

DRAFT STP Shared Fund FFY 2022-2026 Program Application Booklet

Important notes about this draft:

This draft reflects methodology updates that have been proposed by staff and discussed with the STP Project Selection Committee. Significant changes, including changes to policies, procedures, and scoring methodologies, may occur before final action to approve this draft.

The STP Project Selection Committee is scheduled to take action to approve this draft, and the policies and procedures within it, on October 29, 2020. At that time the policies, procedures, and scoring methodologies will be final, however minor changes to the formatting, layout, and content of this draft may occur through the opening of the FFY 2022 – 2026 call for projects in January 2021.

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Introduction | 3 |
| Deadlines and How to Apply | 3 |
| Using eTIP | 3 |
| Grant Accountability and Transparency Act (GATA) Requirement..... | 4 |
| Eligibility..... | 5 |
| Eligible sponsors | 5 |
| Eligible project types | 6 |
| Eligible project phases..... | 7 |
| Eligible project costs and local match requirements..... | 8 |
| Inclusion in plans | 9 |
| Completion of preliminary engineering..... | 11 |
| Project Evaluation Process..... | 11 |
| Project Readiness..... | 12 |
| Engineering and Land Acquisition (all project types)..... | 12 |
| Financial Commitment (all project types) | 13 |
| Transportation Impact..... | 15 |
| Household/Job Impact (all project types)..... | 16 |
| Bicycle and Pedestrian Barrier Elimination Projects | 16 |
| Existing Condition/Need | 16 |
| Improvement | 19 |
| Bridge reconstruction or rehabilitation..... | 20 |
| Existing Condition/Need | 20 |
| Improvement | 20 |
| Bus speed improvements..... | 23 |
| Existing Condition/Need | 23 |
| Improvement | 23 |
| Corridor/Small Area Safety | 24 |
| Existing Condition/Need | 24 |
| Improvement | 24 |
| Rail-Highway grade crossing improvements | 25 |
| Existing Condition/Need | 25 |
| Improvement | 25 |
| Road expansions | 25 |
| Existing Condition/Need | 25 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Improvement | 26 |
| Road reconstructions | 27 |
| Existing Condition/Need | 27 |
| Improvement | 28 |
| Transit stations | 29 |
| Existing Condition/Need | 29 |
| Improvement | 30 |
| Truck route Improvements..... | 30 |
| Existing Condition/Need | 30 |
| Improvement | 32 |
| Planning Factors..... | 33 |
| Inclusive growth..... | 34 |
| Complete streets..... | 35 |
| Green infrastructure | 36 |
| Freight movement..... | 37 |
| Transit-supportive land use | 38 |
| Subregional Priority..... | 40 |
| Project selection and programming process | 41 |
| Step 1: Call for Projects..... | 41 |
| Step 2: Eligibility Screening | 41 |
| Step 3: Project Scoring | 41 |
| Step 4: Draft Program Development | 41 |
| Step 5: Public Comment | 42 |
| Step 6: Final Program Recommendation | 42 |
| Step 7: Program Implementation | 42 |
| Staged Construction | 43 |
| Minimum Acceptable Funding..... | 43 |
| Selection Process Timeline | 44 |
| Application Checklist | 44 |
| Contact Information | 45 |

Introduction

The Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP), the metropolitan planning organization for the seven counties of northeastern Illinois, announces the availability of funding for transportation projects through the Surface Transportation Program (STP) Shared Fund. This program is funded through the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The STP Shared Fund is designed to fund important regional projects that address regional performance measures and the goals of [ON TO 2050](#)¹.

This application booklet provides details on how to apply for funding, eligibility, and project evaluation, selection, and programming processes.

Throughout this document, instructions that relate the policies and processes to the completion of an application can be found emphasized as shown here.

Deadlines and How to Apply

The call for projects begins on <TBD date January 2021>, and ends at the close of business on <TBD date March 2021>. Applications are to be submitted through the [eTIP database](#)², which is the region’s repository of information for all surface transportation projects funded by federal programs or deemed to be regionally significant. The eTIP has a Call for Projects (CFP) portal which will collect the applications’ work type, location, and financial information. Additional forms will still be required and those must be uploaded as attached documents to eTIP.

Using eTIP

The eTIP User Guide for CMAQ/TAP/STP Call for Projects <link to be inserted> will guide applicants on submitting projects with all the relevant materials posted at <URL to be updated>. Application materials are only accepted through eTIP.

Project applications submitted by local sponsor agencies are required to be reviewed by their Council of Mayors’ Planning Liaison before the eTIP submission will be accepted. The review process will occur within the eTIP database and no project materials should be sent directly to the Planning Liaison. To give the Planning Liaisons time to review the applications, all locally sponsored applications should be “saved as final” by close of business on <TBD date March 2021>. The Planning Liaison will review the application and if the application has missing information, they will notify the applicant. The applicant will then be able to amend the application before the final due date. A [list of the Councils and Planning Liaisons](#)³ is available online.

¹ <https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/2050>

² <https://etip.cmap.illinois.gov/secure/login.asp>

³ <https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/0/Municipalities+by+Council+07-14-20.pdf/71fb1f5c-4dae-9ac0-0a99-4cce0e33f8c5>

The eTIP database requires users to request login credentials and have those credentials approved by CMAP staff. Although CMAP staff will attempt to review user requests as soon as they are received, it may take up to three business days for CMAP staff to review and approve accounts. Applicants are encouraged to request credentials as soon as the call for projects opens, rather than waiting until they are ready to complete the application. Procedures for requesting credentials are included in the eTIP User Guide *<link to be updated>*.

Grant Accountability and Transparency Act (GATA) Requirement

All project sponsors of applications receiving federal or state funds through agreements with IDOT will need to participate in the State's [Grant Accountability and Transparency Act \(GATA\)](#)⁴ process. Sponsors of projects that will be implemented through a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant will not be required to participate in GATA and do not need to complete the following steps. The purpose of GATA is for grant oversight of the selection and monitoring of grant recipients. Before submitting an application, two items should be completed by sponsors related to GATA:

1. Sponsors should complete the [GATA Grantee Registration form](#)⁵, which will provide a GATA registration number that should be entered in the eTIP database. In most cases, government agencies have already applied for GATA registration and do not need to complete it again but still need to provide the GATA number their agency received. Once the Grantee registration step is complete, a workflow notification through emails will occur. These e-mail notifications will consist of questionnaires regarding prequalification, fiscal and administrative risk assessment, and indirect costs. All workflow emails will be sent to the original contact person entered during Grantee registration. This process is not administered by CMAP. Please do not contact CMAP for assistance with this process. Visit grants.illinois.gov for more information.
2. Sponsors should complete the GATA Uniform Application for State Grant Assistance, for the fund source being requested (available on the Call for Projects page). The first page of the Uniform Application is unique for each fund source and has already been completed for applicants. Applicants should complete only pages 2 and 3. If multiple fund sources are being requested for a project, a Uniform Application should be completed for each source. The completed form(s) must be attached to the eTIP Application.

It is important to note that additional GATA documents and forms will be required of sponsors selected to receive STP Shared funds. CMAP staff or your Planning Liaison will be in contact at the appropriate time that those documents and forms need to be completed.

⁴ <https://www2.illinois.gov/sites/GATA/About/Pages/GATAVision.aspx>

⁵ <https://grants.illinois.gov/registration/>

Indicate the primary sponsor's GATA Registration Number and SAM Cage Code in the Project Information section of the eTIP application.

Eligibility

Projects eligible for the STP Shared Fund make large and lasting contributions to regional transportation priorities and are derived from a variety of planning activities. The intention of the fund is also to encourage collaboration between municipalities and advance projects that local councils cannot readily fund on their own. Given these goals, projects must meet certain basic eligibility requirements.

- Projects must have a total cost, for all phases from preliminary engineering through construction, of \$5 million or more.
- Projects with a total cost of less than \$5 million will be considered if the funding application is from three (3) or more local partners, and one (1) of those partners is a municipality.
- All projects must be included in or supported by a locally adopted plan developed with input from the public, as described in more detail in the “Inclusion in Plans” section below.
- Preliminary engineering must be substantially complete by the application deadline, as described in more detail in the “Completion of Preliminary Engineering” section below. This requirement does not apply for applicants seeking preliminary engineering only, as described in the “Eligible Project Phases” section below.

Eligible sponsors

For the STP Shared Fund, eligible sponsors or partners include any state agency or unit of government having the authority to levy taxes. Sponsors include but are not limited to municipalities, counties, townships, park districts, forest preserve districts, and transit agencies. Non-municipal sponsors are strongly encouraged to seek partnerships with, or letters of support from, affected municipalities. For the purpose of meeting the eligibility requirements, partners must demonstrate financial or in-kind project involvement beyond just supporting a project. Private for-profit and non-profit organizations may partner with a public sponsor that meets the previously stated conditions, but may not submit applications or act as the lead agency for project implementation.

A project sponsor may submit an application to secure funding for a project that will be implemented by a different agency, however evidence that the implementing agency supports the application, is aware of and will comply with [Active Program Management](#)⁶ requirements of the STP Shared Fund, and agrees that the cost estimate and schedule is reasonable and aligns with the implementing agency's plans to complete the project should be provided by the applicant.

⁶ <https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/931110/STP+APM+Policies+-+approved+9-25-18.pdf/9f751522-021c-a029-ca8f-c75ba9d13e41>

If applicable, submit evidence of implementing agency support by attaching in eTIP.

