

Project Information					Scoring - in categories with different values, the possible points are first listed for roadway/intersection projects, then resurfacing																
					ADT Possible Points 15		Safety Need 12/8		Safety Improvement 4		Pavement Condition 9/30		Multi-Modal Infrastructure Components 14/6		Project Readiness 15/10		Community Cohort 6		ON TO 2050 Planning Measures 25		Total 100
Project	Municipality	Project Type	Total Cost	Amount Requested	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	Answer	Score	
Mason Hill Rd	Bull Valley	Resurface	\$1,498,800	\$1,144,000	3100	3.1	critical	8	N/A	N/A	50.5	30	yes	6	pre-finals	10	2	4	both	25	86.1
Haligus Rd	Lakewood	Resurface	\$920,857	\$712,726	4450	4.5	low	2	N/A	N/A	58.0	30	yes	6	pre-finals	10	1	0	both	25	77.5
Ringwood Rd	Ringwood	Resurface	\$273,070	\$206,708	5800	5.8	medium	4	N/A	N/A	60.0	30	none	0	E2 contract	8	2	4	both	25	76.8
Riverside Dr	Johnsburg	Resurface	\$2,593,700	\$1,500,000	3600	3.6	medium	4	N/A	N/A	53.6	30	yes	6	E1 contract	2	1	0	both	25	70.6
Cary/Main Roundabout	Algonquin	R&I	\$3,700,000	\$1,500,000	7500	7.5	minimal	0	44	3	58.1	6	multi use and sidewalk	14	pre-finals	15	1	0	both	25	70.5
Green St	McHenry	Resurface	\$1,255,042	\$919,187	5250	5.3	low	2	N/A	N/A	59.3	30	yes	6	E1 contract	2	1	0	both	25	70.3
Prospect St	Marengo	R&I	\$2,226,000	\$1,500,000	4900	4.9	medium	6	27	2	29.8	9	multi use and sidewalk	14	E1 contract	3	3	5	both	25	68.9
N Main St	Crystal Lake	R&I	\$3,508,600	\$1,500,000	16100	15.0	critical	12	46	3	40.0	9	sidewalk	7	E2 contract	12	1	0	bike	10	68.0
Madison/South/Lake Roundabout	Woodstock	R&I	\$6,084,400	\$1,500,000	10400	10.4	minimal	0	46	3	65.5	3	sidewalk	7	pre-finals	15	2	4	both	25	67.4
Souwanas Tr	Algonquin	R&I	\$3,905,895	\$1,500,000	1650	1.7	minimal	0	18	1	44.0	9	multi use and sidewalk	14	pre-finals	15	1	0	both	25	65.7
Kreutzer Rd	Huntley	R&I	\$11,040,050	\$1,500,000	8475	8.5	critical	12	45	3	76.9	0	multi use and sidewalk	14	E1 contract	3	1	0	both	25	65.5
Johnsburg Rd	Johnsburg	Resurface	\$1,983,200	\$1,500,000	7400	7.4	minimal	0	N/A	N/A	54.3	30	none	0	E1 contract	2	1	0	both	25	64.4
Valley View Rd	Prairie Grove	Resurface	\$689,222	\$527,417	2075	2.1	minimal	0	N/A	N/A	74.1	20	yes	6	pre-finals	10	1	0	both	25	63.1
Winn Rd	Spring Grove	Resurface	\$1,958,434	\$1,500,000	4300	4.3	minimal	0	N/A	N/A	75.6	20	yes	6	E1 contract	2	2	4	both	25	61.3
Bull Valley Rd	McHenry	Resurface	\$357,920	\$262,139	10000	10.0	medium	4	N/A	N/A	65.4	20	none	0	E1 contract	2	1	0	both	25	61.0
Reed Rd	Lake in the Hills	Resurface	\$98,311	\$78,649	6550	6.6	low	2	N/A	N/A	48.0	30	none	0	E1 contract	2	1	0	bike	15	55.6
Diggins St	Harvard	Resurface	\$599,760	\$539,784	2100	1.9	minimal	0	N/A	N/A	50.5	30	none	0	E1 contract	2	4	6	bike	15	54.9
Sullivan Lake Rd/Four Seasons Blvd	Lakemoor	R&I	\$1,590,000	\$1,199,940	4900	4.9	minimal	0	25	1	42.2	9	multi use	7	E1 contract	3	3	5	both	25	54.9
Marengo Rd	Harvard	Resurface	\$915,436	\$814,374	1850	1.9	minimal	0	N/A	N/A	55.3	30	none	0	E1 contract	2	4	6	bike	15	54.9
Three Oaks/Sands Traffic Signal	Crystal Lake	R&I	\$2,016,107	\$1,500,000	12200	12.2	minimal	0	46	3	86.0	0	multi use	7	E1 contract	3	1	0	both	25	50.2
Pingree Rd	Lake in the Hills	Resurface	\$265,811	\$212,649	875	0.9	minimal	0	N/A	N/A	56.0	30	none	0	E1 contract	2	1	0	bike	15	47.9
Howe/Wonder Lake Rd Resurfacing	Greenwood	R&I	\$430,430	\$384,680	2300	2.3	low	3	35	2	46.2	6	none	0	E1 contract	3	4	6	both	25	47.3
Dartmoor Dr	McHenry	Resurface	\$558,770	\$329,780	2350	2.4	minimal	0	N/A	N/A	31.9	10	yes	6	E1 contract	2	1	0	both	25	45.4
Crystal Lake Ave/Walkup Roundabout	Crystal Lake	R&I	\$1,520,176	\$1,216,141	3600	3.6	minimal	0	46	3	86.9	0	sidewalk	7	E1 contract	3	1	0	both	25	41.6
Crystal Lake Rd	Lake in the Hills	Resurface	\$374,117	\$299,294	3550	3.6	minimal	0	N/A	N/A	75.0	20	none	0	E1 contract	2	1	0	bike	15	40.6
McCullom Lake Rd	McCullom Lake	Resurface	\$373,100	\$333,090	5050	5.1	minimal	0	N/A	N/A	41.0	10	none	0	E1 contract	2	4	6	bike	15	38.1

