



**NORTH SHORE COUNCIL OF MAYORS
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Tuesday May 7, 2019
2:00 P.M.**

**Northwest Municipal Conference
1600 E. Golf Rd., Suite 0700, Des Plaines, IL 60016**

AGENDA

MEMBERS
Antioch
Arlington Heights
Bannockburn
Barrington
Bartlett
Buffalo Grove
Carpentersville
Crystal Lake
Deer Park
Deerfield
Des Plaines
Elk Grove Village
Evanston
Fox Lake
Glencoe
Glenview
Grayslake
Hanover Park
Highland Park
Hoffman Estates
Kenilworth
Lake Bluff
Lake Forest
Lake Zurich
Libertyville
Lincolnshire
Lincolnwood
Morton Grove
Mount Prospect
Niles
Northbrook
Northfield
Northfield Township
Palatine
Park Ridge
Prospect Heights
Rolling Meadows
Schaumburg
Skokie
Streamwood
Vernon Hills
Wheeling
Wilmette
Winnetka

President
Arlene Juracek
Mount Prospect

Vice-President
Daniel DiMaria
Morton Grove

Secretary
Kathleen O'Hara
Lake Bluff

Treasurer
Ghida Neukirch
Highland Park

Executive Director
Mark L. Fowler

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Approval of Meeting Minutes – April 4, 2019 (Attachment A)**
Action Requested: Approval of the Minutes
- III. Shared Fund Bonus Point Distribution Methodology (Attachment B)**
Staff requests approval of the Shared Fund Bonus Point Distribution Methodology with updates based on committee feedback from the last meeting
Action Requested: Approval
- IV. Shared Fund Project Presentations**
The committee will hear presentations on shared fund projects from the Village of Northfield and the Village of Glenview. Presentations will not last longer than 5 minutes per presentation. Each community will have one week to vote per the shared fund bonus point distribution methodology.
Action Requested: Discussion
- V. STP Project Selection Methodology Discussion (Attachments C and D)**
Staff will present an updated STP project selection methodology and outline changes made from the last version. Staff will also outline options for potential updates to the methodology and requests discussion on proposed changes.
Action Requested: Discussion
- VI. Other Business**
- VII. Next Meeting**
To be determined (TBD)
- VIII. Adjourn**

NORTHWEST MUNICIPAL CONFERENCE
1600 East Golf Road, Suite 0700
Des Plaines, Illinois 60016
(847) 296-9200 • Fax (847) 296-9207
www.nwmc-cog.org



Attachment A

*A Regional Association of Illinois
Municipalities and Townships
Representing a Population of Over One Million*

**NORTH SHORE COUNCIL OF MAYORS
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**Thursday April 4, 2019
8:30 a.m.**

**Skokie Village Hall
5127 Oakton Street, Skokie, IL**

MEMBERS

Antioch
Arlington Heights
Bannockburn
Barrington
Bartlett
Buffalo Grove
Carpentersville
Crystal Lake
Deer Park
Deerfield
Des Plaines
Elk Grove Village
Evanston
Fox Lake
Glencoe
Glenview
Grayslake
Hanover Park
Highland Park
Hoffman Estates
Kenilworth
Lake Bluff
Lake Forest
Lake Zurich
Libertyville
Lincolnshire
Lincolnwood
Morton Grove
Mount Prospect
Niles
Northbrook
Northfield
Northfield Township
Palatine
Park Ridge
Prospect Heights
Rolling Meadows
Schaumburg
Skokie
Streamwood
Vernon Hills
Wheeling
Wilmette
Winnetka

President
Arlene Juracek
Mount Prospect

Vice-President
Daniel DiMaria
Morton Grove

Secretary
Kathleen O'Hara
Lake Bluff

Treasurer
Ghida Neukirch
Highland Park

Executive Director
Mark L. Fowler

Attendance

Erik Cook, Village of Skokie, Chair
Sat Nagar, City of Evanston
Adriana Webb, Village of Glenview
Andrew Letson, Village of Lincolnwood
Chris Tomich, Village of Morton Grove
Greg Kramar, Village of Northfield
Dan Manis, Village of Wilmette
Matt Havlik, Village of Winnetka
Alex Beata, Cook County
Kama Dobbs, CMAP
Travis Farmer, IDOT
Steve Andrews, Pace
John Mick, Baxter and Woodman
Steve Fredricks. Chastain and Associates
Salvatore Di Bernardo, Ciobra Group
Sagar Somar, Kimley-Horn
John Bessel. Robinson Engineering
Greg Benske, TEG
Larry Bury, NWMC
Cole Jackson, NWMC
Josh Klingenstein. NWMC

I. Call to Order

Mr. Cook called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m.

