



2050+ Metropolitan Transportation Plan

**Technical Report #5
Fiscally-Constrained Projects**

**Final Report
February 2026**

2050+ Metropolitan Transportation Plan

Technical Report #5 Fiscally-Constrained Projects

Final Report 2.26.2026

This document has been prepared by Region 1 Planning Council in collaboration with its member agencies, partnership organizations, and local stakeholders.

This report was prepared in cooperation with the following:

U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal Highway Administration

Federal Transit Administration

Illinois Department of Transportation

The contents, views, policies, and conclusions expressed in this report are not necessarily those of the above agencies.



AN ENGINE FOR COLLABORATION IN NORTHERN ILLINOIS

Region 1 Planning Council

127 N. Wyman St., Ste. 100 Rockford, IL, 61101

(815) 319-4180 | info@r1planning.org | r1planning.org

For complaints, questions, or concerns about civil rights or nondiscrimination; or for special requests under the Americans with Disabilities Act, please contact:
Internal Services Department at (815) 319-4180 or info@r1planning.org

Acknowledgments

MPO Policy Committee

Chairman Joseph Chiarelli

MPO Chair, Winnebago County

Chairman Karl Johnson

Boone County

Mayor Clint Morris

City of Belvidere

Village President Steve Johnson

Village of Machesney Park

Mayor Tom McNamara

City of Rockford

Mayor Greg Jury

City of Loves Park

Michael Stubbe

Rockford Mass Transit District

Faith Duncan

IDOT - Region 2

MPO Technical Committee

Members

Belvidere Planning Department

Belvidere Public Works Department

Boone County Conservation District

Boone County Highway Department

Boone County Planning Department

Chicago Rockford International Airport

City of Byron

Forest Preserves of Winnebago County

Four Rivers Sanitary District

IDOT, District 2

Loves Park Community Development

Loves Park Public Works Department

Machesney Park Community Development Department

Machesney Park Public Works Department

Rockford Community Development Department

Rockford Mass Transit District

Rockford Park District

Rockford Public Works Department

Village of Roscoe

Village of Winnebago

Winnebago co. Soil & Water Conservation District

Winnebago County Highway Department

Winnebago County Planning & Economic Development
Department

Ex-Officio Members

Boone County Transit

FHWA, Illinois Division

IDOT, Division of Public Transportation

IDOT, Office of Program & Planning

Illinois State Toll Highway Authority

Ogle County Highway Department

State Line Area Transportation Study

Stateline Mass Transit District

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	3
Table of Contents	4
List of Exhibits	5
Introduction	6
Project Evaluation Process	7
Regionally Significant	7
Activity Categories	8
Criteria	8
Project Profiles.....	10
Locally-Sponsored Projects.....	10
State Sponsored Projects.....	11
Appendices	12
Appendix A. Submission Form	12
Appendix B. Evaluation Criteria	20
Appendix C. Breakdown of Activity Categories	28

List of Exhibits

Table 2-1: Evaluation Criteria	9
Figure A-1: 2050 MTP Project Application Sheet Page 1.....	12
Figure A-2: 2050 MTP Project Application Sheet Page 2.....	13
Figure A-3: 2050 MTP Project Application Sheet- Page 3	14
Figure A-4: 2050 MTP Project Application Sheet- Page 4	15
Figure A-5: 2050 MTP Project Application Sheet- Page 5	16
Figure A-6: 2050 MTP Project Application Sheet- Page 6	17
Figure A-7: 2050 MTP Project Application Sheet- Page 7	18
Figure A-8: 2050 MTP Project Application Sheet- Page 8	19
Table C-1: Primary Activity & Activity Categories	28

Introduction

Federal requirements stipulate that a financial plan be included in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) demonstrating how identified projects can be implemented using public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available over the lifespan of the document. The goal of this analysis is to demonstrate the balance between reasonably anticipated revenue sources and the estimated cost of projects.

As mentioned, the financial analysis provides the funding framework for transportation maintenance, operations, and capital investments for the Rockford MPA over the next 25 years. The fiscally-constrained project list is a key component of the required financial plan. These fiscally-constrained projects represent the anticipated expenditures and transportation investment priorities for the region. However, the MPO has also selected to include additional transportation projects, known as illustrative projects, that would be included in the fiscally-constrained lists if additional resources were to become available. The inclusion of projects in the MTP, including the illustrative projects, opens up additional federal and state funding opportunities, including the regionally allocated Surface Transportation Block Group (STBG) program, Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), and Carbon Reduction Program (CRP).

Since the MTP is a living document, it is important to note that projects presented in the financial plan, especially those within the mid- and long-range timeframe are typically conceptual in nature and intended to be used only as a guide. There are countless factors that may affect the projected timeline, cost estimates, and scope of the projects identified. Contributing factors that may affect the projects include the pace and direction of community growth, the state of the overall economy, and its significance to the region.

Fiscally-Constrained:

Fiscally-constrained projects are those with either dedicated or reasonably anticipated funding sources for completion and are considered financially viable with respect to projections of future revenue.

It is also important to note, that transportation investment projects included in the fiscally-constrained project list are not intended to be comprehensive or compulsory; instead these projects are the major improvements likely to occur. These projects are of varying degrees of scale and cost, but all contribute to the overall improvement of the regional transportation system.

Project Evaluation Process

The project evaluation process for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) began with a formal announcement released on July 19, 2024. The announcement included information on the eligibility and evaluation criteria, activity categories, cost estimates, how to submit projects, and the submission deadline. The submission period was open for approximately thirty days, closing on Friday, August 16, 2024.

During this period, a submission form was requested to be submitted by local public agencies (LPAs) for all projects to be included in the MTP, regardless of its inclusion in previous iteration of the plan. The goal of these submission forms was to collect as much detail on each of the projects as possible. Typically, the scope of roadway projects anticipated to be completed within the next 5 to 10 years will be more detailed, while long range projects are often conceptual in nature and will require further design and preliminary engineering. With this in mind, the information provided on these forms was completed to varying degrees. The submission form is provided in [Appendix A](#).

Upon receipt of applications, Region 1 Planning Council (R1) staff reviewed the submission materials to determine eligibility and completeness. Local public agencies with ineligible projects were notified by R1 staff of this determination. Typically, projects were deemed ineligible because they did not meet regionally-significant threshold. If an application is determined to be incomplete, R1 staff informed the LPA and request additional information or materials be submitted within five business days.

For evaluation and cost-estimating purposes, the proposed roadway projects were divided into various categories. First, projects were divided into groups based upon the anticipated timeframe in which the project would be implemented. A total of three timeframes, or cost bands, were created for MTP: near term (2025-2030), midterm (2031 – 2040), and long term (2041 – 2050). The use of cost bands allows transportation revenues and project costs to be calculated in year of expenditure (YOE) dollars. Projects were further delineated by their primary activity category. Project activity categories, include: bicycle and pedestrian, bridge, capacity, intersection, preservation, safety, and transit. More information on the activity categories is included in the following section.