Eligible project types

While STP has very broad eligibility in comparison to other funding sources (for example, CMAQ, TAP, and HSIP), the STP Shared Fund is targeted toward specific priority project types. Applications will only be evaluated as the project type(s) selected by the applicant, and must demonstrate need in the selected category and include scope elements that address that need. The table below provides additional guidance to assist applicants with choosing the appropriate application category. The table is not intended to be all-inclusive and applicants should contact their Planning Liaison or CMAP staff for project-specific guidance.

| Project Type | Need(s) to be addressed | Example scope elements to address needs |
|--|---|---|
| Bicycle and Pedestrian Barrier Elimination | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gaps in regional greenways & trails network due to barriers (such as a waterway, highway, or railroad) to bicycle and pedestrian movement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bicycle/pedestrian overpass Bicycle/pedestrian underpass New multi-use path/trail |
| Bus Speed Improvements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-time performance due to congested conditions Bus travel time vs. auto travel time | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BRT/ART route construction (stops, pull outs, separators, etc.) Transit Signal Priority (TSP) and other ITS Bus-only travel lanes |
| Bridge Rehabilitation or Reconstruction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficiency rating Deck, superstructure, and/or substructure condition | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bridge replacement Deck replacement Superstructure rehab/reconstruct Substructure rehab/reconstruct |
| Highway/Rail Grade Crossing Improvements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority grade crossing rank (based on truck, car, and transit traffic, daily trains, daily gate down time, safety, and mobility) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade separation Other crossing improvements |
| Road Reconstruction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pavement condition (primary) Mobility (secondary) Reliability (secondary) Safety (secondary) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reconstruction of roadway |
| Road Expansion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mobility and reliability (primary) Safety (secondary) Pavement condition (secondary) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional through lanes New/extended road New interchange New ramps (additional movements) |

| Project Type | Need(s) to be addressed | Example scope elements to address needs |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Corridor or Small Area Safety | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High or Critical Safety Tier (related to any mode) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety countermeasures that are appropriate for the crash type(s) in the project corridor/area (see <reference>) • Intersection improvement (turn lanes, etc.) • Vertical/horizontal clearance • Traffic signal modifications |
| Transit Station Improvements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Station asset condition • Gaps in bicycle and pedestrian access to station | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehab, repair, or replace station building, boarding platforms, and other station fixtures • Complete direct connection of sidewalk network to station • Complete direct connection of bicycle network to station • Install bike parking or bike-sharing at station |
| Truck Route Improvements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High truck volumes • Inadequate roadway geometry for trucks • Barriers (physical/operational) to efficient truck movement • Pavement condition | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intersection reconstruction to improve turn radii, lengthen storage, etc. • Signal modifications • ITS solutions (corridor or intersection) • Pavement reconstruction (structural) • Relocation of designated truck route |

Eligible project phases

Phase 1 (preliminary) engineering (for projects to be processed through IDOT) and activities defined by FTA as “pre-engineering” (for projects to be processed through an FTA grant) will be the responsibility of the project sponsor to complete without funding from the STP Shared Fund.

With limited exceptions, all other phases -- including phase 2 (design) engineering, land acquisition, and construction (including construction engineering) -- are eligible for STP Shared Fund funding. Engineering design, land acquisition, and construction activities may be combined into “implementation” for transit projects that will be processed through an FTA grant.

Applicants may request funding for phase 1 engineering based on a hardship. If phase 1 engineering funding is sought, funding for the later phases of the project cannot be requested

until the next call for projects following completion of the phase 1 engineering, and such funding is not guaranteed.

To be considered eligible to request phase 1 engineering funding based on hardship, the project sponsor must be identified as a Cohort 4 (very high need) community in the [FY20 Community Cohorts](#)⁷ document. The project for which funds are being requested must be entirely within the boundaries of that community, however extensions beyond the boundary will be allowed in order to meet “logical termini” requirements. Sponsors seeking funding for phase 1 engineering should contact CMAP staff to confirm eligibility before doing so.

Eligible project costs and local match requirements

Eligible costs include all design engineering, land acquisition, construction, and construction engineering costs that are federally-eligible. Ineligible costs may include items, often referred to as “non-participating costs”, such as decorative lighting or water and/or sewer improvements.

A local match that is a minimum of 20 percent of the total cost, by phase, is required. The sponsor must have already committed matching funds when the project application is submitted. Proposals which indicate that the sponsor will contribute more than the minimum local match will receive points as part of the project readiness portion of the scoring process (see below). The local match does not necessarily have to be provided directly by the sponsor but it must be a non-federal fund source to qualify as match.

To ensure that all communities within the region have reasonable access to federal funds without an undue burden caused by lack of resources for required local matching funds, on November 28, 2018, the STP Project Selection Committee approved a [Policy](#)⁸ for the use of Transportation Development Credits – Highways (TDCHs, also known as “toll credits”) for STP funded projects. Sponsors that are identified as a Cohort 4 (very high need) community in the [FY20 Community Cohorts](#)⁹ document may request the use of TDCHs in lieu of local match.

The use of federal funds for local projects is subject to the policies and procedures of IDOT and FHWA or FTA. These procedures may require local agencies to pay 100% of costs up front, with reimbursement occurring when the local agency invoices IDOT. For more information, see IDOT’s [LPA Project Development and Implementation](#)¹⁰ web page and the IDOT [Local Roads and Streets Manual](#)¹¹, Part III – Policies and Procedures for Federal-Aid Projects.

⁷ https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/997259/01+Community_Cohorts_FY20_2020-02-10.pdf/442cdef5-695c-da13-c6dd-acdbd98b05dd

⁸ <https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/931110/Policy+for+the+use+of+TDCH+for+STP+funded+projects+-+PSC+and+IDOT+approved.pdf/7a997ea1-9379-8583-2431-43b6b736a5a6>

⁹ https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/997259/01+Community_Cohorts_FY20_2020-02-10.pdf/442cdef5-695c-da13-c6dd-acdbd98b05dd

¹⁰ <http://www.idot.illinois.gov/transportation-system/local-transportation-partners/county-engineers-and-local-public-agencies/LPA-Project-Development-and-Implementation/index>

¹¹ <http://www.idot.illinois.gov/Assets/uploads/files/Doing-Business/Manuals-Guides-&-Handbooks/Highways/Local-Roads-and-Streets/Local%20Roads%20and%20Streets%20Manual.pdf>

Inclusion in plans

The link between planning and implementation is critical to ensuring regional investments support communities’ priorities. Therefore, applicants must provide evidence (via hyperlink or attachment) that the proposed project is included in or supported by a locally adopted plan developed with input from the public in order to be considered for funding. Support can be for the project specifically, or for the type of project. Projects applying for phase 1 engineering funding only are exempt from this requirement. However, the requirement must be met for projects seeking funding for any other phase, including those that previously completed phase 1 engineering with STP shared funds.

Acceptable plans are those that are subject to public review and have received local government or implementing agency approval. A project’s inclusion in IDOT’s Multi-Year Program, a local agency Capital Improvement Program, or identification as an ON TO 2050 Regionally Significant Project (RSP) is also acceptable. However, selection for funding in a competitive grant or discretionary funding program or being listed in IDOT’s Local Roads status sheets or Management Monitoring Schedule does not qualify as inclusion in a plan. The table below, while not an exhaustive list, provides guidance for determining what planning documents or programs are acceptable. Applicants may also contact CMAP planning staff *<names/contact info to be inserted>* for additional guidance. In addition, examples from plans cited by applicants in the prior call for projects that demonstrate how a project type may be supported in a plan are also provided below.

✓ - Acceptable ✗ - Not Acceptable ? - Case-by-case, contact CMAP staff to discuss

| Type of Plan or Program | Project Included | Project Type Included |
|--|------------------|-----------------------|
| County Long Range Transportation Plan | ✓ | ✓ |
| Municipal or County Comprehensive Plan | ✓ | ✓ |
| Capital Improvement Program | ✓ | ✓ |
| Multimodal Transportation Plan | ✓ | ✓ |
| Corridor Plan | ✓ | ? |
| Small Area or Subarea Plan | ✓ | ? |
| Neighborhood Plan | ✓ | ? |
| Housing Plan | ✗ | ✗ |
| Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Plan | ✓ | ✓ |
| Livable Streets Plan | ? | ? |
| Active Mobility Plan | ✓ | ? |
| Local Road Safety Plan | ✓ | ? |
| Economic Development Plan | ? | ? |
| Transit Improvement Plan | ✓ | ✓ |
| Access to Transit Plan | ✓ | ? |

✓ - Acceptable ✘ - Not Acceptable ? - Case-by-case, contact CMAP staff to discuss

| Type of Plan or Program | Project Included | Project Type Included |
|---|------------------|-----------------------|
| Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Plan | ✓ | ✓ |
| Stormwater or Green Infrastructure Master Plan | ? | ✘ |
| Transit Agency or Regional Transit Strategic Plan | ✓ | ✓ |
| Regional Transit Signal Priority (TSP) Implementation Program | ✓ | ? |
| Transit Service Coordination Plan | ✓ | ? |
| Bus Network Enhancements Plan | ✓ | ✓ |
| Transit Station Area Master Plan | ✓ | ? |
| Transit Agency Asset Management Plan | ✓ | ✓ |
| Transit Agency Budget/Capital Improvement Program | ✓ | ✘ |
| Municipal/County/State Asset Management Plan | ✓ | ✓ |
| IDOT Multi-Year Plan | ✓ | ✘ |
| ON TO 2050 Regionally Significant Project (RSP) | ✓ | ✘ |
| NE IL Priority Grade Crossings | ✓ | ✘ |
| IDOT Local Roads Status Sheets | ✘ | ✘ |
| Council of Mayors STP-L Program | ✘ | ✘ |
| Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program (ITEP) Project List | ✘ | ✘ |
| Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Project List | ✘ | ✘ |
| IDOT Major Bridge Program Project List | ✘ | ✘ |
| <i>Invest in Cook</i> Project List | ✘ | ✘ |

Examples of plans supporting project types

Will County’s “[Will Connects](#)” 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan includes the goal: “Perform Asset Stewardship – Preserve and maintain transportation assets and manage their operations using a spectrum of strategies, tools, and technologies.” This goal supports all projects that preserve and maintain the existing system, such as Road Reconstruction and Bridge Rehabilitation or Replacement projects, even though every potential project is not listed individually in the plan.

The [Village of Glenview’s Capital Improvement Program \(CIP\)](#)¹³ states that “CIP priorities are based on CIP Standards & IMS Ratings for pavement condition” and describes the method for evaluating roadway condition and the criteria for using condition data to select projects for inclusion in the CIP. This statement and description of performance-based project selection methods serve as support for Road Reconstruction projects.

¹² https://www.willcountyllinois.com/Portals/0/Highway/Long%20Range%20Transportation/will_county_transporation_report_2017_final4_web.pdf?ver=2017-04-25-112630-497

¹³ https://www.glenview.il.us/Documents/CIP%20Documents/2017-2021_CIP_Book%20-%204-19.pdf

[Will Connects](#)¹⁴ discusses truck corridors as an area of need, providing support for Truck Route Improvement projects, and also identifies specific corridors based on varying levels of freight movement.

Include a hyperlink to the applicable plan in the Application Workbook or attach a PDF file in eTIP.

Completion of preliminary engineering

For road, bridge, and bike/ped projects requiring phase 1 engineering, one of the following must occur **on or before the application deadline for the current call for projects**:

- a. Design approval has been received.
- b. IDOT has certified that a final Project Development Report has been submitted for signatures.
- c. IDOT has certified that a preliminary Project Development Report has been received for review and that the report is sufficiently complete to ensure an accurate cost estimate and clear scope for the remaining phases of the project has been established.

For transit projects that will be processed through an FTA grant, the sponsor must demonstrate that sufficient pre-engineering and/or architectural work has been completed to satisfy FTA's checklist for readiness to enter engineering (Appendix C of the [FTA Project and Construction Management Guidelines](#)¹⁵) and establish an accurate cost estimate and a clear scope.

Indicate the status of preliminary engineering in the Project Information section of the eTIP application and attach a copy of your phase 1 Design Approval letter, or a copy of the letter or e-mail that accompanied your PDR submittal. Transit stations projects should provide a link to or attach a copy of work completed that will demonstrate the requirements have been met.

