

Committee Chair:

Robert Phillips
Deerfield

Members:

Antioch
Bannockburn
Beach Park
Buffalo Grove
Deerfield
Deer Park
Fox Lake
Grayslake
Green Oaks
Gurnee
Hainesville
Hawthorn Woods
Highland Park
Highwood
Indian Creek
Island Lake
Kildeer
Lake Barrington
Lake Bluff
Lake Forest
Lake Villa
Lake Zurich
Libertyville
Lincolnshire
Lindenhurst
Long Grove
Mettawa
Mundelein
North Barrington
North Chicago
Old Mill Creek
Park City
Riverwoods
Round Lake
Round Lake Beach
Round Lake Heights
Round Lake Park
Third Lake
Tower Lakes
Vernon Hills
Volo
Wadsworth
Wauconda
Waukegan
Winthrop Harbor
Zion
County of Lake



LAKE COUNTY
COUNCIL OF MAYORS

Transportation Committee Agenda

Time: 9:00 a.m.
Date: July 25, 2019
Location: Lake County Division of Transportation
Main Conference Room
600 W. Winchester Road
Libertyville, Illinois

		<u>Action Requested</u>
1) Opening of Meeting/Introductions		Call to Order
2) Approval of Minutes		Approval
a. April 25, 2019 Meeting	(Attachment 1)	
3) Agency Reports		Information
a. IDOT Bureau of Programming	Katie Herdus	
b. IDOT Bureau of Local Roads & Streets	Alex Househ	
c. ISTHA Report	Vicky Czuprynski	
d. CMAP Report	Barbara Zubek	
e. RTA Report	Andy Plummer	
f. Metra Report	Rick Mack	
g. Pace Report	Mary Donner	
4) Current Lake Council STP Program	(Attachment 2)	Information
5) LCCOM STP Guidebook		
a. Public Comment Period Summary		Information
b. STP Guidebook-Final Draft	(Attachment 3)	Approval
6) GATA Reporting Requirements		Information
a. Periodic Reporting Requirements: Thomas Briggs, IDOT		
7) CMAP Regional Water Demand Forecast		Information
a. Presentation: Nora Beck, CMAP		
8) Other Business		
9) Public Comment		
10) Next Meeting		
October 24, 2019		
11) Adjournment		



LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL OF MAYORS

Minutes of April 25, 2019 Transportation Committee Meeting
at the Lake County Division of Transportation

Meeting Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Robert Phillips	Director of Public Works/Engineering	Deerfield
Steve Shields	Village Administrator	Round Lake
Anne Marrin	Village Administrator	Fox Lake
Mike May	Village Administrator	Volo
Karen Daulton Lange	Village Administrator	Lake Barrington
David Kilbane	Village Administrator	Round Lake Beach
Michael Talbett	Chief Village Officer	Kildeer
Kealan Noonan	Director of Public Works	Fox Lake
Bill Heinz	Director of Public Works	Grayslake
David Brown	Director of Public Works	Vernon Hills
Erika Frable	Dir. of Public Works/Village Engineer	Hawthorn Woods
Scott Hilts	Director of Public Works	Round Lake Beach
Mike Brown	Director of Public Works	Lake Zurich
Paul Kendzior	Director of Public Works	Libertyville
Wally Dittrich	Asst. Dir. Of Public Works	Lincolnshire
Noelle Kischer-Lepper	Dir. Of Planning & Comm. Dev.	Waukegan
Heather Galan	Village Engineer	Gurnee
Jeff Hansen	Village Engineer	Lake Bluff
Robert Ells	Village Engineer	Lake Forest
Ron Milanesio	City Engineer	Highland Park
Katie Herdus	Area Programmer	IDOT Programming
Alex Househ	Field Engineer	IDOT BLRS
Rick Mack	Community Affairs	Metra
Vicky Czuprynski	Community Relations Representative	Illinois Tollway
Jon Bigness	Manager of Public Affairs	Illinois Tollway
Barbara Zubek	Associate Planner	CMAP
Emily Karry	Council Liaison	Lake Council
Mike Klemens	Council Liaison	Lake Council
Stephanie Brown	Council Liaison	Lake Council
Jon Vana		Consultant
Dan Brinkman		Consultant
Peter Stoehr		Consultant
Brian Plum		Consultant
Duane O'Laughlin		Consultant
John Ambrose		Consultant
Jim Massarelli		Consultant
Chris Bouchard		Consultant
Joel Christell		Consultant
Steve Cieslica		Consultant



LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL OF MAYORS

1. Call to Order

Bob Phillips called the meeting to order. Those in attendance gave self-introductions

2. Approval of the Minutes

With a first from David Brown and a second from Mike Brown, on a voice vote the minutes of the January 24, 2019 meeting were approved unanimously.

3. Agency Reports

- a. **IDOT Bureau of Programming-** Katie Herdus gave the committee an update on the IDOT projects in Lake County. IDOT District One has balanced the Multi-Year Program and sent into Springfield for approvals, the District is not yet sure when it will be released. The status sheets handed out to the committee reflect the old program as the new one isn't official yet. Ms. Herdus informed the committee that there are roughly 28 projects in Lake County on going or will be beginning this construction season. Ms. Herdus discussed current status on some projects around Lake County. The only change to the status sheets is that IDOT will be doing a micro-resurfacing of IL 22 between Quentin Road and IL 83 but it won't push off the widening project for multiple years, it is still in IDOT's program.
- b. **IDOT Bureau of Local Roads and Streets-** Alex Househ informed the committee of the changes related to the Local Roads status sheets.
- c. **Illinois Tollway-** Vicky Czuprynski informed the committee that the Tollway board voted to hire a new executive director, his name is Jose Alvarez, he comes to the Tollway from the Chicago Housing Authority and had previously been superintendent of schools for Washington DC, his start date has not yet been announced. The Tollway is reminding everyone to please be safe in construction zones, reduce speeds and please do not be on cell phones.
- d. **CMAQ-** Barbara Zubek informed the committee that the region has obligated \$54.8 million of the \$153 million goal in CMAQ funds so far this fiscal year which is approximately 36% of the goal for the year. For STP-L funds so far, the region has obligated \$91 million all from the suburban councils. CMAP staff is finalizing the data gathering to make final calculations for the distribution of future STP funds to the local councils. Ms. Zubek informed the committee that 136 total applications were submitted during the recent call for projects in STP Shared Fund, CMAQ and TAP. CMAP announced that public comments were being accepted on their Public Participation Plan.
- e. **RTA-** No report
- f. **Metra -** Rick Mack discussed a couple Metra newsletters with the committee. He highlighted the region's Get on Board campaign which highlights the region's \$30 billion backlog of projects. Mr. Mack gave the committee an update of a few station projects in the region, the first is Prairie Crossing on the MDN line, the station is now open just landscaping works remains. Work on the downtown Libertyville station work is ongoing, and it is anticipated it will open later in the summer. North Chicago Station repairs will be funded by Metra with the City acting as the project lead. In Fox Lake, the station platforms are being rehabilitated.



LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL OF MAYORS

A question was asked about Metra More, it is a reverse commute service, that is a public private partnership to pilot new reverse commute service to the west Lake Forest station. It is a two-year pilot program and seems to be successful so far.

- g. **Pace** – Mike Klemens informed the committee that Tim Dilsaver from Pace asked Council staff to highlight the TMA of Lake-Cook’s Annual Construction Map which was included in the e-mail with the meeting materials.

4. Functional Classification Change Request-Village of Lincolnshire

Ms. Karry presented the Village of Lincolnshire’s requests to the committee. Ms. Karry informed the committee that both Village staff and their consultant were present to answer any questions on the proposed requests. Ms. Karry discussed the characteristics and use of each roadway that is being requested to have a change in classification. The Village is requesting to change the functional classification of two roadways from local streets to minor collectors. The first route is Knightsbridge Parkway Between Milwaukee Ave and Schelster Road. The second roadway is Schelster Road, Heathrow Drive, and Bond St taken together between Half Day (RTE 22) and Aptakisic Road.

A motion to approve and forward all three requests to the Full Council was made by Dave Brown and seconded by Michael Talbett, the motion was approved by a voice vote.

5. Functional Classification Change Request-Village of Lake Zurich

Ms. Karry presented the Village of Lake Zurich’s requests to the committee. Ms. Karry informed the committee that Village staff and their consultant were present to answer any questions on the proposed requests. Ms. Karry discussed the characteristics and use of each roadway that is being requested to have a change in classification. The Village is requesting to change the functional classification of four roadways from local streets to minor collectors. The first request is for Bristol Trail Road between Quentin Road and Old Mill Grove Road. The second request is for Ensell Road between Quentin Road and Oakwood Road, the request is to change from a local road to a minor collector. The third request is Golfview Road between Summit Road and US Route 12, the request is from a local road to a minor collector. The fourth request is for Surryse Road between Old Mill Grove Road and Old Rand Road, the request is from a local road to a minor collector.

A motion was made to approve and send all five requests to the Full Council by Michael Talbett and seconded by Anne Marrin. The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

6. Functional Classification Change Request-Village of Volo

Ms. Karry presented the Village of Volo’s request to the committee. Ms. Karry informed the committee that Village staff and their consultant were present to answer any questions on the proposed requests. Ms. Karry discussed the characteristics and use of each roadway that is being requested to have a change in classification. The Village is requesting to change the functional classification of two roadways from local streets to minor collectors, two roadways from a local street to a major collector and one future roadway extension to a major collector.

The first request was for the Ellis Drive Extension between US Route 12/IL 59 and Gilmer Road. The proposed extension of N Ellis is in the Village’s Transportation Comprehensive plan and construction of the extension is anticipated within the next 5 years. The Village’s request is to add this roadway extension to the functional classification system as a major collector.

The second request is for Hartigan Road between US 12/IL 59 and Terra Springs Drive. The request is for a reclassification from a local road to a major collector. The third request is for Terra Springs Drive between Hartigan Road and Nippersink Road reclassification from a local road to a minor collector. The fourth request is for N. Ellis Drive between IL 120 and Gilmer Road, the Village is seeking reclassification from a local road to a major collector. The fifth



LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL OF MAYORS

and final request is for Niagara Drive between Ellis Drive and Fish Lake Road for reclassification from a local road to a minor collector.