bolded numbers (ADT) indicate an average

gray projects are projects previously awarded STP funds (grandfathered)

questions should be directed to Emily Daucher, Planning Liaison: ekdaucher@mchenrycountyil.gov

MCCOM STP-L Scoring Documentation

INTRODUCTION

This document outlines the scoring methodology used by MCCOM staff to score the STP-L project applications received in the 2020 STP-L Call for Projects Cycle. This document is organized by scoring criteria (for roadways and intersections) as presented in the application. Where scoring is different between project types, the differences will be highlighted. After approval of scores from project sponsors, the draft program will be available for review before the next Council of Mayors meeting. The final program will be approved at the July Council of Mayors meeting.

If you have any questions, comments, or concerns about a project's score, please contact Emily Daucher, Planning Liaison, at ekdaucher@mchenrycountyil.gov.

Project Evaluation Criteria - Resurfacing Projects

Resurfacing Projects		
Project Scoring Categories	100 points total	
1. Pavement Condition (9 points) Based on the pavement condition testing done by CMAP (IRI, Cracking_percent, rutting, and faulting)	Poor (0-45)	30
	Fair (46-60)	20
	Satisfactory (61-75)	10
	Excellent (76-100)	0
2. Project Readiness (15 points)	Phase II engineering complete (pre-final plans submitted to IDOT)	10
	Phase II engineering contract executed	8
	Phase I engineering report completed; design approval granted	6
	Phase I engineering report (PDR) draft submitted to IDOT	4
	Phase I engineering contract entered into by project applicant	2
3. Traffic Volume - Average Daily Traffic (ADT) (15 points max)	Two Lane Road	Four Lane Road
	ADT/1000 = Points	ADT/2000 = Points
4. Safety Need (12 points) Based on IDOT Safety Tiers (SRI)	Critical	8
	High	6
	Medium	4
	Low	2
5. Bicycle Accommodations (6 points)	Project adds or includes bicycle facilities such as bike lanes, widened shoulders, or other bicycle safety measures.	6
6. Community Cohort (6 points) McHenry County is considered to be in Community Cohort 1	Community Cohort 4	6
	Community Cohort 3	5
	Community Cohort 2	4
	Community Cohort 1	0
7. ON TO 2050 Planning Measures	Project sponsor has adopted a complete streets policy or ordinance	10
	Project uses green infrastructure to manage stormwater	15

