

BUREAU OF LOCAL ROADS AND STREETS MANUAL

# Chapter 17 PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING – Federal Funds

## **Table of Contents**

<u>Secti</u>	<u>on</u>		<u>Page</u>
17-1	STATE P 17-1.01 17-1.02	PROPOSED HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	17-1-1 17-1-1
17-2	FEDERA 17-2.01 17-2.02 17-2.03	L PLANNING REQUIREMENTS  Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)  Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs)  Value Engineering (VE)  17-2.03(a) Applicability  17-2.03(b) Project Selection  17-2.03(c) Project Cost  17-2.03(d) Scope of Studies  17-2.03(e) Constructability Reviews	17-2-117-2-317-2-317-2-317-2-3
17-3	CLEARIN 17-3.01 17-3.02	NGHOUSE COORDINATION PolicySubstate Clearinghouses in Illinois	17-3-1
17-4	ACRONY	′MS	17-4-1
17-5	RFFFRF	NCES	17-5-1

## Chapter 17 PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING - Federal Funds

#### 17-1 STATE PROPOSED HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

#### 17-1.01 Multi-Year Highway Improvement Program

The Office of Planning and Programming (OPP) is responsible for development of the multi-year highway program. OPP works with the nine highway districts to develop priorities for specific improvement projects that meet Illinois Department of Transportation's (IDOT) overall accomplishment goals. This collective set of candidate projects from throughout the State is then analyzed further to develop multi-year programs within the fiscal limitations of projected revenues and which best meet IDOT's goals. Through these efforts a Multi-Year Highway Improvement Program is developed and published in April each year.

Federal funds are made available to local public agencies (LPA) through IDOT for use on various construction programs. Part of the Illinois apportionment is allocated to LPAs based on accepted distribution formulas. Included in the Multi-Year Highway Improvement Program are LPA Federally-funded projects scheduled for the first four years of the Multi-Year Program.

OPP works through the Central Bureau of Local Roads and Streets (CBLRS) to identify these projects. Each District BLRS office is given a program mark based on anticipated allocations of Federal funds. The District BLRS office then works with the LPAs to identify projects to be included in the program. During the early stage, the LPA should determine whether the project would be accomplished using one or several contracts. This decision is based on the complexity of the project, project costs, and the availability of Federal funds. Each LPA analyzes its priorities and available Federal funds plus the necessary matching funds. This enables the LPA to prepare its multi-year program. The LPA should check with the appropriate District BLRS office for the individual requirements on program submission. The District BLRS office categorizes and reviews all program requests to ensure that the total program costs fall within funding restraints. The District BLRS's program is then submitted to the CBLRS. The CBLRS reviews all programs for statewide funding restraints and then coordinates the District BLRSs' submittals with OPP.

#### 17-1.02 **Annual Highway Improvement Program**

#### 17-1.02(a) **Development**

Projects in the multi-year program that are scheduled within the current fiscal year become part of the Annual Highway Improvement Program. The Annual Program may include only a portion of the entire project (e.g., engineering, land acquisition, utility adjustments, and construction). When Federal funds are used for any of these items, the item is identified as a separate line item in the Annual Program. Any non-participating cost to be included in a State contract must be included in the program cost. The preliminary program for the upcoming fiscal year is

furnished to the State legislature in April. During the following month, the annual element of the multi-year program is finalized and is published in July each year.

## 17-1.02(b) Annual Program Revisions

A number of substantial increases in project cost estimates may have occurred on local projects between the time of their inclusion in the Annual Highway Improvement Program and the time of joint agreement development. These cost increases have an impact on the State appropriation available for accomplishment of the Annual Program.

In an effort to minimize the effect of cost increases on the Annual Program, the LPA should provide the District BLRS office with revised cost estimates as soon as practical in order to avoid delaying projects from letting. It is very important that the District BLRS office maintain the most current cost estimates. The District BLRS office should submit program revisions as soon as practical to the CBLRS for the following types of projects:

- projects less than \$200,000, programmed amount must be within \$10,000 of the funding agreement amount; or
- projects \$200,000 or greater than, programmed amount must be within 5% of the funding agreement amount.

The Program revision request should include program deletions to accommodate the cost increases. If the programming costs of other projects are being reduced to accommodate the increased program estimates, submit a brief explanation for the other project's changes so that the reduction in cost can be included. Requests should be submitted a minimum of thirteen weeks before the scheduled letting.

When it is determined that a project in the Annual Program will not be accomplished during the fiscal year, a request by the District BLRS office to substitute another project should be made as soon as practical.