A motion was made to approve and send all five requests to the Full Council by Mike Brown and seconded by Wally Dietrich. The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

7. Resolution 050919LCC-XXX

Ms. Karry presented this item that is related to the annual resolution regarding the disposition of federal transportation planning funds for professional staff assistance to the Lake County Council of Mayors for FY 20 and the distribution of these funds to Lake County DOT. In order for LCDOT to continue to provide the planning liaison services to the Council, we need a resolution every year from the Council authorizing this to occur and asking for the funds to be directed to LCDOT. Ms. Karry informed the committee that the item on the agenda is to recommend the resolution for approval by the Council to allow CMAP to distribute approximately \$170k of feds funds to the County for Planning Liaison staff assistance. The County contributes approximately \$87k in matching funds to the grant and the balance of council staff salaries/benefits.

A motion was made by Dave Brown with a second by Anne Marrin to recommend approval of the resolution to the Full Council. The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

8. STP-Shared Fund Bonus Points

Mr. Klemens presented the scores for the projects in the Lake County Council that applied for the STP Bonus points. There was a total of 6 projects in the Lake County Council that applied for the STP Shared fund. Mr. Klemens informed the committee that the Council gets a total of 25 bonus points and can't award more than 15 to a single project. Based on the approved Council policy, the Council will award 15 points to the highest scoring project and 10 points to the second highest scoring. The top scoring project was Lake County DOT's Deerfield Road project and the second highest scoring project was Lake Bluff's application for US 41 and IL 176.

A question was asked about the categories in the scoring and how a project would receive points for the ADT. Mr. Klemens answered that it appeared he omitted those scores from the ranking and would re-evaluate the scores.

A motion was made by Steve Shields with a second by Mike Brown that the proposed scores are forwarded to the Full Council for approval on the condition that staff reviews and confirms the rankings. The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

It was pointed out later in the meeting that the ADT scores were included in rankings, just in a separate column and that no further review of the rankings were required, and the scores would be forwarded to the Full Council for approval.

9. GATA Reporting Requirements

Council staff provided the committee with an update on GATA reporting requirements for projects with state and federal funding. Staff reminded the committee about an IDOT circular letter that came out in the fall of 2018 that states that regular reporting is required for all state and federally funded projects. Staff gave the committee an update based on a training that was held by the Illinois Municipal Treasurers Association. A link to the power point from the training was included in the meeting materials. Staff highlighted a couple of items from the training and stated that this GATA reporting process is new and evolving both for communities and IDOT. The required forms should only be filled out for the funds that pass through an agency, so for federal construction phases, only the required local match needs to be reported, as the 80% in federal funds is administered and paid by IDOT. This GATA reporting requirement also applies to a communities MFT distribution and it should be reported on as if it was a single project. The form needs to show how much MFT was received and expended during the reporting period, but it doesn't need to be reported on a project by project basis that MFT funds were used on.



LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL OF MAYORS

A question was asked if MFT funds being considered a grant could lead to MFT funds being considered discretionary by the state. Staff does not have that impression from anyone that there are changes being considered in regard to the way MFT funds are distributed to municipalities, GATA just requires that MFT funds be reported on like a grant.

A question was asked about how to report on projects that are joint projects between two agencies. Staff responded that the community that is the lead agency on the funding agreement with IDOT would be responsible for doing the appropriate reporting for the entire project.

A comment was made that the presentation at the treasurer's association was around 140 slides, and there is a lot of information in the presentation that communities can get answers to some of their questions.

Alex Househ from IDOT volunteered to bring Tom Briggs (one of IDOT District One's staff working on the GATA reporting) to the next LCCOM transportation committee meeting. There was interest from the committee in having Mr. Briggs come to the committee meeting and answer communities' questions. Staff will work with Alex to confirm that Mr. Briggs attendance at future LCCOM meeting.

10. Current Lake Council STP Program

Mr. Klemens gave the committee an update on the status of the Council's STP program, the majority of the Council's funds for the year are on the IDOT April letting, so hopefully the Council sees good bid prices. Mr. Klemens also informed the committee that based on the status updates the program has been updated to reflect new schedules for all the active projects. Based on those updates it is becoming clear that several projects will be moving from FY2020 to FY2021, which means they will need to be grandfathered into the Council's new program. Currently there is around 2 years' worth of funding for projects that will need to be grandfathered into the new program. The Council's current proposal is to take the funding for those projects off the top before adding new projects to the program during the next call for projects. Staff is not recommending changing that proposal, but just wanted all the communities to understand that these projects will be included in the new program before new projects can be added.

A comment was made that these communities are spending money on their projects both local funds and federal funds and that it would be problematic to make them re-apply and risk the projects because they have slipped into FY2021, and that carrying projects forward is how the Council has always operated it is just a change in the federal rules that is requiring programs to be reset in FY2021.

A question was asked if projects applying for the call for projects would be able to seek funding in FY2021, staff responded that it will depend on the schedule of the grandfathered projects at the time when the new program is assembled. Projects will be put in the program in the appropriate year for their schedule, just because projects are grandfathered into the program doesn't mean they will have to put into the first fiscal year, they will be programmed based on their schedule and when they can spend the federal funds.

11. LCCOM STP Guidebook

Mr. Klemens discussed proposed revisions to the draft STP guidebook based on feedback from communities, CMAP staff and FHWA staff. The Pavement Preservation category was renamed Pavement Rehabilitation to better reflect the types of projects the Council is looking to fund under the category. The language regarding Transportation Control Measures (TCM) was removed based on conversations with FHWA staff that FHWA was concerned with taking those projects on a case by case basis. Since there has not been a request from Council members to have these types of projects funded, staff is recommending the section be removed. The Committee agreed with removing the section on TCM's.

The committee discussed if standalone bike path and pedestrian projects would be eligible for Council funds, in the current draft they are included as eligible project. A comment was made that the Council has traditionally funded roadway projects but has not funded stand along bike path projects through the STP program and that there are



LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL OF MAYORS

dedicated fund sources for bike path and pedestrian projects. After discussing the item, the committee left it to the Full Council of Mayors to decide if standalone bike path and pedestrian projects should be eligible.

Mr. Klemens made a point of clarification that even though Pavement Rehabilitation projects are scored on a separate scoring system, it is on the same 200-point scale as the other projects and when the program is being assembled, they will be combined into a single list of projects. FHWA will not allow a program to be built out of two different project ranking lists and FHWA will not allow a “set-aside” of funds for a particular project type. The up to 20% of funding for pavement rehabilitation type projects will be used as a not to exceed amount when creating the new Council program.

Another point of clarification made by staff was that the language around exceptions to the ranking system cannot be used to bring projects into the program outside of a call for projects. The purpose of the language is to be able to capture all the benefits or the unique nature of a project that the scoring system doesn't pick up.

Some proposed language was added regarding cost increases. For projects in the last three years of the active 5-year window, during the next call for projects the sponsor could ask for a cost increase while the new program is being built. This proposal will provide communities some flexibility and allow the council to have realistic programming for projects.

The most substantive text change proposed was regarding the scoring metrics used for pavement condition. The previous proposal had been to score roadways in either good, fair or poor condition, but the new proposal is to use a PCI score which is a composite score of all the federally approved pavement condition metrics. Some language was also added to the proposal to reflect that the same pavement testing data may not be available for all projects and so staff will use the best available data. Since CMAP did all of their pavement testing data last year for roadways classified as minor collectors and above, any roadways that have been added to the system as a minor collector and above since then won't have been included. If CMAP's testing data is not available for a particular roadway, then staff will see if IDOT has testing data available, if neither are available then staff would use testing data provided by the municipality. If no data sources are available, then staff would do a windshield survey and approximate pavement condition scores.

A question was asked about the weighting of the metrics for the pavement condition and if it would lead to getting the right projects at the right time. Staff responded that the two different scoring methodologies would be using the same metrics but would be weighted differently, so that reconstructions and road widenings would prioritize projects with pavements in the worst condition whereas pavement rehabilitation projects would prioritize conditions that are fair or satisfactory. The goal would be to get those rehabilitation projects done before the condition deteriorates to the point that they need reconstruction.

The final text clarification has to do with programming the pavement rehabilitation funds, which the recommendation is to spend up to 20% of the Council's annual allotment on those types of projects. In an ideal world that would be 20% per year but in practice the program will determine when those types of projects get funded, the 20% per year over a 5-year window will serve as a not to exceed number for those types of projects.

Staff also presented ideas on how to engage low capacity communities that have not participated in the program. Since there are a variety of reasons why a community might not participate, more than one strategy will likely be needed to help encourage participation. Staff agreed to host a workshop in the fall to provide information and resources to communities on the federal process and how to apply. Staff presented the following list of potential reasons communities don't participate and the possible actions to assist them to participate to the committee:

- Lack of Understanding of the Federal Process
 - Pre-Call for Projects Trainings
 - Federal Eligibility Requirements
 - Functional Classification Change Process
 - LCCOM Application and Funding Availability



LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL OF MAYORS

- Paperwork and Agreement Process for federally funded projects
- Active Program Management Rules

- Lack of Staff Capacity
 - Possibility for future joint Local Technical Assistance (LTA), Unified Work Program (UWP) or Statewide Planning and Research (SPR) application for multi-agency functional classification network review/changes
 - Partner with other agencies on projects that cross borders
 - CMAP embedded staff planner program

- Lack of Eligible Federal Routes
 - Joint LTA, UWP or SPR application for functional classification network review/changes
 - Project types not tied to federally eligible routes (such as trails and bridges)
 - Planning and Feasibility Studies

- Lack of Local Funding
 - Utilize Toll Development Credits for Highway's (TDCH) for Disadvantaged Communities that qualify; allows for 100% federal funding of Phase 1, Phase 2 and Construction
 - Apply for Council funds before initiating engineering contracts
 - Identify outside agency partners (public and private) ex: private property ROW donation
 - Utilize flexible federal match (apply the value of third party-donated funds, land, material, or services toward the nonfederal share of project costs)

The committee indicated the proposed text edits were acceptable and staff indicated they would incorporate the changes into the draft workbook.

10. Other Business

Ms. Karry informed the committee that IDOT has announced the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) program, applications will be open in June and will be due in August.

