



STP PROJECT SELECTION COMMITTEE

AGENDA - FINAL

Thursday, August 11, 2022

9:30 AM

Please join from your computer, tablet or smartphone.

<https://meet.goto.com/630377757>

You can also dial in using your phone.

United States: +1 (571) 317-3122

Access Code: 630-377-757

1.0 Call To Order

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

3.0 Approval of Minutes - June 23, 2022

[22-350](#)

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval

Attachments: [DRAFT minutes STP PSC 06232022](#)

4.0 Active Program Management Reports

4.1 Shared Fund Status Updates

[22-351](#)

PURPOSE & ACTION: Staff will review highlights from the attached status reports.

ACTION REQUESTED: Information

Attachments: [STP & CRRSAA Shared Fund Status Report - July 2022 \(Active\)](#)
[STP Shared Fund Status Report - July 2022 \(Contingency\)](#)

4.2 Regional Accounting Updates

[22-352](#)

PURPOSE & ACTION: The attached reports summarize the status of available, programmed, and obligated STP and CRRSAA funds for the region, through July 19, 2022. This accounting is updated continuously and published at least quarterly. Staff will review highlights of the current status.

ACTION REQUESTED: Information

Attachments: [Regional STP Accounting Summary - July 2022](#)
[Regional CRRSAA Accounting Summary - July 2022](#)

5.0 STP Shared Fund Methodology

5.1 Eligible Project Types

[22-353](#)

PURPOSE & ACTION: Staff requests committee discussion of the attached proposal for incorporating commuter rail yard and terminal improvements into the Transit Station Improvements project category.

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

Attachments: [Proposed Transit Project Type Revisions 08112022](#)

5.2 Transportation Impact: Jobs + Households

[22-354](#)

PURPOSE & ACTION: Staff requests committee discussion of the attached proposal for minor modifications to the jobs + households scoring criterion.

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

Attachments: [STPPSC MethodologyMemo Jobs+HH 08112022](#)

5.3 Corridor or Small Area Safety Projects

[22-355](#)

PURPOSE & ACTION: Staff requests committee discussion of the attached proposal to modify the Transportation Impact scoring for this project type.

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

Attachments: [Proposed Safety Need Score Revisions 08112022](#)

5.4 Subregional Priority

[22-357](#)

PURPOSE & ACTION: Staff requests discussion of the attached proposal to clarify the requirements for the assignment of subregional priority points.

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

Attachments: [Subregional Priority Scoring Revisions 08112022](#)

6.0 Other Business

7.0 Public Comment

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

8.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 1, 2022 at 9:30 a.m.

9.0 Adjournment



STP PROJECT SELECTION COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

Thursday, June 23, 2022

9:30 AM

Please join from your computer, tablet or smartphone.
<https://meet.goto.com/630377757>

You can also dial in using your phone.
United States: +1 (571) 317-3122

Access Code: 630-377-757

1.0 Call To Order

Chair Dobbs called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m., and reminded the members that as permitted by the Governor's Disaster Declaration of May 27, 2022, the determination has been made that an in person meeting is not practical or prudent for this committee. To ensure that the meeting is as transparent as possible, staff posted the meeting materials one week in advance, we will provide a recording of this meeting linked on our website, and will take all votes by roll call. Mr. Ferguson called the roll.

Present: Kama Dobbs, Jeffery Schielke, Jeffrey Sriver, and Grant Davis

Absent: Dan Burke, Alice Gallagher, Kevin O'Malley, Leon Rockingham, Jennifer (Sis) Killen, and Chad Riddle

Non-Voting: John Donovan, Tony Greep, and Heather Mullins

Staff Present: Erin Aleman, Victoria Barrett, Nora Beck, Wylie Crowther, Teri Dixon, Kate Evasic, Doug Ferguson, Jon Haadsma, Gurleen Kaur, Paul Kenney, Matthew Kolasny, Amy McEwan, Sara Mendez, Jason Navota, Russell Pietrowiak, Todd, Schmidt, Sarah Stolpe

Others Present: Joseph Breinig, Len Cannata, Kaci Crowley, Eric Czarnota, Jon Paul Diipla, Jackie Forbes, Michael Fricano, Scott Hennings, Kendra Johnson, Tom Kelso, Heidi Lichtenberger, Brittany Matyas, Leslie Phemister, Jada Porter, Elizabeth Rocks, Daniel Thomas, David Tomzik, Jazmin Vega

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

The were no agenda changes or announcements.

3.0 Approval of Minutes - February 10, 2022

Approval of Minutes - February 10, 2022

[22-295](#)

Attachments: [DRAFT minutes STP PSC 02102022](#)

A motion was made by Jeffery Schielke, seconded by Grant Davis, to approve the minutes of February 10, 2022 as presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: Kama Dobbs, Jeffery Schielke, Jeffrey Sriver, and Grant Davis

Absent: Dan Burke, Alice Gallagher, Kevin O'Malley, Leon Rockingham, Jennifer (Sis) Killen, and Chad Riddle

Non-Voting: John Donovan, Tony Greep, and Heather Mullins

4.0 Active Program Management Reports

4.1 Shared Fund Status Updates

[22-296](#)

Attachments: [STP & CRRSAA Shared Fund Status Report - June 2022 \(Active\)](#)
[STP Shared Fund Status Report - June 2022 \(Contingency\)](#)

Chair Dobbs reviewed the STP and CRRSAA Status Reports, noting that obligation deadline extensions were approved in May and that the June quarterly status updates were currently in progress.

4.2 Regional Accounting Updates

[22-297](#)

Attachments: [Regional STP Shared Fund Summary - June 2022](#)
[Regional CRRSAA Summary - June 2022](#)

Chair Dobbs reported that across the region \$57.6 million in STP funding, which is about a quarter of the funding available, has been obligated so far in federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022. The Central Council has obligated 100% of their allocated funding and took advantage of active program management policies to utilize over \$550 thousand of the \$6.5 million in unobligated funding that was redistributed at the end of FFY 2021. She also reported that the accounting of FFY 2022 obligation deadline extensions by the councils and CDOT is in progress and those figures are reported as TBD in the meeting materials.

4.3 FFY 2023 - 2027 STP Programming Marks

[22-301](#)

Attachments: [FFY2023-27 STP Marks Memo 03212022](#)

Chair Dobbs stated that the attached FFY 2023 to 2027 programming marks memo was prepared by staff in March and that the councils and CDOT are utilizing the marks in this memo to develop their FFY 2023 - 2027 local programs.

5.0 STP Shared Fund Methodology

5.1 Eligible Project Types

[22-299](#)

Mr. Haadsma provided a summary of staff's research regarding commuter rail yard expansion and improvement projects. He suggested additional research regarding elements of commuter rail yards that could be evaluated similar to transit station elements could lead to a recommendation to incorporate projects of this type into the existing Transit Station Improvements project type. Mr. Davis noted that this committee was deliberate in limiting the number of project types that the Shared Fund should be focused on and expressed concern, along with Mayor Shielke, that adding additional project types could dilute that focus. Ms. Mullins requested some clarification on how rail yard projects, if eligible, would compete with the other project types. Chair Dobbs explained that each of the project types is scored relative to other applications within their type for the transportation impacts portion of the overall scoring, which makes up 50% of the total score. She

added that if rail yards were incorporated into the transit station project type, then they would be ranked against the station projects for the transportation impacts - need and improvement - and against all project types for the other 50% of the score that comes from readiness, financial commitment, and planning factors. Chair Dobbs concluded that the committee members are hesitant to expand the eligible project types but are not quite ready to exclude these projects and suggested that staff continue their work to develop a proposal that considers the discussion for additional committee action at the next meeting.

5.2 Preliminary Engineering Requirements

[22-298](#)

Attachments: [PSC Memo Prelim Eng Reqs 06162022](#)

Chair Dobbs reported that staff is proposing making modest additions to the language surrounding the requirements for preliminary engineering to be "substantially complete" prior to applying for funding, noting that identifying the level of environmental processing and potential environmental impacts of projects is important to developing accurate project schedules, scope, and cost estimates. She also noted that the same language changes were being presented to the CMAQ and TAP-L project selection committee at their meeting later in the day. Mr. Davis commented that during the time from the application for funding to actual construction of projects environmental clearances may expire, making it necessary to repeat the work done to obtain those clearances. He suggested that project type may influence the degree of completing of preliminary engineering that is necessary to meet the eligibility for the shared fund. Ms. Dobbs stated that staff will consider these comments and any discussion at the CMAQ and TAP-L project selection committee and will work with sponsors and implementers to determine if there are alternatives to the proposed language to address Mr. Davis' concern.

5.3 Resilience Planning Factor

[22-300](#)

Ms. Evasic presented staff's proposal to shift the current green infrastructure planning factor to focus more on resiliency. She explained the definition of resilience in the transportation system and suggested scoring criteria that would give projects one point if the sponsor has adopted a resilience policy or the project implements a resilience plan, and would give projects up to two points for including eligible scope elements that address climate vulnerability and up to two additional points for using green infrastructure. She also noted that in the current methodology, projects in the Safety category are not scored on this criteria and requested committee discussion. Mr. Davis expressed concern that there were fewer opportunities to add these types of elements within dense, developed urban areas in comparison to suburban and exurban areas, particularly for projects like bridge repairs or replacements that have a restricted footprint and asked how these types of restraints would be accounted for with this proposal. Ms. Evasic confirmed that bridge projects are not scored on this planning factor and noted that having a resilience planning factor is really about encouraging inclusion of resilience elements in projects, just as the green infrastructure factor encouraged inclusion of green infrastructure elements, and is about doing what you can within the constraints of the project. Mr. Shriver commented that this work is going in the right direction and suggested consideration of improvements to the resiliency of the network that may occur due to a project, even if the project itself doesn't address a resiliency deficiency at the spot of the project. Ms. Evasic noted that redundancy in the system is a part of the overall resilience of the system, and while not included in the proposal, staff will consider ways to incorporate this concept. Chair Dobbs noted that, like safety and complete streets, staff anticipates that the application workbook would also include an opportunity for applicants to provide a narrative explanation of how the project improves resilience,

in addition to providing a checklist of scope elements included the project. She stated staff work will continue on this topic with a final language consideration with the application booklet in the fall.