Project Evaluation Process

The program of projects selected by the STP Project Selection Committee will consider the results of the project evaluation in four categories: project readiness, transportation impact, planning factors, and subregional priority, as shown in the table below.

¹⁴ https://www.willcountyillinois.com/Portals/0/Highway/Long%20Range%20Transportation/will_county_transporation_report_2017_final4_web.pdf?ver=2017-04-25-112630-497

¹⁵ https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/FTA_Project_and_Construction_Mgmt_Guidelines_2016.pdf

| Evaluation criteria | Points | Applies to |
|------------------------------|---------------|--|
| Project Readiness | 15 | All project types |
| Engineering/Land Acquisition | 10 | All project types |
| Financial Commitments | 5 | All project types |
| Transportation Impact | 50 | All project types |
| Current condition/need | 20 | All project types |
| Improvement | 20 | All project types |
| Jobs/Housing benefit | 10 | All project types |
| Planning Factors | 30 | All project types |
| Inclusive Growth | 15 | All project types |
| Complete Streets | 10 | Bike/ped barriers; bridges; hwy/rail crossings; safety; truck routes |
| Complete Streets | 5 | Bus speed; road expansion; road reconstruction |
| Green Infrastructure | 5 | Bike/ped barriers; hwy/rail crossings; road expansion; road reconstruction; transit stations; truck routes |
| Freight Movement | 5 | Bridges; safety; road expansion; road reconstruction |
| Transit Supportive Density | 10 | Bus speed; transit stations |
| Subregional Priority | 5 | All project types |
| Total possible points | 100 | All project types |

Project Readiness

CMAQ and partners are committed to timely obligation and completion of projects to protect the region’s funding from lapse and rescission, and deliver on the significant transportation benefits of selected projects. The [Active Program Management](#)¹⁶ policies provide a framework for strong project and program management of selected projects, and the evaluation process for Shared Fund projects complements these policies by awarding points to projects that demonstrate financial commitment and engineering work. Project readiness is 15% of the total project score.

Engineering and Land Acquisition (all project types)

Projects can receive up to 10 points, 5 for demonstration of substantial completion of phase 2 (design) engineering and 5 for the completion or lack of need for land acquisition.

¹⁶ <https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/931110/STP+APM+Policies+-+approved+9-25-18.pdf/9f751522-021c-a029-ca8f-c75ba9d13e41>

Points for land acquisition are as follows:

| Status | Points |
|---|--------|
| Land acquisition complete or not needed | 5 |
| Land acquisition incomplete | 0 |

Points for phase 2 engineering for projects processed through IDOT are awarded as follows:

| Status | Points |
|-------------------------------------|--------|
| Preliminary plans submitted to IDOT | 2.5 |
| Pre-final plans submitted to IDOT | 5 |

It is recognized that IDOT will not accept submittals or complete plan review for unfunded projects, and that as a result many applicants will not receive points in this category. However, for applicants seeking to fill funding gaps through the STP shared fund, the submittal of plans is a significant readiness milestone that should be recognized with the awarding of points.

Points for design engineering for projects processed through FTA are awarded as follows:

Completion of any of the following items shall be awarded 2.5 points each, up to a maximum of 5 points:

| Item Completed | Points |
|---|--------|
| NEPA Class of Action Determination, FONSI, or ROD | + 2.5 |
| Initiation of Section 106 process | + 2.5 |
| Basis of design/ design criteria report | + 2.5 |
| Design documents (plans and specifications) | + 2.5 |
| Real estate management plan | + 2.5 |
| Project management or project delivery plan | + 2.5 |
| Basis of estimate report | + 2.5 |

Indicate design engineering and land acquisition status in the Project Information section of the eTIP application and attach a copy of preliminary plans (PDF format only!) or a copy of the letter or e-mail transmitting pre-final plans to IDOT. Transit projects should attach a copy (PDF format only!) of items listed for which points are being requested.

Financial Commitment (all project types)

Projects can receive up to 5 points in this category based on their demonstrated leveraging of other funding sources. Points are awarded as follows to projects based on the amount of funding requested from the shared fund as a percent of the federally-eligible share of the total project cost:

| Percent of federally-eligible share requested | Points |
|---|--------|
| Less than 20% | 5 |
| 20% - less than 40% | 4 |
| 40% - less than 60% | 3 |
| 60% - less than 80% | 2 |
| 80% - less than 100% | 1 |
| 100% or more | 0 |

The following examples demonstrate the calculation of these points.

Example 1: Applicant requests maximum federal share for all eligible phases

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------|
| Phase | Total cost | STP-SF eligible share (0.80 * [B]) | Required match ([B]-[C]) | Committed funds (non-federal) | Requested STP-SF ([B]-[E]) | % eligible requested ([F]/[C])*100 | Points |
| ENG1 | \$400,000 | \$0 | \$400,000 | \$400,000 | \$0 | n/a | |
| ENG2 | \$400,000 | \$320,000 | \$80,000 | \$80,000 | \$320,000 | 100% | |
| ROW | \$1,000,000 | \$800,000 | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$800,000 | 100% | |
| CON | \$4,000,000 | \$3,200,000 | \$800,000 | \$800,000 | \$3,200,000 | 100% | |
| CE | \$400,000 | \$320,000 | \$80,000 | \$80,000 | \$320,000 | 100% | |
| Total | \$6,200,000 | \$4,640,000 | \$1,560,000 | \$1,560,000 | \$4,640,000 | 100% | |

Example 2: Applicant requests only construction funding

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------|
| Phase | Total cost | STP-SF eligible share (0.80 * [B]) | Required match ([B]-[C]) | Committed funds (non-federal) | Requested STP-SF ([B]-[E]) | % eligible requested ([F]/[C])*100 | Points |
| ENG1 | \$400,000 | \$0 | \$400,000 | \$400,000 | \$0 | n/a | |
| ENG2 | \$400,000 | \$320,000 | \$80,000 | \$400,000 | \$0 | 0% | |
| ROW | \$1,000,000 | \$800,000 | \$200,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$0 | 0% | |
| CON | \$4,000,000 | \$3,200,000 | \$800,000 | \$800,000 | \$3,200,000 | 100% | |
| CE | \$400,000 | \$320,000 | \$80,000 | \$400,000 | \$0 | 0% | |
| Total | \$6,200,000 | \$4,640,000 | \$1,560,000 | \$3,000,000 | \$3,200,000 | 69% | |

Example 3: Applicant requests the use of TDCHs as match (note: per [TDCH policy](#)¹⁷ TDCHs cannot be used for the ROW phase and TDCHs are not considered to be committed funds.)

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
|--------------|--------------------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|--------|
| Phase | Total cost | STP-SF eligible share (0.80 * [B]) | Required match ([B]-[C]) | Committed funds (non-federal) | Requested STP-SF (including TDCHs) ([B]-[E]) | % eligible requested ([F]/[C])*100 | Points |
| ENG1 | \$400,000 | \$0 | \$400,000 | \$400,000 | \$0 | n/a | |
| ENG2 | \$400,000 | \$320,000 | \$80,000 | \$0 | \$400,000 | 125% | |
| ROW | \$1,000,000 | \$800,000 | \$200,000 | \$200,000 | \$800,000 | 100% | |
| CON | \$4,000,000 | \$3,200,000 | \$800,000 | \$0 | \$4,000,000 | 125% | |
| CE | \$400,000 | \$320,000 | \$80,000 | \$0 | \$400,000 | 125% | |
| Total | \$6,200,000 | \$4,640,000 | \$1,560,000 | \$600,000 | \$5,600,000 | 121% | |

Example 4: Applicant requests only construction and construction engineering funds. A portion of the committed funds are from another federal source, which requires 20% match that must be accounted for separately from the match required for the requested STP-SF.

| A | B | C | E | F | G | H | I | J |
|--------------|--------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|--------------------|---|---|--------|
| Phase | Total cost | STP-SF eligible share (0.80 * [B]) | Committed funds (other federal) | Committed funds (matching other federal) | Requested STP-SF | Required match that must also be committed ([B]-[E]-[F]-[G]) | % eligible requested ([G]/[C])*100 | Points |
| ENG1 | \$400,000 | \$0 | \$320,000 | \$80,000 | \$0 | \$0 | n/a | |
| ENG2 | \$400,000 | \$320,000 | \$320,000 | \$80,000 | \$0 | \$0 | 0% | |
| ROW | \$1,000,000 | \$800,000 | \$800,000 | \$200,000 | \$0 | \$0 | 0% | |
| CON | \$4,000,000 | \$3,200,000 | \$2,000,000 | \$500,000 | \$1,200,000 | \$300,000 | 38% | |
| CE | \$400,000 | \$320,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$320,000 | \$80,000 | 100% | |
| Total | \$6,200,000 | \$4,640,000 | \$3,440,000 | \$860,000 | \$1,520,000 | \$380,000 | 33% | |

Document all funding requests and commitments in the Proposed Funding Information section of the eTIP application.

Transportation Impact

A project’s transportation impact score measures the existing condition of the transportation asset or need for the project, the cost effectiveness of the improvement that would be made by the project, and the number of households and jobs that could benefit from the project’s completion. Transportation impact is worth 50% of the total project score.

¹⁷

<https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/931110/Policy+for+the+use+of+TDCH+for+STP+funded+projects+-+PSC+and+IDOT+approved.pdf/7a997ea1-9379-8583-2431-43b6b736a5a6>

Each project will receive an existing condition or need score on a scale of 0 to 20. Each project type will have a different measure of project need, but all will be converted to a 20-point scale for the purposes of analysis. Scoring methodologies for existing condition/need are described below by project type.

Improvement will be calculated as the cost effectiveness of the proposed improvements involved in the project. Improvements will be indexed on a scale of 0-20 within project type. Total project cost will be used to evaluate cost effectiveness. Scoring methodologies for cost effectiveness of the improvement are described below by project type.

Household/Job Impact (all project types)

The benefits of a transportation project often cross municipal and county borders, and can provide significant improvements to people who are not located in the project’s immediate vicinity. For each project, CMAP uses the travel model to generate a travel shed of the places people come from and go to using the facility. The score in this category is calculated by adding up the total number of jobs and households within each project’s travel shed and converting the total to a score out of 10, indexed to the other submitted projects.

