



CMAP BOARD

AGENDA - FINAL

Wednesday, June 10, 2026

9:30 AM

**Cook County Conference Room
433 West Van Buren Street, Suite 450
Chicago, IL 60607**

Members of the public who attend in-person can pre-register for a visitor's pass at info@cmap.illinois.gov until June 9, 2026, at 4:00 p.m. or should plan to arrive early to check-in with the building's information desk for access.

You can also join from your computer, tablet or smartphone.

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/82917643166?pwd=T5D697gzTxXjvaPBrescB9BeRxuTB1.1>

Conference Call number: 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

Meeting ID: 829 1764 3166 Passcode: 056489

CMAP provides the opportunity for public comments by emailing info@cmap.illinois.gov. Individuals are encouraged to submit written public comments. Public comments received at least 24 hours before the meeting will be shared at the meeting (as time allows) and incorporated into the meeting minutes. Written comments received less than 24 hours before the meeting will be retained and available upon request.

The total cumulative time for public comment is limited to 15 minutes, unless determined otherwise by the Chair. Public comment is limited to three minutes per person unless the Chair designates a longer or shorter time period. Public comments will be invited in this order: Comments from in person attendees submitted ahead of time; comments from in-person attendees not previously submitted; comments from virtual attendees submitted ahead of time; and comments from virtual attendees not previously submitted.

To review CMAP's public participation policy, please visit <https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/committees>

If you require a reasonable accommodation or language interpretation services to attend or join the meeting, please contact CMAP at least five days before the meeting by email (info@cmap.illinois.gov) or phone (312-454-0400).

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions**2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements****2.01 Executive Director's report****[26-148](#)**

PURPOSE & ACTION: An update of notable activities of the agency and the Executive Director.

ACTION REQUESTED: Information

Attachments: [Memo - Executive Director report](#)

CONSENT AGENDA**3.0 Approval of Minutes****3.01 Minutes from May 13, 2025****[26-150](#)**

PURPOSE & ACTION: Review and approval of meeting minutes.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval

Attachments: [5.13.2026 CMAP Board meeting minutes draft](#)

4.0 Approval of Line of Credit report**4.01 Report on Line of Credit (LOC) utilization****[26-151](#)**

PURPOSE & ACTION: In accordance with the controls governing borrowing under the Line of Credit (LOC), a report on LOC utilization is provided.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval

Attachments: [Memo - Report on Line of Credit \(LOC\) utilization](#)

5.0 Procurements and Contract Approvals**5.01 Authorization to pre-approve 63 vendors to bid on scopes of work to perform Project Consulting Services****[26-171](#)**

PURPOSE & ACTION: CMAP is seeking to pre-qualify 63 firms for Project Consulting Services under 14 Service Areas for a period of three (3) years with two (2) one-year options for renewal.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval

Attachments: [Memo - Authorization to pre-approve vendors to bid on Project Consulting Services](#)

REGULAR AGENDA

6.0 Other Items for Approval

6.01 Release draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for public comment

[26-169](#)

PURPOSE & ACTION: The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which is due in October 2026, builds on ON TO 2050 and will serve as the long-term transportation policy and investment framework for northeastern Illinois. The project team will present the components of the draft plan - including the socioeconomic forecast, financial plan, regional capital projects, and policy advancements - and seek approval to release the plan for the public comment period, anticipated to run from June 12 through July 31.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval

Attachments: [Memo - Release draft Regional Transportation Plan \(RTP\) for public comment](#)

7.0 Information Items

7.01 The Century Plan update

[26-164](#)

PURPOSE & ACTION: The Board will receive an update on the development of the Century Plan and hear about notable challenges and opportunities that are emerging as priorities for regional coordination.

ACTION REQUESTED: Information

Attachments: [Memo - The Century Plan update](#)

7.02 Legislative update

[26-163](#)

PURPOSE & ACTION: An update on recent state legislative activity by the CMAP intergovernmental affairs team.

ACTION REQUESTED: Information

Attachments: [Memo - Legislative update](#)

8.0 Other Business

9.0 Public Comment

This is an opportunity for comments from members of the audience.

10.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for September 9, 2026.

11.0 Adjournment



Chicago Metropolitan
Agency for Planning

433 West Van Buren Street
Suite 450
Chicago, IL 60607
312-454-0400
cmap.illinois.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: CMAP Board
From: Erin Aleman, Executive Director
Date: June 2026
Subject: Executive Director's report
Action requested: Information

Dear Board Members,

This report provides an update ahead of our June meeting with the goal of greater transparency to CMAP's work and to supplement the agenda.

Should you have questions regarding this report, please feel free to reach out to me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Erin Aleman'.

Erin Aleman

June Board meeting

The Board will meet on June 10th.

On the agenda, the Board will be asked to approve the draft 2026 Regional Transportation Plan for public comment. The Transportation Committee approved this at their May meeting.

If approved for release, the draft RTP will be made available for public comment, which is anticipated to run from June 12 through July 31. A public hearing is scheduled for Thursday, August 6, from 3:00 to 4:30 p.m. at CMAP's office in the Old Post Office.

The Century Plan team will also provide an update on the challenges and opportunities that are emerging as priorities for regional coordination: infrastructure, drinking water, the electric grid, housing supply, and open space.

We will also have an update on state legislation as the spring session recently came to a close.

We look forward to seeing you on June 10th.

CMAP federal certification

In January, CMAP underwent its federal certification review, a required review that occurs every four years to ensure our metropolitan transportation planning process meets federal standards for Transportation Management Areas.

FHWA and FTA jointly notified CMAP and IDOT that the Chicago IL, TMA's metropolitan transportation planning process meets federal requirements and is certified.

There were no corrective actions identified or issued in the report.

CMAP was commended for:

- Its Performance Measures Dashboard and regionally significant project benefits report
- Certification Review webpage
- Facilitating the Corridor Development Office (CDO) for the I-290/Blue Line project and encouraged CMAP to use this model for similar projects
- Collaboration with IDOT and Illinois MPOs on statewide eTIP deployment
- For developing detailed programming documents for STP, CMAQ, and TA programs
- The RTP, Congestion Management Process, Freight engagement webpages, and centralized committee materials are notable practices

Recommendations included:

- Supporting a smooth transition from RTA to NITA

- Improving clarity and consistency in the Unified Work Program (UWP)
- Strengthening coordination with IDOT and other MPOs
- Enhancing performance-based planning and target setting
- Increasing transparency and clarity in the TIP
- Advancing freight planning priorities

CMAP 2026 Technical Assistance Call for Projects recommended awards

The CMAP Technical Assistance and the Regional Transit Authority Community Planning programs support communities by offering planning and implementation assistance, providing interagency expertise, leverage the region’s transit network, and building local government capacity. This work aligns with the comprehensive plan for the region, ON TO 2050, and the regional transit strategic plan, Invest in Transit.

In conjunction with the RTA’s Community Planning program, CMAP held a call for new technical assistance projects in spring 2026. Applications were due on April 17, 2026, and CMAP and the RTA received a combined 54 applications from 46 different applicants.

Staff evaluated applications against five application strengths.

- Achieves the goals associated with the sought-after type of assistance.
- Strengthens planning capacity.
- Increases community engagement and empowerment.
- Implements previously developed local plans.
- Facilitates collaboration across jurisdictions.

Staff also solicited input on the applications from many groups, including the transit service boards, County planning and transportation departments, and partner technical assistance providers. Staff conducted interviews with selected applicants to further understand the potential scope of work and resource requirements.

Twenty-six projects were selected for inclusion in the 2026 project group. Awarded projects will begin in FY2027, with Wave One projects kicking off first, followed by Wave Two. These projects meet many of the identified application strengths, and all have strong transportation ties. Projects include five ADA self-evaluation and transition plans, seven capital improvement plans, and three bicycle and pedestrian plans. Information on the recommended projects is below.

Staff project recommendations		
Community	Project type	Project Kickoff Wave
Monee	ADA self-evaluation and transition plan	Wave One
Bannockburn	ADA self-evaluation and transition plan	Wave One
Berkeley	ADA self-evaluation and transition plan	Wave One
East Dundee	ADA self-evaluation and transition plan	Wave Two
Franklin Park	ADA self-evaluation and transition plan	Wave Two
Berwyn	Bicycle and pedestrian plan	Wave Two
Winfield	Bicycle and pedestrian plan	Wave Two
Lake Villa	Bicycle and pedestrian plan	Wave One
Diamond	Capital improvement plan	Wave Two
Indian Head Park	Capital improvement plan	Wave Two
Pingree Grove	Capital improvement plan	Wave Two
Richton Park	Capital improvement plan	Wave Two
South Chicago Heights	Capital improvement plan	Wave Two
Summit	Capital improvement plan	Wave Two
University Park	Capital improvement plan	Wave Two
Lockport	Corridor plan (159 th Street)	Wave Two
Plainfield	Corridor plan (Lockport Street / Main Street)	Wave One

Addison	Local road safety plan	Wave Two
Clarendon Hills	Local road safety plan	Wave One
Hanover Park	NEXT	Wave Two
Wauconda	NEXT	Wave One
Woodridge	NEXT	Wave One
Minooka	Node-oriented development plan	Wave One
Arlington Heights	Travel choice pilot plan	Wave Two
Park Forest	Travel choice pilot plan	Wave Two
Sugar Grove	Travel choice pilot plan	Wave One

Follow-up communication regarding application status will be provided to all applicants, and staff will begin initiation of technical assistance projects with awardees in July 2026.

Community Advisory Committee

CMAP’s [Community Advisory Committee](#) met June 2 with new members representing nine organizations from the region in varied sectors – community, housing, education, industry, tourism, transportation, and accessibility. The CAC provides community-focused perspectives to inform CMAP’s initiatives, expand the agency’s understanding of community issues, and articulate local and regional challenges and opportunities. The Community Advisory Committee was created to provide continuous and balanced public representation in the development of regional plans and policies, as required by the Illinois Regional Planning Act, and considered the Regional Transportation Plan at their June 2 meeting.

FY2026 community cohorts

CMAP uses the [Community Cohort Evaluation Tool](#) to assess local capacity and technical assistance needs, ensuring fair project selection and funding. The tool groups the region’s 284 municipalities and Chicago’s 77 community areas into four cohorts based on population, income, tax base per capita, and the share of residents living in [disinvested areas](#). Cohorts are updated each April to reflect changing community conditions.

CMAP has published the [FY2026 community cohorts](#). Cohort assignments are based on a three-year rolling average of annual overall scores to reduce year-to-year fluctuations. The FY2026 scores were averaged with those from FY2025 and FY2024 to determine final cohort placement.



433 West Van Buren Street
Suite 450
Chicago, IL 60607

312-454-0400
cmap.illinois.gov

CMAP BOARD

MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

9:30 AM

Cook County Conference Room
433 West Van Buren Street, Suite 450
Chicago, IL 60607

Members of the public who attend in-person can pre-register for a visitor's pass at info@cmap.illinois.gov until May 12, 2026, at 4:00 p.m. or should plan to arrive early to check-in with the building's information desk for access.

You can also join from your computer, tablet or smartphone.

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/82917643166?pwd=T5D697gzTxXjvaPBrescB9BeRxuTB1.1>

Conference Call number: 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

Meeting ID: 829 1764 3166 Passcode: 056489

CMAP provides the opportunity for public comment. Individuals are encouraged to submit comment by email to info@cmap.illinois.gov at least 24 hours before the meeting. A record of all written public comments will be maintained and made publicly available.

The total cumulative time for public comment is limited to 15 minutes, unless determined otherwise by the Chair. Public comment is limited to three minutes per person unless the Chair designates a longer or shorter time period. Public comments will be invited in this order: Comments from in person attendees submitted ahead of time; comments from in-person attendees not previously submitted; comments from virtual attendees submitted ahead of time; and comments from virtual attendees not previously submitted.

To review CMAP's public participation policy, please visit <https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/committees>.

If you require a reasonable accommodation or language interpretation services to attend or join the meeting, please contact CMAP at least five days before the meeting by email (info@cmap.illinois.gov) or phone (312-454-0400).

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

Mayor Bennett called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.

Present: Gerald Bennett, Frank Beal, Matthew Brolley, Jada Curry, Gary Grasso, Paul Hoefert, Nina Idemudia, John Noak, Nancy Rotering, Joanna Ruiz, Carolyn Schofield, Anne Sheahan, Matthew Walsh and Jung Yoon

Absent: Richard Reinbold

Non-Voting: Kouros Mohammadian

Noting a physical quorum of the Board, Chair Bennett reported requests were received from Members Matt Brolley, Paul Hoefert, John Noak, Carolyn Schofield, and Jung Yoon to attend the meeting virtually in compliance with the Open Meets Act. A vote is needed to approve their virtual attendance.

A motion was made by Member Gary Grasso, seconded by Member Nancy Rotering, to permit Members Matt Brolley, Paul Hoefert, John Noak, Carolyn Schofield, and Jung Yoon to participate in the meeting in accordance with Open Meetings Act requirements. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: Gerald Bennett, Frank Beal, Jada Curry, Gary Grasso, Nina Idemudia, Nancy Rotering, Joanna Ruiz, Anne Sheahan and Matthew Walsh

Absent: Richard Reinbold

Non-Voting: Kouros Mohammadian

Not Present: Matthew Brolley, Paul Hoefert, John Noak, Carolyn Schofield and Jung Yoon

Staff present: Erin Aleman, Bill Barnes, Nora Beck, Vas Boykovskyy, Elizabeth Ginsberg, Ryan Gougis, Craig Hamill, Kasia Hart, Aimee Lee, Maren Lutterbach, Stephane Phifer, George Rivera, Charlie Rotering, Kyle Schulz, Jennie Vana, Blanca Vela-Schneider, Elizabeth Scott, Ismet Sulamc, Claire Williams

Others present: Garland Armstrong, Eric Czarnota, Rithvika Dara, Heidi Files, Dan Forbush, Danielle Hamer, Gretchen Klock, David Kovarik, Brian Larson, Heidi Lichtenberger, Brittany Matyas, Stacey Paradis, Andrew Plenge, Mark Pruitt, Leslie Rauer, Vicky Smith, Joe Surdam

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no changes to the agenda.

2.01 Executive Director’s report

[26-109](#)

Attachments: [Memo - Executive Director report](#)

Erin Aleman provided an update on recent activities of the agency. She reported on her trip to Washington, D.C. for the Coalition for America’s Gateways and Trade Corridors meeting, where she serves as board chair during the organization’s 25th anniversary year. While there, she also met with Senator Duckworth to discuss infrastructure funding and the federal transportation reauthorization bill.

The Executive Director also shared insights from a study trip to the Netherlands focused on bicycling infrastructure, multimodal mobility, and integrated approaches to housing and transportation investment. She noted that the Netherlands’ coordinated land use and affordability strategies offer lessons relevant to CMAP’s Century Plan work.

Erin Aleman announced the release of the My Daily Travel Survey Analysis, now available on CMAP’s Data Hub. The findings highlight increased midday travel, continued telecommuting, and longer trip lengths compared with pre-pandemic patterns. She noted that staff can assist members in interpreting these trends locally.

Director Aleman furthermore informed the Board that Safe Streets and Roads for All funding is open for applications, with many communities eligible due to CMAP’s regional safety action plans. She also congratulated CMAP’s communications team for receiving a national award for the Safe Travel for All website and related outreach.

In addition, she announced the publication of the updated 2026 Land Use Inventory, incorporating 2023 parcel data to support long-range regional forecasting.

Erin Aleman concluded by highlighting recent Century Plan Catalyst Series events on industrial development, climate action, and water governance and emphasized that energy and water infrastructure continue to emerge as top regional priorities and will be central components of the Century Plan moving forward.

The Executive Director's report was presented.

CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of the Group Vote

A motion was made by Member Nancy Rotering, seconded by Member Nina Idemudia, to approve agenda items 3.01 through 4.01 under the Consent Agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: Gerald Bennett, Frank Beal, Matthew Brolley, Jada Curry, Gary Grasso, Paul Hoefert, Nina Idemudia, John Noak, Nancy Rotering, Joanna Ruiz, Carolyn Schofield, Anne Sheahan and Matthew Walsh

Absent: Richard Reinbold

Non-Voting: Kouros Mohammadian

Not Present: Jung Yoon

3.0 Approval of Minutes

3.01 Minutes from April 8, 2026

[26-111](#)

Attachments: [4.8.26 CMAP Board meeting minutes draft](#)

Agenda items 3.01 through 4.01 were approved under the Consent Agenda.

4.0 Other Items for Approval

4.01 Report on Line of Credit (LOC) utilization

[26-110](#)

Attachments: [Memo - Report on Line of Credit \(LOC\) utilization](#)

Agenda items 3.01 through 4.01 were approved under the Consent Agenda.

REGULAR AGENDA

5.0 Information Items

5.01 Comprehensive Climate Action Plan (CCAP) update

[26-120](#)

Attachments: [Memo - CCAP update](#)

Nora Beck, principal in the Regional Policy and Implementation Division, presented an overview of the Comprehensive Climate Action Plan for Greater Chicago and provided an update on its release and next steps. The plan was developed in partnership with the Metropolitan Mayors Caucus and the Northwest Indiana Regional Planning Commission and was formally submitted to the U.S. EPA's Climate Pollution Reduction Grant Program, which funded the work, and has now been publicly released on CMAP's website.

Beck explained that the plan offers a data-driven roadmap to reduce regional greenhouse gas emissions by 86 percent by 2050 through more than 30 strategies across multiple sectors. She emphasized that the analysis shows that state and local action alone can achieve a substantial portion of needed reductions - up to 58 percent - demonstrating that meaningful progress does not rely solely on federal intervention.

Nora Beck provided additional detail on the central role of the electric grid, noting that nearly every major strategy in the plan depends on a grid that is both cleaner and more capable of meeting rising demand driven by building electrification, electric vehicles, and industrial transitions. She explained that generation, transmission, and distribution systems operate on different timelines and under different authorities, which makes coordinated planning critical. She also highlighted emerging uncertainty created by rapid growth in energy-intensive sectors, such as data centers and advanced manufacturing, and stressed the importance of local decisions in shaping energy demand through land use, building practices, and distributed energy resources.

Nora Beck then focused on the buildings sector, which currently accounts for roughly 35 percent of the region's emissions. She explained that buildings are one of the most actionable sectors because state and local governments already control many of the policy levers involved. The plan identifies three major components of the building transition: electrification, energy efficiency, and improved building codes and performance standards. She noted that state and local action alone could achieve 77 percent of the reductions needed from buildings by 2050. She also outlined how municipalities can lead by example through public building retrofits, support implementation by removing local barriers to solar, storage, and EV infrastructure, and advocate for statewide policies that help scale these efforts.

