Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

STP Shared Fund
FFY 2028-2032
Program Application Booklet

October 19, 2026

Introduction **3**
Deadlines and How to Apply **3**
Using eTIP 3
Eligibility **4**
Eligible sponsors 4
Eligible project types 5
Eligible project phases 7
Eligible project costs and local match requirements 8
Inclusion in plans 9
Completion of preliminary engineering 11
Project Evaluation Process **15**
Project Readiness 15
Engineering and Land Acquisition (all project types) 16
Financial Commitment (all project types) 17
Transportation Impact 18
Household/Job Impact (all project types) 19
Bicycle and pedestrian barrier elimination 19
Existing Condition/Need 19
Improvement 23
Bridge reconstruction or rehabilitation 23
Existing Condition/Need 23
Improvement 24
Bus speed improvements 27
Existing Condition/Need 27
Improvement 28
Corridor/small area safety improvements 28
Existing Condition/Need 28
Improvement 29
Rail-Highway grade crossing improvements 30
Existing Condition/Need 30
Improvement 30
Road expansions 31
Existing Condition/Need 31
Improvement 31
Road reconstructions 33
Existing Condition/Need 33
Improvement 33

Transit station, yard, or terminal improvements 34
Existing Condition/Need 35
Improvement 37
Truck route improvements 39
Existing Condition/Need 39
Improvement 40
Planning Factors 41
Inclusive growth 42
Universal mobility 43
Resilience 45
Freight movement 47
Transit-supportive land use 48
Subregional Priority 50
Project selection and programming process 52
Step 1: Call for Projects 52
Step 2: Eligibility Screening 52
Step 3: Project Scoring 52
Step 4: Draft Program Development 53
Step 5: Public Comment 53
Step 6: Final Program Recommendation 54
Step 7: Program Implementation 54
Staged Construction 54
Minimum Acceptable Funding 55
Selection Process Timeline 56
Application Checklist 57
Contact Information 57
Appendix A: FY26 Cohort 4 Communities 58

Introduction

The Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP), the metropolitan planning organization for the seven counties of northeastern Illinois, announces the availability of funding for transportation projects through the Surface Transportation Program (STP) Shared Fund. This program is funded through the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The STP Shared Fund is designed to fund important regional projects that address regional performance measures and the goals of ON TO 2050[1].

This application booklet provides details on how to apply for funding, eligibility, and project evaluation, selection, and programming processes.

Throughout this document, instructions that relate the policies and processes to the completion of an application can be found emphasized as shown here.

Deadlines and How to Apply

The call for projects begins on **Monday, October 19, 2026**, and ends at 5:00 p.m. on **Friday, December 18, 2026**. Applications are to be submitted through the eTIP database[2], which is the region's repository of information for all surface transportation projects funded by federal programs or deemed to be regionally significant. The eTIP has a Call for Projects (CFP) portal which will collect the applications' work type, location, and financial information. Additional forms will still be required and those must be uploaded as attached documents to eTIP.

Using eTIP

An eTIP User Guide[3] is available and additional guidance for submitting projects is available with all the relevant materials posted at cmap.is/2026callforprojects. Application materials are only accepted through eTIP.

Project applications submitted by local sponsor agencies are required to be reviewed by their Council of Mayors' Planning Liaison before the eTIP submission will be accepted. The review process will occur within the eTIP database, and no project materials should be sent directly to the Planning Liaison. To give the Planning Liaisons time to review the applications, **all locally sponsored applications should be "submit for review" by close of business on Monday, December 7, 2026**. The Planning Liaison will review the application and if the application has missing information, they will notify the applicant. The applicant will then be able to amend the application before the final due date. A list of the Councils and Planning Liaisons[4] is available online.

[1] https://www.cmap.illinois.gov/2050
[2] https://portal-cmap.ecointeractive.com/dashboard
[3] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/eTIPUserGuide_2024CFP_final.pdf
[4] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/Municipalities-by-Council.pdf

The eTIP database requires users to request login credentials and have those credentials approved by CMAP staff. Although CMAP staff will attempt to review user requests as soon as they are received, it may take up to three business days for CMAP staff to review and approve accounts. Applicants are encouraged to request credentials as soon as the call for projects opens, rather than waiting until they are ready to complete the application. Procedures for requesting credentials are included in the eTIP User Guide[5].

Eligibility

Projects eligible for the STP Shared Fund make large and lasting contributions to regional transportation priorities and are derived from a variety of planning activities. The intention of the fund is also to encourage collaboration between municipalities and advance projects that local councils cannot readily fund on their own. Given these goals, projects must meet certain basic eligibility requirements.

- Projects must have a total cost, for all phases from preliminary engineering through construction, of $5 million or more.
- Projects with a total cost of less than $5 million will be considered if the funding application is from three (3) or more local partners, and one (1) of those partners is a municipality.
- All projects must be included in or supported by a locally adopted plan developed with input from the public, as described in more detail in the "Inclusion in Plans" section below.
- Preliminary engineering must be underway by the application deadline, as described in more detail in the "Completion of Preliminary Engineering" section below. This requirement does not apply for applicants seeking preliminary engineering only, as described in the "Eligible Project Phases" section below.

Complete the Proposed Funding Information section of the eTIP application, complete the Status Update in the project questions tab of the eTIP application, and complete the Eligibility section (questions 3 and 4) of the All STP Projects worksheet in the application workbook.

Eligible sponsors

For the STP Shared Fund, eligible sponsors or partners include any state agency or unit of government having the authority to levy taxes. Sponsors include but are not limited to municipalities, counties, townships, park districts, forest preserve districts, and transit agencies. Non-municipal sponsors are strongly encouraged to seek partnerships with, or letters of support from, affected municipalities. For the purpose of meeting the eligibility requirements, partners must demonstrate financial or in-kind project involvement beyond just supporting a project. Private for-profit and non-profit organizations may partner with a public sponsor that meets the previously stated conditions but may not submit applications or act as the lead agency for project implementation.

[5] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/eTIPUserGuide_2024CFP_final.pdf

A project sponsor may submit an application to secure funding for a project that will be implemented by a different agency, however evidence that the implementing agency supports the application, is aware of and will comply with Active Program Management[6] requirements of the STP Shared Fund, and agrees that the cost estimate and schedule is reasonable and aligns with the implementing agency's plans to complete the project should be provided by the applicant.

Indicate the sponsor agency in the SPONSOR AGENCY field of the eTIP application and complete the Sponsor/Implementer Relationship section (question 5) of the All STP Projects worksheet in the application workbook.

Eligible project types

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

Complete the STP Shared Fund Project Type(s) section (question 6) of the All STP Projects worksheet and refer to the Instructions worksheet in the application workbook for project type-specific instructions. Also select a complimentary PROJECT TYPE in the eTIP application. See the eTIP User Guide[7] for additional guidance on this field.

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

Project Type	Need(s) to be addressed	Example scope elements to address needs
Bicycle and Pedestrian Barrier Elimination	• Gaps in the regional greenways & trails network due to physical barriers (such as a waterway, highway, or railroad) to bicycle and pedestrian movement	• Bicycle/pedestrian overpass • Bicycle/pedestrian underpass • New multi-use path/trail in a parallel/nearby location that avoids the physical barrier
Bus Speed Improvements	• On-time performance due to congested conditions • Bus travel time vs. auto travel time	• BRT/ART route construction (stops, pull outs, separators, etc.) • Transit Signal Priority (TSP) and other ITS • Bus-only travel lanes

[6] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/STP_APM_policies.pdf
[7] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/eTIPUserGuide_2024CFP_final.pdf

Project Type	Need(s) to be addressed	Example scope elements to address needs
Bridge Rehabilitation or Reconstruction	• Sufficiency rating of structures included in the National Bridge Inventory (NBI) • Deck, superstructure, and/or substructure condition	• Bridge replacement • Deck replacement • Superstructure rehab/reconstruct • Substructure rehab/reconstruct
Highway/Rail Grade Crossing Improvements	• Priority grade crossing rank (based on truck, car, and transit traffic, daily trains, daily gate down time, safety, and mobility)	• Grade separation • Other crossing improvements
Road Reconstruction	• Pavement condition (primary) • Mobility (secondary) • Reliability (secondary) • Safety (secondary)	• Reconstruction of roadway
Road Expansion	• Mobility and reliability (primary) • Safety (secondary) • Pavement condition (secondary)	• Additional through lanes • New/extended road • New interchange • New ramps (additional movements)
Corridor or Small Area Safety	• Part of the High Injury Network in corresponding county Safety Act Plans	• Addresses systemic risk factors outlined in county Safety Action Plans[8] • Involving safety countermeasures in FHWA's Safe System Design Hierarchy[9]

[8] https://engage.cmap.illinois.gov/hub-page/safetravelforall

[9] https://highways.dot.gov/sites/fhwa.dot.gov/files/2024-01/Safe_System_Roadway_Design_Hierarchy.pdf

Project Type	Need(s) to be addressed	Example scope elements to address needs
Transit Station, Yard, or Terminal Improvements	• Condition of passenger facility components • Gaps in bicycle and pedestrian access to passenger facilities • Condition of yard or terminal components • Commuter rail compliance or storage deficiencies	• Rehab, repair, or replace station building, boarding platforms, and other station fixtures • Complete direct connection of sidewalk network to station • Complete direct connection of bicycle network to station • Install bike parking or bike-sharing at station • Rehab, repair, or replace yard or terminal assets (platforms, switches, signals, crew facilities, etc.) • Relocate existing commuter rail yard
Truck Route Improvements	• High truck volumes • Inadequate roadway geometry for trucks • Barriers (physical/operational) to efficient truck movement • Pavement condition	• Intersection reconstruction to improve turn radii, lengthen storage, etc. • Signal modifications • ITS solutions (corridor or intersection) • Pavement reconstruction (structural) • Relocation of designated truck route to avoid barriers and/or inadequate roadway geometry

Eligible project phases

Phase 1 (preliminary) engineering (for projects to be processed through IDOT) and activities defined by FTA as "pre-engineering" (for projects to be processed through an FTA grant) will be the responsibility of the project sponsor to complete without funding from the STP Shared Fund.

All other phases -- including phase 2 (design) engineering, land acquisition, and construction (including construction engineering) -- are eligible for STP Shared Fund funding based on the degree of completion of preliminary engineering at the time of application. Engineering design, land acquisition, and construction activities that are eligible for funding based on the degree of completion of preliminary engineering may be combined into "implementation" for transit projects that will be processed through an FTA grant.

Applicants may request funding for phase 1 engineering based on a hardship. If phase 1 engineering funding is sought, funding for the later phases of the project cannot be requested

until the next call for projects following completion of the STP-funded phase 1 engineering, and such funding for later phases is not guaranteed.

To be considered eligible to request phase 1 engineering funding based on hardship, the project sponsor must be identified as a Cohort 4 (very high need) community in the FY2026 Community Cohorts[10] document. The project for which funds are being requested must be entirely within the boundaries of that community, however extensions beyond the boundary will be allowed in order to meet "logical termini" requirements. Sponsors seeking funding for phase 1 engineering should contact CMAP staff to confirm eligibility before doing so. If an alternate implementing agency, such as a County DOT, DOH, or DOTH or IDOT will be leading the implementation of any phase of a project located on a facility owned and/or maintained by a Cohort 4 community, that alternate agency may serve as the sponsor and applicant for the project. Counties and IDOT are not eligible to request or receive phase 1 engineering funding for projects on county or state highways, regardless of the project location.

Eligible project costs and local match requirements

Eligible costs include all design engineering, land acquisition, construction, and construction engineering costs that are federally eligible. Ineligible costs may include items, often referred to as "non-participating costs", such as decorative lighting.

A local match that is a minimum of 20 percent of the total cost, by phase, is required. The sponsor must have already committed matching funds when the project application is submitted. Proposals which indicate that the sponsor will contribute more than the minimum local match will receive points as part of the project readiness portion of the scoring process (see below). The local match does not necessarily have to be provided directly by the sponsor, but it must be a non-federal fund source to qualify as match.