Select all roadway links/nodes, transit stations, or bicycle/pedestrian facilities on which improvements will occur on the eTIP map. For projects that cannot be mapped in eTIP, attach a location map on the Documents tab in eTIP.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Barrier Elimination Projects

Existing Condition/Need

The existing condition score for these projects has three parts: route characteristics, market for facility, and connectivity. Market for facility and connectivity are measured the same for all types of barriers, however the route characteristics are scored differently based on the type of barrier being eliminated by the project, as summarized in the table below and described in more detail below.

| Barrier Type | Route Characteristics (50%) | | Market for Facility (25%) | Connectivity (25%) |
|---------------|--|---|---|--|
| Railroad | Number of daily freight, commuter, and passenger trains on line(s) being crossed | Proximity to rail operations bottlenecks (yard, rail-rail at grade crossings, etc.) | Population and employment density; Transit availability index; School(s) located within 1 mile of the project | Degree to which project completes the Regional Greenways and Trails Plan |
| Roadway | Level of traffic stress on the facility being crossed | | | |
| Water feature | Distance to nearest alternate crossing with adequate bike/ped infrastructure | | | |

Market for facility (0 – 5 points; all barrier types)

The use of a bicycle and pedestrian facility is influenced by the characteristics of the area surrounding the facility. The market for facility score has three components, scored as follows:

Population and Employment Density (0 – 2 points)

Population and employment density in the area served by the facility is the criterion used to evaluate anticipated usage. Points are assigned as shown below by the population/employment density quintile at the project location. <Refer to the map of density quintiles for the region currently being updated>. For projects that span multiple quintiles, the highest point value will be assigned.

| Population/employment quintile | Points |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| Top quintile | 2 |
| Second quintile | 1.5 |
| Third quintile | 1 |
| Fourth quintile | 0.5 |
| Lowest quintile | 0 |

Transit Availability Index (0 – 2 points)

Measuring transit availability helps ensure that a bicycle/pedestrian facility provides a realistic alternative to auto use by evaluating the potential to link bicycling and walking with transit for longer trips. Points are assigned as shown below based on the transit availability index¹⁸ at the project location. <Refer to the map of transit availability index values currently being updated>. For projects that span areas with different indices, the highest point value will be assigned.

| Transit Availability Index | Points |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| 5 | 2 |
| 4 | 1.5 |
| 3 | 1 |
| 2 | 0.5 |
| 1 | 0 |

Presence of Schools (0 – 1 point)

School children are one of the largest groups of bicycle and pedestrian facility users. One point will be added to the score if there is a public or private school serving students in any grade, K-12, within a one-mile buffer around the project location.

Connectivity (0 – 5 points; all barrier types)

¹⁸ For more information about the transit availability index, see page 56 of the ON TO 2050 Indicators Appendix.

ON TO 2050 specifically recommends implementing the Northeastern Illinois [Regional Greenways and Trails Plan](#)¹⁹ (RGTP). ON TO 2050 also uses miles of RGTP trails completed as an indicator of plan implementation. Thus, points for connectivity are assigned as follows:

| Description | Points |
|--|--------|
| Connects two existing Regional Greenways & Trails Plan sections | 5 |
| Extends an existing regional trail | 4 |
| Builds a new isolated section of a planned regional trail | 3 |
| Builds a new facility that intersects an existing regional trail | 2 |
| Removes bike/ped barrier at a location not included in the RGTP | 1 |

Route Characteristics (0 – 10 points; methodology varies by barrier type)

The need to eliminate barriers is evaluated based on the characteristics of the barrier. The methodology for determining those characteristics varies by the barrier type.

Rail Barriers

Throughout the region motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians experience delay due to the high volume of trains and due to slow moving or stopped trains. Both of these factors contribute equally to the route characteristics score.

The average number of daily freight, commuter, and passenger trains has been evaluated for the region and all rail lines have been assigned a quintile based on those volumes. Points are assigned as shown below by the average daily trains quintile at the project location. <Refer to the map of the quintiles for the regions currently being developed>. For projects that span multiple quintiles, the highest point value will be assigned.

| Average daily trains quintile | Points |
|--|--------|
| Top quintile (__ to __ daily trains) | 5 |
| Second quintile (__ to __ daily trains) | 4 |
| Third quintile (__ to __ daily trains) | 3 |
| Fourth quintile (__ to __ daily trains) | 2 |
| Lowest quintile (__ to __ daily trains) | 1 |

Likewise, rail operations bottlenecks, such as yards and rail-rail at-grade crossings, have been identified and all rail lines have been evaluated for proximity to those bottlenecks and assigned to quintiles. Points are assigned as shown below by the proximity to rail operations bottlenecks quintile at the project location. <Refer to the map of the quintiles for the regions currently being developed>. For projects that span multiple quintiles, the highest point value will be assigned.

¹⁹

https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/911218/MOB_Regional_greenways_and_trails_map_FI_NAL.pdf/01630e87-4862-9de4-5bdc-9586176fa7ae

| Proximity to rail operations bottlenecks quintile | Points |
|--|---------------|
| Top quintile (___ to ___ miles) | 5 |
| Second quintile (___ to ___ miles) | 4 |
| Third quintile (___ to ___ miles) | 3 |
| Fourth quintile (___ to ___ miles) | 2 |
| Lowest quintile (___ to ___ miles) | 1 |

Road Barriers

For bicyclists and pedestrians, crossing a roadway can be both uncomfortable and dangerous, based on the characteristics of the roadway, including speed limits, lane widths, and traffic volumes. The roadway’s level of traffic stress is derived from these characteristics. Level of traffic stress values range from 1.0 to 4.995. The level of traffic stress at a proposed crossing location will be calculated and points will be assigned by multiplying the assigned value by two.

Points = level of traffic stress value x 2

Water Barriers

The degree to which a body of water is a barrier to bicycle and pedestrian mobility will be determined by how far a bicyclist or pedestrian would need to travel to safely and comfortably cross the water at another location. Scores will be assigned as shown below based on the distance to the nearest alternate crossing with adequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities such as:

- The crossing is for bike/ped users only
- The crossing is a roadway with an 8’ or greater sidewalk or shared-use path that is physically separated from the travel lanes on at least one side
- The crossing is a roadway with a 5’ of greater physically separated sidewalk on at least one side *and* striped or protected bike lanes

| Distance to nearest alternate crossing with adequate bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure | Points |
|---|---------------|
| > 2.5 miles | 10 |
| > 1 mile to 2.5 miles | 7.5 |
| > 0.5 miles to 1 mile | 5 |
| > 0.25 mile to 0.5 mile | 2.5 |
| 0.25 mile or less | 0 |

Improvement

Improvement scores for bicycle and pedestrian barrier elimination projects will be the cost effectiveness of the improvement to route characteristics.

The cost effectiveness of all projects within the bicycle and pedestrian barrier elimination category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

Bridge reconstruction or rehabilitation

Existing Condition/Need

The existing condition score will be the [National Bridge Inventory \(NBI\)](#)²⁰ sufficiency rating, published on IDOT's Bridge Information [website](#)²¹, subtracted from the maximum rating of 100, and converted to a 20 point scale. For projects containing multiple structures, the individual structure with the lowest sufficiency rating will be deemed the "most critical structure" within the project limits. Both the existing condition and improvement score will be based on the one structure within the project limits deemed most critical.

For projects containing a structure(s) for which there is no NBI sufficiency rating, it will be the applicant's responsibility to provide a bridge inspection report. If no sufficiency rating is available, or one cannot be estimated from a provided inspection report, 0 points will be awarded in this category.

Improvement

The improvement score will be based on the potential impact of the project scope on the deck, superstructure, and substructure condition ratings, and the bridge posting code. Additional improvement points will be awarded if the project corrects insufficient lane widths or brings traffic safety features (bridge railings, transitions, approach guardrail, and/or bridge guardrail ends) up to currently acceptable standards. All scoring within this category will be based on NBI data published on FHWA's Long-Term Bridge Performance (LTBP) Program [Infobridge](#)²² web portal, unless noted otherwise below.

The raw improvement score will be the sum of the deck improvement, superstructure improvement, substructure improvement, improvement to bridge load posting, improvement to insufficient lane width, and improvement to safety features scores.

When calculating improvement scores for structural elements (deck, superstructure and substructure), the following assumptions are made:

- Full replacement of the structure or a component(s) of the structure results in maximum condition rating for the replaced component(s)
- Partial replacement or rehabilitation of a component(s) results in a "satisfactory" rating for the replaced/rehabbed component(s).
- Repairs to a component not being replaced or rehabbed result in a one category improvement in the component's rating
- The region's historic and/or moveable bridges face significant restrictions to full replacement

²⁰ <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bridge/nbi.cfm>

²¹ <http://apps.dot.illinois.gov/bridgesinfosystem/main.aspx>

²² <https://infobridge.fhwa.dot.gov/Home>

Based on these assumptions, the structural elements will be scored as follows:

Deck improvement (0 – 9 points)

| Scope of work | Points |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Full deck replacement | 9 – (current deck condition rating*) |
| Partial deck replacement or deck rehabilitation | 6 – (current deck condition rating*) |
| Deck repair (including join sealing/repairs) | 1 point |

*Current deck condition rating is NBI Item 58

Superstructure improvement (0 – 9 points)

| Scope of work | Points |
|--|--|
| Full superstructure replacement | 9 – (current superstructure condition rating*) |
| Partial superstructure replacement or superstructure rehabilitation (including girders, stringers, trusses, arches, pin & hangers, etc.) | 6 – (current superstructure condition rating*) |

*Current superstructure condition rating is NBI Item 59

Substructure improvement (0 – 9 points)

| Scope of work | Points |
|---|--|
| Full substructure replacement | 9 – (current substructure condition rating*) |
| Partial substructure replacement or substructure rehabilitation (including abutments, piers, columns, caps, piles, walls, footings, etc.) | 6 – (current substructure condition rating*) |

*Current substructure condition rating is NBI Item 60

If the critical structure being evaluated for improvement is a culvert, Culvert Condition (NBI Item 62) will be used in place of the Deck, Superstructure, and Substructure Conditions.

Full replacement of historic and/or movable structures may not be feasible and/or may be cost prohibitive due in part to State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) requirements, preventing these structures from achieving a condition rating of “9”. Therefore, a multiplier of 1.5 will be applied to the element improvement score(s) for partial replacement or rehabilitation of that element(s) if the bridge is historic and/or movable, as defined below.

Historical Significance (NBI Item 37):

| Code | Value | Application of multiplier |
|------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1 | On National Register | Yes |
| 2 | National Register Eligible | Yes |
| 3 | May be National Register Eligible | TBD, pending review of IDOT Bridge Information (see below) |
| 4 | Unknown Historical Significance | TBD, pending review of IDOT Bridge Information (see below) |

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----|
| 5 | Not National Register Eligible | No |
|---|--------------------------------|----|

Within the IDOT Bridge Information data, historical significance is further stratified, therefore for structures with a code of 3 or 4 in the NBI database, if the “Historical Significance” is indicated as “Yes” within the IDOT Bridge Information data the multiplier will be applied.

Structure Type (NBI Item 43B):

If the structure type code is 15 (Movable – Lift), 16 (Movable – Bascule), or 17 (Movable – Swing), the multiplier will be applied.

If a structure is both historic and movable, only one multiplier will be applied.

When calculating improvement scores for load posting improvements, the following assumptions are made:

- Full replacement results in the removal of any existing load postings
- Partial replacement or rehabilitation may result in additional load capacity; the project sponsor must provide an estimate of the expected new load rating that will result from the project.