II. Approval of Meeting Minutes – December 19, 2018 (Attachment A)

A motion to approve the December 19, 2018 minutes was made by Mr. Manis and seconded by Mr. Nagar. The minutes were unanimously approved.

III. Agency Reports

A. Pace

Mr. Andrews gave an update on the developments of the Pulse line on Milwaukee which is making progress. Mr. Andrews also stated that the Pace website was being redesigned.

B. IDOT Highway Report

IDOT staff gave an update on the IDOT highway report.

C. Cook County Department of Transportation and Highway

Mr. Beata gave an update on Cook County projects and the Invest in Cook call for projects. The call resulted in 83 applications requesting more than \$43 million in funding while only \$8.5 million is available. County staff members are reviewing the applications and will be setting up interviews with applicants.

D. Illinois Tollway

No report.

E. IDOT Local Roads

IDOT staff gave a local roads update

F. Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)

Ms. Dobbs was present to give an update from CMAP. She stated that the region was on track for a record year in STP funding and that a large number of CMAQ/TAP/Shared Fund applications had been received. In total 136 applications were received with many being considered for multiple funding sources. With \$250 million allocated for the shared fund

CMAP received approximately \$1 billion worth of shared fund project applications. Ms. Dobbs also informed the committee about the Future Leaders in Planning (FLIP) program in which high school students can learn about planning for a week in the summer.

IV. North Shore Council of Mayors Surface Transportation Program (STP) (Attachment B)

Mr. Jackson gave an overview of the STP program and asked for any revisions (hearing none). Mr. Jackson also asked that anyone who did not respond to the line item report for the IDOT/CMAP coordination meeting can still do so.

V. STP Project Selection Methodology Update (Attachment C)

Mr. Jackson gave an overview of the changes to the methodology made so far and stated that there are additional necessary changes to the methodology particularly regarding the safety scoring. Mr. Jackson stated he would send out options for consideration.

VI. STP Shared Fund Points Distribution Methodology (Attachment D)

Mr. Jackson asked the committee to approve the draft methodology. Committee members asked for the option to split the bonus points 13/12. Mr. Jackson stated he would revise the methodology. Mr. Jackson asked how the committee would like to perform the vote for the bonus points and the committee decided it would prefer in-person presentations. Mr. Jackson asked the two municipalities to let the committee know of times in which they could be both be prepared for the presentation which must occur before the points are due in May.

VII. CMAP STP Funding Update

Ms. Dobbs informed the committee that additional STP funds may become available if other councils have projects that fall off their schedule. Potential funding amounts cannot be determined at this time. The projects in the approved program, including the MYB projects, may be able to receive funding if they are ready but distributions would likely be on a first ready basis. Staff will be unable to move the projects out of MYB status until much closer to the letting date. The committee stated that this may make programming difficult. Ms. Dobbs stated that communities would be made aware of opportunities in April. The committee stated that their methodology should be updated so that projects can more easily be moved in when funding is available. Ms. Dobbs advised that the council cannot keep two separate programs and the active projects must be ranked. However, projects that are B-list do not necessarily need to be completed in order of rank. Projects must be submitted in the call for projects to be eligible.

VIII. Other Business

None.

IX. Next Meeting

Mr. Jackson stated that the next meeting was needed in May to address the methodology update and shared fund vote. The exact date is pending the schedules of the two communities with shared fund applications.

X. Adjournment

Mr. Nagar made a motion to adjourn which was seconded by Mr. Letson. The committee unanimously approved. The meeting adjourned at 9:20 a.m.

**Surface Transportation Program (STP) Shared Fund
Voting Process for Allocating North Shore Council Bonus Points**

Point Allocation: The North Shore Technical Committee will award 25 bonus points to shared fund applications located within North Shore Council of Mayors communities. Bonus points will be allocated after a vote from Technical Committee members. The Committee will first vote to follow one of the following:

1. The North Shore Technical Committee will award 15 bonus points to the project with the highest vote count. The remaining 10 points will either be distributed entirely to the second ranked project.

2. The North Shore Technical Committee will award 13 bonus points to the project with the highest vote count and 12 bonus points to the project with the second highest voting count.