To ensure that all communities within the region have reasonable access to federal funds without an undue burden caused by lack of resources for required local matching funds, on November 28, 2018, the STP Project Selection Committee approved a policy[11] for the use of Transportation Development Credits – Highways (TDCHs, also known as "toll credits") for STP funded projects. Sponsors that are identified as a Cohort 4 (very high need) community in the FY2026 Community Cohorts[12] document may request the use of TDCHs in lieu of local match. If an alternate implementing agency, such as a County DOT, DOH, or DOTH or IDOT will be leading the implementation of any phase of a project located on a facility owned and/or maintained by a Cohort 4 community, that alternate agency may request the use of TDCHs in lieu of local match on behalf of the qualifying community. Counties and IDOT are not eligible to request or receive TDCHs in lieu of local match for projects on county or state highways, regardless of the project location.

The use of federal funds for local projects is subject to the policies and procedures of IDOT and FHWA or FTA. These procedures may require local agencies to pay 100% of costs up front, with

[10] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/Community_Cohorts_FY26.pdf
[11] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/CMAP_TDCH_Policy_IDOTapproved11-20-2020.pdf
[12] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/Community_Cohorts_FY26.pdf

reimbursement occurring when the local agency invoices IDOT or FTA. For more information, see IDOT's LPA Project Development and Implementation[13] web page and the IDOT Local Roads and Streets Manual[14], Part III – Policies and Procedures for Federal-Aid Projects.

Document local match in the Programming Information section of the eTIP application.

Inclusion in plans

The link between planning and implementation is critical to ensuring regional investments support communities' priorities. Therefore, applicants must provide evidence (via hyperlink or attachment) that the proposed project is included in or supported by a locally adopted plan developed with input from the public in order to be considered for funding. Support can be for the project specifically, or for the type of project. Projects applying for phase 1 engineering funding only are exempt from this requirement. However, the requirement must be met for projects seeking funding for any other phase, including those that previously completed phase 1 engineering with STP shared funds.

Acceptable plans are those that are subject to public review and have received local government or implementing agency approval. A project's inclusion in IDOT's Multi-Year Program, a local agency Capital Improvement Program, or identification as a 2026 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Regional Capital Project (RCP) is also acceptable. However, selection for funding in a competitive grant or discretionary funding program or being listed in IDOT's Local Roads status sheets or Management Monitoring Schedule does not qualify as inclusion in a plan. The table below, while not an exhaustive list, provides guidance for determining what planning documents or programs are acceptable. In addition, examples from plans cited by applicants in prior calls for projects that demonstrate how a project type may be supported in a plan are also provided below.

[13] https://idot.illinois.gov/doing-business/public-agency-marketplace/local-public-agencies.html
[14] https://public.powerdms.com/IDOT/documents/2096656

✓ - Acceptable ✗ - Not Acceptable ? - Case-by-case, contact CMAP staff to discuss

Type of Plan or Program	Project Included	Project Type Included
County Long Range Transportation Plan	✓	✓
Municipal or County Comprehensive Plan	✓	✓
Capital Improvement Program	✓	✓
Multimodal Transportation Plan	✓	✓
Corridor Plan	✓	?
Small Area or Subarea Plan	✓	?
Neighborhood Plan	✓	?
Housing Plan	✗	✗
Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Plan	✓	✓
Livable Streets Plan	?	?
Active Mobility Plan	✓	?
Local Road Safety Plan	✓	?
Economic Development Plan	?	?
Transit Improvement Plan	✓	✓
Access to Transit Plan	✓	?
Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Plan	✓	✓
Stormwater or Green Infrastructure Master Plan	?	✗
Transit Agency or Regional Transit Strategic Plan	✓	✓
Regional Transit Signal Priority (TSP) Implementation Program	✓	?
Transit Service Coordination Plan	✓	?
Bus Network Enhancements Plan	✓	✓
Transit Station Area Master Plan	✓	?
Transit Agency Asset Management Plan	✓	✓
Transit Agency Budget/Capital Improvement Program	✓	✗
Municipal/County/State Asset Management Plan	✓	✓
IDOT Multi-Year Plan	✓	✗
RTP Regional Capital Project (RCP)	✓	✗
NE IL Priority Grade Crossings	✓	✗
IDOT Local Roads Status Sheets	✗	✗
Council of Mayors STP-L Program	✗	✗
Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program (ITEP) Project List	✗	✗
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Project List	✗	✗
IDOT Major Bridge Program Project List	✗	✗
Invest in Cook Project List	✗	✗

Examples of plans supporting project types

Will County's "Our Way Forward[15]" 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan includes the goal: "Preserve and maintain transportation assets and manage their operations using a range of strategies, tools, and technologies." This goal supports all projects that preserve and maintain the existing system, such as Road Reconstruction and Bridge Rehabilitation or Replacement projects, even though every potential project is not listed individually in the plan.

Our Way Forward[16] discusses freight movement and at-grad highway and rail crossings as an area of need, providing support for Highway/Rail Grade Crossing Improvements projects, and also recommends specific grade crossings for improvement.

One of several transportation and mobility goals in the City of Hickory Hills' Comprehensive Plan[17] is to "establish a community-wide pathway system that connects residents and visitors to key community destinations." This goal supports bicycle and pedestrian barrier elimination projects and the bicycle and pedestrian access component of transit station projects.

Complete the Eligibility section (question 4) of the All STP Projects worksheet in the application workbook.

Completion of preliminary engineering

The preliminary engineering phase of a transportation project establishes the purpose and need for a project, determines the potential for environmental and cultural impacts from the project, analyzes alternatives, and provides an opportunity for the public to be involved in decision-making about the project. This work solidifies the scope of a project, the schedule for design, land acquisition, and construction, and the estimated cost of the project. For these reasons, substantial completion of preliminary engineering plays a critical role in ensuring accurate programming of project funding.

However, it is also recognized that there is an expense to completing preliminary engineering, and that not all project sponsors are willing or able to risk these expenses when no funding has been identified for completing a project. There is also a time limit to the validity of environmental and cultural clearances and having to update these clearances adds additional time and cost to projects. Finally, completing preliminary engineering for unfunded projects puts a review burden on IDOT and other regulatory agencies for projects which may not be viable.

To balance these concerns, applications will be accepted for projects that have started, but not substantially completed preliminary engineering, however the phases eligible for funding

---

[15] https://willcounty.gov/Portals/0/Highway/Long%20Range%20Transportation/2050%20LRTP/Our%20Way%20Forward%202050%20Final%20Report.pdf?ver=Z66j-ZwWmDyG9OYT-OYaRA%3d%3d

[16] https://www.willcountyillinois.com/Portals/0/Highway/Long%20Range%20Transportation/will_county_transporation_report_2017_final4_web.pdf?ver=2017-04-25-112630-497

[17] https://engage.cmap.illinois.gov/10947/widgets/35774/documents/45147

consideration and future cost increases will be limited based on the degree of completion of preliminary engineering.

For projects selected for funding with a preliminary engineering status of "substantially complete" or "underway", the status will be reassessed prior to the next scheduled call for projects cycle, and if that status has not been elevated to "complete" or "nearly complete," the funding programmed in the previous cycle will be withdrawn, and the project will have to reapply for funding.

Funding and future cost increase eligibility based on degree of completion of preliminary engineering

Degree of completion	Design (Phase 2) Engineering	Land Acquisition	Construction and Const. (Phase 3) Eng.
Complete	Eligible for funding Eligible for increases up to 100%	Eligible for funding Eligible for increases up to 100%	Eligible for funding Eligible for increases up to 100%
Nearly Complete	Eligible for funding Not eligible for increases	Eligible for funding Eligible for increases up to 50%	Eligible for funding Eligible for increases up to 50%
Substantially Complete	Not eligible	Eligible for funding Not eligible for increases	Eligible for funding Eligible for increases up to 25%
Underway	Not eligible	Not eligible	Eligible for funding Not eligible for increases
Not Started	Not eligible	Not eligible	Not eligible

Definitions: Degree of Completion

Degree of completion	Milestones achieved and requested attachments
Highway (projects processed through IDOT)	
Complete	Design approval received *Attach: Design approval letter/form*
Nearly complete	IDOT has confirmed that a final Project Development Report has been submitted for signatures *Attach: Transmittal letter/email*

Degree of completion	Milestones achieved and requested attachments
Substantially complete	A preliminary PDR (or equivalent) has been submitted to IDOT for review, the project has been presented at a State/Federal Coordination meeting, a CE determination has been made, and FHWA concurrence of environmental processing has been given (not required for State Approved Categorical Exclusions), and the IDOT Bureau of Design and Environment (BDE) has completed the Environmental Survey Request (ESR) review (if required) and documentation of the environmental investigations, associated coordination, and any commitments made are included in the draft PDR *Attach: Kick-off meeting minutes (for State Approved CE), FHWA Coordination Meeting minutes, ESR transmittal and correspondence from BDE, draft PDR transmittal cover or email and appropriate section(s) of draft PDR including documentation of investigations, coordination, and commitments*
Underway	The project has been presented at a State/Federal Coordination meeting, a CE determination has been made, and FHWA concurrence of environmental processing has been given (not required for State Approved Categorical Exclusions), and the IDOT Bureau of Design and Environment (BDE) has begun the Environmental Survey Request (ESR) review (if required). *Attach: Kick-off meeting minutes (for State Approved CE), FHWA Coordination Meeting minutes, ESR transmittal and correspondence from BDE showing review has begun* --OR-- A final Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) report prepared in accordance with IDOT Bureau of Design and Environment (BDE) Manual section 11-7.04 has been completed documenting the project Purpose and Need, Alternatives to Be Carried Forward, and public involvement and there are no further comments from any Federal or state resource agencies *Attach: Appropriate documentation (forms and/or emails) demonstrating completion of the PEL and that there are no further comments*

Degree of completion	Milestones achieved and requested attachments
Transit (projects processed through FTA)	
Complete	For projects requiring an EIS or EA, a Record of Decision (ROD) or Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) has been obtained; for "D-list" CEs (see FTA's "Preparing Environmental Documents" webpage[18] and 23 CFR 711.118(d)[19]), FTA has classified the action as a categorical exclusion with no unusual circumstances; and for "C-list" CEs (see 23 CFR 711.118(c)[20]), a basic project description confirming the project falls within the C-List has been provided to FTA. *Attach: ROD signature page(s) or CE documentation (e.g. letter, email, meeting or phone call notes) demonstrating the above*
Nearly complete	The sponsor has coordinated with FTA to develop documentation supporting processing the project as a CE (C-list or D-list). *Attach: Documentation (e.g. letters, emails, meeting or phone call notes) demonstrating the above*
Substantially complete	Draft EIS or Draft EA has been released for public and regulatory agency reviews; or, for CEs with potential unusual circumstances, all appropriate environmental studies are complete. *Attach: Announcement of availability for review or documentation that environmental studies are complete*
Underway	For projects requiring an EIS or EA, project scoping is complete (purpose and need, range of alternatives and impacts, and significant issues to be addressed are defined). For CEs with potential unusual circumstances, drafts of all appropriate environmental studies are under public and/or regulatory agency review. *Attach: Appropriate documentation (forms, emails, announcements) demonstrating the above*

Indicate the status of preliminary engineering in the Project Information section of the eTIP application, complete the Preliminary Engineering – All tab of the application workbook, and attach the documentation noted above to support the status of completion in the eTIP database.

[18] https://www.transit.dot.gov/regulations-and-programs/environmental-programs/preparing-environmental-documents

[19] https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/chapter-I/subchapter-H/part-771#p-771.118(d)

[20] https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/chapter-I/subchapter-H/part-771#p-771.118(c)

Project Evaluation Process

The program of projects selected by the STP Project Selection Committee will consider the results of the project evaluation in four categories: project readiness, transportation impact, planning factors, and subregional priority, as shown in the table below.

