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CHAPTER I – THE PURPOSE OF THIS MANUAL

The title of this document is drawn from the fact that transportation planning is a cooperative process, involving the interaction between willing partners: local officials working through their Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs)\(^1\) and other relevant, interested parties at the regional level, and the state’s transportation agency. By working together in a cooperative way, state and local interests are best able to foster the involvement of all relevant stakeholders through proactive public engagement activities – whether they are held individually or in partnership – to develop an integrated multimodal transportation system that meets local needs as well as those of the state at-large.

That is, of course, the meaning of cooperation; that all parties work together to ensure a mutual benefit. One of those benefits is to meet the requirements of federal law, which calls for states and local partners to engage in a transportation planning process that is *Continuing, Comprehensive, and Cooperative*; what is often called 3C planning. Working together in an effective partnership allows this to happen.

This is not always a simple or easy task. State transportation agencies must not only operate under various federal and state laws, but under certain rules and regulations that MPOs must also follow. This must be done in a system in which the MPO staff and leadership are partners with Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) staff and leadership. This means that cooperation requires direct, open and honest collaboration between the two parties as they seek ways to advance the goals of both.

This document also intends to serve as a reference for MPOs and IDOT, providing basic information regarding agreed upon processes and procedures through which the two parties will conduct the 3C planning process. That being the case, this Cooperative Operations Manual is intended to meet three purposes:

- To provide MPOs with the information needed to operate efficiently and effectively within the Federal and State of Illinois’ transportation planning process.
- To advise and clarify the individual roles and responsibilities of IDOT and MPOs in that process.
- To establish the processes and procedures through which the MPOs and IDOT will exchange information and interact in order to achieve a 3C transportation planning process within the State.

To achieve these purposes, this manual is operationally divided into three sections. Chapter II addresses the role and responsibility of IDOT in the transportation planning process; Chapter III discusses the role and responsibilities of MPOs; and Chapters IV-XI address specific procedural aspects of this relationship.

Minor updates (contacts, legal, etc.) to this document will be made by IDOT staff as needed. An updated version will then be made available on the IDOT website and the MPOs will be notified.

---

\(^1\) “A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the policy board of an organization created and designated to carry out the metropolitan transportation planning process. MPOs are required to represent localities in all urbanized areas (UZAs) with populations over 50,000, as determined by the U.S. Census. MPOs are designated by agreement between the governor and local governments that together represent at least 75 percent of the affected population (including the largest incorporated city, based on population) or in accordance with procedures established by applicable state or local law.”

The update date will be indicated in the footer of the document. If major revisions are needed, all stakeholders will be invited to contribute to revising the manual.
CHAPTER II – THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

IDOT’s role in transportation planning is to ensure that a 3C planning process is carried out at the statewide and metropolitan level that is consistent with all state and federal laws. This requires maintaining a collaborative process between and among IDOT, MPOs and public transit operators. To carry out its role, IDOT has a number of important responsibilities.

A. PLANNING PROCESS SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

As the administrator of Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) planning funds, IDOT is responsible for working collaboratively with MPOs to establish an effective and efficient multimodal transportation system within the State. As part of this responsibility, IDOT is required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 450.314 to enter into a cooperative agreement with each MPO that clearly identifies the responsibilities of each for carrying out the metropolitan planning process and accomplishing the transportation planning requirements of state and federal law. IDOT will also incorporate each MPO’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) into its Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) by reference. To assist in meeting its responsibilities, IDOT is represented on the Technical and Policy Committees of each MPO.

B. PROVISION OF ALLOCATED PLANNING FUNDS

IDOT is responsible for the allocation of these funds to all MPOs based upon the FHWA approved distribution formula. This allocation is made to the MPOs pursuant to federal law and in a timely way. As the sub-recipients of planning funds, MPOs are required to carry out all provisions of federal law. IDOT’s responsibilities include the review and approval of the MPO’s Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The review is to be completed and final intergovernmental grant agreements in place to provide funding to the MPO by the beginning of the state or MPO fiscal year. Most MPOs in Illinois run on the State Fiscal Year (SFY) which begins July 1st of each year.

C. MONITORING

In accordance with federal law, IDOT is responsible for the monitoring of activities performed by MPOs to ensure that the work is being managed and performed satisfactorily, and time schedules are met. As part of this responsibility, IDOT must ensure that funds are expended for eligible costs and activities in accordance with 23 CFR 420.113 and 2 CFR Chapter 1, Chapter 2, Part 200 (Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards; Final Rule).

D. COORDINATION AND COOPERATION

In order to foster coordination and cooperation with all of the MPO’s IDOT supports the following:

1. MPO Council

IDOT shall work with an organization (hereinafter, “MPO Council”) representing MPO interests. The MPO Council may be organized by IDOT or established by the MPOs themselves, with the form and format of the MPO Council at the discretion of the MPOs.

The MPO Council should meet no less than quarterly to address issues that come before it and to cooperatively determine the optimal solutions for transportation planning issues.
The MPO Council meetings should promote the 3C planning process through comprehensive discussions and interactions to achieve these goals. However, the existence of a MPO Council does not preclude IDOT’s responsibilities to achieve a 3C planning process in working in partnership with the MPOs. IDOT responsibilities include fully interacting with the MPOs as policy and procedural changes are contemplated by the State, taking the MPOs needs and input into consideration and vice versa.

2. Metropolitan Planning Managers

The primary way that IDOT will directly and effectively communicate and collaborate with the MPOs is through its Metropolitan Planning Managers (Metro Managers). The Metro Managers are a key element of the cooperative relationship between IDOT and the MPO, as they are most often interacting with the MPO and their staff. A number of the administrative duties of the Metro Managers are indicated in the sections below, but among their most important responsibilities are to give the MPO timely and accurate answers to their questions and requests, and assist the MPO in solving problems.

One of the important responsibilities of the Metro Manager is to be a timely information provider to the MPO. This means that IDOT will quickly and accurately inform the MPO of any IDOT activities, actions, programs or projects that may be relevant. It also requires that IDOT be a willing supplier of data and other information to MPOs, and that all data collected and maintained by IDOT will be shared in such a way that it will be provided to the MPO in a timely manner and in useful formats such as by the boundaries of their Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) when available.

Although the Metro Manager should be the MPO’s primary and first stop for questions regarding policies and procedures at the department, it does not mean that a MPO should have contact only with the Metro Manager. It would be counterproductive to stop the valuable communication that takes place between IDOT District and MPO staff as well as other entities within IDOT. Metro Managers are there to help in any way they can, including but not limited to meeting notifications, general announcements from FHWA or FTA, updates on funding, etc. The best communication between IDOT and the MPO happens when a strong relationship with the Metro Manager has been cultivated.

3. Statewide Planning

Statewide Planning facilitates numerous efforts at the Department that have an effect on MPOs. Given this it is important that MPO input and work plans are considered while developing the Statewide Planning program. Coordination of planning activities throughout the state, whether by an MPO or the State will result in economies of scale and decrease duplication of efforts. In order to assist in better coordination any Statewide planning occurring within an MPO’s boundaries should be included in that MPO’s UPWP.

Federal planning funds are available in some years to MPOs as additional resources to conduct planning that is not able to be funded with the federal metropolitan transportation planning funds. State planning funds (non-federal) are also available in some years depending on state legislative action and can be used to match federal metropolitan planning funds. For an MPO to request federal statewide planning funds or state planning funds a request should be made to their metro manager including a summary of what they will be used for.
CHAPTER III – THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF ILLINOIS METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS

MPOs are an essential component of the transportation planning process and are intended to assist the state in the development and operation of an effective and efficient 3C planning process. The role and responsibilities of the MPOs are outlined by 23 United States Code (USC) 134, 49 USC 5303 and 23 CFR 450 Subpart C. MPOs must meet the following three general requirements:

- MPOs must develop, in cooperation with the State, public transit operators and local government agencies an annual UPWP, an annual year of the four year Metropolitan TIP, and a Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) (or Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) every four or five years depending on air quality attainment status. All interested parties shall be provided with a reasonable opportunity to participate in the development of these plans. The basis of these plans will be performance-driven, outcome-based approaches for the planning of the metropolitan areas of the state.

- MPOs are to prepare plans and TIPs within metropolitan areas that will provide for the development and integrated management and operation of all transportation systems and facilities. Functioning as a multimodal transportation system for the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA), facilities will also be an integral part of a multimodal transportation system for the State and the United States. All modes of transportation must be considered by MPOs as they work through the continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive 3C planning process.

In addition to the general requirements, 23 CFR Parts 420, 450, and 470 provide additional regulations for metropolitan and statewide planning activities and products. FHWA has provided a matrix as a reference.

A. UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) discusses planning priorities of the MPO and describes all metropolitan transportation planning programs and project activities for a one year time period, including major work elements. Normally this follows the State Fiscal Year July 1- June 30, but not in all instances. The UPWP provides descriptions of the objectives, methodology, products and agency responsibilities for each specific project. The UPWP also contains a detailed financial breakdown of all federal and state transportation planning funds provided to the MPO by IDOT. (See Chapter VII)

B. LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Each MPO prepares and updates a Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) or Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) addressing, at minimum, a twenty year planning horizon. The plan includes strategies and actions that will lead to the development, management and operation of integrated multimodal transportation systems and facilities. Per federal law (23 USC 134 and 49 USC 5303), the transportation plan shall be updated every four years in nonattainment and maintenance areas and every five years in attainment areas. More frequent updates may occur at the discretion of the MPO. (See Chapter VIII)

C. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is, at a minimum, a four year approved list of federally funded and regionally significant transportation improvements consistent with the MTP or LRTP. The TIP is designed to document the implementation of individual projects that achieve the area's goals. The TIP must be fiscally constrained and includes a financial plan that demonstrates how the TIP can be implemented using reasonably
expected public and private revenues. The TIP may include illustrative projects that would be included if additional revenues were available. The financial plan should be developed by the MPO in cooperation with the State, transit operators, and local government agencies. Federal requirements state that the TIP has to be updated a minimum of once every four years and must contain all transportation projects that receive federal funds and those that are regionally significant regardless of fund source. Currently, it is IDOT’s policy that MPOs update their TIPs annually. (See Chapter IX)

D. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

Per federal law (23 USC 134 and 49 USC 5303), in consultation with interested parties MPOs must develop and use a documented Public Participation Plan (PPP). The PPP is an integral part of the transportation process which helps to ensure that decisions are made in consideration of and to benefit public needs and preferences. The plan must, at a minimum, describe explicit procedures, strategies, and desired outcomes for providing the following stakeholders with adequate notice and reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process:

- Citizens
- Affected public agencies
- Representatives of public transportation employees
- Freight shippers
- Providers of freight transportation services
- Private providers of transportation
- Representatives of users of public transportation
- Representative of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities
- Representatives of people with disabilities
- Tourism interests
- Other interested parties

(See Chapter X)

E. NON-ATTAINMENT AREAS AND CONFORMITY

Illinois has two non-attainment areas the Chicago area and St. Louis area. The Chicago area is in non-attainment for 8-Hr Ozone (2008) and the St. Louis area for PM2.5 (1997) and 8-Hr Ozone (2008) meaning that they do not meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for those criteria pollutants. Transportation officials in a given non-attainment area must play a vital role in complying with the Clean Air Act (CAA). These areas are designated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), and are identified using a variety of data including but not limited to air quality monitor data, standard emissions data, urbanization patterns, and meteorology. These data sources are reviewed by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA), which then makes a recommendation for nonattainment area boundaries to US EPA.

Because the Chicago area and St. Louis area are in non-attainment, they must complete a conformity analysis resulting in a conformity determination and facilitate an interagency consultation process per 40 CFR Part 93 Subpart A. Completing a conformity analysis and
determination of conformity requires MPO staff to evaluate the impact of proposed transportation activities that are included in the region’s long range plan and TIP on the area’s air quality. The consultation process is defined in 40 CFR 93.105 and further defined in Illinois’ State Implementation Plan. Per the Code of Federal Regulations consultation is bringing the MPO, State, local air quality planning agencies, and federal agencies that participate in the conformity analysis and determination process as well as TIP and long range plan development together to discuss and agree upon methods to conduct the conformity analysis and determination.

The nonattainment areas do not necessarily match the MPO boundaries therefore Nonattainment areas may also be shared with adjacent MPOs, or include areas outside the MPA. The MPO’s responsibility for completing a conformity analysis and determination depends on the particular situation. For the most up-to-date information on nonattainment areas in Illinois please visit the USEPA Green Book website.

F. OTHER REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

1. Human Service Transportation Plan

Federal law requires that projects funded under the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program (Section 5310) and the Formula Grants for Rural Areas (Section 5311) be derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit Human Service Transportation Plan (HSTP). This plan must be established through a process that engages various members of the public, as well as representatives of public, private and non-profit transportation and human services providers. This plan should identify the transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, older adults and people with low incomes and provide strategies for meeting their needs. A plan must be created in each HSTP Region and MPA within the State. In MPAs, these plans are typically developed and periodically updated by the MPO, but can be led by the public transportation provider.

2. Congestion Management Process for Transportation Management Areas

The Congestion Management Process (CMP) in all MPOs designated as a Transportation Management Area (TMA), which is an MPO over 200,000 in population, is a federal requirement per 23 CFR 450.320 and shall address congestion management through a coordinated and cooperatively developed and implemented area-wide strategy through the use of travel demand reduction and operational management strategies. The CMP serves as a systematic process that provides for safe and effective integrated management and operation of the multimodal transportation system. The CMP should result in multimodal system performance measures and strategies that can be reflected in the LRTP and the TIP. All members of the MPO participate as the MPO staff develops the CMP. Data sharing is strongly encouraged by all parties so the information can be used, regardless of jurisdiction, to make more informed congestion-related policy and project-programming decisions at the MPO level.

3. Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Architecture

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) is defined as electronics, communications, or information processing used singly or in combination to improve the efficiency or safety of a surface transportation system in 23 CFR 940. Per the same federal regulation, MPOs over 200,000 (TMAs) were required to have a Regional ITS Architecture in place that meets local needs. Per 23 CFR 940, all ITS projects
implemented with federal funds must be consistent with the local regional ITS architecture – which is developed by the MPO. See appendix G for the minimum requirements of what an ITS architecture should include.

4. Title VI Document

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a section of federal law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance. Specifically, Title VI provides that "no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance" (42 USC Section 2000d). Pursuant to 49 CFR 21.7, every application for federal financial assistance or continuing federal financial assistance must provide a statement of assurance and give reasonable guarantee that the program is (or, in the case of a new program, will be) conducted in compliance with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to 49 CFR 21 (Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs of the Department of Transportation – Effectuation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964). MPOs must formulate a Title VI Document that is developed through the MPO’s committee structure. The document must include information on how Title VI and environmental justice considerations are reflected in the MPO’s activities, including the UPWP, TIP, LRTP, publications, communications, and public involvement efforts. The requirements are further described in FTA Circular 4702.1B, which establishes a framework for efforts to ensure compliance with Title VI.

5. Annual Listing of Obligated Projects

Per §450.332 all MPOs, on an annual basis, no later than 90 calendar days following the end of the Fiscal Year of their TIP, shall cooperatively develop a listing of all projects for which any federal funds under 23 USC 134 or 49 USC Chapter 53 were obligated in the preceding Fiscal Year of their TIP.

The listing shall be prepared in accordance with §450.314(a) and shall include all federally funded projects authorized in the preceding program year, and shall at a minimum include the TIP information under §450.324(e)(1) and (4) and identify, for each project, the amount of federal funds requested in the TIP, the federal funding that was obligated during the preceding year, and the federal funding remaining and available for subsequent years.

This product is developed by the MPO and the listing shall be published or otherwise made available in accordance with the MPO's public participation criteria for the TIP.

6. Self-Certifications, Federal Certifications, and Planning Reviews

23 CFR 450.334 provides that, concurrent with the submittal of the proposed TIP to the FHWA and FTA as part of the STIP approval, every MPO and the State shall certify at least every four years that the metropolitan planning process is being carried out in accordance with all applicable federal requirements, which are described in appendix C. In TMAs, the FHWA and FTA shall jointly review and evaluate the transportation planning process no less than once every four years. The joint certification shall include opportunities for public involvement within the MPA under review. For MPOs less than 200,000, FHWA completes planning reviews every four years, which includes a less rigorous version of the TMA's certification review.
7. **American with Disabilities (ADA) Act Transition Plans and Self Evaluations**

ADA Transition plans are required by federal regulations, [28 CFR 35.150](https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2014-title28-vol3/pdf/CFR-2014-title28-vol3-part35.pdf) for MPOS with 50 or more employees. If the MPO owns their building, structural changes to achieve program accessibility are necessary as outlined in the ADA Transition Plan. Both full-time and part-time employees count toward the 50-employee level.

MPOs should ensure that any programs they operate are ADA accessible as well as be aware if their member agencies have a transition plan.

CHAPTER IV – FUNDING

A. GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT

The GATA law requires the State of Illinois to issue grant funds in a consistent method regardless of agency. This increases transparency and accountability.

GATA involves creating a consistent notice of funding opportunity, evaluating submittals, and notifying the awardee that they were selected as well as administration of the grant through standard templates. Once a grantee has requested and is identified as a possible awardee of the grant, the awardee must register on the GATA portal and completed a series of pre qualifications and risk assessments. Once those are completed, the agency must complete an indirect costs negotiation. The indirect cost negotiation occurs through the Governor’s Office of Management (GOMB) and Budget with IDOT reviewing the final negotiation. More information on indirect costs is available in the section below. Providing a budget for the project is completed on a standard GOMB template as well as the agreement.