Throughout the presentation, she emphasized that implementation will require not only policy alignment, but also funding, technical assistance, and peer support. Many tools already exist - including utility programs, state financing, and regional networks - but need stronger regional coordination. Beck concluded by highlighting that the plan's findings align closely with ongoing Century Plan engagement, particularly around energy reliability, equitable implementation, and long-term resilience.

Board members engaged in a detailed discussion on topics such as the limits of local versus regional control over transmission, opportunities for battery storage, affordability concerns, implications for

housing costs, incentives for rooftop solar on commercial buildings, and the role of CMAP's technical assistance in supporting coordinated climate action.

The CCAP update was presented.

5.02 The Century Plan update

[26-118](#)

Attachments: [Memo - The Century Plan update](#)

The Board participated in an extended panel discussion on regional energy challenges, grid modernization, and implications for economic competitiveness. The panel featured Mark Pruitt, principal of The Power Bureau and former director of the Illinois Power Agency; Desislava Dikova of Pure Lithium, a battery researcher and policy lead; Commissioner Stacey Paradis of the Illinois Commerce Commission; and Andrew Plenge, Vice President of Strategy and Energy Policy at ComEd.

The panel discussed why energy and grid modernization have become urgent priorities across the CMAP region. Panelists agreed that electrification, climate pressures, data center growth, and increased reliance on digital infrastructure are creating rapid load growth, while grid components - generation, transmission, and distribution - operate under different regulatory and investment timelines. They emphasized that grid modernization requires coordinated planning and significant investment to maintain reliability, manage peak demand, and enable economic development.

(CMAP Board Member Jung Yoon joined the meeting at 10:19 a.m.)

Mark Pruitt highlighted the region's emerging capacity constraints, noting that while Illinois historically exported power, retirements of large power plants have shifted the balance. He stressed that without sufficient capacity, the region risks losing opportunities for new housing, industrial development, and data centers. He also noted the long lead times required to build new utility scale resources and encouraged municipalities to deepen their understanding of reliability standards, hosting capacity maps, and local substation impacts.

Commissioner Paradis addressed the regulatory landscape, explaining that energy prices and system adequacy have become central policy issues nationwide. She outlined the state's new responsibilities under recently passed legislation, including the development of a statewide integrated resource plan and the need to coordinate electric and gas system planning. She emphasized affordability as the ICC's top concern and underscored the importance of accurate load forecasting to prevent under or overbuilding system infrastructure.

Desi Dikova spoke about the potential role of advanced battery storage in strengthening the grid. She described Pure Lithium's high density battery chemistry and vertically integrated domestic supply chain model, noting that the technology could support microgrids, resilience hubs, and decentralized energy solutions if scaled with appropriate public sector support.

Andrew Plenge discussed ComEd's investments in modern distribution technologies, distributed generation integration, and demand side management programs. He highlighted Illinois' strong position relative to other metropolitan areas, noting high reliability and competitive rates, while acknowledging system pressures from largescale users and climate driven weather events. He encouraged municipalities to engage early with ComEd when considering new developments, rooftop solar, or energy intensive land uses to ensure accurate cost and capacity assessments.

Throughout the discussion, Board members raised questions about data center siting, local zoning authority, the tradeoff between solar farms and other land uses, the public’s understanding of energy infrastructure, and how CMAP can support municipalities with technical guidance. Panelists underscored that local governments are uniquely positioned to educate residents, streamline permitting, integrate land use and energy planning, and advocate for their communities in state level processes.

The panel concluded by emphasizing that coordinated action - across utilities, regulators, local governments, and regional partners - is essential to maintaining affordability, achieving climate goals, and preparing the region for long-term economic growth.

(CMAP Board Member Nancy Rotering left the meeting at 10:45 a.m.)

The Century Plan update was presented.

5.03 Legislative update

[26-117](#)

Attachments: [Memo - Legislative update](#)

A substantial legislative update was provided in the Board’s agenda packet; no verbal presentation was given during the meeting.

The legislative update was received and filed.

6.0 Other Business

There was no other business before the CMAP Board.

Member Nina Idemudia requested that future panels include community-based and diverse perspectives, noting that the discussion had not addressed environmental justice, land use, or impacts on vulnerable communities. She emphasized the importance of grounding expert panels in CMAP’s values and incorporating social, political, and demographic context to provide a fuller picture.

7.0 Public Comment

This is an opportunity for comments from members of the audience.

Garland Armstrong commented on the importance of ensuring that ADA communities are included in discussions about energy, infrastructure, and preparedness and encouraged CMAP to conduct outreach and provide information in accessible formats and multiple languages.

8.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for June 10, 2026.

9.0 Adjournment

A motion was made by Member Gary Grasso, seconded by Member Frank Beal, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: Gerald Bennett, Frank Beal, Matthew Brolley, Jada Curry, Gary Grasso, Paul Hoefert, Nina Idemudia, John Noak, Joanna Ruiz, Carolyn Schofield, Anne Sheahan, Matthew Walsh and Jung Yoon

Absent: Richard Reinbold

Non-Voting: Kouros Mohammadian

Not Present: Nancy Rotering

The meeting was adjourned at 11:03 a.m.

Minutes prepared by Maren Lutterbach using Microsoft Copilot M365.



MEMORANDUM

To: CMAP Board

From: Vas Boykovskyy, Deputy of Finance

Date: June 10, 2026

Subject: Report on Line of Credit (LOC) utilization

Action Requested: Approval

Purpose

In accordance with the controls governing borrowing under the Line of Credit (LOC), a report on LOC utilization is provided.

There was no utilization of the LOC.

By approving this item, the Board acknowledges the LOC utilization status as of today, June 10, 2026.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval



MEMORANDUM

To: CMAP Board

From: Stephane Phifer, Deputy of Planning

Date: June 10, 2026

Subject: Authorization to pre-approve 63 vendors to bid on scopes of work to perform Project Consulting Services

Action Requested: Approval

Purpose

CMAP is seeking to prequalify 63 firms under 14 Service Areas as a result of the formal RFQ process for Project Consulting Services. RFQ 341 invited firms to submit qualifications for at least one of the service areas listed below. The individual service areas are:

- **SERVICE AREA 1:** ADA public right-of-way self-evaluation and transition plans
- **SERVICE AREA 2:** Bicycle and pedestrian-focused transportation plans / supplemental support
- **SERVICE AREA 3:** Capital improvement planning
- **SERVICE AREA 4:** Consensus-based stakeholder communications and engagement strategy development and management
- **SERVICE AREA 5:** Land use plans
- **SERVICE AREA 6:** Local road safety plans/ Safety action plans / supplemental support
- **SERVICE AREA 7:** Market and demographic analysis
- **SERVICE AREA 8:** Pavement management planning
- **SERVICE AREA 9:** Planning renderings, illustrations, drawings, and graphic design
- **SERVICE AREA 10:** Regional policy analysis
- **SERVICE AREA 11:** Transportation modeling and technical analyses
- **SERVICE AREA 12:** Transportation plans
- **SERVICE AREA 13:** Travel activity data capture and processing by camera and other detection devices
- **SERVICE AREA 14:** Water quality

Background

Each year projects are identified to determine how much work will occur across the northern Illinois region, within service areas as listed above. CMAP anticipates approximately ten (10) or more projects will be issued per year as a result of RFQ 341. However, projects depend on many factors, such as available funding, and CMAP makes no guarantee of a minimum quantity or value for the anticipated projects. As projects progress and consultant assistance needs within a Service Area are identified, project authorization orders (PAOs) will be compiled and CMAP will transmit requests for bids to all firms who have been prequalified under the applicable Service Area. Contractor or firm selection for each PAO will be based upon cost, best overall value, project understanding, and reference verification.

For each project, the firm will work directly for CMAP, although interaction with the local project sponsor (typically a municipality) will often be needed as well. Projects may consist of a single community, a subarea, or a multijurisdictional project. The specific communities where the work will be conducted will be determined by CMAP as projects advance.

Procurement process

A formal Request for Qualifications was posted to CMAP's Procurement site, and direct communication was sent to all firms registered to receive updates regarding CMAP procurement opportunities.

The key dates were as follows:

RFQ Release	February 20 th , 2026
Pre-Submittal Meeting (optional)	February 25 th , 2026, at 1:00 PM Central Time
Deadline for Questions	March 4 th at 3:00 PM Central Time
Submission deadline	March 25 th at 3:00 PM Central Time
Estimated award recommendation	June 17 th , 2026

As a result of the solicitation process, CMAP received 346 responses to the RFQ, submitted by 104 unique vendors.

PLEASE NOTE: Following the submission deadline, but prior to the review of submitted responses, CMAP determined it will not move forward with contracting through this RFQ for Service Area 8: Pavement management planning.

Evaluation and Recommendation for Selection

CMAP received 346 responses to the RFQ, submitted by 104 unique vendors. RFQ submissions were reviewed by individual Service Area evaluation panels composed of CMAP staff, who scored each proposal independently based on the evaluation criteria included in the RFQ as shown in the below tables. Proposals were assessed based on the following criteria:

- 1) Firm capability
Overview of the firm's qualifications to provide the services and complete the projects and tasks as described in the Service Area description.
- 2) Project approach
The firm approaches the projects and tasks as described in the Service Area

description.

- 3) Public engagement approach (if applicable)
A summary explaining the firm’s philosophy toward public engagement and provide clear examples of how the firm’s project tasks, activities, or events demonstrate that philosophy in action. (PLEASE NOTE: This is not applicable to the following Service Areas: 7, 9, 10, 11, 13)
- 4) Working with agencies similar to CMAP or completing similar scopes of work
A practical explanation of how the firm will work and coordinate with CMAP staff, including explaining the firm’s understanding of the role of client in the projects and tasks as described in the Service Area description.
- 5) Project team resumes
Resumes of project team members who would work on projects and tasks as listed in the specific Service Area description.
- 6) Project examples
3 project examples demonstrate experience completing tasks and projects as described in the Service Area description.

The maximum possible points for each criterion are shown in the tables below.

Evaluation Factor Table 1:

Service Areas requiring a public engagement approach: (Service Areas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 14)	
Evaluation Factor	Max Points
Firm capability (15%)	15
Project approach (30%)	30
Public engagement approach (10%)	10
Working with CMAP or similar agencies (5%)	5
Project team resumes (15%)	15
Project examples (25%)	25
TOTAL	100

Evaluation Factor Table 2:

Service Areas <u>not</u> requiring a public engagement approach: (Service Areas 7, 9, 10, 11, 13)	
Evaluation Factor	Max Points
Firm capability (20%)	20
Project approach (30%)	30
Working with CMAP or similar agencies (5%)	5
Project team resumes (15%)	15
Project examples (30%)	30
TOTAL	100

The overall evaluation scores and overall assessment of submitted responses are included in **Attachment 1**. The evaluation panels considered the consultant score along with anticipated

project needs, recommending between 5 and 14 consultants for prequalification in the different Service Areas, as provided in **Table 3**.

Table 3: Consultants recommended for service area prequalification:

1) <u>AECOM: 3, 6, 7, 12</u>	15) <u>Conlon Public Strategy: 10</u>	30) <u>High Street: 3</u>	46) <u>Oates 1</u>
2) <u>Antero Group: 3, 4, 5</u>	16) <u>Design Workshop: 5, 9, 10</u>	31) <u>Horizon 54: 4</u>	47) <u>Parametrix: 2, 3, 11, 12</u>
3) <u>Arcadis: 2, 10, 11</u>	17) <u>DLZ: 11, 13</u>	32) <u>HR Green: 3, 14</u>	48) <u>Psomas: 1, 9</u>
4) <u>Baxter & Woodman: 3, 14</u>	18) <u>EBP: 7</u>	33) <u>ICF: 10</u>	49) <u>R.M. Chin: 4</u>
5) <u>Benesch: 1, 2</u>	19) <u>ECT: 14</u>	34) <u>Jacobs: 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 12</u>	50) <u>RSG: 11</u>
6) <u>Borderless Studio: 4, 9</u>	20) <u>Egret & Ox Planning: 5</u>	35) <u>Jasculca Terman: 4</u>	51) <u>SB Friedman: 7, 10</u>
7) <u>Buro Happold: 7, 10</u>	21) <u>Epstein: 2, 12</u>	36) <u>Kimley-Horn: 1, 11</u>	52) <u>Smith Group: 5, 6, 12</u>
8) <u>Cambridge Systematics: 6, 11, 12</u>	22) <u>ESI: 7</u>	37) <u>KPMG: 7, 10, 11</u>	53) <u>Spheros: 14</u>
9) <u>Canete Medina: 7</u>	23) <u>Estolano Advisors: 4</u>	38) <u>LJC: 5, 9</u>	54) <u>SRF: 6, 11</u>
10) <u>Cascadia: 10</u>	24) <u>Foursquare ITP: 2, 4</u>	39) <u>Lochner: 2</u>	55) <u>Stanley Consultants: 6</u>
11) <u>CDM Smith: 10, 12</u>	25) <u>Geosyntec: 10, 14</u>	40) <u>MIG: 5, 7</u>	56) <u>Stantec: 5, 6, 7, 12</u>
12) <u>Civiltech: 1, 9, 11, 12, 13</u>	26) <u>Gewalt Hamilton: 3, 13</u>	41) <u>MK Corona: 10</u>	57) <u>Terra:13</u>
13) <u>Cole & Associates: 1</u>	27) <u>Greenprint Partners: 4, 9</u>	42) <u>MKSK: 5</u>	58) <u>Teska Associates: 5</u>
14) <u>Collabo: 9</u>	28) <u>HDR: 1</u>	43) <u>Morreale: 4</u>	59) <u>Toole Design 2, 6, 9</u>
	29) <u>Hey and Associates: 14</u>	44) <u>Muse: 4, 5, 9</u>	60) <u>TY Lin: 1, 2, 6, 10, 12</u>
		45) <u>NN Engineering: 2, 6, 10, 11, 12</u>	61) <u>Urban: Works 5, 9</u>
			62) <u>Vitruvian 1</u>
			63) <u>WSP: 3, 11, 1</u>

Attachments:

Attachment 1: Firm Evaluation and Scoring Details



Attachment 1: Firm Evaluation and Scoring Details

SERVICE AREA 1: ADA public right-of-way self-evaluation and transition plans

Service Area 1 description:

These projects seek to assist local municipalities develop and implement ADA transition plans and self-evaluations in compliance with Title II requirements, specifically focused on public rights-of-way. Projects require:

- Measuring, inventorying, analyzing, and prioritizing public ROW components and their compliance status
- Development of grievance procedures
- Robust public outreach
- Integration of recommended ADA infrastructure improvements into existing capital improvement plans and municipal budgeting processes

Service Area 1 recommendations for pre-qualification summary:

Nineteen (19) responses were submitted for Service Area 1. The evaluation team determined that prequalifying nine (9) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Benesch, Civiltech, Cole & Associates, HDR, Kimley-Horn, Oates, Psomas, TY Lin, and Vitruvian Planning.

Several of the firms not recommended for prequalification demonstrated impressive experience and approaches to developing ADA transition plans but did not receive as high an overall average score as the top-scoring nine firms.

Service Area 1 recommendations for pre-qualification summary:

Nineteen (19) responses were submitted for Service Area 1. The evaluation team determined that prequalifying nine (9) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Benesch, Civiltech, Cole & Associates, HDR, Kimley-Horn, Oates, Psomas, TY Lin, and Vitruvian Planning.

Several of the firms not recommended for prequalification demonstrated impressive experience and approaches to developing ADA transition plans but did not receive as high an overall average score as the top-scoring nine firms.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
-----------	---------------	------------

Recommended for prequalification		
Oates	97.3	Experienced firm with a proven track record of developing ADA PROW TPs.
Vitruvian Planning	97.3	Firm with extensive and proven experience successfully completing ADA PROW TPs.
Benesch	91.7	Firm has extensive experience developing ADA PROW TPs nationwide.
Civiltech	90.7	Firm demonstrates intimate familiarity with CMAP processes and ADA PROW TPs.
Cole & Associates	77.0	Firm has documented expertise as an ADA PROW expert and demonstrates they can successfully complete an ADA PROW TP.
TY Lin	76.2	Firm with strong project approach, including in-depth explanation of TP project engagement.
HDR	75.7	Firm with long-rooted experience and thorough, clear understanding of approach to TPs, with inclusion of real-world estimates.
Kimley-Horn	74.3	Experienced firm with comprehensive data-driven approach to TPs.
Psomas	74.3	Firm with solid staff experience and strong project examples, with innovative ideas to improve on project approach beyond expectations.
Not recommended for prequalification		
Baxter & Woodman	73.7	Firm has baseline experience and understanding of doing ADA PROW TPs, with limited explanation of integration of public engagement.
Atlas	69.3	Firm has experience but is limited to designing and planning for ADA compliant infrastructure as part of larger roadway projects.
LCM Architects	68.7	Architecture firm with limited experience assessing and planning for PROWs but may translate to transportation infrastructure given their deep accessibility knowledge.
EXP	67.7	Multi-disciplined firm that has a lot of transportation engineering experience; however, they did not demonstrate experience developing ADA PROW transition plans.
Jensen Hughes	62.8	Accessibility consultants with significant facilities assessment experience that may translate to PROW, but limited explanation of project approach and public engagement strategy.
InNova Consulting	60.8	Engineering firm with familiarity with ADA infrastructure design but no experience developing a full ADA PROW transition plan.
MKSK	60.7	Design firm with experience mainly in park accessibility.
Globetrotters	59.7	Engineering firm that primarily focuses on Phase I and II engineering. While they have familiarity assessing and designing ADA-compliant ramps, they appear to lack experience developing a full ADA PROW transition plan.
Primera	59.7	Engineering firm with more limited experience developing ADA plans.

GRAEF	58.3	While they have familiarity assessing and designing ADA-compliant ramps, they appear to lack experience developing a full ADA PROW transition plan.
-------	------	---

SERVICE AREA 2: Bicycle and pedestrian-focused transportation plans / supplemental support

Service Area 2 description:

These plans address local transportation needs to improve and increase safe and efficient access to destinations via a variety of modes, with a primary focus on walking and biking.

The planning process will involve:

- Community outreach and engagement
- Convening of local expertise through a steering or advisory committee
- Analysis of existing conditions, including:
 - Analysis of crash history and appropriate countermeasures, with a focus on vulnerable roadway users
 - Route planning and infrastructure
 - Safe routes to schools and other destinations
 - Streetscapes and furnishings
 - Access for people with disabilities
 - Connections to transit (if applicable)
 - Past plans and policies
- Use of a Safe System approach to propose recommended policies, programs, and infrastructure changes to improve safe and connected travel for people on foot, bicycle, and other low-speed mobility devices
- Identification of planning level cost estimates for infrastructure as well as estimated level of difficulty or complexity

Service Area 2 recommendations for pre-qualification summary:

Forty-three (43) responses were submitted for Service Area 2. The evaluation team determined that prequalifying ten (10) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Arcadis, Benesch, Epstein, Foursquare ITP, Jacobs, Lochner, NN Engineering, Parametrix, Toole Design, and TY Lin for prequalification.

