

DRAFT FOR PUBLIC REVIEW
SEPTEMBER 4 - OCTOBER 18, 2012

Please submit comments in writing to
McLean County Regional Planning Commission
to jsicks@mcplan.org, or in person or by mail to
the Commission office at Government Center.

PUBLIC HEARING, October 19, 2012

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION TO THE MID-21ST CENTURY

Long Range Transportation Plan 2040
Bloomington – Normal Urbanized Area & McLean County



MCLEAN COUNTY
Regional Planning Commission

APPENDICES

APPENDICES

1. Intergovernmental Development Review form
2. Functional Classified Street Index
3. TransSummit report
4. Transportation Survey Questions, Results and Citizen Comments (to be updated at intervals)
5. Programmed Projects from the FY 2013 – 2017 Transportation Improvement Program
6. Supporting Information regarding SAFETEA-LU programming

1: INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVIEW FORM

**Review of Development Proposal for Consistency with Local and Regional Comprehensive Plans
McLean County Regional Planning Commission (MCRPC)**

1. INTENT

This review is intended to assist local governments in determining the consistency of regionally significant development proposals with the objectives and policies of local and regional comprehensive plans. "Regionally significant" is generally defined as proposals of five or more acres, but may include smaller projects, including infill or redevelopment, that could reasonably be expected to produce significant impacts or benefits beyond the immediate vicinity of the project in terms of traffic generation and/or other considerations. This review results in a rating of the specified proposal based on the number of identified features that support the comprehensive plans. This review and rating process is designed to help ensure at least minimal features are provided in new development and to encourage the provision of optional features that support adopted strategies to enhance the quality of life in this region.

The Intergovernmental Development Committee, which includes local and regional planning and engineering staff, normally reviews each project and assigns a rating of "A" through "E" for consideration by the review bodies. When sufficient time exists before the designated action dates, the MCRPC also notes its recommendation regarding project approval.

2. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Case No.: _____ Jurisdiction: _____
 Project Name: _____ Applicant Name: _____
 Action Dates: _____ PC/ZBA _____ Council/Board _____
 No. of Acres: _____ Location: _____

No. of Dwelling Units: _____ Public Water Supply? _____ Y _____ N Public Sewer Service? _____ Y _____ N
 Access: _____
 Applicant's Proposed Land Use: _____ Applicant's Proposed Zoning: _____

Existing Land Use: _____ Existing Zoning: _____
 Subject Property _____
 Property North _____
 Property East _____
 Property South _____
 Property West _____

Affected Taxing Bodies Represented on MCRPC: <input type="checkbox"/> City of Bloomington <input type="checkbox"/> Town of Normal <input type="checkbox"/> BN Water Reclamation District <input type="checkbox"/> BN Airport Authority <input type="checkbox"/> District 87 <input type="checkbox"/> Unit 5 Nearest Elementary School: _____ _____
--

3. PROJECT TYPE/PHASE (Check all that apply):

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Annexation Agreement | <input type="checkbox"/> Zoning Change | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Subdivision Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Site Plan Review | <input type="checkbox"/> Concept Plan |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary PUD Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Special Use | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify): _____ |

4. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FEATURES IN PROJECT VICINITY (See attached map.)

Land Use: _____ Street or Road Improvements: _____
 Com. Facilities (parks, schools, trails, fire stations, other): _____

5. MINIMAL FEATURES IN SUPPORT OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

		Yes	No	N/A
Land Use	Project is consistent with adopted land use plan or provides acceptable alternative.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	At least 50% of project area is within planned growth area and/or contiguous to an existing developed area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	At least 20% of project site is within or contiguous to existing urban service area or development.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Project is compatible with adjacent land use.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Proposed multiple land uses are compatible (if applicable).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Meets zoning map amendment guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Meets general commercial zoning requirements as applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Meets general municipal landscape standards as applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transportation	Meets local requirements for street, curb and gutter, and sidewalk design, or provides staff approved alternative design.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provides traffic impact analysis, if required, based on expected trip generation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provides appropriate number of connections to local street or road networks.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provides adequate connectivity with existing and future adjacent developments (including stub streets).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Project streets are interconnected with no more than 20% of lots fronting on streets that terminate as dead ends.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Points of egress with arterial roadways are consistent with the requirements of an access management plan and/or policy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Proposed arterial and collector streets within the project are compatible with transit and pedestrian movement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Utilities	Provides public water service or individual water supplies approved by McLean County Public Health Department (MCPHD).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provides public sewer service or other wastewater disposal system approved by MCPHD.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Open Space/ Other Features	Implements planned bikeway or greenway (if applicable).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Meets appropriate park land dedication requirement (if applicable).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Meets school land dedication requirement (if applicable).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preserves cultural or historic features.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. OPTIONAL FEATURES IN SUPPORT OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

		Yes
Land Use	Makes compatible use of vacant land within community (applies to infill development).	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provides properly designed mixed uses within an appropriate service center location.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Meets density and transit design requirements (8 d.u.a. net density).	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Land use and street design are expected to reduce traffic generation over conventional design.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provides open space in excess of park land dedication requirement.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The development includes at least one pedestrian destination of natural or urban character.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The development is located within a half mile of a commercial or activity center.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Commercial activity and housing density increases towards the center of the neighborhood.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	A diversity of housing types is featured that includes one or more of the following in addition to the primary housing type: single family detached, row houses, coach or "granny flat" houses, apartments above commercial spaces, multi-family housing.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Results in jobs and/or services within a ½ mile of a residential development.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meets design concepts for conservation subdivision as applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Transportation	Development includes or is located within a half mile of an existing or planned transit corridor.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provides sheltered transit stops.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provides for bicycle parking and/or storage.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provides bikeway connection to existing or planned regional bikeway.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Utilizes only existing transportation infrastructure.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Response time of emergency services would be expected to be within five minutes travel of development.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Traffic generation will not exceed current design of roadways.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Streets feature medians or traffic calming devices to promote pedestrian safety.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Design of development encourages one or more of the following when appropriate: on-street parking, use of alleys, and non-motorized travel options.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Sidewalk widths exceed local minimum standards.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Development provides curb extensions and/or textured pedestrian crossings.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Average block length is 450 feet or less.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Housing	At least 10% of proposed housing units meet HUD guidelines for low to moderate income housing.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No more than 30% of proposed housing units in any 400 linear feet of streetscape meet HUD guidelines for low to moderate income housing.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preserves or renovates historically or architecturally significant structures.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Development provides a compatible mixture of housing sizes and styles, including houses of less than 1,000 square feet.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provides a variety of high-quality, durable external building materials, such as brick, wood, or concrete fiber.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The same design is not used for more than 25% of the total number of single family units in any 400 linear feet of streetscape.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Project provides for the acceptable use of green building techniques.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pedestrian access is to the front with parking or garages to the rear of buildings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Redevelopment	Does not require new water or sewer infrastructure.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Redevelops a brownfield site.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Does not require new school infrastructure (applies to residential projects only).	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Does not require new park and recreation infrastructure (applies to residential projects only).	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The development maintains necessary pervious cover or other options for storm water detention on site.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Open Space/Other Amenities	Preserves or restores natural areas.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Development exceeds minimum stream buffer requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provides open space linkages to existing or planned open space through greenways and/or trails.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Development preserves or renovates historical or architecturally significant structures.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Development provides decorative or pedestrian scale street lighting.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Schools are centrally located within the development or within half mile and accessible by pedestrians and non-motorized travel.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Libraries are centrally located within the development or within half mile and accessible by pedestrians and non-motorized travel.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Active or passive recreation available within ½ mile of 75% of housing units in project area.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Development provides pocket parks or plazas.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Development exceeds minimum requirements for landscaping.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Community gardens and/or public social areas are provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provides public art and monuments at approved locations.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provides pedestrian seating and/or other pedestrian amenities.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Includes other notable amenity(ies) not listed herein (see comments).	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Commercial	Paved surfaces are mitigated with shade trees (one tree to ten parking spaces) or other green space amenities.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Pervious materials are used in medium to light-use parking areas.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Signage is visible to drivers but oriented to scale for pedestrians.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Buildings are scaled with appropriate proportion to the width of the right of way.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	The development encourages off-street parking behind buildings and pedestrian access to the front of buildings.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Building entrances are located at the public sidewalk or within five feet of a public sidewalk.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Project provides for acceptable use of green building techniques.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provides for appropriate extraction of mineral resources consistent with comprehensive plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Includes acceptable reclamation plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. PROJECT RATING