Voting Eligibility: Only Transportation Technical Committee members are eligible to vote. Only one Committee member per municipality is allowed to vote. All Transportation Technical Committee municipal members will be given 5 votes to allocate to one or more Shared Fund applications.

Presentation Process: Each project sponsor requesting North Shore Council bonus points shall be given five minutes to explain their project to the Committee and discuss benefits of the project. PowerPoint presentations, videos or other technology may be utilized.

Vote: Once all project sponsors have presented to the Committee, ballots will be distributed to each Committee member (only one per municipality). Members will allocate their 5 points (in whole number increments) to one or more projects. The person voting must sign their ballot. NWMC staff will collect the ballots and tally the votes. Points will be awarded according to which point allocation strategy was chosen by the council.

NORTH SHORE COUNCIL OF MAYORS

STP Project Selection Methodology

Introduction

Overview

Federal surface transportation funding operates under multiyear authorizations. Northeastern Illinois is comprised of eleven regional Councils of Mayors and the City of Chicago. Each local council oversees the planning and programming of these STP funds within their own region. The STP provides flexible funding states and localities can use for projects on any federally eligible roadways, bridge projects on any public road, transit capital projects, or intercity and intercity bus terminals and facilities. Each Council has developed a set of project selection guidelines. These guidelines set the parameters by which the Councils program STP funds to locally submitted projects.

The North Shore Council is comprised of Evanston, Glencoe, Glenview, Golf, Kenilworth, Lincolnwood, Morton Grove, Northbrook, Northfield, Skokie, Wilmette and Winnetka. Project applications are reviewed by the North Shore Council of Mayors Technical Committee. The Technical Committee recommends projects to the North Shore Council of Mayors which makes final decisions based on Council vote.

Key Terms

1. **Planning Liaison** - The Planning Liaison coordinates the Surface Transportation Program for the North Shore Council of Mayors. The liaison also represents the Council to county, state, regional and federal transportation agencies and performs other duties described in the contract scope of work with CMAP.
2. **North Shore Council of Mayors** - A cooperative body of municipalities comprised to plan and program the Surface Transportation Program for the North Shore region. The North Shore Council of Mayors membership includes the mayor or president from each municipality in the North Shore Council.
3. **North Shore Council of Mayors Technical Committee** - The committee contains municipal engineers (or other staff) that review and recommend projects for STP funds. Membership on the Technical Committee is made up of one engineer from each municipality.

Project Application and Selection Process

Project Submittal Process

1. **Call for Projects**

The North Shore Council of Mayors will develop a five-year program with a call for project every two years. The Technical Committee will only consider programming new projects after a call for projects. Project applicants should be given adequate notice of call for projects. In addition, project applicants should have no less than sixty days between the call for projects and the application deadline.

2. Project Scoping

Project applicants wishing to apply for STP funds must first contact the Planning Liaison to discuss the scope of the project. Project applicants may (but are not required to) get initial concurrence from the Bureau of Local Roads at the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) regarding the project's scope, federal and state requirements and schedule. Project scoping prior to submittal of an application is extremely important. Requirements associated with the use of federal funds and the IDOT review process can delay and add costs to projects. Poorly scoped projects can face significant delays and considerable cost increases.

3. Project Application

Following project scoping, project applicants will complete the project application form provided to them by the Planning Liaison and located at the back of this packet.

4. Project Review

The Planning Liaison, with the assistance of the Technical Committee, shall review each project application in accordance with the project prioritization system outlined in Section III. The Planning Liaison will assign a "benefit number" which shall be used to compare project applications.

Once each project has been assigned a benefit number, the project applications will be placed on the agenda of a Technical Committee meeting. Prior to the project selection meeting of the Technical Committee, the Planning Liaison shall distribute copies of the project applications to all committee members. At the meeting, the project applicants should be prepared to give a brief presentation and answer questions concerning the project. The Technical Committee will review project applications, project rankings and available funding in making programming recommendations. The technical Committee will recommend projects with the five-year program and will recommend projects for inclusion in a Contingency Program.