Evaluation criteria	Points	Applies to
Project Readiness	**15**	**All project types**
Engineering/Land Acquisition	10	All project types
Financial Commitments	5	All project types
Transportation Impact	**50**	**All project types**
Current condition/need	20	All project types
Improvement	20	All project types
Jobs/Housing benefit	10	All project types
Planning Factors	**30**	**All project types**
Inclusive Growth	15	All project types
Universal Mobility	10	Bike/ped barriers; bridges; hwy/rail crossings; safety; truck routes
Universal Mobility	5	Bus speed; road expansion; road reconstruction
Resilience	5	Bike/ped barriers; hwy/rail crossings; road expansion; road reconstruction; transit stations, yards, or terminals; truck routes
Freight Movement	5	Bridges; safety; road expansion; road reconstruction
Transit Supportive Density	10	Bus speed; transit stations, yards, or terminals
Subregional Priority	**5**	**All project types**
Total possible points	**100**	**All project types**

Project Readiness

CMAP and partners are committed to timely obligation and completion of projects to protect the region's funding from lapse and rescission and deliver on the significant transportation benefits of selected projects. The Active Program Management[21] policies provide a framework for strong project and program management of selected projects, and the evaluation process for Shared Fund projects complements these policies by awarding points to projects that demonstrate financial commitment and engineering work. Project readiness is 15% of the total project score.

[21] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/STP-APM-Policies-approved-02-09-2023.pdf

Engineering and Land Acquisition (all project types)
Projects can receive up to 10 points, 5 for demonstration of substantial completion of phase 2 (design) engineering and 5 for the completion or lack of need for land acquisition.

Points for land acquisition are as follows:

Status	**Points**
Land acquisition complete or not needed	5
Land acquisition incomplete	0

Points for phase 2 engineering for projects processed through IDOT are awarded as follows:

Status	**Points**
Preliminary plans submitted to IDOT	2.5
Pre-final plans submitted to IDOT	5

It is recognized that IDOT will not accept submittals or complete plan review for unfunded projects, and that as a result many applicants will not receive points in this category. However, for applicants seeking to fill funding gaps through the STP shared fund, the submittal of plans is a significant readiness milestone that should be recognized with the awarding of points.

Points for design engineering for projects processed through FTA are awarded as follows:

Completion of any of the following items shall be awarded 2.5 points each, up to a maximum of 5 points:

Item Completed	**Points**
NEPA Class of Action Determination, FONSI, or ROD	+ 2.5
Initiation of Section 106 process	+ 2.5
Basis of design/ design criteria report	+ 2.5
Design documents (plans and specifications)	+ 2.5
Real estate management plan	+ 2.5
Project management or project delivery plan	+ 2.5
Basis of estimate report	+ 2.5

Complete the milestones section of the Project Questions tab in eTIP, including the date that the milestones above were completed, and indicate design engineering and land acquisition status in the Project Information section of the eTIP application and attach a copy of preliminary plans (PDF format only!) or a copy of the letter or e-mail transmitting pre-final plans to IDOT. Transit projects should attach a copy (PDF format only!) of items listed above for which points are being requested.

Financial Commitment (all project types)

Projects can receive up to 5 points in this category based on their demonstrated leveraging of other funding sources. Points are awarded as follows to projects based on the amount of funding requested from the shared fund as a percent of the federally-eligible share of the total project cost:

Percent of federally-eligible share requested	Points
Less than 20%	5
20% - less than 40%	4
40% - less than 60%	3
60% - less than 80%	2
80% - less than 100%	1
100% or more	0

The following examples demonstrate the calculation of these points.

Example 1: Applicant requests maximum federal share for all eligible phases

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Phase	Total cost	STP-SF eligible share (0.80 * [B])	Required match ([B]-[C])	Committed funds (non-federal)	Requested STP-SF ([B]-[E])	% eligible requested ([F]/[C])*100	Points
ENG1	$400,000	$0	$400,000	$400,000	$0	n/a	
ENG2	$400,000	$320,000	$80,000	$80,000	$320,000	100%	
ROW	$1,000,000	$800,000	$200,000	$200,000	$800,000	100%	
CON	$4,000,000	$3,200,000	$800,000	$800,000	$3,200,000	100%	
CE	$400,000	$320,000	$80,000	$80,000	$320,000	100%	
Total	**$6,200,000**	**$4,640,000**	**$1,560,000**	**$1,560,000**	**$4,640,000**	**100%**	**0**

Example 2: Applicant requests only construction funding

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Phase	Total cost	STP-SF eligible share (0.80 * [B])	Required match ([B]-[C])	Committed funds (non-federal)	Requested STP-SF ([B]-[E])	% eligible requested ([F]/[C])*100	Points
ENG1	$400,000	$0	$400,000	$400,000	$0	n/a	
ENG2	$400,000	$320,000	$80,000	$400,000	$0	0%	
ROW	$1,000,000	$800,000	$200,000	$1,000,000	$0	0%	
CON	$4,000,000	$3,200,000	$800,000	$800,000	$3,200,000	100%	
CE	$400,000	$320,000	$80,000	$400,000	$0	0%	
Total	**$6,200,000**	**$4,640,000**	**$1,560,000**	**$3,000,000**	**$3,200,000**	**69%**	**2**

Example 3: Applicant requests the use of TDCHs as match (note: per TDCH policy[22] TDCHs cannot be used for the ROW phase and TDCHs are not considered to be committed funds.)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Phase	Total cost	STP-SF eligible share (0.80 * [B])	Required match ([B]-[C])	Committed funds (non-federal)	Requested STP-SF (including TDCHs) ([B]-[E])	% eligible requested ([F]/[C])*100	Points
ENG1	$400,000	$0	$400,000	$400,000	$0	n/a	
ENG2	$400,000	$320,000	$80,000	$0	$400,000	125%	
ROW	$1,000,000	$800,000	$200,000	$200,000	$800,000	100%	
CON	$4,000,000	$3,200,000	$800,000	$0	$4,000,000	125%	
CE	$400,000	$320,000	$80,000	$0	$400,000	125%	
Total	**$6,200,000**	**$4,640,000**	**$1,560,000**	**$600,000**	**$5,600,000**	**121%**	**0**

Example 4: Applicant requests only construction and construction engineering funds. A portion of the committed funds are from another federal source, which requires 20% match that must be accounted for separately from the match required for the requested STP-SF.

A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	J
Phase	Total cost	STP-SF eligible share (0.80 * [B])	Committed funds (other federal)	Committed funds (matching other federal)	Requested STP-SF	Required match that must also be committed ([B]-[E]-[F]-[G])	% eligible requested ([G]/[C])*100	Points
ENG1	$400,000	$0	$320,000	$80,000	$0	$0	n/a	
ENG2	$400,000	$320,000	$320,000	$80,000	$0	$0	0%	
ROW	$1,000,000	$800,000	$800,000	$200,000	$0	$0	0%	
CON	$4,000,000	$3,200,000	$2,000,000	$500,000	$1,200,000	$300,000	38%	
CE	$400,000	$320,000	$0	$0	$320,000	$80,000	100%	
Total	**$6,200,000**	**$4,640,000**	**$3,440,000**	**$860,000**	**$1,520,000**	**$380,000**	**33%**	**4**

Document all funding requests and commitments for all phases in the Programming Information section of the eTIP application.

Transportation Impact

A project's transportation impact score measures the existing condition of the transportation asset or need for the project, the cost effectiveness of the improvement that would be made by the project, and the number of households and jobs that could benefit from the project's completion. Transportation impact is worth 50% of the total project score.

Each project will receive an existing condition or need score on a scale of 0 to 20. Each project type will have a different measure of project need, but all will be converted to a 20-point scale for the purposes of scoring. Scoring methodologies for existing condition/need are described

[22] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/CMAP_TDCH_Policy_IDOTapproved11-20-2020.pdf

below by project type. Projects with a low degree of need, as defined for each project type, will not be considered for funding or inclusion in the contingency program.

Improvement will be calculated as the cost effectiveness of the proposed improvements due to the project. Improvements will be indexed on a scale of 0 to 20 within project type. Total project cost (all phases and all fund sources) will be used to evaluate cost effectiveness. If costs are not provided by the applicant for all phases of the project, staff will apply regional averages for similar project types, derived from the TIP, to estimate costs for the missing phases. Scoring methodologies for cost effectiveness of the improvement are described below by project type. Any project with a raw improvement score of zero (before applying cost) will not be considered for funding or inclusion in the contingency program.

Household/Job Impact (all project types)

The benefits of a transportation project often cross municipal and county borders and can provide significant improvements to people who are not located in the project's immediate vicinity. For each project, CMAP uses the regional travel model to generate a travel shed of the places people come from and go to using the facility. The score in this category is calculated by scoring jobs and households separately, each with a score of 5. For jobs, the score is calculated by adding up the total number of jobs within each project's travel shed and converting the total to a score out of 5, indexed to the other submitted projects. For households, the score is calculated by determining the ratio of households within each project's travel shed to the total number of households within the project area and converting the total to a score out of 5, indexed to the other submitted projects. Project area is defined by measuring the distance from the center of the project to the centroid of the farthest zone within the travel shed, then using that distance as a radius to define all zones that make up the project area.

Select all roadway links/nodes, transit facilities, or bicycle/pedestrian facilities on which improvements will occur on the eTIP Map tab. For projects that cannot be mapped in eTIP, attach a location map on the Attachments tab in eTIP.

Bicycle and pedestrian barrier elimination

Existing Condition/Need

The existing condition score for these projects has three parts: route characteristics, market for facility, and connectivity. Market for facility and connectivity are measured the same for all types of barriers, however the route characteristics are scored differently based on the type of barrier being eliminated by the project, as summarized in the table below and described in more detail below. Projects that do not include a physical barrier of one of the three types below will not be eligible for funding.

Barrier Type	Route Characteristics (50%)		Market for Facility (25%)	Connectivity (25%)
Railroad	Number of daily freight, commuter, and passenger trains on line(s) being crossed	Proximity to rail operations bottlenecks (yard, rail-rail at grade crossings, etc.)	Population and employment density; Transit availability index; School(s) located within 1 mile of the project	Degree to which project completes the Regional Greenways and Trails Plan
Roadway	Level of traffic stress on the facility being crossed			
Water feature	Distance to nearest alternate crossing with adequate bike/ped infrastructure			

Market for facility (0 – 5 points; all barrier types)

The use of a bicycle and pedestrian facility is influenced by the characteristics of the area surrounding the facility. The market for facility score has three components, scored as follows:

Population and Employment Density (0 – 2 points)

Population and employment density in the area served by the facility is the criterion used to evaluate anticipated usage. Points are assigned as shown below by the population/employment density quintile at the project location. A map of these values is available here[23]. For projects that span multiple quintiles, the highest point value will be assigned.

Population/employment quintile	Points
Top quintile	2
Second quintile	1.5
Third quintile	1
Fourth quintile	0.5
Lowest quintile	0

Transit Availability Index (0 – 2 points)

Measuring transit availability helps ensure that a bicycle/pedestrian facility provides a realistic alternative to auto use by evaluating the potential to link bicycling and walking with transit for longer trips. Points are assigned as shown below based on the transit availability index[24] at the project location. A map of these values is available here[25]. For projects that span areas with different indices, the highest point value will be assigned.

[23] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/PopEmpDensityMap.pdf

[24] For more information about the transit availability index, see page 56 of the ON TO 2050 Indicators Appendix.

[25] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/BP-TransitAvailabilityMap.pdf

Transit Availability Index	Points
5	2
4	1.5
3	1
2	0.5
1	0

Presence of Schools (0 – 1 point)

School children are one of the largest groups of bicycle and pedestrian facility users. One point will be added to the score if there is a public or private school serving students in any grade, K-12, within a one-mile buffer around the project location.