- A = Provides minimal features or acceptable alternatives, plus 11 or more options. Merits highly favorable recommendation.
- B = Provides minimal features or acceptable alternatives, plus 6 to 10 options. Merits favorable recommendation.
- C = Provides minimal features or acceptable alternatives, with 0 to 5 optional features. Favorable recommendation is possible.

- D = Does not provide minimal features or acceptable alternatives, but does provide one or more optional features. Project should be modified and/or reevaluated prior to approval.
- E = Does not provide minimal or optional features. Project should be modified to be considered for approval.

8. STAFF COMMENTS (if any):

9. INTERGOVERNMENTAL STAFF REVIEWED THIS PROJECT: Yes No

10. MCRPC RECOMMENDS PROJECT APPROVAL: Yes No No action

SIGNATURE: _____

Paul E. Russell, AICP, Executive Director

Date

2: FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFIED STREET INDEX

Collectors			
Street/Road	Jurisdiction	From:	To:
1000 North Rd. (Old Colonial Road)	Bloomington	BR 51 / Main St.	1750 East Rd.
1600 East Rd.	Bloomington	910 North Rd.	1000 North Rd.
1750 East Rd.	Bloomington	1000 North Rd.	Morrissey Dr.
910 North Rd.	Bloomington	Alvis Rd.	1600 East Rd.
Allin St.	Bloomington	Division St.	Seminary St.
Alvis Rd.	Bloomington	Crestwicke Rd.	910 North Rd.
Bloomington Heights Rd.	Bloomington	Wylie Dr.	Washington St.
Brigham School Road	Bloomington	Morris Ave.	Main St.
Bunn St.	Bloomington	Woodrig Rd.	Oakland Ave.
Capodice Rd.	Bloomington	1000 North Rd.	Woodrig Rd.
Clearwater Ave.	Bloomington	BL-I 55/Veterans	Airport Rd.
Clinton Blvd.	Bloomington	Clinton Pl.	Empire St.
Colton Ave.	Bloomington	Empire St.	Washington St.
Cottage Ave.	Bloomington	Parkshore Dr. (MLKing Dr.)	Forrest St.
Crestwicke Dr.	Bloomington	BR 51 / Main St.	Alvis Rd.
Dinsmore St. (Brown St.)	Bloomington	Market St.	Washington St.
Eastland Dr.	Bloomington	Fairway Dr.	Hershey Rd.
Eldorado Rd.	Bloomington	Oakland Ave.	Lincoln St.
Emerson St.	Bloomington	Allin St.	Center St.
Euclid Ave.	Bloomington	Washington St.	Oakland Ave.
Fairway Dr.	Bloomington	Empire St.	Eastland Dr.
Forrest St.	Bloomington	Cottage Ave.	Hinshaw Ave.
Four Seasons Rd.	Bloomington	Oakland Ave.	Lincoln St.
Fox Creek Rd.	Bloomington	Cabintown Rd./ Danbury Dr.	North of 1050 Rd.
Grove St.	Bloomington	Mercer Ave.	BR 51 / Main St. (East St.)
Hinshaw Ave.	Bloomington	Forrest St.	Locust St.
Lafayette St.	Bloomington	BR 51 / Main St.	Morrissey Dr.
Lee St.	Bloomington	Emerson St.	Empire St.
Lee St.	Bloomington	Locust St.	Wood St.
Lincoln St.	Bloomington	BR 51 / Main St.	Hershey Rd.
Linden St.	Bloomington	Empire St.	Locust St.
Locust St.	Bloomington	Towanda Ave.	Cottage Ave.
McLean St.	Bloomington	Empire St.	Grove St.
Mercer Ave.	Bloomington	Washington St.	Hamilton Rd.
Morris Ave.	Bloomington	Hamilton Rd.	Brigham School Rd.
Oakland Ave.	Bloomington	Alexander Rd.	Fox Creek Rd.
Prospect Rd.	Bloomington	Empire St.	Oakland Ave.

Collectors			
Street/Road	Jurisdiction	From:	To:
Regency Dr.	Bloomington	Eastland Dr.	Oakland Ave.
Royal Pointe Dr.	Bloomington	Clearwater Ave.	Empire St.
Seminary Ave.	Bloomington	Allin St.	Cottage Ave.
Six Points Rd.	Bloomington	Alexander Rd.	Oakland Ave. (Silverton Way)
Springfield Rd.	Bloomington	Morris Ave.	Beich Rd. (Cabintown Rd.)
Washington St.	Bloomington	Morris Ave.	Bloomington Hts. Rd.
Wood St.	Bloomington	Rt.51 / Main St.	Morris Ave.
Woodrig Rd.	Bloomington	BR 51 / Main St.	Morrissey Dr.
Wylie Dr.	Bloomington	Enterprise Dr.	Bloomington Heights Rd.
1075 East Rd.	McLean County	County Highway 34	Stringtown Rd.
County Highway 34 (Shirley Rd.)	McLean County	1155 East Rd.	U.S. Route 66
1350 North Rd. (Washington Street)	McLean County	Bloomington Heights Rd.	Urban limits (Mitsubishi extension)
1425 East Rd.	Normal	Urban Limits (MPO Boundary)	Ziebarth Rd.
Adelaide St.	Normal	Gregory St.	Division St.
Beech St.	Normal	Raab. Rd.	College Ave.
Blair Dr.	Normal	Fort Jesse Rd.	College Ave.
Clinton Pl.	Normal	Fell Ave.	Clinton Blvd.
Cottage Ave.	Normal	Dr. Martin Luther King Dr.	Parkshore Dr.
Fell Ave.	Normal	Willow St.	Clinton Pl.
Grandview Dr.	Normal	College Ave.	Jersey Ave.
Gregory St.	Normal	Parkside Rd.	Cottage Ave.
Hovey Ave.	Normal	Kingsley Ct.	White Oak Rd.
Jersey Ave.	Normal	Towanda Ave.	Linden St.
Parkside Rd.	Normal	Raab Rd.	Hovey Ave.
Raab Rd.	Normal	Hershey Rd.	Towanda-Barnes Rd.
School St.	Normal	Raab. Rd.	Willow St.
Shepard Rd.	Normal	Veterans' Parkway	Hershey Rd.
Summit St.	Normal	Main St.	Linden St.
Towanda Ave.	Normal	Northtown Rd.	Raab Rd.
Virginia Ave.	Normal	Linden St.	Main St.
Wylie Dr.	Normal	College Ave.	Enterprise Dr.
Ziebarth Rd.	Normal	1425 East Rd.	Rt.51 / Main St.