5.4 Corridor or Small Area Safety Projects

[22-302](#)

Chair Dobbs reminded the committee that staff is concerned about the use of absolute point values when scoring the need portion of corridor and small area safety projects. She stated that staff is considering ways to incorporate the region's safety priorities, such as vulnerable users and speed management, into the need assessment and is seeking any suggestions the committee has for additional focus areas or data sources that should be considered. No suggestions were made, therefore Chair Dobbs concluded that staff will proceed with the priorities in mind when developing a proposal for the committee's consideration in August or September.

6.0 Other Business

There was no other business.

7.0 Public Comment

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

There was no public comment.

8.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 11, 2022 at 9:30 a.m.

Chair Dobbs reminded the committee that the next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 11, 2022 at 9:30 a.m. and stated that staff will reach out to members a week or two in advance of the meeting regarding the format of that meeting.

9.0 Adjournment

On a motion by Grant Davis, seconded by Mayor Schielke, the meeting was adjourned by a unanimous voice vote at 10:25 a.m.

Minutes prepared and respectfully submitted by Kama Dobbs.

FFY 2022 - 2026 STP - Shared Fund Active Program Status Report: July 2022

FFY 2022

TIP ID	Project	Sponsor	Programmer	Fund Source	STP-SF Programmed	Match Source(s)	Authorization Deadline	Phase	Target Let / Auth.	STP-SF Obligated Amount	Obligation Remainder	Current Status	Current Status Date	Prior Status	Prior Status Date
03-14-0010	U.S. Route 14 Grade Separation at the Canadian National Railway -- Barrington	Barrington	Northwest Council	STP-SF	\$8,480,000	State	n/a - authorized	ROW	N/A - Auth (11/23/2021)	\$8,480,000	\$0	ROW certification expected 3/2023	6/17/2022	ROW certification expected 11/2022.	3/24/2022
01-12-0012	Canal Street Viaducts - Adams to Madison stage	CDOT	CDOT	STP-SF	\$16,000,000	SOCC, Rebuild Illinois, STP-L	6/30/2022	CON/CE	4/2022 (Auth 3/2022)	\$0		UIGA approval and local letting anticipated 7/2022	6/21/2022	UIGA approval and local letting anticipated 4/2022; Obligation deadline extended to 6/30/22.	3/28/2022
07-19-0017	University Park Metra Reconstruction	University Park	South Council	STP-SF	\$2,500,000	TDCH	6/30/2022	ENG1	6/2022	\$0		Revised draft agreements submitted 4/2022; Approval anticipated 7/2022.	6/30/2022	Revised draft agreements submitted 4/2022; Obligation deadline extended to 6/30/22.	4/1/2022
08-06-0028	North Aurora Rd (FAU Route 1509) Pennsbury Ln to Frontenac Rd	Naperville	DuPage Council	STP-SF	\$9,800,000	Local/ICC	3/17/2023	CON	11/2022 (Auth 10/2022)	\$0		Responding to pre-final plans comments; final plans targeting 8/2022 for 11/2022 target letting.	6/9/2022	Pre-final plans submitted 1/17/22; final plans targeting 8/2022. Updated target letting is 11/18/22. CMAP staff approved obligation deadline extension request 5/2/2022.	3/14/2022
16-19-0033	CTA Green Line Austin Station Accessibility Improvements	CTA	CTA	STP-SF	\$13,930,000	Local	3/31/2023	CON	10/2022	\$0		Final design verification expected 10/2022; Anticipated FTA grant approval not provided.	6/13/2022	Final design verification expected 10/2022; Anticipated FTA grant approval not provided. CMAP staff approved obligation deadline extension request 5/2/2022.	3/16/2022
09-11-0025	Prairie Street Improvements - Wilson Street to Pine Street (Stage 2)	Batavia	Kane/Kendall Council	STP-SF	\$1,527,050	Local	3/17/2023	CON/CE	3/2023 (Auth 1/2023)	\$0		Pre-final plan submittal estimated for 8/2022. ROW certification expeted 9/2022 for the 3/2023 letting	6/28/2022	Pre-final plan submittal estimated for 8/2022. ROW certification expeted 9/2022. Target letting 3/2023. CMAP staff approved obligation deadline extension request 5/2/2022.	3/31/2022
07-94-0027	Joe Orr Rd Extension	Cook DOTH	South Council	STP-SF	\$2,500,000	Local	3/17/2023	CON	4/2023 (Auth 2/2023)	\$0		Pre-final plans submittal targeting 8/2022 and ROW certification targeting 12/2022 for a 4/2023 target letting	6/22/2022	Pre-final plans submittal estimated for 8/2022; target letting 4/2023. CMAP staff approved obligation deadline extension request 5/2/2022.	3/17/2022

Requests for cost increases

\$32,157,000

TIP ID	Project	Sponsor	Programmer	Fund Source	Additional STP-SF Requested	Match Source(s)	Date of Request	Phase	Target Let / Auth.	Prior Obligated Amount	Obligation Remainder	Current Status	Current Status Date	Reason for Request
08-06-0028	North Aurora Rd (FAU Route 1509) Pennsbury Ln to Frontenac Rd	Naperville	DuPage Council	STP-SF	\$2,800,000	Local/ICC	10/13/2022	CON	11/2022 (Auth 10/2022)	\$0		Responding to pre-final plans comments; final plans targeting 8/2022 for 11/2022 target letting.	6/9/2022	Request submitted during the FFY 2022 - 2026 call for projects.
03-09-0073	Irving Park Road at Bartlett Road	Streamwood	Northwest Council	STP-SF	\$28,000	Local	11/3/2021	ENG2	Supp	\$79,919		Funds authorized in FFY 2020 converted to obligation on 4/20/22; Project was let for construction on 11/5/2021.	6/30/2022	Additional engineering needed due to right of way delays and significant design revisions to accommodate both IDOT and CCDOH staging requirements
09-11-0025	Prairie Street Improvements - Wilson Street to Pine Street (Stage 2)	Batavia	Kane/Kendall Council	STP-SF	\$34,879	Local	1/6/2022	ENG2	Supp	\$243,600		Pre-final plan submittal estimated for 8/2022. ROW certification expeted 9/2022 for the 3/2023 letting	6/28/2022	Reason not provided. Staff has requested additional information

FFY 2023

TIP ID	Project	Sponsor	Programmer	Fund Source	STP-SF Programmed	Match Source(s)	Authorization Deadline	Phase	Target Let / Auth.	STP-SF Obligated Amount	Obligation Remainder	Current Status	Current Status Date	Prior Status	Prior Status Date
03-14-0010	U.S. Route 14 Grade Separation at the Canadian National Railway -- Barrington	Barrington	Northwest Council	STP-SF	\$37,947,672	Private, Local, State	9/30/2023	CON/CE	9/2023 (Auth 8/2023)	\$0		Pre-final plans planned for 10/2022, ROW certification planned for 3/2023. Target letting 9/2023.	6/17/2022	No change; Pre-final plans planned for 5/2022, ROW certification planned for 11/2022. Target letting 1/2023.	3/24/2022
07-19-0009	Cottage Grove Avenue grade separation (CREATE GS23a)	Cook DOTH	Cook DOTH	STP-SF	\$2,000,000	TDCH	9/30/2023	ENG1	8/2023	\$0		Phase 1 QBS ad planned for 10/2022	6/28/2022	Phase 1 QBS ad planned for 6/2022	3/28/2022

FFY 2024

TIP ID	Project	Sponsor	Programmer	Fund Source	STP-SF Programmed	Match Source(s)	Authorization Deadline	Phase	Target Let / Auth.	STP-SF Obligated Amount	Obligation Remainder	Current Status	Current Status Date	Prior Status	Prior Status Date
01-12-0013	LaSalle Street Bridge and Viaduct over Chicago River	CDOT	CDOT	STP-SF	\$39,200,000	SOCC	9/30/2024	CON/CE	11/2023	\$0		Pre-final plans expected to be submitted 3/2023	6/21/2022	Pre-final plans expected to be submitted 3/2023; now targeting 11/2023 letting	3/25/2022

FFY 2022 - 2026 STP - Shared Fund Active Program Status Report: July 2022

FFY 2025

TIP ID	Project	Sponsor	Programmer	Fund Source	STP-SF Programmed	Match Source(s)	Authorization Deadline	Phase	Target Let / Auth.	STP-SF Obligated Amount	Obligation Remainder	Current Status	Current Status Date	Prior Status	Prior Status Date
01-98-0072	Milwaukee Avenue from Gale St to Jefferson St (Logan to Armitage stage)	CDOT	CDOT	STP-SF	\$9,440,000	Local	9/30/2025	CON	3/2024	\$0		Phase 2 kick-off anticipated 3/2023; Pre-final plans targeting 6/2023 for 3/2024 letting.	6/28/2022	Phase 2 kick-off anticipated 3/2023; Pre-final plans targeting 6/2023 for 3/2024 letting.	3/28/2022
05-16-0001	16th Street Traffic Improvements	Berwyn	Central Council	STP-SF	\$2,197,468	Local, STP-L	9/30/2025	CON	3/2025	\$0		Phase 2 kick-off anticipated 5/2022; Pre-final plans targeting 7/2023 for a 3/2025 letting	6/30/2022	Phase 2 kick-off anticipated 5/2022; Pre-final plans targeting 7/2022 for a 3/2025 letting	3/31/2022
07-21-0008	Dixie Highway Corridor Improvement Project: 138th St to 159th St	Harvey	South Council	STP-SF	\$1,432,466	TDCH	9/30/2025	ENG1	11/2024	\$0		Phase 1 QBS anticipated to begin 10/2023	6/30/2022	Phase 1 QBS anticipated to begin 10/2023	3/31/2022
01-98-0068	Grand Avenue from Fullerton to Des Plaines (Ogden to Jefferson Road Reconstruction stage)	CDOT	CDOT	STP-SF	\$9,896,891	Local	9/30/2025	CON	6/2025	\$0		Pre-final plans targeting 2/2024 for a 6/2025 letting.	6/28/2022	Pre-final plans targeting 2/2024 for 3/2025 letting.	3/28/2022