Over the next month, eligible projects will be reviewed by R1 staff and scored based on criteria established under the Policies & Procedures for the Distribution of Federal Transportation Funds, adopted by the Policy Committee in

October 2024. These criteria, discussed below, aligned with the goals and strategies identified in [Part 4. Strategic Direction](#) of the 2050+ MTP, as well as align with the federal planning factors. Evaluation criteria categories include: system performance, system preservation, safety, connectivity, economic vitality, environmental resilience, and investment and coordination. Each of these categories include a number of metrics based upon available data. Project evaluation was largely conducted through the use of geographic information system (GIS) software and utilizing data from the travel demand model (TDM), Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT), and Winnebago County Geographic Information Systems (WinGIS) databases. The full list of metrics used in the project evaluation can be found under the Evaluation Criteria section of this document and [Appendix B](#).

Once projects were evaluated and it was determined if and to what extent each project adequately addressed the region's transportation needs and goals, a financial analysis was conducted. In order to have a fiscally-constrained plan, projects listed must have a dedicated or reasonably anticipated funding source for completion to be considered financially viable with respect to projections of future revenue. The financial analysis process allowed the MPO to compare the costs of all of the proposed roadway projects within each cost band against the anticipated revenues for the corresponding cost band. More information on the financial analysis can be found in [Technical Report #6: Financial Assumptions & Funding Resources](#).

Finally, the fiscally-constrained project list was presented to the MPO Technical and Policy Committees. This list was presented to the MPO Technical Committee at their January 23, 2025 meeting, at which time they provided a recommendation to the MPO Policy Committee for their concurrence on the final list. The recommended list was presented at the MPO Policy Committee at the January 31, 2025 meeting, where the Committee approved the list for inclusion in the 2050 MTP.

Regionally Significant

Projects included in the MTP should be of regional significance. Regional significance is defined as a project on the federal-aid highway system which addresses a weakness on a major corridor or corrects a missing link in the transportation system. Roads functionally classified as local streets are not typically a part of the federal-aid highway system and, therefore, are not normally included

in the fiscally-constrained list of the MTP. However, bridge, sidewalks, and multi-use path projects, as well as some safety activities on minor collector and local roads were included due to the nature of these projects.

Activity Categories

Realizing the difficulty in evaluating different types of projects, projects were evaluated by criteria developed for one of seven Activity Categories. Much of the evaluation criteria are the same across the activity categories, but some criteria may be scored slightly different to better reflect the distinguishable aspects of projects within particular categories. The grouping of projects into categories allows for a better “apples-to-apples” comparison.

The seven activity categories are:

- **Bicycle and Pedestrian** - This category includes any activity that primarily benefits bicycle and pedestrian transportation. Examples include installing or modifying multi-use paths, bicycle lanes, or sidewalks, provided that they are not part of a roadway modification project. An independent bicycle project may include construction of bicycle facilities, signage, pavement markings, and bicycle parking facilities. This category does not include bikeway or walkway maintenance.
- **Bridge** - This category is for the replacement of a structurally deficient or functionally obsolete bridge or rehabilitation of an existing bridge to restore its structural integrity or to correct major safety defects, not associated with a roadway widening, new construction, or resurfacing project.
- **Capacity** - Projects that increase the motor-vehicle capacity of the regional transportation system or result in operational changes comprise this category. Examples include the addition of travel lanes, turn lanes, or widening of existing travel lanes to an existing facility, thus resulting in an increase in vehicle capacity, including the widening of any bridges associated with the roadway improvement and railroad/highway grade separations associated with a widening project. New construction of a roadway on a new alignment, or on an existing alignment on which no road surface (other than dirt or gravel) has previously existed, including new bridge and intersection construction, are also included under this category.
- **Intersection** - This category includes any activity that improves the safety or operation of an intersection. Examples include: widening at an intersection for turning lanes, installation of traffic signals (including school zone signals), improving sight distances, signal synchronization, improvements on approaches to intersections, and installation of barrier curbs. (*An intersection is defined as extending 500 feet from the*

intersection of the centerlines or 450 feet from the stop bars for each leg of the intersection, whichever is greater).

- **Preservation** - This category includes projects that are solely replacement or maintenance of existing roadway infrastructure without resulting in operational changes to motor vehicle traffic. Examples include pavement resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, or reconstruction. It also includes bridge resurfacing, rehabilitation, or restoration associated with a roadway improvement, or intersection resurfacing. A reconstruction or resurfacing project which includes new bike and pedestrian infrastructure may still be considered in this category.
- **Safety** - This category includes projects that reduce fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads, on bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and on transit related facilities. Examples include pedestrian signals, pedestrian crosswalks, raised reflective pavement markers, traffic circles (roundabouts), safety rest areas, pavement marking, school zone markings, rail-highway crossing closure, and installation of traffic/warning/guide signs or guardrails.
- **Transit** - This category includes any activity that primarily benefits public transportation. Examples include transit vehicle replacements, exclusive lanes for transit, park and ride lots, enhanced bus stops, capital projects related to new or expanded service, bus rapid transit, or rail transit.

To determine the primary activity, LPAs considered what activity accounts for the largest portion of the costs or addresses the projects purpose and need most directly. For most projects, it is clear which category it falls within. However, there are cases in which a roadway project has significant characteristics of multiple categories. Therefore, R1 staff reviewed the project category the LPA selected and provided feedback if it appeared the project should be classified in a different category. A breakout of the activity categories by primary activities is provided in [Appendix C](#).

Criteria

To ensure that projects align with the goals and priorities of the region, the MPO created evaluation criteria for the fiscally-constrained project list within this MTP update. The purpose of this criteria is to evaluate roadway projects to determine if, and to what extent, each project adequately addresses the region’s transportation needs and goals. The evaluation criteria categories include: system performance, system preservation, safety, connectivity, economic vitality, environmental resilience, and investment and coordination.

Criteria under each category may vary slightly to better reflect the distinguishable aspects of activity types or context of a project within particular evaluation categories.

For example, transportation system management strategies would be used to evaluate capacity projects, but would not be used to evaluate bicycle and pedestrian projects.

To also account for distinguishable aspects of the activity types, a weighting system will be applied by activity type. For example, the system preservation category may have a higher weight for “bridge” projects than “bicycle and pedestrian” projects. The final weighting system is still being determined with input from the Surface Transportation Block Grant Working Group and best practices.

The project evaluation criteria described below was used as a framework for generating an overall list of fiscally-constrained projects that meet multiple transportation investment priorities and/or objectives. The following table summarizes the seven evaluation criteria and associated weights. A detailed breakdown of the criteria and metrics can be found in [Appendix B](#).