Based on these assumptions, the load posting improvements will be scored as follows:

Improvement to bridge posting (0 – 5 points)

| Scope of work | Points |
|---|---|
| Full replacement | 5 – (current bridge posting code*) |
| Partial replacement or rehabilitation of deck, superstructure, substructure, and/or bearings and/or installation of temporary or permanent strengthening measures | (bridge posting code base on estimated load rating) – (current bridge posting code) |

*Current bridge posting code is NBI Item 70

Improvement to insufficient lane width (0 – 1 point)

Up to 1 additional point will be added to the raw improvement score if the average lane width prior to the project is less than shown below, based on the number of lanes carried and if the project replaces or widens the deck or the entire structure and/or removes a lane(s) in order to exceed the minimum. The point will also be awarded if a design exception for the insufficient lane width is documented.

| # of lanes | Average width* |
|------------|----------------|
| 1 | 14 ft |
| 2 | 16 ft |
| 3 | 15 ft |
| 4 | 14 ft |
| 5+ | 12 ft |

The average lane width will be calculated by dividing the Lanes on Structure (NBI Item 28A) by the Bridge Roadway Width Curb to Curb (NBI Item 51).

Improvement to safety features (0 – 2 points)

Up to 2 additional points will be added to the raw improvement score if any of the following safety features are currently rated “0”, 0.5 points will be awarded for each feature that will be brought up to standard by the project, or for each feature for which a design exception is documented:

- Bridge railings (NBI Item 36A)
- Transitions (NBI Item 36B)
- Approach guardrail (NBI Item 36C)
- Bridge guardrail ends (NBI Item 36D)

The total raw improvement score will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness. The cost effectiveness of all projects within the category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

Enter the structure number(s) in the location information section of the eTIP application, select the structure(s) on the eTIP map, and complete <TBD questions> on the <TBD tab> of the Application Workbook.

Bus speed improvements

Existing Condition/Need

The existing condition score will measure the current on-time performance of bus routes being improved as well as the difference between bus travel time and auto travel time on the road(s) being improved. Both factors are worth 50% of the score.

On-time performance scores will be calculated by averaging the applicant-provided on-time performance for all bus routes affected by the project, subtracting that value from the maximum on-time performance of 100%, and scaling to 10 points by comparing to all other applications in the category.

Bus travel time and auto travel time will be estimated from a review of schedules and travel time estimates from Google maps. The percent difference between the estimates will be calculated and scaled to 10 points by comparing to all other applications in the category.

The existing condition score will be the sum of the two scaled scores.

Improvement

The anticipated increase in on-time performance of bus routes being improved and the anticipated change in the bus-auto travel time differential will be used to calculate raw improvement scores. Both factors are worth 50% of the raw score. The total raw improvement

score will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness. The cost effectiveness of all projects within the category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

Complete <TBD questions> on the <TBD tab> of the Application Workbook and select all roadway links on which improvements will occur on the eTIP map.

Corridor/Small Area Safety

Existing Condition/Need

The need score for safety projects is calculated using IDOT's safety road index (SRI) for roadway segments and intersections. The SRI is based on the location's [Potential for Safety Improvement](#)²³ (PSI) score. IDOT developed SRI scores for local and state routes and categorized them by peer group into critical, high, medium, low, or minimal. Within each peer group, locations categorized as critical have the highest PSIs, and locations categorized as minimal are less likely to have safety benefits from treatments. The proposed project's need score will be the highest SRI category along the project location. This will include both segment and intersection locations.

| SRI Score | Points |
|------------------|---------------|
| Critical | 20 |
| High | 15 |
| Medium | 10 |
| Low | 5 |
| Minimal | 0 |

Improvement

This score is based on the improvements made by the project and the planning level expected safety benefit (reduction of crashes) after implementing the improvement. CMAP staff has developed a list of common improvement types (countermeasures) <link to be inserted> and the accompanying planning level CRFs using information from IDOT, the Crash Modification Clearinghouse, and the Highway Safety Manual. CMAP staff will review project details to determine the relevant countermeasure and the assigned planning level CRF for that countermeasure. If multiple countermeasures are part of the project, CMAP staff will use the maximum planning level CRF for the project. The maximum CRF will be multiplied by the number of fatal and serious injury (K and A) crashes occurring within the project limits within the most recent five years for which data was available from IDOT or provided by the applicant, to determine the potential crash reduction due to the project. Cost effectiveness will be determined by dividing the project's total cost by the potential crash reduction to determine the cost per reduced crash.

The cost effectiveness of all projects within the corridor or small area safety category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

²³ https://rspcb.safety.fhwa.dot.gov/noteworthy/html/projident_il.aspx?id=8

Complete <TBD questions> on the <TBD tab> of the Application Workbook.

Rail-Highway grade crossing improvements

Existing Condition/Need

The existing condition score is based on the project’s score from the 2019 Grade Crossing Prioritization. For projects involving multiple crossings, the “most critical crossing” will be identified and will be used for calculating both the existing condition and improvement score for the project. 75% of the score (15 points) is based on the most critical crossing’s rank compared to the 1437 crossings evaluated in the region. Crossings identified as Priority Grade Crossings will receive 5 additional points.

For projects containing a crossing that was not included in the 2019 analysis, it will be the applicant’s responsibility to provide the data necessary to complete an evaluation. If no analysis can be completed due to lack of data, 0 points will be awarded in this category.

Improvement

The improvement to the delay and safety components of the Grade Crossing Screening Level 2 evaluation as a result of the project determines the project’s raw improvement score. These components are equally weighted for a new grade-separated crossing. For projects improving, but not separating crossings, if the project involves improvements to train movements, the delay component will be used; If the project involves improvements to the crossing (gates, signals, etc.), the safety component will be used.

The raw scores will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness. The cost effectiveness of all projects within the highway-rail grade crossing category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

Complete <TBD questions> on the <TBD tab> of the Application Workbook and select the crossing(s) on the eTIP map.

Road expansions

Existing Condition/Need

The road expansion need score will be calculated in a similar method to the [highway needs score](#)²⁴ for regionally significant projects in ON TO 2050. This score incorporates information about pavement condition, safety, reliability, and mobility. Weights for these factors will be as follows:

| Factor | Weight |
|---------------|---------------|
| Condition | 15% |
| Mobility | 30% |

²⁴ https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/871931/RSP_Report_June06-12-2018+DRAFT+FINAL.pdf/2633b74a-4f19-8df1-c7b9-26c3a9fba378#page=24

| | |
|-------------|-----|
| Reliability | 30% |
| Safety | 25% |

Pavement condition is the length weighted average of either the road’s Condition Rating Score (CRS) or international roughness index (IRI), depending on data availability, scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

Mobility is the length weighted average of the [travel time index](#)²⁵ (the ratio of peak period travel time to free flow travel time) and the number of [at least lightly congested hours of traffic per weekday](#)²⁶, scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

Reliability is measured by the length-weighted average of the [planning time index](#)²⁷ (95th percentile travel time divided by free flow travel time), scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

The safety score will be calculated using IDOT’s safety road index (SRI). The value for the segment or intersection within the project limits with the most critical SRI rating will be used and will be scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

The established weights are applied to the individual component scores and those scores are summed to obtain a raw need score, which is scaled to 20 points.

Improvement

Ten of the raw improvement points for road expansions will come from improvements to the mobility, calculated by subtracting the mobility need score from 100, and then scaling to 10 points. Projects can also receive a maximum of ten additional raw improvement points if the project has any of the following characteristics or helps implement any of the following as part of a larger program:

| Improvement | Points |
|--|---------------|
| <i>Systematic Improvements</i> | |
| Integrated Corridor Management | + 5 |
| Work zone management (traveler information improvements) | + 5 |
| Truck travel information systems | + 4 |
| Strategies to improve transit on-time performance | + 4 |
| Ramp metering | + 4 |
| Road weather management systems | + 2 |
| Special event management | + 3 |
| Traffic signal interconnect | + 4 |
| Adaptive signal control | + 5 |

²⁵ http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/349301/ChicagoRegionTravelTimeIndexMap_2012.pdf/77ce3ad9-b443-41c2-8e08-dd689fdb406e

²⁶ http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/349301/DurationofHighwayCongestion_ChicagoRegion_2012.pdf/d0b4cfe9-809c-4ba8-9a36-4645aa031604

²⁷ http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/349301/HighwayTravelTimeReliability_ChicagoRegion_2012.pdf/7334e26f-c258-4e4f-9af7-8a928441970e

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Incident Detection:</i> | |
| Traffic Management Center (TMC) to TMC Communications | + 4 |
| Computer-aided dispatch (911 call center) to (TMC) communications | + 4 |
| Extension or improvement of real-time traffic surveillance on regional expressways and tollways, including video and detectors | + 3 |
| Integration of real-time probe data into incident detection procedures | + 3 |
| Establishment of detector health program | + 3 |
| <i>Incident Response:</i> | |
| Expansion of response operations capabilities (e.g., minutemen) | + 5 |
| Dispatch improvements, including center-to-operator and supervisor-to-operator communications (including supervisor-bus communications) | + 4 |
| Response equipment (e.g., minuteman vehicles) | + 4 |
| <i>Incident Recovery:</i> | |
| Expediting coroner's/medical examiner's accident investigation process | + 5 |
| Dynamic message signs (DMS, multiple, including arterial DMS) | + 3 |
| Incident-responsive ramp meters | + 3 |
| Speed Management Systems | + 2 |
| On-scene communication, coordination, and cooperation | + 2 |
| Development and improvement of highway closure detour routes | + 2 |

The raw scores will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness. The cost effectiveness of all projects within the road expansion category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

Select all roadway links on which improvements will occur on the eTIP map and complete <TBD questions> on the <TBD tab> of the Application Workbook.

Road reconstructions

Existing Condition/Need

The road reconstruction need score will be calculated in a similar method to the [highway needs score](#)²⁸ for regionally significant projects in ON TO 2050. This score incorporates information about pavement condition, safety, reliability, and mobility. Weights for these factors will be as follows:

| Factor | Weight |
|---------------|---------------|
| Condition | 50% |
| Mobility | 10% |
| Reliability | 20% |
| Safety | 20% |

²⁸ https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/871931/RSP_Report_June06-12-2018+DRAFT+FINAL.pdf/2633b74a-4f19-8df1-c7b9-26c3a9fba378#page=24

Pavement condition is the length weighted average of either the road’s Condition Rating Score (CRS) or international roughness index (IRI), depending on data availability, scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

Mobility is the length weighted average of the [travel time index](#)²⁹ (the ratio of peak period travel time to free flow travel time) and the number of [at least lightly congested hours of traffic per weekday](#)³⁰, scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

Reliability is measured by the length-weighted average of the [planning time index](#)³¹ (95th percentile travel time divided by free flow travel time), scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

The safety score will be calculated using IDOT’s safety road index (SRI). The value for the segment or intersection within the project limits with the most critical SRI rating will be used and will be scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

The established weights are applied to the individual component scores and those scores are summed to obtain a raw need score, which is scaled to 20 points.