Connectivity (0 – 5 points; all barrier types)

ON TO 2050 specifically recommends implementing the Northeastern Illinois Regional Greenways and Trails Plan[26] (RGTP). ON TO 2050 also uses miles of RGTP trails completed as an indicator of plan implementation. Thus, points for connectivity are assigned as follows:

Description	Points
Connects two existing Regional Greenways & Trails Plan sections	5
Extends an existing regional trail	4
Builds a new isolated section of a planned regional trail	3
Builds a new facility that intersects an existing regional trail	2
Removes bike/ped barrier at a location not included in the RGTP	1

Complete the All Barriers section of the Bike Ped Barrier Elimination worksheet in the application workbook (questions 7-9). Select all roadway links/nodes, transit facilities, or bicycle/pedestrian facilities on which improvements will occur on the eTIP map. For projects that cannot be mapped in eTIP, attach a location map on the Documents tab in eTIP.

Route Characteristics (0 – 10 points; methodology varies by barrier type)

The need to eliminate barriers is evaluated based on the characteristics of the barrier. The methodology for determining those characteristics varies by the barrier type.

Rail Barriers

Throughout the region motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians experience delay due to the high volume of trains and due to slow moving or stopped trains. Both of these factors contribute equally to the route characteristics score.

The average number of daily freight, commuter, and passenger trains has been evaluated for the region, and all rail crossings have been assigned a quintile based on those volumes. Points are assigned as shown below by the average daily trains quintile

[26] https://cmap.illinois.gov/focus-areas/transportation/walking-and-biking/greenways-and-trails/

at the project location. Refer to this Google Map[27] to look up the number of points assigned for each railroad crossing by clicking on the crossing location. For projects that span multiple crossings, the highest point value will be assigned. For projects at new crossing locations, use the closest existing crossing.

Average daily trains quintile	Points
Top quintile (60 to 168 daily trains)	5
Second quintile (37 to 59 daily trains)	4
Third quintile (23 to 36 daily trains)	3
Fourth quintile (5 to 22 daily trains)	2
Lowest quintile (0 to 4 daily trains)	1

Likewise, rail operations bottlenecks, such as yards and rail-rail at-grade crossings, have been identified and all rail crossings have been evaluated for proximity to those bottlenecks and assigned to quintiles. Points are assigned as shown below by the proximity to rail operations bottlenecks quintile at the project location. Refer to this Google Map[28] to look up the number of points assigned for each railroad crossing by clicking on the crossing location. For projects that span multiple crossings, the highest point value will be assigned. For projects at new crossing locations, use the closest existing crossing.

Proximity to rail operations bottlenecks quintile	Points
Top quintile (0 to 2,565 feet)	5
Second quintile (2,566 to 6,724 feet)	4
Third quintile (6,725 to 14,088 feet)	3
Fourth quintile (14,174 to 28,328 feet)	2
Lowest quintile (28,441 to 201,575 feet)	1

Complete the Railroad Barriers Only section (question 10) of the Bike Ped Barrier Elimination worksheet in the application workbook.

Road Barriers

For bicyclists and pedestrians, crossing a roadway can be both uncomfortable and dangerous, based on the characteristics of the roadway, including speed limits, lane widths, and traffic volumes. The roadway's level of traffic stress is derived from these characteristics. Level of traffic stress values range from 1.0 to 4.995. The level of traffic stress at a proposed crossing location will be calculated and points will be assigned by multiplying the assigned value by two.

[27]https://www.google.com/maps/d/viewer?mid=1u7vmfy0tDh3uu2h9ORLeb18N3DlX93k&ll=41.87469309620664%2C-88.11527&z=9

[28]https://www.google.com/maps/d/viewer?mid=1g08Z9nwNSJ6agH9QjRYc1bk4JWBGMmW4&ll=41.87470159224282%2C-88.111666&z=9.

Points = level of traffic stress value x 2

Complete the Road Barriers Only section (question 11) of the Bike Ped Barrier Elimination worksheet in the application workbook.

Water Barriers

The degree to which a body of water is a barrier to bicycle and pedestrian mobility will be determined by how far a bicyclist or pedestrian would need to travel to safely and comfortably cross the water at another location. Scores will be assigned as shown below based on the distance to the nearest alternate crossing with adequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities such as:

- The crossing is for bike/ped users only
- The crossing is a roadway with an 8' or greater sidewalk or shared-use path that is physically separated from the travel lanes on at least one side
- The crossing is a roadway with a 5' of greater physically separated sidewalk on at least one side *and* striped or protected bike lanes

Distance to nearest alternate crossing with adequate bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure	**Points**
> 2.5 miles	10
> 1 mile to 2.5 miles	7.5
> 0.5 miles to 1 mile	5
> 0.25 mile to 0.5 mile	2.5
0.25 mile or less	0

Complete the Water Barriers Only section (question 12) of the Bike Ped Barrier Elimination worksheet in the application workbook.

Improvement

Improvement scores for bicycle and pedestrian barrier elimination projects will be the cost effectiveness of the improvement to route characteristics.

The cost effectiveness of all projects within the bicycle and pedestrian barrier elimination category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

Bridge reconstruction or rehabilitation

Existing Condition/Need

The existing condition score will be the National Bridge Inventory (NBI)[29] sufficiency rating, published on IDOT's Bridge Information website[30], subtracted from the maximum rating of 100, and converted to a 20 point scale. For projects containing multiple structures, the individual

[29] https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bridge/nbi.cfm
[30] http://apps.dot.illinois.gov/bridgesinfosystem/main.aspx

structure with the lowest sufficiency rating will be deemed the "most critical structure" within the project limits. Both the existing condition and improvement score will be based on the one structure within the project limits deemed most critical.

For projects containing a structure(s) for which there is no NBI sufficiency rating, it will be the applicant's responsibility to provide a bridge inspection report. If no sufficiency rating is available, or one cannot be estimated from a provided inspection report, the project will be eligible for funding consideration, but 0 points will be awarded in this category. Structures with a sufficiency rating greater than 80 will not be eligible for funding. For projects that include multiple structures, the average sufficiency rating will be used to determine eligibility.

Enter the NBI structure number(s) in the location information section of the eTIP application, select the structure(s) on the eTIP map, and provide the NBI structure number(s) in the Structure Information and Project Scope section (question 5) of the Bridge Projects worksheet in the application workbook.

Improvement

The improvement score will be based on the potential impact of the project scope on the deck, superstructure, and substructure condition ratings, and the bridge posting code. Additional improvement points will be awarded if the project corrects insufficient lane widths or brings traffic safety features (bridge railings, transitions, approach guardrail, and/or bridge guardrail ends) up to currently acceptable standards. All scoring within this category will be based on NBI data published on FHWA's Long-Term Bridge Performance (LTBP) Program Infobridge[31] web portal, unless noted otherwise below.

The raw improvement score will be the sum of the deck improvement, superstructure improvement, substructure improvement, improvement to bridge load posting, improvement to insufficient lane width, and improvement to safety features scores.

When calculating improvement scores for structural elements (deck, superstructure and substructure), the following assumptions are made:

- Full replacement of the structure or a component(s) of the structure results in maximum condition rating for the replaced component(s)
- Partial replacement or rehabilitation of a component(s) results in a "satisfactory" rating for the replaced/rehabbed component(s).
- Repairs to a component not being replaced or rehabbed result in a one category improvement in the component's rating
- The region's historic and/or moveable bridges face significant restrictions to full replacement

[31] https://infobridge.fhwa.dot.gov

Based on these assumptions, the structural elements will be scored as follows:

Deck improvement (0 – 9 points)

Scope of work	**Points**
Full deck replacement	9 – (current deck condition rating*)
Partial deck replacement or deck rehabilitation	6 – (current deck condition rating*)
Deck repair (including join sealing/repairs)	1 point

*Current deck condition rating is NBI Item 58

Superstructure improvement (0 – 9 points)

Scope of work	**Points**
Full superstructure replacement	9 – (current superstructure condition rating*)
Partial superstructure replacement or superstructure rehabilitation (including girders, stringers, trusses, arches, pin & hangers, etc.)	6 – (current superstructure condition rating*)

*Current superstructure condition rating is NBI Item 59

Substructure improvement (0 – 9 points)

Scope of work	**Points**
Full substructure replacement	9 – (current substructure condition rating*)
Partial substructure replacement or substructure rehabilitation (including abutments, piers, columns, caps, piles, walls, footings, etc.)	6 – (current substructure condition rating*)

*Current substructure condition rating is NBI Item 60

If the critical structure being evaluated for improvement is a culvert, Culvert Condition (NBI Item 62) will be used in place of the Deck, Superstructure, and Substructure Conditions.

Full replacement of historic and/or movable structures may not be feasible and/or may be cost prohibitive due in part to State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) requirements, preventing these structures from achieving a condition rating of "9". Therefore, a multiplier of 1.5 will be applied to the element improvement score(s) for partial replacement or rehabilitation of that element(s) if the bridge is historic and/or movable, as defined below.

Historical Significance (NBI Item 37):

Code	**Value**	**Application of multiplier**
1	On National Register	Yes
2	National Register Eligible	Yes
3	May be National Register Eligible	TBD, pending review of IDOT Bridge Information (see below)
4	Unknown Historical Significance	TBD, pending review of IDOT Bridge Information (see below)
5	Not National Register Eligible	No

Within the IDOT Bridge Information data, historical significance is further stratified, therefore for structures with a code of 3 or 4 in the NBI database, if the "Historical Significance" is indicated as "Yes" within the IDOT Bridge Information data the multiplier will be applied.

Structure Type (NBI Item 43B):
If the structure type code is 15 (Movable – Lift), 16 (Movable – Bascule), or 17 (Movable – Swing), the multiplier will be applied.

If a structure is both historic and movable, only one multiplier will be applied.

When calculating improvement scores for load posting improvements, the following assumptions are made:

- Full replacement results in the removal of any existing load postings
- Partial replacement or rehabilitation may result in additional load capacity; the project sponsor must provide an estimate of the expected new load rating that will result from the project.

Based on these assumptions, the load posting improvements will be scored as follows:

Improvement to bridge posting (0 – 5 points)

Scope of work	**Points**
Full replacement	5 – (current bridge posting code*)
Partial replacement or rehabilitation of deck, superstructure, substructure, and/or bearings and/or installation of temporary or permanent strengthening measures	(bridge positing code based on estimated load rating) – (current bridge posting code)

*Current bridge posting code is NBI Item 70

<u>Improvement to insufficient lane width (0 – 1 point)</u>
Up to 1 additional point will be added to the raw improvement score if the average lane width prior to the project is less than shown below, based on the number of lanes carried and if the project replaces or widens the deck or the entire structure and/or removes a lane(s) in order to exceed the minimum. The point will also be awarded if a design exception for the insufficient lane width is documented.

# of lanes	**Average width***
1	14 ft
2	16 ft
3	15 ft
4	14 ft
5+	12 ft

The average lane width will be calculated by dividing the Lanes on Structure (NBI Item 28A) by the Bridge Roadway Width Curb to Curb (NBI Item 51).

Improvement to safety features (0 – 2 points)

Up to 2 additional points will be added to the raw improvement score if any of the following safety features are currently rated "0", 0.5 points will be awarded for each feature that will be brought up to standard by the project, or for each feature for which a design exception is documented:

- Bridge railings (NBI Item 36A)
- Transitions (NBI Item 36B)
- Approach guardrail (NBI Item 36C)
- Bridge guardrail ends (NBI Item 36D)

The total raw improvement score will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness. The cost effectiveness of all projects within the category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

Complete the Structure Information and Project Scope section (questions 6 – 9) of the Bridge Projects worksheet in the application workbook.

Bus speed improvements

Existing Condition/Need

The existing condition score will measure the current on-time performance of bus routes being improved as well as the difference between bus travel time and auto travel time on the road(s) being improved. Both factors are worth 50% of the score.

On-time performance scores will be calculated by averaging the applicant-provided on-time performance for all bus routes affected by the project, subtracting that value from the maximum on-time performance of 100%, and scaling to 10 points by comparing to all other applications in the category.