Table 2-1: Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Capacity	Intersection	Preservation	Bridge	Bicycle & Pedestrian	Transit	Safety
System Preservation	n/a	n/a	40	40	n/a	n/a	n/a
System Performance	30	30	15	12	15	30	20
Safety	6	24	4	n/a	20	n/a	45
Connectivity	24	15	12	15	40	40	20
Economic Vitality	25	15	12	12	15	25	10
Environmental Resiliency	10	10	12	16	5	n/a	n/a
Investment & Coordination	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Project Profiles

Local public agencies (LPAs), Illinois Department of Transportation, and Illinois Tollway have identified more than 82 projects as regional significant and submitted for inclusion in the 2050+ Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). The projects range from \$700,000 to over \$200 million in cost and are located in rural, suburban and urban parts of the region.

The following section provides project profiles for each of the project included in the fiscally-constrained project list, as well as project profiles for the state-sponsored projects. The locally-sponsored projects are broken into timeframe and listed by their total evaluation points received, from highest to lowest. Comparatively, state-sponsored projects have been divided by sponsor agency and timeframe.

Locally-Sponsored Projects

Near Term

1. South Perryville Road Rehabilitation
2. Riverside Road Rehabilitation
3. 11th Street Bridge Replacement
4. 9th Street Two-Way Conversion
5. Perryville Road Rehabilitation
6. Long Prairie Trail Rehabilitation Project
7. Riverside Reconstruction Phase 1
8. Harrison Avenue Rehabilitation
9. Material & Riverside Signal improvements
10. Appleton Road Grade Separation
11. Latham & Ralston Road Widening & Rehabilitation
12. Activate Church & Main
13. Harrison Avenue Reconstruction
14. Roscoe Road Bridge Rehabilitation
15. Jefferson Street Pedestrian Bridge Approaches
16. Townhall Road
17. Corbin Street Bridge Replacement
18. Baxter Road Resurfacing
19. 15th Avenue Bridge

20. Elmwood Road Widening & Resurfacing
21. Love Road Reconstruction
22. Willowbrook Road Reconstruction
23. Kishwaukee Road Widening
24. Winnebago Street Bridge Repairs
25. Swanson Road Resurfacing
26. Perryville Path Extension
27. McDonald Road Bike Path
28. Roscoe Road Safety Project
29. Clifford Bridge Replacement
30. Baxter Road & Harrisville Road Intersection
31. Owen Center Road Safety Improvements
32. Woodstock Road

Midterm

1. Whitman Interchange- Ultimate Phase
2. Perryville Road Rehabilitation
3. Rockford Complete Streets Revitalization (Phase 2)
4. Pecatonica Prairie Path
5. Springfield Avenue Rehabilitation
6. Central Avenue Rehabilitation
7. Windsor Rd Reconstruction
8. Poplar Grove Road- North Boone School
9. Roscoe Road Pedestrian Path
10. Riverside Boulevard & Mulford Road Intersection
11. Bell School Road Widening
12. East State Street & Alpine Road
13. Alpine Road & Newburg Road Intersection Improvements
14. 20th Street and Charles Street Culvert
15. Jefferson Street Bridge Repairs
16. Bauer Bridge Rehabilitation
17. Graham Road (East)
18. Graham Road (West)
19. Belt Line Road Resurfacing
20. Cedar Street Bridge Replacement

Long Term

1. East State Street Sidewalk Gaps
2. Union Pacific Railroad Crossing Improvements
3. Main Street Reconstruction
4. Spring Creek Interchange
5. Airport Drive Widening
6. Lyford Road Corridor Improvements
7. Sandy Hollow Road Widening

Illustrative

1. Riverside Boulevard Share Use Path
2. Latham Road Bridge
3. Roscoe Road Bridge Replacement
4. Riverside Bridge Replacement
5. South Mulford Road Widening

State Sponsored Projects

Illinois Department of Transportation

1. IL-2, IL-72 to Beltline Road
2. I-39, Blackhawk Road to I-90
3. Alpine Road, Charles Street to US-20
4. IL-76, US BUS 20 to IL-173
5. I-19, Baxter Road to Blackhawk Road
6. US-20, IL-2 to I-39
7. IL-76, US 20 to Caledonia Road

Illinois Tollway

1. Bridge 723 Replacement, Rote Road over I-90 (Bell School Road to Lyford Road)
2. Bridge 701 Replacement, Keeneland Place to Rock Cut East Entrance
3. Bridge 713 Replacement, Elevator Road over I-90 (Courtdale Dr to Pint Dr)
4. Bridge 717 Replacement, Rockton Road (Willowbrook Road to Love Road)
5. Bridge 711 Replacement, WB I-90 over Burr Oak Road (Elevator Road to Stone Bridge Path)
6. Bridge 712 Replacement, EB I-90 over Burr Oak Road (Elevator Road to Stone Bridge Path)
7. Bridge 721 Replacement, Business US 20 Interchange Ramps over I-90

Appendices

Appendix A. Submission Form

Figure A-1: 2050 MTP Project Application Sheet Page 1

The thumbnail shows the top portion of the application form. It includes the '2050 MTP Project Application' title, a logo for 'Regional Transportation Planning' (RT1), and an 'Instructions' section. Below the instructions are two sections: 'Applicant Information' and 'Project Information'. The 'Applicant Information' section contains fields for Project Sponsor, Contact Name, Title, Phone Number, and Email. The 'Project Information' section contains fields for Road Name, Project Limits, Location Type, Project Length (in miles), Anticipated Timeframe, Activity Category, MTP Identification Number, and Functional Classification. There are also two text boxes for 'Project Scope' and 'Describe the reason for the project and the problem the project will address.' At the bottom, there is a note: 'If you are submitting multiple applications, please rank your applications by priority. ___ out of ___.'

2050 MTP Project Application

Instructions

Complete application in the space provided. Applicants are limited to the application form, required attachments, and three additional pages of attachments. Submit completed applications and attachments electronically to _____@r1planning.org. If you have any questions, contact _____ at xxx-xxx-xxxx.

Applicant Information

Project Sponsor: _____

Contact Name: _____

Title: _____

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

Engineer/Consultant (if applicable): _____

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

Project Information

Road Name: _____

Project Limits: _____

Location Type: _____

Project Length (in miles): _____

Anticipated Timeframe: _____

Activity Category: _____

MTP Identification Number: _____

Functional Classification: _____

Project Scope - Explain the nature of the project; indicate major work involved, and provide a brief comparison of existing and proposed conditions.

Describe the reason for the project and the problem the project will address.

If you are submitting multiple applications, please rank your applications by priority. _____ out of _____.

Figure A-2: 2050 MTP Project Application Sheet Page 2

Cost Summary & Anticipated Schedule

Total Estimated Project Cost:
 FY YYYY STBG Request: _____

Has your agency previously applied for STBG funds for this project? Yes No
 Has your agency previously awarded funds for this project? Yes No
If so, how many has been awarded to date?

Is this project seeking funding over multiple years? Yes No
If yes, how many consecutive years of funding be requested?
 2 Years 3 Years 4+ Years
 What is the total anticipated STBG funding request over the multiple years?

Complete all cells to show total project cost.