B. METROPOLITAN PLANNING FUNDS

Metropolitan Planning (PL) funds are provided to MPOs under the authority of: 23 USC 104(f), 23 USC 315, 49 CFR 1.48(b), and 49 CFR 1.51(f). Procedures for matching and programming are provided under: 2 CFR 200 and 30 ILCS 708. PL funds are allocated to MPOs by a formula based on population that is developed by IDOT and approved by the FHWA. PL funds are sourced through federal construction program allocations. The statewide amount of metropolitan planning funds is based on the State’s base apportionment and the State’s apportionment for the National Highway Freight Program. The FHWA apportionments for the states can be found on FHWA’s website. The Federal transit planning funds can be found on FTA’s website. Federal PL funds must be matched with state and/or local funds at an 80-20 match rate, at minimum.

1. Timing

Upon authorization of the federal funding, IDOT will distribute PL funding marks to the 16 Illinois MPOs for the upcoming State Fiscal Year (SFY). The state fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30. The current SFY funds come from the previous Federal Fiscal year (FFY). This process will typically occur in February, but is subject to change based upon when the federal government approves their budget. The distribution chart will be sent to each MPO from their respective Metro Manager.

IDOT generally enters into one-year agreements to access PL funds. These agreements must be in place by the beginning of the SFY (July 1).

2. General Eligibility for Use/Costs

Each agreement that IDOT enters into with an MPO begins with the submission of that MPO’s approved UPWP, which includes a budget and scope of work being submitted to the appropriate Metro Manager. The Metro Managers have worked with the MPO during the development of the UPWP to ensure the scope of work included in the document and any indicated use of PL funds is an eligible activity. They use the guidelines of eligibility indicated in Appendix D.
Generally, activities related to the core functions of the metropolitan planning process (including the TIP, LRTP, UPWP, and other transportation related activities) are eligible. Also generally eligible is planning of future transportation projects as well as planning of how to finance those projects. Studies, training, research, and materials related to safety, design, and engineering standards for highway and intermodal transportation are also eligible.

Because of the wide spectrum of eligible uses, it is necessary that a determination be made if a proposed activity (e.g., collection of travel data, citizen participation, development of plans and programs, etc.) is necessary to carry out the metropolitan planning process mandated by [23 USC 134]. MPOs, IDOT and the federal partners must cooperate in determining eligibility of costs and it is possible that something may be eligible for partial costs. For example, a transit oriented development plan that incorporates zoning updates would be eligible for partial use of metropolitan planning funds. Anything that is questionable can be sent to IDOT for review and concurrence by the appropriate Metro Manager.

3. Procurement

All MPOs must use their own documented procurement policy which reflects applicable state and local laws as well as regulations. If the MPO would like to default to the State procurement requirements, this is acceptable, however they must document that they choose to follow the State procurement requirements. All MPO procurement policies must also conform to applicable federal law and the standards identified in 2 CFR 200.318 (General Procurement) through 200.326 (Contract Provisions).

4. Indirect Costs

Indirect costs are an eligible expense for metropolitan planning funds. However, the rate in which indirect costs are charged must be approved by either a federal or state agency. A federal agency is the appropriate agency to review and approve an indirect cost allocation plan if the grantees receives any funding directly from a federal agency. If a grantees receives direct funding from multiple federal agencies, the federal agency granting the most funding to the grantees is the federal agency that approves indirect cost rates. If the grantees does not receive federal funds directly from a federal agency, the State of Illinois will negotiate an indirect cost rate. This is done through the online GATA portal. In either instance, a federally approved rate, or a negotiated rate with the State of Illinois, the information must be entered into the GATA portal. There are two other options within the GATA portal as well and those are not charging Indirect costs or using the de minimis rate, which is 10%.

C. STATE PLANNING AND RESEARCH FUNDS

State Planning and Research funds (SPR) are federal funds used for statewide planning and research activities. Eligibility are defined in Appendix D. The funds are used to establish a 3C framework for making transportation investment decisions and to carry out the transportation research activities throughout the state. An MPO, at any time, can request the use of SPR funds for a project that may require additional funds. The MPO should discuss with their Metro Manager to request these discretionary funds.
D. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUNDS

The State receives an allocation of federal STP funds. Per the Fixing America Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, these funds are to be distributed with 50 percent going to the State for programming and 50 percent going to the local jurisdictions for programming increasing throughout the life of the bill to 55 percent locals and 45 percent state. However, in the early 1990’s, the State of Illinois, the Illinois Association of County Engineers, the Illinois Municipal League (IML) and the MPOs of Illinois agreed to use a different formula for distribution. This formula provides funding to local agencies for programming in an amount equal to 18.92 percent of the combined dollar amount for all the core federal programs (STP, HSIP, NHPP, TAP, NHFP) for Illinois. This formula guarantees that no matter the federal funding splits of STP, the state and local jurisdictions will receive a consistent share of funding. Since SAFETEA-LU (records available), the 18.92% agreement has exceeded the required distribution in authorization acts.

IDOT sets aside 15 percent of the 18.92 percent of core program funding for the local bridge program (STP-Bridge). The remaining amount is split between urban and rural areas; 77.54 percent goes to urban areas with populations over 5,000 and 22.46 percent goes to rural areas. The Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) receives 82.37 percent of the urban portion and 10.80 percent of the rural portion. The remaining urban area funds are distributed to the other urban areas in Illinois based on the most recent census populations. The remaining rural area funds are distributed to the counties in IDOT Districts 2 through 9 via a designated funding formula. That funding formula equally divides ten percent of the funds for distribution to each county; the remaining 90 percent is distributed based on three equal factors: 1) non-urban area, 2) non-urban population, and 3) non-urban mileage (total all systems). Notification of the federal funding distribution to the local agencies and MPOs is done through an IDOT Bureau of Local Roads and Streets circular letter. This letter is distributed through an email subscription service. The circular letter is generally distributed in December with federal funding allotment for the following fiscal year starting in July. Generally, District staff notifies the MPOs of their upcoming Urban Surface Transportation program (STU) allocations. A flow chart is available in Appendix F.

E. CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FUNDS

The State of Illinois receives an allocation of federal CMAQ funds. Under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), funding apportionments for each state were calculated based on a formula using weighted populations in ozone and PM$_{2.5}$ nonattainment and maintenance areas. Under MAP-21 and the FAST Act, the federal funds are allocated using the proportions from the final year of SAFETEA-LU. In Illinois, CMAQ funds are distributed between the nonattainment areas of the state based on the same formula used in ISTEA, TEA-21, and SAFETEA-LU. Currently, the only two MPOs with ozone and PM$_{2.5}$ nonattainment areas in Illinois are CMAP and the East-West Gateway Council of Governments (EWGCOG). CMAP receives approximately 95.21 percent of the annual apportionment and EWGCOG receives approximately 4.79 percent. As of MAP-21, 25% of the funds must be obligated on projects that improve PM$_{2.5}$. 
F. TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM

The State of Illinois receives an annual allocation of federal Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds. Fifty percent of the TAP funds are eligible for use anywhere in the State and programmed by IDOT through the competitive processes of its Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program (ITEP) and Safe Routes to School (SRTS) programs. The remaining fifty percent is for use in urban areas in the state (greater than 5000 population). The TMA MPOs receive TAP funds from this 50% based on the urbanized area population and program the funding through a competitive process in their MPA. IDOT programs the remainder of the 50% of TAP funds to be used in urban areas (that portion not going to TMAs) in the same competitive process as used for the 50% of TAP funds for use anywhere in the state (ITEP and SRTS programs). These are competitive programs with projects selected statewide based on selection criteria established by IDOT. IDOT may, at its discretion, assign MPOs to program some or the entire 50 percent State share of TAP funds.

G. STATE PLANNING FUNDS

Since 2011, State Planning Funds have been allocated by an appropriation out of the Road Fund. There is no law or statute in place which requires distribution; however IDOT currently allows these funds to be requested as federal match or other eligible transportation planning projects upon request and approval.

There are three ways for MPOs or local units of government to use these state planning funds:

1. As the required 20 percent match in the annual agreements between IDOT and the MPO’s for their pass-through for federal PL and FTA funds.
2. As a separate agreement to fund other IDOT approved transportation planning project(s).
3. As the 20 percent match to an approved federal SPR funded project.

The state planning funds are not a guaranteed source of funds; each request will be reviewed and approval will be based upon the fiscal situation and the discretion of IDOT at the time of request. Current IDOT practice is to use this, at minimum, to match each MPO’s apportioned federal funds.

H. LOCAL PROGRAM MATRIX

The state provides revenue sharing through their motor fuel tax. For information on the state-only revenue sharing as well as federal transportation programs, please view the Local Programming Matrix (Appendix E).
CHAPTER V – EXPENDITURE REIMBURSEMENT PROCESS

A. RESPONSIBILITIES

MPO Staff

- Prepares and submits quarterly/monthly invoices to the IDOT Operations Manager and Metro Manager. All invoices prepared and submitted should have supporting documentation if requested.

IDOT Metro Manager:

- Reviews invoice and expense reports for all FHWA planning, FTA planning, State Planning funds, and SPR funds if applicable.
- Ensures that work is being accomplished and billings are consistent with work described in the UPWP.