5. Project Selection

The North Shore Council of Mayors will consider the Technical Committee's programming recommendation at its next regular scheduled meeting. Following the North Shore Council's approval, the Planning Liaison will submit the required documentation to the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) so that the project may be considered for addition to the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

6. Project Kick-Off

Following inclusion in the TIP, the project sponsor and Planning Liaison will schedule a kick-off meeting with IDOT's Bureau of Local Roads. Similar to the project scoping, this meeting will confirm the project scope, engineering requirements and schedule. Although Phase I Engineering is not an eligible for STP funding, the project sponsor must hold a kick-off meeting at the beginning of Phase I Engineering to ensure that all federal and state requirements will be met.

The municipality must work closely with IDOT's Bureau of Local Roads. Any work that proceeds without the consent of IDOT may be ineligible to receive STP funding.

Outside Agency Applications

Outside agencies, such as Cook County, townships and transit agencies have access to STP funds for capital costs of projects by obtaining the co-sponsorship of the project from at least one North Shore Council of Mayors member. This municipality would then present the project to the North Shore Council of Mayors Technical Committee for consideration for STP funding. Any applications from outside agencies must be for STP eligible projects.

Project Prioritization

Overview

The following project selection categories shall be considered by the Technical Committee in formulating their recommendations for STP projects.

Project Selection Category	Weight
A. Safety	20 %
B. Pavement Condition	20 %
C. Congestion Mitigation	10 %
D. Project Readiness	10 %
E. Local Needs	15 %
F. Complete Streets	15 %
G. Inclusive Growth	3 %
H. Green Infrastructure	2 %
I. Transit Supportive Land Use	5 %

The Planning Liaison will score each project on a 100-point scale. Point totals in the Congestion Mitigation and Complete Streets/Multimodal categories will be multiplied by a weighting factor.

A. Safety

The Safety category aims to prioritize projects where major safety concerns exist and can be addressed by appropriate engineering solutions.

Safety Need

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. Within each peer group, locations categorized as critical have the highest PSIs, and locations categorized as minimal are less likely to have safety benefits from treatments. CMAP will provide the data on SRI scores. The proposed project's safety need score will be the highest SRI category along the project location. This will include both segment and intersection locations.

SRI Category	Points
Critical	10
High	8
Medium	6

Low	4
Minimal	2

Safety Improvement

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, NWMC staff will develop a list of common improvement types (countermeasures) and the accompanying planning level crash reduction factors (CRFs). The planning level CRFs will be developed using information from CMAP, IDOT, Crash Modification Clearinghouse, and Highway Safety Manual. NWMC staff will review project details from the application to determine the relevant countermeasure and the assigned planning level CRF for that countermeasure. Score will be based on the cumulative score of all the CRFs. Planning level crash reduction factor (CRF) point assignment:

CRF	Points
Above 50%	10
36-49%	8
26-35%	6
15-25%	4
Under 15%	2

B. Pavement Condition

The Pavement Condition category aims to prioritize projects most in need of rehabilitation and repair. Scoring will be based on CMAP collected data of routes.

<u>Condition Rating</u>	<u>Points (20 point maximum)</u>
1.0 to 4.5 (poor)	20
4.6 to 6.0 (fair)	15
6.1 to 7.5 (good)	10
7.6 to 9.0 (excellent)	5

C. Congestion Mitigation

The Congestion Mitigation category aims to prioritize projects on roadways with severe congestion that threatens the transportation utility of a roadway or intersection. The project must address the level of service to qualify for congestion mitigation points. The project sponsor is asked to provide supporting documentation of the level of service improvement.

<u>Level of Service (Existing)</u>	<u>Points (5 point maximum)</u>
F	5
E	4
A-D	3

<u>Level of Service Improvement</u>	<u>Points (5 point maximum)</u>
3 levels	5
2 levels	4
1 level	3
No improvement	0

D. Project Readiness

The Project Readiness category aims to prioritize those projects that are closer to construction. Given the complexities that go along with federal funding, project readiness is important for spending STP funds within a reasonable timeframe.

<u>Project Status</u>	<u>Points (10 point maximum)</u>
IDOT approved Phase I Report	10
Phase I underway through IDOT	5
Project has not started Phase I	0

E. Local Needs

The Local Need category aims to prioritize projects in communities that have not had the assistance of STP funding for their transportation system.

<u>Years Since Last STP Project</u>	<u>Points (15 point maximum)</u>
5 years	5
10 years	10

<u>Planning</u>	<u>Points (5 point maximum)</u>
Project appears in local, subregional or regional plan	5
Project not in any adopted plans	0

F. Complete Streets (Up to 15 points total)

The Complete Streets/Multimodal category aims to prioritize projects that account for all users of the transportation network. **The Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning will conduct a proximity analysis for bicycle and pedestrian network improvements.** The Planning Liaison will determine scoring based on the proximity analyses and application information.