Project Evaluation Criteria - Roadway and Intersection Projects

Roadway and Intersection Projects		
Project Scoring Categories	100 points total	
1. Traffic Volume - Average Daily Traffic (ADT) (15 points max)	Two Lane Road	Four Lane Road
	ADT/1000 = Points	ADT/2000 = Points
2. Safety Need (12 points) Based on IDOT Safety Tiers (SRI)	Critical	12
	High	9
	Medium	6
	Low	3
	Minimal	0
3. Safety Improvement (4 points) Based on the maximum crash reduction factor (CRF) associated with proposed project countermeasures	Above 50%	4
	36%-49%	3
	26%-35%	2
	15%-25%	1
4. Pavement Condition (9 points) Based on the pavement condition testing done by CMAP (IRI, Cracking_percent, rutting, and faulting)	Under 15%	0
	Poor (0-45)	9
	Fair (46-60)	6
	Satisfactory (61-75)	3
	Excellent (76-100)	0
5. Multi-modal Infrastructure Components (14 points max, cumulative points)	New Alignment	3
	Project includes multi-use path	7
	Project includes on-street bike lanes	7
	Project includes marked shared lanes	4
	Project includes sidewalk	7
6. Project Readiness (15 points)	Project adds new bus shelters	3
	Phase II engineering complete (pre-final plans ready to be submitted to IDOT)	15
	Phase II engineering contract executed	12
	Phase I engineering report completed; design approval granted	9
7. Community Cohort (6 points) McHenry County is considered to be in Community Cohort 1	Phase I engineering report (PDR) draft submitted to IDOT	6
	Phase I engineering contract entered into by project applicant	3
8. ON TO 2050 Planning Measures	Community Cohort 4	6
	Community Cohort 3	5
	Community Cohort 2	4
	Community Cohort 1	0
Project sponsor has adopted a complete streets policy or ordinance	Project sponsor has adopted a complete streets policy or ordinance	10
	Project uses green infrastructure to manage stormwater	15

ADT

Preliminary score range: 0.9-15.0

Average score: 5.3

ADT was calculated by using the sponsor provided number and verifying that number with IDOT's Getting Around Illinois AADT map. In cases where there were multiple roadways included in the project, the average AADT of those roadways were taken. These numbers are **bolded** in the scoring sheet. The AADT numbers were then divided by 1000 for two-lane roads and 2000 for four-lane roads. The maximum score is 15.

7 applications received 2.5 points or below, 6 applications received 2.6-4.7 points, 6 applications received 4.8-7.2 points, and 7 applications received 7.3-15 points.

SAFETY NEED

Preliminary score range: 0-12 (roadway/intersection), 0-8 (resurfacing)

Average score: 3.3 (roadway/intersection), 1.625 (resurfacing)

Safety need looked at IDOT's SRI Safety Tiers to determine the safety need of the project location. The safety need only applied to the location of the project and not the entire roadway. In situations where IDOT lacked data for a segment, that segment was ignored and the safety need was determined by the rest of the project location.

Of the 16 resurfacing applications, 8 received 0 points, 3 received 2 points, 3 received 4 points, 0 received 6 points, 1 received 8 points. Of the 10 roadway and intersection projects, 6 received 0 points, 1 received 3 points, 1 received 6 points, and 2 received 12 points.

SAFETY IMPROVEMENT- roadway and intersection projects only

Preliminary score range: 1-3

Average score: 2.4

Safety improvement looked at the improvements the project sponsor indicated were part of the project. These improvements were evaluated in a CMAP Safety Improvement spreadsheet that included the CMF for each improvement. From there, the improvement with the highest CMF was chosen as the value for determining the score. A CMF of 0.46 = 46% = 3 points. Below is a list of improvements that were indicated on applications and their CMF.

Countermeasure	CMF
Convert all-way stop controlled intersection to roundabout	0.46
Convert minor stop to - traffic signal with left turn lane	0.46
Improve curve super-elevation	0.45
Convert minor road stop intersection to roundabout	0.44
Install chevron signs on horizontal curves	0.40
Median treatments - provide a raised median-2 lane at location with access issues	0.39
Replace left-turns with right-turn/u-turn combination	0.36
Add shoulder where not provided (4' or greater)	0.35
Install lighting on a roadway segment	0.32
Install curve advance warning signs (flashing beacon)	0.30
All stop/minor stop add left turn lane on one approach-major road	0.27
Install twtlt (two-way left turn lane) on two lane road	0.26
Prohibit on-street parking	0.22
General-install median	0.20
Install centerline rumble strips/stripes	0.20
Install edge-lines and centerlines(much improved where high crash area)- or increase 4 to 6 inch	0.18
Install/upgrade signs with new fluorescent sheeting (regulatory/warning)	0.18
Add left turn lane permissive	0.15
Install left-turn lane (4-leg intersection) -minor stop	0.15
Install mast arm	0.15
Install/upgrade larger or additional stop signs or other intersection warning/regulatory signs	0.15
Widen lanes 10 to 12 feet	0.15
Curves - install advanced curve speed/warning sign	0.13
Raised median	0.11
Add intersection lighting	0.10
Add signal (additional primary head)- all lanes have signal	0.10
Install guardrail	0.10
Add right turn lane on one approach-signal-urban	0.09
Positive left turn offset - 1 ft minimum	0.08
Add right turn lane	0.07
Widen lanes 11 to 12 feet	0.05
Flatten sideslopes	0.03
Signing - install advance street name signs	0.01
Add ADA improvements	n/a

Countermeasure	CMF
Add pedestrian island	n/a
Add pedestrian signal	n/a
Add sidewalk	n/a
Emergency vehicle traffic signal preemption	n/a
Install pedestrian bump outs/curb extensions	n/a
Improve pedestrian crossing-other	n/a
Improve RR crossing	n/a
Lane channelization -other	n/a
Significantly improve median	n/a

Of the 10 roadway and intersection projects, 2 received 1 point, 2 received 2 points, 6 received 3 points, and 0 received 4 points.