IDOT Air Quality Manager:

- Reviews and approves the invoices and expense reports for CMAQ projects.

IDOT Operations Manager:

- Reviews, approves, and processes invoices to be paid within 15 days of receipt of invoice by IDOT.

B. SCHEDULING AND TIME CONSTRAINTS

Invoices can be submitted monthly or quarterly. The final invoice should be submitted no later than four weeks after the end of the SFY. Federal law (23 U.S.C. 104(d)(2)(B)) requires states to reimburse an MPO for eligible planning activities within 15 days. IDOT may withhold payment until a complete and accurate invoice is received.

C. PROCEDURE FOR MPO INVOICES

1. MPO Submits an Invoice for Allowable Expenditures
   i. The MPO must submit invoices for allowable expenditures to the Operations Manager in order to receive reimbursement.
   ii. Final invoices must be submitted no later than six weeks after the end of the given SFY.
   iii. The invoice must include:
       a. Indication of total amount of federal and matching funds expended.
       b. Cover Letter to the C-13:
           1. States the Obligation Number, contract name, source of funds being requested (typically PL, but can be SPR, FTA, state funds, and CMAQ).
       c. Requests for reimbursement must be requested on Form C-13.
       d. Timesheets
           1. MPO Staff and which projects were worked on
           2. If MPO is over 25 staff, summary reported may be submitted but detailed information should be available upon request.
e. Back up documentation which may include payroll and expenditures must be submitted with each invoice.

f. Certification by the MPO finance officer of accurate expenses.

g. Expenditure and Progress Report:
   1. Percentage of work complete and amount requested per line item for invoice period.
   2. Identification of expenditures by work task.
   3. Progress reports are required via 23 CFR 420.117. State and federal regulations require:
      I. Quarterly reports shall be submitted to the Operations Manager 30 days after end of the reporting period.
      II. Final reports shall be submitted to the Operations Manager 90 days after the end of the reporting period.

h. At the end of the SFY, a Year-End Report should include a summary of work completed and list all deliverables that were completed.

2. Metro Manager Review and Approval
   i. Upon submittal of an invoice, the Metro Manager reviews and checks:
      a. Mathematical accuracy.
      b. That requested reimbursement is consistent with items included in the approved UPWP.
      c. That total amount invoiced is proportional to total amount budgeted.
      d. Expenditure for each line item is less than or equal to the budgeted amount.
      e. Completion of the work being invoiced.
   ii. Failure to provide a complete invoice may delay or prevent reimbursement. If there are problems with the invoice, the Metro Manager will contact the MPO to resolve the issue so that payment can be made, assuming it is appropriate. This may include submission of a new or corrected invoice by the MPO.
   iii. The Metro Manager will review and approve or reject the invoice within seven days of the MPOs submittal. If rejected, the invoice is not sent to the Comptroller until it is revised and approved by the Metro Manager.

3. Operations Manager Approval
   i. Once approved, the Operations Manager submits invoices to the Bureau of Business Services, Accounting Unit, which documents the transaction and forwards it to the Comptroller.
4. **Send Payment**
   
   i. Once approved, the Comptroller forwards payment either via Electronic Fund Transfer (EFT) or by mailing a check to the MPO’s Local Public Agency (LPA).
   
   ii. If approved by the Metro Manager, payment is made within 15 days of receiving a complete invoice.

5. **Close Out Contract**
   
   i. Once the Comptroller pays the final invoice, the agreement is closed out in the FHWA’s Fiscal Management Information System (FMIS).

6. **Ineligible costs**
   
   If it is found later after payment to the MPO that ineligible costs were reimbursed, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will be written and executed for recoupment of the funds. Ineligible costs would include things such as construction engineering, purchasing transportation vehicles, and costs incurred before an agreement with IDOT is executed.
CHAPTER VI – URBANIZED AND PLANNING AREA BOUNDARIES

After each decennial census, the United States Census Bureau publishes a revised Urbanized Area (UZA – areas with over 50,000 in population) in the Federal Register along with its method for developing the UZAs. Once the UZAs are announced, their boundaries are used to develop MPAs and adjusted UZAs.

A. METROPOLITAN PLANNING AREA

The MPA boundary may need to be updated based on the Census Bureau’s announcement of the UZA. The MPA is the adjusted UZA (see below) plus any other contiguous area anticipated to be urbanized in the next twenty years. The MPA is the boundary under the planning jurisdiction of the MPO. The boundary is to be developed in partnership with local jurisdictions, local stakeholders, the state, and the MPO policy board. The MPA must be approved by the Illinois Governor.

In some instances an urban cluster outside the adjusted UZA may be partially included in the MPA and in these cases it is acceptable for an MPA to divide an urban cluster. Many MPAs also extend across state boundaries or have shared boundaries with other MPAs. When this is the case, an agreement as to which MPO has jurisdiction is required.

B. ADJUSTED URBANIZED AREA

After the Census Bureau announces the UZAs, transportation officials may incorporate additional adjacent territory for planning purposes. This is termed “smoothing” of the census-defined UZA and results in an adjusted UZA. IDOT Central Office and District
staff works with local jurisdictions, including the MPO, to develop the adjusted UZA. These adjusted UZAs must be approved by the MPO before being submitted to IDOT and FHWA for approval.

Functional Class

IDOT reviews the functional classification of the roadways throughout the UZA every five years to account for the roadways’ functions changing over that time due to new development, changes in land use, and/or other factors.

Changes to the functional class of roadways may be requested at any time by whatever entity has jurisdiction over the roadway. If a request for a change is within an MPA boundary, the request must be coordinated with the MPO or their designee. Once concurrence is received, the request is sent to IDOT for consideration, then on to the FHWA Illinois Division for approval. When IDOT reviews the functional classification of the system every five years, that review follows the same approval process.
CHAPTER VII - UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

All MPOs are required to produce a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) annually. The UPWP is an annual work plan of transportation planning activities that are to be conducted by the MPO and its implementers in the upcoming fiscal year. The UPWP must also contain a detailed budget of all state and federal transportation planning funds provided to the MPO. UPWPs are generally adopted for the state fiscal year beginning July 1 and are valid until June 30 of the following year. UPWPs must be approved by the MPO, IDOT, and, if a TMA, FHWA each year. Adoption and completion of the funding agreement between IDOT and the MPOs must be completed by July 1 of each year.

The UPWP combines the planning activities, regardless of fund source into a centralized document. The following is a guide to the UPWP process and will guide MPO’s through the joint process.

A. GROUNDWORK

1. Identifying Funding Sources

Funding for planning activities at the MPO level comes from four areas:

i. FHWA – PL
ii. FTA – 5303
iii. IDOT – Statewide Planning Funds (SPF)
iv. Local Agency Contributions

IDOT makes sure these funding sources are correctly identified and are accurately represented in the UPWP.

2. Local Agency Outreach

The annual development of the UPWP is a lengthy process and requires a significant amount of outreach to MPO members. While MPO staff is responsible for drafting the document, local agencies, including counties, municipalities and public transportation providers can propose planning studies and activities for federal funding and inclusion in the UPWP. It is recommended that MPOs begin these outreach discussions in the winter and spring.

B. DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM

1. Budget for Federal Planning Marks

In order to develop an UPWP prior to July 1 each year, the MPO must know the amount of Federal funds (FHWA PL and FTA 5303) they have available for the next SFY to carry out planning activities captured in the UPWP. These Federal funds (PL and 5303) are generally referred to as the “marks” for the MPOs. It is IDOT’s desire to provide final and complete marks to the MPOs that are based on FHWA and FTA final figures so that MPO UPWPs are accurate. While the FHWA generally releases their PL figures in early October, the release of FTA figures can be inconsistent. The timing of the release of these funds can affect IDOT’s ability to provide final and complete MPO marks in a timely manner. As such, IDOT encourages the MPOs to discuss with their Metro Manager whether they should assume an increase or decrease in their funding, or use the prior year’s mark as their starting point for the development of the UPWP. In this case, when final and complete numbers are eventually issued, the MPO may...
have to adjust (through amendment or administrative modification) the approved UPWP to reflect more accurate numbers.

2. Drafting the Program

Drafting the UPWP should include input from MPO Policy Committee members and it is recommended the Metro Manager is consulted throughout all stages of drafting the UPWP.

3. Preliminary Review

The first draft of the UPWP provided to the IDOT Metro Manager is for preliminary review. The Metro Manager will review the draft UPWP for inconsistencies and ensure that the UPWP budget and scope of work are appropriate and in accordance with federal planning guidance and requirements. IDOT will then return the draft to the MPO for final revisions as necessary.

4. Final Review

Once any changes due to input from members and regulatory changes have been made to the UPWP draft, the document can proceed through the approval process. While each MPO may have a different process to review and receive comments on the document (a subcommittee, a working group, etc.); the final required step in this process is approval by the MPO Policy Committee. IDOT requires all planning funds received from IDOT - both federal and state to be listed in the UPWP and approved by the MPO Policy Committee. Once the MPO Policy Committee has approved it, the document is officially submitted to IDOT via the designated Metro Manager. After receiving the UPWPs from a TMA, IDOT submits the document to USDOT for approval.