Many of the firms not recommended for prequalification demonstrated exceptional experience and thoughtful approaches to developing bicycle and pedestrian-focused transportation plans but did not receive as high an overall average score as the top-scoring ten firms. The evaluation team noted that some firms received lower scores due to insufficiently demonstrating experience working with smaller communities, effective public engagement strategies, integration of Safe System approaches, or understanding of working with CMAP.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
Toole Design	88.7	Firm has deep expertise in planning and design for biking and walking. Proposal demonstrates the firm has a thoughtful and thorough approach to planning, and experience with all of the tasks of Service Area.
Lochner	88.0	Firm demonstrates expertise in the tasks of the Service Area and shows innovative approaches in outreach. Team and project examples demonstrate broad experience with transportation planning and design.
NN Engineering	88.0	The firm demonstrates a strong project portfolio and level of expertise directly related to both this Service Area and CMAP's scale of work. They have a strong focus on excellent design and a deep expertise in the Service Area.
Epstein	87.3	Strong proposal showing thoughtfulness, passion, experience, and a range of skills. The firm showcases innovative but practical approaches to public engagement; project examples demonstrate their ability to deliver and shows clear understanding of working with CMAP and related entities.
Benesch	85.7	The firm demonstrates expertise and a thoughtful approach to bicycle and pedestrian planning. The submittal fully addressed evaluation criteria as well as Service Area tasks and showed how the firm would approach tasks in an innovative and effective way based on past experience.
Foursquare ITP	85.0	The firm focuses on sustainable transportation, with demonstrated expertise in bicycle and pedestrian planning, VRU safety, and connections to transit. The firm has worked with other MPOs and has worked on local plans developing bicycle and pedestrian networks.
Jacobs	83.7	The firm has deep expertise in bicycle and pedestrian analysis and design. The firm also has experience with traffic safety analysis and broad experience relevant to the Service Area.
Parametrix	83.5	Firm has broad transportation planning experience, including working with MPOs. Specialized knowledge of IDOT processes is a highlight of the application, along with demonstrated experience with implementation.
Arcadis	83.0	The firm has an innovative and data driven approach to bicycle and pedestrian planning. The team has broad and deep experience.
TYLin	83.0	The firm has broad and deep expertise, and the team has a strong focus on bicycle and pedestrian planning. The firm possesses extensive familiarity and demonstrates success working with CMAP. Additionally, the firm has expertise in engineering and safety.
Not recommended for prequalification		

Smith Group	80.7	Firm has a strong approach to planning processes and a strong, community-centered approach to engagement. Though firm has extensive trail design experience, the firm did not demonstrate extensive experience with developing on-street bicycle and pedestrian networks.
Buro Happold	79.3	Firm has strong transportation design experience. However, they did not demonstrate specific expertise in local bicycle and pedestrian planning.
Civiltech	77.3	The firm's experience is a strong highlight, both in terms of the team and the projects completed. However, the approach to public outreach, especially in regard to how it is integrated into project management, lacks detail.
Vitruvian Planning	77.3	Though the firm did not indicate understanding or experience in Safe System, its principled approach and expertise in innovative outreach are impressive. They have several unique skills, including public health analysis, low-cost demonstration projects, and night-time audits.
MKSK	77.0	The firm's project approach, understanding of community engagement, and thoughtfulness around project management are exemplary. The firm has strong streetscape design skills and a commitment to creating more human scale streets. However, their attention to safety for VRUs felt insufficient.
High Street	76.5	The firm has impressive expertise with data management and analysis, which is one aspect of the Service Area. Firm does not demonstrate breadth of experience covering some important aspects of the Service Area.
SRF	76.3	Firm has deep expertise in bicycle and pedestrian design, and a broad range of relevant experience. Proposal included insufficient explanation of public engagement strategies and incorporation of Safe System approaches.
Mead & Hunt	76.0	Firm has strong technical design skills and relevant experience detailed in the project examples and team resumes. Direct responses in the firm capability and project approach sections would have helped the firm to better highlight their skills.
CDM Smith	74.7	The team's experience and technical expertise are strong highlights for this firm. Additional information about project management and public outreach philosophy would have been useful.
WSP	73.7	The firm has broad experience in transportation planning and design. The community outreach process is a highlight, and the firm has some relevant bicycle and pedestrian planning experience.
RS&H	72.0	Firm has strong experience in planning and designing for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Firm also has experience with Vision Zero planning and Safe System approaches. Public engagement approach seemed insufficient as did explanation of working with CMAP.
Stantec	72.0	Firm demonstrates impressive, nationally recognized leadership in the field. However, firm does not demonstrate deep experience with producing local plans or sufficient familiarity with CMAP's role.

CMT	71.7	Strong proposal demonstrating local planning experience and understanding of bicycle and pedestrian design. Most team members possess five or less years of experience and engagement approach was not fully aligned with CMAP approach.
Oates	71.7	Oates has relevant local experience in addition to design experience. The firm is focused on feasibility and implementation. Firm does not provide sufficient specific examples of work and does not address Safe System approaches.
EXP	70.7	The firm has some strong qualifications in design and in project management and delivery. The team resumes and selected projects suggest the firm uses a transportation planning framework centered on motor vehicle movement and accommodation, with bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure accommodated where possible.
LJC	70.3	Firm has extensive experience in landscape architecture and design. Firm has strong commitment to equitable processes and bicycle and pedestrian planning. The submission lacks direct bicycle and pedestrian planning experience.
GRAEF	69.3	The firm has strong technical skills including design. It would have been helpful if firm had demonstrated more relevant experience and deeper expertise in local bicycle and pedestrian planning, as well as effective public engagement approaches and coordination with CMAP.
Cambridge Systematics	68.7	The firm is highly qualified for regional and state planning, with strong qualifications in data analysis. The firm appears to lack experience in small-scale local planning where a variety of outreach techniques are needed to reach a broad range of participants, and data is often limited.
GFT Infrastructure	67.7	The firm has extensive experience, especially in transit planning, corridor planning, and engineering. Does not demonstrate expertise in bicycle and pedestrian planning for local agencies. The team's focus seems more geared to transit and corridor engineering rather than bike/ped planning.
Antero Group	65.7	The firm is well-acquainted with CMAP and meets baseline expectations for each evaluation factor but did not go above-and-beyond in areas such as incorporating Safe System approaches or offering unique approaches to achieving VRU safety. The proposal includes innovative outreach.
Stanley Consultants	65.7	Firm has deep experience and expertise in safety analysis focused on crash history and countermeasures. The team has broad experience, and a focus on VRUs. However, the team does not appear to have strong experience in local bicycle and pedestrian planning.
Muse	64.3	This firm offers very strong skills and expertise in engagement and public involvement in projects related to the Service Area. However, the depth of their experience in the other aspects of the Service Area is unclear.
Estolano Advisors	59.3	The firm has a deep expertise in community outreach and a truly exceptional skill set and level of commitment. The firm

		did not demonstrate a commensurate experience in local bicycle and pedestrian planning.
V3 Companies	56.5	The firm has broad experience in landscape architecture, planning, and design. They have some experience with bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure but do not have a strong focus on local planning for bicycle and pedestrian networks.
Primera	54.7	The firm demonstrates experience with designing and constructing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. However, the firm does not demonstrate deep expertise in local planning or innovative bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.
Borderless Studio	46.3	The firm is exceptionally strong in outreach and process. But the firm lacks key experience and technical skills around bicycle and pedestrian planning and design, including understanding of the Safe System approach.
Design Workshop	46.0	The firm demonstrates its commitment to bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and strong urban design. More local bicycle and pedestrian plans, along with more attention to detail on how CMAP differs from the City of Chicago, would be helpful.
InNova Consulting	45.8	The firm has transportation planning and design experience. However, the submittal does not demonstrate the firm has sufficient expertise in the range of required tasks of the Service Area, including the projects typical in CMAP's work.
Baxter & Woodman	45.7	The firm has relevant engineering work but does not demonstrate sufficient relevant experience, as well as a deep knowledge of local bicycle and pedestrian planning, including Safe System approaches.
EFK Moen	40.7	Firm demonstrates strong civil engineering experience, including some bicycle and pedestrian design, but firm does not show sufficient relevant bicycle and pedestrian planning experience for local plans.
McKenna	40.7	The firm brings a unique land use and development perspective to active transportation planning, and their proposal layout displays their visual communication skills. However, the firm did not directly address some questions and did not demonstrate deep expertise in bicycle and pedestrian planning and design.
Atlas	29.8	The firm has strong qualifications and experience in other disciplines but does not demonstrate needed experience in bicycle and pedestrian planning. This submittal provided insufficient explanation of how the firm will complete the work.
Vega Impact Group	25.7	Firm has expertise in communications, engagement, and project management. Firm did not demonstrate relevant skills for the Service Area.

SERVICE AREA 3: Capital improvement planning

Service Area 3 description:

This Service Area includes assisting communities with:

- Capital asset inventories
- Prioritization of future capital improvements based on importance, budget, and

condition

- Asset management planning
- Creation of Capital Improvement Plans (CIPs) that include multiple categories of community assets and infrastructure systems (such as water supply, stormwater, and transportation)

Firms will also assist with:

- Capital program planning
- Financial analysis
- Asset rehabilitation and replacement costs
- Revenue projections
- Public engagement
- Potential efficiencies
- Capacity-building training for relevant staff and officials on elements of capital program planning and ongoing implementation
- Related tasks

Work under this Service Area may include assistance with:

- Infrastructure condition assessment (condition, age, service history, design life, useful life, level of redundancy)

Service Area 3 recommendations for prequalification summary:

Twenty (20) responses were submitted for Service Area 3. The evaluation team determined that prequalifying nine (9) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending AECOM, Antero Group, Baxter & Woodman, Gewalt Hamilton, High Street, HR Green, Jacobs, Parametrix, and WSP for prequalification.

The evaluation team noted that some firms, including firms with other impressive qualifications, received lower scores due to insufficiently demonstrating CIP experience at the municipal scale which is typical for CMAP projects in this Service Area.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
Parametrix	95.7	Parametrix has experienced staff with well-documented experience working on CIPs, municipal partners, and with CMAP. The approach is ideal and very clearly described.
Jacobs	93.0	Very experienced in exactly the scope desired for this Service Area. Project approach is clearly articulated.
Antero Group	79.7	Clear understanding of capital improvement planning technical assistance, with good examples documenting approach to delivering desired service to municipalities.
Gewalt Hamilton	75.0	Strong team qualifications, including relevant experience with CMAP and municipalities. Strong, thoughtful approach that

		includes all tasks as described in the Service Area description and includes additional innovations.
AECOM	71.7	AECOM presents a solid team, wealth of experience, and thought leadership in this work. Good qualifications for expert analysis and asset management, particularly pavement and road infrastructure.
WSP	69.2	The firm presented a sound approach and understanding of CIPs, with examples showing application for larger agencies but also applicable on a municipal scale. Strong engagement approach and good qualifications indicated on team.
HR Green	67.8	Strong experience creating and administering capital improvement programs. The firm presented a thoughtful and experienced approach to capital improvement planning. Project examples included past work on tasks within the Service Area with local municipalities. The firm's submission lacked discussion of training for staff needed for CIP maintenance.
High Street	64.7	Approach description is solid. Project examples and team experience show work performed on a larger scale than tasks to be completed in this Service Area but it appears scaling would not be an issue for firm.
Baxter & Woodman	61.7	Firm is experienced working for and with municipalities, demonstrating its qualifications to create CIPs, conduct asset management planning and financial analysis. Work examples include previous CIP projects with lower capacity communities in the CMAP region. However, most of the highlighted experiences in the team resumes focus on water/sewer infrastructure planning.
Not recommended for prequalification		
Arcadis	60.0	Impressive qualifications of team staff and larger-scale projects but demonstrated less experience at the municipal scale that is the focus of CMAP projects in this Service Area.
Stantec	57.0	Response includes many relevant qualifications from national firm, with solid approach. However, project examples did not directly demonstrate needed service of municipal CIP delivery.
Psomas	55.3	Team resumes show extensive experience as municipal staff engaging in capital programming. But project examples did not evidence relevant experience for Service Area.
Strand	53.5	Strong experience of firm providing technical assistance to in-region municipalities to analyze assets and plan for capital improvements. Resumes and project examples seemed to be missing some key tasks outlined in the Service Area description. Firm did not demonstrate sufficient consideration of training and capacity building
MKSK	46.3	Project approach and engagement approach are good, however firm appears to lack sufficient team experience in the necessary tasks of the Service Area.
Buro Happold	43.7	While the team staff has some impressive experience and qualifications, it appears to have insufficient CIP experience

		at the scale and scope of CMAP projects in this Service Area.
Cambridge Systematics	39.2	Good expertise in some needed project components, but firm does not demonstrate experience and familiarity with the range of tasks required for this Service Area.
Dama	39.0	Response does not demonstrate experience in delivering the necessary components of this Service Area. Project examples focused on larger scale transportation analysis and traffic studies.
KPMG	39.0	Interesting approach, heavier on financial analysis of capital planning. Good qualifications on team, but lack of engineering/public works experience on team and lack of municipal CIP specific experience.
Jack Faucett	35.7	Response does not effectively demonstrate experience or capabilities to complete all necessary components of municipal CIPs. Qualifications are shown, but not the coverage needed for the tasks in this Service Area.
RLE	15.7	Team experience and project examples don't demonstrate necessary experience with relevant project tasks for municipal CIPs.

SERVICE AREA 4: Consensus-based stakeholder communications and engagement strategy development and management

Service Area 4 description:

This Service Area includes collaborating with CMAP staff to develop strategies for policy development through stakeholder consensus building activities to realize more equitable and resilient outcomes for all. Work may include:

- Identifying key stakeholders
- Assessing stakeholder interests and potential for reaching consensus-based agreements
- Designing a consensus-based process with clear goals, ground rules, work plan and timeline
- Message mapping “story maps”
- Preparing for meetings, and conducting pre-meeting research
- Communicating with stakeholders via email, phone, and engagement platforms
- Resolving stakeholder questions
- Meeting facilitation and drafting meeting summaries
- Managing the consensus building process to maximize success in reaching agreements that are technically sound and politically acceptable
- Promoting consensus agreements where possible and enabling near-consensus alternatives when full consensus is not feasible
- Event planning, marketing, branding

Service Area 4 recommendations for prequalification summary:

Forty-one (41) responses were submitted for Service Area 4. It was decided that

prequalifying eleven (11) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Antero Group, Borderless Studio, Estolano Advisors, Foursquare ITP, Greenprint Partners, Horizon 54, Jacobs, Jasculca Terman, Morreale, Muse, and R.M. Chin for prequalification.

Most of the firms not recommended for prequalification demonstrated strong experience and exceptionally thoughtful approaches for achieving successful consensus-based communication and engagement with stakeholders but did not receive as high an overall average score as the top-scoring eleven firms. CMAP hopes to have the opportunity to work with many of these talented firms as subconsultants/subcontractors on larger project teams.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
Jacobs	95.5	Large firm with clear capability and capacity to complete project work. Dedicated engagement team, extensive experience with CMAP and other agencies.
Estolano Advisors	93	Strong proposal from firm that showcases their stakeholder engagement process and portfolio. Project examples show an understanding of working toward shared goals in difficult environments.
Muse	93	Strong proposal with a strong approach to projects and public engagement. Firm has an extensive and nuanced understanding of the work and needs of CMAP.
Morreale	92	Strong proposal from a firm with extensive experience in transportation communications. Extensive partner experience. Quality approach to engagement and communications strategy.
Greenprint Partners	91.5	Strong proposal that shows a commitment to community co-design and thorough project approach. Firm demonstrates full capability to deliver all Service Area tasks with exceptional examples demonstrating inclusive, innovative public engagement. The firm's expertise in communications, engagement, and marketing is apparent.
R.M. Chin and Associates	89	Firm has good experience leading the engagement portions of larger planning and engineering initiatives. Good project approach, Good staff qualifications, and work examples completing similar work.
Foursquare ITP	87.5	Firm understands what it means to work within a regional entity and convene stakeholders with differing levels of familiarity with planning concepts. Good proposal with a strong approach to projects.
Antero Group	87	Antero Group demonstrates a clear methodology, project experience and community engagement philosophies that would result in a quality project. Innovative approach to

		engagement that is cognizant of barriers to the planning process.
Horizon 54	86	Firm has a good approach to projects that would make them successful in completing activities within the Service Area description. Demonstrated experience working with public agencies (local, state, regional, federal) as well as experience in consensus-based engagement. Highlights existing connections with our local partners.
Borderless Studio	85	Strong proposal highlighting the firm's commitment and experience with the activities described in the Service Area. Strong approach to firm-client relationship with phased process to support coordination.
Jasculca Terman	85	Firm shows extensive experience in public affairs and engagement. "Neighborhood dialogues" suggests a unique proactive approach to approaching issues of potential contention. Solid understanding of northeastern Illinois context.
Not recommended for prequalification		
NSP & Company	84.5	Firm demonstrates good experience and qualifications, as well as a clear interest in informing change management practices through public engagement.
3X3	84	Firm demonstrates a strong understanding and level of experience in engagement, project execution, and consensus building. It also demonstrates extensive experience with CMAP and similar organizations.
Teska Associates	83.25	Firm has clear experience creating and executing quality engagement efforts as a part of larger planning efforts. Experience with most of the tasks in the Service Area.
Metro Strategies	83	Good proposal showing experience in working with CMAP and similar agencies, as well as good staff qualifications. Strong approach to project work but could have provided a clearer plan for coordination with CMAP.
V3	83	Firm demonstrates good ability to complete projects under the Service Area description. Engagement as a standalone contract and as part of broader planning efforts. Shows connection between their engagement and policy development.
Vega Impact Group	82.5	Firm demonstrates ability to complete projects with tasks relating to the Service Area. It is unclear if the firm regularly is a subconsultant or prime on contracts. Good experience and good staff qualifications.
Delta Institute	82	Firm shows good experience in convening community partners and engagement to create high quality projects. Firm mainly focuses on environmental work.
Conlon Public Strategies	80.5	Good proposal that highlights extensive experience in organizational management and strategic planning. Firm shows ability to convene partners, but firm experience is mainly with nonprofits instead of government agencies.
McKenna	79.5	Firm highlights good experience and approach to community engagement that is deeply rooted in the communities they work with. Particularly skilled in contentious local issues.