FFY 2026

TIP ID	Project	Sponsor	Programmer	Fund Source	STP-SF Programmed	Match Source(s)	Authorization Deadline	Phase	Target Let / Auth.	STP-SF Obligated Amount	Obligation Remainder	Current Status	Current Status Date	Prior Status	Prior Status Date
01-12-0015	Grand Avenue Bridge over North Branch of the Chicago River	CDOT	CDOT	STP-SF	\$17,600,000	STP-L, Local	9/30/2026	CON	10/2025	\$0		Phase 2 Kick-off anticipated 6/2022	6/21/2022	Phase 2 Kick-off anticipated 6/2022	3/28/2022
07-21-0007	Ashland Ave Complet Streets Road Modernization (120th St to Thornton Rd)	Calumet Park	South Council	STP-SF	\$500,000	TDCH	9/30/2026	ENG1	11/2024	\$0		Phase 1 consultant selection anticipated 11/2022	7/1/2022	Phase 1 consultant selection anticipated 6/2022	3/23/2022
06-16-0007	131st Street from Pulaski Road to Kedzie Avenue	Alsip	Southwest Council	STP-SF	\$3,280,570	Local, STP-L, Econ Dev	9/30/2026	CON	11/2025 (Auth 9/2025)	\$0		Phase 2 consultant selected; kick-off anticipated 9/2022. Pre-final plans anticipated 6/2025 and ROW certification anticipated 9/2025 for an 11/2025 target letting.	6/27/2022	Phase 2 consultant selected; kick-off anticipated 5/2022. Pre-final plans anticipated 6/2025 and ROW certification anticipated 9/2025 for an 11/2025 target letting.	3/28/2022
06-16-0007	131st Street from Pulaski Road to Kedzie Avenue	Alsip	Southwest Council	STP-SF	\$825,000	Local, STP-L, Econ Dev	9/30/2026	CE	11/2025 (Auth 9/2025)	\$0		Phase 2 consultant selected; kick-off anticipated 9/2022. Pre-final plans anticipated 6/2025 and ROW certification anticipated 9/2025 for an 11/2025 target letting.	6/27/2022	Phase 2 consultant selected; kick-off anticipated 5/2022. Pre-final plans anticipated 6/2025 and ROW certification anticipated 9/2025 for an 11/2025 target letting.	3/28/2022
08-20-0022	Bicycle and Pedestrian Overpass over IL 83	Elmhurst	DuPage Countil	STP-SF	\$278,400	Local	9/30/2026	CE	11/2024 (Auth 9/2024)	\$0		Design approval anticipated 8/2022; Pre-finals anticipated 6/2024; Target 11/2024 letting. Requested reprogramming in FFY2025 to align with STP-L funded CON phase. Request will be held until funds become available in that year.	6/24/2022	Public meeting held 9/13/21; Fed coordination 11/16/21; DA anticipated 6/2022; Pre-finals anticipated 6/2024; Target 11/2024 letting.	3/25/2022
03-21-0003	IL 59 Bicycle and Pedestrian Overpass	Streamwood	Northwest Council	STP-SF	\$482,855	Local, TAP-L, ITEP	9/30/2026	CON/CE	3/1/2024 (Auth 1/2024)	\$0		Design approval received 4/27/22; Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 7/2023 for a 3/2024 target letting.	6/3/2022	Phase 1 DA expected 6/2022; Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 7/2023 for a 3/2024 target letting.	3/9/2022

FFY 2022 - 2023 STP - Shared Fund Contingency Program Status Report: July 2022

PROJECT INFORMATION							REQUESTED FUNDING							TARGET AUTH	CURRENT STATUS		PRIOR STATUS	
Rank	CFP ID	TIP IP	Project	Council/Lead	Sponsor	Phases	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Min Acceptable	5-year Total	Date	Status	Status Date	Status	Status Date
8	17-21-0002		South Halsted Bus Corridor Enhancement Project	Pace	Pace	CON			\$16,952,500	\$6,384,000		n/a	\$23,336,500	3/2024	Final design verificaation anticipated 11/2024; Target 2/2025 construction contractor selection	6/30/2022	Final design verificaation anticipated 6/2024; Target 7/2024 construction contractor selection	3/28/2022
						ENG			\$2,112,000			n/a	\$2,112,000	7/2023	NEPA process expected to be complete 12/2022	6/30/2022	NEPA process expected to be complete 5/2022	3/28/2022
						IMP				\$6,120,000		n/a	\$6,120,000	3/2024	Final design verificaation anticipated 11/2024; Target 2/2025 construction contractor selection	6/30/2022	Final design verificaation anticipated 10/2023; Target 4/2023 construction contractor selection	3/28/2022
9	04-21-0007	04-10-0025	Washington Boulevard Improvements - 21st Avenue to 9th Avenue	Central	Maywood	CON		\$1,001,600				n/a	\$1,001,600	11/2022	Pre-final plans submitted 6/10/22 for 11/2022 letting.	6/1/2022	Phase 2 kick-off 9/2020; Pre-final plans submittal targeting 5/2022; target letting 11/2022	3/1/2022
						CE		\$384,000				n/a	\$384,000	11/2022	Pre-final plans submitted 6/10/22 for 11/2022 letting.	6/1/2022	Phase 2 kick-off 9/2020; Pre-final plans submittal targeting 5/2022; target letting 11/2022	3/1/2022
11	07-21-0004		Dolton Road/State Street - Road Improvements: State Line Road to I-94	South	Calumet City	CON				\$10,346,000		n/a	\$10,346,000	8/2025	Phase 1 Design Approval anticipated 7/2022; waiting on wetlands, bio, and special waste	6/17/2022	Phase 1 Design Approval anticipated 4/2022; waiting on wetlands, bio, and special waste	3/29/2022
						CE				\$725,000		n/a	\$725,000	8/2025	Phase 1 Design Approval anticipated 7/2022; waiting on wetlands, bio, and special waste	6/17/2022	Phase 1 Design Approval anticipated 4/2022; waiting on wetlands, bio, and special waste	3/29/2022
14	09-21-0010	09-20-0110	Kautz Road Reconstruction & Widening	Kane/Kendall	Geneva	CON	\$1,280,370					\$640,000	\$1,280,370	1/2023	Target 1/2023 letting Appears to be fully funded with STP-L, TAP-L, and TARP funds.	6/30/2022	Target 1/2023 letting Appears to be fully funded with STP-L, TAP-L, and TARP funds.	3/31/2022
						CE	\$592,080					\$296,000	\$592,080	1/2023	Target 1/2023 letting Appears to be fully funded with STP-L, TAP-L, and TARP funds.	6/30/2022	Target 1/2023 letting Appears to be fully funded with STP-L, TAP-L, and TARP funds.	3/31/2022
15	02-21-0001	02-20-0015	Happ Road from Winnetka Road to Willow Road and Happ Road/Orchard Lane Intersection Roundabout	North Shore	Northfield	CON			\$3,367,000			\$2,000,000	\$3,367,000	9/2023	Phase 2 authorized 3/17/22 (AC); Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 4/2023 for a 9/2023 target letting	6/8/2022	Phase 2 authorized 3/17/22 (AC); Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 4/2023 for a 9/2023 target letting	3/14/2022
16	18-21-0028		Olympia Fields Station Rehabilitation	Metra	Metra	IMP				\$3,960,000	\$4,840,000	\$1,660,000	\$8,800,000	8/2023	NEPA completion anticipated 4/2023; Final design verification anticipated 1/2024; Target 6/2024 construction notice to proceed.	6/30/2022	NEPA completion anticipated 4/2023; Final design verification anticipated 1/2024; Target 6/2024 construction notice to proceed.	3/31/2022
18	09-21-0012	09-20-0089	Dundee Avenue Reconstruction	Kane/Kendall	Elgin	CON			\$2,500,000			n/a	\$2,500,000	11/2023 (Auth 10/2023)	Phase 1 Design Approval anticipated 5/2022; Phase 2 consultant selected and kick-off anticipated 6/2022; pre-final plans anticipated 5/2023 and ROW certification anticipated 9/2023 for 11/2023 target letting.	6/14/2022	Phase 1 Design Approval anticipated 5/2022; Phase 2 consultant selected and kick-off anticipated 6/2022; pre-final plans anticipated 5/2023 and ROW certification anticipated 9/2023 for 11/2023 target letting.	3/15/2022
20	08-21-0012	08-00-0009 (IDOT)	Illinois Route 53 from South of Illinois Route 56 (Butterfield Road) to Park Boulevard	DuPage	DuPage Co DOT	CON				\$13,647,200		n/a	\$13,647,200	5/2023	Pre-final plnas submitted 11/2021; Final plans anticipated 3/2023; ROW initiated 1/2022; Target 6/2023 letting	6/27/2022	Pre-final plnas submitted 11/2021; Final plans anticipated 3/2023; ROW initiated 1/2022; Target 6/2023 letting	3/10/2021
						CE				\$1,637,600		n/a	\$1,637,600	5/2023	Pre-final plnas submitted 11/2021; Final plans anticipated 3/2023; ROW initiated 1/2022; Target 6/2023 letting	6/27/2022	Pre-final plnas submitted 11/2021; Final plans anticipated 3/2023; ROW initiated 1/2022; Target 6/2023 letting	3/10/2021
22	16-21-0003	16-22-0007	Irving Park All Stations Accessibility Program (ASAP) Design	CTA	CTA	ENG	\$3,768,218					n/a	\$3,768,218	6/2023	NEPA process to begin 8/2022. Taget is 7/2023 to hire enigneering and design consultant.	6/13/2022	NEPA process to begin 7/2022. Taget is 6/2023 to hire enigneering and design consultant.	3/11/2022
24	08-21-0011		Illinois Route 56 (Illinois Route 53 to Interstate 355)	DuPage	DuPage Co DOT	CON				\$19,885,600		n/a	\$19,885,600	11/2022	Pre-final plans submitted 7/20/21; final plans anticipated 8/2022; ROW certification anticipated 9/2022; Target 11/2022 letting	6/27/2022	Pre-final plans submitted 7/20/21; final plans anticipated 3/2022; ROW certification anticipated 6/2022; Target 6/17/2022 letting	3/10/2022
						CE				\$2,386,400		n/a	\$2,386,400	11/2022	Pre-final plans submitted 7/20/21; final plans anticipated 8/2022; ROW certification anticipated 9/2022; Target 11/2022 letting	6/27/2022	Pre-final plans submitted 7/20/21; final plans anticipated 3/2022; ROW certification anticipated 6/2022; Target 6/17/2022 letting	3/10/2022