Ms. Karry informed the committee IDOT has released the awards for the Safe Routes to School program. IDOT provided some statistics on applications for the Safe Routes to School program. A total of 168 applications were received for the program requesting a total of nearly \$27.8 million. 5 applications were submitted from municipalities in Lake County. The applications were reviewed by 7 IDOT employees from different departments and scored. Reviewer scores were averaged and then added to the score calculated from demographic information (low income and students with disabilities) provided by the Illinois State Board of Education. The projects were then ranked according to the scores. Based on funding available, 28 Infrastructure and 11 Non-Infrastructure projects were chosen for award. There were no projects in Lake County selected for funding.

11. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for July 25, 2019 at 9am.

12. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made Wally Dittrich and seconded by Anne Marrin, the meeting adjourned at 10:40.



FFY 2019 STP Program

Municipality =====	Roadway =====	TIP ID# =====	Project Type =====	Total \$ =====	Federal \$ =====	Letting	
<u>Phase II Engineering</u>							
Buffalo Grove	Brandywyn Ln - Deerfield Pkwy to Prairie Rd	10-16-0038	Eng II	360,685	288,548	12/1/2018	19
Buffalo Grove	Thompson Blvd - Arl Hghts Rd to Weiland Rd	10-16-0039	Eng II	363,575	290,860	5/1/2019	19
Long Grove	N. Krueger Road - IL 22 to Gilmer Road	10-15-0024	Eng II	128,000	102,400	3/1/2019	19
Vernon Hills	Lakeview Pkwy - Center Rd to Fairway Dr.	10-03-0012	Eng II	453,390	362,712	5/1/2019	19
Highland Park	Clavey Rd - US 41 to Green Bay Road	10-15-0026	Eng II	988,600	630,880	9/1/2019	19
<u>Construction Projects</u>							
North Chicago	14th Street - Green Bay Rd to Jackson	10-99-0116	Con Reconstruction	16,525,114	13,015,079	1/18/2019	19
North Chicago	14th Street - Green Bay Rd to Jackson	10-99-0116	CE Reconstruction	1,571,699	1,231,115	1/18/2019	19
Deerfield	Greenwood Rd - Wilmot Rd to Waukegan Rd	10-17-0004	Con Recon/Resurface	1,826,532	879,600	3/8/2019	19
Deerfield	Greenwood Rd - Wilmot Rd to Waukegan Rd	10-17-0004	CE Recon/Resurface	232,814	150,000	3/8/2019	19
Buffalo Grove	Weiland Rd - Lake Cook Rd to Deerfield Pkwy (Stg 2)	10-94-0021	Con Add Lanes	10,405,771	7,788,872	4/26/2019	19
Buffalo Grove	Weiland Rd - Lake Cook Rd to Deerfield Pkwy (Stg 2)	10-94-0021	CE Add Lanes	1,095,700	778,887	4/26/2019	19
Libertyville	Rockland Rd. - IL 21 to Des Plaines River	10-97-0029	Con Reconstruction	6,015,000	2,464,080	4/26/2019	19
Libertyville	Rockland Rd. - IL 21 to Des Plaines River	10-97-0029	CE Reconstruction	706,900	565,520	4/26/2019	19
Round Lake Bch	Orchard Lane/Hook Drive - Monaville to Rollins Rd/ Orchard to Rollins	10-15-0010	Con Reconstruction	4,165,625	3,092,444	4/26/2019	19
Round Lake Bch	Orchard Lane/Hook Drive - Monaville to Rollins Rd/ Orchard to Rollins	10-15-0010	CE Reconstruction	496,397	326,142	4/26/2019	19
Fox Lake	Grand Ave - Rollins Road to IL 59	10-15-0002	Con Resurface	1,230,054	984,043	4/26/2019	19
Fox Lake	Grand Ave - Rollins Road to IL 59	10-15-0002	CE Resurface	147,594	98,357	4/26/2019	19
Buffalo Grove	Weiland Rd - Deerfield Pkwy to Aptakisic R (Stg 3)	10-94-0021	Con Add Lanes	11,090,290	7,945,229	9/20/2019	19
Buffalo Grove	Weiland Rd - Deerfield Pkwy to Aptakisic R (Stg 3)	10-94-0021	CE Add Lanes	1,195,326	856,260	9/20/2019	19
Libertyville TWP	Rockland Rd. - Des Plaines R to St Marys Rd	10-16-0033	Con Reconstruction	2,500,000	1,913,000	9/20/2019	19
Libertyville TWP	Rockland Rd. - Des Plaines R to St Marys Rd	10-16-0033	CE Reconstruction	250,000	200,000	9/20/2019	19
				Total	61,749,066	43,964,028	



FFY 2020 STP Program

Municipality	Roadway	TIP ID#	Project Type	Total \$	Federal \$	Letting	
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====		
Highland Park	West Park Ave - US 41 to west of Skokie River	10-14-0002	Eng II	75,000	60,000	3/1/2020	MYB
Highland Park	Greenbay Rd - Central Ave to Clavey Rd	10-16-0037	Eng II	700,000	560,000	3/1/2020	20
Lake Forest	Everett Road at Waukegan Road	10-17-0016	Con Int Imp	2,903,000	1,932,938	1/17/2020	20
Buffalo Grove	Brandywyn Ln - Deerfield Pkwy to Prairie Rd	10-16-0038	Con Recon/Resurface	3,970,000	3,176,000	1/1/2020	MYB
Buffalo Grove	Brandywyn Ln - Deerfield Pkwy to Prairie Rd	10-16-0038	CE Recon/Resurface	516,100	412,880	1/1/2020	MYB
Buffalo Grove	Thompson Blvd - Arl Hgts Rd to Weiland Rd	10-16-0039	Con Recon/Resurface	6,236,000	4,988,800	1/1/2020	MYB
Buffalo Grove	Thompson Blvd - Arl Hgts Rd to Weiland Rd	10-16-0039	CE Recon/Resurface	810,680	648,544	1/1/2020	MYB
Fox Lake	Sayton Rd - Industrial Ave to Rand Rd	10-15-0001	Con Reconstruction	600,000	480,000	3/6/2020	MYB
Fox Lake	Sayton Rd - Industrial Ave to Rand Rd	10-15-0001	CE Reconstruction	38,000	30,400	3/6/2020	MYB
Long Grove	N. Krueger Road - IL 22 to Gilmer Road	10-15-0024	Con Reconstruction	1,000,200	801,600	4/24/2020	MYB
Long Grove	N. Krueger Road - IL 22 to Gilmer Road	10-15-0024	CE Reconstruction	120,215	96,172	4/24/2020	MYB
Grant Township	Fish Lake Rd - Nippersink Rd to IL 120	10-15-0021	Con Reconstruction	1,364,000	955,000	4/24/2020	MYB
Grant Township	Fish Lake Rd - Nippersink Rd to IL 120	10-15-0021	CE Reconstruction	136,000	95,500	4/24/2020	MYB
Fox Lake	Nippersink BLVD - Oak St to Grand Ave	10-16-0035	Con Reconstruction	1,665,000	1,332,000	4/24/2020	MYB
Fox Lake	Nippersink BLVD - Oak St to Grand Ave	10-16-0035	CE Reconstruction	152,000	121,600	4/24/2020	MYB
Round Lake Bch	Hook Dr Extension - Rollins Rd to Nicole Lane	10-18-0005	Eng II	389,180	311,344	8/1/2020	MYB
Vernon Hills	Lakeview Pkwy - Center Rd to Fairway Dr.	10-03-0012	Con Intersection Imp.	4,651,610	3,721,288	9/18/2020	MYB
Vernon Hills	Lakeview Pkwy - Center Rd to Fairway Dr.	10-03-0012	CE Intersection Imp.	556,000	336,000	9/18/2020	MYB
Highland Park	Clavey Rd - US 41 to Green Bay Road	10-15-0026	Con Reconstruction	10,260,000	5,388,000	11/6/2020	20
Highland Park	Clavey Rd - US 41 to Green Bay Road	10-15-0026	CE Reconstruction	1,030,000	581,120	11/6/2020	20
				Total	37,172,985	26,029,186	
				FFY18-20 Totals	139,035,539	101,880,094	

FFY 2021 STP Program

Municipality	Roadway	TIP ID#	Project Type	Total \$	Federal \$		
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====		
Round Lake Bch	Hook Dr Extension - Rollins Rd to Nicole Lane	10-18-0005	Road Extension	4,358,816	3,487,053	1/1/2021	MYB
Highland Park	West Park Ave - US 41 to west of Skokie River	10-14-0002	Con Resurface	750,000	600,000	1/1/2021	MYB
Highland Park	West Park Ave - US 41 to west of Skokie River	10-14-0002	CE Resurface	112,500	90,000	1/1/2021	MYB
Highland Park	Green Bay Road - Central Ave to Clavey Rd	10-16-0037	Con Reconstruction	11,000,000	8,800,000	4/1/2021	MYB
Highland Park	Green Bay Road - Central Ave to Clavey Rd	10-16-0037	CE Reconstruction	560,000	448,000	4/1/2021	MYB



LAKE COUNTY
COUNCIL OF MAYORS

**STP Program of Projects
FFY 2019-2020**

7/15/2019

16,781,316 13,425,053



FFY 2022 STP Program

Municipality	Roadway	TIP ID#	Project Type	Total \$	Federal \$
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

B-List: Post FFY2020

Municipality	Roadway	TIP ID#	Project Type	Total \$	Federal \$
=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Antioch	Lake Street	10-99-0101	Reconstruction	430,000	301,000
Antioch	Lake Street	10-99-0100	Resurface	332,000	232,400
Antioch	McMillen Rd./Anita Ave.	10-99-0102	Reconstruction	721,000	504,700
Buffalo Grove	Weiland Rd - Prairie Road Realignment (Stg 1)	10-94-0021	Add Lanes	11,049,539	7,161,806
Buffalo Grove	Weiland Rd - Miramar Ln to IL Rte 22 (Stg 4)	10-94-0021	Add Lanes	5,570,217	4,192,867
North Chicago	Dugdale Road	10-99-0117	Reconstruction	3,500,000	2,450,000
North Chicago	Argonne Dr. - IL 131 to Jackson St	10-06-0012	Reconstruction	7,160,000	5,012,000
Waukegan	Dugdale Road - Jackson St to 14th St	10-03-0009	Reconstruction	3,500,000	2,450,000
Wauconda	Lake Shore Blvd/ Grand Blvd - IL 176 to Bonner Road	10-11-0052	Widen & Resurface	3,650,000	2,555,000
Grayslake	Center St - at Seymour Ave & at Hawley St	10-11-0044	Intersection Imp.	1,056,000	739,200
Grayslake	Atkinson Rd - IL 120 to Washington St	10-11-0045	Channelization	1,100,000	770,000
Green Oaks	Bradley Rd - IL 176 to I-94	10-11-0048	Widen & Resurface	4,100,000	2,870,000
				Total	29,238,973