Bus travel time and auto travel time will be estimated from a review of schedules and travel time estimates from Google Maps™. The percent difference between the estimates will be calculated and scaled to 10 points by comparing to all other applications in the category.

The existing condition score will be the sum of the two scaled scores. Projects with an on-time percentage of 90% or higher or bus travel times that are the same as auto travel times will not be eligible for funding.

Complete the Service (CMAQ) or Bus Speed (STP) Improvement Projects section (questions 4-6) of the Transit Projects worksheet in the application workbook and select all roadway links on which improvements will occur on the eTIP map.

Improvement
The anticipated increase in on-time performance of bus routes being improved and the anticipated change in the bus-auto travel time differential will be used to calculate raw improvement scores. Both factors are worth 50% of the raw score. The total raw improvement score will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness. The cost effectiveness of all projects within the category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

Complete the Service (CMAQ) or Bus Speed (STP) Improvement Projects section (questions 7-8) of the Transit Projects worksheet in the application workbook and select all roadway links on which improvements will occur on the eTIP map.

Corridor/small area safety improvements

Existing Condition/Need
In 2025 the counties of Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, and Will adopted county-wide Safety Actions Plans (SAPs), available on CMAP's Safe Travel for All website[32]. The SAPs identify High Injury Networks for each county and act as roadmaps for improving traffic safety utilizing the FHWA Safe System Approach to reduce the risk of death and serious injury on roadways throughout the region. The need score for safety projects consists of two parts: location on the High Injury Network and the presence of systemic risk factors identified in the SAPs.

HIN Score (0 – 5 points)
Projects located on the appropriate county's High Injury Network (HIN) will receive 5 points. Projects not located on the HIN will receive 0 points.

Systemic Risk Factors Score (0 – 15 points)
Projects will receive up to 15 points based on the presence of common systemic risk factors identified in the relevant county SAP and how those risk factors will be addressed.

Goal: Project is in a location that aligns with a systemic risk typology identified in the relevant county Safety Action Plan (0 – 5 points)

Criteria	**Points**
Project location matches all of the characteristics of a high risk typology.	5
Project location matches most of the characteristics of a high risk typology.	3
Project location matches a few of the characteristics of a high risk typology.	2
Project location does not match the characteristics of a high risk typology.	0

[32] https://engage.cmap.illinois.gov/hub-page/safetravelforall

Goal: The project sponsor includes relevant source information (SAP name & page number) for the systemic typology alignment (0 – 5 points)

Criteria	Points
Yes - Relevant SAP name and page number were provided.	5
No - The sponsor was missing all or some of the information requested to support the systemic risk identification.	0

Goal: The sponsor identifies elements of the project that will address, and not worsen, identified risk factors (0 – 5 points)

Criteria	Points
Sponsor identifies scope element(s) that directly address all identified risk factors for the project location.	5
Sponsor identifies scope element(s) that directly address most identified risk factors for the project location.	3
Sponsor identifies scope element(s) that directly address a few identified risk factors for the project location.	2
Sponsor does not identify scope elements that address identified risk factors for the project location.	0

Select all roadway links on which improvements will occur on the eTIP map and complete the High Injury Network and Systemic Risk Alignment section (questions 3-6) of the Safety Projects worksheet in the application workbook.

Improvement

The FHWA's Safe System Design Hierarchy[33] assigns tier values to countermeasures based on their impact to the roadway system and their overall potential to reduce serious injuries and fatalities. Tier 1 countermeasures remove severe conflicts; Tier 2 measures reduce vehicle speeds/kinetic energy; Tier 3 treatments help manage conflicts in time; Tier 4 elements increase user awareness and attentiveness.

Raw improvement scores will be based on the total value of all countermeasures included in the project scope. No score will be given for in-kind replacement of existing countermeasures. Removal of countermeasures that currently exist at the project location will subtract from the total raw improvement score. There is no upper limit to the total raw improvement score.

[33] https://highways.dot.gov/sites/fhwa.dot.gov/files/2024-01/Safe_System_Roadway_Design_Hierarchy.pdf

Tier	Points (+/-)
Tier 1	5
Tier 2	4
Tier 3	3
Tier 4	1

The total raw scores will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness. The cost effectiveness of all projects within the corridor/small area safety category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

Complete the Countermeasures (All Projects) section (questions 7) of the Safety worksheet in the application workbook.

Rail-Highway grade crossing improvements

Existing Condition/Need

The existing condition score is based on the project's score from the 2019 Grade Crossing Prioritization. For projects involving multiple crossings, the "most critical crossing" will be identified and will be used for calculating both the existing condition and improvement score for the project. 75% of the score (15 points) is based on the most critical crossing's rank compared to the 1437 crossings evaluated in the region. Crossings identified as Priority Grade Crossings[34] will receive 5 additional points.

For projects containing a crossing that was not included in the 2019 analysis, it will be the applicant's responsibility to provide the data necessary to complete an evaluation. If no analysis can be completed due to lack of data, 0 points will be awarded in this category. Because the data used for this scoring is relative, there is no threshold to meet to be eligible for funding.

Improvement

The improvement to the delay and safety components of the Grade Crossing Screening Level 2 evaluation as a result of the project determines the project's raw improvement score. These components are equally weighted for a new grade-separated crossing. For projects improving, but not separating crossings, if the project involves improvements to train movements, the delay component will be used; If the project involves improvements to the crossing (gates, signals, etc.), the safety component will be used.

The raw scores will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness. The cost effectiveness of all projects within the highway-rail grade crossing category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

[34] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/PriorityGradeCrossings_2019.pdf

Complete the Project Location and Scope section (question 7) of the Rail-Hwy Crossings worksheet in the application workbook and select the crossing(s) on the eTIP map.

Road expansions

Existing Condition/Need

The road expansion need score incorporates information about pavement condition, safety, reliability, and mobility. Weights for these factors will be as follows:

Factor	Weight
Condition	15%
Mobility	30%
Reliability	30%
Safety	25%

Pavement condition is the length weighted average of either the road's Condition Rating Score (CRS) or international roughness index (IRI), depending on data availability, scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

Mobility is the length weighted average of the travel time index (the ratio of peak period travel time to free flow travel time) and the number of at least lightly congested hours of traffic per weekday, scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

Reliability is measured by the length-weighted average of the planning time index (95th percentile travel time divided by free flow travel time), scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

The safety score will be calculated using the same methodology used to calculate need for Corridor/Small Area Safety projects, scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

The established weights are applied to the individual component scores, and those scores are summed to obtain a raw need score, which is scaled to 20 points. Projects with "Little" or "Light" congestion, and 1.50 or fewer congested hours, and a PTI of "Generally Reliable" will not be eligible for funding.

Select all roadway links on which improvements will occur on the eTIP map and complete the Project and Segment Characteristics section (questions 9-11) of the Road Projects worksheet in the application workbook

Improvement

Ten of the raw improvement points for road expansions will come from improvements to the mobility, calculated by subtracting the mobility need score from 100, and then scaling to 10 points. Projects can also receive a maximum of ten additional raw improvement points if the

project has any of the following characteristics or helps implement any of the following as part of a larger program:

Improvement	Points
Systematic Improvements	
Integrated Corridor Management	+ 5
Work zone management (traveler information improvements)	+ 5
Truck travel information systems	+ 4
Strategies to improve transit on-time performance	+ 4
Ramp metering	+ 4
Road weather management systems	+ 2
Special event management	+ 3
Traffic signal interconnect	+ 4
Adaptive signal control	+ 5
Incident Detection:	
Traffic Management Center (TMC) to TMC Communications	+ 4
Computer-aided dispatch (911 call center) to (TMC) communications	+ 4
Extension or improvement of real-time traffic surveillance on regional expressways and tollways, including video and detectors	+ 3
Integration of real-time probe data into incident detection procedures	+ 3
Establishment of detector health program	+ 3
Incident Response:	
Expansion of response operations capabilities (e.g., minutemen)	+ 5
Dispatch improvements, including center-to-operator and supervisor-to-operator communications (including supervisor-bus communications)	+ 4
Response equipment (e.g., minuteman vehicles)	+ 4
Incident Recovery:	
Expediting coroner's/medical examiner's accident investigation process	+ 5
Dynamic message signs (DMS, multiple, including arterial DMS)	+ 3
Incident-responsive ramp meters	+ 3
Speed Management Systems	+ 2
On-scene communication, coordination, and cooperation	+ 2
Development and improvement of highway closure detour routes	+ 2

The raw scores will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness. The cost effectiveness of all projects within the road expansion category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

Complete the Project Scope section (question 6), Systematic Improvements section (question 12), and Safety Improvements section (question 13) of the Road Projects worksheet, and if applicable, the Safety worksheet (questions 1-7) in the application workbook.

Road reconstructions

Existing Condition/Need

The road reconstruction need score incorporates information about pavement condition, safety, reliability, and mobility. Weights for these factors will be as follows:

Factor	Weight
Condition	50%
Mobility	10%
Reliability	20%
Safety	20%

Pavement condition is the length weighted average of either the road's Condition Rating Score (CRS) or international roughness index (IRI), depending on data availability, scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

Mobility is the length weighted average of the travel time index (the ratio of peak period travel time to free flow travel time) and the number of at least lightly congested hours of traffic per weekday, scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

Reliability is measured by the length-weighted average of the planning time index (95th percentile travel time divided by free flow travel time), scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

The safety score will be calculated using the same methodology used to calculate need for Corridor/Small Area Safety projects, scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

The established weights are applied to the individual component scores, and those scores are summed to obtain a raw need score, which is scaled to 20 points. Projects with a pavement condition of "Excellent" (CRS) or "Good" (CRS or IRI) will not be eligible for funding.

Select all roadway links on which improvements will occur on the eTIP map and complete the Project and Segment Characteristics section (questions 9-11) of the Road Projects worksheet in the application workbook

---

Improvement

The improvement to the condition, calculated as 100 – the raw condition score, will be scaled to 10 points. Projects can also receive a maximum of ten additional raw improvement points if the project has any of the following characteristics or helps implement any of the following as part of a larger program:

Improvement	Score
Systematic Improvements	
Integrated Corridor Management	+ 5
Work zone management (traveler information improvements)	+ 5

Improvement	Score
Truck travel information systems	+ 4
Strategies to improve transit on-time performance	+ 4
Ramp metering	+ 4
Road weather management systems	+ 2
Special event management	+ 3
Traffic signal interconnect	+ 4
Adaptive signal control	+ 5
Incident Detection:	
Traffic Management Center (TMC) to TMC Communications	+ 4
Computer-aided dispatch (911 call center) to (TMC) communications	+ 4
Extension or improvement of real-time traffic surveillance on regional expressways and tollways, including video and detectors	+ 3
Integration of real-time probe data into incident detection procedures	+ 3
Establishment of detector health program	+ 3
Incident Response:	
Expansion of response operations capabilities (e.g., minutemen)	+ 5
Dispatch improvements, including center-to-operator and supervisor-to-operator communications (including supervisor-bus communications)	+ 4
Response equipment (e.g., minuteman vehicles)	+ 4
Incident Recovery:	
Expediting coroner's/medical examiner's accident investigation process	+ 5
Dynamic message signs (DMS, multiple, including arterial DMS)	+ 3
Incident-responsive ramp meters	+ 3
Speed Management Systems	+ 2
On-scene communication, coordination, and cooperation	+ 2
Development and improvement of highway closure detour routes	+ 2

The raw scores will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness. The cost effectiveness of all projects within the road reconstruction category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

Complete the Project Scope section (question 6), Systematic Improvements section (question 12), and Safety Improvements section (question 13) of the Road Projects worksheet, and if applicable the Safety worksheet (questions 1-7) in the application workbook.

Transit station, yard, or terminal improvements

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

Existing Condition/Need

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

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

For project scopes which include only reconstruction/rehab of a station, with no bike/ped access changes, the existing condition score will be the cost-weighted average Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM)[35] condition rating scale of station components, subtracted from the maximum value of 5, and scaled from a 5-point scale to a 20-point scale. Projects with an average TERM score of "Good" or "Excellent" will not be eligible for funding.