Phase	FY XX STBG	Add. Federal Funds	Match Funds	Total Cost	Match Ratio
PE/Design					
Right-of-Way					
Construction					
Procurement					
Total					

List each funding source (private, local, state, or sub-region) and contribution amount.

Match Source	Contribution Amount	% of Contribution to Project Total
Total Match		

Would a project award less than the request in this application be acceptable while maintaining the original intent of the project? Yes No
If no, please explain why not?

Has this project been incorporated into other Federal-aid grant applications? Yes No
If yes, please list all federal-aid grant programs in which this project has been included in and the funding amounts requested?

Cost Summary & Anticipated Schedule

Total Estimated Project Cost:

FY YYYY STBG Request:

Has your agency previously applied for STBG funds for this project? Yes No.

Has your agency previously awarded funds for this project? Yes No.

If so, how many has been awarded to date?

Is this project seeking funding over multiple year? Yes No.

If yes, how many consecutive years of funding be requested?

2 years 3 years 4+ years

What is the total anticipated STBG funding request over the multiple years?

Complete all cells to show total project cost.

Phase	FY XX STBG	Add. Federal Funds	Match Funds	Total Cost	Match Ratio
PE/Design					
Right-of-Way					
Construction					
Procurement					
Total					

List each funding source (private, local, state, or sub-regional) and contribution amount.

Match Source	Contribution Amount	% of Contribution to Project Total
Total Match		

Would a project award less than the request in this application be acceptable while maintaining the original intent of the project? Yes No.

If no, please explain why not?

Has this project been incorporated into other Federal-aid grant applications? Yes or No.

If yes, please list all federal-aid grant programs in which this project has been included in and the funding amounts requested?

Figure A-3: 2050 MTP Project Application Sheet- Page 3

Current & Proposed Conditions			
Current		Proposed	
Through Traffic Lanes	Number: _____ Width (ft.): _____	Number: _____ Width (ft.): _____	
Surface Type	<input type="radio"/> Continuous Center <input type="radio"/> Left Turn <input type="radio"/> Right Turn	Surface Type	<input type="radio"/> Continuous Center <input type="radio"/> Left Turn <input type="radio"/> Right Turn
Turn Lanes	Number: _____	Number: _____	
Type	<input type="radio"/> Depressed <input type="radio"/> Closed <input type="radio"/> Raised <input type="radio"/> Painted or Flushed <input type="radio"/> None	Type	<input type="radio"/> Depressed <input type="radio"/> Closed <input type="radio"/> Raised <input type="radio"/> Painted or Flushed <input type="radio"/> None
Width (ft.):	_____	Width (ft.):	_____
Shoulder	Surface Type <input type="radio"/> Paved <input type="radio"/> Unpaved Width (ft.): _____	Surface Type <input type="radio"/> Paved <input type="radio"/> Unpaved Width (ft.): _____	
Placement	<input type="radio"/> One side <input type="radio"/> Both sides <input type="radio"/> Intermittent <input type="radio"/> None	Placement	<input type="radio"/> One side <input type="radio"/> Both sides <input type="radio"/> Intermittent <input type="radio"/> None
On-Street Parking	Width (ft.): _____	Width (ft.): _____	
Curb & Gutter	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
Sidewalks	Placement <input type="radio"/> One side <input type="radio"/> Both sides <input type="radio"/> Intermittent <input type="radio"/> None Width (ft.): _____	Placement <input type="radio"/> One side <input type="radio"/> Both sides <input type="radio"/> Intermittent <input type="radio"/> None Width (ft.): _____	
On-Road Bicycle Facility	Type <input type="radio"/> Wide shoulders <input type="radio"/> Sharrows <input type="radio"/> Bike lane <input type="radio"/> Separated bike lane <input type="radio"/> Other <input type="radio"/> None	Type <input type="radio"/> Wide shoulders <input type="radio"/> Sharrows <input type="radio"/> Bike lane <input type="radio"/> Separated bike lane <input type="radio"/> Other <input type="radio"/> None	
Shared-Use Path or Sidewalk	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No Width (ft.): _____	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No Width (ft.): _____	

Current & Proposed Conditions

	Current		Proposed	
Through Traffic Lanes	Number: _____	Width (ft.): _____	Number: _____	Width (ft.): _____
Turn Lanes	Surface Type <input type="radio"/> Continuous Center <input type="radio"/> Left Turn <input type="radio"/> Right Turn	Number: _____	Surface Type <input type="radio"/> Continuous Center <input type="radio"/> Left Turn <input type="radio"/> Right Turn	Number: _____
Median	Type <input type="radio"/> Depressed <input type="radio"/> Closed <input type="radio"/> Raised <input type="radio"/> Painted or Flushed <input type="radio"/> None	Width (ft.): _____	Type <input type="radio"/> Depressed <input type="radio"/> Closed <input type="radio"/> Raised <input type="radio"/> Painted or Flushed <input type="radio"/> None	Width (ft.): _____
Shoulder	Surface Type <input type="radio"/> Paved <input type="radio"/> Unpaved	Width (ft.): _____	Surface Type <input type="radio"/> Paved <input type="radio"/> Unpaved	Width (ft.): _____
On-Street Parking	Placement <input type="radio"/> One side <input type="radio"/> Both sides <input type="radio"/> Intermittent <input type="radio"/> None	Width (ft.): _____	Placement <input type="radio"/> One side <input type="radio"/> Both sides <input type="radio"/> Intermittent <input type="radio"/> None	Width (ft.): _____
Curb & Gutter	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
Sidewalks	Placement <input type="radio"/> One side <input type="radio"/> Both sides <input type="radio"/> Intermittent <input type="radio"/> None	Width (ft.): _____	Placement <input type="radio"/> One side <input type="radio"/> Both sides <input type="radio"/> Intermittent <input type="radio"/> None	Width (ft.): _____
On-Road Bicycle Facility	Type <input type="radio"/> Wide shoulder <input type="radio"/> Sharrows <input type="radio"/> Bike lane	<input type="radio"/> Separated bike lane <input type="radio"/> Other <input type="radio"/> None	Type <input type="radio"/> Wide shoulder <input type="radio"/> Sharrows <input type="radio"/> Bike lane	<input type="radio"/> Separated bike lane <input type="radio"/> Other <input type="radio"/> None
Shared-Use Path or Sidewalk	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Width (ft.): _____	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Width (ft.): _____

Figure A-4: 2050 MTP Project Application Sheet- Page 4

Please describe any improvements being made as a part of this project to crosswalks, signage or signals, or streetscape elements not discussed in the project scope.

Project Readiness

Is the project identified in an approved local Comprehensive Plan, Asset Management Plan, or Capital Improvement Plan?
 Yes No *If yes, please cite the plan and page number.*

Is this project being coordinated with other infrastructure projects (i.e. utility, water, sewer, etc.)? Yes No
If yes, please indicate the project type, lead agency, and construction year?

Will this project require environmental mitigation, purchase of Right of Way (ROW), or railroad permits?
 Yes No Unsure
If yes, please explain how they will be addressed.