Minor Arterials			
Street/Road	Jurisdiction	From:	To:
Streid Dr.	Bloomington	Oakland Ave.	Ireland Grove Rd.
Airport Rd.	Bloomington	Fort Jesse Rd.	Empire St.
Alexander Rd.	Bloomington	Oakland Ave.	Six Points Rd.
Beich Rd.	Bloomington	Springfield Rd. (Fox Creek Rd.)	Stringtown Rd.

Minor Arterials			
Street/Road	Jurisdiction	From:	To:
Cabintown Rd.	Bloomington	Beich Rd.	Fox Creek Rd.
Clinton St.	Bloomington	Empire St.	Oakland Ave.
Dr. Martin Luther King Dr.	Bloomington	Cottage Ave.	Market St.
Emerson St.	Bloomington	Main St. (Center St.)	Towanda Ave.
Fairway Dr.	Bloomington	Towanda Ave.	Empire St.
General Electric Rd.	Bloomington	Towanda Barnes Rd.	BL-1 55/ Veterans' Parkway
Hamilton Rd.	Bloomington	Main St. / BR 51	E. to Ireland Grove Rd.
Hannah St.	Bloomington	Morrissey Dr.	Oakland Ave.
Hershey Rd.	Bloomington	Ireland Grove Rd. (Hamilton Rd.)	N. to Fort Jesse Rd.
Ireland Grove Rd.	Bloomington	BL 55 / Veterans Parkway	Towanda-Barnes Rd.
Linden St.	Bloomington	Division St.	Empire St.
Locust St.	Bloomington	Cottage Ave.	White Oak Rd.
Macarthur Ave.	Bloomington	Gridley St.	Livingston St.
Market St.(Rt. 9)	Bloomington	East St.	Hinshaw Ave.
Morris Ave.	Bloomington	Springfield Rd.	Market St.
Morris Ave.	Bloomington	Veterans' Parkway	Hamilton Rd.
Morrissey Dr.	Bloomington	1750 East Rd	Hannah St.
Oakland Ave.	Bloomington	Alexander Rd.	E. to Ireland Grove Rd.
Sale Barn Rd. (Hamilton Rd.)	Bloomington	Rt. 51	Morris Ave.
Six Points Rd.	Bloomington	Morris Ave.	Alexander Rd.
State St.	Bloomington	Washington St.	Oakland Ave.
Stringtown Rd.	Bloomington	Beich Rd. (Old Rt.66)	1075 East Rd.
Stringtown Rd.	Bloomington	1075 East Rd.	Bloomingsdale Rd.
Towanda Ave.	Bloomington	Jersey Ave.	Empire St.
Towanda Ave.	Bloomington	Locust St.	Washington St.
Washington St.	Bloomington	Hershey Rd.	Morris Ave.
White Oak Rd.	Bloomington	Dr. Martin Luther King Dr.	Locust St.
County Highway 14	McLean County	Towanda-Barnes Rd.	2000 East Rd.
County Highway 36	McLean County	Towanda-Barnes Rd.	County Highway 27
County Highway 34	McLean County	U.S. Route 66	Urban Area Limit/MPO Boundary
County Highway 27	McLean County	County Highway 36	U.S. Route 150
Ireland Grove Rd.	McLean County	Towanda-Barnes Rd.	2100 East Rd.
Pipeline Rd.	McLean County	1900 North Rd.	I-55
Towanda Barnes Rd.	McLean County	Fort Jesse Rd.	Ireland Grove Rd.
Towanda Barnes Rd./CH 29	McLean County	Fort Jesse Rd./1600 North Rd.	2000 North Rd./Urban Area Limit
Towanda Barnes Rd.	McLean County	Ireland Grove Rd.	650 North Rd./Urban Area Limit
U.S. Route 66	McLean County	Airport Rd.	Urban Area Limit/MPO Boundary
U.S. Route 66	McLean County	Stringtown Rd.	County Highway 34
U.S. Route 150	McLean County	1750 East Rd.	Urban Area Limit/MPO Boundary

Minor Arterials			
Street/Road	Jurisdiction	From:	To:
Hershey Rd.	Normal	Fort Jesse Rd.	Taft Dr./(Shepard Rd.)
Airport Rd.	Normal	Fort Jesse Rd.	U.S. Route 66
Beaufort St.	Normal	Vernon Ave.	Main St.
College Ave.	Normal	Mitsubishi Motorway	Airport Rd.
Cottage Ave.	Normal	Gregory St.	Dr. Martin Luther King Dr.
Fort Jesse Rd.	Normal	Hershey Rd.	Beech St.
Gregory St.	Normal	Cottage Ave.	Main St.
Linden St.	Normal	Urban limits N of 1900 N	Division St.
Mulberry St.	Normal	Maple St.	School St.
Northtown Rd.	Normal	Pipeline Rd.	BR 51 / Main St.
Old U.S. Rt. 66	Normal	Shelbourne Dr.	Urban limits
Raab Rd.	Normal	55/74/Rt. 51 (Parkside Rd.)	Towanda Ave.
Shelbourne Dr.	Normal	Summit St.	BL-I 55
Towanda Ave.	Normal	Raab Rd.	Jersey Ave.
Vernon Ave.	Normal	BL-I 55	Beaufort St.
White Oak Rd.	Normal	Urban limit South of Rt. 150	Martin Luther King Dr.
Willow St.	Normal	Beech St.	Main St.
Fort Jesse Road	Bloomington	Towanda Barnes Rd.	Hershey Rd.

Principal Arterials			
Street/Road	Jurisdiction	From:	To:
Main St. / BR 51	Bloomington	S to 55/74	Urban limits
BL-55 / Veterans Parkway	Bloomington	General Electric Rd.	I-55 South
Empire St.	Bloomington	Towanda Barnes Rd.	Lee St.
Empire St./Illinois Route 9	Bloomington	Towanda Barnes Rd.	2100 East Rd.
Hinshaw Ave.	Bloomington	Locust St.	Market St.
Lee St.	Bloomington	Empire St.	Locust St.
Main St. / BR 51	Bloomington	Division St.	S to 55/74
Market St.(Rt. 9)	Bloomington	Hinshaw Ave.	Mitsubishi /150
Towanda Ave.	Bloomington	Empire St.	Locust St.
U.S. 150/Mitsubishi Motorway	Normal	White Oak Rd.	150 / Rt 9 (Market)
BL-55 / Veterans Parkway	Normal	I-55	General Electric Rd.
Main St. / BR 51	Normal	1900 N. Rd & Rt. 51	Division St.