Surface Transportation Program Guidebook

Funding Policies, Programming Policies,
& Project Evaluation Methodology
Adopted xx/xx/xxxx

Table of Contents

Introduction and Overview	4
Lake County Council of Mayors Membership	5
LCCOM Implementation Policy	6
Eligible Routes	6
Eligible Projects	6
Funding Eligibility	7
Maximum Federal Funding	7
Assistance for Disadvantaged Communities	7
Program Development	8
Project Proposals	8
Call for Project	8
Project Applications	8
Project Evaluation Process	9
Exceptions to the Ranking System	9
Active Programs	9
Contingency Programs	10
Project Management	11
Training	11
Designated Project Managers	11
Status Updates	12
Active Program Management	13
Obligation Deadlines	13
Active Reprogramming	14
ROW Clearance for Program Management	15
Cost Increase Limitations	15
Current Year Cost Increases	15
Sponsor Commitment	16
Carryover Limitations and Redistribution of Unobligated Funds	16
Accessing Unobligated Funds	17
Additional Provisions	18
Grant Accountability and Transparency Act	18
Qualifications Based Selection	18
Effective Date	18
Grandfathering Projects	18
Roadways and Intersections Evaluation Methodology	19
Pavement Rehabilitation Evaluation Methodology	24

Introduction and Overview

Federal surface transportation funding operates under multiyear congressional authorizations and administered through the U.S DOT's Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The current federal authorization is the [Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act](#) (FAST Act). The FAST Act provides federal funding, guidelines and requirements for federally funded transportation projects. Under the FAST Act, the [Surface Transportation Block Grant Program](#) (STP) provides funding to state departments of transportation.

The STBG Program provides flexible funding that states and localities can use for projects on any federally eligible roadways, bridge projects on any public road, transit capital projects, or intracity and intercity bus terminals and facilities. A portion of the Illinois Department of Transportation's (IDOT) STP funding is designated for northeast Illinois through the Chicago Metropolitan Planning Organization, which is housed at the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP).

The [MPO Policy Committee](#) is designated by the governor of Illinois and northeastern Illinois local officials as the Chicago region's Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). It is the decision-making body for all regional transportation plans and programs for this area. The MPO Policy Committee plans, develops and maintains an affordable, safe and efficient transportation system for the region, providing the forum through which local decision makers develop regional plans and programs.

Programming authority for STP funding is delegated to the regional Councils of Mayors and City of Chicago by the MPO Policy Committee. The distribution of funding and programming procedures are outlined in an [agreement](#) between the Council of Mayors and City of Chicago. Due to recent changes to federal requirements in MAP-21 and the FAST Act, the agreement was updated and endorsed by the MPO Policy Committee and CMAP Board on October 11, 2017.

The primary responsibility of the Lake County Council of Mayors (LCCOM) is to program Federal Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) funds.

Made up of units of local governments located within Lake County, the [Lake County Council of Mayors](#) (LCCOM) is one of eleven regional Councils of Mayors in the Chicago metropolitan region that have been delegated STP programming authority. There are six councils in suburban Cook County, and there is one council for each of the five collar counties. Each council is responsible for programming an annual allocation of STP funds. At the beginning of each federal fiscal year (FFY), the CMAP [Council of Mayors Executive Committee](#) will be informed of the STP funding allocations for each council.

Local agencies that wish to participate in the local STP program must do so through their designated sub-regional council, according to the methodology of that council. A list of municipalities belonging to each council can be downloaded [here](#), and a list of LCCOM members is on the next page.

The LCCOM has approved a STP Program Implementation Policy and Methodology. Communities should consult this policy to understand the process and determine if the project under consideration is eligible.

Lake County Council of Mayors Membership

Antioch	Lindenhurst
Bannockburn	Long Grove
Beach Park	Mettawa
Buffalo Grove	Mundelein
Deerfield	North Barrington
Deer Park	North Chicago
Fox Lake	Old Mill Creek
Grayslake	Park City
Green Oaks	Riverwoods
Gurnee	Round Lake
Hainesville	Round Lake Beach
Hawthorn Woods	Round Lake Heights
Highland Park	Round Lake Park
Highwood	Third Lake
Indian Creek	Tower Lakes
Island Lake	Vernon Hills
Kildeer	Volo
Lake Barrington	Wadsworth
Lake Bluff	Wauconda
Lake Forest	Waukegan
Lake Villa	Winthrop Harbor
Lake Zurich	Zion
Libertyville	County of Lake
Lincolnshire	

LCCOM Implementation Policy

Eligible Routes

Currently the [functional classification](#) of a road determines its eligibility for federal funding. The routes eligible for STP funding should be those routes which promote regional and/or sub-regional travel. Roads classified as Arterials (Principal or minor) or Collectors (major or minor) are eligible to receive funding. Recognizing that the function of a roadway may change as land development and travel patterns change over time, LCCOM members may propose additions or deletions to the system (along with [justification](#) for the addition or deletion). STP routes must serve more than a local land access function. Additions or deletions to the system will be considered by LCCOM members via a written request from the local agency sponsor with jurisdiction of the route. The LCCOM will forward its recommendations for additions and deletions to IDOT for a final determination in consultation with FHWA. The final determination of a route must be approved by IDOT and FHWA for a project application to be submitted for the route during a call for projects. The functional classification of a route must be federally eligible at the time of application to be considered for STP funding.

Eligible Projects

The improvement of STP system routes will require strict adherence to federal and state standards and policies. For example, a project adding capacity may be required to go through a regional air [conformity quality analysis](#) by CMAP before the project can be added to the [Transportation Improvement Program](#) (TIP). The list of eligible projects is subject to change and may be revised based on subsequent interpretation of the current federal transportation, clean air, or other related Acts and the priorities of the LCCOM. The LCCOM has determined the following categories of projects are eligible for STP funding through the LCCOM:

Roadways and Intersections

- Intersection Improvement/Channelization
- Roadway Widening
- New Roadway Construction
- Roadway Reconstruction
- Traffic Signals, Modifications and/or Modernization
- Modern Roundabout

Pavement Rehabilitation

The intended purpose of a pavement rehabilitation program is to maintain or restore the surface characteristics of a pavement and to extend service life of the pavement assets being managed. The Pavement Rehabilitation category addresses the repair and resurfacing of existing roadways. The LCCOM has determined that the following types of Pavement Rehabilitation Projects are eligible for STP funding through the LCCOM:

- Local Agency Functional Overlay (LAFO)
- Local Agency Structural Overlay (LASO)
- Resurfacing

Funding Eligibility

Table 1: LCCOM STP Funding by Phase

Project Phase	Phase 1 Engineering	Phase 2 Engineering	ROW Acquisition	Construction	Phase III Construction Engineering
Federal	0%*	80% max	0%	80% max	80% max
Local	100%	20%	100%	20%	20%

*-Exceptions for Highest Need Communities are discussed in Assistance for Disadvantaged Communities Phase I Engineering and Land Acquisition will be a 100% local responsibility, Land acquisition must be accomplished in accordance with federal land acquisition requirements. Funding exceptions for Phase I Engineering are discussed in Assistance for Disadvantaged Communities below. Phase II, Phase III Engineering and Construction will be matched at a ratio of 80% federal (max), 20% local. Wetland mitigation/purchase of wetland credits for STP funded projects are considered part of Phase II Engineering and therefore are eligible costs.

The LCCOM has decided that Pavement Rehabilitation projects are to receive up to 20% of the Council's STP funding on an annual basis, and Pavement Rehabilitation projects will be ranked separately from other project types.

Maximum Federal Funding

The maximum federal funding available for any single project under Roadways and Intersections will be approximately 80% of the LCCOM's annual allotment of STP funds. Based on the current annual allotment of STP funds; the current maximum federal funding is \$7,500,000; requiring a 20 percent local match of \$1,875,000. Any costs above the \$9,375,000 (federal funding+ local match) will be the responsibility of the local agency.

The maximum federal funding for a single Pavement Rehabilitation project will be \$1,000,000; requiring a local match of \$250,000. Any cost for a pavement rehabilitation project above \$1,250,000 (federal funding + local match) will be the responsibility of the local agency.

An agency which receives over \$4,000,000 in federal funding for a single project, will be eligible to apply for another project during the next round of call for projects, however projects applied for during the next call will have 10 points deducted from their total score.

Assistance for Disadvantaged Communities

As part of the [agreement](#) for STP funding, the Council of Mayors Executive Committee and the City of Chicago agreed that aiding disadvantaged communities so that they may have more opportunities to access the federal funds was a desired outcome. While not the only barrier to reinvesting in local infrastructure, supplying the required match can be challenging and may discourage local officials in disadvantaged communities from seeking funding for needed projects.

Federal law allows states to accrue transportation development credits (TDCs), also known as "Toll Credits", when capital investments are made on federally approved tolled facilities. The TDCs can be used in place of the 20 percent local/state match and a project can be funded at essentially 100 percent federal funds. The Illinois Tollway has historically generated a great deal of these credits, considerably more than are used each year, and previously the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) policy has allowed them to be used on transit projects but not local roads projects. IDOT has now approved a policy that includes local use on non-transit project types, referred to as Transportation Development Credits for Highways (TDCH).