For each phase, select the option that most fully describes the status of your project. If awarded, the earliest you can expect funding for your project is September of this year.

	Not Applicable	Not Started	Will be Started Before Award	Will be Complete Before Award	Complete
PE/Design	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
NEPA	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Right-of-Way	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Utility Relocation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Construction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Multimodal Connectivity

Is the project identified in in local, regional, and/or state active transportation plan?
 Yes No *If yes, please cite the plan and page number.*

If the project is not explicitly included, but meets one or more of the study's goals, please describe that connection.

Will this project be a complete street as described in the Complete Streets Policy and Design Standards Guide?

Please describe any improvements being made as a part of this project to crosswalks, signage or signals, or streetscapes elements not discussed in the project scope.

Project Readiness

Is the project identified in an approved local Comprehensive Plan, Asset Management Plan, or Capital Improvement Plan?

Yes No *If yes, please cite the plan and page number.* _____

Is this project being coordinated with other infrastructure projects (i.e. utility , water, sewer, etc.)?

Yes No *If yes, please indicate the project type, lead agency, and construction year?*

Will this project require environmental mitigation, purchase of Right of Way (ROW), or railroad permits?

Yes No Unsure

If yes, please explain how they will be addressed.

For each phase, select the option that most fully describes the status of your project. If awarded, the earliest you can expect funding for your project is September of this year.

	Not Applicable	Not Started	Will be Started Before Award	Will be Complete Before Award	Complete
PE/Design	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
NEPA	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Right-of-Way	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Utility Relocation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Construction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Multimodal Connectivity

Is the project identified in in local, regional, and/or state active transportation plan?

Yes No *If yes, please cite the plan and page number.* _____

If the project is not explicitly included, but meets one or more of the study's goals, please describe that connection.

Will this project be a complete street as described in the Complete Streets Policy and Design Standards Guide?

Figure A-5: 2050 MTP Project Application Sheet- Page 5

Yes No
 If yes, please describe how it aligns with the Regional Complete Streets Policy and Design Standards Guide.

What modes will the project improvements directly address? (Check all that apply)

Automobile or Truck Bicycle Facility (on-street and/or shared use path)
 Public Transit* Pedestrian (sidewalk or trail)

*Just a bus route running through does not qualify.

List the elements of this project that will address the above modes (i.e., sidewalk, shared use path, bus stop improvements, signal interconnection).

Does this project connect to an existing pedestrian and/or bicycle facility or one that is planned to be completed before 2028?
 Yes No If yes, please provide a map of the connecting facility.

System Performance

Average Daily Traffic Volume (ADT): _____ ADT Source: _____

Will this project address an operational issue identified in local, regional, and/or state planning work?
 Yes No

If yes, please explain how it will be addressed.

Type(s) of operational improvements included in project. (Check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Improves traffic signal timing	<input type="checkbox"/> Relieves a bottleneck
<input type="checkbox"/> Improves access management	<input type="checkbox"/> Commercial Vehicle Information / Networks
<input type="checkbox"/> Improves intersection geometry	<input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian crossing detection
<input type="checkbox"/> Adds capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Traveler information systems
<input type="checkbox"/> Deploy Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)	<input type="checkbox"/> Incident detection technologies
<input type="checkbox"/> Promotes alternative transportation mode	<input type="checkbox"/> Promotes carpooling and park-and-ride
<input type="checkbox"/> Increases transit services, coverage area, and access	<input type="checkbox"/> Improves sight distance
<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency and/or transit vehicle preemption	<input type="checkbox"/> Roundabout
<input type="checkbox"/> Improves traffic incident management and/or reduces clearance times	<input type="checkbox"/> Transit Automated Vehicle Location/Computer-Aided dispatch
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify): _____	

Yes No

If yes, please describe how it aligns with the Regional Complete Streets Policy and Design Standards Guide.

What modes will the project improvements directly address? (Check all that apply)

- Automobile or Truck
- Public Transit*

*Just a bus route running through does not qualify.

- Bicycle Facility (on-street and/or shared use path)
- Pedestrian (sidewalk or trail)

List the elements of this project that will address the above modes (i.e., sidewalk, shared use path, bus stop improvements, signal interconnection).

Does this project connect to an existing pedestrian and/or bicycle facility or one that is planned to be completed before 2028?

Yes No If yes, please provide a map of the connecting facility.

System Performance

Average Daily Traffic Volume (ADT): _____ ADT Source: _____

Will this project address an operational issue identified in local, regional, and/or state planning work?

Yes No

If yes, please explain how it will be addressed.

Type(s) of operational improvements included in project. (Check all that apply)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Improves traffic signal timing | <input type="checkbox"/> Relieves a bottleneck |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Improves access management | <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial Vehicle Information/Networks |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Improves intersection geometry | <input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian crossing detection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adds capacity | <input type="checkbox"/> Traveler information systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Deploy Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) | <input type="checkbox"/> Incident detection technologies |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Promotes alternative transportation mode | <input type="checkbox"/> Promotes carpooling and park-and-ride |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Increases transit services, coverage area, and access | <input type="checkbox"/> Improves sight distance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency and/or transit vehicle preemption | <input type="checkbox"/> Roundabout |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Improves traffic incident management and/or reduces clearance times | <input type="checkbox"/> Transit Automated Vehicle Location/Computer-Aided dispatch |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify): _____ | |

Figure A-6: 2050 MTP Project Application Sheet- Page 6

Describe any other operations improvements this project will provide:

Safety

Will this project address a safety issue identified in local, regional, and/or state planning work? (e.g., studies, safety audits, or other related efforts to identify hazardous locations.)

Yes No

If yes, please explain how it will be addressed:

Which of the following FHWA Proven Countermeasures will this project incorporate? (Check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate Speed Limits for all Road Users	<input type="checkbox"/> Median Barriers
<input type="checkbox"/> Speed Safety Cameras	<input type="checkbox"/> Roadside Design Improvements at Curves
<input type="checkbox"/> Bicycle Lanes	<input type="checkbox"/> SafetyEdge
<input type="checkbox"/> Crosswalk Visibility Enhancements	<input type="checkbox"/> Wider Edge Lanes
<input type="checkbox"/> Leading Pedestrian Interval	<input type="checkbox"/> Backplates with Retroreflective Borders
<input type="checkbox"/> Medians and Pedestrian Refuge Islands	<input type="checkbox"/> Corridor Access Management
<input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons	<input type="checkbox"/> Dedicated Left- and Right-Turn Lanes at Intersections
<input type="checkbox"/> Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons	<input type="checkbox"/> Reduced Left-Turn Conflict Intersections
<input type="checkbox"/> Road Diets	<input type="checkbox"/> Roundabout
<input type="checkbox"/> Walkways	<input type="checkbox"/> Yellow Change Interval
<input type="checkbox"/> Enhanced Delineation for Horizontal Curves	<input type="checkbox"/> Lighting
<input type="checkbox"/> Longitudinal Rumble Strips or Stripes	<input type="checkbox"/> Pavement Friction Management
<input type="checkbox"/> Systemic Application of Multiple Low-Cost Countermeasures at Stop-Controlled Intersection	

Describe any other safety improvements this project will provide:

System Preservation

How does this project preserve or improve the existing infrastructure?