PAVEMENT CONDITION

*Preliminary score range: 0-9 (roadway/intersection), 10-30 (resurfacing)
Average score: 4.8 (roadway/intersection), 25 (resurfacing)*

Pavement condition was evaluated using CMAP's PCI data. Score determination was from [Lake County's GIS map](#). Segments were weighted based on length. In some cases, project sponsors self-reported PCI data. The data was reviewed and, if deemed acceptable, used in place of CMAP's data.

Example:

Road Name	Beginning Station	End station	Length	PCI	L * PCI
Road Name	0	0.5	0.5	50	25
	0.5	1	0.5	60	30
	1	1.25	0.25	30	7.2
	1.25	2	0.75	40	30
	2	2.5	0.5	70	35
Total				2.5	127.5
Score					51

Of the 16 resurfacing projects, 0 received 0 points, 2 received 10 points, 4 received 20 points, and 10 received 30 points.

Of the 10 roadway and intersection projects, 3 received 0 points, 1 received 3 points, 3 received 6 points, and 3 received 9 points.

MULTI-MODAL COMPONENTS

*Preliminary score range: 0-14 (roadway/intersection), 0-6 (resurfacing)
Average score: 9.1 (roadway/intersection), 2.625 (resurfacing)*

Multi-modal components were indicated by the project sponsor on the application. For roadway and intersection projects, scores were decided based on the components selected, with a maximum score of 14 points. For resurfacing projects, a project could receive either 0 points or 6 points. Components for resurfacing projects included striping, bike lanes, signage, and others.

Of the 16 resurfacing projects, 9 received 0 points, and 7 received 6 points.

Of the 10 roadway and intersection projects, 1 received 0 points, 5 received 7 points, and 4 received 14 points.

PROJECT READINESS

*Preliminary score range: 3-15 (roadway/intersection), 2-10 (resurfacing)
Average score: 8.1 (roadway/intersection), 3.875 (resurfacing)*

Project readiness scores were assigned based on how far the project sponsor was in the engineering process. Those with pre-final plans ready to be submitted included those with the application. Resurfacing projects could score 2-10 points, while roadway and intersection projects could score 3-15 points.

Of the 16 resurfacing projects, 12 received 2 points, 0 received 4 points, 0 received 6 points, 1 received 8 points, and 3 received 10 points.

Of the 10 roadway and intersection projects, 5 received 3 points, 0 received 6 points, 1 received 9 points, 1 received 12 points, and 3 received 15 points.

COMMUNITY COHORT

*Preliminary score range: 0-6
Average score: 1.92*

Community cohorts are determined by CMAP, with Cohort 1 being the more advantaged communities and Cohort 4 being the least. Cohort 1 received 0 points, Cohort 2 received 4, Cohort 3 received 5, and Cohort 4 received 6. Cohorts are below:

COHORT 1	COHORT 2	COHORT 3	COHORT 4
Algonquin	Bull Valley	Lakemoor	Greenwood
Barrington Hills	Fox River Grove	Marengo	Harvard
Cary	Ringwood	Oakwood Hills	Hebron
Crystal Lake	Spring Grove	Wonder Lake	Holiday Hills
Huntley	Trout Valley		McCullom Lake
Johnsburg	Union		Richmond
Lake in the Hills	Woodstock		
Lakewood			
McHenry			
Prairie Grove			
McHenry County			

We received 16 applications from Cohort 1, 4 from Cohort 2, 2 from Cohort 3, and 4 from Cohort 4.

ON TO 2050 PLANNING MEASURES

*Preliminary score range: 10-25
Average score: 22.1*

Scoring for planning measures required an approved Complete Streets policy or ordinance, inclusion of green infrastructure in the project scope, or both. Green infrastructure includes trees, bioswales, native planting, or any other natural or "green" methods used to mitigate and manage stormwater. Note that for roadway and intersection projects, the Complete Streets policy was worth 10 points and the green infrastructure worth 15, while for resurfacings a Complete Streets policy was worth 15 points and green infrastructure worth 10.

One project received 10 points, 6 received 15 points, 19 received 25 points.