<u>Transit*</u>	<u>Points (10 point maximum)</u>
Transit Improvement	5
Transit Access Improvement	5
No Transit Improvements	0

<u>Pedestrian</u>	<u>Points (10 point maximum)</u>
Pedestrian Network Improvement	Up to 10

Pedestrian Improvement	5
No Pedestrian Improvements	0

<u>Bicycle</u>	<u>Points (10 point maximum)</u>
Bicycle Network Improvement	Up to 10
Bicycle Improvement	5
No Bicycle Improvements	0

*A project with transit components can receive points for an improvement (bus pullout, transit shelter, transit signal priority, etc.) and for an access improvement (sidewalk to transit stop or station, bicycle access, etc.).

G. Inclusive Growth (3 points max)

Inclusive growth is a regional priority from ON TO 2050.

Percent of users that are low-income and people of color	<u>Points</u>
10%+	3
5-10%	2
0-5%	0

H. Green Infrastructure (2 points max)

<u>Element</u>	<u>Points</u>
Project incorporates a green infrastructure element (bioretention, bioswale, street trees, permeable pavement, native plants, other elements as approved by technical committee on a case-by-case basis)	2
Project does not incorporate green infrastructure elements	0

I. Transit Supportive Land Use (Up to 5 points total)

<u>Element</u>	<u>Points</u>
A project adjacent zoning district has eliminated parking minimums	2
A project adjacent zoning district has parking maximums	2
A project adjacent zoning district allows for vertical mixed uses	1
A project adjacent zoning district allows for shared parking	1
A project adjacent zoning district requires parking behind, to the side, or underneath buildings	1
A project adjacent zoning district allows for between 6 and 16 dwelling units/acre	2
A project adjacent zoning district allows for greater than 16 dwelling units/acre	1
A project adjacent zoning district allows for Missing Middle Housing (duplexes, fourplexes, bungalow courts, etc.)	1

Programming Guidelines

Eligible Routes

All projects must be on STP eligible routes (federal-aid eligible) prior to applying for STP funds. Routes must have a functional classification as a "collector" or higher. STP eligible routes serve a regional purpose and must serve more than a local land access function. Project applicants can review current roadway classifications at the following website:

<https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/mobility/roads/roadway-functional-classification>

The STP provides flexible funding. Under federal provisions, bridge projects on any public road are eligible for STP funding. In addition, carpool, pedestrian, bicycle and safety projects may be implemented with STP funding on roads of any functional classification.

Eligible Projects

The following is a partial list of projects eligible for STP funding. Should a project applicant be unsure of a project's eligibility, contact the Planning Liaison.

- Construction, reconstruction, restoration and rehabilitation of roads and bridges
- Highway and transit safety improvements
- Traffic signalization projects
- Intersection improvements
- Park & ride facilities
- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- Wetland mitigation, wetland banking, landscaping and mitigation of water quality impacts if undertaken with an approved STP project

Project Requirements

Before submitting an STP application, project applicants must complete the following:

- Contact the Planning Liaison and the Illinois Department of Transportation to discuss the project's scope, timetable and estimated costs
- Confirm that the project is on a STP eligible route
- Confirm that the project work type is STP eligible
- Confirm that the project sponsor can fund the required local match

Regional Projects

The Technical Committee shall accept proposals for regional projects and may develop its own project proposals. Proposals for regional projects must go through project scoping and have the support of the relevant jurisdictions before the Technical Committee will consider programming funds to regional projects.

Active Program Management

Applicants must follow the guidelines in CMAP's [STP Active Program Management Policies](#). Training, when available, is encouraged for applicants but not required. Applicants will not be required to provide status updates more often than what is required in active program management policy document. Applicants are highly encouraged, but not required, to have projects in their capital improvement

programs. The North Shore technical committee must approve requests for the six month extensions of the phase obligation deadlines allowed in the active program management program. If denied, the applicant can appeal to the North Shore Council of Mayors.

All cost increases must be approved by the North Shore Technical Committee. No project can be moved out of the active program without approval of the North Shore Technical Committee unless it is due to the policies outlined in the active program management policies. NWMC staff may make other active reprogramming decisions without the need for technical committee approval. This includes accelerating projects into the active program and current FFY (if the project is ready to obligate and funding is available). NWMC staff must log any changes and present them to the North Shore Technical Committee at the next meeting.