Is this project expected to increase the remaining service life? Yes No N/A

Describe any other operations improvements this project will provide.

Safety

Will this project address a safety issue identified in local, regional, and/or state planning work? (e.g., studies, safety audits, or other related efforts to identify hazardous locations.)

Yes No

If yes, please explain how it will be addressed.

- Appropriate Speed Limits for all Road Users
- Speed Safety Cameras
- Bicycle Lanes
- Crosswalk Visibility Enhancements
- Leading Pedestrian Interval

- Medians and Pedestrian Refuge Islands
- Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons
- Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons
- Road Diets
- Walkways
- Enhanced Delineation for Horizontal Curves
- Longitudinal Rumble Strips or Stripes
- Systemic Application of Multiple Low-Cost Countermeasures at Stop-Controlled Intersection
- Median Barriers
- Roadside Design Improvements at Curves
- SafetyEdge
- Wider Edge Lanes
- Backplates with Retroreflective Borders
- Corridor Access Management
- Dedicated Left- and Right-Turn Lanes at Intersections
- Reduced Left-Turn Conflict Intersections
- Roundabout
- Yellow Change Interval
- Lighting
- Pavement Friction Management

Describe any other safety improvements this project will provide.

System Preservation

How does this project preserve or improve the existing infrastructure?

In this project expected to increase the remaining service life? Yes No N/A

Figure A-7: 2050 MTP Project Application Sheet- Page 7

If yes, please indicated the number of years this project is anticipated to extend the life of the infrastructure and explain how it was calculated.

Environmental Resiliency

How does this project or program protect the natural regional environment?

Which of the following green infrastructure, emissions reduction, and hazard mitigation strategies will this project incorporate? (Check all that apply)

- Storm water management techniques (e.g., bioswales, rain gardens, detention ponds, catch basins)
- Reduce impervious surface ground cover
- Maximize infiltration on-site or off-site beyond porous or impervious surfaces
- Streetscapes (e.g., street trees, native/drought landscaping, street lights, and/or street furniture)
- Additional shaded structures for pedestrians using tree canopy
- Additional shaded structures for pedestrians using built structure, including bus shelters
- Provides alternative travel option/s to single occupant vehicle (not strictly recreational)
- Traffic flow improvements (e.g., ITS, traffic signal optimization)
- Additional shaded structures for pedestrians using built structure, including bus shelters
- Parking management / pricing
- Vehicle use limitations and restrictions, such as truck idle reduction
- Incorporates alternative fuel infrastructure
- Other (Specify): _____

Investment & Coordination

Will this project be implemented in partnership with any other organizations? Yes No

If yes, please include a list of partner organizations and their role in the project.

Does this project have support of any other organizations? Yes No

If yes, please include a list of organizations in support of this project. Please include any letters of support as an attachment to this application.

If yes, please indicated the number of years this project is anticipated to extend the life of the infrastructure and explain how it was calculated.

Environmental Resiliency

How does this project or program protect the natural regional environment?

Which of the following green infrastructure, emissions reduction, and hazard mitigation strategies will this project incorporate? (Check all that apply)

- Storm water management techniques (e.g., bioswale, rain gardens, detention ponds, catch basins)
- Reduce impervious surface ground cover
- Maximize infiltration on-site or off-site beyond porous or impervious surfaces
- Streetscapes (e.g., street trees, native/drought landscaping, street lights, and/or street furniture)

- Additional shaded structures for pedestrians using tree canopy
- Additional shaded structures for pedestrians using built structure, including bus shelters
- Provides alternative travel option/s to single occupant vehicle (not strictly recreational)
- Traffic flow Improvement (e.g., ITS, traffic signal optimization)
- Additional shaded structures for pedestrians using built structure, including bus shelters
- Parking management/pricing
- Vehicle use limitations and restrictions, such as truck idle reduction
- Incorporates alternative fuel infrastructure
- Other (Specify): _____

Investment & Coordination

Will this project be implemented in partnership with any other organizations? Yes No

If yes, please include a list of partner organizations and their role in the project.

Does this project have support of any other organizations? Yes No

If yes, please include a list of organizations in support of this project. Please include any letters of support as an attachment to this application.

Figure A-8: 2050 MTP Project Application Sheet- Page 8

Has any public input been gathered on this project? Yes No

If yes, please briefly describe the level of engagement and acceptance of this project.

Has any public input been gathered on this project? Yes No

If yes, please briefly describe the level of engagement and acceptance of this project.

Appendix B. Evaluation Criteria

System Preservation

Criteria 1. Infrastructure Condition

Select one of the following measures for bridge projects:	
Project has a bridge sufficiency rating above 80 or N/A.	0%
Project has a bridge sufficiency rating between 50 and 79.	50%
Project has a bridge sufficiency rating below 50.	100%

Select one of the following measures for pavement projects:	
Project has an overall pavement rating of "Good"	0%
Project has an overall pavement rating of "Fair"	50%
Project has an overall pavement rating of "Poor"	100%

Methodology: Based on bridge sufficiency rating or pavement rating provided by Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT). The lowest segment rating is used.

Data Sources: Data compiled by R1 staff from the Illinois PM2 Pavement Reports and the IDOT Structures Information Management System- Structure Summary Report.

System Performance

Criteria 2. Traffic Volume

Select one of the following measures:	
0	0
1-1,349 ADT	10%
1,350-2,249 ADT	20%
2,251-3,299 ADT	30%
3,300-4,449 ADT	40%
4,450-5,649 ADT	50%
5,650-7,699 ADT	60%
7,700-10,499 ADT	70%
10,500-13,799 ADT	80%
13,800-17,799 ADT	90%
17,800-31,800 ADT	100%

Methodology: Based on the percentiles of all current average daily traffic (ADT). Percentiles calculations do not include Interstates and Freeways ADT. Highest ADT segment is used. The higher the percentile, the higher the score.

Data Sources: Data compiled by R1 staff from the Illinois Roadway Information System (IRIS) database.

Criteria 3. Functional Classification

Select one of the following measures:	
Local	0%
Collector	30%
Minor Arterial	60%
Principal Arterial	100%

Methodology: Highest functionally-classified segment is used. The higher the functional classification, the higher the score.

Data Sources: Data compiled by R1 staff from the IRIS database.

Criteria 4. Operational Improvement Strategies Utilized

Select one of the following measures and identify the strategies utilized:	
Project design does not include strategies	0%
Project design includes 1 strategy	50%
Project design includes 2 or more strategies	100%

Methodology: Based on the number of operational strategies selected by the partner agency on the application. Operational strategies are derived from the approved *Transportation Systems Management and Operations Plan/Congestion Mitigation Process* adopted by the MPO Policy Committee. The more strategies integrated into the project, the higher the score.