[35] https://www.transit.dot.gov/TAM/TERMLite

Complete the Transit Station, Yard or Terminal Improvement Projects, Asset Condition Component section (question 18) of the Transit Projects worksheet in the application workbook and select the station(s) on the eTIP map. For projects that cannot be mapped in eTIP, attach a location map on the Documents tab in eTIP.

For project scopes which include only bike/ped access improvements, with no station improvements, 75% of the score will be the percentage of roads in the station area with no sidewalk, scaled to 15 points. Station area is defined as within ½ mile of the station. The percentage will be determined from CMAP's Sidewalk Inventory[36] data. Data for all CTA and Metra rail stations and select CTA and Pace bus terminals and transfer points is summarized here[37]. Locations not included in the summary will be evaluated individually if an application is received. An additional 5 points (25% of the need score) will be awarded if the station does not have any bicycle parking infrastructure at the station or a bike-sharing dock(s) within the station area.

Complete the Transit Station, Yard or Terminal Improvement Projects, Bike/Ped Access Component section (question 19) of the Transit Projects worksheet in the application workbook and select the station(s) and any roadway links that will have sidewalks added, replaced, or repaired, on the eTIP map. For projects that cannot be mapped in eTIP, attach a location map on the Documents tab in eTIP.

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

Complete the Transit Station, Yard or Terminal Improvement Projects, Asset Condition Component section (question 18) and Bike/Ped Access Component section (question 19) of the Transit Projects worksheet in the application workbook and select the station(s) and any roadway links that will have sidewalks added, replaced, or repaired, on the eTIP map. For projects that cannot be mapped in eTIP, attach a location map on the Documents tab in eTIP.

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

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

[36] https://cmapgis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=3f4967eb43614929aad95f9358a189e5
[37] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/STP-SF-Transit-Station-Sidewalks-App-Resource.xlsx

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

If the project scope does not address the compliance deficiencies, a score of 0 will be assigned for this criterion. Projects with an average TERM score of "Good" or "Excellent" will not be eligible for funding.

Complete the Transit Station, Yard or Terminal Improvement Projects, Asset Condition section (question 18), Compliance Component section (questions 21 – 23), and Efficiency Component section (questions 24-25) of the Transit Projects worksheet in the application workbook and select the yard or terminal on the eTIP map. For projects that cannot be mapped in eTIP, attach a location map on the Documents tab in eTIP.

Improvement

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

Project Scope	Asset Condition	Bike/Ped Access	Efficiency
Transit station reconstruction/ rehab only	The difference in cost-weighted average TERM score of station components before and after project	N/A	N/A
Bike/ped access to transit station only	N/A	75% Percentage of new plus improved sidewalk within station area 25% Bicycle parking infrastructure added	N/A

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

For project scopes which only include reconstruction/rehab of a station, with no bike/ped access changes, the raw improvement score will be the difference in cost-weighted average Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM)[38] condition rating scale of station components before and after the project, scaled to 20 points. The raw scores will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness.

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

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

For project scopes which include rehab/improvement or relocation of a rail yard or terminal, 75% of the raw improvement score will be for improvements to asset condition, defined as the

[38] https://www.transit.dot.gov/TAM/TERMLite

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

Complete the Transit Station, Yard, or Terminal Improvement section (questions 18-25, as applicable for the project scope) of the Transit Projects worksheet in the application workbook.

Truck route improvements

Existing Condition/Need

The truck route existing conditions score incorporates information about pavement condition, safety, reliability, mobility, truck volumes, and geometric deficiencies of the roadway(s) that currently makes up the truck route. These factors are weighted as follows:

Factor	Weight
Condition	10%
Safety	10%
Reliability	20%
Mobility	20%
Truck volume	20%
Geometric deficiencies	20%

Pavement condition is the length weighted average of either the road's Condition Rating Score (CRS) or international roughness index (IRI), depending on data availability, scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

Mobility is the length weighted average of the travel time index (the ratio of peak period travel time to free flow travel time) and the number of at least lightly congested hours of traffic per weekday, scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

Reliability is measured by the length-weighted average of the planning time index (95th percentile travel time divided by free flow travel time), scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

The safety score will be calculated using the same methodology used to calculate need for Corridor/Small Area Safety projects, scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

Truck volume is the length weighted average of the number of trucks (calculated by multiplying AADT by the % trucks) within the project corridor(s), scaled to a value from 0 to 100.

Geometric deficiencies can impede the safe and efficient movement of trucks. Points will be awarded as follows for geometric deficiencies within the project limits:

Deficiency	**Points**
Presence of a weight-restricted bridge(s) within project limits	1
Presence of vertical clearance restrictions within project limits	1
% of project length with insufficient* outer lane width for the design vehicle	Up to 1 point
% of intersections within project limits with insufficient* turn radii and/or insufficient* queue storage for the design vehicle	Up to 1 point

The established weights are applied to the condition, safety, reliability, mobility, and truck volume component scores and those scores are summed with the geometric deficiencies score to obtain a raw need score, which is scaled to 20 points. Projects with no geometric deficiencies and truck volumes less than 2% will not be eligible for funding.

Complete the Project and Segment Characteristics section (questions 7-14) of the Truck Routes worksheet in the application workbook and select all roadway links on which improvements will occur on the eTIP map. If the project is re-routing trucks from one location to another, map the new location only in eTIP and attach a map/description of the old location.

Improvement

Improvement to mobility, reduction of geometric deficiencies, inclusion of systematic improvements, and mitigation of negative impacts of trucks will all contribute equally to the improvement score. Improvements can be realized by improving the current truck route corridor or by improving a nearby corridor and designating that improved corridor as a replacement for the current truck route.

The improvement to mobility, calculated as 100 – the raw mobility score, will be scaled to 5 points.

Improvement to geometric deficiencies will be scored as follows, for a total of up to 5 points.

Improvement	**Points**
Removal or avoidance of bridge weight limits within the project limits	1
Removal or avoidance of vertical clearance restrictions within project limits	1
Reduction of the % of project length with insufficient outer lane width for the design vehicle	Up to 1 point

Improvement	Points
Reduction of the % of intersections within project limits with insufficient turn radii for the design vehicle	Up to 1 point
Reduction of the % of intersections within project limits with insufficient queue storage for the design vehicle	Up to 1 point

Additional points, up to a maximum of five points, will be added for the inclusion of the following systematic improvements.

Improvement	Points
Truck travel information systems	+ 5
Adaptive signal control	+ 4
Integrated corridor management	+ 3
Traffic signal interconnect	+ 3
Dynamic message signs	+ 2
Truck route signing	+ 1

Additional points, up to a maximum of five points, will be added for the following actions that can mitigate the negative impacts of truck traffic.

Mitigation Strategy	Points
Project reroutes trucks away from sensitive land uses*	+ 5
Project includes electrification infrastructure	+ 4
Project includes noise mitigation (sound walls, berms)	+ 3
Presence of off-street freight loading zones within project limits	+ 3
Loading/delivery time restrictions are imposed in project area	+ 2

*Sensitive land uses may include, but are not limited to, hospitals, cemeteries, schools, parks, low income communities, downtown areas, agricultural areas, natural areas, etc. Applicants will be required to provide a narrative description of land uses surrounding the project location that could be considered sensitive.

The raw scores will be divided by the total project cost to determine cost effectiveness. The cost effectiveness of all projects within the road reconstruction category will be indexed to a scale of 0-20.

Complete the Project and Segment Characteristics section (questions 7-14), the Systematic Improvements section (question 15), and the Mitigation of Negative Impacts section (question 16) of the Truck Routes worksheet in the application workbook.

Planning Factors

In addition to the transportation benefits and readiness scores explained above, all projects are evaluated on their support for regional priorities. The intent of the planning factors is to set projects up for success by encouraging supportive policies and to account for additional project

benefits not captured through the transportation impact analysis. Planning factors are 30% of the total project score.

There are five planning factors: Inclusive Growth, Universal Mobility, Resilience, Freight, and Transit Supportive Density. The application of these planning factors varies by project category as summarized in the table below.

Project Type	Maximum Points by Planning Factor					
	Inclusive Growth	Universal Mobility	Resilience	Freight	Transit supportive density	Total
Bicycle/Pedestrian Barrier Elimination	15	10	5	0	0	30
Bridge Rehab or Reconstruction	15	10	0	5	0	30
Bus Speed Improvements	15	5	0	0	10	30
Corridor/Small Area Safety Improvements	15	10	0	5	0	30
Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Improvements	15	10	5	0	0	30
Road Expansion	15	5	5	5	0	30
Road Reconstruction	15	5	5	5	0	30
Transit Station, Yard, and Terminal Improvements	15	0	5	0	10	30
Truck Route Improvements	15	10	5	0	0	30

Inclusive growth

Long-term regional prosperity requires economic opportunity for all residents and communities. Inclusive Growth[39], one of the ON TO 2050 plan principles, focuses on strategies, including transportation investments, that can increase access to opportunity for low income residents and people of color, and help the region to be stronger and more successful economically.

All projects are evaluated based on the percent of travelers using a facility that are people of color below the poverty line. Projects can receive a maximum of 15 points, which are awarded as shown below. For projects spanning multiple roadway or transit segments, the highest point value among those segments will be assigned.

[39] https://cmap.illinois.gov/regional-plan/principles/

Percent of facility users* that are people of color and under poverty line	Points
25% or more	15
20% to < 25%	12
15% to < 20%	9
10% to < 15%	6
5% to < 10%	3
Less than 5%	0

* For bicycle/pedestrian barrier elimination projects, points are based on the percent of the population within a 1-mile buffer area of the project that are people of color and under the poverty line.

Select all roadway links/nodes, transit facilities, or bicycle/pedestrian facilities on which improvements will occur on the eTIP map. For projects that cannot be mapped in eTIP, attach a location map on the Documents tab in eTIP.

Universal mobility

ON TO 2050 includes recommendations to support development of compact, walkable communities[40] improving access to public rights of way for pedestrians, people on bikes, and people with disabilities is a key strategy to advance this priority. Universal Mobility (UM) promotes projects that enhance accessible mobility for all users while encouraging implementation of traditional complete streets elements. The universal mobility planning factor awards points to projects based on implementation of design elements that improve accessibility and mobility.

Depending on the design element included in the project, a multiplier will be applied to the quantity of the element (e.g. number of accessible bus boarding pads), the linear mileage of the improvement (e.g. miles of multi-use path), or a binary yes (1) / no (0) based on overall project impact (e.g. implements speed reduction).
The eligible project activities include:

Project Activity/Design Element	Measurement Type	Multiplier
Completes bike/ped gap to key destination (urban districts)	quantity	0.1
Completes bike/ped gap to key destination (not urban districts)	quantity	0.2
Connects accessible transit boarding pads to sidewalk network	quantity	0.5
Constructs curb/barrier protected or elevated bike lane	linear	0.4
Constructs multi-use path	linear	0.5
Constructs one lane roundabout/mini roundabout with multimodal facilities	quantity	0.5

[40] https://cmap.illinois.gov/regional-plan/goals/recommendation/support-development-of-compact-walkable-communities/

Project Activity/Design Element	Measurement Type	Multiplier
Constructs new sidewalks (4’) on both sides of the road	linear	0.5
Constructs new sidewalks (4’) on one side of the road	linear	0.3
Implements accessible pedestrian signals (APS)	quantity	0.3
Implements protected intersection	quantity	0.3
Implements marked/striped bike lane (both sides)	linear	0.3
Implements speed reduction in locations with activity generators (essential services, medical, grocery, school, etc.)	yes/no	0.4
Installs accessible raised crossings, medians, bump-outs, and/or refuge islands	quantity	0.5
Installs new or upgraded detached sidewalks (minimum 3' separation from traffic)	linear	0.5
Installs new signalized crossing for people walking, rolling, or biking (traffic signal or HAWK)	quantity	0.5
Installs paint buffered or flex delineator protected bike lane	linear	0.4
Installs pedestrian-scale lighting	yes/no	0.1
Installs RRFB for people walking, rolling, or biking	quantity	0.3
Provides grade separation at railroad crossings for people walking, rolling, or biking	yes/no	0.5
Reduces or combines access points/driveways	yes/no	0.5
Upgrades bus shelters/bus pads to be accessible	yes/no	0.5
Widens shoulder or adds space to create a 4' shoulder (natural/agriculture areas only)	linear	0.5
Widens sidewalks beyond PROWAG requirements (more than 4’)	linear	0.5
Installs detectable warning surfaces/directional indicators leading to a crosswalk	yes/no	0.1
Other - write-ins subject to CMAP approval	TBD	TBD

Projects will receive these points for adding/replacing UM elements or providing maintenance/improvements to existing UM elements. No points will be awarded removing UM elements. The total points for inclusion of the UM elements will be normalized by project cost and scaled according to the maximum UM points for each project type, as shown below:

Project type(s)	Maximum universal mobility points
Bicycle/pedestrian barrier elimination, Bridge rehab/reconstruction; Corridor/small area safety improvements; Highway-rail grade crossing improvements; Truck route improvements	10
Bus speed improvements; Road expansion; Road reconstruction	5

Resilience

Improving the resilience of the transportation network to weather events and climate change, one of ON TO 2050's recommendations[41], will help reduce impacts from flooding, extreme heat, and other hazards while also providing other benefits like improving water and air quality.