C. AMENDMENTS AND MODIFICATIONS

Changes to the UPWP involving increases or decreases of funding for work elements already existing in the UPWP are allowed by modification if they involve a ten percent or less change to total federal planning funds. The MPO must notify their IDOT metro managers of such changes when they occur.

Changes involving increases or decreases of funding for work elements already existing in the UPWP that involve more than a ten percent change in total federal planning funds require an amendment to the UPWP. Also, adding new work elements or deleting existing work elements require an amendment to the UPWP. If an amendment to the UPWP is required, the MPO must seek approval of the amendment by their IDOT Metro Manager.
CHAPTER VIII – METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN OR LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

A. CONTENTS AND GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

A Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), also known as a Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), is a federally required planning document that serves as the guiding force for a region’s transportation planning decisions. 23 CFR 450.322 and 49 CFR 613.100 state that the metropolitan planning process shall provide for the establishment and use of a performance-based approach to transportation decision-making to support the national goals. The LRTP is a significant contributor to that performance-based approach. This includes the use of developing a preferred scenario, travel demand modeling, population forecasting and many other planning efforts to anticipate demographic, population, mode and many more changes within the horizon year of the LRTP.

IDOT encourages MPOs to consider the LRTP as a document for how planning decisions are made at the regional level. The federal requirements are as follows:

1. Eight planning factors must be considered in the planning process as a potential basis for developing plan goals, objectives, and performance measures. These eight planning factors should be used to guide the discussion in formulating the LRTP goals not merely translated into the goals of the LRTP.
   i. Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.
   ii. Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.
   iii. Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.
   iv. Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and freight.
   v. Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.
   vi. Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight.
   vii. Promote efficient system management and operation.
   viii. Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.
   ix. Improve resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation.
   x. Enhance travel and tourism.

2. Consultation with various interested parties

As detailed below, various elements of the LRTP must be coordinated with appropriate agencies as specified in 23 USC 134 and 49 USC 5303, and other interested parties must be provided with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan. MPOs shall, to the maximum extent possible, hold meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times; employ visualization techniques to describe plans’ and make public information available in
electronically accessible format and means. Some of the agencies that might be consulted for participation in the LRTP process are listed below:

i. Federal, State, tribal, wildlife, land management, and regulatory agencies for potential environmental mitigation activities;

ii. Transit operators and the state for estimates of funds that will be available to support plan implementation;

iii. State and local agencies responsible for “land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation”, as appropriate.

iv. Air quality agencies in metropolitan areas that are designated as nonattainment for specific air pollutants, and

v. All other interested parties including “citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, and persons with disabilities, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment” on the plan.

3. **Identification and assessment of human and natural environments including but not limited to community assessment, cultural resources, historic resources, farmlands, wetlands and/or ecosystem and wildlife habitat as appropriate**

4. **Discussion of environmental mitigation activities and potential areas in which to carry out these activities.**

5. **Analysis of equity and environmental justice**

   i. Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act 42 USC 2000d-1 prohibits recipients of federal financial assistance from taking actions that discriminate on the basis of race, sex, color, national origin, or religion. Title VI bars intentional discrimination as well as disparate impact discrimination (i.e., a neutral policy or practice that has a disparate impact on protected groups).

   ii. **Executive Order 12898**, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, further amplifies Title VI by providing that “each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice a part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations”. These requirements apply not only during project development, but also to the processes and products of statewide and metropolitan transportation planning, such as the development of transportation plans.

These requirements are in regards to the general content of the plan. Other regulations and requirements exist and will be discussed in following sections.

**B. FISCAL CONSTRAINT AND FINANCIAL PLANNING**

LRTPs must include a financial plan identifying the revenue that is reasonably expected to be available for the specific projects and initiatives included in the plan. Part of this is...
determining available funding for proposed projects. Both revenues and expenditures should be in Year of Expenditure dollars.

The LRTP must be fiscally constrained, meaning, the cost of implementing the proposed transportation improvements, operations, and facility maintenance included in the plan must not exceed the level of reasonably expected revenue.

It is important to note that if funding shortfalls do occur, MPOs may not be required to alter the funding forecasts to meet the financial demands of fiscally constrained planned projects or revise the fiscally constrained planned project(s). Federal regulation requires that financial plans be based on future reasonably expected funding for transportation uses. Revenue projections should be based on data reflecting the existing and historical situation. However, the LRTP can identify and suggest additional funding strategies that may not exist yet, but might be available in the future. Since it is typical for proposed LRTP projects to exceed the amount of funding reasonably expected to be available, those projects may be identified for illustrative purposes as priority projects that would be implemented in the metropolitan area if additional revenues were identified.

C. HORIZON OR LIFE SPAN OF THE PLAN

Federal regulation 23 CFR 450.322 requires that “the metropolitan transportation planning process shall include the development of a transportation plan addressing no less than a 20-year planning horizon.

D. DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Development of the LRTP will differ between MPOs. MPOs should cultivate their own development process, ensuring that the requirements listed in this section are met and the planning process is cooperative, continuous, and comprehensive. IDOT, and specifically the Metro Manager, will participate in the development as well as work with MPOs to assist in determining these processes if needed.

E. UPDATE REQUIREMENTS

Updating a LRTP (every 4 years in an air quality nonattainment area and every 5 years in an attainment area) is an important part of the metropolitan planning process and is required per 23 CFR 450.322 (c) of the planning process. The purpose of updating the LRTP is to ensure that the document is valid and consistent with current and forecasted transportation and land use conditions, ensure that the financial plan is still fiscally constrained, and reflect changes in performance measures.

MPO committees should take time to think about the goals and objectives stated in the LRTP. Committees should reaffirm existing goals and objectives or revise them as the regional situation and priorities require. These goals and objectives should guide all other transportation planning processes - ensuring they are correct and relevant is vitally important to the planning process. Updates require public involvement and MPO Policy Committee approval.

F. APPROVAL

MPOs alone approve LRTPs which reflects the importance of developing regionally agreed upon goals, metrics, and strategies. However, while U.S. DOT and IDOT do not approve LRTPs, planning funds and project development approvals may be at risk if LRTP requirements are not satisfied. Typically, U.S. DOT would act through the certification review process or the STIP approval process to formally take action against LRTP deficiencies.
CHAPTER IX – TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Under 23 CFR 450, MPOs are required to develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that includes all surface transportation projects proposed for Federal funding under 23 U.S.C. and 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53. The TIP is based on existing area-wide transportation plans and programs of the implementing agencies and is prepared by MPO staff under the direction of the MPO’s Committees. The purpose of the TIP is to document projects that will use the Federal funding available for the life of the TIP (minimum of four-year period).

Projects that will seek federal authorization to use funding from any FHWA or FTA program are required to be in the TIP. Also, projects that are regionally significant regardless of fund source are required to be included. For projects to be included in the TIP, they must first be itemized in the LRTP or consistent with the goals of the LRTP.

A. RELATIONSHIP OF THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO THE STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Every three years, IDOT develops a new Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), which includes all federal funded projects proposed in Illinois over a four-year period. Any change to STIP projects located in MPO areas must first be reflected in the MPO TIP. The MPO TIPs are incorporated into the STIP by reference.

B. FISCAL CONSTRAINT

The TIP must be fiscally constrained, meaning that all funding estimates are based on anticipated state, federal, and local budgets. TIPs are fiscally constrained to assure project costs do not exceed reasonably available estimated revenues. Additionally, all projects should be shown in year of expenditure dollars. This means that increases in cost due to inflation over time should be considered in TIP projects and documented in TIP narratives.

C. UPDATE REQUIREMENTS

In Illinois, the MPO TIPs are generally updated annually to reflect project scope changes and adjustments in project cost. They may also be updated more often to reflect changes to project scope and funding, or to add or delete projects (through Administrative Modifications and Amendments as appropriate). MPOs are required to provide opportunities for public comment and review during TIP update development and subsequent TIP amendment processes.

D. PROCESS FOR TIP CHANGES

There are two types of changes that can be made to the TIP: administrative modifications and amendments. Each MPO may develop their own specific set of policies and procedures that clearly define what constitutes an administrative modification or an amendment. A general description of both of these TIP changes follows:

1. Administrative Modification

An administrative modification is a revision that does not require public input, demonstration of fiscal constraint, or a formal approval by the MPO’s committees. These modifications are revisions to the TIP that include minor changes to projects’ phase costs, minor changes to funding sources of previously
included projects, minor changes to project description, and the movement of an included project among fiscal years of the TIP.

2. Amendment

An amendment refers to any major change to a project in the TIP including: the addition or deletion of a federally funded or regionally significant project, a major change in project cost, a major change in design concept, or a major change in project scope. These revisions must maintain a year-to-year fiscal constraint for the first four years of the TIP. The amended project must also be included in the conformity determination if it affects capacity on the transportation system in nonattainment and maintenance areas. It also must be consistent with the MPO’s approved LRTP. Amendments require application of public participation procedures and MPO Policy Committee approval unless otherwise delegated by the MPO Policy Committee.

E. ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION

Advance Construction (AC) is a technique that allows the state to initiate a project using non-federal funds while preserving eligibility to convert to federal-aid funds in the future. After an AC project is federally authorized, the State may convert the project to regular federal-aid funding at any time before project close-out, provided federal funds are available for the project at the time of the conversion.

To notify MPOs of a project being authorized to use AC, the State sends an e-mail to the MPO requesting that the TIP be updated to reflect AC status. Once the MPO has completed the update to the TIP through an administrative modification, they notify IDOT through the confirmation link provided in the initial request e-mail. The AC designation needs to remain in the project listing until they are converted to using federal funds. The same e-mail notification and confirmation process is used when AC status is removed from a project.

CHAPTER X – PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

Per 23 CFR 450.316, MPOs must develop a Public Participation Plan (PPP) to document and guide public participation in major transportation planning products. Public participation should be inclusive, informative, proactive, early and continuing, and open and collaborative.

The following are the federal requirements for the PPP. These requirements specifically deal with public participation as it relates to a MPO’s PPP and the methods public feedback is gathered:

A. Require a minimum public comment period of 45 days before the MPO’s PPP is initially adopted or when amended.
B. Provide timely notice and reasonable access to information about transportation issues and processes to citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of transportation agency employees, private providers of transportation, other interested parties, and segments of the community affected by transportation plans, programs, and projects (including but not limited to central city and other local jurisdiction concerns). Provide adequate public notice of public participation activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points including, but not limited to, a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed LRTP and the TIP.
C. Employ visualization techniques to describe LRTPs and TIPs;
D. Make technical information and meeting notices available in electronically accessible formats and means;
E. Hold any public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times;

F. Demonstrate explicit consideration and response to public input received during the development of the LRTP and TIP.

G. Seek out and consider the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems.

H. When significant written and oral comments are received on the draft LRTP or TIP (including the financial plan) as a result of the public involvement process or the interagency consultation process required under the US EPA’s conformity regulations, a summary, analysis, and report on the disposition of comments shall be made part of the final plan and TIP.

I. If the final LRTP or TIP differs significantly from the one which was made available for public comment and raises new material issues which interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts, an additional opportunity for public comment on the revised plan or TIP shall be provided.

J. Public participation processes shall be periodically reviewed by the MPO in terms of their effectiveness in ensuring that the process provides full and open access to all.

K. These procedures will be reviewed by the FHWA and the FTA during certification reviews for TMAs, and as otherwise necessary for all MPOs, to ensure that full and open access is provided to MPO decision-making processes.

L. Metropolitan public involvement processes shall be coordinated with statewide and local public involvement processes wherever possible to enhance public consideration of the issues, plans, and programs and reduce redundancies and costs.

CHAPTER XI – TRANSIT

Public transit providers in Illinois rely on local, state and federal funds for capital and operating expenses. IDOT’s role in Illinois’ transit system includes the oversight of state and federal funding for transit projects across the state.

Transit capital funding allows agencies to improve safety and repair, rehabilitate and modernize aging assets and support system growth. The program needs are based on information provided by transit agency assessments per federal and state rules. IDOT’s Office of Intermodal Project Implementation (IPI), in conjunction with the Governor’s office, reviews proposed capital projects submitted by transit operators in all of Illinois. As funds become available from a state capital program or the Downstate Transportation Improvement Fund (DTIF), IDOT manages an application process by which transit grantees may apply for capital funding for different kinds of projects. Priority is given to projects that can address state of good repair needs immediately. All Downstate projects must be identified in the Downstate Capital Needs Assessment, required for the provision of public transportation, and identified in the appropriate TIP or STIP document.

IPI oversees the development of regional Human Services Transportation Plans (HSTP). Downstate is divided into nine regions with each region having a HSTP Regional Coordinator who writes the plan, oversees the Regional Transportation Committees and reviews project applications. Each MPA is expected to have a plan, developed by the MPO or transit provider, and a group that discusses needs and approves projects. This is often the MPO Technical Committee, but could also be a separate subcommittee.
APPENDIX A: STATE AND FEDERAL CONTACTS

A. IDOT METROPOLITAN PLANNING MANAGERS

Tom Caldwell, Metropolitan Planning Manager
IDOT Office of Planning & Programming
2300 South Dirksen Parkway, Room 311
Springfield, Illinois 62764
217-785-2368
Thomas.Caldwell@illinois.gov
MPOs: Champaign, Danville, Decatur, Kankakee

Doug Delille, Metropolitan Planning Manager
IDOT District 2
819 Depot Avenue
Dixon, Illinois 61021
815-284-5445
Douglas.Delille@Illinois.gov
MPOs: Beloit, Dubuque, Quad Cities & Rockford

Curtis Jones, Metropolitan Planning Manager
IDOT District 8
1102 Eastport Plaza Drive
Collinsville, Illinois 62234
618-346-3134
Curtis.Jones@illinois.gov
MPOs: Cape Girardeau, Carbondale, Saint Louis

Tom Kelso, Senior Metropolitan Planning Manager
IDOT Office of Planning & Programming
2300 South Dirksen Parkway, Room 311
Springfield, Illinois 62764
217-785-2996
Tom.Kelso@illinois.gov
MPOs: Chicago

Holly Ostdick, Metropolitan Planning Section Chief
IDOT Office of Planning
2300 South Dirksen Parkway, Room 311
Springfield, Illinois 62764
217-785-2994
Holly.Ostdick@Illinois.gov
MPOs: All
B. IDOT DISTRICTS

The individuals working with MPOs vary at each District office. Typical contacts include Local Roads Engineer and Programming Development Engineer.

IDOT District 1
201 West Center Court
Schaumburg, Illinois 60196-1096
Phone: 847/705-4000

IDOT District 2
819 Depot Avenue
Dixon, Illinois 61021-3546
Phone: 815/284-2271

IDOT District 3
700 East Norris Drive
Ottawa, Illinois 61350-1628
Phone: 815/434-6131

IDOT District 4
401 Main Street
Peoria, Illinois 61602-1111
Phone: 309/671-3333

IDOT District 5
13473 Illinois Hwy. 133
P. O. Box 610
Paris, Illinois 61944-0610
Phone: 217/465-4181

IDOT District 6
126 East Ash Street
Springfield, Illinois 62704-4792
Phone: 217/782-7301

IDOT District 7
400 West Wabash
Effingham, Illinois 62401-2699
Phone: 217/342-3951

IDOT District 8
1102 Eastport Plaza Drive
Collinsville, Illinois 62234-6198
Phone: 618/346-3100

IDOT District 9
State Transportation Building
P. O. Box 100
Carbondale, Illinois 62903-0100
Phone: 618/549-2171
C. FHWA ILLINOIS DIVISION CONTACT INFORMATION

John Donovan, Metropolitan Planning Specialist
FHWA Illinois Division – Chicago Urban Satellite Office
200 West Adams St., Suite 330
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312-353-4048
john.donovan@dot.gov
MPOs: Beloit, Chicago, DeKalb, Kankakee, Rockford

Betsy Tracy, Transportation Planning Specialist
FHWA Illinois Division
3250 Executive Park Drive
Springfield, Illinois 62703
217-492-4642
betsy.tracy@dot.gov
MPOs: Cape Girardeau, Carbondale, Champaign, Danville, Dubuque, Peoria, Quad Cities & Saint Louis

J.D. Stevenson, Planning, Environment & Right of Way Team Leader
FHWA Illinois Division
3250 Executive Park Drive
Springfield, Illinois 62703
217-492-4638
jerry.stevenson@dot.gov
MPO’s covered: Bloomington, Decatur & Springfield

D. FTA REGION 5 CONTACT INFORMATION

Tony Greep, Community Planner
FTA Region 5
200 West Adams Street, Suite 320
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312-353-1646
anthony.greep@dot.gov
Area: Chicago

David Werner, Community Planner
FTA Region 5
200 West Adams Street, Suite 320
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312-353-3879
david.werner@dot.gov
Area: Downstate
E. MPO METRO MANAGER MAP

[Map of Illinois Metropolitan Planning Organizations]

IDOT MPO Managers

- **Tom Caldwell**: O: 217/785-2368 M: 217/720-0840
- **Tom Kelso**: O: 217/785-2596 M: 217/836-9404
- **Doug Delille**: O: 815/284-5445 M: 217/299-7397
- **Curtis Jones**: O: 618/346-3134 M: 217/720-4408

June 26, 2017

[Logo: Illinois Department of Transportation Mapping & Information Systems Office of Planning & Programming]
APPENDIX B: METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS

Bi-State Regional Commission
Denise Bulat, Director
Gena McCullough, Staff
1504 Third Avenue
Rock Island, IL 61204
(309) 793-6300
www.bistateonline.org