Eligible municipal jurisdictions are determined based upon CMAP's Local Technical Assistance (LTA) program community need measures, which may be updated from time to time. Only jurisdictions in the [highest need group](#) (Cohort 4) are considered eligible to utilize TDCHs as local match for STP-L. Eligibility is determined at the time of application for STP funds. TDCHs cannot be used as local match on the right-of-way acquisition phase of any project. All other project phases are eligible to use TDCHs as match, including Phase I engineering. Eligibility for TDCHs does not guarantee that the project will be selected for STP-L funding or that IDOT will ultimately approve the use of TDCHs for that project. The LCCOM will follow both CMAP's and IDOT's [policies](#).

Program Development

Active Program Management (APM) provides a mechanism for ensuring timely obligations to protect the region's funding from lapse and rescission, and to provide flexibility for moving forward projects that are "ready" in favor of those that are "delayed". APM is achieved through strong project and program management with active monitoring of project implementation status from project selection through obligation of federal funds. Active Program Management begins with the development of a program of projects. To facilitate active program management, the LCCOM program of projects will be made up of two distinct programs: an active five-year, fiscally constrained program, and a contingency program of projects that can move forward into the active program if additional funds become available. The steps for program development are below:

The LCCOM will solicit for project applications starting in January of even years for the next five federal fiscal years (FFYs). Final applications will be due in March. From April through August, evaluations, development of recommended programs, LCCOM Transportation Committee reviews, and public comment will occur. A CMAP TIP Amendment(s) to incorporate the recommended program(s) will be prepared in the fall for CMAP Transportation Committee consideration. The CMAP Transportation Committee will be asked to recommend approval of the program(s) and the TIP amendment(s) to the MPO Policy Committee. Final approval of the program(s) will occur when the MPO Policy Committee acts on the TIP Amendment(s) in October.

Project Proposals

Any member of the Lake County Council of Mayors may propose a project to be funded through the STP program, provided:

1. The project is on a STP eligible route and has logical termini, as determined by the LCCOM and concurred by IDOT, in accordance with FHWA requirements;
2. The project is a STP eligible project type as specified in the current federal transportation program bill, and on the LCCOM eligible project list;
3. The project sponsor(s) can fund the required local match and adopts a resolution/ordinance. Multi-jurisdictional projects must specify which municipality will be responsible for each component or phase of the project.
4. The project sponsor is a member of the Lake County Council of Mayors; any Township Road District within Lake County or any transit agency that wishes to apply for a project must have a Lake County Council of Mayors member as a co-sponsor.
5. The project sponsor completes the proper Project Application and submits it for consideration during a Call for Projects.

Call for Projects

Project applications can only be submitted for consideration when the LCCOM has issued a Call for Projects. In accordance with the [agreement](#) between the Council of Mayors and the City of Chicago, the LCCOM will solicit for project applications starting in January of even years, for the next five federal fiscal years (FFYs). Final applications will be due in March and must be submitted by the date approved by the LCCOM to be considered for funding. For each Call for Projects, LCCOM staff, in conjunction with CMAP staff, will determine how much funding is estimated to be available to keep the five-year active STP program full and to spend the Council's funding mark yearly.

Project Applications

A STP Project Application must be prepared on the approved application form for eligible projects to be considered for STP funding. Copies of the application form are available on the [LCCOM website](#). The person that should prepare the application will depend on the complexity of the project and previous work that has occurred on this project. Project applicants need to provide complete information to allow LCCOM Staff to apply the approved ranking system to submitted projects. In all cases the application must be submitted by the Local Agency that is seeking funding, whether it is prepared by the Local Agency directly or prepared by a consultant at the request of a Local Agency.

Project Evaluation Process

Once the Calls for Projects has closed and all applications have been received, the Project Evaluation process will begin. Project evaluations shall be based on published ranking and programming methodologies.

All projects with work types listed under the Roadways and Intersections (see page 6) will be rated using the LCCOM Roadways and Intersections Project Selection Methodology (Page 18). Pavement Rehabilitation projects will be ranked using the LCCOM Pavement Rehabilitation Methodology (Page 23). While projects will be evaluated using the separate ranking systems as described above, once scored, all projects will be ranked in a single program of projects in order to generate the recommended program. A recommended active program of projects and contingency program will be released at the end of the evaluation period. The LCCOM Transportation Committee will review the recommended program, and public comment will occur after all projects have been evaluated.

A CMAP TIP Amendment(s) to incorporate the recommended program(s) will be prepared in the fall for CMAP Transportation Committee consideration. The CMAP Transportation Committee will be asked to recommend approval of the program(s) and the TIP amendment(s) to the MPO Policy Committee. Final approval of the program(s) will occur when the MPO Policy Committee acts on the TIP Amendment(s) in October. In accordance with [conformity analysis](#) requirements, proposed new projects and previously programmed projects with significant changes to scope and/or schedule that include not exempt work types cannot be included in the TIP until the next semi-annual conformity analysis. These projects will be identified and recommended for inclusion in the LCCOM program, contingent upon the next conformity determination. Based on the semi-annual conformity amendment schedule, the LCCOM will not program new not exempt projects in the first year of any program.

Exceptions to the Ranking System

The project selection methodology is used in the selection of the Council's Five-year Program. If a member community would like a project considered for reasons beyond those listed in the ranking system, a written justification must be provided to the Council on why the project should be approved. A 2/3-majority vote of the Lake County Council of Mayors members is required to approve a project for reasons outside of the ranking system. Exceptions to the ranking system cannot be used to add new projects to the program outside a call for projects, new projects can only be added through an active call for projects. The exception to the ranking system is designed to provide a mechanism for a unique project with components not captured by the Council scoring system.

Active Programs

The result of each Call for Projects will be the development of a fiscally constrained multi-year program of projects to be completed, in whole or in part, with STP funds. Active Programs will be included in the region's TIP and are therefore subject to fiscal constraint. The first year of the active program will be considered the "current year" and will be subject to obligation deadlines described in the Program Management section of this document. The next four years will be considered the "out years". Project phases programmed in the out years are not subject to obligation deadlines and can be actively reprogrammed in other out years at any time, subject to each year of the multi-year Active Program maintaining fiscal constraint at all times.

Since the Active Program contains projects selected through a performance-based ranking process, funding is awarded to a specific project and cannot be reallocated from the awarded project to another project even if it is in the same community. Additionally, sponsors of project phases that are programmed in the out years should reaffirm their commitment to the scheduled implementation in subsequent calls, but will not be required to re-apply, as described in the Program Management section of this document.

Contingency Programs

It is anticipated that during each call for projects there will be more applications than can be programmed within the years of the call cycle. To facilitate the region's goal of obligating 100% of available funding each year, the LCCOM can effectively "over program" by developing a Contingency Program of projects during each call cycle. The Contingency Program should include, in rank order, the next highest ranked projects that were unable to be funded in the call for projects due to fiscal constraint. Sponsors of contingency projects must be committed to keeping projects active and moving forward toward obligation of federal funding in the two years between calls for projects. If sponsors of potential Contingency Program projects are not committed to moving forward, for example because funding was requested in an out year, those projects should not be included in the Contingency Program. Projects requiring a conformity determination that are not already included in the current conformed TIP, may be included in Contingency Programs, but cannot be reprogrammed into the current year of the Active Program after the TIP change submittal deadline for the spring semi-annual conformity analysis. These projects can be reprogrammed into an out year of the Active Program. Projects, or phases of projects, that did not apply for funding during a call for projects cannot be added to a Contingency Program until the next applicable call for projects.

Inclusion of a project in a Contingency Program is not a guarantee of future federal funding for any phase of a project. The Contingency Program will expire with each subsequent call for projects. Projects included in the Contingency Program from the prior call for projects must reapply for funding consideration during the next call. If the first phase of a project in the contingency program is moved to the active program, there is no guarantee that the subsequent phases will be funded via the Contingency Program or future Active Programs. There shall be no "automatic" reprogramming from the Contingency Program to the Active Program at the time of each call for projects.

Active projects that are reprogrammed in the Contingency Program, either voluntarily, or due to missing an obligation deadline, must also reapply for funding consideration during the next call. This reapplication will reset all deadlines associated with project phases and make phases eligible for obligation deadline extensions, as discussed in more detail in the Program Management section of this document. If unsuccessful with future applications for STP funding, the sponsor may complete the project using another fund source(s). If the project is not completed within the timeframe required by federal law, the sponsor will be required to pay back federal funds used for previous phases of the project.

Project Management

Transportation projects can take many years to implement. With an understanding of the federal process, strong advocacy, and good project management, projects can be more successful in moving from conception to implementation. The relationship and communication between the technical staff, the financial staff, and the elected officials that set priorities and make budget decisions for the local agency must also be strong.

Training

Stakeholders throughout the region, including public and private sector implementers, have indicated that a thorough understanding of the project implementation process is critical for the successful completion of projects. An understanding of the process leads to realistic expectations and better overall scheduling and project planning. Project sponsors that have projects recommended for inclusion in either the LCCOM's Active Program or the Contingency Program will be required to attend an STP workshop prior to the formal adoption of the program.

Designated Project Managers

Communication is critical at all levels of project implementation. Throughout project implementation there are several agencies and individuals involved in the process, including state and federal staff, CMAP programming staff, councils of mayors' staff and officials, consulting firms, sponsor staff, elected leaders, and the public. The staff of the various agencies will monitor project progress and finances. To facilitate comprehensive understanding and communication regarding projects, each sponsor shall designate the following from their staff upon inclusion in an active or contingency program:

1. A Technical Project Manager that will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the project, managing any consultants involved in the project, ensuring that all federal, state, and local requirements are met and, in conjunction with the Financial Project Manager, ensuring that the required agreements between the sponsor agency and IDOT are approved and executed in an appropriate and timely manner.
2. A Financial Project Manager that will be responsible for ensuring that any required local matching funds are included in the sponsor agency budget in the appropriate fiscal year(s) in which federal obligation and/or project expenditures will occur, and, in conjunction with the Technical Project Manager, that the required agreements between the sponsor agency and IDOT are approved and executed in an appropriate and timely manner.

The Technical Project Manager and Financial Project Manager generally should not be the same person, unless the Technical Project Manager has a direct role in developing the sponsor's budget and/or securing local funding. For each project phase utilizing consulting services, a Consultant Project Manager must also be designated.

The project managers must be reported to LCCOM staff and should also be documented in the CMAP eTIP database. In the event of staff changes, a new designee(s) shall be assigned as soon as possible, and this shall be reported to LCCOM staff. These managers should be familiar with the federally funded project implementation process and are strongly encouraged to take advantage of training opportunities.