Urban Interstates			
Street/Road	Jurisdiction	From:	To:
I-55	Bloomington	Beich Rd.	Stringtown Rd.
I-55 / 74 / Rt. 51	Bloomington	Division St.	BL-51/ Main St.
I-55	McLean County	East of Pipeline Rd.	2000 North Rd.
I-74	McLean County	1750 East Rd.	Urban Area Limit/MPO Boundary S.E.
I-55	Normal	East of Pipeline Rd.	West to 74/55
I-55 / 74 / Rt. 51	Normal	Intersection at Urban limits	Division St.

3: TRANSUMMIT REPORT

4: TRANSPORTATION SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Bloomington-Normal Transportation Survey

Q1. Please indicate where you live, street and nearest intersecting cross street

Q2. Please identify the location of the primary destination of your household members' trips from home, by the street name and nearest intersecting street:

Answer Options	Response Percent
Household member 1:	99.60%
Household member 2:	71.40%
Household member 3:	28.60%
Household member 4:	14.50%
Household member 5:	4.80%
Household member 6:	1.10%

Q3. Please select the answer that best describes your response to the statements below:

Answer Options	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Rating Average
The streets in my neighborhood are well maintained.	116	76	30	34	0	1.93
My neighborhood streets are safe for walking, bicycling and driving.	94	83	52	28	0	2.05
The street signs and traffic signals in my neighborhood are well-placed, visible and working properly.	161	72	13	9	0	1.49
The streets in Bloomington-Normal are well maintained.	32	113	70	42	0	2.47
Streets in Bloomington-Normal are safe for walking, bicycling and driving.	15	80	87	70	2	2.86
The streets, roads and highways in McLean County are well maintained.	50	128	45	17	14	2.28
Streets, roads and highways in McLean County are safe for walking, bicycling and driving.	15	73	80	65	22	3.02

Q4. Streets in my neighborhood are unsafe due to the following: (please check reasons below)

Answer Options	Response Percent
Not applicable - my neighborhood streets are safe	32.40%
Not enough lighting	15.20%
Poorly maintained (with potholes, damaged pavement, broken curb, etc.)	31.60%
No sidewalks (or limited sidewalks)	24.80%

Crime	4.80%
Traffic speed	31.60%
Too much traffic	13.60%
Off-leash pets or wild animals	8.00%
Not accessible for people with disabilities	5.20%
Other (please describe the unsafe condition)	23.60%

Q5. Please give the location of streets or intersections in your neighborhood that are unsafe, and describe your concerns.

Answer Options	Response Count
	139
answered question	139
skipped question	146

Q6. Please give the location of streets or intersections in Bloomington-Normal that are unsafe, and describe your concerns.

Answer Options	Response Count
	151
answered question	151
skipped question	134

Q7. Please give the location of streets, roads, intersections, bridges or highways in McLean County that are unsafe, and describe your concerns.

Answer Options	Response Count
	67

Q8. The streets my student(s) use going to and from school are safe and well maintained.

Answer Options	Response Percent
Agree	24.30%
Somewhat Agree	32.50%
Somewhat Disagree	11.80%
Disagree	6.50%
Not sure	24.90%

Q9. If conditions are not safe or well maintained, please identify any school locations where improvements should be made to improve safety or road conditions.

Answer Options	Response Count
	62

Q10. Please indicate the usual way you or your student(s) travels to school (check those that apply by grade level)

Answer Options	Grades K-6	Grades 7-8	High school	College
Walking	23	9	7	20
Bicycling	12	5	6	22
School bus	15	18	12	1
Day care provider	4	2	2	1
Driven by family member	27	16	9	4
Driven as part of a car pool	3	2	4	4
Drives self	0	0	29	26
Public transit bus	2	1	4	19
Taxi	0	0	1	3
Comments				

Q11. If you have a child or children not riding a school bus for which they are eligible, please check your reasons:

Answer Options	Grades K-6	Grades 7-8	High school
No seatbelts	1	1	2
Long travel time	3	2	5
Conflict with before and after school activities	1	2	8
Scheduling	3	0	4
Inconvenience	1	1	6
Overcrowded	1	0	1
Darkness	1	0	2
Distance to bus stop	1	0	1
Bus stop safety	1	1	1
Unsafe or poorly maintained buses	0	0	1
Bullying	1	2	2
Off-leash pets or wild animals in neighborhood	0	0	1
Comments			

Q12. If a member of your household uses senior care or other adult day care, continuing medical treatment (such as dialysis) or other social or medical support programs, what is the usual way that person travels?

Answer Options	Response Percent
----------------	------------------

Public transit bus, regular bus routes (B-NPTS)	5.10%
Public transit bus, paratransit (Special Services, SHOW BUS)	2.20%
Other bus or van (for example, medical services van or service provider bus or van)	0.00%
Driven by family member	2.20%
Driven by volunteer	0.00%
Driven as part of car pool	0.00%
Drives self	0.70%
Taxi	0.70%
Walk	0.00%
Bicycle	0.70%
Not applicable	86.80%
Other (please specify)	1.50%

Q13. If a member of your household uses the service programs or medical care mentioned above, does the program, service or medical provider assist with transportation? Please check any that apply:

Answer Options	Response Percent
Yes, provides transportation directly	1.50%
Yes, provides referral to transportation service	0.00%
Yes, provides referral to or assistance in using public transit paratransit services	0.00%
Yes, provides referral to or assistance in using regular scheduled transit routes	0.00%
No	4.40%
Not applicable	94.10%

Q14. How often do you use the Bloomington-Normal Public Transit System?

Answer Options	Response Percent
Every day	8.90%
Once a week	4.50%
Once a month	3.70%
Occasionally	17.90%
Never (skip to question 18)	65.00%

Q15. What is your primary destination when using the Public Transit System?

Answer Options	Response Percent
Work	46.50%
School	9.30%
Shopping or other daily errands	24.40%
Medical services	2.30%
Adult day care or similar programs	0.00%
Other (please specify)	17.40%

Q16. What Public Transit System services do you use?

Answer Options	Response Percent
Regular bus routes	98.80%
Special Services (paratransit)	3.50%
University/college universal access/Redbird Ride	18.80%
School shuttle	1.20%
NiteRide/Late NiteRide	9.40%
After Hours	3.50%
Other (please specify)	1.20%

Q17. Are you satisfied with the service provided by the Public Transit System that you or members of your household use?

Answer Options	Response Percent
Always	25.60%
Usually	50.00%
Sometimes	14.00%
Rarely	9.30%
Never	1.20%

Q18. What service improvements, if made by the Public Transit System, would encourage you to use the system or to use it more often?

Answer Options	Response Percent
More frequent service on major routes	53.00%
Changes in the route system	34.80%
Express buses	19.90%
Bus shelters	21.00%
Easy-to-find information on routes and fares	49.70%
Newer or larger buses	5.50%
Improved accessibility for persons with disabilities and/or senior citizens	3.30%
More fare options (long-term passes, special fares, etc.)	19.90%
Lower fares	3.90%
Service on Sundays	30.90%
Service outside the corporate limits of Bloomington and Normal	13.30%
Cooperation or integration with other transportation services	16.00%
Other (please specify)	29.30%

Q19. Please identify areas of the community that are not well served by public transit:

Answer Options	Response Count
----------------	----------------

Q20. Aside from Bloomington-Normal Public Transit System, do you use other transportation services, public or private? (This can include services provided by social service agencies such as the YWCA, rural public transit provided by SHOW BUS, and services such as corporate shuttles, and transportation provided by institutions.)