FFY 2022 - 2023 STP - Shared Fund Contingency Program Status Report: July 2022

PROJECT INFORMATION							REQUESTED FUNDING							TARGET AUTH	CURRENT STATUS		PRIOR STATUS	
Rank	CFP ID	TIP IP	Project	Council/Lead	Sponsor	Phases	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Min Acceptable	5-year Total	Date	Status	Status Date	Status	Status Date
25	04-21-0008	04-18-0006	Armitage Avenue Reconstruction, Mannheim Road to 25th Avenue	North Central	Melrose Park	CON		\$5,800,000				n/a	\$5,800,000	1/2024 (Auth 12/2023)	Final DA received 5/24/22; Pre-final plans anticipated 3/2023 for a 1/2024 target letting. Pursuing section 1440 process for ENG2.	6/30/2022	Final DA anticipated 5/2022; Pre-final plans anticipated 3/2023 for a 9/2023 target letting.	3/31/2022
						CE		\$580,000				n/a	\$580,000	9/2023 (Auth 8/2023)	Final DA received 5/24/22; Pre-final plans anticipated 3/2023 for a 1/2024 target letting. Pursuing section 1440 process for ENG2.	6/30/2022	Final DA anticipated 5/2022; Pre-final plans anticipated 3/2023 for a 9/2023 target letting.	3/31/2022
26	09-21-0007		Randall Rd at Hopps Rd	Kane/Kendall	Kane Co DOT	CON				\$16,037,985		\$2,000,000	\$16,037,985	12/2024	Phase 1 PDR submitted 3/3/21; DA anticipated 9/2022; Project is targeting a 1/2025 letting	6/27/2022	Phase 1 PDR submitted 3/3/21, with DA anticipated 5/2022; Project is targeting a 1/2025 letting	3/25/2022
27	07-21-0012		Steger Road from Halsted Street to Union Avenue	South	Steger	ENG1				\$392,000		n/a	\$392,000	12/2024	Phase 1 QBS planned for 2/2024	6/29/2022	Phase 1 QBS planned for 2/2024	3/28/2022
29	10-21-0008	10-22-0004	Argonne Drive Reconstruction	Lake	North Chicago	ENG2		\$1,168,000				n/a	\$1,168,000	6/2023	Phase 1 DA anticipated 9/2022; Target 8/2022 for Phase 2 QBS	6/22/2022	Phase 1 DA anticipated 7/2022; Target 8/2022 for Phase 2 QBS	3/21/2022
						ROW		\$76,800				n/a	\$76,800	8/2023	Anticipate initiation 8/2023	6/22/2022	Anticipate initiation 8/2023	3/21/2022
						CON				\$12,935,200		n/a	\$12,935,200	1/2025	Target 1/2025 letting	6/22/2022	Target 1/2026 letting	3/21/2022
						CE				\$1,552,000		n/a	\$1,552,000	1/2025	Target 1/2025 letting	6/22/2022	Target 1/2026 letting	3/21/2022
30	07-21-0009		150th St Complete Street Project: Dixie Hwy to Halsted St	South	Harvey	ENG1				\$952,219		n/a	\$952,219	11/2024	Phase 1 QBS targeting 10/2023 advertisement.	6/30/2022	Phase 1 QBS targeting 10/2023 advertisement.	3/31/2022
31	09-21-0004		Randall Rd at Big Timber Rd	Kane/Kendall	Kane Co DOT	CON				\$2,946,756		\$1,500,000	\$2,946,756	12/2026	PDR submitted 9/30/21; DA anticipated 9/2022; Project targeting 1/2027 letting	6/22/2022	PDR submitted 9/30/21; DA anticipated 6/2022; Project targeting 1/2027 letting	3/25/2022
33	06-21-0005	06-00-0042	143rd Street from West Avenue to Southwest Highway	Southwest	Orland Park	ROW	\$1,033,610					n/a	\$1,033,610	4/2023	Agreement approval antiipated 4/2023	6/30/2022	Agreement approval antiipated 4/2023	3/24/2022
						CON		\$7,992,380				n/a	\$7,992,380	9/2024	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 12/2023 and ROW certification anticipated 4/2024 for a 94/2024 target letting.	6/30/2022	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 6/2023 and ROW certification anticipated 10/2023 for a 3/2024 target letting.	3/24/2022
						CE		\$799,240				n/a	\$799,240	9/2024	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 12/2023 and ROW certification anticipated 4/2024 for a 94/2024 target letting.	6/30/2022	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 6/2023 and ROW certification anticipated 10/2023 for a 3/2024 target letting.	3/24/2022
35	11-21-0014		Randall Road from Alexandra Blvd to Acorn Ln	McHenry	McHenry Co DOT	CON			\$19,848,869			\$1	\$19,848,869	10/2023	No change; Phase 2 in progress; Target 10/2023 letting.	6/30/2022	Phase 2 in progress; Target 10/2023 letting.	3/10/2022
36	09-21-0009	09-20-0056	US Route 20 and Reinking Road Roundabout	Kane/Kendall	Elgin	ROW	\$20,000					n/a	\$20,000	9/2022	ROW initiation (fed funds) anticipated 9/2022	6/10/2022	ROW initiation (fed funds) anticipated 9/2022	3/30/2022
						CON		\$1,044,592				n/a	\$1,044,592	3/2023 (Auth 1/2023)	Phase 2 kick-off held 6/2022, pre-fnial plans submittal anticipated 8/2022 and ROW certification anticipated 11/2022 for a 3/2023 target letting	6/10/2022	Phase 2 kick-off planned 4/2022, pre-fnial plans submittal anticipated 8/2022 and ROW certification anticipated 11/2022 for a 1/2023 target letting	3/30/2022
						CE		\$99,789				n/a	\$99,789	3/2023 (Auth 1/2023)	Phase 2 kick-off held 6/2022, pre-fnial plans submittal anticipated 8/2022 and ROW certification anticipated 11/2022 for a 3/2023 target letting	6/10/2022	Phase 2 kick-off planned 4/2022, pre-fnial plans submittal anticipated 8/2022 and ROW certification anticipated 11/2022 for a 1/2023 target letting	3/30/2022
37	12-21-0023		Gougar Road Grade Separation at Wisconsin Central Ltd. Railroad	Will	Will Co DOT	CON					\$12,600,000	\$5,000,000	\$12,600,000	11/2025	Phase 2 kick-off held 1/2022; Pre-final plans anticipated 9/2023; ROW certification anticipated 8/2024	6/23/2022	Phase 2 kick-off held 1/2022; Pre-final plans anticipated 9/2023; ROW certification anticipated 8/2024	3/29/2022
38	03-21-0008	03-19-0006	National Parkway from American Ln to Higgins Rd	Northwest	Schaumburg	CON			\$5,522,182			n/a	\$5,522,182	9/2022	Pre-final plans submitted 6/10/22. ROW certification anticated 9/2022 for a 11/2022 target letting.	6/28/2022	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 4/2022 and ROW certification anticated 8/2022 for a 9/2022 target letting. Note: A portion of the project (American to Woodfield) was completed with Rebuild IL funds, therefore cost estimate has been reduced.	3/28/2022