### 17-2 FEDERAL PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

The planning process involves the development of projects, decisions on funding, and the determination of construction priorities. The CBLRS and District BLRS offices assist LPAs with project coordination.

## 17-2.01 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

The Federal Transportation Funding Act requires that a State establish a minimum four-year Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for highway and transit projects that are federally funded or require Federal action. This program is updated every year. Projects that are not considered of significant scale for individual identification may be grouped by function, work type, and/or geographic area.

The first three annual elements of IDOT's Multi-Year Highway Improvement Program are used as a basis for the development of the highway portion of the STIP. The portion of the STIP for projects located in urbanized areas is developed in cooperation with the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). Section 17-2.02 gives additional details of the MPO requirements. The State and the affected local officials select other projects. The responsible party for highway planning work at the local level is dependent on the type of area in which the project is located. The following presents the appropriate local official for each area type:

- 1. <u>Rural</u>. The chairman of the appropriate county board or designated representative, typically the county engineer, is responsible for the planning. The appropriate local official and the district formulate and establish the need and priority of construction projects.
- 2. <u>Urban</u>. A committee composed of county, city, and district representatives typically conducts planning for an urban area.

IDOT must provide citizens, affected agencies, and other interested parties a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed STIP. The STIP is published with reasonable notification of its availability. Upon completion of the public involvement review process, the STIP is submitted to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for approval. Approval of the STIP allows IDOT to proceed with the authorization of Federal funds for highway and transit projects. Projects not included in the federally approved STIP will not be eligible for Federal funding.

Projects included in the STIP can be advanced to or deferred from the first annual element without additional action or approvals. Projects being added to or deleted from the STIP that are of significant scale for individual identification are considered amendments and will require an opportunity for public review and comment and approval by the FHWA and FTA. The implementing LPA will be responsible for public involvement on the STIP amendment.

## 17-2.02 <u>Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs)</u>

23 USC 134 requires that an MPO be designated for each urbanized area and the metropolitan area has a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive (3-C) transportation planning process

that results in plans and programs that consider all transportation modes and support metropolitan community development and social goals. Areas with populations over 200,000 are called transportation management areas (TMAs). The Governor has designated an MPO for each urbanized area. Figure 17-2A lists the MPO for each urbanized area. The MPO is responsible, along with IDOT, for administering the 3-C process. This type of planning results in transportation improvement plans and programs consistent with the planned development of the urbanized areas and assists in determining the transportation modal choice. For additional information, see OPP's publication MPO Cooperative Operations Manual.

URBANIZED AREA (population 200,000 and under)	METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO)				
Beloit	State Line Area Transportation Study (SLATS)				
Bloomington / Normal	McLean County Regional Planning Commission (MCRPC)				
Carbondale / Marion	Southern Illinois Metropolitan Planning Organization (SIMPO)				
Cape Girardeau	Southeast Metropolitan Planning Organization (SEMPO)				
Champaign / Urbana	Champaign / Urbana Urban Area Transportation Study (CUUATS)				
Danville	Danville Area Transportation Study (DATS)				
Decatur	Decatur Urbanized Area Transportation Study (DUATS)				
DeKalb / Sycamore	DeKalb / Sycamore Area Transportation Study (DSATS)				
Dubuque	Dubuque Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (DMATS)				
Kankakee	Kankakee Area Transportation Study (KATS)				
Springfield	Springfield Area Transportation Study (SATS)				

URBANIZED AREA (population over 200,000)	METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) (TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREAS (TMA))				
Chicago	Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)				
Peoria / Pekin	Peoria / Pekin Urban Area Transportation Study (PPUATS)				
Quad Cities	Bi-State Regional Planning Commission				
Rockford	Rockford Metro Agency for Planning (RMAP)				
St. Louis	East-West Gateway Council of Governments				

## METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS AND TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AREAS

Figure 17-2A

IDOT provides fund estimates (program marks) to the MPOs. These estimates can be used in developing the metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) using the MPO's procedures for actions/approvals. The TIP must cover a period of not less than three years. The TIP may be modified at any time consistent with the procedures established for its development and approval. While the TIP does not need to be approved by the FHWA or FTA, copies of any new or amended TIP must be provided to both agencies. The TIP is included without modification into the STIP by reference.

The first year of the TIP constitutes an "agreed to" list of projects for project selection. No further project selection action is required to proceed with these projects. If a LPA wants to proceed with a project in the second or third year of the TIP, the project must be added to the annual element in accordance with the MPO's selection and amendment procedures.