Answer Options	Response Percent
Yes	16.70%
No	83.30%

Q21. If yes, please specify which service providers you use:

Answer Options	Response Percent
Church van or shuttle	2.60%
Faith in Action	0.00%
Hospital van or shuttle	2.60%
SHOW BUS	0.00%
State Farm shuttle	41.00%
YWCA Medivan	0.00%
YWCA Wheels-to-Work	0.00%
Taxi	33.30%
Intercity buses (such as Greyhound, Peoria Charter, Megabus)	33.30%
Other (please specify)	25.60%

Q22. What is your primary destination when using the transportation services you checked in the last question?

Answer Options	Response Percent
Work	44.80%
School	5.20%
Shopping or other daily errands	17.20%
Medical services	0.00%
Adult day care or similar programs	0.00%
Other (please specify)	32.80%

answered question

Q23. How often do you use the Central Illinois Regional Airport for flights?

Answer Options	Response Percent
Daily	0.40%
Weekly	0.40%

Monthly	7.40%
Occasionally	79.00%
Never	12.80%

Q24. Are you satisfied with services provided at Central Illinois Regional Airport?

Answer Options	Response Percent
Yes	80.70%
No	19.30%

Q25. If no, please briefly describe your concerns.

Answer Options	Response Count
	45

Q26. Do you use other airports as a starting or ending point for your air travel? Please check all that apply:

Answer Options	Response Percent
Peoria	43.00%
Champaign	4.50%
Springfield	3.60%
St. Louis	14.50%
Chicago - O'Hare	64.70%
Chicago-Midway	44.30%
Indianapolis	9.00%
Not applicable	16.70%
Other (please specify)	1.80%

Q27. Is there an air travel destination not currently served for which you would like direct service to be available? Please specify:

Answer Options	Response Count
	88

Q28. How often do you use passenger rail services to or from Bloomington-Normal?

Answer Options	Response Percent
Daily	0.00%
Once a week	0.80%
Once a month	6.20%
Occasionally	70.20%
Never	22.70%

Q29. Do you anticipate using high speed rail service?

Answer Options	Response Percent
Yes	82.80%
No	17.20%

Q30. Are you satisfied with passenger rail/Amtrak service in Bloomington-Normal?

Answer Options	Response Percent
Yes	70.80%
No	29.20%

Q31. If no, please briefly describe your concerns.

Answer Options	Response Count
	71

Q32. How often do you ride a bike for recreation?

Answer Options	Response Percent
Daily	17.8%
Weekly	39.0%
Monthly	3.7%
Occasionally	23.2%
Never	16.2%

Q33. How often do you ride a bike for non-recreational purposes, such as commuting to work or school?

Answer Options	Response Percent
Daily	17.5%
Weekly	15.4%
Monthly	5.4%
Occasionally	21.3%
Never	40.4%

Q34. If you bicycle for recreation, do you ride most often on (pick one):

Answer Options	Response Percent
bicycle trails or paths	48.5%
sidewalks	4.9%
side streets	13.6%
major streets	4.4%
rural bike routes, such as Route 66	16.0%
Other (please specify)	12.6%

Q35. If you bicycle for non-recreational purposes (to work, school, etc.), do you ride most often on (pick one):

Answer Options	Response Percent
bicycle trails or paths	30.6%
sidewalks	6.8%
side streets	39.5%
major streets	16.3%
rural bike routes, such as Route 66	2.7%
Other (please specify)	4.1%

Q36. What are your major obstacles to biking in Bloomington-Normal? (please select any that apply)

Answer Options	Response Percent
No bicycle available	4.5%
Weather - winter conditions (cold, snow/ice)	45.7%
Weather - summer conditions (heat, summer storms)	15.8%
Not enough off-street bike trails	25.8%
Off-street trails not located near my home or work, school	19.5%
Lack of designated bike lanes on streets	63.3%
Difficult or dangerous intersections	51.1%
Speed of nearby motor vehicles	41.6%
Uncooperative or discourteous drivers of motor vehicles	46.2%
Street and road pavement conditions	23.5%
Street signs and pavement markings (or the absence of these things)	6.3%
No significant obstacles	6.3%
Other (please specify)	17.2%
Daily	37.2%
Weekly	35.1%
Monthly	2.9%
Occasionally	18.0%
Never	6.7%
Outdoors	70.4%
Indoor location	7.5%
Depends on weather	22.1%

Q39. How often do you walk for non-recreational purposes, such as commuting to work or school?

Answer Options	Response Percent
Daily	12.9%
Weekly	13.3%
Monthly	2.1%
Occasionally	32.6%
Never	39.1%
Weather - winter conditions (cold, snow/ice)	47.3%
Weather - summer conditions (heat, summer	23.4%

storms)	
Intersections that are difficult or dangerous to cross	30.2%
Speed of nearby motor vehicles	19.4%
Uncooperative or discourteous drivers of motor vehicles	15.8%
Sidewalk conditions, missing or discontinuous sidewalks	41.0%
Street and road pavement conditions	5.4%
Street signs and pavement markings (or the absence of these things)	2.3%
No significant obstacles	22.5%
Other (please specify)	13.5%
Agree	38.1%
Agree Somewhat	31.8%
Disagree Somewhat	11.4%
Disagree	10.2%
Not Sure	0.8%
No sidewalks provided in my neighborhood	7.6%
Priority on investing in new streets and roads	9.9%
Priority on improvements to safety	59.9%
Expanded joint public-private investment to fund new streets	5.6%
Other (please specify)	14.2%

Q44. Streets, Roads and Highways - new or improved facilities

Answer Options	Response Percent
Completion of Mitsubishi Motorway between Route 9 and I-55 at Shirley	11.3%
Better access to interstate highway system (additional interchanges)	12.3%
Completion of proposed East Side Highway	22.2%
Expanded public parking, on-street	23.2%
Expanded public parking, in parking decks	16.7%
More accessible parking	15.8%
Car sharing program	25.1%
Installation of alternative fuel stations	33.5%
Other (please specify)	25.1%

Q45. Transit

Answer Options	Response Percent
More frequent service on major routes	44.8%
Expanded transit routes in outlying neighborhoods	32.8%
Bus shelters	22.9%
Easy-to-find information on routes and fares	34.4%
Real-time electronic route information (arrival times at bus stops)	39.6%
Electronic fare collection	22.4%

Newer or larger buses	6.3%
Improved accessibility	5.7%
More fare options (long-term passes, special fares, etc.)	14.6%
Lower fares	5.7%
Service on Sundays	26.0%
Service outside the corporate limits of Bloomington and Normal	16.7%
Cooperation or integration with other transportation services	15.6%
Other (please specify)	9.9%

Q46. Air Transportation

Answer Options	Response Percent
Additional direct service destinations (specify preferred destinations)	54.4%
Additional airlines serving CIRA (specify preferences)	37.8%
More frequent flight options	34.4%
Airport expansion	7.2%
Shuttle from airport to Bloomington-Normal destinations	30.0%
Enhanced public transit service at airport	17.8%
More short-term parking at CIRA	2.8%
More long-term parking at CIRA	3.3%
Expanded amenities at CIRA (restaurants, shops, passenger waiting areas)	14.4%
Enhanced car rental services	2.2%
Other (please specify)	23.9%