Required project status updates described below may only be submitted by one of these managers, and all managers are jointly responsible for the content and timely submittal of updates. Correspondence from the LCCOM and/or CMAP regarding project status, upcoming programming deadlines, or any other information regarding the programming status of projects will be sent to each of these managers. Correspondence from the LCCOM and/or CMAP regarding the technical details of projects may be sent only to the Technical Project Manager and/or Consultant Project Manager, as appropriate.

Status Updates

Upon inclusion of any phase of a project within an active or contingency program, quarterly status updates detailing initial (time of application) estimated dates, current adjusted estimated dates (based on progress made since the application was submitted), and actual accomplishment dates of all project milestones, regardless of the phase(s) programmed with STP funds, shall be submitted by one of the project's designated project managers through CMAP's eTIP website. These updates are required to be submitted in December, March, June, and September of every federal fiscal year. Updates submitted any day within the required month will be considered to have met the deadline. Updates submitted in any other month of the year will not be considered an official quarterly update.

Submittals shall be verified by LCCOM staff, in consultation with IDOT District 1 Bureau of Local Roads and Streets (BLRS) staff. Status updates may be submitted more often than required, at the LCCOM's request and/or sponsor's discretion. Status updates must be submitted even if no progress has been made since the prior update. Failure to submit required status updates, as outlined in Table 2, may result in significant project delay or the loss of funding for current and subsequent phases of projects.

Table 2:

	If required quarterly updates are not submitted...
Projects with any phase programmed in the current FFY	The project phase, and all subsequent phases, will be moved from the active program to the contingency program. Funds programmed in the CMAP TIP for these phases will be moved to "MYB", and a formal TIP amendment will be required to reinstate these phases.
Projects with any phase(s) programmed in an out year (years 2 – 5)	The project phase, and all subsequent phases, will be removed from the active program. Out year projects removed will <i>not</i> be placed in the contingency program and must re-apply for funding during the next Call for Projects.
Contingency projects	The project phase, and all subsequent phases, will be removed from the contingency program, and must re-apply for funding during the next Call for Projects.

Active Program Management

Obligation Deadlines

Any project phase(s) programmed in the current Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) on or after the first day (October 1) of that FFY is required to fully obligate the programmed federal funds prior to the end of that FFY (September 30). For the purposes of obligation deadlines, a project phase is considered to be “obligated” if federal funds have been authorized as “current” or “Advance Construction (AC)” in FHWA’s FMIS database. The entire phase must be obligated, up to the programmed amount or the final engineer’s estimate, whichever is less, to be considered fully funded. “Staged” construction, or “combined” engineering phases are not considered fully obligated until all stages/phases under a single State Job or Federal Project Number are fully obligated. Table 3 describes the action(s) necessary to obligate each federally funded phase, and the milestone deadlines that should be met to meet the obligation requirement.

Table 3: Milestones for Obligation

Federally Funded Phase	Federal Obligation Action	Milestone(s)	Milestone Deadline
Phase 2 Engineering	Execution of Local Agency Agreement and Engineering Agreement	1. Phase 2 QBS completed	1. Before submitting draft agreements (may be completed with Phase 1 QBS; may begin before DA received)
		2. Phase 1 Design Approval (DA) received	2. Before submitting draft agreements
		3. Draft agreements submitted to IDOT district (7-10 month review)	3. April 30th (approx.)
Construction (state let)	Execution of Local Agency Agreement*	1. Phase 2 pre-final plans submitted	a. Date specified on the IDOT Region 1 Letting Schedule for the November state letting (typically early-June)

*-Approximately 6 weeks prior to letting

If these milestones are not anticipated to be achieved, based on the March status update, the project sponsor may by **April 15th**:

1. Request a one time, six (6) month extension of the phase obligation deadline.
 - a. For Phase 1 Engineering, Phase 2 Engineering, and Right-of-Way, the extended deadline will be March 30 of the following calendar year.
 - b. For Construction/Construction Engineering, the extended deadline will be the federal authorization date for the April state letting in the following calendar year.

Programmed funds will be eligible to be carried over (subject to carryover limitations described later in this document) to the next FFY if the request is approved. Each project phase may only be granted one extension. If an extended project phase misses the extended obligation deadline, the phase, and all subsequent phases of the project, will immediately be moved to the contingency program, and the funds programmed in the current year will be removed from the LCCOM’s programming mark. If not moved back into the active program prior to the next call for projects, the sponsor must reapply for funding consideration. If the end of the six-month extension period has been reached, and the phase remains unobligated solely due to agreement review and the agreement was submitted to IDOT before August 1st of the prior year in a good faith attempt to ensure timely obligation of funds within the programmed FFY, an additional three-month extension will be automatically granted for that phase. The additional extension will be to June 30 for engineering and right-of-way phases, and to the federal authorization date for the August state letting for construction/construction engineering phases.

2. Request the current phase and all subsequent phases be immediately removed from the active program and placed in the contingency program. Programmed funds will not be automatically carried over but will be available for immediate active reprogramming in the current FFY as described below. The obligation deadline for the phase will be removed, and the phase will remain eligible for a future extension request. If not moved back into the active program prior to the next call for projects, the sponsor must reapply for funding consideration.
3. Proceed at their own risk. If the programmed funds are not obligated as of September 30, the programmed phase and all subsequent phases will be removed from the active program and will not be added to the contingency program. Programmed funds will not be carried over or available for reprogramming and will be permanently removed from the LCCOM's programming mark. The sponsor may reapply for funding during the next call for projects.

Requests for extensions will be reviewed by LCCOM staff, in consultation with CMAP, IDOT, and/or FHWA staff as needed, and will be granted based only on the ability of the sponsor to meet the extended obligation deadline. The reason for delay, whether within sponsor control or not, shall not be a factor in decisions to grant extensions. If an extension request is denied by staff, the sponsor may appeal to the LCCOM Transportation Committee, or may choose another option.

Following review of the March status updates, and any subsequent requests for extensions, sponsors of project phases included in the Contingency Program that have indicated potential for current year obligation of funds will be notified of the possible availability of funding and will be encouraged to take necessary actions to prepare for obligation of funds between June and October. Program changes to move project phases from the Contingency Program to the Active Program will occur no later than June 30. Formal TIP Amendments will be required to move contingency project phases into the current year of the TIP, the current CMAP TIP Amendment schedule should be considered when making re-programming decisions. Request for extensions after April 15th will not be accepted and the project will be reprogrammed to a later fiscal year or the contingency list.

Active Reprogramming

It is the goal of the region to obligate 100% of the federal STP funding allotted to the region each year. Recognizing that implementation delays can and do occur, the LCCOM shall have the flexibility to actively reprogram funds.

**When considering active reprogramming, the fiscal constraint
of the program must always be maintained.**

Active reprogramming can occur at any time and requires that the LCCOM to publish an updated active program and updated contingency program prior to making TIP changes associated with the reprogramming. LCCOM staff shall have the authority to publish routine program updates without calling a meeting of the LCCOM Transportation Committee. The LCCOM Transportation committee will approve all changes to project scope or change in project limits.

Within out years of the active program, reprogramming from one out year to another out year and shall be limited only by fiscal constraint in those years.

Any project phase(s) moved into the current FFY through active reprogramming is subject to the same obligation deadlines as all other current year phases. It may be necessary to move another project phase(s) out of the current FFY to accommodate ready to obligate phases.

LCCOM staff will use the follow hierarchy when actively reprogramming the current federal fiscal year:

- a. Cost changes for already obligated phases before,
- b. Cost Increases for Phases already in the current year before,
- c. Accelerating construction phases programmed in out years of the active program before,
- d. Accelerating engineering phases programmed in out years of the active program before,
- e. Accelerating construction phases included in the contingency program before,
- f. Accelerating engineering phases included in the contingency program before,

When the LCCOM has obligated 100% of the current year's programming mark, the LCCOM may request additional funding from the shared fund, as described in the Carryover Limitations and Redistribution of Unobligated Funding section of this document.

Right-of-Way Clearances for Program Management

Right-of-Way (ROW) Acquisition is a local responsibility, however because the acquisition of Right-of-Way is a critical path to project delivery, the LCCOM will use the following rules for the programming of Construction/Phase III engineering for projects where ROW is needed:

ROW must be certified by IDOT by June 30th of the proceeding federal fiscal year for Construction/Phase III engineering to be programmed in the next federal fiscal year.

Cost Increase Limitations

A project that has already received the maximum federal funding allowed by LCCOM rules is not eligible for a cost increase. Projects below the federal funding cap are eligible for a cost increase of up to 20% of the originally programmed amount of STP funding; subject to the LCCOM's federal funding cap, and the availability of additional STP funds. Cost increases cannot be guaranteed. Any cost increase above 20% of the originally programmed STP funding will be the responsibility of the local sponsor. Recognizing that some additional costs are outside the control of the project sponsor, a sponsor wishing to request a cost increase request above 20% will need to have the request approve by the LCCOM Transportation Committee. Project Phases in the Contingency List are not eligible for cost increases. For projects phases programmed in the first two years of the Council's Active program, cost increases can only be granted for project phases in the current fiscal year that are ready for obligation. Projects that are in the last three years of the Council's Active Program can seek cost increases only during the Council's next Call for Projects.

Current Year Cost Increases

Cost increases in the current federal fiscal year are subject to the availability of funding through active reprogramming and the STP shared fund and cannot be guaranteed. If the Council has the available funding at the time of the request, additional funds will be granted up to the cost increase limitation. If Council funds are not available at the time of the request, an eligible project seeking a cost increase for a project phase in the current fiscal year must wait until April of the current federal fiscal year to see if local council funds will be available to accommodate the requested increase due to active reprogramming. To be eligible for a cost increase for:

- a. Phase II Engineering in the current federal fiscal year the project sponsor must submit draft Phase II engineering agreements to Council Staff by April 30th of the current year.
- b. Construction or Phase III Engineering in the current federal fiscal year Pre-Final Plans must be submitted to IDOT in accordance with the published Bureau of Local Roads and Streets Letting Schedule to make the September bid letting.