FFY 2022 - 2023 STP - Shared Fund Contingency Program Status Report: July 2022

PROJECT INFORMATION							REQUESTED FUNDING							TARGET AUTH	CURRENT STATUS		PRIOR STATUS	
Rank	CFP ID	TIP IP	Project	Council/Lead	Sponsor	Phases	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Min Acceptable	5-year Total	Date	Status	Status Date	Status	Status Date
38	03-21-0008	03-19-0006	National Parkway from American Ln to Higgins Rd	Northwest	Schaumburg	CE			\$757,352			n/a	\$757,352	9/2022	Pre-final plans submitted 6/10/22. ROW certification anticated 9/2022 for a 11/2022 target letting.	6/28/2022	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 4/2022 and ROW certification anticated 8/2022 for a 9/2022 target letting. Note: A portion of the project (American to Woodfield) was completed with Rebuild IL funds, therefore cost estimate has been reduced.	3/28/2022
39	08-21-0006		North Aurora Rd (FAU Route 1509) Pennsbury Ln to Frontenac Rd	DuPage	Naperville	CON	\$2,800,000					\$500,000	\$2,800,000	10/2022	Addressing pre-final commetns and updating out-of-date phase 1 components; final plan submittal targeting 8/2022; ROW certification targeting 9/2022 for an 11/2022 target letting.	6/9/2022	Addressing pre-final plans commets; final plan submittal targeting 8/2022; ROW certification targeting 9/2022 for an 11/2022 target letting.	3/14/2022
40	06-21-0003	06-00-0042	143rd Street from Wolf Road to Southwest Highway	Southwest	Orland Park	ROW	\$2,400,000					n/a	\$2,400,000	4/2023	Agreement approval antiipated 4/2023	6/30/2022	Agreement approval antiipated 4/2023	3/24/2022
						CON			\$38,011,980			n/a	\$38,011,980	9/2024	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 12/2023 and ROW certification anticipated 4/2024 for a 9/2024 target letting.	6/30/2022	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 6/2023 and ROW certification anticipated 10/2023 for a 3/2024 target letting.	3/24/2022
						CE			\$3,801,200			n/a	\$3,801,200	9/2024	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 6/2023 and ROW certification anticipated 10/2023 for a 3/2024 target letting.	6/30/2022	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 6/2023 and ROW certification anticipated 10/2023 for a 3/2024 target letting.	3/24/2022
42	06-21-0002	06-03-0005	143rd Street from Will-Cook Road to Wolf Road	Southwest	Orland Park	ROW	\$181,735					n/a	\$181,735	11/2022	Target is the reported completion date. No date provided for submittal of fed funded agreements	6/30/2022	Target is the reported completion date. No date provided for submittal of fed funded agreements	3/24/2022
						CON		\$8,790,685				n/a	\$8,790,685	3/2024	Currently responding to comments on pre-final plans submitted in 2015. Target 9/2023 for final plans submittal for 3/2024 target letting	6/30/2022	Currently responding to comments on pre-final plans submitted in 2015. Target 9/2023 for final plans submittal for 3/2024 target letting	3/24/2022
						CE		\$879,070				n/a	\$879,070	3/2024	Currently responding to comments on pre-final plans submitted in 2015. Target 9/2023 for final plans submittal for 3/2024 target letting	6/30/2022	Currently responding to comments on pre-final plans submitted in 2015. Target 9/2023 for final plans submittal for 3/2024 target letting	3/24/2022
43	12-21-0025	12-10-0008	143rd Street from State Street/Lemont Road to Bell Road (State St to Crème Rd)	Will	Will Co DOT	CON (Stage 1)				\$6,000,000		\$4,000,000	\$6,000,000	3/2024	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 12/2023; ROW initiation expected 3/2022	6/23/2022	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 12/2023; ROW initiation expected 3/2022	3/29/2022
			143rd Street from State Street/Lemont Road to Bell Road (Crème Rd to Bell Rd)			CON (Stage 2)				\$8,000,000		\$4,000,000	\$8,000,000	3/2026	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 12/2023; ROW initiation expected 3/2022	6/23/2022	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 12/2023; ROW initiation expected 3/2022	3/29/2022
44	09-21-0006		Randall Rd at IL 72	Kane/Kendall	Kane Co DOT	CON				\$4,273,668		\$1,500,000	\$4,273,668	12/2025	Draft PDR submitted 3/5/21; DA anticipated 8/2022; Target letting 1/2026	6/28/2022	Draft PDR submitted 3/5/21; DA anticipated 6/2022; Target letting 1/2026	3/25/2022
45	12-21-0016	12-20-0023	Will Road Reconstruction	Will	Diamond	ENG2	\$326,000					n/a	\$326,000	9/2022	Agreement submitted to IDOT 3/16/22	6/1/2022	Consultant selection anticipated 1/2022	3/1/2022
						CON		\$5,532,790				n/a	\$5,532,790	9/2023	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 9/2022 and ROW certification anticipated 3/2023 for a 9/2023 target letting	6/1/2022	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 9/2022 and ROW certification anticipated 3/2023 for a 9/2023 target letting	3/1/2022
						CE		\$553,279				n/a	\$553,279	9/2023	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 9/2022 and ROW certification anticipated 3/2023 for a 9/2023 target letting	6/1/2022	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 9/2022 and ROW certification anticipated 3/2023 for a 9/2023 target letting	3/1/2022
48	03-21-0005	03-20-0049	Bernard Drive Reconstruction from Arlington Heights Road to Buffalo Grove Road	Northwest	Buffalo Grove	ENG2	\$101,167					n/a	\$101,167	N/A - Auth 7/2021 (STP-L)	Funded with STP-L; Kick-off held 9/2021. Pre-final plans submittal targeting 11/2022	6/27/2022	Funded with STP-L; Kick-off held 9/2021. Pre-final plans submittal targeting 11/2022	3/4/2022
						ROW	\$46,258					n/a	\$46,258	Proceeding with local funding	Certification target 11/2024.	6/27/2022	Cost updated per TIP records; Certification target 11/2024 based on target constuction letting.	3/4/2022

FFY 2022 - 2023 STP - Shared Fund Contingency Program Status Report: July 2022

PROJECT INFORMATION							REQUESTED FUNDING							TARGET AUTH	CURRENT STATUS		PRIOR STATUS	
Rank	CFP ID	TIP IP	Project	Council/Lead	Sponsor	Phases	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Min Acceptable	5-year Total	Date	Status	Status Date	Status	Status Date
48	03-21-0005	03-20-0049	Bernard Drive Reconstruction from Arlington Heights Road to Buffalo Grove Road	Northwest	Buffalo Grove	CON				\$6,366,325		\$4,790,455	\$6,366,325	12/2024	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 11/2022; Target 1/2025 letting	6/27/2022	Phase 2 engineering underway; Target 1/2025 letting	12/1/2021
						CE				\$614,045		\$397,022	\$614,045	12/2024	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 11/2022; Target 1/2025 letting	6/27/2022	Phase 2 engineering underway; Target 1/2025 letting	12/1/2021
49	16-21-0001	16-20-0002	Harlem Station Bus Bridge Reconstruction	CTA	CTA	ENG		\$2,112,217				n/a	\$2,112,217	N/A - Auth	Final design and verificaiton expected 10/2022	6/13/2022	No change; final design and verificaiton expected 4/2022	3/11/2022
						CON			\$23,072,997			n/a	\$23,072,997	9/2022	Target 6/2023 construction notice to proceed. CTA will utilize Rebuild Illinois if no federal funds.	6/13/2022	Target 9/2022 FTA grant approval if federal funds programmed. CTA will utilize Rebuild Illinois if no federal funds.	3/11/2022
50	07-21-0013		Steger Road Improvement Project: Central Ave to Governors Hwy	South	University Park	ENG1			\$682,946			n/a	\$682,946	11/2024	Anticipate QBS to be started 10/2023.	7/1/2022	Anticipate QBS to be started 10/2023.	4/1/2022
51	06-21-0006	06-16-0009	John Humphrey Drive at 143rd Street	Southwest	Orland Park	CON		\$7,040,000				n/a	\$7,040,000	9/2023 (Auth 8/2023)	Phase 2 agreement submitted 11/2021; Pre-final plans anticipated 3/2023 for 9/2023 target letting	6/12/2022	Phase 2 agreement submitted 11/2021; Pre-final plans anticipated 3/2023 for 9/2023 target letting	3/12/2022
						CE		\$720,000				n/a	\$720,000	9/2023 (Auth 8/2023)	Phase 2 agreement submitted 11/2021; Pre-final plans anticipated 3/2023 for 9/2023 target letting	6/12/2022	Phase 2 agreement submitted 11/2021; Pre-final plans anticipated 3/2023 for 9/2023 target letting	3/12/2022
52	12-21-0024	12-13-0004	Laraway Road from US 52 to Nelson Road (@ US 52)	Will	Will Co DOT	CON (Stage 1)				\$6,000,000		\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	3/2024 (Auth 1/2024)	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 6/2023 and ROW certification 1/2024 for a 3/2024 target letting	6/23/2022	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 6/2023 and ROW certification 1/2024 for a 3/2024 target letting	3/29/2022
			Laraway Road from US 52 to Nelson Road (Cherry Hill to Nelson)			CON (Stage 2)					\$7,138,000	\$569,000	\$7,138,000	8/2023 (Auth 6/2023)	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 5/2023 and ROW certification 9/2022 for an 8/2023 target letting	6/23/2022	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 5/2023 and ROW certification 9/2022 for an 8/2023 target letting	3/29/2022
53	06-21-0004	06-00-0042	143rd Street from Wolf Road to West Avenue	Southwest	Orland Park	ROW	\$1,794,590					n/a	\$1,794,590	4/2023	Agreement approval antiipated 4/2023	6/30/2022	Agreement approval antiipated 4/2023	3/24/2022
						CON		\$30,019,600				n/a	\$30,019,600	9/2024	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 12/2023 and ROW certification anticipated 4/2024 for a 9/2024 target letting.	6/30/2022	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 6/2023 and ROW certification anticipated 10/2023 for a 3/2024 target letting.	3/24/2022
						CE		\$3,001,960				n/a	\$3,001,960	9/2024	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 12/2023 and ROW certification anticipated 4/2024 for a 9/2024 target letting.	6/30/2022	Pre-final plans submittal anticipated 6/2023 and ROW certification anticipated 10/2023 for a 3/2024 target letting.	3/24/2022
54	10-21-0003		Hazel Avenue Improvements	Lake	Deerfield	CON	\$3,626,310					n/a	\$3,626,310	1/2023	Phase 2 kick-off held 3/23/21. Pre-final plans submittal targeting 8/2022 for a 1/2023 letting.	6/10/2022	Phase 2 kick-off held 3/23/21. Pre-final plans submittal targeting 8/2022 for a 1/2023 letting.	3/10/2022
						CE	\$362,400					n/a	\$362,400	1/2023	Phase 2 kick-off held 3/23/21. Pre-final plans submittal targeting 8/2022 for a 1/2023 letting.	6/10/2022	Phase 2 kick-off held 3/23/21. Pre-final plans submittal targeting 8/2022 for a 1/2023 letting.	3/10/2022



In order for all councils and the Shared Fund to be able to make the best active reprogramming choices, an accounting of available, programmed, and obligated funds will be maintained for the region. This accounting will show actual and projected redistribution of unobligated funds and the use of those funds by councils and shared fund projects.