Champaign/Urbana Urbanized Area Transportation Study (CUUATS)
Elizabeth Murray, Interim Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
Rita Morocoima-Black, Staff
1776 E. Washington Street
Urbana, IL 61802
(217) 328-3313
http://www.ccrpc.org/transportation/about/

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
Joseph Szabo, Executive Director
Tom Kotarac, Staff
Ross Patronsy, Staff
233 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 454-0400
www.cmap.illinois.gov

Danville Area Transportation Study
Jackie Marganski, Director
17 W. Main Street
Danville, IL 61832
(217) 431-2873
www.dats-il.com

Decatur Urbanized Area Transportation Study
Joselyn Stewart, Director
Suzan Stickle, Staff
#1 Gary K. Anderson Plaza
Decatur, IL 62523
(217) 424-2790
www.ci.decatur.il.us/citygovernment/duats.htm

DeKalb Area Transportation Study
John Laskowski, Director
Brian Dickson, Staff
Jessica Hyink, Staff
2235 S. Fourth St., Suite A
DeKalb, IL 60115
(815) 748-2367
www.cityofdekalb.com/Engineering/DSATS/DSTAS.htm
Dubuque Metro Area Transportation Study
Kelley Hutton-Deutmeyer, Director
Chandra Ravada, Staff
Gail Kuhle, Staff
3999 Pennsylvania Ave., Suite 200
Dubuque, IA 52002
(563) 556-4166
www.eciatrans.org/DMATS/dmats_tab.cfm

East-West Gateway COG (St. Louis)
Jim Wild, Director
Jerry Blair, Staff
One S. Memorial Dr.
St. Louis, MO 63102
(314) 421-4220
www.ewgateway.org

Kankakee Area Transportation Study
Vacant, Director
Geoffrey Olson, Staff
189 E. Court Street
Kankakee, IL 60901
(815) 937-2940
http://planning.k3county.net/transportation.htm

McLean County Transportation Study
Vasudha Pinnamaraju, Director
Jennifer Sicks, Staff
115 E. Washington St., Suite #1
Bloomington, IL 61701
(309) 828-4331
www.mcplan.org/department/division.php?structureid=28

Peoria/Pekin Urban Area Study
Eric Miller, Acting Executive Director
Maggie Martino, Staff
456 Fulton Street, Suite 401
Peoria, IL 61602
(309) 673-9330
http://www.tricountyrpc.org/transportation-committees

Rockford Metropolitan Agency for Planning
Michael Dunn Jr., Executive Director
Gary McIntyre, Staff
Jon-Paul Diipla, Staff
313 N. Main St.
Rockford, IL 61101
(779) 348-7627
http://www.rmapil.org/rmap-home/

Springfield-Sangamon County Regional Planning Commission
Norm Sims, Executive Director
Linda Wheeland, Senior Planner for Transportation Planning  
200 S. Ninth St., Room 212  
Springfield, IL 62701  
Phone: (217) 535-3110  
Fax: (217) 535-3111  
http://co.sangamon.il.us/departments/m-r/regional-planning-commission/program-areas/transportation-planning

**State Line Area Transportation Study (Beloit)**

T.J. Nee, MPO Director  
2400 Springbrook Ct  
Beloit, WI 53511  
Phone: (608) 364-6702  
Fax: (608) 364-2879  

**Southeast MPO**

Molly Hood, Director  
Ryan Shrimplin, Staff  
401 Independence  
Cape Girardeau, MO 63703  
(573) 339-6327  
http://southeastmpo.org/

**Southern Illinois MPO**

Cary Minnis, Director  
Joe Zdankiewicz, Transportation Planner  
3000 W. De Young Street, Suite 800B-3  
Marion, IL 62959  
(618) 997-9351  
www.greateregypt.org
APPENDIX C: MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Typically, the MPO TIPs contain a one page document with the list of requirements shown below that is signed by the MPO and the IDOT. While having this self-certification included in the TIP meets the letter of the law, in most cases, the MPO members and even staff may need a reminder of what is behind these requirements. As such, FHWA provides the following information on each requirement to better explain the requirement. This document can easily be used by the MPO staff and members to make themselves aware of what the requirements are and as a self-assessment tool in determining if they are carrying out the transportation planning process in accordance with these requirements prior to signing the self-certification document.

23 CFR 450.334 states the following:

(a) For all MPAs, concurrent with the submittal of the entire proposed TIP to the FHWA and the FTA as part of the STIP approval, the State and the MPO shall certify at least every four years that the metropolitan transportation planning process is being carried out in accordance with all applicable requirements including:

1. 23 USC 134, 49 USC 5303, and this subpart;

2. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, sections 174 and 176 (c) and (d) of the CAA, as amended (42 USC 7504, 7506 (c) and (d)) and 40 CFR part 93;

3. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (42 USC 2000d–1) and 49 CFR part 21;

4. 49 USC 5332, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age in employment or business opportunity;

5. Section 1101(b) of the SAFETEA–LU (Pub. L. 109–59) and 49 CFR part 26 regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in USDOT funded projects;

6. 23 CFR part 230, regarding the implementation of an equal employment opportunity program on Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts;

7. The provisions of the ADA of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.) and 49 CFR parts 27, 37, and 38;

8. The Older Americans Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6101), prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance;

9. Section 324 of title 23 U.S.C. regarding the prohibition of discrimination based on gender; and

APPENDIX D: ELIGIBLE COSTS FOR METROPOLITAN PLANNING FUNDS

PL funds are available for MPOs to carry out the metropolitan transportation planning process required by 23 U.S.C. 134, including development of metropolitan area transportation plans and transportation improvement programs. Eligible activities include conducting inventories of existing routes to determine their physical condition and capacity, determining the types and volumes of vehicles using these routes, predicting the level and location of future population, employment, and economic growth, and using such information to determine current and future transportation needs.

In addition, general eligibility activities under the SPR program can also be used for PL funds:

1. Engineering and economic surveys and investigations.

2. The planning of future highway programs and local public transportation systems and the planning of the financing of such programs and systems, including metropolitan and statewide planning under sections 134 and 135 [of 23 U.S.C.].


4. Studies of the economy, safety, and convenience of surface transportation systems and the desirable regulation and equitable taxation of such systems.

5. Research, development, and technology transfer activities necessary in connection with the planning, design, construction, management, and maintenance of highway, public transportation, and intermodal transportation systems.

6. Study, research, and training on the engineering standards and construction materials for transportation systems described in paragraph (5), including the evaluation and accreditation of inspection and testing and the regulation and taxation of their use.