Improvement

The improvement to the condition, calculated as 100 – the raw condition score, will be scaled to 10 points. Projects can also receive a maximum of ten additional raw improvement points if the project has any of the following characteristics or helps implement any of the following as part of a larger program:

| Improvement | Score |
|---|--------------|
| <i>Systematic Improvements</i> | |
| Integrated Corridor Management | + 5 |
| Work zone management (traveler information improvements) | + 5 |
| Truck travel information systems | + 4 |
| Strategies to improve transit on-time performance | + 4 |
| Ramp metering | + 4 |
| Road weather management systems | + 2 |
| Special event management | + 3 |
| Traffic signal interconnect | + 4 |
| Adaptive signal control | + 5 |
| | |
| <i>Incident Detection:</i> | |
| Traffic Management Center (TMC) to TMC Communications | + 4 |
| Computer-aided dispatch (911 call center) to (TMC) communications | + 4 |

²⁹ http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/349301/ChicagoRegionTravelTimeIndexMap_2012.pdf/77ce3ad9-b443-41c2-8e08-dd689fdb406e

³⁰ http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/349301/DurationofHighwayCongestion_ChicagoRegion_2012.pdf/d0b4cfe9-809c-4ba8-9a36-4645aa031604

³¹ http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/349301/HighwayTravelTimeReliability_ChicagoRegion_2012.pdf/7334e26f-c258-4e4f-9af7-8a928441970e

| | |
|---|-----|
| Extension or improvement of real-time traffic surveillance on regional expressways and tollways, including video and detectors | + 3 |
| Integration of real-time probe data into incident detection procedures | + 3 |
| Establishment of detector health program | + 3 |
| <i>Incident Response:</i> | |
| Expansion of response operations capabilities (e.g., minutemen) | + 5 |
| Dispatch improvements, including center-to-operator and supervisor-to-operator communications (including supervisor-bus communications) | + 4 |
| Response equipment (e.g., minuteman vehicles) | + 4 |
| <i>Incident Recovery:</i> | |
| Expediting coroner's/medical examiner's accident investigation process | + 5 |
| Dynamic message signs (DMS, multiple, including arterial DMS) | + 3 |
| Incident-responsive ramp meters | + 3 |
| Speed Management Systems | + 2 |
| On-scene communication, coordination, and cooperation | + 2 |
| Development and improvement of highway closure detour routes | + 2 |

The raw scores will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness. The cost effectiveness of all projects within the road reconstruction category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

Select all roadway links on which improvements will occur on the eTIP map and complete <TBD questions> on the <TBD tab> of the Application Workbook.

Transit stations

Existing Condition/Need

For project scopes which include only reconstruction/rehab of the station, with no bike/ped access changes, the existing condition score will be the cost-weighted average [Transit Economic Requirements Model \(TERM\)](#)³² condition rating scale of station components, subtracted from the maximum value of 5, and scaled from a 5-point scale to a 20-point scale.

For project scopes which include only bike/ped access improvements, with no station improvements, 75% of the score will be the percentage of roads in the station area with no sidewalk, scaled to 15 points. Station area is defined as within ½ mile of the station. The percentage will be determined from CMAP's Sidewalk Inventory [data](#)³³. (Note: at the time of the publication of this draft application booklet, the linked data includes only Metra and CTA rail stations. Analysis of Pace and CTA bus transfer terminals and transfer points will be completed prior to the opening of the call for projects, and the link will be updated at that time.)

³² <https://www.transit.dot.gov/TAM/TERMLite>

³³ <https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/1101859/station+download+file.xlsx/0c606dd4-679f-3924-3541-486935361116>

An additional 5 points (25% of the need score) will be awarded if the station does not have any bicycle parking infrastructure at the station or a bike-sharing dock(s) within the station area.

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

Improvement

For project scopes which only include reconstruction/rehab of the station, with no bike/ped access changes, the raw improvement score will be the difference in cost-weighted average [Transit Economic Requirements Model \(TERM\)](#)³⁴ condition rating scale of station components before and after the project, scaled to 20 points. The raw scores will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness.

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

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

The cost effectiveness of all projects within the transit station category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

Complete <TBD questions> on the <TBD tab> of the Application Workbook.

Truck route Improvements

Existing Condition/Need

The truck route existing conditions score incorporates information about pavement condition, safety, reliability, mobility, truck volumes, and geometric deficiencies of the roadway(s) that currently makes up the truck route. These factors are weighted as follows:

| Factor | Weight |
|---------------|---------------|
| Condition | 10% |
| Safety | 10% |

³⁴ <https://www.transit.dot.gov/TAM/TERMLite>

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Reliability | 20% |
| Mobility | 20% |
| Truck volume | 20% |
| Geometric deficiencies | 20% |

Pavement condition is the length weighted average of either the road’s Condition Rating Score (CRS) or international roughness index (IRI), depending on data availability, scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

Mobility is the length weighted average of the [travel time index](#)³⁵ (the ratio of peak period travel time to free flow travel time) and the number of [at least lightly congested hours of traffic per weekday](#)³⁶, scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

Reliability is measured by the length-weighted average of the [planning time index](#)³⁷ (95th percentile travel time divided by free flow travel time) , scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

The safety score will be calculated using IDOT’s safety road index (SRI). The value for the segment or intersection within the project limits with the most critical SRI rating will be used and will be scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

Truck volume is the length weighted average of the number of trucks (calculated by multiplying AADT by the % trucks) within the project corridor(s), scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

Geometric deficiencies can impede the safe and efficient movement of trucks. Points will be awarded as follows for geometric deficiencies within the project limits:

| Deficiency | Points |
|--|---------------|
| Presence of a weight-restricted bridge(s) within project limits | 1 |
| Presence of vertical clearance restrictions within project limits | 1 |
| % of project length with insufficient* outer lane width for the design vehicle | Up to 1 point |
| % of intersections within project limits with insufficient* turn radii and/or insufficient* queue storage for the design vehicle | Up to 1 point |

The established weights are applied to the condition, safety, reliability, mobility, and truck volume component scores and those scores are summed with the geometric deficiencies score to obtain a raw need score, which is scaled to 20 points.

³⁵ http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/349301/ChicagoRegionTravelTimeIndexMap_2012.pdf/77ce3ad9-b443-41c2-8e08-dd689fdb406e

³⁶ http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/349301/DurationofHighwayCongestion_ChicagoRegion_2012.pdf/d0b4cfe9-809c-4ba8-9a36-4645aa031604

³⁷ http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/349301/HighwayTravelTimeReliability_ChicagoRegion_2012.pdf/7334e26f-c258-4e4f-9af7-8a928441970e

Improvement

Improvement to mobility, reduction of geometric deficiencies, inclusion of systematic improvements, and mitigation of negative impacts of trucks will all contribute equally to the improvement score. Improvements can be realized by improving the current truck route corridor or by improving a nearby corridor and designating that improved corridor as a replacement for the current truck route.

The improvement to mobility, calculated as $100 - \text{the raw mobility score}$, will be scaled to 5 points.

Improvement to geometric deficiencies will be scored as follows, for a total of up to 5 points.

| Improvement | Points |
|--|---------------|
| Removal or avoidance of bridge weight limits within the project limits | 1 |
| Removal or avoidance of vertical clearance restrictions within project limits | 1 |
| Reduction of the % of project length with insufficient outer lane width for the design vehicle | Up to 1 point |
| Reduction of the % of intersections within project limits with insufficient turn radii for the design vehicle | Up to 1 point |
| Reduction of the % of intersections within project limits with insufficient queue storage for the design vehicle | Up to 1 point |

Additional points, up to a maximum of five points, will be added for the inclusion of the following systematic improvements.

| Improvement | Points |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| Truck travel information systems | + 5 |
| Adaptive signal control | + 4 |
| Integrated corridor management | + 3 |
| Traffic signal interconnect | + 3 |
| Dynamic message signs | + 2 |
| Truck route signing | + 1 |

Additional points, up to a maximum of five points will be added for the following actions that can mitigate the negative impacts of truck traffic.

| Mitigation Strategy | Points |
|--|---------------|
| Project reroutes trucks away from sensitive land uses* (e.g. hospitals, cemeteries, schools, parks, low income communities, downtown areas, agricultural areas, natural areas, etc.) | + 5 |
| Project includes electrification infrastructure | + 4 |
| Project includes noise mitigation (sound walls, berms) | + 3 |
| Presence of off-street freight loading zones within project limits | + 3 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Loading/delivery time restrictions are imposed in project area | + 2 |
|--|-----|

*Sensitive land uses may include, but are not limited to, hospitals, cemeteries, schools, parks, low income communities, downtown areas, agricultural areas, natural areas, etc. Applicants will be required to provide a narrative description of land uses surrounding the project location that could be considered sensitive.

The raw scores will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness. The cost effectiveness of all projects within the road reconstruction category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

Select all roadway links on which improvements will occur on the eTIP map and complete <TBD questions> on the <TBD tab> of the Application Workbook. If the project is re-routing trucks from one location to another, map the new location in eTIP and attach a map of the old location.

Planning Factors

In addition to the transportation benefits and readiness scores explained above, all projects are evaluated on their support for regional priorities, identified as part of [ON TO 2050](https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/2050)³⁸, the region’s long range comprehensive plan. The intent of the planning factors is to set projects up for success by encouraging supportive policies and to account for additional project benefits not captured through the transportation impact analysis. Planning factors are 30% of the total project score.

There are five planning factors: Inclusive Growth, Complete Streets, Green Infrastructure, Freight, and Transit Supportive Density. The application of these planning factors varies by project category as summarized in the table below.

³⁸ <https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/2050>

| Project Type | Maximum Points by Planning Factor | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------|----------------------------|-------|
| | Inclusive Growth | Complete Streets | Green Infrastructure | Freight | Transit supportive density | Total |
| Bicycle/Pedestrian Barrier Elimination | 15 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Bridge Rehab or Reconstruction | 15 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 30 |
| Bus Speed Improvements | 15 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 30 |
| Corridor/Small Area Safety Improvements | 15 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 30 |
| Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Improvements | 15 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Road Expansion | 15 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 30 |
| Road Reconstruction | 15 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 30 |
| Transit Station Improvements | 15 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 30 |
| Truck Route Improvements | 15 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 30 |

Inclusive growth

Long-term regional prosperity requires economic opportunity for all residents and communities. [Inclusive Growth](#)³⁹, one of the ON TO 2050 plan principles, focuses on strategies, including transportation investments, that can increase access to opportunity for low income residents and people of color, and help the region to be stronger and more successful economically.

All projects are evaluated based on the percent of travelers using a facility that are people of color below the poverty line. Projects can receive a maximum of 15 points, which are awarded as shown below. For projects spanning multiple roadway or transit segments, the highest point value among those segments will be assigned.