If LCCOM funds are available due to active reprogramming, cost increases will be funded in the order they were received until LCCOM funds are expended or the requests are exhausted. If or when LCCOM funds are

exhausted, cost increases will be requested from CMAP through the STP Shared Fund. If additional funds are not available from either the LCCOM Program or the STP Shared Fund to accommodate a cost increase, the project sponsor must notify LCCOM how they wish to proceed by June 1st. The options for sponsors are:

- a. Delay the project phase; and actively reprogram it to await additional federal funding; or
- b. Keep the project in the current year and fund the increased project cost with local funds

Sponsor Commitment

Each call for projects is an additional opportunity to request reprogramming in a different FFY. Sponsors may request to have project phases reprogrammed in a different FFY, based on the implementation status of those projects, without the need to re-apply or be re-ranked if the sponsor reaffirms their commitment to completing the project according to the requested schedule. Sponsors may reaffirm their commitment to completing a project(s) according to the requested schedule(s) by:

- Submitting a resolution specific to the project(s) and schedule(s);
- Submitting a resolution or appropriate record of elected body action within one year of the CFP adopting a Capital Improvements Program (CIP), or similar, containing the project(s); or
- Submitting a letter signed by the Village Manager/Administrator, Clerk, Mayor/President, or similar, that addresses the sponsor's commitment to the project(s) and schedule(s).

For sponsors with multiple projects being reaffirmed, a single resolution or letter may be submitted that addresses each project.

In the event that a project included in the active program has not started phase 1 engineering (or equivalent) since the prior call for projects, whether that phase is to be federally or locally funded, that project must re-apply in the next call, except if; the project is for pavement rehabilitation techniques that were selected and programmed in out years to align with sponsor/sub-regional/regional pavement management system recommendations.

Carryover Limitations and Redistribution of Unobligated Funding

The LCCOM is responsible for obligating 100% of the funding available to it each FFY. The amount of unobligated funding at the end of each FFY that can be carried over to the next year shall be limited to the LCCOM's allotment (not including prior year carryover) for the year. Funds can only be carried over under the following circumstances:

1. The unobligated funds were programmed for a project(s) that was granted an extension.
2. The unobligated funds are the result of an "obligation remainder" that occurs when the actual federal obligation was less than the funding programmed for the project phase.
3. The unobligated funds were unprogrammed at the end of the FFY due to one of the following:
 - a. The cost of ready to obligate project(s) exceeds the unprogrammed balance available, no funds are available from the shared fund to fill the gap, and the selecting body has not accessed the shared fund in the current FFY; or
 - b. No projects are ready to obligate the available funds, but the selecting body can demonstrate a reasonable expectation for using the carried over funds in the following FFY.

The LCCOM must "pay back" any shared funds used in the current FFY before carrying over any unprogrammed balance. Any unobligated funding resulting from other circumstances, or more than the maximum allowed, will be removed from the LCCOM's programming mark and redistributed to the shared fund, where it will be available to all selecting bodies as described below.

Funds carried over with an extended project will expire on the obligation deadline of the extension. All other funds carried over will expire on March 31 of the following calendar year. Expired carryover that remains

unobligated will be removed from the LCCOM's balance on the expiration date and will be placed in the shared fund where it will be available to all selecting bodies as described below.

Accessing Unobligated Funds

Unobligated funds which are redistributed to the shared fund can be used for project cost increases or to advance ready to obligate local program and shared fund projects if all the LCCOM's current year funds have been obligated, including any funds carried over from the previous FFY. Access to funds redistributed to the shared fund will be on a "first ready, first funded" basis. Requests can only be made when obligation of funds is imminent. CMAP staff will determine if shared funds are available and will approve requests upon verification of obligation readiness. If there are more requests for funds than those available, priority shall be given as follows:

- Regional program projects shall be accommodated before local program projects
- Construction phases shall be accommodated before right-of-way*, right-of-way before phase 2 engineering, and phase 2 engineering before phase 1 engineering
- Cost increases shall be accommodated before advancing active or contingency project phases
- Active out year phases shall be accommodated before contingency project phases
- Readiness for obligation will have more weight than the date of the request for funding

*-LCCOM does not fund ROW, therefore the Shared Fund cannot be used to access unobligated funds for ROW for projects within the LCCOM program.

Shared funds may be requested for increases in STP-eligible costs at the time of obligation, based on the IDOT approved estimated cost at the time, or for cost increases after obligation due to higher than estimated bids, change orders, or engineering supplements. STP funds cannot be requested for increased costs on project elements specifically funded with other sources (such as CMAQ, TAP, Economic Development, ICC, Invest in Cook, etc.). Cost increases from the shared fund are limited to the lesser of 20% of the programmed STP funds or the LCCOM's maximum increase amount. For example, if the project was selected by a local council that limits individual projects to \$1.5 million in STP funds, the shared fund cannot be used to provide funds beyond that \$1.5 million limit. Shared funds may also be requested to advance ready to obligate phases from out years of any selecting body's active program or from any selecting body's contingency program. If a project sponsor requests and receives shared funds but is unable to obligate those funds by the end of the current FFY, future requests from that sponsor may be denied. Extended phases that missed the extended obligation deadline are never eligible to utilize shared funds.

The paragraph above applies only to projects programmed exclusively through the LCCOM Local Program. A project may apply and receive funding from both the LCCOM Local Program and the [STP Shared Fund](#). Projects within the LCCOM program are encouraged to apply directly to the STP Shared fund to receive additional STP funding, so long as they meet the eligibility requirements of the STP Shared Fund.

Additional Provisions

Grant Accountability and Transparency Act (GATA)

All sponsor agencies applying for federal funding must have completed Illinois GATA pre-qualification and Fiscal and Administration Risk Assessment (ICQ) for the current year prior to submitting an application, and must maintain qualified status each subsequent year, until all phases of the selected project(s) are complete. Failure to maintain qualified status will result in all programmed funds being withdrawn from all phases of all projects programmed for the sponsor, whether programmed in the shared fund or local program.

All sponsor agencies with a project(s) included in a recommended program(s) must complete the GATA Programmatic Risk assessment by the first day (October 1) of the federal fiscal year in which the first federally funded phase is programmed and must agree to and comply with any special conditions that are imposed because of the assessment.

GATA, requires a uniform periodic reporting of expenditures. For transportation funds, uniform reports of expenditures shall be reported no less than quarterly using the IDOT's BoBS 2832 form available on IDOT's web page under "Resources." Additional reporting frequency may be required based upon specific conditions, as listed in the accepted Notice of State Award (NOSA). Specific conditions are based upon the award recipient/grantee's responses to the Fiscal and Administrative Risk Assessment (ICQ) and the Programmatic Risk Assessment (PRA). All active and future joint funding agreements for any project using state and federal funds will require this reporting as a condition of the agreement. The joint funding agreement forms are currently being updated to include this language on all future joint funding agreements.

Qualifications Based Selection (QBS)

Local agencies utilizing federal funds for any engineering phase must use [Qualifications Based Selection](#) (QBS) procedures for hiring the consultant for each federally funded phase. The QBS process can begin prior to the start of the FFY in which the engineering phase is programmed to facilitate execution of local agency and engineering agreements as soon as possible after the start of the FFY.

Grandfathering Projects

The LCCOM has a current program of projects that are targeting obligation on or before September 30th, 2020. It will be the policy of the LCCOM to accommodate currently programmed projects in the council's Active Program that will be developed during the 2020 Call for Projects without the currently active projects needing to re-apply. Projects grandfathered into the Active Program will become subject to all Active Program Management policies, including obligation deadlines on October 1, 2020.

Effective Date

Program Development polices for LCCOM programs take effect on January 1, 2020, and the balance of policies take effect on October 1, 2020.



LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL OF MAYORS

Roadways and Intersections Project Evaluation Methodology

This project ranking methodology will be used to evaluate project applications from the following project types:

- Intersection Improvement/Channelization
- Roadway Widening
- Traffic Signals, Modifications and/or Modernization
- New Roadway Construction
- Roadway Reconstruction
- Modern Roundabout

Evaluation Criteria	Max Points	Percentage
1. On to 2050 Regional Priorities*	50	25%
2. Project Readiness	35	17.5%
3. Transportation Impact	30	15%
4. Pavement Condition	25	12.5%
5. Safety	20	10%
6. Sustained Participation	15	7.5%
7. Community Need	10	5%
8. Congestion Mitigation	8	4%
9. Traffic Volumes	7	3.5%
Total	200	100%

*- Per STP [agreement](#), required to be 25% of all local council methodologies

1. On To 2050 Regional Priorities (50 possible points)

All Councils are required to base at least 25% of their project criteria based on CMAP's ON TO 2050 Long Range Plan.

Regional Goal	Points
Project benefits freight movement	0
Project uses green infrastructure to manage storm water	0
Project improves access to jobs for economically disconnected areas*	0
Project serves a reinvestment area*	0
Density permitted at transit supportive levels around transit	0
Project sponsor has adopted a complete streets policy or ordinance	50

* - as defined by CMAP's ON TO 2050 Plan

2. Project Readiness (35 possible total points)

Projects will receive project readiness points based on their status relative to completion of Phase I and Phase II Engineering.

Phase Complete	Points
Phase II Engineering Complete (Pre-Final Plans Submitted to IDOT)	30
Phase II Engineering Contract Executed	20
Phase I Engineering Report Completed; Design Approval Granted	15
Phase I Engineering Report (PDR) Draft Submitted to IDOT	10
Phase I Engineering Contract Entered into by Applicant Member	5

Financial Commitment

Projects can receive up to 5 points based on their demonstrated leveraging of other funding sources (federal or local). Points are awarded as follows to projects based on the amount of funding requested from the Local Council Program. The percentage of funding requested will be calculated based on the cost of all phases eligible to be funded by the LCCOM.

Percent Local Council STP Funding Requested	Points
50% or less	5
51-60%	4
61-69%	3
70-74%	2
75-79%	1
80%	0

3. Transportation Impact (30 possible total points)

The Transportation Impact category aims to prioritize projects that are most significant to the region's transportation network. For an intersection improvement project, the higher roadway classification will be used for scoring. If additional project participants (i.e., adjacent municipality, county, township, IDOT, transit agency, school district, park district, forest preserve, private developer) are identified as financially contributing to the project or through ROW donation, granting of Permanent and/or Temporary Easements, the project will receive points per additional participant (see below).