This accounting will be updated continuously and published periodically. It is expected that updates will occur around the time that TIP changes are published for Transportation Committee action and at key active program management action points, such as when obligation deadline extensions are considered in April. At a minimum the accounting will be published quarterly, in the months following required quarterly status updates.

Current: FFY 2022

Updated: 7/21/2022

	STP-SF	All Councils	Redistribution
Start of FFY22			
FFY22 Allotment	\$39,927,035	\$132,243,149	\$6,476,746
Carryover from FFY21 (expires 3/31/22)	\$14,826,115	\$56,897,942	n/a
Carryover from FFY21 (no expiration)	\$0	\$560,846	n/a
FFY22 Mark	\$54,753,150	\$189,701,937	\$6,476,746
Programmed (current year + extended)	\$54,753,150	\$181,889,286	n/a
Unprogrammed (available for active reprog.)	\$0	\$7,812,651	n/a
Program adjustments throughout FFY22			
Cost changes	\$0	\$8,041,578	n/a
Active Reprogramming	-\$16,100	-\$4,408,079	n/a
Revised program	\$54,737,050	\$185,522,785	n/a
Mark adjustments throughout FFY22			
Funds from redistribution	\$0	\$556,350	-\$556,350
Funds from obligation remainders	\$0	\$72,319	n/a
Revised FFY22 mark	\$54,753,150	\$190,330,606	\$5,920,396
Revised unprogrammed	\$16,100	\$4,807,821	n/a
Obligations and Extensions			
Transferred to FTA	\$0	\$0	n/a
Obligated	\$8,480,000	\$53,874,139	n/a
Obligation Remainders (eligible to reprogram or carryover)	\$0	\$910,516	n/a
Unobligated	\$46,257,050	\$131,648,646	n/a
Extended (eligible to carryover)	\$27,757,050	TBD	n/a
Proceeded without extension (ineligible to carryover)	\$0	TBD	n/a
Unprogrammed (ineligible to carryover)	\$16,100	\$4,807,821	n/a
End of FFY22			
Carryover (remainders + extended; capped at 1 yr. allotment)	\$27,757,050	TBD	n/a
Transfer to Redist (unprogrammed or ob remainders > cap)	\$16,100	\$4,807,821	n/a

Projected: FFY 2023 - 2026

	STP-SF	All Councils	Redistribution
Start of FFY23			
FFY23 Allotment	\$39,947,672	\$172,985,656	\$10,744,317
Carryover from FFY22 (expires 3/31/23)	\$27,757,050	TBD	n/a
Carryover from FFY22 (no expiration)	\$0	TBD	n/a
FFY23 Mark	\$67,704,722	\$172,985,656	\$10,744,317
Programmed (current year + extended)	\$67,704,722	\$141,838,036	n/a
Unprogrammed (available for active reprog.)	\$0	\$31,147,620	n/a
End of FFY23			
Carryover (remainders + extended; capped at 1 yr. allotment)	\$0	\$0	n/a
Transfer to Redist (unprogrammed or ob remainders > cap)	\$0	\$54,513,786	n/a



	STP-SF	All Councils	Redistribution
Start of FFY24			
FFY24 Allotment	\$39,200,000	\$177,725,606	\$65,258,103
Carryover from FFY23 (expires 3/31/24)	\$0	\$0	n/a
Carryover from FFY23 (no expiration)	\$0	\$0	n/a
FFY24 Mark	\$39,200,000	\$177,725,606	\$65,258,103
Programmed (current year + extended)	\$39,200,000	\$119,050,371	n/a
Unprogrammed (available for active reprog.)	\$0	\$58,675,235	n/a
End of FFY24			
Carryover (remainders + extended; capped at 1 yr. allotment)	\$0	\$0	n/a
Transfer to Redist (unprogrammed or ob remainders > cap)	\$0	\$52,505,215	n/a

	STP-SF	All Councils	Redistribution
Start of FFY25			
FFY25 Allotment	\$31,598,458	\$179,057,930	\$117,763,318
Carryover from FFY24 (expires 3/31/25)	\$0	\$0	n/a
Carryover from FFY24 (no expiration)	\$0	\$0	n/a
FFY25 Mark	\$31,598,458	\$179,057,930	\$117,763,318
Programmed (current year + extended)	\$22,966,825	\$114,549,490	n/a
Unprogrammed (available for active reprog.)	\$8,631,633	\$64,508,440	n/a
End of FFY25			
Carryover (remainders + extended; capped at 1 yr. allotment)	\$0	\$0	n/a
Transfer to Redist (unprogrammed or ob remainders > cap)	\$8,631,633	\$67,360,467	n/a

	STP-SF	All Councils	Redistribution
Start of FFY26			
FFY26 Allotment	\$32,148,271	\$182,173,438	\$193,755,418
Carryover from FFY25 (expires 3/31/26)	\$0	\$0	n/a
Carryover from FFY25 (no expiration)	\$0	\$0	n/a
FFY26 Mark	\$32,148,271	\$182,173,438	\$193,755,418
Programmed (current year + extended)	\$22,966,825	\$0	n/a
Unprogrammed (available for active reprog.)	\$9,181,446	\$182,173,438	n/a
End of FFY26			
Carryover (remainders + extended; capped at 1 yr. allotment)	\$0	\$0	n/a
Transfer to Redist (unprogrammed or ob remainders > cap)	\$9,181,446	\$182,173,438	n/a

Start of FFY: Represents the allotments, marks, programming, and unprogrammed balance at the beginning of the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). For redistribution the allotment reflects funds transferred at the end of the prior FFY.

Program Adjustments: Includes changes to programming due to active program management, such as cost changes and active reprogramming in different FFYs.

Marks Adjustments: Includes changes to available marks due to use of redistribution, obligation remainders, and expiration of funds.

Obligations and Extensions: Accounting of the obligation of funds and funds associated with projects granted obligation deadline extensions.

End of FFY: Accounting of funds eligible to be carried over to the next FFY and those that are ineligible and will be transferred to Redistribution.



In order for all councils and the Shared Fund to be able to make the best active reprogramming choices, an accounting of available, programmed, and obligated funds will be maintained for the region. This accounting will show actual and projected redistribution of unobligated funds and the use of those funds by councils and shared fund projects.

This accounting will be updated continuously and published periodically. It is expected that updates will occur around the time that TIP changes are published for Transportation Committee action and at key active program management action points, such as when obligation deadline extensions are considered in April. At a minimum the accounting will be published quarterly, in the months following required quarterly status updates.

Current: FFY 2022

Updated:

7/19/2022

	CRRSAA - SF	CRRSAA - Local
Start of FFY22		
FFY22 Allotment	\$5,330,928	\$37,316,499
Programmed	\$5,330,928	\$36,794,042
Unprogrammed (available for active reprog.)	\$0	\$522,457
Program adjustments throughout FFY22		
Cost changes	\$0	\$124,220
Active Reprogramming	\$0	-\$395,748
Revised program	\$5,330,928	\$36,522,514
Mark adjustments throughout FFY22		
Funds from redistribution	\$0	\$0
Funds from obligation remainders	\$0	\$0
Revised FFY22 mark	\$5,330,928	\$37,316,499
Revised unprogrammed	\$0	\$793,985
Obligations and Extensions		
Obligated	\$0	\$7,100,974
Obligation Remainders (eligible to reprogram or carryover)	\$0	\$5,209
Unobligated	\$5,330,928	\$30,215,525
Extended (eligible to carryover)	\$5,330,928	\$29,685,179
Proceeded without extension (ineligible to carryover)	\$0	\$0
Unprogrammed (ineligible to carryover)	\$0	\$793,985
End of FFY22		
Carryover (remainders + extended; capped at 1 yr. allotment)	\$5,330,928	\$29,690,388
Transfer to Redist (unprogrammed or ob remainders > cap)	\$0	\$793,985

Start of FFY: Represents the allotments, marks, programming, and unprogrammed balance at the beginning of the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).

Program Adjustments: Includes changes to programming due to active program management, such as cost changes and active reprogramming in different FFYs.

Marks Adjustments: Includes changes to available marks due to use of redistribution, obligation remainders, and expiration of funds.

Obligations and Extensions: Accounting of the obligation of funds and funds associated with projects granted obligation deadline extensions.

End of FFY: Accounting of funds eligible to be carried over to the next FFY and those that are ineligible and will be transferred to Redistribution.



MEMORANDUM

To: STP Project Selection Committee

From: CMAP Staff

Date: August 4, 2022

Re: STP Shared Fund Methodology – Eligible Project Types

Purpose: Staff requests committee discussion of this proposal for incorporating commuter rail yard and terminal improvements into the Transit Station Improvements project category

Action Requested: Discussion

At the June committee meeting, staff provided a summary of research regarding the potential addition of commuter rail yard expansion and improvement projects as an eligible shared fund project type. Based on committee concerns regarding the potential for added project types to dilute the overall program, staff worked with Metra and CTA staff to develop a proposed method for incorporating this project type into the existing transit station improvements category. This means that transit yard and terminal improvements will be directly compared with transit station improvements.