³⁹ <https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/2050/principles#IG1>

| Percent of facility users* that are people of color and under poverty line | Points |
|--|--------|
| 25% or more | 15 |
| 20% to < 25% | 12 |
| 15% to < 20% | 9 |
| 10% to < 15% | 6 |
| 5% to < 10% | 3 |
| Less than 5% | 0 |

* For bicycle/pedestrian barrier elimination projects, points are based on the percent of the population within a 1-mile buffer area of the project that are people of color and under the poverty line.

A map of these values is available here <link to be added>.

Select all roadway links/nodes, transit stations, or bicycle/pedestrian facilities on which improvements will occur on the eTIP map. For projects that cannot be mapped in eTIP, attach a location map on the Documents tab in eTIP.

Complete streets

One of ON TO 2050’s recommendations is to [support development of compact, walkable communities](#)⁴⁰. Complete streets policies require streets to be planned, designed, operated, and maintained to enable safe, convenient, and comfortable travel and access for all anticipated roadway users, regardless of their age, abilities, or mode of travel. The adoption of complete streets policies and incorporation of complete streets design elements into all projects is encouraged.

Projects will receive points if the local jurisdiction (municipality, township, and/or county) in which they are located has an adopted complete streets policy. The number of points assigned varies by project type, as shown below.

| Project type(s) | Maximum complete streets policy points |
|--|--|
| Bicycle/pedestrian barrier elimination | 10 |
| Bridge rehab/reconstruction; Corridor/small area safety improvements; Highway-rail grade crossing improvements; Truck route improvements | 4 |
| Bus speed improvements; Road expansion; Road reconstruction | 2 |

Bicycle/pedestrian barrier elimination and transit station improvement projects are not eligible to receive complete streets elements points.

⁴⁰ <https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/2050/community/walkable-communities>

Eligible projects will also receive points if the project adds, replaces, improves, or leaves existing complete streets elements in place. The raw number of points varies by element as shown below and are cumulative, up to a maximum of 15 points.

| Elements included in project* | Raw Points |
|---|------------------------------|
| Sidewalks | + 2 points per side |
| Marked/striped bike lane | + 1 point per side |
| Buffered/protected bike lane | + 1 point per side/direction |
| Multi-use path or trail (either side) | + 4 points |
| Refuge islands (any number) | + 1 point |
| Curb extensions/bump outs/chicanes (any number) | + 1 point |
| Bicycle racks and/or bike-sharing docks (any number) | + 1 point |
| Crosswalk or lane enhancements (e.g. colored, raised, textured) | + 1 point |
| Pedestrian beacons or countdown signals | + 1 point |

*Added, replaced, improved, or existing; Other elements may be considered on a case-by-case basis

Raw points will be scaled to the following maximum number of points by project category.

| Project type(s) | Maximum complete Streets elements points |
|--|--|
| Bridge rehab/reconstruction; Corridor/small area safety improvements; Highway-rail grade crossing improvements; Truck route improvements | 6 |
| Bus speed improvements; Road expansion; Road reconstruction | 3 |

Bicycle/pedestrian barrier elimination and transit station improvement projects are ineligible to receive complete streets elements points.

For more information about complete streets policies and project design, see the [CMAP complete streets toolkit](#)⁴¹.

Complete <TBD questions> on the <TBD tab> of the Application Workbook.

Green infrastructure

Implementing green infrastructure as part of transportation investments can help achieve a number of regional priorities, including reducing flooding, improving water quality, and mitigating the urban heat island effect.

Projects in the eligible categories below will receive green infrastructure policy points if the local jurisdiction (municipality, township, and/or county) in which they are located has an adopted green infrastructure policy. These projects will also receive green infrastructure

⁴¹ <http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/programs/local-ordinances-toolkits/complete-streets>

elements points if the project includes any green infrastructure components such as bioswales, infiltration trenches, permeable pavers and vegetated filter strips.

| Project type(s) | Maximum green infrastructure policy points | Maximum green infrastructure elements points |
|---|--|--|
| Bicycle/pedestrian barrier elimination; Highway-rail grade crossing improvements; Road expansion; Road reconstruction; Transit station improvements; Truck route improvements | 2.5 | 2.5 |

Bridge rehab/reconstruction, bus speed improvements, and corridor/small area safety improvement projects are ineligible to receive any green infrastructure points.

For more resources and examples of green infrastructure in transportation projects, see the [US EPA’s Green Streets website](#)⁴², the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago’s [Technical Guidance Manual](#)⁴³, and the National Association of City Transportation Officials [Urban Street Stormwater Guide](#)⁴⁴.

Complete <TBD questions> on the <TBD tab> of the Application Workbook.

Freight movement

[Maintaining the region’s status as North America’s Freight hub](#)⁴⁵ is one of the recommendations of ON TO 2050. While some of the shared fund priority project types are specifically aimed at improving freight movement in the region (rail-highway grade crossings, and truck route improvements), other project types can also have substantial freight benefits.

Eligible projects will receive 3 points if they are located on a regional freight network, including the National Highway Freight Network, a designated Class I or Class II truck route, or a National Highway System Intermodal Freight Connector. <link(s) to map(s) of these networks to be added>

Eligible projects will also receive points if the sponsor or local jurisdiction (municipality, township, and/or county) in which they are located has adopted any of the below policies or procedures to improve truck routing and permitting and/or delivery management strategies to reduce negative impacts of freight. Points are cumulative, up to a maximum of 2 points.

⁴² <https://www.epa.gov/G3/learn-about-green-streets>

⁴³ <https://www.mwrd.org/irj/portal/anonymous/managementordinance>

⁴⁴ <https://nacto.org/publication/urban-street-stormwater-guide/>

⁴⁵ <https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/2050/mobility/freight>

| Freight policy or procedure | Points |
|---|---------------|
| Sponsor/local jurisdiction has an online truck permitting program | + 1 |
| Sponsor/local jurisdiction has one or more delivery management policies | + 1 |
| Sponsor has completed/participated in a truck routing study | + 1 |
| Sponsor has completed a systematic review of truck restrictions within their jurisdiction | + 1 |
| The project is identified in a local, county, or regional freight mobility plan | + 1 |

Projects in the categories below are eligible to receive these points.

| Project type(s) | Maximum freight policy points | Maximum freight network points |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Bridge rehab/reconstruction; Corridor/small area safety improvements; Road expansion; Road reconstruction | 2 | 3 |

Bicycle/pedestrian barrier elimination, bus speed improvements, highway-rail grade crossing improvements, transit station improvements, and truck route improvements projects are not eligible to receive freight planning factor points.

Complete <TBD questions> on the <TBD tab> of the Application Workbook.

Transit-supportive land use

ON TO 2050 includes the recommendation to [make transit more competitive](#)⁴⁶. Transit agencies cannot sustain fast, frequent, reliable service without accompanying supportive land use changes. Eligible projects receive points if they are located in areas where zoning and urban design requirements are transit-supportive. This will be scored as follows:

| Max Score | Criteria |
|------------------|--|
| 7 | <p>Up to 4.5 points will be awarded based on the permitted density for residential and non-residential land uses within one-half mile of the transit station. If more than one residential or non-residential classification is zoned within the station area, points will be assigned to the classification with the highest permitted density.</p> <p>Points will be assessed based on both residential <i>and</i> non-residential densities. If the two categories yield different point totals, the average of the two totals will be awarded.</p> |

⁴⁶ <https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/2050/mobility/transit>

| Max Score | Criteria | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------|-----|------------------|---|--------------|------------------|-----|---------------|------------------|-----|---------------|------------------|-----|------|----------------------|-----|
| | <p>Permitted Densities:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="532 264 1305 548"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="532 264 829 344">Residential (DU/buildable acre)</th> <th data-bbox="829 264 1114 344">Non-Residential (Building Height*)</th> <th data-bbox="1114 264 1305 344">Points</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="532 344 829 386">< 6</td> <td data-bbox="829 344 1114 386">1 story (12 ft.)</td> <td data-bbox="1114 344 1305 386">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="532 386 829 428">> 6 and ≤ 10</td> <td data-bbox="829 386 1114 428">2 story (24 ft.)</td> <td data-bbox="1114 386 1305 428">1.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="532 428 829 470">> 10 and ≤ 16</td> <td data-bbox="829 428 1114 470">3 story (36 ft.)</td> <td data-bbox="1114 428 1305 470">2.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="532 470 829 512">> 16 and ≤ 24</td> <td data-bbox="829 470 1114 512">4 story (48 ft.)</td> <td data-bbox="1114 470 1305 512">3.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="532 512 829 548">> 24</td> <td data-bbox="829 512 1114 548">> 4 story (> 48 ft.)</td> <td data-bbox="1114 512 1305 548">4.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="545 554 1273 590">*Building height given in feet based on 12 feet per story.</p> <p data-bbox="883 596 954 625">AND</p> <p data-bbox="407 632 1409 747">Up to 2.5 points will be awarded based on innovative parking requirements, which supports denser development by increasing space available for other uses (one point for each strategy implemented):</p> <ul data-bbox="456 793 1305 1060" style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced minimum parking requirements • Enacted maximum parking requirements • Shared parking permitted • In-lieu parking fees permitted • Enacted bicycle parking requirements • Off-street parking is required behind or underneath buildings • Off-street parking is permitted off-site | Residential (DU/buildable acre) | Non-Residential (Building Height*) | Points | < 6 | 1 story (12 ft.) | 0 | > 6 and ≤ 10 | 2 story (24 ft.) | 1.0 | > 10 and ≤ 16 | 3 story (36 ft.) | 2.0 | > 16 and ≤ 24 | 4 story (48 ft.) | 3.0 | > 24 | > 4 story (> 48 ft.) | 4.5 |
| Residential (DU/buildable acre) | Non-Residential (Building Height*) | Points | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| < 6 | 1 story (12 ft.) | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| > 6 and ≤ 10 | 2 story (24 ft.) | 1.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| > 10 and ≤ 16 | 3 story (36 ft.) | 2.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| > 16 and ≤ 24 | 4 story (48 ft.) | 3.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| > 24 | > 4 story (> 48 ft.) | 4.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.0 | <p data-bbox="407 1066 1398 1142">Up to 3 points will be awarded for the presence of mixed-use zoning within one-half mile of transit project (1 point for each strategy implemented):</p> <ul data-bbox="456 1188 1398 1455" style="list-style-type: none"> • Zoning allows vertical mixing of uses (e.g., residential units above ground-level retail or office). • Zoning allows pedestrian-friendly diverse land uses (e.g., drugstores, groceries, dry cleaning, banks, restaurants, gyms, hardware stores, etc.). • Zoning excludes car-dependent land uses (e.g., drive-through stores, strip malls, etc.). <p data-bbox="407 1501 1398 1608">Communities that have implemented form-based codes may require additional qualitative analysis from CMAP staff to ensure their zoning meets the above standards.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

CMAP staff will also consider additional information provided by applicants that notes where potential transit users within a ½ mile of a station or stop may be higher than the zoning might suggest.