		Roles and responsibilities between consultant and client could be more clear.
Perkins & Will	79	Proposal demonstrates firm has experience in completing projects that include tasks listed in the Service Area description. Demonstrated engagement experience is part of larger planning efforts.
Epstein	77	Good proposal showcasing the firm's ability to provide quality, creative engagement with the public in the pursuit of larger policy development initiatives. Project examples and firm capability sections show that community engagement is a part of their larger transportation planning projects. Engagement philosophy in action is unclear.
Community Allies	76	Firm demonstrates a strong approach to public engagement with proposed activities that reflect this approach and the activities listed in the Service Area description. However, firm experience is mainly nonprofit organizations rather than government agencies similar to CMAP.
ECT	75.5	Large firm with a dedicated engagement team and extensive experience. Primarily an environmental planning firm where engagement is a part of larger projects or initiatives.
LJC	75	This is an architectural and design firm that also prepares engagement activities. Project examples and team resumes do not highlight extensive experience in public engagement, but the firm has worked with many organizations similar to CMAP and understands client relationships. The consultant/client relationship is described as collaborative but is not clear in terms of roles.
MK Corona	75	Small firm that specializes in engagement and brings a thoughtful approach to convening stakeholders and building coalitions for policy development. Project approach framework is not clear.
Design Workshop	74	Strong proposal for a firm with extensive experience in using community engagement to lead to policy development. Strong approach with innovative ideas for public engagement. Missing descriptions of some activities listed in the Service Area description.
Primera	73.5	Firm demonstrates experience in completing tasks with the Service Area description as part of larger planning and engineering projects. Clear connection between stakeholder engagement and policy development. Firm capability emphasizes visual communication expertise.
RS&H	71.5	Good proposal that shows the firm has experience completing public engagement tasks as parts of overarching planning efforts. It's unclear whether they have been contracted specifically to provide engagement efforts. Firm's experience working with agencies similar to CMAP is not clearly demonstrated.
MKSK	71	Proposal does not highlight staff experience and project examples that are relevant to many of the tasks within the Service Area. Firm shows good capacity in policy development and urban design, and firm has worked with many local partners. However, project examples do not

		sufficiently specify the firm’s contribution relevant to this Service Area.
Jack Faucett	69	Good proposal that showcases the firm's commitment to understanding place as a key component of policy development. Firm focuses on research and anthropological context to inform engagement activities. Submission appears to advocate for firm’s methodology more strongly than it demonstrates a commitment to meeting client needs.
Anderson Smith	67	This firm has a strong approach to client management, change management, and project work. The project examples highlighted in the application show a strong focus on internal engagement for change management within organizations, and do not highlight extensive experience working on projects with an external or public facing result or focus.
NIU	66.5	Proposal demonstrates experience in completing community engagement activities to inform policy development decisions. However, submission is difficult to read due to typos and passive voice. Submission does not address or demonstrate importance of visual communication.
Cambridge Systematics	65	Firm has extensive experience creating plan documents for projects that involve public engagement as a component of their finished deliverable. Project examples show extensive experience in engaging agency and government level officials, but less experience engaging with the public. Proposal does not expand much in the activities listed in the Service Area.
WSP	65	Large firm with experience with CMAP and similar entities. Good approach that could result in good engagement with partners.
Collabo	61	Firm demonstrates a commitment to engagement guided by ten core principles. Team resumes don't highlight the ways in which firm staff have experience in the activities listed in the Service Area description, and project examples do not provide relevant experience.
InNova Consulting	61	Firm demonstrates a strong approach to project initiation and management but does not provide many examples of experience working within the Service Area and on activities related to community and stakeholder engagement. Firm submitted 1 of 3 required project examples.
A5 Digital Branding	59	Firm has strong experience in marketing and branding campaigns for state agencies and neighborhood organizations. However, project examples did not address specific examples of project work within the Service Area description related to coalition and consensus building.
Latent	54.5	Architectural firm with a solid public engagement strategy. Staff resumes did not provide any descriptions of tasks related to the Service Area. Project examples did not extensively highlight community engagement experience.
GTI Energy	50.5	Firm demonstrates extensive experience in energy-related project work, and engagement is a part of their process. Partnerships with other organizations is outlined but their plan for working with CMAP staff is unclear.

EcoVidalDesign, Inc.	28.25	Overall, firm has limited experience in providing the services listed in the Service Area description and provides limited examples of projects and qualifications to provide services in consensus-based community engagement.
----------------------	-------	---

SERVICE AREA 5: Land use plans

Service Area 5 description:

The land use plan Service Area includes the development of comprehensive community plans as well as downtown, neighborhood, corridor, subarea, and site-specific land use plans. Firms may be asked to lead full planning processes or provide targeted technical support for comprehensive plans, downtown, neighborhood, corridor, subarea, site plans, and other forms of land use planning.

- **Comprehensive plans** establish a long-term vision for a community and provide a policy framework intended to help the community achieve its goals.

Comprehensive plans generally address:

- Land use
- Housing
- Environment
- Transportation

Comprehensive plans may include other topics relevant to individual communities such as:

- Stormwater and flooding management
- Public Health
- Historic preservation
- Sustainability and climate resilience
- Natural resources
- Agricultural preservation
- Water resources
- Community character and branding

- **Downtown, neighborhood, corridor, and subarea plans** typically address specific areas, topics, or challenges rather than the all-inclusive approach used for comprehensive plans. These types of plans may focus on:

- Flooding and storm water
- Capital improvements
- Housing supply and conditions analysis
- Retail or commercial analysis
- Industry
- Zoning and regulatory strategies
- or a combination of topics for a defined area of a community

- **Site plans** identify appropriate land uses and concepts for locally controlled redevelopment sites. These plans are based on previous planning work, local zoning regulations, and existing market data and analysis.

Service Area 5 recommendations for prequalification summary:

A total of thirty one (31) firms submitted responses for Service Area 5. It was decided that prequalifying eleven (11) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Antero Group, Design Workshop, Egret & Ox Planning, LLC, MIG, MKSK, Muse, Smith Group, Stantec, Teska Associates, and Urban Works for prequalification. Firms that were not selected for prequalification demonstrated strong capabilities but did not score as high as the firms selected for prequalification. Many of these had valuable experience in related fields such as environmental planning, engagement or engineering, but did not show the full breadth of experience required for prequalification in this Service Area.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
Design Workshop	90.3	The firm has extensive experience producing comprehensive, corridor, and downtown plans. Project approach is extensive and covers a lot of bases. The firm has a multidisciplinary team and prior experience working with MPOs.
Teska Associates	87.7	The firm demonstrated an excellent project approach, and a well-structured engagement approach. Their experience across comprehensive, downtown, corridor, and subarea plans aligns with Service Area needs, and application demonstrates wide breadth of relevant skills.
Smith Group	87.3	The firm has extensive capabilities across land use, zoning, transportation, and environmental planning. The firm also demonstrated familiarity with CMAP's regulatory context and role in the region.
MKSK	86.0	The firm demonstrates deep experience in comprehensive, corridor and downtown planning across the Midwest. The firm's integration of fiscal sustainability and data-driven decision-making is well-suited for projects in this Service Area.
LJC	83.7	The firm shows extensive regional planning experience in the Service Area, and strong multidisciplinary capacity. Project approach and project examples demonstrated good focus on implementation. The firm also showed good understanding of CMAP's role and has experience working with MPOs.
Antero Group	83.3	Strong proposal with a well-structured project approach and excellent project examples. Also demonstrated key skills and technical capabilities. Strong understanding of municipal capacity.
Muse	83.0	Firm offers a highly community-centered planning approach and demonstrates capabilities in comprehensive, corridor, and TOD planning. Public engagement was a strong suite and project approach factored in accessibility.

Stantec	82.2	Demonstrates extensive experience with comprehensive, neighborhood and corridor plans across the Midwest. The firm demonstrated a strong analytical approach and multidisciplinary team. The firm’s experience reflects consistent high-quality planning work.
MIG	79.3	The firm’s project history demonstrates the ability to produce robust, data-driven, community-centered plans. Its public engagement approach was notable, with forty different methods of engagement in one example. Experience in trail-oriented development and evaluating public benefits of investment were seen as additional skills valuable to Service Area projects.
Urban Works	78.0	Design-oriented firm with demonstrated experience in producing corridor, site, and neighborhood-scale plans. While some highlighted projects have an emphasis on architecture, the firm’s portfolio shows clear ability to deliver the types of plans required in the Service Area.
Egret & Ox Planning	77.3	The firm has a strong portfolio of comprehensive and corridor plans. The firm has the ability to handle projects at multiple scales and is familiar with CMAP’s regional context.
Not recommended for prequalification		
GRAEF	75.7	Offers multidisciplinary team and demonstrated municipal planning experience, with skills in design and placemaking. However, there are gaps in depth of experience in land use planning, and the firm’s approaches and examples did not cover the full range of tasks required by the Service Area.
Collabo	74.5	The firm provided a solid proposal with strengths in community-responsive planning and tailored engagement approaches. However, there are gaps in expertise relevant across all tasks in the Service Area. Their capabilities align with engagement roles more than core tasks in this Service Area.
Borderless Studio	73.8	The firm demonstrates strong design and engagement capabilities, with a community centered approach. However, their expertise would be more closely aligned with more engagement-focused or design-oriented Service Areas.
V3	73.5	The firm shows strong multidisciplinary expertise and experience with municipal-level plans. However, land use planning experience was secondary to infrastructure engineering or fiscal analysis experience. The submission did not clearly demonstrate alignment with the needs of the Service Area.
Buro Happold	72.3	The firm shows strong capabilities in sustainability, environmental planning and high-level master-planning. Project examples and capabilities leaned toward large scale or specialized planning rather than comprehensive or corridor plans.
Perkins & Will	68.5	The firm demonstrates overall solid planning and design capabilities. Compelling engagement and planning philosophy. However, there are gaps in land-use specific experience aligned with the needs of the Service Area.

Michael Baker	66.8	Firm demonstrates strong multidisciplinary expertise and experience working with agencies like CMAP. However, land use experience was limited, with a stronger emphasis on stormwater, engineering, and transportation.
Epstein	66.3	The firm brings strong experience in transportation engineering and demonstrates knowledge of CMAP's role in the region. Project approach was standard, and examples were transportation focused. Capabilities did not fully align with the broader range of tasks in the Service Area.
Houseal Lavigne	66.2	The firm has extensive experience producing high-quality comprehensive, downtown, and corridor plans. The firm's technical capabilities were strong. Links to resumes were inaccessible and could not be evaluated.
Sightline	64.0	The proposal demonstrates strong zoning and regulatory experience and an understanding of CMAP's role in the region. Submission was strongest in zoning-focused tasks and did not fully meet the breadth required for the Service Area.
Baxter	63.3	The firm provides solid engineering and planning capabilities, but their submission relied on boilerplate language and did not demonstrate a strong understanding of CMAP's role in the land use planning context. Evaluators found the firm's project examples to be focused more on engineering than community land use planning
Greenprint Partners	58.0	The firm demonstrated strong environmental and green infrastructure expertise, with meaningful community engagement. However, there are gaps in core planning competencies and subject matter expertise required for this Service Area.
Ramboll	56.3	The firm brings strong climate resilience and policy experience but shows limited evidence of full land use plan development capabilities aligned with the Service Area. Their examples emphasize hazard mitigation and resilience rather than land use planning.
Latent	49.3	Firm offers design and corridor planning experience but did not sufficiently demonstrate capabilities in the full range of services required in the Service Area. The firm has an emphasis on architecture and design and has limited planning examples that are not design-oriented.
Jack Faucett	36.5	This firm does not have the experience or expertise to effectively prepare land use plans as detailed in the Service Area description.
ECT	35.3	The firm has experience in environmental planning and green infrastructure. The firm's focus is stormwater and natural resource planning, and did not include the range of services required in the Service Area.
Eco Vidal Design, Inc	26.5	The firm shows experience in sustainability and architectural design, but lacks demonstrated experience delivering land use plans. Evaluators found their examples limited or outside the scope of modern comprehensive planning practice.
Delta Institute	26.3	The firm specializes in environmental work and community engagement but does not demonstrate experience producing

		land use plans. The firm’s capabilities align better as subconsultants supporting sustainability components.
Geosyntec	23.3	The firm specializes in engineering, stormwater, and climate resilience, with limited land use planning experience. While technically strong, the firm did not sufficiently demonstrate its capacity to lead or deliver plans in line with the needs of the Service Area.
NIU	N/A	This submission was intended for Service Area 4 and was evaluated under that Service Area.

SERVICE AREA 6: Local road safety plans/ Safety action plans / supplemental support

Service Area 6 description:

A local road safety plan (LRSP) provides a process for identifying and prioritizing potential safety improvements on local roads.

The planning process will involve:

- Engage local stakeholders and a steering committee with a focus on engaging hard-to-reach residents
- Analyze crash data to develop a high injury network using a Safe System approach
- Identify the most common causes of fatal and serious injury crashes and develop recommendations for countermeasures

The process results in a plan that:

- Assesses crash risk
- Prioritizes the most important actions including capital improvements as well as broader safety programs
- Lays out implementation steps with planning level cost estimates, level of difficulty, primary implementor and support entities

The geographic scope of the project and number of locations evaluated will depend somewhat on resources and extent of safety problems, but it is expected that an LRSP could be developed for a smaller municipality or a section of a larger one.

Service Area 6 recommendations for prequalification summary:

A total of thirty-one (31) firm submitted responses for Service Area 6. It was decided that pre-qualifying ten (10) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending AECOM, Cambridge Systematics, Jacobs, NN Engineering, Smith Group, SRF, Stanley Consultants, Stantec, Toole Design, and TY Lin for prequalification.

Several additional firms offered valuable skills in engineering, traffic operations, or data analysis but did not demonstrate the full range of competencies required by this Service Area. Common gaps included limited Safe System Approach integration, insufficient examples of completed SAP and LRSP projects, or heavy reliance on conventional or reactive engineering methods.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
TY Lin	95	The firm submitted an excellent package, demonstrating clear expertise and directly relevant experience with safety action planning. Their innovative outreach and implementation approaches, strong staff qualifications, and familiarity with CMAP processes indicate they would deliver strong projects.
AECOM	91.5	The firm is highly qualified, with deep national experience in safety planning and demonstrated subject matter expertise that will result in strong projects. The firm’s project approach is thoughtful, analytical, and proactive, and is supported by robust engagement.
Toole Design	91.5	An excellent national firm that brings strong safety expertise and demonstrates a clear understanding of CMAP values and work. The submission was regarded as thoughtful and technically strong, with demonstrated safety action planning experience.
Smith Group	86.5	The firm offers qualified staff, strong mobility and corridor planning experience and solid understanding of the Safe System Approach. Their approach and technical skills reflect strong capability in this Service Area.
Cambridge Systematics	82	The firm offers extensive MPO experience, a highly qualified team, and a data-driven, Safe System-aligned approach. They pair strong engagement practices with clear, implementable deliverables across multiple scales. Firm demonstrates a compelling project approach and extensive, relevant experience.
Stantec	80.5	A highly qualified firm with extensive and relevant safety planning experience. They offer strong expertise gained from leading Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) and Vision Zero plans nationwide, along with a proactive, analytically driven planning approach that aligns with Safe System approaches.
Stanley Consultants	79.5	The firm is highly qualified, with strong project experience and a thoughtful approach. While their staff experience skews engineering-heavy, they are still well positioned to lead successful projects within the Service Area.
Jacobs	78.5	The firm shows strong familiarity with CMAP’s role in the region, and has a qualified team, a clear approach to data, engagement, and process management. The firm demonstrates capability to handle the full range of tasks expected in this Service Area.
NN Engineering	78.5	The firm has a strong portfolio of projects, deep technical expertise and high-quality project experience. The firm is well placed to lead a project of the type and scale expected in this Service Area.
SRF	78.5	The firm is highly qualified, with strong experience working on safety action plans and local road safety plans, as well as related initiatives at the regional and county levels. They

		propose a proactive and thoughtful approach and are highly capable of the technical aspects of this Service Area.
Not recommended for prequalification		
Horizon 54	77.5	The firm brings strong community- and equity-focused safety planning, with Safe System expertise, experience working with MPOs, and comprehensive engagement strategy. However, their past involvement has been as equity advisors on safety action plans, and in policy and engagement. The firm's capabilities do not demonstrate ability to lead LRSPs and SAPs in totality.
Mead & Hunt	76	The firm demonstrates good experience and skills related to safety action planning and related services but scored lower than firms recommended for prequalification.
Psomas	74.5	The firm brings strong experience in Safety Action Plans and a clear, well-structured approach that incorporates Safe System principles and robust engagement. However, the submission lacked a required project manager résumé, which hindered full evaluation of the proposed team.
Kimley Horn	73.5	The firm provided a clear and concise submission that demonstrated a solid understanding of CMAP's safety work along with strong technical expertise and national experience. However, the application of Safe System approaches was limited.
Antero Group	72.5	The firm brings good experience with planning processes in this Service Area. Their team brings strong regional experience and multidisciplinary expertise. Project examples show good capability across tasks like systemic risk analysis, engagement, and implementation. However, the firm scored lower due to limited experience with safety action plans compared to recommended firms.
Epstein	69.5	The firm's submission conveyed strong qualifications and good alignment with requirements in the Service Area. Safe System understanding is present but limited, and the firm's core strengths align with reactive rather than proactive safety planning.
Lochner	69	The firm offers solid experience on projects within the Service Area. However, the project examples and methodology have limited application of Safe System approaches.
WSP	69	The firm brings experience working in similar roles and has demonstrated capacity to deliver many tasks within the Service Area. However, engagement strategies and project examples in which the firm served as a prime consultant were limited.
HDR	67	The firm offers strong engineering-focused safety expertise and local experience, with organized engagement and implementable recommendations. However, the proposal had unclear integration of public feedback and the firm's work leans toward reactive safety practices rather than proactive, systemic approaches.

