,145,394 | \$4,355,692 | \$4,147,282 | \$4,147,282 | \$4,147,282 |
| Northwest | \$9,269,713 | \$8,910,214 | \$8,571,675 | \$8,571,675 | \$8,571,675 |
| South | \$6,740,451 | \$7,141,126 | \$6,853,132 | \$6,853,132 | \$6,853,132 |
| Southwest | \$4,831,670 | \$5,440,765 | \$6,039,214 | \$6,039,214 | \$6,039,214 |
| Will | \$7,661,747 | \$7,390,142 | \$7,095,034 | \$7,095,034 | \$7,095,034 |
| Total | \$130,238,771 | \$126,621,027 | \$123,003,283 | \$123,003,283 | \$123,003,283 |

The programming marks were developed by applying the performance-based formula included in the STP agreement:

$$\text{Council Mark } (\$) = \text{Regional Mark}(\$) \times \text{Performance } (\%)$$

where:

$$\text{Performance } (\%) = \left(\frac{\text{Council } M_1}{\text{Region } M_1} + \frac{\text{Council } M_2}{\text{Region } M_2} + \frac{\text{Council } M_3}{\text{Region } M_3} + \frac{\text{Council } M_4}{\text{Region } M_4} + \frac{\text{Council } M_5}{\text{Region } M_5} \right) / 5$$

“Council” in this formula means each of the eleven individual subregional councils and the City of Chicago. M_1 , M_2 , etc. represent the individual performance measures, which are weighted equally, and the 5 in the formula is the number of measures. Each measure is described in detail below. Table 2 contains a summary of each council’s performance data.

Pavement Condition

Measured as lane-miles in poor condition as defined in 23 CFR 490. CMAP hired a consultant to collect pavement condition data on all non-National Highway System (NHS) federal aid eligible roads under local jurisdiction in the region in 2018. For the NHS and Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) roads under local jurisdiction, CMAP used IDOT’s pavement condition data of similar vintage. To calculate pavement condition according to 23 CFR 490, the data collected included International Roughness Index (IRI), cracking percent, rutting, and faulting. For asphalt pavement or jointed concrete pavement, at least two of the condition values (IRI, cracking percent, and rutting for asphalt pavement and IRI, cracking percent, and faulting for jointed concrete pavement) need to be defined as “poor” for the segment condition to be defined as “poor.” For continuous reinforced concrete pavement two of the condition values (IRI and percent cracking) need to be defined as “poor” for the segment condition to be defined as “poor.” The total lane-miles of pavement in poor condition was totaled within each council.

Congestion

Measured as the peak hour excessive delay (PHED) as defined in 23 CFR 490 and tabulated as annual person-hours of delay. Excessive delay is incurred when travel times are longer than the travel time at 20 mph or 60% of the posted speed limit travel time, whichever is greater. Peak travel hours are defined as 6:00 – 10:00 am and 4:00 – 8:00 pm. Total excessive delay is weighted by vehicle volumes and occupancy. CMAP obtained 2018 traffic speed data from IDOT collected by the firm HERE. If a local-jurisdiction federal aid road link did not have any speed data available for the analysis, CMAP used the council average to fill in the missing data for that link. Speed limit and volume data for 2018 were obtained from the Illinois Roadway Information System (IRIS) produced annually by IDOT. The total PHED by council was calculated by summing the annual hours of excessive delay on all local jurisdiction federal aid eligible roadways within each council.

Safety

Measured as the number of annual serious injuries and fatalities for the most recent year from IDOT's annual crash data extract. The data includes fatal and serious injury crashes occurring within the council boundary on local jurisdiction federal aid roads. The analysis was based on 2016 crash data because changes in IDOT's processing of the 2017 data incorrectly assigned crashes on the local jurisdiction federal aid eligible system.