Projects in the categories below are eligible to receive these points.

| Project type(s) | Maximum transit supportive density points |
|--|---|
| Bus speed improvements; Transit station improvements | 10 |

Bicycle/pedestrian barrier elimination, bridge rehab/reconstruction, corridor/small area safety improvements, highway-rail grade crossing improvements, road expansion; road reconstruction, and truck route improvements projects are not eligible to receive transit supportive density planning factor points.

Complete <TBD questions> on the <TBD tab> of the Application Workbook.

Subregional Priority

The CMAP region consists of eleven subregional councils of mayors and the City of Chicago. While the STP Shared Fund methodology captures priorities of the entire region, each subregion and Chicago also have unique priorities. In order to give consideration to those subregional priorities, each council and the City of Chicago (through CDOT) are asked to identify their five highest priority projects from the eligible applications received during the call for projects. These projects will be assigned subregional priority points as follows:

| Priority | Points |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| Highest priority | 5 |
| 2 nd highest priority | 4 |
| 3 rd highest priority | 3 |
| 4 th highest priority | 2 |
| 5 th highest priority | 1 |

Although it is anticipated that councils and CDOT will identify projects located within their borders, regardless of the sponsor agency, as their highest priorities, they may also identify priorities outside of their borders. To do so, they should provide a justification of the transportation benefit to their residents or to persons working or traveling within their subregion. Projects that are designated as priorities by more than one subregion will receive the combined points appropriate to the level of priority, up to a maximum of 5 points.

CMAP will provide the councils and CDOT with a list of eligible project applications received no later than 3 weeks after the close of the call for projects. The councils and CDOT will have no less than 3 additional weeks to identify their priorities. Initial project evaluation results will not be released prior to the identification of subregional priorities.

Councils and CDOT may also indicate at this time lack of support for non-municipally sponsored project applications falling wholly or partially within their boundaries. Lack of support will not cause a project application to be disregarded, however the lack of support will be communicated to the STP PSC for consideration.

Subregional priority is 5% of the total project score.

Project selection and programming process

Step 1: Call for Projects

CMAP staff will issue a call for projects in January of 2021, with a closing date in March 2021. This application booklet, which documents the application, scoring, and program development process has been provided, along with an *estimate* of funds available for programming during each year for which applications are being accepted, all application materials, and instructions for completing those materials. At least one training and information session for prospective applicants will be held, with an option for attending virtually, and a recording of that session will be made available on the call for projects website.

Step 2: Eligibility Screening

CMAP staff will review all applications to determine if the minimum eligibility criteria (minimum cost/multiple partners, completion of preliminary engineering, and inclusion in plans) have been met. A list of eligible applications will be published and provided to councils and CMAP for the assignment of subregional priority points. Sponsors of projects deemed to be ineligible will be notified that their application(s) will not be scored.

Step 3: Project Scoring

CMAP staff will score all applications using the methodology described in this application booklet. If staff requires additional information from an applicant to complete the scoring, the applicant will have no less than ten business days from the time staff requests the data to provide that data. In the event data is not provided in the original application or in response to a follow-up request, CMAP staff may award zero points for the criteria in question. Upon completion of the scoring, CMAP staff will publish all draft scores and provide a minimum of two weeks for applicants to request clarification of the calculated scores. No supplemental information will be accepted during this period, but staff may adjust scoring if application materials were mis-interpreted in any way. Following that two-week period, staff will develop final scores and project rankings.

Step 4: Draft Program Development

CMAP staff will determine the amount of funding anticipated to be available in each year, from FFY 2022 to FFY 2026, based on projected programming marks provided by IDOT (anticipated to be received by CMAP in January 2021), application of the shared fund set-asides contained in the October 2017 agreement between CDOT and the councils, and the current STP Shared Fund active program of projects. Starting with the highest ranked project application, CMAP staff will program projects in rank order, until all available funds are exhausted or until there are insufficient funds available to accommodate the requested funds. In doing so, the following considerations will be made:

- CMAP cannot program more funds in any single FFY than are estimated to be available in that FFY. Unprogrammed funds from one year are not available for programming in other years.

- Due to federal authorization procedures, no phase can be split across federal fiscal years, except in the case of projects that identified a staged construction plan in which all stages of construction meet state and federal requirements including having logical termini and independent utility (see “Staged Construction” additional information below).
- If all requested phases of a project cannot be fully funded within FFYs 2022 to 2026, CMAP staff will refer to the minimum acceptable funding indicated in the project application. If all phases of the project can be accommodated at the minimum acceptable funding level (or higher), the project will be programmed at those levels (see “Minimum Acceptable Funding” additional information below).
- If all requested phases of a project cannot be funded at the “minimum acceptable funding” levels, the entire project will be placed in the contingency program at the fully requested funding amounts. Both full funding and minimum acceptable funding will be considered when making active reprogramming decisions.
- If a project phase cannot be funded (fully or at the minimum acceptable level) in the year requested, but that phase, and all subsequent phases of the project can be funded in later years, it will be funded in the later years. Sponsors of projects in this situation will be asked to confirm acceptance of the revised schedule or will be placed in the contingency program.
- In no case will a project phase(s) be programmed in an earlier year than requested or with a smaller interval between phases than requested. For example, if ENG2 was requested in FFY 2022 and CON was requested in FFY 2024 (two-year interval), but ENG2 is programmed in FFY 2023, CON will not be programmed any earlier than two years later (FFY 2025).
- Full funding in later years will be considered before funding at the minimum acceptable (or higher) level.

Step 5: Public Comment

Following release of the draft staff recommended Active and Contingency programs, a public comment period of no less than 30 days will be held.

Step 6: Final Program Recommendation

Staff will provide the STP Project Selection Committee (PSC) with a final programming recommendation, based on the draft program and public comments. Following STP PSC action to recommend a final program, CMAP staff will prepare a TIP amendment(s) incorporating the STP PSC recommended program for consideration by the MPO Policy Committee and CMAP Board.

Step 7: Program Implementation

Following approval of the TIP amendment(s), implementation of the program according to [Active Program Management](#)⁴⁷ policies, will begin.

⁴⁷ <https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/931110/STP+APM+Policies+-+approved+9-25-18.pdf/9f751522-021c-a029-ca8f-c75ba9d13e41>

Staged Construction

Large, complex projects may be constructed in “stages” or “phases” due to cost or other factors when segments of the project have independent utility and logical termini, while also contributing to the function of the overall project. Typically, staged construction is identified during the NEPA process for the overall project. A project is not considered to be staged if separate NEPA documents or preliminary engineering was completed for the individual stages. Staged construction within the STP-SF program requires that each stage will be treated as an independent construction project, let separately, with unique state job, federal project, and construction contract numbers. As such, **each construction stage of a project will be evaluated as a separate application** and each stage may receive significantly different total scores based on the transportation impacts and planning factors that apply to each stage.

When calculating the total cost of all phases of the project for the improvement score for individual stage, costs for preliminary engineering (ENG1) and design engineering (ENG2) will not be prorated. Land acquisition costs (and points in the Project Readiness criterion) will be applied by stage, if stage-specific land acquisition data is provided by the applicant. Stages should be sequenced in the order in which they are proposed to be constructed, which may not be the order in which they are physically aligned.

Minimum Acceptable Funding

During the application process, sponsors may indicate if they are willing to accept less than full funding for a project or project phase. By providing a minimum acceptable funding amount, sponsors must agree that:

- They have local or other funds available to fill the funding gap. Those funds must be identified in the TIP when the MPO Policy Committee approves the STP Shared Fund active program in October. If STP-Local funds will be used to fill the funding gap, those funds must have been programmed in a prior STP-Local funding cycle or must be actively reprogrammed according to Active Program Management policies prior to MPO Policy Committee consideration of the STP Shared Fund active program in October.
- They will not be awarded any additional STP Shared funds under any active reprogramming actions allowed by the Active Program Management policies. However, they may reapply for additional STP Shared funds in future calls for projects, but any STP Shared funds already programmed will not be considered as “committed” funds during future calls.
- Projects funded at a minimum acceptable funding level will not be "made whole". When accepting a funding dollar amount, the applicant is accepting a set percentage share of STP Shared funds. If the total project or project phase cost changes over time, whether increasing or decreasing, the percentage share of STP Shared funds will remain constant and will not be increased or decreased. For example, if \$5 million in STP-SF is programmed for a \$10 million project, the ratio is 50%. If the cost of the project increased to \$12 million, 50% would be \$6 million, therefore a \$1 million increase could be requested. If the cost of the project decreased to \$8 million, the STP-SF programmed would be decreased to \$4 million.

- Financial commitment points will be calculated based on the full requested amount of STP Shared funds. These points will *not* be recalculated if a project is funded at the minimum acceptable level.

Projects being considered for staged construction must provide a minimum acceptable funding amount for each stage for which the sponsor wishes to be considered for less than full funding.

Selection Process Timeline

The timeline below represents the general flow of the application and approval process. Specific deadlines will be determined and released with the call for projects.

| Tentative Schedule (all dates in 2021) | Action |
|---|--|
| Early January | Call for projects open |
| Early March | Applications due |
| Early April | Summary of applications available |
| Late April | Deadline for councils and CDOT to submit subregional priority point allocations |
| June | Evaluation results and preliminary scores available for applicant review |
| June – July | Draft program development and public comment |
| July – August | Public comment |
| August | Final program development |
| Early September | STP Project Selection Committee considers final program for approval |
| Late September | CMAP Transportation Committee considers TIP changes incorporating approved program |
| October | MPO Policy Committee and CMAP Board consider final approval of TIP changes for the program |

Application Checklist

The application process is completed online using CMAP’s eTIP database. Please ensure the following steps are completed.

- Creation of project application in eTIP with project work types, location, and financial information
- GATA registration completed (except projects to be processed through FTA)
- Application Workbook – sections specific to the project type are completed and the entire workbook is uploaded to eTIP
- Quarterly Status Update form completed and uploaded to eTIP

- Detailed cost estimate completed and uploaded to eTIP

All forms are available at <link to be added>. Applications submitted that are missing any of the following will not be considered for funding:

- Project financing & funding request in eTIP, detailing all project phases
- Completed Application Workbook (MS Excel format)

For any other missing information, CMAP staff or the applicant's Planning Liaison will contact the applicant and the applicant will have no less than ten business days from the time of the request to provide that data.

Contact Information

If you have a question or need assistance, please review the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on the Call for Projects web page <link to be added>, contact your [Planning Liaison](#)⁴⁸, or contact [Kama Dobbs](#)⁴⁹, CMAP's program manager for the STP Shared Fund.

⁴⁸ <https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/0/Municipalities+by+Council+07-14-20.pdf/71fb1f5c-4dae-9ac0-0a99-4cce0e33f8c5>

⁴⁹ kdobbs@cmap.illinois.gov or 312.386.8710