High Street	65	The firm is technically qualified, with strong MPO experience and good Safe System understanding. They excel in analysis and implementation but appeared less well-equipped to oversee the whole LRSP or SAP process, particularly in engagement and engineering tasks.
Benesch	64	The firm brings strong multimodal safety experience, data capabilities, Safe System expertise and a familiarity with the region. However, they lack directly related LRSP and SAP experience.
RS&H	62	The firm demonstrates strong qualifications and Vision Zero experience, but limited LRSP and SAP experience. They present a highly technical, engineering focused approach, with less emphasis on engagement and community buy-in.
Arcadis	59.5	The firm offers strong analytical tools, good experience, and thorough engagement methods. However, their approach leans toward conventional safety planning and shows limited alignment with Safe System approaches.
Civiltech	58	A highly competent firm with strong engineering and data capabilities. However, the proposal had limited reference to Safe System approaches and did not directly cite a SAP or LRSP in project examples.
CMT	58	The firm has relevant planning and engineering experience. However, they have limited Safe System expertise. They are capable but not strongly aligned with proactive SAP and LRSP methodologies.
Oates	44.5	The firm is a solid transportation planning firm with MPO experience. However, their approach remains engineering-focused and used conventional safety frameworks rather than holistic safety planning approaches.
Primera	43.5	The firm is highly skilled in the engineering and technical aspects of the Service Area, but does not offer the level of Safe System approaches and local safety planning necessary for this Service Area.
EFK Moen	37.2	The firm offers strong engineering expertise and a data-driven approach. They demonstrate good engagement practices and MPO experience. However, work is heavily engineering-oriented with limited Safe System alignment.
Atlas	33.5	The firm has traffic engineering competency but lacks experience with several critical tasks in this Service Area. Their submission showed a limited understanding of the Safe System Approach.
InNova Consulting	26.25	The firm has experience supporting safety initiatives and offers a project approach that covers required tasks, though it makes limited use of Safe System approaches. While they show strengths in public participation and engineering services, their team and project examples demonstrate limited expertise in the specific safety planning needs of this Service Area.
Dama	20.5	The firm has traffic engineering skills but no evidence of LRSP or SAP experience. Their safety work aligns with conventional, reactive methods, not the proactive Safe System approach required.

SERVICE AREA 7: Market and demographic analysis

Service Area 7 description:

CMAP often requires assistance with market and demographic analysis to enhance projects during various phases of the planning process or undertake new demographic policy research in the region.

- Market analysis may be used to inform existing conditions analysis or plan recommendations based on:
 - Site-driven analysis
 - Use-driven analysis
 - Fiscal impact analysis
 - Economic impact analysis
- Market analysis may be used for implementation steps, such as:
 - Identifying partner organizations
 - Specific funding mechanisms
- Market analysis must include both qualitative and quantitative approaches to understanding market area conditions, including asset-based analysis.
- Storytelling as qualitative research can complement more conventional quantitative research/data, offering a different understanding of lived experience and subjectivity to effect change in public knowledge, attitudes, and behavior.
- Demographic analysis may be used to inform existing conditions analysis or plan recommendations but may also be used for higher level regional policy research.
- In addition, a firm may be asked to assist municipalities with limited staff or resources, which may include:
 - Preparing RFQs
 - Acting as the community's representative in interactions with potential developers

Service Area 7 recommendations for prequalification summary:

A total of twenty three (23) firms submitted responses for Service Area 7. It was decided that prequalifying nine (9) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending AECOM, Buro Happold, Canete Medina, EBP, ESI, KPMG, MIG, SB Friedman, and Stantec for prequalification.

Firms not recommended for prequalification demonstrated partial but incomplete alignment with the Service Area requirements. Many firms showed strong capabilities in some areas such as local market analysis, or community-centered planning but did not demonstrate capabilities in the full range of tasks required for Service Area 7.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
AECOM	91.2	The firm demonstrates significant experience and strong qualifications across all desired services in the Service Area. The proposal includes a strong project approach, robust data methods, and a multi-disciplinary team. Project examples illustrate both local and regional applications. Submission exceeded expectations.
SB Friedman	87.7	The firm demonstrates extensive technical expertise and experience with tasks in the Service Area. The response showed strong quantitative research, excellent understanding of local and regional context, and consistently high-quality project examples. Project examples illustrate ability to understand local context and the ability to render regional analytical services.
KPMG	82.3	The firm has significant experience with regionally significant real estate and policy work. The proposal demonstrated that the firm has a well-equipped staff team and specific, relevant approaches. More detail in selected project resumes would have further strengthened the submission, but overall, the firm demonstrated strong alignment with CMAP needs in this Service Area.
ESI	82.2	The firm demonstrates significant experience and strong qualifications related to the desired services. The work experiences and project examples provided demonstrate experience with regionally significant projects that utilize market, demographic, fiscal, and/or economic analysis, as well as related policy development efforts.
Canete Medina	82.0	The firm demonstrates significant experience and strong qualifications related to most of the desired services. The work experiences and project examples demonstrate experience with both local and regional projects, indicating capability to perform the desired services for a variety of projects.
MIG	81.8	The firm demonstrates technical expertise and experience providing most of the services that fall within the scope of the Service Area. The project examples demonstrate ability to use market and demographic analysis to work at local and regional scales, and support regional policy development. Combines strong modeling and economic analysis capabilities with intentional community coordination.
Buro Happold	79.8	Demonstrates solid experience with local market, demographic, and labor market analysis, along with strong understanding of CMAP context and consideration of client role. The experiences and examples provided demonstrate capability to support regional policy efforts.
Stantec	79.7	The firm demonstrates technical expertise and experience providing the services within the scope of the Service Area. The experiences and project examples included in the

		proposal demonstrate the firm's ability to work in both local and regional contexts.
EBP	79.2	The firm demonstrates significant experience and strong qualifications related to the desired services. The response provides detailed approaches to several types of analysis and illustrates strong forecasting and modeling expertise. While the firm does not provide project examples of specific local market analyses, the resumes illustrate that firm has these capabilities.
Not recommended for prequalification		
Teska Associates	76.5	The firm has extensive experience providing local market and demographic analysis, with strengths in community-centric approaches and coordination with local partners. However, the proposal does not provide sufficient evidence of qualifications or expertise related to other projects and/or tasks included in the Service Area.
Egret & Ox Planning	76.2	The firm has extensive experience providing local market and demographic analysis but does not provide sufficient evidence of qualifications or expertise related to other projects and/or tasks included in the Service Area.
WSP	75.7	The firm demonstrates technical expertise that could adequately support the projects and/or tasks identified in the Service Area description. Project approach demonstrates robust data capabilities, illustrating specific tools and proven workflows. However, the resumes and project examples provided, despite illustrating high quality experience, only demonstrate qualifications for some of the projects and/or tasks.
LJC	73.3	The firm has extensive experience providing local market and demographic analysis but does not provide sufficient evidence of qualifications or expertise related to other projects and/or tasks included in the Service Area.
Cambridge Systematics	70.7	The firm demonstrates technical qualifications and expertise, especially related to transportation-adjacent market efforts. Staff has experience and familiarity with MPO-level work and CMAP's role. However, the proposal did not adequately demonstrate experience with the projects and tasks identified in the Service Area description.
Goodman Williams Group	69.5	The firm has extensive experience providing local market and demographic analysis but does not provide sufficient evidence of qualifications or expertise related to other projects and/or tasks included in the Service Area. The experiences and examples provided demonstrate some experience supporting higher level regional policy development.
Design Workshop	67.7	The firm has experience providing local and subarea analyses but does not provide sufficient evidence of qualifications or expertise related to other projects and/or tasks included in the Service Area. The proposal does not provide a sufficient understanding of CMAP context and specific needs.

Jack Faucett	67.7	The firm demonstrates strong qualifications and technical expertise — especially for economic impact analysis — but their proposal does not speak to, nor sufficiently demonstrate experience with, the full suite of projects and tasks identified in the Service Area description.
3X3	64.3	The firm demonstrates experience conducting qualitative data collection and synthesis for public agencies but does not provide evidence of qualifications or experience with the other projects and/or tasks identified in the Service Area description.
Anderson Smith	64.0	The firm demonstrates experience providing labor market analysis and fiscal assessments. The firm’s emphasis on pairing qualitative and quantitative data with implementation-oriented methods is notable. However, they do not provide evidence of qualifications or expertise related to other projects and/or tasks included in the Service Area description. The experiences and examples provided demonstrate some capabilities to support regional policy efforts.
The 1861 Group	61.8	The project approach and project examples provided demonstrate the firm's understanding of regional planning and the types of projects and/or tasks that could fall within the Service Area. However, the project team resumes do not provide in-depth information on individuals’ project experiences, and the project examples are high-level summaries.
Foursquare ITP	58.7	The firm demonstrates strong technical expertise and experience with regional analysis but does not provide sufficient evidence of qualifications related to the desired services.
McKenna	55.8	The firm has extensive experience providing local market and demographic analysis but does not provide sufficient evidence of qualifications or expertise related to other projects and/or tasks included in the Service Area description. Proposal does not provide a concrete proposed approach or illustrate relevancy to past work with similar agencies.
InNova Consulting	47.2	Although the firm demonstrates technical expertise related to transportation analysis and planning, the proposal does not demonstrate experience with the projects and tasks described in the Service Area description. Project examples do not illustrate robust experience with Service Area tasks.

SERVICE AREA 8: Pavement management planning

CMAQ will not be moving forward with contracting through this RFQ for pavement management.

SERVICE AREA 9: Planning renderings, illustrations, drawings, and graphic design

Service Area 9 description:

CMAQ often requires assistance enhancing projects visually to improve the understanding

and accessibility of the content for potential users. These services cover general graphic designer support, to include:

- Renderings, illustrations, and drawings to demonstrate the visual impact of planning or policy directions in specific areas using:
 - Hand-drawn mediums
 - Computer-generated mediums
 - Comparing current and future conditions, this work often includes:
 - Oblique aerial views
 - Street-level renderings
 - Street-level photo simulations
- To ensure that content is visually appealing, easy to understand, and accessible to users, additional services may include:
 - The design and layout of planning documents
 - Infographics
 - Icons/logos, and other deliverables in final published reports
- Visual storytelling through video and audio design and production may also be required

Service Area 9 recommendations for prequalification summary:

A total of twenty-nine (29) firms submitted responses for Service Area 9. It was decided that pre-qualifying ten (10) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Borderless Studio, Civiltech, Collabo, Design Workshop, Greenprint Partners, LJC, Muse, Psomas, Toole Design, and Urban Works for prequalification.

Several firms not recommended for prequalification demonstrated valuable skills and partial strengths, such as strong architectural renderings, unique technical capabilities, or solid experience in related design fields. However, they did not score as highly as the recommended firms due to common gaps, including insufficient breadth across required visualization types, limited alignment with CMAP’s planning context and insufficient project examples.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
Greenprint Partners	93.0	The firm’s submission demonstrates outstanding quality, strong alignment with CMAP’s work, and impressive graphic examples. The submission highlights the firm’s diverse graphic skills across multiple mediums, prior work with local governments, and explicit attention to accessibility in graphic production.

Borderless Studio	89.5	The firm offered an exceptionally strong submission, featuring high-quality renderings, a visually compelling submission, and a clearly articulated design and project workflow.
LJC	88.8	The firm has highly experienced staff and has demonstrated successful work with government agencies like CMAP. The firm has in-house graphic designers with high-quality visual and storytelling capabilities, and strong technical skills to produce quality illustrations.
Civiltech	88.3	The firm demonstrates strong qualifications in its capabilities, approach, team resumes, and project examples. They have solid experience working with agencies like CMAP, and their renderings and design work align well with the requirements for this Service Area. Having a drone pilot on staff is a unique asset.
Psomas	87.8	The proposal demonstrated deep expertise and a wide range of graphic capabilities, including video, audio, and interactive media. The firm's submission stands out as comprehensive, detailed, and well-aligned with the Service Area's needs.
Muse	86.3	The proposal demonstrates a strong project approach, high-quality visual and storytelling capabilities, supported by a well-structured design team. An excellent proposal that included strong work examples and a well thought out process for working with CMAP.
Toole Design	85.9	The firm clearly meets all requirements to execute the deliverables for the Service Area. The proposal is strong across all criteria, featuring high-quality, diverse examples and familiarity working with agencies like CMAP.
Collabo	84.9	The firm provides relevant experience and a solid approach, resulting in a strong overall score. The firm demonstrated strong design capabilities, fun and unique graphic style, hand-drawing skills, and well-structured examples of engagement materials.
Design Workshop	83.6	The firm demonstrates strong qualifications in its capabilities, approach, team resumes, and project examples. They have solid experience working with agencies like CMAP, and their renderings and design work align well with the requirements for this Service Area. Notably, the firm cites their ongoing research aimed at remaining at the cutting-edge of graphic work.
Urban Works	82.3	The firm submitted a strong submission and demonstrated capability to produce high-quality work within the Service Area. The submission demonstrates outstanding quality, with strong alignment to the project and well-supported examples. The firm's approach is both thoughtful and highly effective.
Not recommended for prequalification		
Houseal Lavigne	81.5	Strong visualization skills and high-quality graphics. However, resume links were inaccessible, preventing full evaluation of team qualifications.

Perkins & Will	81.4	The firm demonstrated high-quality work and strong project approach. However, the submission showed limited experience working with agencies like CMAP.
V3	81	The firm demonstrates strong qualifications in its capabilities, approach, team resumes, and project examples. However, pixelated images and lack of experience working with agencies like CMAP lowered confidence in consistency.
Foursquare ITP	80.5	The submission demonstrates good quality, with well-supported examples. However, the submission did not demonstrate capabilities across the full range of services required in the Service Area.
Parametrix	78.4	The firm meets the basic requirements for the Service Area, has relevant design experience, and a solid project approach. The overall score reflects a functional but limited response.
R.M. Chin & Associates	71.3	The firm demonstrates strong qualifications in its capabilities, team resumes, and approaches that address many key requirements. However, submission had limited detail and alignment with the scope of work in this Service Area.
RS&H	70.6	The firm meets the basic requirements for the Service Area and has relevant design experience and a solid project approach. While the proposal demonstrates a foundational understanding of the project it lacks clarity and specificity in execution.
Epstein	70.5	The firm demonstrated strong qualifications in its capabilities, team resumes, and approach. Its proposal could have been strengthened by offering more diverse examples of visualizations.
Mckenna	70.5	The firm shows strong qualifications in its capabilities, team resumes, and project examples. The firm demonstrates strong graphic skills using a variety of mediums. The firm's submission would have benefitted from more relevant project examples.
MIG	70.4	The firm demonstrates strong qualifications in its capabilities, approach, team resumes, and project examples. The proposal includes a diverse array of graphics and illustrations. However, the lack of depth in experience and approach limits the strength of the firm's submission.
Stantec	70.0	The firm demonstrates strong qualifications in its capabilities, approach, team resumes, and project examples. The firm shows sufficient qualifications and a workable approach, though several elements feel underdeveloped, suggesting limited confidence in their ability to deliver services required in the Service Area.
GRAEF	69.6	The proposal demonstrated impressive skills in graphics and visualizations using a variety of mediums, including hand drawing and video. The proposal would have been stronger if they shared a third project example relevant to the Service Area and demonstrated more experience working with agencies like CMAP.

Primera	68.9	The proposal meets the basic requirements across most categories. While the firm demonstrates the ability to complete the work, their approach and supporting materials do not strongly differentiate them.
JGMA	68.5	The firm shows strong qualifications in its capabilities, team resumes, and project examples. Its submission demonstrates consistent strength across categories. But highlighted work is architecture focused and does not demonstrate strong alignment with Service Area needs.
MKSK	67.9	The firm shows strong qualifications in its capabilities, team resumes, and approach. However, the firm’s project examples for rendering, illustrations, and drawings services were missing from the submission.
Latent	67.8	The proposal meets the basic requirements across most categories but lacks depth in several areas. While the firm demonstrates the ability to complete the work, their approach and supporting materials do not strongly differentiate them.
Baxter	66.3	The firm shows strong qualifications in its capabilities, team resumes, approach, and project examples. However, the presence of pixelated images and non-functioning QR codes limit confidence in the firm’s ability to consistently deliver quality services.
Globetrotters	53	The firm’s submission demonstrates a foundational understanding of the project but lacks clarity and specificity in execution. It does not clearly demonstrate the firm’s capabilities, approach, project team structure, or relevant experience in rendering and design services.
Eco Vidal Design, Inc.	32.4	While the firm demonstrates general experience in the planning and design field, the proposal does not demonstrate sufficient skills or experience necessary to perform the work in the Service Area.

SERVICE AREA 10: Regional policy analysis

Service Area 10 description:

These analyses would involve collaborating with CMAP to answer discrete questions raised through the regional planning, programming, and policy development processes. These analyses are intended to supplement CMAP staff capacity and provide specialized expertise to inform decision-making, evaluate tradeoffs, and support implementable strategies.

Assignments may range in scale, duration, and topic and will be closely coordinated with CMAP staff. Work may include qualitative and quantitative analysis, policy evaluation, scenario testing, and synthesis of complex information for technical and non-technical audiences.

Policy Categories

Consultant work under this Service Area may include, but is not limited to, the below

policy categories CMAP anticipates that the most competitive (outstanding) responses will demonstrate experience across multiple policy categories, ideally all four. However, firms with strong expertise in one or more categories are encouraged to submit a response and clearly identify their areas of focus and experience.

Transportation policy, finance, and system performance

- Transit policy, including fare policy, service planning options, capital planning, governance approaches, supportive land use strategies, and alternative revenue strategies
- Tolling policy and road pricing policy, including toll rate structures, regulatory environments, tolling technologies, customer service considerations, and road usage charging concepts
- Transportation system funding, including identification of revenue options, evaluation of the suitability of revenue options across generally accepted tax policy principles, exploration of regulatory constraints and opportunities, and commentary on implementation considerations
- Planning-level financial forecasting and modeling, including spreadsheet-based analyses for various potential transportation funding options across various implementation scenarios
- Transportation system asset management, including approaches to optimize conditions for both highway and transit facilities

Economy and regional competitiveness

- Economic development and regional competitiveness, including labor markets, access to jobs, industry clusters, freight and logistics, and global economic positioning
- Workforce and employment trends, including implications for transportation access, land use, and regional investment strategies
- Market and real estate analysis related to infrastructure investment, redevelopment, and regional growth patterns

Land use, housing, and community development

- Land use and development policy, including growth patterns, redevelopment strategies, and coordination between land use and infrastructure investment
- Housing supply, affordability, and market dynamics at regional and subregional scales
- Community-scale planning and policy analysis that supports reinvestment, infill development and sustainable growth

Environment, climate and natural resources

- Water resource policy, including water supply, water quality, and stormwater management
- Climate adaptation and resilience strategies, including integration into planning and investment decisions

- Emissions reduction strategies, including transportation and land use related approaches
- Natural resource protection and open space systems
- Environmental policy analysis related to regional planning and infrastructure investment

Expected deliverables may include:

- Best practice/peer scan memos
- Demographic and socioeconomic analysis
- Data-driven analysis to support scenario planning and policy development at regional and subregional scales
- Recommendation memos
- Technical memos
- Legislative/regulatory reviews
- Maps/spatial analysis
- Charts/infographics
- Plans
- Dashboards
- StoryMaps
- Live models detailing analysis (for example, in Excel)
- Presentation materials
- Meeting support (for example, polling, discussion questions, facilitation, subject matter expertise)

Service Area 10 recommendations for pre-qualification summary:

Twenty-seven (27) responses were submitted for Service Area 10. staff determined that prequalifying fourteen (14) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Arcadis, Buro Happold, Cascadia, CDM Smith, Conlon Public Strategies, Design Workshop, Geosyntec, ICF, Jacobs, KPMG, MK Corona, NN Engineering, SB Friedman, and TY Lin for prequalification.