#### 17-2.03 **Value Engineering (VE)**

Value Engineering (VE) is the systematic application of recognized techniques by a multidisciplinary team not directly involved with the planning and development phase of a project to identify the function of a product or service, establish a worth for that function, generate alternatives through the use of creative thinking, and provide the needed functions to accomplish the original purpose of the project, reliably and at the lowest life-cycle cost, without sacrificing safety, necessary quality, and environmental attributes of the project.

#### 17-2.03(a) **Applicability**

VE is applicable to all highway projects on the National Highway System receiving Federal assistance with an estimated cost of \$50 million or more, all bridge projects on the National Highway System receiving Federal assistance with an estimated cost of \$40 million or more, and any project the FHWA determines to be appropriate.

#### 17-2.03(b) **Project Selection**

Each district identifies applicable projects during the preparation of the multi-year program. Due to the complexity and scope of large projects, more than one VE study may be desirable. Other projects not meeting the definition may be selected for this program. The District shall notify the CBLRS and FHWA of the identified projects as part of the multi-year plan development.

#### 17-2.03(c) **Project Cost**

Costs associated with environmental studies, preliminary engineering, final design, land acquisition and construction should be used in determining the selected project's cost. The project cost includes state, LPA, and federal-aid highway funds.

#### 17-2.03(d) Scope of Studies

1. <u>Initiation of VE Study</u>. Local projects utilizing VE should be coordinated with the District VE Coordinator at the initiation of the project. Schedule VE studies in such a manner so as not to cause delay of the project. For a Phase I report with multiple construction contracts, develop a plan for conducting the VE study(s) based on the Phase I

considerations and the nature and complexity of the work type, (e.g., one VE study may cover alike construction projects). A single VE study should cover as many construction contracts under the single Phase I report as practicable and beneficial. The VE study should be initiated as close to the completion of the Phase I report as possible. Initiate the VE study no later than the time the construction plans are 30% complete and to allow for the implementation of the recommendations without delaying the project. The VE study should be, at the least, scheduled when the Phase I report is completed.

- 2. <u>Team Makeup</u>. The VE team, selected by the district, consists of individuals not personally involved in the design of the project. The team leader should have attended the National Highway Institute (NHI) course on Value Engineering or have equivalent experience in the preparation of VE studies. When making up the team, take into account the following:
  - Draw team members from either the district or central office;
  - Consider individuals from specialty areas depending on the project scope;
  - Assign personnel from construction, maintenance, and studies and plans (as applicable):
  - Include representatives from environment, operations, and land acquisition as necessary;
  - Include individuals from the public and other agencies when in the public interest;
  - Participation by FHWA members is encouraged where feasible;
  - Participation by the central office is encouraged; and
  - Invitation of IDOT personnel from nearby districts should be considered.

Qualified consultants may be retained to conduct VE studies provided the consultant has not worked on the subject project or the consultant maintains an independent VE study team.

- 3. <u>Process.</u> To best accomplish the goals of Value Engineering, the districts have considerable latitude in determining the type, size, and complexity of a VE study. Value engineering studies should follow widely recognized problem solving principles.
- 4. <u>Final Report</u>. Each Study concludes with a formal VE report, which outlines the decisions and recommendations and is presented to the Deputy Director/Regional Engineer or his/her representative. FHWA should be invited to all VE closeout meetings. Each district establishes a procedure for prompt review and implementation of the approved recommendations. When any recommendation is a major change to an approved Design Report or is a design exception to policy, the recommended change is coordinated through the appropriate central bureau.
- Monitoring. Each district appoints a VE coordinator who is knowledgeable in VE studies and trained in VE procedures. The VE coordinator's responsibilities include monitoring each VE study from initiation through the final report, reviewing the report, and assisting in the implementation of the findings. As there may be local projects meeting this threshold, the district VE coordinator will be responsible for coordinating both state and

## **BUREAU OF LOCAL ROADS & STREETS**

December 2018

PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING - Federal Funds

17-2-5

local roads administered projects. During the month of October, each year, the district VE coordinator sends the Bureau of Design and Environment's (BDE) VE coordinator a list, which itemizes the total number of VE studies conducted over the past year and the estimated cost savings for each study. BDE will summarize the information and forward it to the FHWA. The BDE VE coordinator will compile an annual list of approved recommendations from all VE studies completed within that year.

## 17-2.03(e) Constructability Reviews

Constructability reviews are a useful tool for complex or unusual projects and are encouraged as a cost or time saving measure. These reviews may include the use of IDOT personnel, unassociated with the project, or consultant/contractor teams that would not be bidding on the project. These reviews would not typically be making complex design change recommendations as would be expected in a full VE study. The constructability review would focus upon staging issues, work staging areas, field expedient procedures or methods, and similar activities focused upon accelerating or enhancing the proposed design.