Funding Parameters and Policies

Eligible Phases

The North Shore Council of Mayors dedicates STP funding for Phase II Engineering and Construction (including Construction Engineering). Phase I Engineering and any Right-of-Way acquisition are the responsibility of the project sponsor.

Local Match Requirements

The North Shore Council of Mayors allocates STP funding to projects based on a 70/30 federal/local match ratio for phase II engineering. If an applicant does not utilize STP funds for phase II engineering they may receive an 80/20 federal/local match for construction and construction engineering. Project sponsors are responsible for the local match and any non-participating expenses.

Funding Limit

The North Shore Council of Mayors limits the funding of a single project to 5 million. This can be waived by a majority vote from the technical committee.

Cost Increase Policies

All cost increases will be funded at the same match ratio they are receiving for the project unless otherwise specified. Project sponsors seeking cost increases will be required to submit a written request to the Planning Liaison. The written request must outline the updated project costs, explain the cause for the cost increase and state that the project sponsor agrees to pay the percent local match.

All cost increases will be subject to approval by the North Shore Council of Mayors via the Technical Committee. Approval will be contingent upon the following:

- a. Programming constraints and funding availability within that fiscal year.
- b. Special circumstances that resulted in an increase in project costs such as additional improvements that are being required by federal, state and/or county transportation agencies not considered in during the project scoping process.
- c. Project sponsor has not petitioned the Council for cost increases for the same project during that particular fiscal year.

Limit on Cost Increases

The Technical Committee shall limit large cost increase requests as outlined below:

- a. If the programmed STP funding for a project phase is less than 25 percent of the Council's annual STP allocation, then the Council will not consider cost increases in excess of 100 percent of programmed STP funding for the project phase.
- b. If the programmed STP funding for a project phase is between 25 and 50 percent of the Council's annual STP allocation, then the Council will not consider cost increases in excess of 75 percent of the programmed STP funding for the project phase.
- c. If the programmed STP funding for a project phase is more than 50 percent of the Council's annual STP allocation, then the Council will not consider cost increases in excess of 50 percent of the programmed STP funding in the project phase.

Percent of Annual Allocation	Maximum Cost Increase Request
< 25 percent	100 percent
Between 25 and 50 percent	75 percent
> 50 percent	50 percent

If the cost increase request exceeds the limits outlined above, the project sponsor may choose to move the project to the contingency program or remove the project from the program and have it reconsidered during the next programming cycle.

Proper project scoping (see Section II.A.2) is important in developing project application cost estimates in order to avoid large cost increases. Requests for increases from the Shared Fund, per the regional APM policies, are subject to these same limitations

Cost Increase Requests Between Regular Technical Committee Meetings

All cost increase requests submitted between regular quarterly meetings of the Technical Committee shall be added to the agenda of the next quarterly meeting, unless a project's letting or local agency agreement is contingent on approval of the cost increase request before the next quarterly meeting. In such cases, the Technical Committee can vote via fax/email, with a simple majority of the twelve members constituting the requisite votes for passage. A fax/email vote shall not be used if the cost increase request is:

- Over 35 percent of the currently programmed project cost estimate, or
- Over 25 percent of the North Shore Council's annual STP allotment for the federal fiscal year. If either of these two conditions is met, then the project shall require a special meeting of the Technical Committee to act on the request.

If either of these two conditions is met, then the project shall require a special meeting of the Technical Committee to act on the request.

Council Prerogative

The North Shore Council of Mayors has the authority to grant special exceptions to any of the above guidelines if in its opinion the circumstances so dictate and the exceptions are within federal and

state guidelines, the provisions of the October 2017 agreement between the Council of Mayors, Chicago DOT, and CMAP Active Program Management policies.

Safety Scoring Options

Below are three potential options for scoring in the safety category of the North Shore Council of Mayors STP Methodology. Staff will review the options below, and committee members are asked to choose their preferred option.

Option 1 (Lake County Council of Mayors Model)

Safety

The Safety category aims to prioritize projects where major safety concerns exist and can be addressed by appropriate engineering solutions.

Safety Need

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 location's 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. Within each peer group, locations categorized as critical have the highest PSIs, and locations categorized as minimal are less likely to have safety benefits from treatments. CMAP will provide the data on SRI scores. The proposed project's safety need score will be the highest SRI category along the project location. This will include both segment and intersection locations.