The evaluation team found that many firms were highly skilled but did not score as highly as the firms recommended for prequalification. Additionally, many firms demonstrated capable analysis skills but did not demonstrate ample experience on projects at the regional level, as described in the Service Area description.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
CDM Smith	93.5	CDM Smith has strong capabilities in the tasks outlined in the Service Area description and a history of working successfully with agencies like CMAP. Their work examples

		show they can manage complex assignments and translate technical findings into strategies that fit the northeastern Illinois context.
SB Friedman	93.5	SB Friedman has strong expertise in economic development, revenue strategy, transit finance, and value capture and work examples directly reflect the type of regional policy evaluation and funding analysis CMAP anticipates.
KPMG	90.75	KPMG brings strong advisory experience in infrastructure finance, economic analysis, feasibility assessment, and market evaluation. Their examples show involvement in complex, multi-agency assignments where financial strategy and policy direction intersect.
Conlon Public Strategies	90.5	Conlon offers highly specialized expertise. Their understanding of CMAP's stakeholder environment, fiscal policy challenges, and legislative dynamics provided value beyond technical analysis.
Geosyntec	89.25	Geosyntec has successfully delivered multiple projects relevant to this Service Area and consistently ties technical environmental work to practical regional policy applications.
MK Corona	87.25	MK Corona offers specialized strengths in community-centered policy development, nondiscrimination analysis, and outcomes-focused implementation methods. Their work reflects a nuanced understanding of regional planning challenges.
Cascadia	87	Cascadia shows strong cross-sector capabilities in different topics with particular strengths in scenario planning and data-driven policy evaluation. Their methods emphasize transparency and adaptability, which align well with CMAP's analytical standards.
Jacobs	86.5	Jacobs indicates policy, modeling, and policy development expertise, and their project examples show experience managing large regional initiatives that require coordination across multiple agencies.
Buro Happold	85.75	Buro Happold demonstrates strong capabilities in climate analysis, sustainability planning, economic strategy, and regional policy frameworks. Their prior work with regional planning organizations demonstrates an ability to produce technical deliverables that fit the northeastern Illinois context.
TY Lin	82.75	TY Lin demonstrates solid experience in transportation systems and financial modeling and understands the work of CMAP and peer transportation agencies, primarily the planning-level analysis and decision-making expected in this Service Area.
Arcadis	81.75	Arcadis demonstrates good experience in policy, infrastructure governance, capital programming, and funding strategy at various levels, including MPO, DOT, and municipal.
Design Workshop	81.5	Design Workshop's proposal indicated a well-qualified planning staff with capability to integrate multi-sector data across land use, transportation, housing and environment.
ICF	81.5	ICF demonstrates strong technical methods and subject-matter expertise with high-quality work.

NN Engineering	80	NN Engineering brings useful experience in transit policy and pricing analysis.
Not recommended for prequalification		
WSP	79.75	WSP offers extensive multidisciplinary capabilities, but the proposal speaks less to how they will develop inferences and takeaways with CMAP staff to support decision-making.
Cambridge Systematics	79.5	Cambridge Systematics brings deep technical transportation expertise, but many of their proposed tools and analyses overlap with capabilities CMAP already maintains. Proposal appears to rely on leveraging specialist partners or advisors to guide the work.
Kimley-Horn	79.5	Kimley-Horn provides strong planning and modeling capabilities, but the proposal focuses more on project delivery and operational analysis than on the type of policy research CMAP requires.
MIG	77	MIG has broad planning and engagement experience, but much of the work is not the type of projects we'd be looking for firms to assist with in terms of policy development.
Parametrix	76.75	Parametrix shows strong skills in expressway policy and pricing but has a narrower technical focus than is needed for comprehensive regional policy analysis.
AECOM	76.5	AECOM presents strong planning and engineering capabilities, but the proposal emphasizes broader infrastructure and planning work rather than the specific type of regional policy analysis and methods needed for the tasks described in this Service Area.
Estolano Advisors	74.25	Estolano Advisors demonstrates strong policy work in land use, housing, and environmental topics, but their portfolio does not closely reflect CMAP's specific regional policy environment.
Farr Associates	73.75	Farr Associates offers strong sustainable urbanism and decarbonization expertise, but their portfolio centers on design-oriented assignments rather than regional policy analysis.
MKSK	73	MKSK demonstrates strong design and local planning capabilities, but the examples do not reflect significant experience with regional policy work.
EBP	72.5	EBP provides strong economic and accessibility modeling experience, but their examples focus less on regional policy implementation and more on technical analysis.
SRF	71.5	SRF provides strong technical assistance and safety planning experience, but their examples center on modal and corridor work more than regional policy evaluation.
Anderson Smith	68.5	Anderson Smith provides strong analytics and research capabilities, although much of their experience is in education, workforce, and health fields that do not closely match CMAP's transportation policy focus. Limited past work in planning or working with MPOs.
Jack Faucett	64.5	Jack Faucett demonstrates solid economic and transportation policy analysis, but their examples are not

		closely aligned with CMAP's upcoming regional policy priorities.
--	--	--

SERVICE AREA 11: Transportation modeling and technical analyses

Service Area 11 description:

- Independent review and interpretation of modeling results, anticipated to primarily include regional travel demand modeling
- Specialized modeling services, such as traffic microsimulation and transit ridership modeling, and/or independent review and interpretation of those modeling results

Service Area 11 recommendations for prequalification summary:

Twenty-one (21) responses were submitted for Service Area 11. CMAP staff determined that prequalifying eleven (11) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Arcadis, Cambridge Systematics, Civiltech, DLZ, Kimley-Horn, KPMG, NN Engineering, Parametrix, RSG, SRF, and WSP for prequalification.

While the firms not recommended for prequalification did not receive as high an overall average score as the top-scoring four firms, many demonstrated extensive experience and high-quality project examples. Several firms did not demonstrate sufficient experience interpreting regional travel modeling results.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
Cambridge Systematics	94	The firm has deep modeling experience, including with other MPOs, and a strong technical approach.
Arcadis	91	The firm brings significant experience with regional travel demand modeling and specialized modeling.
Parametrix	91	This firm has strong knowledge of MPO models and experience with modeling in the region.
WSP	91	This firm demonstrates significant expertise in modeling tools used by CMAP and relevant experience from other MPOs.
Civiltech	89	The firm demonstrates a strong understanding of CMAP and partner modeling, including demonstrated experience with interpretation.
KPMG	89	This firm brings a strong mix of technical skills and local policy background to support interpretation of model results.
RSG	88	This firm brings significant knowledge of trip based and activity based models to support interpretation.
NN Engineering	87	This firm brings strong experience with MPO travel models and particularly strong experience with transit modeling.

SRF	87	This firm brings a strong project approach and experience with specialized modeling and microsimulation.
DLZ	82	The firm has strong modeling experience and a detailed description of workflow.
Kimley-Horn	80	The firm demonstrates strong experience across the country.
Not recommended for prequalification		
Stantec	78	This firm brings a clear, well laid out project approach and experience with MPOs. This firm also brings experience with regional modeling, corridor modeling, and project modeling. However, staff have mixed experience with regional modeling.
Ramboll	73	This firm has significant experience with modeling in regional policy and planning across the world. However, it's less clear how many total years of experience the firm has focusing on interpreting regional travel model results.
RS&H	73	This firm brings significant technical expertise across many modeling and microsimulation tools.
Buro Happold	71	The firm describes strong work flows and great planning principles. Regional modeling is less present in resumes and project examples.
GRAEF	64.5	The firm has experience with traffic analysis and microsimulation, but less with MPO travel demand modeling.
EFK Moen	61	The firm provided a very strong description of the project approach. Project examples do not heavily feature interpretation of regional modeling results.
EXP	57	The firm has strong transportation planning experience. However, the firm's submission did not sufficiently demonstrate experience interpreting regional travel model results.
Jack Faucett	49	The firm has solid experience with travel modeling at federal and state levels. The submission's focus on interpreting regional travel demand model results was insufficient.
GTI Energy	15	The proposal shows limited direct experience with interpreting regional travel demand modeling results.
Globetrotters	14	The firm has limited experience relevant to this Service Area.

SERVICE AREA 12: Transportation plans

Service Area 12 description:

These plans may address:

- Assessing existing and future conditions for specific corridors, intersections, districts, or community-wide transportation networks, including roadway, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit infrastructure
- Evaluating the feasibility and potential performance of proposed transportation infrastructure improvements, including technical, operation, fiscal, and implementation considerations
- Developing graphically driven multimodal concept plans suitable for public

- engagement and stakeholder review
- Analyzing anticipated impacts of proposed improvements, such as changes in traffic operations, multimodal access, safety outcomes, and budget implications

Work may also include:

- Preparing generalized cost estimates for recommended improvements, including capital, operations, and long-term maintenance considerations
- Drafting high-level scopes of work and corresponding cost estimates for preliminary engineering, final engineering, construction engineering, or related phases to support local budgeting, grant applications, and project programming
- Developing recommendations that are actionable and accompanied by considerations related to phasing, funding eligibility, permitting, and interagency coordination, as appropriate

CMAA does not anticipate that the firm will be asked to prepare engineering drawings as a part of these activities.

Service Area 12 recommendations for pre-qualification summary:

Thirty-four (34) responses were submitted for Service Area 12. It was decided that prequalifying eleven (11) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending AECOM, Cambridge Systematics, CDM Smith, Civiltech, Epstein, Jacobs, NN Engineering, Parametrix, Smith Group, Stantec, and TY Lin for prequalification.

Several firms not recommended for prequalification demonstrated accomplished experience in transportation planning but did not receive as high an overall average score as the other firms. The evaluation team noted that some firms had an inadequate engagement approach, did not have services or staff that fully aligned with the description of the Service Area, or had limited experience with public agencies.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
TY Lin	94	TY Lin's submittal pointed to its comprehensive capabilities and an approach that was likely to result in successful project completion.
Smith Group	93.5	SmithGroup presented a comprehensive suite of transportation planning services and indicated a qualified firm with local project experience.
AECOM	84.5	AECOM showed a range of transportation planning services that seem to be well aligned with this Service Area and

		demonstrated that the firm has a highly experienced project team.
Civiltech	82	Civiltech demonstrated excellent qualifications for this Service Area, including a flexible approach, effective engagement, and expert staff.
CDM Smith	81.5	CDM Smith presented a qualified team and comprehensive approach well suited to the needs of the Service Area. The firm demonstrated its ability to complete the types of studies included in the Service Area.
NN Engineering	81	NN presented a qualified team and a set of services aligned with the needs of the Service Area. The firm has worked on numerous PAO-type projects for other regions of the country.
Cambridge Systematics	78.5	Cambridge Systematics presented a highly qualified national firm with an excellent range of expertise and experience for this Service Area.
Jacobs	78	Jacobs is a qualified firm with solid transportation skills. The proposal highlighted the tools, staff, and approach necessary to complete the transportation planning work in this Service Area.
Stantec	76.5	Stantec provided information on a qualified team that had experience in a comprehensive array of transportation planning projects.
Parametrix	75.5	Parametrix presented a comprehensive list of services with the capacity to deliver.
Epstein	75	Epstein demonstrated that it is a qualified firm with good experience in transportation planning.
Not recommended for prequalification		
Arcadis	74.5	The Arcadis team is experienced and well qualified. The team's experience includes agency experience in such multimodal focus areas as freight and non-motorized transportation. However, their public engagement lacked specific examples.
Buro Happold	72	Impressive submission with a thoughtful approach and description of qualifications. The project list was not as strong in demonstrating public agency coordination.
Kimley-Horn	72	Kimley-Horn presented a qualified team and a set of services aligned with the Service Area. They provided an adequate approach but didn't incorporate public input.
WSP	71.5	WSP presented a comprehensive approach, but the engagement approach lacked concrete strategies, and their narrative did not provide steps on working with CMAP.
SRF	71	SRF presented a comprehensive approach that would likely result in successful project implementation, but the firm did not show an understanding for CMAP's role and lacked steps for working with CMAP.
Antero Group	69.5	Antero indicated both technical and more community-based capabilities, but the narrative lacked specificity on working with CMAP and the project examples appeared small-scale.
RS&H	67.75	The project team has comprehensive transportation planning experience, but the narrative lacked practical steps for working with CMAP or other MPOs.

CMT	67.5	The CMT submittal presented a very competent firm with a variety of skills and experience, but the engagement plan lacked specific examples.
Psomas	67	Psomas's submittal demonstrated that the firm was a capable transportation planning firm, but they laid out a range of services that seemed to exclude some key tasks needed in this Service Area.
EXP	66	EXP is a global firm with experience on large-scale projects, but didn't sufficiently demonstrate their experience with smaller and municipal transportation projects.
GFT	65	GFT presented a competent team with services aligned with many of the project types included in the Service Area, but the firm did not present a comprehensive approach.
Michael Baker	65	Michael Baker presented a team that overall was qualified, with a range of experience, but the narrative didn't clearly lay out an understanding of CMAP's role or concrete strategies for working with CMAP.
LJC	64.5	LJC presented a compelling response to the RFQ. However, the firm had important gaps in transportation planning skills.
Mead & Hunt	62.75	Mead & Hunt provided very good staff and sample project information. However, their engagement approach did not include examples and did not mention incorporating feedback into work.
MKSK	58	MKSK's team appears to have substantial multimodal transportation planning experience, but their submittal was too focused on non-motorized transportation for the needs of this Service Area.
Atlas	57	Atlas's submission showed great technical abilities. Parts of the submission were very strong, but key points like public engagement and working with a multi-jurisdictional agency like CMAP were lacking.
Ramboll	56	Ramboll demonstrated that they could complete transportation planning projects. However, they did not elaborate on how they would complete projects or provide a comprehensive approach to public engagement.
Foursquare ITP	51.5	Foursquare ITP has a strong understanding of data, engagement, and showed many useful tools, but the submittal focused on transit, and CMAP will likely have much wider range of projects.
EFK Moen	43	EFK Moen has strong engineering expertise, but the resumes didn't align with the varieties of transportation planning highlighted in the Service Area and lacked insights into planning, data, and policy.
GRAEF	42.5	GRAEF's submission indicated a capable design firm, but one not well suited for the type of transportation planning services we seek, which can range from modeling to technical assistance projects - neither of which were highlighted.
KPMG	30.5	KPMG is a highly skilled technical infrastructure firm, but their approach as a strategic advisor does not address the need for local transportation planning as described in the Service Area description.

Jack Faucett	20	The submission did not provide sufficient evidence that the firm could complete the transportation planning tasks in the Service Area and lacked resumes.
Lochner	19.5	Capable firm, but they did not provide the project approach for the correct Service Area.

SERVICE AREA 13: Travel activity data capture and processing by camera and other detection devices

Service Area 13 description:

CMAP often requires assistance collecting passenger vehicle, non-motorized, and freight system data (such as volumes, speeds, delay and user behavior) to better understand the regional transportation network in large-scale regional and local area context. This work supports corridor planning efforts, freight network planning, safety planning, and future project programming efforts. This will include the ability to:

- Capture video footage for defined 24-hour periods.
 - Some video (e.g., at highway-rail grade crossings) will simply be transmitted to CMAP. Other video will be transmitted to commercial services to detect, process, and document vehicle classification, including passenger vehicles, single-unit trucks, multi-unit trucks, pedestrians, and cyclists.
 - This also includes the ability to provide turning-vehicle counts by intersection approach by these classifications, all in 15-minute increments for a defined 24-hour period. Pole-mounted field cameras are commonly used for these purposes. The data collected by these means shall also be capable of being downloaded and formatted into documents and reports supporting CMAP internal and external work activities.
 - Equipment to capture video will be the firm’s responsibility, as will engagement of commercial services to process the video into counts.
- Capture vehicle speed distributions for defined periods using radar devices.
- Capture infrastructure condition images and data using location-enabled survey software, such as Survey123, to support CMAP transportation planning activities.
- Obtain data manually, consistent with the procedures laid out in the ITE Manual of Transportation Engineering Studies or as coordinated with CMAP.
 - Such data may include freight studies, saturation flow rates, and occupancy/length of stay for loading zones, truck parking, and other parking studies.
 - In addition, some bike-pedestrian counts may be obtained manually where the installation of pole-mounted video cameras is not feasible in off-street locations.
- As activities are assigned, determine what permits, if any, are necessary from the

jurisdiction agency, and obtain the permits, providing proof of insurance as required by the jurisdiction agency.

- Conduct data collection in a manner so as to maximize the safety of workers and travelers, including appropriate attire and setbacks from moving vehicles. Safety training will be the firm’s responsibility.

Service Area 13 recommendations for prequalification summary:

Ten (10) responses were submitted for Service Area 13. It was decided that prequalifying five (5) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Civiltech, DLZ, Gewalt Hamilton, Terra, and WSP for prequalification.

Several firms not recommended for prequalification demonstrated exceptional experience in data collection but did not receive as high an overall average score as the other firms. The evaluation team found that some proposals did not provide specific examples of how they collected the data or what equipment they have available to conduct the data collection or did not demonstrate adequate experience in collecting multi-model transportation data.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
Terra	94.5	Terra’s submission demonstrated the capabilities, staff, and equipment to complete the work outlined in the Service Area, and that their approach would yield high-quality data.
DLZ	93.5	DLZ demonstrated an extensive history of competent project delivery in terms of gathering traffic data and that it has the capacity to cover a large MPO region in a relatively short period of time. The submission also demonstrated that DLZ has experience in integrating ArcGIS in project inventory and work processes.
Gewalt Hamilton	91.5	Firm provides thorough description of client delivery process, including communication throughout project, constant QA/QC and equipment monitoring, and flexibility and timeliness of end product deliverables.
Civiltech	85.8	Civiltech demonstrated their capability and experience to complete CMAP data collection requests. Civiltech's approach matched the needs of the Service Area.
WSP	82.8	As a comprehensive entity, WSP’s submission demonstrated that it is capable of delivering on large scale projects and in doing so competently executes traffic and non-motorized data capture.
Not recommended for prequalification		

Ramboll	70.5	Ramboll demonstrated that they deploy data collection activities as indicated in the Service Area description. However, Ramboll didn't sufficiently indicate that they possessed any equipment or staff dedicated to doing so.
InNova Consulting	66.8	Staff now working at InNova had suitable experience from working at prior firms. However, the submission did not include a summary of equipment capacity or matches of methods/equipment to study types.
SRF	60.3	Staff now working at SRF had suitable experience from working at prior firms. However, SRF did not commit to completing all of the data collection tasks listed in the Service Area description.
Globetrotters	56.0	While Globetrotters laid out their overall capabilities for engineering, they didn't sufficiently demonstrate substantial data collection capabilities. Firm does not provide concrete examples of video-assisted traffic counting devices either in number of units or number of counts.
Locus	40.5	Locus focused on cloud processing of data feeds, not locally collected data as set forth in the Service Area description.

