

Methodology Comments and Responses

Bike/Pedestrian

Comment: Thank you for including a maximum of 14 out of 100 criteria scoring points for multi-modal infrastructure points and roadway and intersection projects, as well as 6 out of 100 for bicycle accommodations on resurfacing projects.

Comment: When FHWA guidelines are met or exceeded, award the maximum sidewalk points – maybe make that 8. If the FHWA calls for both sides but only one sidewalk is in the design, award less – maybe 5. Note that for “Rural Highways”, FHWA does not call for sidewalks, but it does suggest shoulders – so doing that would result in the maximum of 8. Deduct most or all sidewalk (or multi-use path) points if there are any intersections in the project area not having proper connectivity across a road, or preventing such connectivity in the future.

Response: Rural highways are not really an issue, as many, if not all applications will be for roads within municipalities. Council consideration will be given to changing the score to 8 for projects exceeding FHWA guidelines or 5 for projects not meeting FHWA guidelines. This will require re-tooling the definitions and explanations for proper or preventative connectivity.

Comment: For multi-use path, use “multi-use path or separated bike lanes”, to allow the flexibility appropriate in some denser contexts. Increase to 8 points maximum.

Response: We are open Council consideration will be given to the idea of re-phrasing multi-use path and the point increase.

Comment: For on-street bike lanes, use “on-street bike lanes or paved shoulders”. It should be noted that the width of the bike lanes or paved shoulders should meet national recommendations for the road’s context, and that any rumble strips must use national bike-friendly design techniques including at least three (or four?) feet of clear zone. Decrease to 6 points maximum.

Response: Council consideration will be given to the idea of re-phrasing on-street bike lanes and the point decrease.

Comment: For the resurfacing project 6 points, keep as is, adding the note directly above about width and rumble strips

Response: We are willing to add the note regarding bicycle friendly rumble strips and width.

Local Match Ratio

Comment: \$300,000 and \$100,000 cap is low and may limit the type of project that can be done. I also don't follow the 100/300 cap wording.

Response: This amount is an agreed upon number determined by the MCCOM STP Methodology Review Committee. It is not the priority of STP-L to fund engineering. This section will be reworded to be clearer.

Federal Funding Cap

Comment: Can this be increased to \$3,000,000? This would be closer in sync with what a common roundabout improvement costs.

Response: No – in order to be able to fund as many projects as possible, the cap will remain at \$1.5 million. If we double the cap to \$3 million, then fewer projects can get funded. This \$1.5 million federal funding cap ensures lower capacity municipalities can get funding for projects.

Milestone Extensions

Comment: Suggest providing three (3) one year extensions instead of a one-time six month Phase I/II extension, as deadlines shift often based on a multiple of outside factors.

Response: The one-time 6-month extension is a CMAP Active Program Management (APM) guideline that we must comply with, so this cannot be changed.

Project Evaluation Criteria – Roadways and Intersection Projects

Comment: Move Safety need to highest point value; followed by Safety Improvement.

Response: The Council may consider the possibility of rearranging point values to accommodate this comment.

Project Evaluation Criteria – LAFO

Comment: Move Safety need to highest point value

Response: The Council may consider the possibility of rearranging point values to accommodate this comment.

Other

Comment: Suggest providing points for all partnering communities. For instance, if McHenry County and Algonquin or Cary partner on a project, they get 10 points.

Response: While there certainly is value in partnerships, the decision was made not to award points based on that criteria alone. Applicants should submit applications for their most worthwhile projects, regardless of whether they are able to partner with another agency.