Roadway Classification	Points
Principal Arterial	10
Minor Arterial	7
Major Collector	4

Number of Contributing Participants	Points
4 or more participants	15
3 project participants	10
2 project participants	5
1 project participant	0

Project Planning	Points
Project is included in an approved plan*	5

*-comprehensive plan, capital improvement plan, bike plan, ON TO 2050, county long range plan or another similar plan.

4. Condition of Pavement (25 possible points)

The Pavement Condition Testing done by CMAP will be used to rank projects where data is available, IDOT's CRS data will be used where PCI data is not available, if neither data source is available local pavement testing data will be considered, if no testing data is available Council staff will estimate pavement condition index score. The performance measure for pavements shall be based on four condition ratings of Excellent, Satisfactory, Fair, and Poor calculated for each pavement section. The Overall condition for asphalt and jointed concrete pavement sections shall be determined based on the ratings for IRI, Cracking_Percent, rutting and faulting, as defined by FHWA in [23 CFR 490.313](#). The Pavement Condition Index (PCI) is an overall rating of road condition.

Pavement Category	Points
Poor (0-45)	25
Fair (46-60)	15
Satisfactory (61-75)	5
Excellent (75-100)	0
New Alignment	10

5. Safety (20 possible total points)

The Safety category aims to prioritize projects where major safety concerns exist and can be addressed by appropriate engineering solutions. The safety category points are split equally into safety need and safety improvement

Safety Need (10 possible points)

The safety need score is calculated using IDOT's safety road index (SRI) for roadway segments and intersections. The SRI score is based on the locations Potential for Safety Improvement (PSI) score. IDOT developed SRI scores for local and state routes and categorized them by peer group into critical, high, medium, low, or minimal.

SRI Category	Points
Critical	10
High	8
Medium	6
Low	3
Minimal	0

Safety Improvement (10 possible points)

This score is based on the improvement of the project and the planning level expected safety benefit (reduction of crashes) after implementing the improvement. The planning level safety improvement score is modeled after the SMART SCALE Safety Factor Evaluation method developed by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT). Similar to VDOT's method, CMAP staff developed a list of common improvement types (countermeasures) and the accompanying planning level crash reduction factors (CRFs).

The planning level CRFs were developed using information from IDOT, Crash Modification Clearinghouse, and Highway Safety Manual. LCCOM staff will review project details from the application to determine the relevant countermeasure and the assigned planning level CRF for that countermeasure. If multiple countermeasures are part of the project, LCCOM staff will take the maximum planning level CRF for the project. Planning level crash reduction factor (CRF) point assignment:

CRF	Points
Above 50%	10
36%-49%	8
26%-35%	6
15%-25%	3
Under 15%	0

6. Sustained Participant Interest (15 possible points)

This category is for when a project is unable to be programmed by the LCCOM due to constrained funds and the sponsor exhibits sustained interest, committed resources, and Project Readiness by agreeing to keep the project on the Council's Contingency List. If during a project's time on the Contingency List, the project is not moved to the Active Program, the project shall receive an additional 15 points during the next call for projects if the sponsor re-submits an STP application for the project.

For the 2020 LCCOM Call for Projects **only**, projects that were included in the approved FFY17 LCCOM program B-List but were unable to be funded during the transition period (FFY 2018-2020) will be awarded 5 points to their total for re-applying during the 2020 Call for Projects or will receive 15 points for re-applying and having Phase 1 engineering substantially complete (IDOT has certified that a preliminary Project Development Report has been received with an accurate cost and clear scope established). This scoring will take the place of the Sustained Participation Category for the 2020 Call for Projects only.

7. Community Need (10 possible points)

The Community Need category aims to prioritize projects in communities that have not recently had the assistance of STP funding for their transportation system. Communities that fall into the [highest need category](#) (Cohort 4) as defined by CMAP will receive 10 points regardless of when the last time they have had a project funded.

Years Since Last Project Authorized by FHWA	Points
10+	10
5-9	5

8. Congestion Mitigation (8 possible points)

The Congestion Mitigation category aims to prioritize projects that are anticipated to improve air quality through reduction in idling or motorist delay. Points will be awarded based on the type of work being completed as a part of the project.

High – 8 points	Medium - 5 points	Low - 0 points
Signal Interconnects	Improve/modernize existing traffic signals	Resurfacing
New traffic signals (warranted)	Auxiliary Lane (Turn Lane) Additions	Shoulder improvements
Modern Roundabout	Realignment of offset intersection	Curb and gutter installation or repair
Full Channelization improvement	Consolidation of access	
Add lane project	Minor Channelization improvement (1 or 2 leg addition)	
Bottleneck Elimination	Widening and resurfacing	

9. Traffic Volumes (7 possible points)

The Traffic Volumes category aims to prioritize projects on roadways with severe congestion that threaten the transportation utility of a roadway or intersection. This category assigns a point value based on existing Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes. If no AADT is provided, LCCOM Staff will refer to IDOT’s AADT data for the respective segment. The point value will be determined by the following calculation, rounded to the nearest point.

$$(AADT \times 20) / 10,000 = \text{Points (maximum 7)}$$



LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL OF MAYORS

Pavement Rehabilitation Project Evaluation

The intended purpose of a pavement rehabilitation program is to maintain or restore the surface characteristics of a pavement and to extend service life of the pavement assets being managed. The Pavement Rehabilitation category addresses the repair and resurfacing of existing roadways and is intended to provide interim improvement until rehabilitation or reconstruction improvements are required. The LCCOM has determined the following types of Pavement Rehabilitation Projects are eligible for STP funding through the LCCOM:

- Local Agency Functional Overlay (LAFO)
- Local Agency Structural Overlay (LASO)
- Resurfacing

As the pavement management systems are used to determine the right treatment at the right time, rather than simply a “worst first” approach to project selection, the LCCOM will evaluate each Pavement Rehabilitation projects using the categories below. The selection criteria are designed to use federally approved performance measures to selection projects to improve the regions overall pavement condition. Each category will be assigned a weighted value. Pavement Rehabilitation projects are to receive up to 20% of the LCCOM’s STP funding on annual basis. While efforts will be made to program Pavement Rehabilitation projects evenly across the program, this may not be possible depending on the other projects making up the active program. The maximum of 20% of the Council’s allotment annually will provide a not to exceed amount of Pavement Rehabilitation funds to be programmed during the active program window.

Evaluation Criteria	Max Points	Percentage
1. Project Readiness	55	27.5%
2. ON TO 2050 Regional Priorities*	50	25%
3. Pavement Condition	40	20%
4. Sustained Participation/Community Need	25	12.5%
5. Traffic Volumes	20	10%
6. Multi-Agency Collaboration	10	5%
Total	200	100%

*- Per STP [agreement](#), required to be 25% of all local council methodologies

1. Project Readiness (55 possible points)

Projects will receive project readiness points based on their status relative to completion of Phase I and Phase II Engineering.

Phase Complete	Points
Phase II Engineering Complete (Pre-Final Plans Ready for Submittal to IDOT)	55
Phase II Engineering Contract Executed	40
Phase I Engineering Report Completed; Design Approval Granted	35
Phase I Engineering Report (PDR) Draft Submitted to IDOT	10
Phase I Engineering Contract Entered into by Applicant Member	5

2. ON TO 2050 Priorities (50 possible points)

All Councils are required to base at least 25% of their project criteria based on CMAP's ON TO 2050 Long Range Plan.

Regional Goal	Points
Project benefits freight movement	0
Project uses green infrastructure to manage storm water	0
Project improves access to jobs for economically disconnected areas*	0
Project serves a reinvestment area*	0
Density permitted at transit supportive levels around transit	0
Project sponsor has adopted a complete streets policy or ordinance	50

3. Pavement Condition: (40 possible points)

The Pavement Condition Testing done by CMAP will be used to rank projects where data is available, IDOT's CRS data will be used where PCI data is not available, if neither data source is available local pavement testing data from within the past three years will be considered, if no testing data from within the past three years is available Council staff will estimate pavement condition index score. The performance measure for pavements shall be based on four condition ratings of Excellent, Satisfactory, Fair, and Poor calculated for each pavement section. The Overall condition for asphalt and jointed concrete pavement sections shall be determined based on the ratings for IRI, Cracking_Percent, rutting and faulting, as defined by FHWA in [23 CFR 490.313](#). As the pavement management systems are used to determine the right treatment at the right time, rather than simply a "worst first" approach to project selection, the LCCOM will give preference to projects with pavement rated as Fair and Satisfactory.

Condition	Points
Fair (46-60)	40
Satisfactory (61-75)	30
Poor (0-45)	20
Excellent (75-100)	0

4. Sustained Participation/ Community Need (25 possible total points)

Sustained Participation (15 possible Points)

This category is for when a project is unable to be programmed by the LCCOM due to constrained funds and the sponsor exhibits sustained interest, committed resources, and Project Readiness by agreeing to keep the project on the Council's Contingency List.

If during a project's time on the Contingency List, the project is not moved to the Active Program, the project shall receive an additional 15 points during the next call for projects if the sponsor re-submits an STP application for the project.

Community Need (10 possible points)

The Community Need category aims to prioritize projects in communities that have not recently had the assistance of STP funding for their transportation system. Communities that fall into the [highest need category](#) (Cohort 4) as defined by CMAP will receive 10 points regardless of when the last time they have had a project funded.

Years Since Last Project Authorized by FHWA	Points
10+	10
5-9	5

5. Traffic Volumes: (20 possible points)

This category assigns a point value based on existing Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes. If no AADT is provided, LCCOM Staff will refer to IDOT's AADT data for the respective segment. The point value will be determined by the following calculation, rounded to the nearest point.

$$(AADT \times 20) / 10,000 = \text{Points (Maximum 20)}$$

6. Multi-Agency Participation (10 possible points)

If additional project participants (i.e., adjacent municipality, county, township, IDOT, transit agency, school district, park district, forest preserve, private developer) are identified as financially contributing to the project or through ROW donation, granting of Permanent and/or Temporary Easements, the project will receive points per additional participant (see below).

Number of Contributing Participants	Points
3 project participants	10
2 project participants	5
1 project participant	0