SERVICE AREA 14: Water quality

This Service Area consists of tasks to assist CMAP with watershed-based planning and water quality technical assistance being conducted in partnership with Illinois EPA.

Service Area 14 description:

This Service Area consists of tasks to assist CMAP with watershed-based planning and water quality technical assistance being conducted in partnership with Illinois EPA. Work may include:

- Development of new or updates of existing watershed-based plans and executive summaries to be consistent with U.S. EPA’s nine minimum elements for a watershed management plan, Illinois EPA requirements, and current watershed planning principles. Work may include:
 - Assistance with stakeholder engagement
 - Development or update of a comprehensive watershed resource inventory, including aerial analyses, field data collection, development of GIS-based data collection apps, pollutant load modeling, and preparation of maps and data tables
 - Development or update of a watershed management action plan, including recommended watershed protection measures and associated pollutant load reductions and planning level cost estimates for both site-specific best management practices (BMPs) and watershed-wide BMP scenarios, public education and outreach products and activities, funding and technical assistance resources, implementation schedule, interim measurable milestones, criteria for determining progress, and monitoring to evaluate effectiveness of BMP implementation
 - Development of interactive GIS web maps for public input, display of

stream, lake, and detention basin inventory assessment data, and display of final plan recommendations

- Technical assistance, which may include:
 - Water quality modeling, which may include:
 - Identifying point-source pollution sources
 - Modeling to quantify pollutant loading
 - Modeling to estimate pollutant load reductions and planning level costs for urban and agricultural BMPs
 - Developing hydrologic and nutrient budgets
 - Assessing how surface waters will respond to watershed and environmental changes (e.g., land use change, climate change)
 - Developing total maximum daily loads (TMDLs)
 - Quantifying benefits of water quality protection policies
 - Hydrologic and hydraulic modeling
 - Field reconnaissance and provision of general recommendations for best management practices (BMPs) to address nonpoint source pollution and water quality problems
 - Development of preliminary designs for BMPs to address nonpoint source pollution and water quality problems
 - Assistance with public information, education, and outreach products and activities
 - Assistance with grant applications

Service Area 14 recommendations for prequalification summary:

Fifteen (15) responses were submitted for Service Area 14. It was decided that pre-qualifying six (6) firms was the maximum number appropriate for the anticipated needs for this Service Area. Scoring of the submitted responses according to the evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 1 resulted in the evaluation team recommending Baxter & Woodman, ECT, Geosyntec, Hey and Associates, HR Green, and Spheros.

Many of the firms not recommended for prequalification submitted strong qualifications relative to the Service Area but did not score as highly as the top-scoring firms. The evaluation team also noted that some firms demonstrated experience in stormwater planning but not watershed-based planning, or they did not provide examples of, or experience with, watershed management plans consistent with U.S. EPA’s nine minimum elements for a watershed management plan, as outlined in the Service Area description.

Firm Name	Score Average	Assessment
Recommended for prequalification		
Baxter & Woodman	86.7	Baxter & Woodman demonstrated outstanding experience in the development of watershed-based plans. They also

		demonstrated good experience in the technical assistance aspects of the Service Area.
Geosyntec	84.3	Geosyntec provided examples and laid out skills that were exactly aligned with what is being requested in the Service Area. The team has lots of experience and many different skills needed to conduct watershed plans, modeling, engagement, etc.
ECT	79.3	ECT demonstrated that it offers a solid approach, backed by extensive experience, to watershed planning and providing water quality technical assistance.
Hey and Associates	78.7	Hey and Associates exhibited very good experience in the watershed-based planning aspects and outstanding experience in the technical assistance aspects of the Service Area.
HR Green	76.7	HR Green demonstrated solid experience in the watershed-based planning and technical assistance aspects of the Service Area.
Spheros	68.7	Spheros demonstrated extensive experience with watershed-based planning within the EPA's nine minimum element requirements and the ability to carry out water quality monitoring.
Not recommended for prequalification		
GRAEF	63.0	GRAEF offered a solid approach, but the staff selected for this team did not exhibit an understanding of the watershed-based planning skills needed for the Service Area.
Jacobs	62.8	Team has extensive modeling experience, yet it did not demonstrate an adequate level of experience in watershed-based planning. The submission's project examples did not outline a watershed based plan that aligns with EPA's nine minimum element requirements.
Parametrix	52.8	The firm's project approach very closely aligns with the needs of the Service Area, but the resumes and project examples included in the submission do not demonstrate an adequate level of experience in watershed-based planning.
Civiltech	52.2	While Civiltech demonstrated solid experience relevant to several components of the work of this Service Area, the firm's demonstrated experience in the development of nine minimum element watershed-based plans is not adequate for the overall needs of this Service Area.
Michael Baker	52.0	Team has extensive TMDL and modeling experience yet does not demonstrate an adequate level of experience in watershed-based planning.
Arcadis	53.5	Arcadis has extensive stormwater experience yet does not demonstrate an adequate level of experience in watershed-based planning and water quality technical assistance activities.
Greenprint Partners	45.0	Greenprint Partners exhibit outstanding community engagement and green infrastructure planning experience but did not sufficiently demonstrate experience in development of nine minimum element watershed-based plans, WQ and H&H modeling, and agricultural BMP design.

Delta Institute	33.3	Delta Institute exhibited strong community engagement and water infrastructure technical assistance/funding knowledge but did not demonstrate an adequate level of experience in the more technical aspects of the Service Area.
Jack Faucett	29.7	Firm's submission did not demonstrate sufficient experience, qualifications, or project approach to complete the project. No resumes were provided.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval



MEMORANDUM

To: CMAP Board

From: The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) project team

Date: June 10, 2026

Subject: Release draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for public comment

Action Requested: Approval

Background

Federal law requires CMAP, as the designated metropolitan planning organization for northeastern Illinois, to develop and periodically update a long-range regional transportation plan. The 2026 RTP is the region's transportation policy and investment framework for the next 20 years. It is one of the first plans developed under CMAP's transition to a family of plans approach to comprehensive planning, in which a long-term regional vision guides a series of topic-specific planning efforts. The Century Plan, scheduled for adoption in 2027, will serve as that overarching vision and inform future RTP cycles. In the meantime, ON TO 2050 continues to serve as the policy foundation for the 2026 RTP.

Development of the 2026 RTP involved multi-year engagement with transportation agencies, local governments, community organizations, and residents across the seven-county region. The Transportation Committee, CMAP Board, and MPO Policy Committee provided direction and oversight throughout. Resource groups covering congestion management, regional capital projects, and financial planning contributed technical expertise at key stages. Other advisory groups — including the Community Alliance for Regional Equity, Future Leaders in Planning, and the Regional Mobility Council — ensured that community perspectives informed the planning process. Nearly 1,800 residents participated in a public questionnaire, and public comment received in recent months has been extensive.

About the Draft Plan

The draft 2026 RTP elevates five transportation goal areas and identifies priority investments to advance them. A brief summary of each goal area follows.

- **Connections:** The plan examines travel reliability, multimodal choice, and accessibility across the region. It identifies strategies to address congestion, expand transit and active transportation, and ensure the system is accessible to all residents, including people with disabilities and older adults.

- **Safety:** The plan confronts a roadway safety crisis that peaked at more than 700 traffic deaths in 2021. It calls for a regional Safe System Approach framework, context-appropriate speed management, protective infrastructure, and prioritized investment in corridors and communities where risk is greatest.
- **Climate and environment:** The plan addresses transportation emissions, air quality, and the resilience of transportation infrastructure to flooding and extreme heat. It calls for progress on emissions-reduction targets and investments to mitigate the effects of extreme weather on the regional transportation system.
- **Economy:** The plan examines how transportation supports workforce access, freight movement, and inclusive economic growth. It recommends aligning transportation investment with land use decisions to strengthen economic centers and multimodal connections across the region and addresses intercity bus and passenger rail as regional economic assets.
- **Governing, funding, and preserving the system:** The plan documents the region's infrastructure maintenance backlog, the gap between revenues and costs, and the coordination needed to address both. It identifies specific revenue mechanisms — including expanded tolling, a road usage charge, sales tax modernization, and more — and calls for more coordinated, performance-based investment decision-making.

To implement this transportation vision, the 2026 RTP elevates 15 priority investments, which were identified through a rigorous, performance-based evaluation process. These priorities include the projects and programs that most substantially advance regional goals. Beyond this list, all fiscally constrained regional capital projects remain eligible for federal funding.

To explore this information in greater detail, the draft RTP and accompanying set of appendices are included below:

- [2026 Regional Transportation Plan](#)
- [Plan de Transporte Regional de 2026](#)
- [Appendix A: Administrative Policies and Procedures](#)
- [Appendix B: Air Quality Conformity Documentation](#)
- [Appendix C: Financial Plan for Transportation](#)
- [Appendix D: Public and Stakeholder Engagement](#)
- [Appendix E: Regional Capital Projects Benefits Report](#)
- [Appendix F: Socioeconomic Forecast](#)
- [Appendix G: System Performance Report](#)
- [Appendix H: Transportation System Inventory](#)
- [Appendix I: Travel Demand Model Documentation](#)

Federal Nondiscrimination Requirements

Federal law, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes, prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, and disability in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance. As a recipient of federal transportation planning funds, CMAP is required to conduct planning activities in a nondiscriminatory manner and to assess whether the benefits and burdens of regional transportation investments are consistent with these requirements. In developing the 2026 RTP, CMAP conducted a nondiscrimination analysis examining the distribution of plan investments across the region's

population, with particular attention to minority and low-income populations, persons with limited English proficiency, people with disabilities, and people age 65 and older.

To assess nondiscrimination, the activity-based model was used to measure access to colleges and universities, grocery stores, trauma centers, and jobs within varying time thresholds by both auto and transit. The analysis compared levels of access to these key destinations in the 2026 base year compared to the 2050 plan build-out year and found that the plan's investments are distributed across the region in a manner that does not discriminate against any of the assessed populations.

CMAP's public engagement process was designed to reach a broad cross-section of the region's residents, including those with limited English proficiency, through a public questionnaire, translated materials, partnership with local organizations, and in-person outreach in a wide range of communities throughout the region.

Public Comment and Public Hearing

The public comment period will provide residents, organizations, municipalities, and agencies across northeastern Illinois the opportunity to review and comment on the draft plan. Once the plan is released, feedback can be submitted through a form at cmap.is/rtp, by emailing rtp@cmap.illinois.gov, or by calling, mailing, or visiting the CMAP office. The comment period is anticipated to run from June 12 through July 31.

Federal regulations require CMAP to hold a public hearing on the draft RTP during the comment period. The public hearing is scheduled to be held at the Old Post Office (433 West Van Buren Street, Suite 450, Chicago) from 3:00 to 4:30 p.m. on Thursday, August 6. Members of the public are invited to attend and provide comments on the draft plan. Please [register](#) in advance.

All comments received — whether submitted in writing, by phone, at the public hearing, or through other channels — will be reviewed and considered before the plan is finalized and presented to the board and MPO Policy Committee for adoption.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval

MEMORANDUM

To: CMAP Board

From: The Century Plan project team

Date: June 10, 2026

Subject: The Century Plan update

Action Requested: Information

Throughout 2026, CMAP has made substantial progress toward developing The Century Plan, a new, long-term vision for northeastern Illinois. Activities include four Catalyst Series events focused on key regional topics, six Local Insights workshops with municipal leaders, and strategic foresight planning exercises to inform The Century Plan so that it is forward-looking, actionable, and relevant long-term.

CMAP will continue to facilitate more of these conversations across the region over the next several months as the region defines its vision for the future. At these convenings, leaders representing government, business, and civic spheres are developing a collective understanding of the challenges northeastern Illinois is facing and the commitments needed to orient ourselves toward a shared vision for the future.

CMAP is beginning to synthesize findings and narrow in on priorities for The Century Plan. The Board will hear about notable challenges and opportunities that are emerging as priorities for regional coordination: infrastructure, drinking water, the electric grid, housing supply, and open space.

The Board will also hear about next steps in The Century Plan development.

ACTION REQUESTED: Information



433 West Van Buren Street, Suite 450
 Chicago, IL 60607
 cmap.illinois.gov | 312-454-0400

MEMORANDUM

To: CMAP Board

From: CMAP Intergovernmental Affairs division

Date: June 10, 2026

Subject: Legislative update

Action Requested: Information

FEDERAL

Surface transportation reauthorization

Bipartisan surface transportation reauthorization legislation was recently introduced in the House (the BUILD America 250 Act). This legislation would authorize \$580 billion for surface transportation programs over the next five fiscal years (FY27-31), covering funding for federal highways, bridges, transit. This legislation would serve as the successor to the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), which is set to expire at the end of FY26 (September 30).

The bill includes guaranteed funding for crucial programs like Safe Streets for All and provides a significant increase in funding for bridge repair and replacement. The bill also repeals several discretionary funding programs, including the Carbon Reduction Program and PROTECT. However, expanded CMAQ eligibilities may provide funding for some of these projects.

As currently proposed, CMAP would be eligible to become a direct recipient of Metropolitan Planning (PL) funding. The federal share of PL funds would increase to 90%, and PL eligibility would expand to include preliminary design, local technical assistance, fiscal administration of local projects, transportation studies, and critical data procurement.

It is still very early in the process, and staff are in communication with the delegation to share CMAP’s perspective on the bill. The Senate must also draft and consider reauthorization legislation, and the appropriations committees in both chambers must debate and pass funding bills. As IIJA funds are set to expire on September 30, it is increasingly likely Congress will pursue a continuing resolution (CR) while both chambers continue to debate reauthorization legislation. If a CR is passed, then the increased resources available under IIJA via advance appropriations will no longer be available, and funding levels will fall to the level appropriated specifically for FY26.

STATE

FY27 budget, BIMP, and revenue omnibus

Early in the morning on June 1st, the General Assembly passed a \$55.9 billion FY27 budget ([HB111](#)) alongside the budget implementation bill ([HB2949](#)). The General Assembly also passed a revenue omnibus bill ([SB3019](#)) that includes a new digital ad tax, a new social media platform fee, and a 6-month suspension of the state motor fuel tax collection. Staff are continuing to review these bills for their impacts to the region.

Several priority bills, including the megaprojects legislation and the Governor's BUILD initiative, did not advance prior to adjournment. The General Assembly is next expected to convene during veto session, following elections in November.

NITA clean-up

The General Assembly passed [HB2335](#), the NITA trailer bill, which addresses technical errors, extends deadlines for required reports and the completion of reconsecration for certain transit stations. The legislation also ensures that board representation remains in place from June 1, 2026, when NITA takes effect, through September 1, 2026, when the terms of current RTA, CTA, Metra, and Pace board members expire.

General legislative activity

In addition to the measures identified above, CMAP staff tracks legislation before the General Assembly that impacts the region and is relevant to the agency's work. The following has been identified by CMAP staff as key pieces of legislation that are still active in the legislative process and may be of interest to the CMAP Board.

It should be noted this is not an exhaustive list of legislation tracked by CMAP staff. For more information on other tracked legislation of interest, please contact Ryan Gougis, IGA Specialist at rgougis@cmapp.illinois.gov.

Bike and Pedestrian

[SB3336 HA2 & 3](#) – **LOW-SPEED ELECTRIC BICYCLE (Rep. B. Hernandez/Sen. Villivalam)**

Description: Amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. Provides for the operation of toy vehicles, motor driven cycles, and electric micromobility devices within the State, including provisions regarding certificate of title requirements, prohibition signage, licensing requirements, age requirements, equipment requirements, sale requirements, violations, and home rule limitations. Authorizes the Department of Natural Resources to adopt administrative rules for the regulation of low-speed electric bicycles on any and all properties owned, managed, or leased by the Department of Natural Resources. Allows a person to operate a Class 1 or Class 2 low-speed electric bicycle only if he or she is 15 years of age or older. Provides that a low-speed electric bicycle that is manufactured to accommodate passengers may not be operated by a person under the age of 18 with a passenger unless the passenger is a sibling, stepsibling, child, or stepchild of the operator. Repeals a provision regarding low-speed electric scooters. HA2 establishes titling and registration requirements and exemptions for electric-powered motor driven cycles or gas-powered bicycles. Provides that the Bicycle Article of the Rules of the Road Chapter applies to adaptive electric bicycles when operated by a person with a mobility disability. HA3 Provides that the requirements of driving while under the influence of alcohol, other drug or drugs, intoxicating compound or compounds, or any combination thereof do not apply to low-speed electric bicycles and low-speed gas bicycles. Provides that to the extent that a low-speed electric bicycle or low-speed gas bicycle is capable of and operating in excess of 28 miles per hour, that vehicle is considered a motor driven cycle under the Code, and is subject to the requirements of this provision. Effective July 1, 2027.

Status: Placed on Senate Calendar Order of Concurrence on 5/28/2026

SB3484 HA1 – MICROMOBILITY/E-BIKE SAFETY (Sen. Villivalam/Rep. B. Hernandez)

Description: HA1 Amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. Sets forth titling requirements for (i) a motor driven cycle that is powered by an electric motor with a nominal power rating of greater than 750 watts but less than or equal to 8,000 watts and (ii) a gas-powered bicycle capable of operating at speeds greater than 28 miles per hour. Excludes electric micromobility devices from titling, registration, license or permit, and liability insurance policy requirements. Establishes signage requirements notifying users of areas where the operation of motor driven cycles is strictly prohibited. Sets forth the operation of toy vehicles, motor driven cycles, and electric micromobility devices in the State. Prohibits low-speed gas bicycles and low-speed electric bicycles from being operated by a person under the age of 18 with a passenger unless the passenger is a sibling, stepsibling, child, or stepchild of the operator. Establishes where a low-speed gas bicycle may be operated. Allows the Department of Natural Resources and park districts, forest preserve districts, conservation districts, and transit districts to regulate the use of low-speed electric bicycles on their properties. Defines terms. Makes other changes. Makes conforming changes in the Micromobility Fire Safety Act and the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act. Effective January 1, 2027.

Status: Held on 2nd Reading in House

Climate Mitigation & Resilience

SB41 SA2 – CLEAN TRANSPORTATION STANDARD (Sen. Koehler)

Description: SA2 creates the Clean Transportation Standard Act. Establishes the clean transportation standard to reduce life cycle carbon intensity of fuels for the ground transportation sector by specified amounts. Provides for related rulemaking and calculations. Provides that the clean transportation standard shall take the form of a credit marketplace monitored by the Environmental Protection Agency. Provides for verification and data privacy requirements for the Agency. Provides for penalties for failing to offset deficits in certain situations, and for penalties for submitting false information. Exempts airline, rail, ocean-going, and military fuel. Provides that the Agency must develop a periodic fuel supply forecast. Establishes findings. Defines terms. Contains other provisions. Effective January 1, 2027.