Project type(s)	**Maximum resilience points**
Bicycle/pedestrian barrier elimination; Highway-rail grade crossing improvements; Road expansion; Road reconstruction; Transit station, yard, or terminal improvements; Truck route improvements	5

Bridge rehab/reconstruction, bus speed improvements, and corridor/small area safety improvement projects are ineligible to receive resilience points.

Projects in the eligible categories above will be reviewed for eligible resilience elements[42] found in the table below. If a project does not feature at least one resilience element, it will receive a score of zero. Projects that feature one or more resilience elements will then be evaluated for need and project impact. The resilience need score will be weighted 60 percent and resilience impact will be 40 percent to make up the final score for the resilience planning factor that will be scaled to the maximum of 5 resilience planning factor points.

Resilience elements*	**Hazard**
Structural	
Elevate bridges	Flooding
Elevate or relocate roadways	Flooding
Install flood walls to prevent flooding of roadway	Flooding
Install geotextiles on embankments	Flooding
Improve or deepen drainage ditches	Flooding
Upgrade or install culverts and other stormwater management infrastructure	Flooding
Implement flood protection measures for transit tunnels	Flooding
Upgrade rail infrastructure, particularly interlockings	Extreme heat

[41] https://cmap.illinois.gov/regional-plan/goals/recommendation/improve-resilience-of-the-transportation-network-to-weather-events-and-climate-change/

[42] For more information on resilience elements, see page 28 of CMAP's Transportation Resilience Improvement Plan: https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/Transportation-Resilience-Improvement-Plan-2026.pdf.

Resilience elements*	Hazard
Install shade structures and shelters along sidewalks and at outdoor transit stops	Extreme heat
Use cool pavement technologies	Extreme heat
Nature-based**	
Manage streams to reduce erosion and overtopping	Flooding
Implement natural revetments	Flooding
Reconnect river floodplains to increase flood storage	Flooding
Use flood buyouts in flood-prone areas	Flooding
Create a natural high-flow bypass	Flooding
Restore, enhance, and create wetlands	Flooding
Install stormwater detention facilities	Flooding
Install swales and infiltration practices (e.g., bump-outs)	Flooding
Use permeable pavements and grass medians	Flooding
Recycle greywater on site	Flooding
Provide shade trees along trails, sidewalks, and at transit stops	Extreme heat

*Other elements, including elements to reduce impacts from other hazards and add redundancy, may be considered on a case-by-case basis.
**Nature-based solutions include green infrastructure practices.
Source: CMAP, Transportation Resilience Improvement Plan, 2026.

Resilience need will be determined based on the highest asset exposure score within the project boundaries, using the Transportation Resilience Improvement Plan (TRIP) vulnerability assessment. Exposure represents the degree to which an asset may be affected by a given hazard. Project sponsors can refer to the TRIP Risk-based Vulnerability Assessment Data Viewer[43] to identify exposure scores for flooding (all assets) and extreme heat (CTA/Metra rail and train stations, CTA/Pace bus stations). Project sponsors can provide their own climate hazard exposure information to be considered where data does not exist or if the TRIP flood risk scores deviate from known flood events.

Resilience need scoring

TRIP exposure score*	Resilience need score
3	5
2.5	4
2	3
1.5	2
1	1
Not exposed	0

*Identified using the TRIP Data Viewer

[43] TRIP Risk-based Vulnerability Assessment Data Viewer: https://cmapgis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?webmap=08a4d59480b14660ad9f375306677ee9

Project impact will be assessed based on the project's ability to mitigate the need and/or build additional resilience and co-benefits. Scoring project impact is based on four of the eight criteria used to score impact for TRIP's priority project list. These criteria include risk mitigation, green/gray infrastructure, modernization, and broader environmental benefits.

Each criterion will be rated on a scale of 1 (lowest impact) to 5 (highest impact). The final impact score will be calculated by averaging the scores across each criterion. When a project that is on the TRIP priority project list is submitted for the STP Shared Fund program, CMAP will use the previously calculated scores for the selected scoring criteria shown in the impact scoring criteria table below.

Impact scoring criteria

Criterion	Definition
Risk mitigation	To what extent does the project protect transportation assets from extreme weather events and climate hazards?
Modernization	Does the project modernize assets to reflect or go beyond standard design requirements to build resilience and future climate adaptation?
Nature-based/structural solutions	How well does the project integrate nature-based and structural solutions for long-term resilience?
Broader environmental benefits	Does the project provide additional co-benefits beyond resilience, such as improvements in air quality, water quality, or ecosystem health?

For more information and examples of resilience improvements in transportation projects, see the Resilience strategies section on page 28 of the Transportation Resilience Improvement Plan.

Complete the Resilience Planning Factor section on the Bike Ped Barrier Elimination (questions 3-5), Rail-Hwy Crossings (questions 4-6), Road Projects (questions 16-18), Transit Projects (questions 30-32), or Truck Routes (questions 4-6) worksheet(s) of the application workbook, as appropriate for the application's project type(s).

Freight movement

Maintaining the region's status as North America's Freight hub[44] is one of the recommendations of ON TO 2050. While some of the shared fund priority project types are specifically aimed at improving freight movement in the region (rail-highway grade crossings, and truck route improvements), other project types can also have substantial freight benefits.

[44] https://cmap.illinois.gov/regional-plan/goals/recommendation/maintain-the-regions-status-as-north-americas-freight-hub/

Eligible projects will receive 3 points if they are located on a regional freight network[45], including the National Highway Freight Network, a designated Class I or Class II truck route, or a National Highway System Intermodal Freight Connector.

Eligible projects will also receive points if the sponsor or local jurisdiction (municipality, township, and/or county) in which they are located has adopted any of the below policies or procedures to improve truck routing and permitting and/or delivery management strategies to reduce negative impacts of freight. Points are cumulative, up to a maximum of 2 points.

Freight policy or procedure	**Points**
Sponsor/local jurisdiction has an online truck permitting program	+ 1
Sponsor/local jurisdiction has one or more delivery management policies	+ 1
Sponsor has completed/participated in a truck routing study	+ 1
Sponsor has completed a systematic review of truck restrictions within their jurisdiction	+ 1
The project is identified in a local, county, or regional freight mobility plan	+ 1

Projects in the categories below are eligible to receive these points.

Project type(s)	**Maximum freight policy points**	**Maximum freight network points**
Bridge rehab/reconstruction; Corridor/small area safety improvements; Road expansion; Road reconstruction	2	3

Bicycle/pedestrian barrier elimination, bus speed improvements, highway-rail grade crossing improvements, transit station, yard, or terminal improvements, and truck route improvements projects are not eligible to receive freight planning factor points.

Complete the Freight Planning Factor section on the Bridge Projects (question 4), Road Projects (question 15), or Safety (question 9) worksheet(s) of the application workbook, as appropriate for the application's project type(s).

Transit-supportive land use

ON TO 2050 includes the recommendation to make transit more competitive[46]. Transit agencies cannot sustain fast, frequent, reliable service without accompanying supportive land use changes. Eligible projects receive points if they are located in areas where zoning and urban design requirements are transit-supportive. This will be scored as follows:

[45] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/NE-IL-Hwy-Freight-Planning-Network-Map.pdf
[46] https://cmap.illinois.gov/regional-plan/goals/recommendation/make-transit-more-competitive/

<table>
<tr><th>Max Score</th><th>Criteria</th></tr>
<tr><td>7</td><td>Up to 4.5 points will be awarded based on the permitted density for residential and non-residential land uses within one-half mile of the transit station, yard, or terminal. If more than one residential or non-residential classification is zoned within the station area, points will be assigned to the classification with the highest permitted density.

Points will be assessed based on both residential and non-residential densities. If the two categories yield different point totals, the average of the two totals will be awarded.

Permitted Densities:
<table>
<tr><th>Residential (DU/buildable acre)</th><th>Non-Residential (Building Height*)</th><th>Points</th></tr>
<tr><td>< 6</td><td>1 story (12 ft.)</td><td>0</td></tr>
<tr><td>> 6 and ≤ 10</td><td>2 story (24 ft.)</td><td>1.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>> 10 and ≤ 16</td><td>3 story (36 ft.)</td><td>2.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>> 16 and ≤ 24</td><td>4 story (48 ft.)</td><td>3.0</td></tr>
<tr><td>> 24</td><td>> 4 story (> 48 ft.)</td><td>4.5</td></tr>
</table>
*Building height given in feet based on 12 feet per story.
AND
Up to 2.5 points will be awarded based on innovative parking requirements, which supports denser development by increasing space available for other uses (one point for each strategy implemented):

• Reduced minimum parking requirements
• Enacted maximum parking requirements
• Shared parking permitted
• In-lieu parking fees permitted
• Enacted bicycle parking requirements
• Off-street parking is required behind or underneath buildings
• Off-street parking is permitted off-site</td></tr>
</table>

Max Score	Criteria
3.0	Up to 3 points will be awarded for the **presence of mixed-use zoning** within one-half mile of transit project (1 point for each strategy implemented): • Zoning allows vertical mixing of uses (e.g., residential units above ground-level retail or office). • Zoning allows pedestrian-friendly diverse land uses (e.g., drugstores, groceries, dry cleaning, banks, restaurants, gyms, hardware stores, etc.). • Zoning excludes car-dependent land uses (e.g., drive-through stores, strip malls, etc.). Communities that have implemented form-based codes may require additional qualitative analysis from CMAP staff to ensure their zoning meets the above standards.

CMAP staff will also consider additional information provided by applicants that notes where potential transit users within a ½ mile of a station or stop may be higher than the zoning might suggest.

Projects in the categories below are eligible to receive these points.

Project type(s)	Maximum transit supportive density points
Bus speed improvements; Transit station, yard, or terminal improvements	10

Bicycle/pedestrian barrier elimination, bridge rehab/reconstruction, corridor/small area safety improvements, highway-rail grade crossing improvements, road expansion; road reconstruction, and truck route improvements projects are not eligible to receive transit supportive density planning factor points.

Complete the Transit Supportive Land Use Planning Factor section (questions 26-29) on the Transit Projects worksheet of the application workbook.