Q47. Rail

Answer Options	Response Percent
More frequent service (more trains per day)	35.0%
Improved on-time performance	55.5%
Lower cost	22.5%
Very high speed rail service (200+ mph)	40.0%
Commuter rail service to the Peoria area	35.0%
Commuter rail service to other central Illinois cities	34.5%
Direct public transit or shuttle connection to Central Illinois Regional Airport	23.5%
Other (please specify)	5.5%

Q48. Bicycling

Answer Options	Response Percent
Dedicated bicycle-only trails	20.3%
Expanded bicycle trails, such as Constitution Trail	67.3%
Completion of the Route 66 Bicycle Trail throughout McLean County	36.9%

Designated on-street bicycle lanes in Bloomington-Normal	68.7%
More designated automobile-bicycle shared lanes ("sharrows")	25.8%
Designated bicycle routes in Bloomington-Normal	30.4%
Better enforcement of bicycle/pedestrian right-of-way laws	34.1%
More bicycle parking in parks and at public buildings	27.2%
Bicycle parking requirements for private parking lots and structures	11.1%
Secure bicycle storage available to the public (bicycle lockers)	19.8%
Bicycle sharing program	10.1%
Other (please specify)	12.4%

Q49. Pedestrian

Answer Options	Response Percent
Expanded trail system	63.2%
Dedicated pedestrian-only trails, to avoid conflicts with bicycles	20.3%
Better enforcement of pedestrian right-of-way laws	33.0%
Sidewalk installation and improvements	56.1%
Community walking program or club	9.0%
School walking program or walking school bus	20.3%
Other (please specify)	10.8%

Q50. How many people reside in your household?

Answer Options	Response Count
	221

Q51. What type of transportation do you most often use on daily basis?

Answer Options	Response Percent
Personal motor vehicle (car, truck, motorcycle)	69.6%
Public transit bus, regular routes	7.8%
Public transit vehicle, paratransit (Special Services)	0.0%
Public transit bus, rural (SHOW BUS)	0.0%
Transit, private (Buses or vans provided by social service agency, church, corporation or institution)	0.0%
Bicycle	17.8%
Walking	4.8%
Train	0.0%
Air	0.0%
Male	50.7%
Female	49.3%

Q53. Age of person completing survey:

Answer Options	Response Percent
17-19	0.9%
20-24	5.2%
25-39	13.0%
30-49	38.1%
50-64	35.1%
65-79	7.8%
80	0.0%

Q54. Employment Status:

Answer Options	Response Percent
Student	5.7%
Full-time employment	74.3%
Part-time employment	6.1%
Not employed	1.7%
Employed at home	2.6%
Retired	9.6%

Q55. Vehicle Access: How many people in your household are able to drive?

Answer Options	Response Count
	226

Q56. How many motor vehicles does your household have available?

Answer Options	Response Count
	226

Q57. How many bicycles does your household have available?

Answer Options	Response Count
	226

5: PROGRAMMED PROJECTS:
FY 2013-2013 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Project No.	Cross-ref	Jurisdiction	Project Location	Termini		Description	Phase	Total Project Cost	Funding Source			Funding Detail
				Beginning (or cross street)	End				Local	State	Federal	
2013												
B-10-02	50-01-11155-05-00	B	Mitsubishi Motorway	Six Points Rd	Sugar Creek	Construct urban section		\$304,000	\$304,000	\$0	\$0	304000 - BMFT
B-06-04	50-01-42156-06-00	B	Lafayette Street	Morrissey Drive	Maple Street	Reconstruct as 3-Lane Urban Section	E, ROW, C	\$1,925,000	\$1,925,000	\$0	\$0	1,702,000-BMFT; 223,000 - WDF
B-05-01	50-01-11052-08-01	B	Morris Avenue	Fox Hill Apartments	Six Points Road	Reconstruct as 3-Lane Urban Section	C	\$1,550,000	\$1,550,000	\$0	\$0	1,140,000-BMFT; 200,000 WDF; 210,000 SWMF
B-11-03	50-01-41170-10-00	B	Hershey Rd	Hamilton Rd	750 feet south	Construct as 2-lane Urban Section for future expansion to 4 lane	ROW	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	100,000 - BMFT
B-13-04	50-01-43182-11-00	B	Hamilton Road	Mooring Rd	1200 feet east	Construct as 2-lane Urban Section for future expansion to 4 lane	C	\$435,000	\$435,000	\$0	\$0	\$235,000 - BCIF; \$200,000 - BPRI PROP
B-13-00	50-01-53001-13-00	B	Citywide			General resurfacing of various City streets	C	\$3,500,000	\$3,500,000	\$0	\$0	\$3,500,000 - BCIF
C-12-01	11-00001-02-BT	C	Historic Route 66 Bike Trail	Towanda Ave. and Shelbourne Dr. intersection in Normal	County Highway 29 in Towanda	Construction of a Bike Trail along Historic Route 66	Const. & Phase III Eng.	\$1,740,000	\$349,557		\$1,390,443	349,557 - Route 66 Group 1,390,443 - ITEP
C-13-01	04-00073-07-BR	C	Carver Road at Lake Bloomington	Carver Road at 1725E	Carver Road 800' East of 1725E	Bridge Replacement	Const.	\$900,000	\$900,000			900,000 - County Bridge
C-13-02	11-00049-06-RS	C	Funk's Farm Road	C.H. 34 (850N)	C.H. 36 (550N)	Resurfacing	Const.	\$650,000	\$650,000			650,000 - County Highway
N-11-05		N	Uptown Normal	Fell Avenue	Linden Street	Street Lighting and Sidewalks on College Avenue and Mulberry Street from Fell Avenue to Linden Street	C	\$456,885	\$221,515		\$235,370	221,515 - NCIF; 235,370 ITEP
N-13-05		N	Uptown Normal	Amtrak Station		Construct Platform Passenger Access Structure and Southside Boarding Platform	E,C	\$442,375	\$81,735		\$360,640	81,375 - NCIF; 360,640 IDOT TIGER (FRA)
N-07-06		N	Various			Resurfacing of various city streets	C	\$688,440	\$688,440	\$0	\$0	400,000 - NMFT; 200,000-NCIF; 88,440-CD
N-10-01		N	Northtown Road	Linden Street	Towanda Avenue	Reconstruct to 3-lane rural section	E,ROW,C	\$4,030,000	\$1,730,000	\$0	\$2,300,000	1,730,000 - NMFT; 2,300,000 - STU
N-11-03		N	Church Street	Franklin	University	Reconstruct to 2-lane urban section	E	\$22,110	\$22,110	\$0	\$0	22,110 - NCIF
N-07-07		N	Irving Street	Fell Avenue	Hester alley	Reconstruct to 2-lane urban section	C	\$163,600	\$163,600	\$0	\$0	163,600 - NCD
N-13-06		N	Raab Road	Millenium Drive	Community College Dr.	Traffic signal improvements and sidewalk	E,C	\$280,740	\$280,740			280,740 - NMFT
N-13-07		N	Vernon / Beaufort			Traffic signal improvements	E,C	\$30,000	\$30,000			30,000 - NMFT
N-13-08		N	Raab Road	Healing Stone	North Pointe Drive	Reconstruct to 2-lane urban section	E	\$67,600	\$67,600			67,600 - NMFT
N-11-03		N	Church Street	Franklin	University	Reconstruct to 2-lane urban section	E,C	\$207,000	\$207,000	\$0	\$0	207000 - NCD
A161		S	I-39	I-55	Woodford County line	Patching		\$475,000	\$0	\$475,000	\$0	State Only
Annual Total								\$17,967,750	\$13,206,297	\$475,000	\$4,286,453	
								73.5%	2.6%	23.9%		