Data Sources: Qualitative data provided by the project sponsor, per the application submitted.

Operational Strategies:

- Improves traffic signal timing
- Improves access management
- Improves intersection geometry
- Adds capacity
- Deploys Intelligent Transportation Systems
- Promotes alternative transportation mode
- Increases transit services, coverage area, and access
- Emergency/transit vehicle preemption
- Improves traffic incident management and/or reduces clearance times
- Relieves a bottleneck
- Commercial Vehicle Information / Networks
- Pedestrian crossing detection
- Traveler information systems
- Incident detection technologies
- Promotes carpooling and park-and-ride
- Improves sight distance
- Roundabout
- Transit Automated Vehicle Location/Computer-Aided Dispatch

Safety

Criteria 5. Crash Rate per 100,000 million VMT

Select one of the following measures:	
First Quartile	0%
Second Quartile	10%
Third Quartile	20%
Fourth Quartile	30%

Methodology: Based on the crash rate per 100,000 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) calculated by R1 staff. Crash points were spatially joined to the nearest roadway link. Roadway links that had multiple crash points were duplicated for each additional instance of a crash. The total number of duplicated roadway links was added to a “frequency”, which represented the total number of crashes for a given time period. The following formula was applied to each segment to calculate the VMT:

$$(\text{Frequency} * 100,000,000) / (\text{AADT} * 365 * (\text{number of years}) * \text{Segment Length (miles)})$$

For roadway segments that did not have AADT data, the following calculation was used, which results in the number of crashes per mile of roadway:

$$\text{Frequency} / (6 * \text{Segment Length (miles)})$$

Data Sources: Downloaded from the Illinois Department of Transportation Crash database and analyzed by R1 staff.

Criteria 6. Fatal & Serious Injury Crash Rate per 100,000 million VMT

Select one of the following measures:	
First Quartile	0%
Second Quartile	10%
Third Quartile	20%
Fourth Quartile	30%

Methodology: Based on the crash rate per 100,000 million VMT calculated by R1 staff for all crashes resulting in a fatality or incapacitating injury. Fatal (K) and serious injuries (A) crash points were spatially joined to the nearest roadway link. Roadway links that had multiple crash points were duplicated for each additional instance of a crash. The total number of duplicated roadway links was added to a “frequency”, which represented the total number of crashes for a given time period. The following formula was applied to each segment to calculate the 100 million VMT:

$$(\text{Frequency} * 100,000,000) / (\text{AADT} * 365 * (\text{number of years}) * \text{Segment Length (miles)})$$

For roadway segments that did not have AADT data, the following calculation was used, which results in the number of crashes per mile of roadway:

$$\text{Frequency} / (6 * \text{Segment Length (miles)})$$

Data Sources: Downloaded from the Illinois Department of Transportation Crash database and analyzed by R1 staff.

Criteria 7. Non-Motorized Crashes per 100,000 million VMT

Select one of the following measures:	
First Quartile	0%
Second Quartile	10%

Select one of the following measures:	
Third Quartile	20%
Fourth Quartile	30%

Methodology: Based on the crash rate per 100,000 million VMT calculated by R1 staff for all crashes involving a pedestrian or pedalcyclists. Crash points involving non-motorized mode were spatially joined to the nearest roadway link. Roadway links that had multiple crash points were duplicated for each additional instance of a crash. The total number of duplicated roadway links was added to a “frequency”, which represented the total number of crashes for a given time period. The following formula was applied to each segment to calculate the 100 million VMT:

$$(\text{Frequency} * 100,000,000) / (\text{AADT} * 365 * (\text{number of years}) * \text{Segment Length (miles)})$$

For roadway segments that did not have AADT data, the following calculation was used, which results in the number of crashes per mile of roadway:

$$\text{Frequency} / (6 * \text{Segment Length (miles)})$$

Data Sources: Downloaded from the Illinois Department of Transportation Crash database and analyzed by R1 staff.

Criteria 8. Safety Strategies Incorporated

Select one of the following measures and identify the strategies utilized:	
Project design does not include strategies	0%
Project design includes 1 strategy	30%
Project design includes 2 strategies	60%
Project design includes 3 or more strategies	100%

Methodology: Based on the number of safety strategies selected by the partner agency on the application. Safety strategies are derived from Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) Proven Safety Countermeasures (listed below). The more strategies integrated into the project, the higher the score.

Data Sources: Qualitative data provided by the project sponsor, per the application submitted.

Safety Strategies Examples:

- Longitudinal rumble strips and stripes
- Median barriers
- Improvement of sharp hills/steep curves
- Pavement markings, edge markings, safety edge
- Roadway reconfiguration
- Lighting improvements
- Corridor access management
- Dedicated left- and right-turn lanes at intersection
- Reduced left-turn conflict intersections
- Roundabouts
- Yellow change intervals
- Grade separation (all modes)
- Safety utility poles
- School zone improvements

Connectivity

Criteria 9. Integrates multiple transportation modes

Select one of the following measures and identify the modes integrated:	
Project design only includes 1 mode	0%
Project design includes 2 modes	30%
Project design includes 3 modes	60%
Project design includes 4 modes	100%

Methodology: Based on the number of modes selected by the partner agency on the application. Transportation modes include automobile or truck (street and highway); public transit (bus facility and/or rail facility—a route running through does not qualify); bicycle (on-street bike facility or multi-use path); and pedestrian- sidewalk and/or multi-use path). The more modes integrated into the project, the higher the score.

Data Sources: Qualitative data provided by the project sponsor, per the application submitted.

Criteria 10. Provides access to essential services

Select one of the following measures:	
Greater than 2.5 miles	0%
1 to 2.5 mile	30%
0.5 to 0.9 mile	60%
0 to 0.49 mile	100%

Methodology: Using geographic information system (GIS) software, R1 staff creates polygon buffers around each project of a ½-mile, 1-mile, and 2 ½-mile. If an essential service falls within the buffer, the associated distance is used to score the project. Essential services include food (e.g., supermarkets and other grocery, fruit and vegetable retailers, and all other specialty food stores); healthcare (e.g., hospitals, medical clinics, and urgent/immediate care); emergency services (e.g., police and fire stations); and educational institutions (e.g., universities, community colleges, primary and secondary, and technical training). The closer the project is to an essential service, the higher the score.

Data Sources: Data compiled by R1 staff from county GIS databases.

Criteria 11. Supports a Livable Community

Select one of the following measures:	
Project is not located on, does not intersect, or does not improve access to a Livable Community, identified in the MTP	0%
Project is located on, intersects with, or improves access to a Livable Community, identified in the MTP.	100%

Methodology: Based on if the project is located within, intersects, or improves access to a Census tract meeting the thresholds of a Livable Community. Threshold data includes population density, job proximity, percent of old buildings, vacancy rates, education attainment, percent of health uninsured individuals, percent of households with a housing cost of 30% or more, high blood pressure and depression.