SRI Category	Points
Critical	10
High	8
Medium	6
Low	4
Minimal	2

Safety Improvement

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, NWMC staff will develop a list of common improvement types (countermeasures) and the accompanying planning level crash reduction factors (CRFs). The planning level CRFs will be developed using information from CMAP, IDOT, Crash Modification Clearinghouse, and Highway Safety Manual. NWMC staff will review project details from the application to determine the relevant countermeasure and the assigned planning level CRF for that countermeasure. Score will be based on the cumulative score of all the CRFs. Planning level crash reduction factor (CRF) point assignment:

CRF	Points
Above 50%	10
36-49%	8
26-35%	6
15-25%	4
Under 15%	2

Considerations

1. Could base scoring solely on SRI score and just require applicant to show they are making some sort of improvement.
2. CRF could be the total of all CRF scores added together or simply the single highest scoring one.
3. CRF score could be multiplied by ADT to determine impact. A 5% reduction in crashes has a higher impact on a busier road.
4. CMAP is collecting a list of common CRFs. We can use their list. They are not weighing theirs and will only use the highest score.
5. We will likely want to use CMAP's list, but the website for CRFs is <http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/index.cfm>

Option 2 (Kane-Kendal Council of Mayors Model)

The point value assigned in this category is based on the ability of the local agency to clearly demonstrate a correlation between the proposed project and an improvement in vehicle and/or pedestrian/bicyclist safety.

Scoring is based on a comparison of the average number of crashes (most recent three years) per 1,000,000 vehicle miles for the proposed project with the average in the respective county (most recent three years). The data source for the table below is from the Illinois Travel Statistics Report and Illinois Crash Facts and Statistics Report, 2012 – 2014.

2012 - 2014	DeKalb	DuPage	Kane	Kendall	Will	Points
125% above Average	2.13 +	2.85 +	3.19 +	2.81 +	2.62 +	15
Average or Greater	1.71 +	2.28 +	2.55 +	2.25 +	2.09 +	10
75% of Average	1.28 +	1.71 +	1.91 +	1.69 +	1.57 +	7
50% of Average	0.85 +	1.14 +	1.28 +	1.13 +	1.05 +	3
Below 50% of Average						0
New Alignment						5

Crash Rate Formulas	$R_1 = \text{Crashes per 1 million vehicle-miles traveled (vmt)}$ $R_2 = \text{Crashes per 1 million vehicles entering intersection}$ $C = \text{Total of last 3 years of crashes}$ $1,095 = \text{Number of days in 3 years}$ $V_1 = \text{Average Daily Traffic (ADT) of both directions (if segment contains intersection(s), use ADT of project segment)}$ $V_2 = \text{Average Daily Traffic (ADT) entering intersection}$ $L = \text{Length of the roadway segment in miles}$	Segment <i>(may include intersection(s))</i>	$R_1 = \frac{1,000,000 \times C}{1,095 \times V_1 \times L}$
		Intersection	$R_2 = \frac{1,000,000 \times C}{1,095 \times V_2}$

Project sponsors will also be expected to list the most common types or crashes that occurred at the proposed project location and to also list proposed safety improvements for the segment that may remedy the most common types of crashes.

Option 3 (Southwest Council of Mayors)

This option is very similar to the Kane Kendall model, as it uses IDOT data on accidents per one million vehicle miles traveled. However, the method differs by using separate statistics for roadways and intersections, and using different crash rate benchmarks for two-lane and four-lane roadways. The point scale also differs slightly from the Kane Kendall model.

3. Safety

The averages of the last three-year's accident reports are to be used and compared against the IDOT average for that type of roadway. The project must address the accident situation and be reasonably expected to lower the accident rate to qualify for safety points. (Statistics are listed as per million miles traveled.)

Roadways

	2 Lane Road	4 Lane Road	PTS
125% of IDOT Avg.	8.27	8.35	15
76% - 124% of IDOT Avg.	6.62	6.68	10
51% - 75% of IDOT Avg.	4.96	5.01	05
50% or less of IDOT Avg.	3.31	3.34	00

Intersections

125% of IDOT Avg.	8.006	12.944	15
76% - 124% of IDOT Avg.	6.405	10.35	10
51% - 75% of IDOT Avg.	4.804	7.766	05
50% or less of IDOT Avg.	3.203	5.178	00