Status: Assigned to Senate Energy and Public Utilities; committee/3rd reading deadline established as 5/31/2026

SB3772 – EPA-ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE (Sen. Villanueva/Rep. Jimenez)

Description: Amends the Environmental Protection Act. Makes findings about the imposition of disproportionate and adverse effects on communities in areas of environmental justice concern. Defines terms. Applies to the following permits for which an owner or operator applies on or after January 1, 2026: (1) a construction permit for a new source that is to be located in an area of environmental justice concern and that is required to obtain from the Agency a CAAPP permit or a Federally Enforceable State Operating Permit; (2) a construction permit for any existing source that is located in an area of environmental justice concern, that possesses a CAAPP permit or a Federally Enforceable State Operating Permit issued by the Agency, and that seeks an increase in annual permitted emissions; or (3) a construction permit for any existing source that is located in an area of environmental justice concern, that seeks an increase in annual permitted emissions, and that will for the first time require a new CAAPP permit or a Federally Enforceable State Operating Permit issued by the Agency. Requires the Environmental Protection Agency to evaluate the application for affects on environmental justice and may suggest additional testing or changes in the application. Requires that the Agency to conduct an evaluation of the prospective owner's or operator's prior experience in owning and operating sources of

air pollution before it may issue a construction permit. Makes other changes. Creates the Office of Environmental Justice within the Environmental Protection Agency. Effective immediately.

Status: Passed both Houses on 5/30/2026

Freight & Rail

HB4442– HIGH SPEED RAIL COMM REPEAL (Rep. Cochran/Sen. Stadelman)

Description: Amends the High Speed Rail Commission Act. Extends the duration of the Commission to January 1, 2030 (rather than January 1, 2027). Effective immediately.

Status: Passed both Houses on 5/19/2026

Housing, Zoning, and Land Use

HB5424 HA1 – IHDA-HOUSING PLANNING (Rep. Tarver, II)

Description: Requires the State to prepare and be guided by a 3-year Comprehensive Housing Plan, that is consistent with the affirmative fair housing provisions of the Illinois Human Rights Act and specifically addresses specified underserved populations. Requires the Comprehensive Housing Plan to reflect the State's commitment to an affordable housing approach for priority populations that promotes access to opportunity and resources for low-income households through certain priority initiatives. Expands the membership on the State Housing Task Force to include the Directors or Secretaries of several State departments and agencies. HA1 adds a definition for "area median household income". Expands the purpose of the Act to include: (i) creating housing to avoid displacement of existing residents in areas with rapidly escalating housing costs; (ii) promoting housing investment in communities with vacant and abandoned properties; and (iii) supporting innovative models of homeownership, including, but not limited to, community land trusts and other shared equity models

Status: Assigned to Senate Executive on 4/28/2026; committee/3rd reading deadline established as 5/31/2026

SB329 SA1 – BUILD: BROKER FEES (Sen. Stadelman)

Description: SA1 prohibits landlords and property owners from requiring tenants or prospective tenants to retain, engage with or pay a fee to a real estate broker or residential leasing agent hired by the landlord. The measure would also prohibit landlords from directing brokers or leasing agents to collect payment from tenants for services performed on behalf of the landlord or property owner.

Status: Placed on Senate Calendar 3rd Reading on 5/21/2026; 3rd reading deadline established as 5/31/2026

SB330 SA1 – BUILD: DV DISCRIMINATION (Sen. Guzman)

Description: SA1 would bolster protections for Illinoisans by prohibiting discrimination on the basis of someone's real or perceived experience as a survivor of domestic, sexual or gender-based violence during any real estate transaction.

Status: Placed on Senate Calendar 3rd Reading on 5/21/2026; 3rd reading deadline established as 5/31/2026

SB331 SA1 & 2 – BUILD: PRIVATE EQUITY FEE (Sen. Ventura)

Description: SA1 would establish a fee on private equity firms' speculative purchases of existing housing – a practice that often turns residential properties into high-profit investment assets. SA2 makes changes to the definitions of "covered entity", "large institutional real estate investor", and "residential property" and removes definitions for "multi-family home" and "single family home". Provides that the annual fee shall be imposed for each residential property in excess of 10 residential properties (rather than 10 single family homes or 8 multi-family homes). It also adds a July 1, 2027 effective date.

Status: Placed on Senate Calendar 3rd Reading on 5/21/2026; 3rd reading deadline established as 5/31/2026

SB332 SA1 – BUILD: FIRST REFUSAL (Sen. Simmons)

Description: SA1 would allow tenants in Illinois to have the right of first refusal when residential property is put up for sale, enabling them to organize to purchase their building before it can be sold to outside investors.

Status: Placed on Senate Calendar 3rd Reading on 5/21/2026; 3rd reading deadline established as 5/31/2026

SB608 SA1 – BUILD: SEC. 8 WORK REQ. (Sen. Villivalam)

Description: SA1 would clearly establish that housing authorities and private owners of subsidized housing in Illinois can't mandate work requirements or place time limits on residents.

Status: Placed on Senate Calendar 3rd Reading on 4/29/2026; 3rd reading deadline established as 5/31/2026

SB635 SA2 & 3 – BUILD: FBOs ZONING REFORM (Sen. Feigenholtz)

Description: SA2 and 3 would empower faith-based organizations with a clear path to develop affordable, mixed-use and multifamily developments on their land by exempting them from strict zoning requirements.

Status: Placed on Senate Calendar 3rd Reading on 5/22/2026; 3rd reading deadline established as 5/31/2026

SB640 SA2 – BUILD: LOCAL ZONING REFORM (Sen. Hunter)

Description: SA2 Amends the Energy Efficient Building Act and the Electric Vehicle Charging Act. Exempts middle housing developments from certain provisions under the Act. Amends the Illinois Municipal Code and the Counties Code. Provides that a county or municipality may not require a minimum lot area of more than 2,500 square feet for detached single-family dwellings in any residential zoning district that permits detached single-family dwellings. Provides that, 12 months after the effective date of the amendatory Act, a county or municipality shall, on any lot located in a residential zoning district that permits single-family dwellings, allow (1) at least one detached single-family dwelling unit on any area of not more than 2,500 square feet; (2) up to 4 dwelling units on any lot with an area of more than 2,500 square feet and not more than 7,500 square feet; and (3) up to 6 dwelling units on any lot with an area of more than 7,500 square feet. Provides that a county or municipality must allow an existing principal residential structure to be converted to any middle-housing type if (1) the structure is not expanded by more than 50% of its existing floor area or more than 1,200 square feet, whichever is greater; and (2) the conversion complies with applicable building codes and preservation or landmark laws. Provides that counties or municipalities may not adopt or enforce standards for bulk, lot area, yards, height, automobile parking, density, floor-area ratio, lot coverage, access, unit size, building separation, and design that (1) impose requirements on middle housing that are more restrictive than those applicable to detached single-family dwellings; (2) require automobile parking mandates for residential dwellings of less than 1,500 square feet and require automobile parking mandates no greater than specified requirements; and (3) require any form of discretionary review, unless the same review is required for detached single-family dwellings. Limits home rule powers. Amends the Community Land Trust Home Ownership Act. Creates the Community Land Trust Housing Fund. Provides that, subject to appropriation, the Illinois Housing Development Authority shall establish and administer the Community Land Trust Housing Fund to provide financial assistance to eligible community land trusts for the acquisition, rehabilitation, construction, preservation, and long-term stewardship of permanently affordable housing. Sets forth the costs associated with affordable housing and the projects that may be

financially assisted by the Community Land Trust Housing Fund. Makes conforming changes to the Illinois Housing Development Act. Makes other changes.

Status: Placed on Senate Calendar 3rd Reading on 5/22/2026; 3rd reading deadline established as 5/31/2026

SB643 SA2 – BUILD: PERMITTING REFORM (Sen. Ellman)

Description: SA2 Amends the Illinois Municipal Code and the Counties Code. Provides that a county or municipality shall complete its initial plan review within 30 business days after receipt of a complete application for any one-family residential project, any 2-family residential project, or any multifamily, mixed-use, or commercial project. Provides that, if a county or municipality fails to complete its plan review within the deadlines established under the provisions, then the applicant may retain a qualified third-party plan reviewer. Provides that a county or municipality shall accept any plan review submitted by a qualified third-party plan reviewer as meeting the county's or municipality's requirements if the review demonstrates compliance with the applicable building codes. Provides that, if a county or municipality fails to conduct a required inspection within 10 business days, then the applicant may retain a qualified third-party inspector. Provides that a county or municipality may require reasonable documentation demonstrating that a qualified third-party plan reviewer or qualified third-party inspector meets the qualification requirements, including proof that the qualified third-party plan reviewer's or qualified third-party inspector's licensure or certification is current and active. Provides that a county or municipality may not charge plan review or inspection fees for any portion of the review process or inspection process performed by a qualified third-party plan reviewer or qualified third-party inspector. Provides that a qualified third-party plan reviewer or qualified third-party inspector shall disclose any potential conflict of interest to the applicant and the county before accepting an engagement. Limits home rule powers.

Status: Placed on Senate Calendar 3rd Reading on 5/22/2026; 3rd reading deadline established as 5/31/2026

Regional Economy

HB910 HA3 – MEGAPROJECTS (Speaker Welch/President Harmon)

Description: HA3 creates the Megaproject Assessment Freeze and Payment Law within the Code. Provides that the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity may issue megaproject certificates in connection with projects that satisfy certain minimum investment requirements and other requirements. Provides that property that receives a megaproject certificate from the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity is eligible for an assessment freeze. Provides that sales of building materials that will be incorporated into a megaproject and that are purchased during the incentive period are eligible for the same building materials exemption available to High Impact Businesses under the Retailers' Occupation Tax Act. Provides that, to be eligible for megaproject incentives, the company and the local municipality must enter into an incentive agreement. Provides that, in addition to other requirements, the incentive agreement must require the company to pay, or be responsible for the payment of, an annual special payment to the local municipality. Provides that no person who participates personally and substantially in the negotiation of a megaproject agreement on behalf of a local municipality or taxing district may, within a period of one year after the effective date of the agreement, knowingly accept employment or receive compensation or fees from a company that is a party to the agreement.

Status: Arrived in Senate on 4/28/2026

Transit Improvement

HB2335 SA3 & 4 – NITA CLEAN-UP (Rep. Delgado/Sen. Villivalam)

Description: SA3 amends the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act. Deletes a provision that prohibits a Regional Transit Board or Regional Development Authority from creating or retaining an investigative body that investigates matters under the Executive Inspector General's jurisdiction. Authorizes complaints or allegations of violations of the Act to be received and reviewed by a Regional Transit Board. Amends the Department of Transportation Law of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Provides that the Department of Transportation's statewide multi-modal transportation improvement program shall evaluate project potential for mode shift away from single-occupancy vehicles and commercial motor vehicles. Specifies that the Transit Integration Policy Development Committee shall also coordinate with local transit authorities, intercity bus operators, and local governments on the delivery of bus rapid transit. Requires the Department of Transportation to complete its planning study on improvements to the Joliet train station by January 1, 2028. Amends the State Finance Act. In provisions concerning the State Construction Account Fund and Road Fund, specifies that 90% (rather than 85%) of the investment income in those funds shall be deposited into the Northern Illinois Transit Authority Capital Improvement Fund and 10% (rather than 15%) shall be deposited into the Downstate Mass Transportation Capital Improvement Fund. Amends the Downstate Public Transportation Act. Makes changes in provisions concerning residual fund balances and definitions. Amends the Regional Transportation Authority Act. Provides that the Regional Transportation Authority shall remodel, renovate, or construct a new station at or near the Central Avenue Station and the western entrance at the Lavergne Avenue location on the Blue Line. Provides that the renovated or newly constructed station shall be completed and open for public operation no later than January 1, 2029. Amends the Illinois Procurement Code, the Downstate Public Transportation Act, the People Over Parking Act, the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act, the Local Mass Transit District Act, and the Regional Transportation Authority Act. Makes changes in provisions concerning the installation of bus shields on fixed-route buses; the threshold at which employment contracts must be approved by the authority and the compensation paid to members for service on the Commuter Rail Board, the Chicago Transit Board, or the Suburban Bus Board; renovations to terminals; transit-related taxes; the management of contracts entered into on or before January 1, 2027; the Board of the Northern Illinois Transit Authority and the terms of its members; and other matters. Makes various technical changes. Further amends the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act and the Regional Transportation Authority Act to repeal provisions concerning visitor paratransit service. Effective June 1, 2026. SA4 provides that in the Downstate Public Transportation Act, with regard to quarterly reports and annual audits, provides that: beginning July 1, 2026, the participant's appropriation shall increase by an amount equal to the year-over-year percentage increase in revenue deposited into the Downstate Public Transportation Fund; and beginning July 1, 2032, and every fiscal year thereafter, if the participant's expenditures in the immediately preceding fiscal year are equal to or greater than 85% of the amounts appropriated to the participant in the immediately preceding fiscal year, then the participant's appropriation shall increase by an amount equal to the year-over-year percentage increase in revenue deposited into the Downstate Public Transportation Fund. Further amends the Regional Transportation Authority Act. With regard to renovations and terminals, provides that the renovated or newly constructed station along the Green Line within the Englewood community area shall be completed and open for public operation no later than January 1, 2031 (rather than 2029). With regard to the Suburban Bus Board, provides that the director appointed by the County Executive of the Will County Board shall have an initial term of 3 (rather than 5) years. With regard to the Commuter Rail Board, provides that the director appointed by the County Executive of Will County shall have an initial term of 5 (rather than 3) years. With regard to the Board of Directors, provides that, until September 1, 2030: the Chair of the Board must be confirmed by the Senate; if the Directors elect a Chair of the Board, then the elected Chair of the Board may serve as the acting Chair of the Board until confirmation; and if the Senate votes against confirming the acting Chair of the Board, then the acting Chair of the Board must resign and the Directors must elect a new Chair of Board.

Status: Placed on House Calendar Order of Concurrence on 5/29/2029

Transportation Safety

HB4948 – INTELL SPEED ASSIST PROGRAM (Rep. Deuter)

Description: Establishes the Intelligent Speed Assistance Program to supervise the installation and compliance of intelligent speed assistance systems. Sets forth requirements for the Secretary of State upon receipt of notice from a court that a person is required to enroll in the Program. Provides that a person enrolled in the Program shall install a certified intelligent speed assistance system on each motor vehicle owned by or registered to the person and shall not operate any motor vehicle that is not equipped with a functioning, certified intelligent speed assistance system. Provides that the Zero Traffic Fatalities Task Force shall certify intelligent speed assistance systems for use in the State and adopt rules and forms for the installation, maintenance, and certification of intelligent speed assistance systems. HA2 allows the ILSOS to offer the ISA program to first-time super speeders (26 mph in excess) for a total of 6 months to terminate a 12-month license suspension. It requires individuals with a second violation to enroll in the program for 12 months, and those with additional violations to enroll for 24 months.

Status: Passed both Houses on 5/20/2026

HB5081 – VEH CD-ALTER SPEED LIMITS (Rep. Hanson/Sen. Porfirio)

Description: HB5081 with regard to automated speed enforcement systems in safety zones, provides that "safety zone" does not include any roadway in which the 30 mile per hour speed limit is decreased by local ordinance without an engineering or traffic investigation. Provides that a local authority or park district shall determine and declare by ordinance a reasonable and safe absolute maximum speed which: decreases the limit within an urban district which shall not require an engineering or traffic investigation to a maximum speed limit of 25 miles per hour, but not less than 20 miles per hour and a maximum speed limit of 10 miles per hour in an alley; increases the limit within an urban district, but not to more than 55 miles per hour, if after increasing the limit within an urban district an engineering or traffic investigation is required to decrease the limit; or decreases the limit within a residence district which shall not require an engineering or traffic investigation to a maximum speed limit of 20 (rather than not to less than 25) miles per hour. Requires a park district, city, village, incorporated town, or county board to post a sign designating the new speed limit. Provides that where any highway under the Department of Transportation's jurisdiction lies within the jurisdictional boundary of a local authority, the Department may, at the local authority's request, set a reduced maximum speed limit upon the basis of an engineering and traffic investigation. Allows a county, municipality, or township to request that the Department perform an engineering and traffic investigation concerning any portion of highway for which the Department has jurisdiction, which lies within the geographic boundary of the requesting local authority, to determine a reasonable or safe absolute maximum speed limit for that portion of highway. Defines "target speed". Effective immediately, except for provisions allowing the Department to set a reduced maximum speed limit upon the basis of an engineering and traffic investigation which take effect January 1, 2027.

Status: Passed both Houses on 5/20/2026

SB3275 SA1 – IDOT-INTERSECTION REVIEW (Sen. Joyce)

Description: Amends the Department of Transportation Law of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Requires the Department of Transportation to conduct a road safety assessment for the 10 most hazardous intersections under State jurisdiction in Will County south of Interstate 80. Provides that the Department shall submit the road safety assessment to the General Assembly by January 1, 2028. Repeals the provision on July 1, 2028.

Status: Passed both Houses on 5/21/2026

Water Resources Management

HB4418 – EPA-STORMWATER-PLASTIC PELLETT (Rep. Mason/Sen. Morrison)

Description: Amends the Environmental Protection Act. Provides that one year after the effective date of the amendatory Act, the Agency shall develop and begin implementation of requirements for a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan or other similar best management practice requirements, to be included in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits issued to facilities regulated under certain federal regulations. Provides that these requirements apply to the control of plastic pellets or other preproduction plastic materials, in stormwater runoff from these facilities.

Status: Passed both Houses on 5/28/2026

SB3381 SA2 – WATER COMMISSION-CONSTRUCTION (Sen. Ellman/Rep. Deuter)

Description: Amends the Water Commission Act of 1985. Deletes a provision which specifies that no commissioner who is a member of the governing board or an officer or employee of the county or any unit of local government within the county may receive any compensation for serving as a commissioner on the county water commission. Allows a county water commission to use alternate project delivery methods, establish goals or requirements for the procurement of goods and services and for construction contracts, and accept assignment of municipal waterworks system contracts or other public improvement contracts. Gives commissions the authority to enter into design-build contracts and use a design-build delivery system. Includes requirements pertaining to the design-build delivery system. Amends the Illinois Municipal Code. Provides that a county water commission may construct water transmission and distribution lines within a radius of 50 miles (rather than 25 miles) outside the corporate limits of member municipalities for the purpose of furnishing water to any additional entities that contract with the commission for a supply of water. SA2 Deletes a provision concerning a waterworks system or a common source of supply of water, or both, and the parameters of its purchase or construction. Makes other technical and conforming changes.

Status: Assigned to House Executive Committee; committee/final action established as 5/31/2026

ACTION REQUESTED: Information