Note: If a new construction or widening project falls within a livable community it will not receive points in this measure.

Data Sources: Data compiled by R1 staff.

Criteria 12. Provides options for Justice 40 Census tract or DCEO Underserved Area

Select one of the following measures:	
Project is not located on, does not intersect, or does not improve access to a Justice 40 tract or DCEO Underserved Area	0%
Project is located on, intersects with, or improves access to a Justice 40 Census tract or DCEO Underserved Area	100%

Methodology: Based on if the project is located within, intersects, or improves access to a Census tract meeting the thresholds of a Justice 40 or underserved area.

Note: Based on if the project is located within, intersects, or improves access to a Census tract meeting the thresholds of a Justice 40 or underserved area.

Data Sources: Data compiled by R1 staff from the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Office (DCEO) Underserved Areas map and U.S. Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool.

Economic Vitality

Criteria 13. Significant Transportation Facility

Select all of the following measures that apply:	
State or local freight corridor	50%
Improves direct connection to intermodal facility or interstate	50%

Methodology: Based on if the underlying roadway is designated a state or local truck route and/or the project is within a ½-mile proximity of an interchange or the Chicago-Rockford airport.

Data Sources: Data compiled by R1 staff from the IRIS database and listing of locally designated truck routes.

Criteria 14. Supports a Commercial or Industrial Area

Select one of the following measures:	
Project is not located on, intersects with, or improves access to a planned or existing commercial or industrial area.	0%
Project is located on, intersects with, or improves access to a commercial or industrial area listed in a Comprehensive Plan.	25%
Project is located on, intersects with, or improves access to a commercial or industrial area under a development agreement.	50%
Project is located on, intersects with, or improves access to a commercial or industrial area under construction.	75%
Project is located on, intersects with, or improves access to an existing commercial or industrial area.	100%

Methodology: Based on the response by the partner agency on the application.

Data Sources: Qualitative data provided by the project sponsor, per the application submitted.

Environmental Resiliency

Criteria 15. Vulnerability Analysis Score

Select one of the following measure:	
Very low	0%
Low	25%
Moderate	50%
High	75%
Very High	100%

Methodology: Based on the vulnerability assessment developed by R1 staff to determine the system's vulnerability to natural and human hazards. The assessment uses both asset criticality and risk factors to quantify the vulnerability of a given roadway. It utilizes key data and attributes of the physical infrastructure in combination with socioeconomic factors and generators to score and compare an urbanized area's transportation network. The full methodology can be found in the [Transportation Resiliency Study for the Rockford Region](#). The higher the vulnerability of a roadway or structure, the higher the score.

Data Sources: Data compiled by R1 staff from the IRIS database, U.S. Census Bureau, StreetLight Data, Rockford Mass Transit District, and WinGIS.

Criteria 16. Incorporates green infrastructure and design approaches that address air and water quality

Select one of the following measure and identify the strategies utilized:	
Project design does not include strategies	0%
Project design includes 1 strategy	50%
Project design includes 2 or more strategies	100%

Methodology: Based on the number of green infrastructure and mitigation design approaches selected by the partner agency on the application (listed below). The strategies used must account for at least 1% of the total project cost to be eligible to earn points. The more strategies integrated into the project, the higher the score.

Data Sources: Qualitative data provided by the project sponsor, per the application submitted.

Green Infrastructure and Mitigation Design Approaches:

- Storm water management techniques (e.g., bioswales, rain gardens, detention ponds, wide grass ditches)
- Includes permeable pavement
- Streetscapes (e.g., street trees, native/drought landscaping, street lights, and/or street furniture)
- Promotes truck idle reduction
- Other (as specified)

Environmental Resiliency

Criteria 17. Non-Federal Funding Match

Select one of the following measure:	
20%	0%
30%	25%
40%	50%
50%	75%
Greater than 50%	100%

Methodology: Based on the percent of non-federal match committed to the project. The higher the non-federal funding committed to the project, the higher the score.

Data Sources: Qualitative data provided by the project sponsor, per the application submitted.

Criteria 18. Continues an already completed resurfacing, reconstruction, or restoration project.

Select one of the following measure:	
No	0%
Yes	100%

Methodology: Based on the response by the partner agency in the application.

Data Sources: Qualitative data provided by the project sponsor, per the application submitted.

Criteria 19. Benefits multiple communities

Select one of the following measures:	
Does not benefit multiple communities	0%
Supports multiple communities	100%

Methodology: Based on the number of municipalities the project intersects.

Data Sources: Data compiled by R1 staff from the U.S. Census Bureau.

Criteria 20. Number of Partners

Select one of the following measures:	
0 partners	0%
1 partner	50%
2+ partners	100%

Methodology: Based on the number of partners who are financially supporting the project, either through cash or in-kind contributions.

Data Sources: Qualitative data provided by the project sponsor, per the application submitted.

Criteria 21. Project sponsor ranking of project.

Select one of the following measures:	
Ranked #4 or higher	0%
Ranked #3	30%
Ranked #2	60%
Ranked #1	100%

Methodology: Based on the response by the partner agency on the application.

Data Sources: Qualitative data provided by the project sponsor, per the application submitted.

Appendix C. Breakdown of Activity Categories

When submitting a project for inclusion in the 2050+ Metropolitan Transportation Plan, local public agencies (LPAs) were required to choose one activity that best describes the project. To determine the primary activity, LPAs considered what activity accounts for the largest portion of the costs or addresses the project's purpose and need most directly. This list is not exhaustive; many eligible activities are not listed.

Table C-1: Primary Activity & Activity Categories

Primary Activity	Activity Category	Primary Activity	Activity Category
Bridge Maintenance	Bridge	Improving sight distances	Intersection
Bridge/Bridge Deck Replacement	Bridge	Preventative Maintenance	Preservation
Bridge Reconstruction	Bridge	Reconstruction (w/o changing capacity)	Preservation
Bicycle Lanes	Bicycle/Pedestrian	Rehabilitation	Preservation
Multi-Use Path	Bicycle/Pedestrian	Resurfacing	Preservation
Sidewalk Installation/Modification	Bicycle/Pedestrian	Roundabouts	Safety
Streetscape Improvement	Bicycle/Pedestrian	At-Grade Crossings	Safety
Minor Widening (e.g., adding turn lanes (s))	Capacity	Installation of Proven Safety Countermeasures (s)	Safety
New Roadway	Capacity	School zone improvements	Safety
Road-rightsizing (removing through lanes (s))	Capacity	Transit Capital Expansion (New Vehicles)	Transit
Interchange Modification	Capacity	Transit Service Expansion	Transit
Grade Separation (Railroad/Roadway)	Capacity	Transit Vehicle Replacement	Transit
Intersection modification	Intersection		
Installation of Traffic Signals	Intersection		



Region 1 Planning Council

127 N Wyman St. Suite 100

Rockford, Illinois 61101

815-319-4180 | info@r1planning.org