Subregional Priority

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

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

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

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

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

CMAP will provide the councils and CDOT with a list of eligible project applications received no later than 4 weeks after the close of the call for projects. CMAP will also provide travel shed maps for individual projects under consideration for priority points upon request only. The councils and CDOT will have no less than 3 additional weeks to identify their priorities. Up to two additional weeks may be utilized for CMAP staff to review and seek committee feedback on any external projects identified as priorities. Should any project identified as a priority by a council or CDOT be determined to be ineligible for the Shared Fund after the initial assignment of priority points, the council or CDOT will be given one opportunity to reassign that priority to a different project or to elevate projects of lower priority into the ineligible project's slot. Initial project evaluation results will not be released for applicant or public review prior to the final identification of subregional priorities. The overall program development schedule may be modified to accommodate this policy.

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

Subregional priority is 5% of the total project score.

Project selection and programming process

Step 1: Call for Projects

CMAP staff will issue a call for projects in October of 2026, with a closing date in December 2026. This application booklet, which documents the application, scoring, and program development process has been provided, along with an *estimate* of funds available for programming during each year for which applications are being accepted, all application materials, and instructions for completing those materials. At least one training and information session for prospective applicants will be held, with an option for attending virtually, and a recording of that session will be made available on the call for projects website.

Step 2: Eligibility Screening

CMAP staff will review all applications to determine if the minimum eligibility criteria (minimum cost/multiple partners, completion of preliminary engineering, and inclusion in plans) have been met. A list of eligible applications will be published and provided to councils and CDOT for the assignment of subregional priority points. Sponsors of projects deemed to be ineligible will be notified that their application(s) will not be scored. If funding has been requested for any phase deemed to be ineligible based on the degree of completion of preliminary engineering, the sponsor will be notified and given no less than 5 business days to submit a revised funding request that excludes the ineligible phase(s).

Step 3: Project Scoring

CMAP staff will score all applications using the methodology described in this application booklet. If staff requires additional information from an applicant to complete the scoring, the applicant will have no less than ten business days from the time staff requests the data to provide that data. In the event data is not provided in the original application or in response to a follow-up request, CMAP staff may award zero points for the criteria in question.

If at any time during the scoring of a project it is determined that the project is not eligible for funding consideration because it does provide any improvement or because the calculated need does not meet thresholds for funding consideration within the project category, all further scoring of the project will be halted, and the sponsor will be notified of the eligibility determination. If any subregional priority points have been assigned to the project, the body assigning those points will be given no less than 5 business days to re-assign the points to a different project.

Upon completion of the scoring, CMAP staff will publish all draft scores and provide a minimum of two weeks for applicants to request clarification of the calculated scores. No supplemental information will be accepted during this period, but staff may adjust scoring if application materials were misinterpreted in any way. Following that two-week period, staff will develop final scores and project rankings.

Step 4: Draft Program Development

CMAP staff will determine the amount of funding anticipated to be available in each year, from FFY 2028 to FFY 2032, based on projected programming marks provided by IDOT (anticipated to be received by CMAP in January 2026), application of the shared fund set-asides contained in the October 2017 agreement between CDOT and the councils, and the current STP Shared Fund active program of projects. Starting with the highest ranked project application, CMAP staff will program projects in rank order, until all available funds are exhausted or until there are insufficient funds available to accommodate the requested funds. In doing so, the following considerations will be made:

- CMAP cannot program more funds in any single FFY than are estimated to be available in that FFY. Unprogrammed funds from one year are not available for programming in other years.
- Due to federal authorization procedures, no phase can be split across federal fiscal years, except in the case of projects that identified a staged construction plan in which all stages of construction meet state and federal requirements including having logical termini and independent utility (see "Staged Construction" additional information below).
- If all requested phases of a project cannot be fully funded within FFYs 2028 to 2032, CMAP staff will refer to the minimum acceptable funding indicated in the project application. If all phases of the project can be accommodated at the minimum acceptable funding level (or higher), the project will be programmed at those levels (see "Minimum Acceptable Funding" additional information below).
- If all requested phases of a project cannot be funded at the "minimum acceptable funding" levels, the entire project will be placed in the contingency program at the fully requested funding amounts. Both full funding and minimum acceptable funding will be considered when making active reprogramming decisions.
- If a project phase cannot be funded (fully or at the minimum acceptable level) in the year requested, but that phase, and all subsequent phases of the project can be funded in later years, it will be funded in the later years. Sponsors of projects in this situation will be asked to confirm acceptance of the revised schedule or will be placed in the contingency program.
- In no case will a project phase(s) be programmed in an earlier year than requested or with a smaller interval between phases than requested. For example, if ENG2 was requested in FFY 2028 and CON was requested in FFY 2030 (two-year interval), but ENG2 is programmed in FFY 2029, CON will not be programmed any earlier than two years later (FFY 2031).
- Full funding in later years will be considered before funding at the minimum acceptable (or higher) level.

Step 5: Public Comment

Following release of the draft staff recommended Active and Contingency programs, a public comment period of no less than 30 days will be held.

Step 6: Final Program Recommendation

Staff will provide the STP Project Selection Committee (PSC) with a final programming recommendation, based on the draft program and public comments. Following STP PSC action to recommend a final program, CMAP staff will prepare a TIP amendment(s) incorporating the STP PSC recommended program for consideration by the MPO Policy Committee and CMAP Board.

Step 7: Program Implementation

Following approval of the TIP amendment(s), implementation of the program according to Active Program Management[47] policies will begin.

Staged Construction

Large, complex projects may be constructed in "stages" or "phases" due to cost or other factors when segments of the project have independent utility and logical termini, while also contributing to the function of the overall project. Typically, staged construction is identified during the NEPA process for the overall project. A project is not considered to be staged if separate NEPA documentation or preliminary engineering was completed for the individual stages.

Staged construction within the STP-SF program requires that each stage will be treated as an independent construction project, let separately, with unique state job, federal project, and construction contract numbers. As such, **each construction stage of a project will be evaluated as a separate application,** and each stage may receive significantly different total scores based on the transportation impacts and planning factors that apply to each stage.

When calculating the total cost of all phases of the project for the improvement score for an individual stage, costs for preliminary engineering (ENG1) and design engineering (ENG2) will not be prorated. Land acquisition costs (and points in the Project Readiness criterion) will be applied by stage, if stage-specific land acquisition data is provided by the applicant.
Stages should be sequenced in the order in which they are proposed to be constructed, which may not be the order in which they are physically aligned.

Complete ONE eTIP application for the entire project – see the eTIP User Guide[48] for instructions for indicating stages in the location and proposed funding information sections of eTIP. Complete a SEPARATE application workbook for each stage of the project, and one for the entire project. Be sure to include the stage in the Project Title field(s) of the application workbook.

---

[47] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/STP_APM_policies.pdf
[48] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/eTIP-User-Guide.pdf

Minimum Acceptable Funding

During the application process, sponsors may indicate if they are willing to accept less than full funding for a project or project phase. By providing a minimum acceptable funding amount, sponsors must agree that:

- They have local or other funds available to fill the funding gap. Those funds must be identified in the TIP when the MPO Policy Committee approves the STP Shared Fund active program in October. If STP-Local funds will be used to fill the funding gap, those funds must have been programmed in a prior STP-Local funding cycle or must be actively reprogrammed according to Active Program Management policies prior to MPO Policy Committee consideration of the STP Shared Fund active program in June.
- They will not be awarded any additional STP Shared funds under any active reprogramming actions allowed by the Active Program Management policies. However, they may reapply for additional STP Shared funds in future calls for projects, but any STP Shared funds already programmed will not be considered as "committed" funds during future calls.
- Projects funded at a minimum acceptable funding level will not be "made whole". When accepting a funding dollar amount, the applicant is accepting a set percentage share of STP Shared funds. If the total project or project phase cost changes over time, whether increasing or decreasing, the percentage share of STP Shared funds will remain constant and will not be increased or decreased. For example, if $5 million in STP-SF is programmed for a $10 million project, the ratio is 50%. If the cost of the project increased to $12 million, 50% would be $6 million, therefore a $1 million increase could be requested. If the cost of the project decreased to $8 million, the STP-SF programmed would be decreased to $4 million.
- Financial commitment points will be calculated based on the full requested amount of STP Shared funds. These points will *not* be recalculated if a project is funded at the minimum acceptable level.

Projects being considered for staged construction must provide a minimum acceptable funding amount for each stage for which the sponsor wishes to be considered for less than full funding.

Complete the Minimum Acceptable Funding section (questions 7-8) of the All STP Projects worksheet in the application workbook. Note that the eTIP Proposed Funding Information should reflect the full funding request, not the maximum acceptable funding.

Selection Process Timeline

The timeline below represents the general flow of the application and approval process. This schedule is subject to change. If changes occur, those changes will be posted on the call for projects[49] web page.

Schedule	Action
October 19, 2026	Call for projects open
December 7, 2026	Local applications due in eTIP for Planning Liaison review
December 18, 2026	All applications and attachments due
January 15, 2027	List of eligible applications (based on sponsor, total cost, and inclusion in plans only) provided to councils and CDOT for subregional priority points
TBD based upon PSC schedule	Summary of applications available
February 5, 2027	Deadline for councils and CDOT to submit subregional priority point allocations
March 2027	Evaluation results and preliminary scores available for applicant review
April 2027	Staff recommended program presented to STP Project Selection Committee
April-May 2027	Public comment period open
May 2027	STP Project Selection Committee review of public comment and consideration of final program approval
May/June 2027	CMAP Transportation Committee considers TIP changes incorporating approved program
June 2027	MPO Policy Committee and CMAP Board consider final approval of TIP changes for the program

[49] https://cmap.is/2026callforprojects

Application Checklist

The application process is completed online using CMAP's eTIP database. Please ensure the following steps are completed.

- ☐ Creation of project application in eTIP with completed information on the Programming, Map, Contacts, Attachments, Project Questions, and Schedule Info tabs completed.
- ☐ Application Workbook (Excel) – sections specific to the project type are completed and the entire workbook is uploaded to eTIP as an **Excel workbook**.
- ☐ Detailed cost estimate completed and uploaded to eTIP
- ☐ Project milestone questions completed on the Project Questions tab of the eTIP project application.

All forms are available on the call for projects web page. Applications submitted that are missing any of the following **will not be considered for funding**:

- Project financing & funding request in eTIP, detailing all project phases
- Completed Application Workbook (MS Excel format)

For any other missing information, CMAP staff and/or the applicant's Planning Liaison will contact the applicant and the applicant will have no less than ten business days from the time of the request to provide that data.

Contact Information

If you have a question or need assistance, please review the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on the call for projects web page, contact your Planning Liaison[50], or contact CMAP staff at transportation@cmap.illinois.gov.

[50] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/Municipalities-by-Council.pdf

Appendix A: FY26 Cohort 4 Communities

These communities were designated as Cohort 4 communities in the FY26 Community Cohorts[51] document and are eligible to request Phase 1 Engineering funding and to request the use of Transportation Development Credits – Highways (TDCHs, also known as "toll credits"), as described in the Eligibility section of this document.

Municipalities

Bellwood
Blue Island
Braceville
Broadview
Burnham
Calumet City
Calumet Park
Chicago Heights
Cicero
Diamond
Dixmoor
Dolton
East Hazel Crest
Ford Heights
Glenwood
Godley
Harvey
Hazel Crest
Holiday Hills
Hometown
Justice
Kaneville
Lisbon
Markham
Maywood
McCullom Lake
North Chicago
Park City
Park Forest
Phoenix
Posen
Riverdale
Robbins
Round Lake Heights
Round Lake Park
Sauk Village
South Chicago Heights
Steger
Stickney
Stone Park
Summit
Winthrop Harbor

Chicago Community Areas

Auburn Gresham
Austin
Brighton Park
Chicago Lawn
East Garfield Park
East Side
Englewood
Fuller Park
Gage Park
Greater Grand Crossing
New City
North Lawndale
Oakland
Riverdale
Roseland
South Lawndale
South Chicago
South Lawndale
South Shore
Washington Heights
Washington Park
West Elsdon
West Englewood
West Garfield Park
West Pullman
Woodlawn

[51] https://cmap.illinois.gov/wp-content/uploads/Community_Cohorts_FY26.pdf