7. The conduct of activities relating to the planning of real-time monitoring elements.

Source: [http://www fhwa dot gov/federalaid/projects cf m](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/federalaid/projects.cfm)
## APPENDIX E: LOCAL PROGRAMMING MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>General Description</th>
<th>Match Ratio</th>
<th>Eligible Items</th>
<th>Distribution Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL $</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STR</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Rural funds reserved for rural projects on any Federal-aid highway, including NHS, and bridge or safety projects on any public road.</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>ROW, PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>Formula / Dist 1 Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STU</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Urban funds reserved for urban area projects on any Federal-aid highway, including NHS; bridge or safety projects on any public road, transit capital projects and bus terminals and facilities.</td>
<td>Up to 80% federal; varies by MPO/Council</td>
<td>ROW, PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBP</td>
<td>Highway Bridge Program provides funds to replace or rehabilitate deficient highway bridges, perform systematic preventive maintenance and seismic retrofit.</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>ROW, PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBP Soft Match</td>
<td>Highway Bridge Soft Match Program used to earn credits for non-federal dollars used to repair or replace HBP eligible structures.</td>
<td>up to 100% of match</td>
<td>Construction only to earn</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Bridge</td>
<td>State designated HBP funds to replace bridges of significant cost ($1 million or more for local bridges).</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>CE, Construction</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program provides funding for safety improvement projects that will achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.</td>
<td>90/10</td>
<td>ROW, PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>General Description</td>
<td>Match Ratio</td>
<td>Eligible Items</td>
<td>Distribution Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRRRP</td>
<td>High Risk Rural Roads Program provides funds for construction and operational improvements on rural major or minor collectors and rural local roads with fatal and incapacitating injury crash rates above the state average.</td>
<td>90/10</td>
<td>ROW, PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>Safe Routes to School Program funds projects to enable and encourage children to walk and bicycle to school, improve safety and reduce traffic and air pollution in the vicinity of schools.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>ROW, PE, CE, Construction as well as evaluation, encouragement, and enforcement activities</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancements</td>
<td>Transportation related enhancements designed to strengthen the cultural, aesthetic, and environmental aspects of the intermodal transportation system.</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>ROW, PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funds projects and programs in air quality nonattainment areas for ozone, carbon monoxide and small particulate matter to reduce transportation related emissions.</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>ROW, PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>Formula (to MPO)/Selection (at MPO level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Bridge</td>
<td>Funds projects which demonstrate the application of innovative material technology in the repair, rehabilitation, replacement or new construction of bridges and other highway structures.</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>Innovative material and associated constr and engineering</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail-Highway Safety</td>
<td>Provides funding for safety improvements at rail / highway crossings.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Covered Bridge</td>
<td>Funds projects for the restoration and preservation of historic covered bridges</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>CE, Construction</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>General Description</td>
<td>Match Ratio</td>
<td>Eligible Items</td>
<td>Distribution Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Byways</td>
<td>Roads that are outstanding examples of scenic, historic, recreational, cultural, archeological and/or natural qualities make communities along the designated route eligible for federal scenic byways funding.</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>ROW, PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPP</td>
<td>High Priority Projects provides designated funding for specific projects (commonly referred to as demonstration projects) identified by Congress.</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>Based on earmark language</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>Transportation Improvements provides designated funding for specific projects identified in SAFETEA-LU.</td>
<td>varies from 80-100%</td>
<td>Based on earmark language</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCSP</td>
<td>Transportation, Community and System Preservation provides grants and research to investigate and address the relationship between transportation and community preservation and to identify private sector based initiatives.</td>
<td>varies from 80-100%</td>
<td>Based on earmark language</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCPD</td>
<td>National Corridor Planning and Development provides funds to states and MPO’s for coordinated planning, design and construction of corridors of national significance or international trade.</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>Based on earmark language</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 115, 117, 330, 112</td>
<td>Provides designated funding for specific projects identified by Congress.</td>
<td>varies up to 100%</td>
<td>Based on earmark language</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Lands</td>
<td>Provides funding for coordinated program of public roads and transit facilities serving Federal and Indian lands, including parks and forests.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>ROW, PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>General Description</td>
<td>Match Ratio</td>
<td>Eligible Items</td>
<td>Distribution Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL $</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Boat</td>
<td>Funds the construction of ferry boats and ferry terminal facilities.</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE $</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFT</td>
<td>Motor Fuel Tax provides funds for the purpose of improving, maintaining, repairing, and constructing highways.</td>
<td>up to 100</td>
<td>ROW, PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBP</td>
<td>Township Bridge Program provides funds for the use of road districts for the construction of bridges 20 feet or more in length.</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>ROW, PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBP Lapse Pool</td>
<td>Township Bridge Program unexpended funds from original county allotments used to construct bridges with cost exceeding road districts 4-year allotment limit.</td>
<td>80/20</td>
<td>ROW, PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP</td>
<td>Economic Development Program provides assistance in improving highway access to new or expanding industrial distribution or tourism developments.</td>
<td>100% state route 50% local route</td>
<td>PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARP</td>
<td>Truck Access Route Program helps local government agencies upgrade roads to accommodate 80,000 pound trucks.</td>
<td>$45K/lane mile or $22K/intersection up to $900K or 50% of project (whichever is less)</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Matching Assistance</td>
<td>Provides counties with funds to assist in matching federal dollars in areas that do not have sufficient tax base to provide adequate local funds.</td>
<td>up to 100% of match</td>
<td>ROW, PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Crossing Protection</td>
<td>Provides funding for safety improvements at rail / highway crossings.</td>
<td>Typ. 85% for warning devices / 60% for grade separation</td>
<td>ROW, PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>General Description</td>
<td>Match Ratio</td>
<td>Eligible Items</td>
<td>Distribution Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE $</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional Transfer for Present Worth</td>
<td>Allows the state to transfer a highway to a local agency in return for state funds that are deposited in the local agency MFT account.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>MFT eligible</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Engineer Salary</td>
<td>Aids counties in paying a reasonable professional salary for their county engineers by exchanging an equal amount of Federal Surface Transportation Program Rural (STR) funds for state funds.</td>
<td>50/50 swap</td>
<td>Salary only</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Add-on</td>
<td>Provides designated funding for specific projects identified by the Illinois Legislature.</td>
<td>up to 100%</td>
<td>Based upon language</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov/Secretary Commitment</td>
<td>Provides designated funding for specific projects identified by the Governor or IL Secretary of Transportation.</td>
<td>up to 100%</td>
<td>Based upon language</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Growth Cities</td>
<td>Provides funding to municipalities over 5,000 population experiencing above normal growth.</td>
<td>same as MFT</td>
<td>MFT eligible</td>
<td>Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated County</td>
<td>Provides funding to all counties excluding Cook based on MFT formula by combining three previous special county programs.</td>
<td>same as MFT</td>
<td>MFT eligible</td>
<td>Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needy Township</td>
<td>Program to assist townships and road districts that do not meet minimum revenue requirements for maintaining local roads.</td>
<td>same as MFT</td>
<td>MFT eligible</td>
<td>Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Access Road Program</td>
<td>Program for both internal and access road improvement projects to sites operated by IDNR or IHPA</td>
<td>up to 100%</td>
<td>ROW, PE, CE, Construction</td>
<td>by % usage for access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: FUNDING CHARTS

Local Surface Transportation Program Distribution

18.92% of Core Programs

85% STP Program Local Distribution

22.4596% Rural Areas (Statewide)

10.8503% Chicago Area (Partially Rural Counties)

82.3717% Chicago MPA

77.5404% Urban Areas (over 5,000 in population)

89.1907% Rural Areas (Statewide by Formula)

17.6293% Urban Areas (Distributed by Population)
Metropolitan Transportation Planning Funds Distribution

Illinois Apportionment for Metropolitan Transportation Planning Funds

- $70,000 base to each TMA and each non-TMA MPO wholly in the State of Illinois.
- Smaller base amounts to non-TMA MPOs split between two states:
  - Dubuque
  - South Beloit
  - Cape Girardeau

Remainder split by MPO urbanized area population:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urbanized Area</th>
<th>2010 Census Urbanized Area Population</th>
<th>% of Metropolitan Transportation Planning Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>8,406,900</td>
<td>80.3905%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>479,562</td>
<td>4.5858%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>146,798</td>
<td>1.4037%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>137,927</td>
<td>1.3189%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>97,386</td>
<td>0.9312%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>165,143</td>
<td>1.5792%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kankakee</td>
<td>85,409</td>
<td>0.8167%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubuque</td>
<td>3,791</td>
<td>0.0363%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Beloit</td>
<td>18,968</td>
<td>0.1814%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria</td>
<td>274,599</td>
<td>2.6258%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford</td>
<td>304,316</td>
<td>2.9100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Island</td>
<td>141,098</td>
<td>1.3492%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville</td>
<td>54,404</td>
<td>0.5202%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dekalb</td>
<td>70,198</td>
<td>0.6713%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbondale</td>
<td>70,697</td>
<td>0.6760%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Girardeau</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>0.0057%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,457,583</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0000%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G: REGIONAL ITS ARCHITECTURE REQUIREMENTS

- Architecture scope and region description – geography, timeframe, range of services, other overlapping or adjacent ITS architectures
- Stakeholder Identification – agency name and jurisdiction. Stakeholder agencies should be involved in the development of the architecture
- System inventory – a listing of regional system elements with descriptions, associated with stakeholders
- Needs and services – transportation needs for the region should be defined and the desired services should derive from the transportation needs
- Operational concept – roles of the primary stakeholders should be defined with enough detail to understand how they deliver ITS services
- Functional requirements – high level functions should be defined and the requirements should be stated with “shall” statements
- Interfaces and information flows – Information flows between elements should be defined and described
- Project sequencing – an initial sequencing of projects should be defined
- Agreements needed to implement projects – existing interagency agreements which can support ITS projects should be identified, and future agreements that will become necessary should be listed
- Standards identification – a listing of appropriate standards and a description how standards will be incorporated into project development should be presented
- Maintenance plan – there must be a specific documented plan for maintaining the architecture.
APPENDIX H: EXPLANATION OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>Continuing, Comprehensive, and Cooperative Planning Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Advance Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA</td>
<td>Clean Air Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Construction Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAP</td>
<td>Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>Congestion Management Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Calendar Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>Disadvantaged Business Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH</td>
<td>Division of Highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTIF</td>
<td>Downstate Transportation Improvement Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>Electronic Fund Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAST</td>
<td>Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY</td>
<td>Federal Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMIS</td>
<td>Fiscal Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP</td>
<td>Human Service Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICI</td>
<td>Office of Intermodal Project Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDNR</td>
<td>Illinois Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDOT</td>
<td>Illinois Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEPA</td>
<td>Illinois Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IML</td>
<td>Illinois Municipal League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTEA</td>
<td>Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEP</td>
<td>Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPA</td>
<td>Local Public Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRTP</td>
<td>Long Range Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP-21</td>
<td>Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPP</td>
<td>National Highway Performance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPP</td>
<td>Office of Planning and Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Planning Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public Participation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETEA-LU</td>
<td>Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFY</td>
<td>State Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>State Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPF</td>
<td>Statewide Planning Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR</td>
<td>Statewide Planning and Research Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>Safe Routes to School Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>Statewide Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-B</td>
<td>Local Bridge Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-R</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-U</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>Transportation Alternatives Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCM</td>
<td>Transportation Control Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA-21</td>
<td>Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMA</td>
<td>Transportation Management Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPWP</td>
<td>Unified Planning Work Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>United States Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DOT</td>
<td>United States Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US EPA</td>
<td>United States Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UZA</td>
<td>Urbanized Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>