Project No.	Cross-ref	Jurisdiction	Project Location	Termini		Description	Phase	Total Project Cost	Funding Source			Funding Detail
				Beginning (or cross street)	End				Local	State	Federal	
2014												
B-11-03	50-01-41170-10-00	B	Hershey Rd	Hamilton Rd	750 feet south	Construct as 2-lane Urban Section for future 4 lane	C	\$2,675,000	\$2,675,000	\$0	\$0	2,675,000 - BMFT
B-12-02	50-01-12146-04-00	B	Fox Creek Rd	Danbury Drive	Union Pacific Railroad Bridge	Reconstruct as 4 lane Urban Section	E	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	150,000-BMFT
B-12-03	50-11-12533-06-00	B	Fox Creek Rd Bridge	over Union Pacific Railroad		Reconstruct bridge with 4 lanes	E	\$262,000	\$262,000	\$0	\$0	262,000-BMFT
B-03-09	50-01-42063-94-01	B	Hamilton Rd	Bunn St	Commerce Dr	Street improvements	E, ROW	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$0	\$0	400,000 - BMFT
B-13-00	50-01-53001-13-00	B	Citywide			General resurfacing of various City streets	C	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$4,000,000 - BCIF
C-14-01	10-24119-00-BR	T	Mount Hope R.D. Bridge (100E)	Bridge 1300' North of 550N		Bridge Replacement	C	\$450,000	\$90,000	\$0	\$360,000	45,000 - County 45,000 - Mount HopeRD 360,000 - HBP
C-14-02	12-00050-00-FP	C	Washington Street in Downs	CH 27 (Seminary St)	US 150	Re-construction	C	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$0	\$0	450,000 - County MFT 1,050,000 - Matching
N-14-01		N	Uptown Normal	Amtrak Station		Construct Platform Passenger Access Structure and Southside Boarding Platform	C	\$5,336,000	\$106,720		\$5,229,280	106,720 - NCIF; 5,229,280 IDOT TIGER (FRA)
N-07-06		N	Various			Resurfacing of various city streets	C	\$860,000	\$860,000	\$0	\$0	400,000 - NMFT; 200,000-NCIF; 260,000-CD
N-13-02		N	University Street	Virginia Street	Division Street	Reconstruct to 2-lane urban section	E	\$56,300	\$56,300	\$0	\$0	56,300 - NMFT
N-13-01		N	University Street Bridge	University Street	Sugar Creek	Bridge Replacement	E	\$225,000	\$225,000	\$0	\$0	225,000-NMFT
N-06-01		N	Airport Road	Raab Road		Traffic signal improvements	E	\$47,800	\$47,800	\$0	\$0	47,800-NMFT
N-13-03		N	Airport Road	Shepard Road		Traffic signal installation	E	\$42,350	\$42,350	\$0	\$0	42,350-NMFT
N-14-02		N	Raab Road	Healing Stone	North Pointe Drive	Reconstruct to 2-lane urban section	E	\$297,440	\$297,440			297,440 - NMFT
Annual Total								\$16,301,890	\$10,712,610	\$0	\$5,589,280	
									65.7%	0%	34.3%	

Project No.	Cross-ref	Jurisdiction	Project Location	Termini		Description	Phase	Total Project Cost	Funding Source			Funding Detail
				Beginning (or cross street)	End				Local	State	Federal	
2015												
B-09-04	50-01-12164-07-00	B	Lutz Road	Morris Avenue	Greenwood Avenue	Construct Urban Section	E, ROW	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$0	\$0	360,000-BMFT
B-09-07	50-01-42167-07-00	B	Woodrig Road	Main Street	Geneva Blvd	Construct Urban Section	E	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	200,000-BMFT
B-12-03	50-11-12533-06-00	B	Fox Creek Rd Bridge	over Union Pacific Railroad		Reconstruct bridge with 4 lanes	ROW	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	20,000-BMFT
B-15-03		J	Jersey Ave Bridge			Reconstruct bridge	E	\$160,000	\$160,000	\$0	\$0	160,000 - BMFT
B-15-04		B	Cottage Ave Bridge			Reconstruct bridge	E	\$160,000	\$160,000	\$0	\$0	160,000 - BMFT
B-15-01	50-02-33073-13-00	J	Hershey Road	Fort Jesse Road		Traffic signal installation	C	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$0	\$0	250,000 - BCIF
B-15-02	50-02-33074-13-00	J	Airport Road	Fort Jesse Road		Traffic signal installation	C	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$0	\$0	250,000 - BCIF
B-14-01	50-02-33064-05-00	B	GE Road	Keaton Pl / Auto Row		Traffic signal installation & NB left turn lane	C	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$0	\$0	350,000 - BCIF
B-03-09	50-01-42063-94-01	B	Hamilton Rd	Bunn St	Commerce Dr	Street improvements	E, ROW	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$0	\$0	400,000 - BMFT
B-13-00	50-01-53001-15-00	B	Citywide			General resurfacing-various City streets	C	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000	\$0	\$0	4,500,000 - BCIF
C-15-01	07-00113-04-FP	C	Towanda-Barnes Rd (C.H. 29)	Fort Jesse Rd (1600N)	Raab Rd (1700N)	Widen to 5-lanes with signal improvements @ Fort Jesse Rd and Raab Rd	C	\$5,700,000	\$1,140,000	\$0	\$4,560,000	1,140,000 - County 2,560,000 - STR 2,000,000 - STU
C-15-02	12-00165-01-RS	C	Towanda-Barnes Rd (C.H. 29)	US 150	Ireland Grove Road	Resurfacing	C	\$1,450,000	\$1,450,000	\$0	\$0	395,000 - County MFT 1,055,000 - Matching
C-15-03	12-00113-06-WR	C	Towanda-Barnes Rd (C.H. 29)	Raab Rd (1700N)	CH 14 (1925E)	Widening and Resurfacing	C	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$0	\$0	400,000 - County MFT 350,000 - Matching
N-03-1828		N	Towanda Avenue	Raab Road		Traffic signal installation	E	\$49,565	\$49,565	\$0	\$0	49,565 – NMFT
N-07-06		N	Various			Resurfacing of various city streets	C	\$860,000	\$860,000	\$0	\$0	400,000 - NMFT; 200,000-NCIF; 260,000-CD
N-06-01		N	Airport Road	Raab Road		Traffic signal improvements	C	\$238,830	\$238,830	\$0	\$0	238,830-NMFT
N-10-01		N	Northtown Road	Linden Street	Towanda Avenue	Reconstruct to 2-lane rural section	C	\$403,000	\$403,000	\$0	\$0	403,000 - NMFT
N-13-03		N	Airport Road	Shepard Road		Traffic signal installation	C	\$211,750	\$211,750	\$0	\$0	211,750 - NMFT
N-13-01		N	University Street Bridge	University Street	Sugar Creek	Bridge Replacement	C	\$765,000	\$765,000	\$0	\$0	765,000-NMFT
N-13-02		N	University Street	Virginia Street	Division Street	Reconstruct to 2-lane urban section	C	\$375,150	\$375,150	\$0	\$0	375,150 - NMFT
N-15-01		N	Towanda Avenue	Raab Road	I-55	Reconstruct to 2-lane rural section	E	\$150,000	\$150,000			150,000 - NMFT
A161		S	I-39 / US 51	I-55	N of TR 157A	Resurfacing (INT-1ST) / Patching		\$6,690,000	\$0	\$669,000	\$6,021,000	Int. Maintenance / State Match
D082		S	I-55 Bus / Veterans Pkwy	W of Fox Creek Rd (omission at Six Points)	0.2 mi W of Bunn St in Bloomington	Resurfacing (3R) / Sign Maintenance / Lighting / New Shoulders / Curb and Gutter / Guardrail / Bridge Deck Repairs		\$2,700,000	\$0	\$540,000	\$2,160,000	NHS-STATE / State Match
H618		S	I-74 / I-55 Bus / US 51	I-55 Busn over I-74 SW of Bloomington		Bridge Replacement / Vertical Realignment		\$13,075,000	\$0	\$1,407,000	\$11,668,000	Int. Maintenance / State Match
H608		S	US 51 Bus / Main St (Northbound)	Sugar Creek 0.8 mi N of IL 9		Bridge Replacement / Bridge Widening / Utility Adjustment		\$1,435,000	\$0	\$391,000	\$1,044,000	NHS-STATE / State Match / State Only
Annual Total								\$41,503,295	\$13,043,295	\$2,338,000	\$26,122,000	
								31.4%	5.6%	62.9%		