Bridge Condition

Measured as square feet of deck area on bridges in poor condition as defined in 23 CFR 490. CMAP obtained 2018 bridge condition data from the National Bridge Inventory (NBI). 23 CFR 490 defines a bridge as in poor condition when the deck, substructure, or superstructure is rated as 4 or below. The square footage of deck area for all local jurisdiction bridges in poor condition within each council was totaled.

SOV Travel

Measured as the total number of single occupant vehicle (SOV) commuters based on the most recent US Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS). CMAP tabulated 2017 ACS five-year data for workers that drove alone by council area.

Table 2. Council Performance Data

| Council | Lane-miles in poor condition | Peak hour excessive delay (annual hours) | Number of annual serious & fatal crashes | Sq. ft. of deck on bridges in poor condition | Number of SOV commuters |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| Central | 18.10 | 217,745.84 | 62 | 7,888 | 81,204 |
| Chicago | 264.04 | 6,994,241.60 | 1188 | 1,864,474 | 634,326 |
| DuPage | 192.62 | 1,515,929.58 | 229 | 64,440 | 365,003 |
| Kane/Kendall | 78.26 | 570,734.36 | 223 | 142,282 | 288,501 |
| Lake | 85.45 | 571,900.20 | 132 | 143,412 | 273,266 |
| McHenry | 34.85 | 158,262.97 | 84 | 72,409 | 135,260 |
| North Central | 37.82 | 363,194.90 | 95 | 37,400 | 110,924 |
| North Shore | 65.32 | 454,275.36 | 110 | 33,906 | 96,248 |
| Northwest | 196.39 | 663,250.22 | 122 | 14,877 | 291,745 |
| South | 156.01 | 262,594.12 | 187 | 37,355 | 175,883 |
| Southwest | 134.09 | 312,678.44 | 117 | 84,505 | 138,765 |
| Will | 82.85 | 563,514.24 | 163 | 98,126 | 249,422 |
| Total | 1,346 | 12,648,322 | 2,712 | 2,601,075 | 2,840,547 |

Applying equal weights to each of the five measures, each council's total performance was calculated and is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Total performance by Council

| Council | Pavement Condition | Congestion | Safety | Bridge Condition | SOV Travel | Total performance |
|----------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Central | 1.35% | 1.72% | 2.29% | 0.30% | 2.86% | 1.70% |
| Chicago | 19.62% | 55.30% | 43.81% | 71.68% | 22.33% | 42.55% |
| DuPage | 14.31% | 11.99% | 8.44% | 2.48% | 12.85% | 10.01% |
| Kane/Kendall | 5.82% | 4.51% | 8.22% | 5.47% | 10.16% | 6.84% |
| Lake | 6.35% | 4.52% | 4.87% | 5.51% | 9.62% | 6.17% |
| McHenry | 2.59% | 1.25% | 3.10% | 2.78% | 4.76% | 2.90% |
| North Central | 2.81% | 2.87% | 3.50% | 1.44% | 3.91% | 2.91% |
| North Shore | 4.85% | 3.59% | 4.06% | 1.30% | 3.39% | 3.44% |
| Northwest | 14.59% | 5.24% | 4.50% | 0.57% | 10.27% | 7.04% |
| South | 11.59% | 2.08% | 6.90% | 1.44% | 6.19% | 5.64% |
| Southwest | 9.96% | 2.47% | 4.31% | 3.25% | 4.89% | 4.98% |
| Will | 6.16% | 4.46% | 6.01% | 3.77% | 8.78% | 5.84% |
| Total | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

The total performance for each council from Table 3 was multiplied by the regional mark for the local programs, then, per the agreement, the results of the formula were “smoothed” to prevent any council from receiving less than \$3 million in any year, and to prevent any council from receiving 10% more or less than their FFY 2017 mark in the first FFY and 20% more or less than their FFY 2017 mark in the second year. The smoothing process is iterative, requiring the addition or subtraction of funds to be applied proportionally across councils until the required thresholds are satisfied. The smoothed application of the performance-based formula results in the programming marks provided in Table 1.

###