In keeping asset conditions as the primary focus for evaluation to determine need and improvement within the transit station improvement project type, staff proposes to also focus primarily on asset condition for the additions to the methodology, which are attached. In addition, regulatory compliance, such as ADA accessibility at yards and terminals, is recommended as part of the evaluation of need for yards and terminals. Finally, when assessing the potential improvements to the system from changes to yards and terminals, the degree of increased storage capacity and the degree of reduction in running empty trains from a yard or terminal to a route's first passenger station are proposed.

Transit station, yard, or terminal improvements

Our region's aging transit infrastructure has a profound impact on not only transit ridership, but also on the ability to operate transit service. This infrastructure includes the stations utilized by riders to access transit services, and the yards and terminals where train sets are stored, configured, and maintained.

Existing Condition/Need

The existing condition/need score for these projects has three parts: asset condition, compliance, and bike/ped access, as summarized in the table below and described in more detail following the table.

<u>Project Scope</u>	<u>Asset Condition</u>	<u>Compliance</u>	<u>Bike/Ped Access</u>
<u>Transit station reconstruction/rehab only</u>	<u>100%</u> <u>Cost-weighted average TERM score of station components</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Bike/ped access to transit station only</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>75%</u> <u>Percentage of roads within station area with no sidewalk</u> <u>25%</u> <u>Bicycle parking infrastructure</u>
<u>Station and bike/ped access improvements</u>	<u>50%</u> <u>Cost-weighted average TERM score of station components</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>37.5%</u> <u>Percentage of roads within station area with no sidewalk</u> <u>12.5%</u> <u>Bicycle parking infrastructure</u>
<u>Commuter rail yard and/or terminal improvements only</u>	<u>80%</u> <u>Cost-weighted average TERM condition rating scale of yard/terminal components</u>	<u>20%</u> <u>Level of compliance with ADA, FTA, IDOT, and other code requirements</u>	<u>N/A</u>

Proposed revisions to STP Shared Fund Application Booklet. Underlined text indicates an addition, ~~stricken~~ text indicates a deletion.

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

For project scopes which include only bike/ped access improvements, with no station improvements, 75% of the score will be the percentage of roads in the station area with no sidewalk, scaled to 15 points. Station area is defined as within ½ mile of the station. The percentage will be determined from CMAP's [Sidewalk Inventory](#) data. Data for all CTA and Metra rail station data and select CTA and Pace bus terminals and transfer points is summarized [here](#). Locations not included in the summary will be evaluated individually if an application is received. An additional 5 points (25% of the need score) will be awarded if the station does not have any bicycle parking infrastructure at the station or a bike-sharing dock(s) within the station area.

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

For projects that include improvements to the rail yard or terminal, including relocation of an existing facility, 80% of the existing condition score will be the cost-weighted average TERM condition rating scale of the yard/terminal components to be improved, subtracted from the maximum value of 5, and scaled from a 5-point scale to a 16-point scale.

Compliance, which includes meeting ADA, FTA, IDOT, and other code requirements, will be scored as shown below.

<u>Level of Compliance</u>	<u>Score</u>
<u>Critical compliance failure</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Critical compliance risk</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Major compliance exception</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Minor compliance exception</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>No compliance exception</u>	<u>0</u>

If the project scope does not address the compliance deficiencies, a score of 0 will be assigned for this criterion.

Improvement

The raw improvement score for these projects has three parts: asset condition, ~~and bike/ped access~~, and efficiency as summarized in the table below and described in more detail following the table.

<u>Project Scope</u>	<u>Asset Condition</u>	<u>Bike/Ped Access</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>
<u>Transit station reconstruction/rehab only</u>	<u>The difference in cost-weighted average TERM score of station components before and after project</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Bike/ped access to transit station only</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>75%</u> <u>Percentage of new plus improved sidewalk within station area</u> <u>25%</u> <u>Bicycle parking infrastructure added</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Station and bike/ped access improvements (the greater of the asset condition or bike/ped access score)</u>	<u>100%</u> <u>The difference in cost-weighted average TERM score of station components before and after project</u>	<u>75%</u> <u>Percentage of new plus improved sidewalk within station area</u> <u>25%</u> <u>Bicycle parking infrastructure added</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Commuter rail yard and/or terminal improvements only</u>	<u>75%</u> <u>The difference in cost-weighted average TERM score of yard/terminal components before and after project</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>12.5%</u> <u>The increase (%) in the vehicle (train set) storage capacity before and after the project</u> <u>12.5%</u> <u>The reduction in non-revenue trips (based on schedules in effect on the date of application)</u>

Proposed revisions to STP Shared Fund Application Booklet. Underlined text indicates an addition, ~~stricken~~ text indicates a deletion.

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

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

In order to incentivize doing more within a single project, for projects that include both station improvements and bike/ped access improvements, the raw improvement score will be calculated using the above methods, and the higher of the two scores will be used in the cost effectiveness calculation. The cost effectiveness of all projects within the transit station category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20

For project scopes which include rehab/improvement or relocation of a rail yard or terminal, 75% of the raw improvement score will be for improvements to asset condition, defined as the difference in the cost-weighted average TERM condition rating scale of station components before and after the project, scaled to 15 points. In the case of relocations, the existing yard or terminal facility must be removed or fully abandoned in order to receive any points for asset condition improvements. The remaining 25% of the score will be for efficiency improvements. Up to 2.5 points will be added to the raw improvement score for the percent increase in vehicle storage capacity created from the project. Up to 2.5 additional points will be added for the percent decrease in non-revenue trips as a result of the project. Efficiency improvement points will be calculated based on the operational schedule in effect on the closing date of the call for projects. The sum of the raw scores will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness.

Eligible project types

While STP has very broad eligibility in comparison to other funding sources (for example, CMAQ, TAP, and HSIP), the STP Shared Fund is targeted toward specific priority project types. Applications will only be evaluated as the project type(s) selected by the applicant, and must demonstrate need in the selected category and include scope elements that address that need.

The table below provides additional guidance to assist applicants with choosing the appropriate application category. The table is not intended to be all-inclusive and applicants should contact their Planning Liaison or CMAP staff for project-specific guidance.

[Condensed to show only rows with changes]

Project Type	Need(s) to be addressed	Example scope elements to address needs
Transit Station Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Station asset condition • Gaps in bicycle and pedestrian access to station • <u>Commuter rail yard or terminal asset condition</u> • <u>Commuter rail compliance or storage deficiencies</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehab, repair, or replace station building, boarding platforms, and other station fixtures • Complete direct connection of sidewalk network to station • Complete direct connection of bicycle network to station • Install bike paring or bike-sharing at station • <u>Rehab, repair, or replace yard or terminal assets (platforms, switches, signals, crew facilities, etc.)</u> • <u>Relocate existing commuter rail yard</u>

Proposed revisions to STP Shared Fund Application Booklet. Underlined text indicates an addition, ~~stricken~~ text indicates a deletion.



MEMORANDUM

To: STP Project Selection Committee

From: CMAP Staff

Date: August 4, 2022

Subject: STP Shared Fund Methodology – Transportation Impact: Jobs + Households

Purpose: Staff requests committee discussion of this proposal for minor modifications to the jobs + households scoring criterion.

Action Requested: Discussion

The jobs + households (jobs + hh) score is a component of a project's Transportation Impact score, along with Need and Improvement. As stated in the Shared Fund Application Booklet, "The benefits of a transportation project often cross municipal and county borders and can provide significant improvements to people who are not located in the project's immediate vicinity. For each project, CMAP uses the regional travel model to generate a travel shed of the places people come from and go to using the facility. The score in this category is calculated by adding up the total number of jobs and households within each project's travel shed and converting the total to a score out of 10, indexed to the other submitted projects." This methodology leads to higher jobs + hh scores for transit projects that inherently have a larger "reach" than roadway or bike/ped projects and for projects within the region's most densely populated areas. While these results are not unexpected, concerns have been raised that there are projects that have scored very high in the need and/or improvement categories that are not able to rise to the level of funding consideration due to a perceived disparity in jobs + hh points.

Staff examined scoring from prior calls for projects as well as the characteristics of the counties and City of Chicago to inform project selection committee discussion regarding the jobs + hh score. As a result of this examination, staff recommends a slight adjustment to the methodology to acknowledge the proportion of households served by a project, relative to the total households within the project area, rather than just the raw number of households within the travel shed. This change improves the equity of the scoring, while maintaining an appropriate spread of points across projects and continues emphasizing projects that encourage transit use and discourage sprawl.

Past scoring

During the 2019 and 2021 calls for projects (CFPs), the range and average jobs + hh scores by project location and type were:

Project Location & Type	# of apps	Maximum jobs + hh	Minimum jobs + hh	Max pts	Min pts	Ave pts
Cook	49	2,167,927	44,461	9.0	0.3	5.4
Transit	6	2,167,927	61,748	9.0	0.4	6.8
Highways	43	1,873,929	44,461	8.8	0.3	5.15
Chicago	16	3,222,989	968,092	9.9	7.4	9.0
Transit	8	3,222,989	1,230,620	9.9	7.8	9.4
CDOT	8	2,475,127	968,092	9.2	7.4	8.5
Collar Counties	62	2,102,412	17,617	8.9	0.1	3.7
Transit	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Highways	62	2,102,412	17,617	8.9	0.1	3.7
DuPage	13	915,176	134,152	7.8	1.3	3.9
Kane	20	492,721	17,617	7.3	0.1	3.4
Kendall	2	331,853	329,853	4.9	3.8	4.3
Lake	11	838,203	133,853	6.9	0.7	4.0
McHenry	5	596,285	161,775	5.7	0.8	2.3
Will	11	2,102,412	151,685	8.9	0.4	4.1
All Applications	127	3,222,989	17,617	9.9	0.1	4.9

As shown above, the average jobs + hh score among all applications is 4.9. The average in the collar counties is below the regional average, while the average in Chicago is well above the regional average. Although the collar counties' averages are low, the maximum scores in some counties are competitive with the maximums in Chicago and Suburban Cook.