### 17-3 CLEARINGHOUSE COORDINATION

## 17-3.01 **Policy**

Clearinghouse coordination was established after Federal Executive Order 12372 revoked the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Circular A-95. It offers States and LPAs the opportunity to initiate and establish their own review procedures and priorities. Under the Executive Order, States can decide which activities to review and how they should be reviewed. The Executive Order encourages States to establish a single point of contact, through which all reviews can be focused. In Illinois, the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity is the approval agency for the Regional Planning Commission Act (50 ILCS 15/0.01 and 15/1). The Regional Planning Commissions serve as the Substate Clearinghouses for regional reviews in all but four counties in the State. The FHWA is obligated to cooperate with the State-established process and must provide an explanation if State clearinghouse comments are not accommodated.

## 17-3.02 Substate Clearinghouses in Illinois

Because coordination with Substate Clearinghouses varies, this *Manual* does not discuss their coordination requirements. It is the LPA's responsibility to submit the request for Substate Clearinghouse review to the appropriate clearinghouse. The Substate Clearinghouse should be contacted to determine which projects require submittal.

Figure 17-3A lists the Substate Clearinghouses and corresponding counties currently recognized in Illinois.

Bi-State Regional Commission	Henry	Mercer *	Rock Island		
Blackhawk Hills Regional Council	Carroll Whiteside	Jo Daviess	Lee *	Ogle	Stephenson
Boone / Belvidere Regional Planning Commission	Boone				
Champaign County Regional Planning Commission	Champaign Piatt	Douglas * Vermillion	Ford	Iroquois	Livingston
Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning	Cook McHenry	DuPage Will	Kane	Kendall	Lake
Coles County Regional Planning and Development Commission	Clark	Coles	Cumberland	Edgar *	Moultrie
Greater Egypt Regional Planning & Development Commission	Franklin	Jackson	Jefferson	Perry	Williamson
Greater Wabash Regional Planning Commission	Crawford Wayne	Edwards White	Lawrence	Richland	Wabash
Kankakee County Regional Planning Commission	Kankakee				
Logan County Regional Planning Commission	Logan				
Macon County Regional Planning Commission	Macon				
McLean County Regional Planning Commission	McLean				
Morgan County Regional Planning Commission	Cass	Morgan	Scott		
North Central Illinois Council of Governments	Bureau Putnam	DeKalb Stark	Grundy	LaSalle	Marshall
South Central Illinois Regional Planning & Development Commission	Clay	Effingham	Fayette	Jasper	Marion
Southeastern Illinois Regional Planning & Development Commission	Gallatin	Hamilton	Hardin	Pope	Saline
Southern Five Regional Planning District & Development Commission	Alexander	Johnson	Massac	Pulaski	Union
Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan & Regional Planning Commission	Bond St. Clair	Clinton Washington	Madison	Monroe	Randolph
Springfield-Sangamon County Regional Planning Commission	Sangamon				
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission	Peoria	Tazewell	Woodford		
Two Rivers Regional Council of Public Officials	Adams	Brown	Pike	Schuyler	
West Central Development Council	Calhoun Montgomery	Christian Shelby	Greene	Jersey	Macoupin
Western Illinois Regional Council	Fulton Warren	Hancock	Henderson	Knox	McDonough

**Notes:** DeWitt, Mason, and Menard Counties have no designated regional planning commission. Winnebago County has a Planning and Economic Development Department. Counties with a \* may be served by a secondary regional planning commission.

## SUBSTATE CLEARINGHOUSES

Figure 17-3A

## 17-4 ACRONYMS

This is a summary of the acronyms used within this chapter.

BDE Bureau of Design and Environment
CBLRS Bureau of Local Roads and Streets
FHWA Federal Highway Administration
FTA Federal Transit Administration
IDOT Illinois Department of Transportation

ILCS <u>Illinois Compiled Statutes</u>
LPA Local Public Agency

MPO Metropolitan Planning Organization

NHI National Highway Institute

OMB Office of Management and Budget's OPP Office of Planning and Programming

STIP Statewide Transportation Improvement Program

TIP Transportation Improvement Program
TMA Transportation Management Areas

USC United State Code VE Value Engineering

## **BUREAU OF LOCAL ROADS & STREETS**

December 2018

PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING - Federal Funds

17-5-1

## 17-5 REFERENCES

- 1. <u>Illinois Compiled Statutes</u>, Illinois General Assembly by the Legislative Information System.
- 2. MPO Cooperative Operations Manual, IDOT, July 2017