Households served

In the CMAP region, there are a total of 3,266,741 households¹, distributed as shown below.

Area	Total households
Chicago	1,142,725
Suburban Cook	944,215
DuPage	348,216
Kane	180,374
Kendall	45,534
Lake	244,523
McHenry	114,282
Will	240,009
Region	3,266,741

¹ CMAP Community Data Snapshots (2021)

Considering the intention of the shared fund to direct funding to projects that are more regional in nature, staff compared the number of households served by individual projects from the 2021 call for projects cycle to the total number of households within the county where each project is located. This revealed that, on average projects in less dense counties may serve a significantly larger number of households than the total households within the county, and projects in more dense counties may serve a significantly smaller number of households than the total households within the county, as illustrated in the table below.

Area	Total hh within area	Average hh in project travel sheds	% of total hh in area
Chicago	1,142,725	391,102	34.2%
Suburban Cook	944,215	148,652	15.7%
DuPage	348,216	149,478	42.9%
Kane	180,374	141,468	78.4%
Kendall	45,534	143,546	315.3%
Lake	244,523	73,625	30.1%
McHenry	114,282	67,781	59.3%
Will	240,009	117,262	48.9%
All Projects	3,266,741	149,859	42.8%

Recognizing that counties are large and irregularly shaped and that the actual service reach of projects is more concentrated, staff proposes defining a “project area” based on the project’s modeled travel shed. This would be determined by measuring the distance from the center of the project to the farthest zone within the travel shed, then using that distance as a radius to define all zones that make up the project area. Staff further proposes splitting the jobs + hh (sum) scoring into two equally weighted (5 points each) components: jobs and households. The jobs component would be unchanged from past cycles, with the score calculated by adding up the total number of jobs within each project’s travel shed and converting the total to a score out of 5, indexed to the other submitted projects. The households component would involve calculating the ratio of households within each project’s travel shed to the total households within the project area and converting that ratio to a score out of 5, indexed to the other submitted projects.

Conclusion

Some disparity in the jobs + households scoring does exist between Chicago, Suburban Cook, and the Collar Counties. While this disparity is partially by design – to direct funding to projects that encourage transit use, serve in a regional capacity, and discourage sprawl – a small change to the scoring methodology would result in a more equitable process that elevates projects within less dense areas that are more regional relative to more locally-oriented projects.



MEMORANDUM

To: STP Project Selection Committee

From: CMAP Staff

Date: August 4, 2022

Subject: STP Shared Fund Methodology - Corridor or Small Area Safety Projects

Purpose: Staff requests committee discussion of the attached proposal to modify the Transportation Impact scoring for this project type

Action Requested: Discussion

The STP Shared Fund scoring methodology was designed to provide an analysis of both the need for and benefit of projects relative to one another, rather than providing an absolute numeric score. Throughout the methodology numeric scores are calculated, but most are scaled relative to all project applications, or all applications with the project type category. One prominent exception is the “need” component of the Corridor or Small Area Safety projects, which provides one of five absolute point values with no scaling. These absolute scores can provide either an advantage or disadvantage to these project types over other project types. Additionally, the CMAP Safety Resource Group has identified speed-related crashes and crashes involving vulnerable road users as a high priority for the region, thus project locations with higher instances of these types of crashes can be considered to have a higher need for improvement than other locations with otherwise similar safety need.

To address these issues, staff proposes the attached modifications to the scoring methodology. These modifications will introduce some gradation in the scoring and elevate scores for projects that are experiencing higher priority crash types relative to peer projects.

Corridor/small area safety improvements

Existing Condition/Need

The need score for safety projects consists of two parts: the safety road index (SRI) and the percentage of crashes that are considered high risk. High risk crashes are those that are speed related and/or involve vulnerable road users. The total need score will be the sum of the SRI Score and the High Risk Crash Types Score.

SRI Score (0 – 16 points)

The SRI score is calculated using IDOT's safety road index (SRI) for roadway segments and intersections. The SRI is based on the location's [Potential for Safety Improvement](#)¹ (PSI) score. IDOT developed SRI scores for local and state routes and categorized them by peer group into critical, high, medium, low, or minimal. Within each peer group, locations categorized as critical have the highest PSIs, and locations categorized as minimal are less likely to have safety benefits from treatments. The ~~proposed project's need score will be the~~ highest SRI category along the project location will be used to determine 80% of the project's need score using the scale below. This will include both segment and intersection locations.

SRI Score	Points
Critical	20 <u>16</u>
High	15 <u>12</u>
Medium	10 <u>8</u>
Low	5 <u>4</u>
Minimal	0

High Risk Crash Types Score (0 – 4 points)

The CMAP Safety Resource Group has identified both speed-related crashes and crashes involving vulnerable road users as emphasis areas for improving safety. Locations with a high percentage of these types of crashes are therefore a higher priority for safety improvement projects. Up to two additional points will be awarded based on the percentage of speed related crashes that occurred within the project limits and up to two more points will be added to the need score based on the percentage of crashes involving vulnerable road users that occurred within the project limits. Crash data used to determine these percentage will be the most recent five years for which data was available from IDOT or provided by the applicant. No points will be given for speed-related or vulnerable user-involved crashes if the project scope does not include countermeasures to address reduction of these types of crashes. A crash that was both speed related and involved a vulnerable user would be counted in both parts of this scoring.

Points = (Percentage of speed related crashes x 2) + (Percentage of vulnerable user-involved crashes x 2)

¹ https://rspcb.safety.fhwa.dot.gov/noteworthy/html/projident_il.aspx?id=8

Improvement

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

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



MEMORANDUM

To: STP Project Selection Committee

From: CMAP Staff

Date: August 4, 2022

Re: STP Shared Fund Methodology - Subregional Priority

Purpose: Staff requests committee discussion of this proposal to clarify the requirements for the assignment of subregional priority points

Action Requested: Discussion

The Subregional Priority category of the STP Shared Fund scoring methodology provides a way to consider the relative importance of project applications within the region's eleven subregional councils and the City of Chicago, by allowing each of these subregions to assign points to their five highest priority projects. This criterion has evolved from "bonus points" in the 2019 call for projects cycle, to be a part of the total project score in the 2021 call for projects cycle. Despite the success of this evolution in providing a more appropriate level of scoring, concerns regarding the subjectivity of this category remain, particularly in instances when a subregion identifies projects outside of their borders as a priority. Considering the characteristics of the region, which include people travelling significant distances between their homes and their jobs, it is not unrealistic for improvement priorities to lie outside of political boundaries. Therefore, staff recommends continuing the use of this scoring category, with the attached modifications.

The proposed modifications tighten the requirements for identifying projects located outside of a subregion as a priority of that subregion by requiring that the travel shed of the project must extend into the subregion that wishes to prioritize it. The modifications do not explicitly prohibit a subregion from identifying any project as a priority but do lay out a review process that ultimately places the decision on whether or not to accept a priority designation for a particular project with the project selection committee. Additional language has also been added to the methodology to prohibit the "swapping" of points between councils and to clarify the timeline for submittal of subregional priorities to CMAP.

Subregional Priority

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

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

Although it is anticipated that councils and CDOT will identify projects located within their borders, regardless of the sponsor agency, as their highest priorities, they may also identify priorities outside of their borders if the travel shed of the priority project (developed as part of the jobs + households scoring) extends into their jurisdiction.

Should a council or CDOT identify a project outside their borders and that project's travel shed does not extend into their jurisdiction (an "external project"), ~~To do so,~~ they must provide a clear justification of ~~the~~ this external project's transportation benefit to their residents and/or to persons working or traveling within their subregion. -This justification will be reviewed by CMAP staff and discussed with CDOT and Council representatives. Any disagreement on the validity of the justification provided will be presented to the STP PSC for discussion and a final decision regarding the assignment of subregional priority points. Should the STP PSC decide not to accept the priority designation, the council that assigned the priority will not be given an opportunity to identify an alternate priority.

Projects that are designated as priorities by more than one subregion will receive the combined points appropriate to the level of priority, up to a maximum of 5 points. "Point swapping" between councils and/or CDOT is prohibited. The STP PSC will have discretion in determining if any point swapping has occurred and may elect to nullify any priority points assigned by the involved councils or CDOT.

CMAP will provide the councils and CDOT with a list of eligible project applications received no later than 3-2 weeks after the close of the call for projects. CMAP will also provide travel shed maps for projects under consideration for priority points upon request. The councils and CDOT will have no less than 3 additional weeks to identify their priorities. Up to two additional weeks may be utilized for CMAP staff to review and seek committee feedback on any external projects identified as priorities. Should any project identified as a priority by a

Proposed revisions to STP Shared Fund Application Booklet. Underlined text indicates an addition, ~~stricken~~ text indicates a deletion.

council or CDOT be determined to be ineligible for the Shared Fund after the initial assignment of priority points, the council or CDOT will be given one opportunity to re-assign that priority to a different project or to elevate projects of lower priority into the ineligible project's slot. Initial project evaluation results will not be released for applicant or public review prior to the final identification of subregional priorities. The overall program development schedule may be modified to accommodate this policy.

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

Subregional priority is 5% of the total project score.