Project No.	Cross-ref	Jurisdiction	Project Location	Termini		Description	Phase	Total Project Cost	Funding Source			Funding Detail
				Beginning (or cross street)	End				Local	State	Federal	
2016												
B-09-07	50-01-42167-07-00	B	Woodrig Road	Main Street	Geneva Blvd	Construct Urban Section	ROW	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	100,000-BMFT
B-16-02	50-02-23042-97-00	B	Lee Street	Market Street		Traffic signal installation	C	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$0	\$0	250,000 - BCIF
B-16-03		B	Streid Drive	Ireland Grove Road		Traffic signal installation	C	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$0	\$0	250,000 - BCIF
B-09-03	50-01-42063-94-01	B	Hamilton Rd	Bunn St	Commerce Dr	Street improvements	C	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$0	\$0	3,200,000-BOND; 250,000-WDF; 250,000-SDF; 300,000-SWMMF
B-13-00	50-01-53001-15-00	B	Citywide			General resurfacing-various City streets	C	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$0	\$0	5,000,000 - BCIF
C-16-01	12-00168-01-RS	C	Towanda-Barnes Rd (C.H. 29)	Ireland Grove Road	IL Route 9	Resurfacing	C	\$1,150,000	\$1,150,000	\$0	\$0	375,000 - County MFT 775,000 - Matching
C-16-02	10-11127-00-BR	T	Dale R.D. Bridge (750E)	Bridge 1000' North of 1200N		Bridge Replacement	C	\$800,000	\$160,000	\$0	\$640,000	80,000 - County 80,000 - Dale RD 640,000 - HBP
N-03-1828		N	Towanda Avenue	Raab Road		Traffic signal installation	C	\$310,200	\$310,200	\$0	\$0	310,200 – NMFT
N-07-06		N	Various			Resurfacing of various city streets	C	\$860,000	\$860,000	\$0	\$0	400,000 - NMFT; 200,000-NCIF; 260,000-CD
N-13-02		N	University Street	Virginia Street	Division Street	Reconstruct to 2-lane urban section	C	\$375,150	\$375,150	\$0	\$0	375,150-NMFT
N-02-1736		N	Virginia Avenue	University Street	Franklin Street	Reconstruct to 3-lane urban section	E	\$77,350	\$77,350	\$0	\$0	77,350 – NMFT
N-13-01		N	University Street Bridge	University Street	Sugar Creek	Bridge Replacement	C	\$765,000	\$765,000	\$0	\$0	765,000-NMFT
N-15-01		N	Towanda Avenue	Raab Road	I-55	Reconstruct to 2-lane rural section	C	\$750,000	\$750,000			750,000 - NMFT
Annual Total								\$18,687,700	\$18,047,700	\$0	\$640,000	
								96.6%	0%	3.4%		

Project No.	Cross-ref	Jurisdiction	Project Location	Termini		Description	Phase	Total Project Cost	Funding Source			Funding Detail
				Beginning (or cross street)	End				Local	State	Federal	
2017												
B-13-01	50-02-33072-12-00	B	Empire St (IL 9)	Hershey Rd & Fire Station 3 Signals		Upgrade traffic signal installation & extend westbound left turn lane	C	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$0	\$0	500,000 - BCIF
B-13-02	50-02-33044-97-00	B	Hershey Road	Arrowhead Drive		Traffic signal installation	C	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$0	\$0	250,000 - BCIF
B-13-03	50-02-33045-97-00	B	Hershey Road	Clearwater Drive		Traffic signal installation	C	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$0	\$0	250,000 - BCIF
B-12-02	50-01-12146-04-00	B	Fox Creek Rd	Danbury Drive	Union Pacific Railroad Bridge	Reconstruct as 4 lane Urban Section	C	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$0	\$0	1,500,000-BMFT
B-12-03	50-11-12533-06-00	B	Fox Creek Rd Bridge	over Union Pacific Railroad		Reconstruct bridge with 4 lanes	C	\$2,000,000	\$1,500,000	\$500,000	\$0	1,500,000-BMFT; 500,000-IDOT
B-13-00	50-01-53001-15-00	B	Citywide			General resurfacing – various City streets	C	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000	\$0	\$0	5,500,000-BCIF
N-07-05		N	Zeibarth Road	Pipeline Road	Thru Northbridge Sub.	Reconstruct to 3-lane urban section	E	\$172,000	\$172,000	\$0	\$0	172,000 – NMFT
N-07-06		N	Various			Resurfacing of various city streets	C	\$860,000	\$860,000	\$0	\$0	400,000 - NMFT; 200,000-NCIF; 260,000-CD
N-02-1736		N	Virginia Avenue	University Street	Franklin Street	Reconstruct to 3-lane urban section	C	\$394,485	\$394,485	\$0	\$0	394,485 – NMFT
S183		S	US 51 / US 51 Bus	Woodrig Rd in Bloomington	Country Acres Rd	Resurfacing (3P)		\$2,835,000	\$0	\$567,000	\$2,268,000	NHS-STATE / State Match
Annual Total								\$14,261,485	\$10,926,485	\$1,067,000	\$2,268,000	
								76.6%	7.5%	15.9%		

This page intentionally left blank.

6: SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR SAFETEA-LU PROGRAMMING

L RTP requirements

SAFETEA-LU also states that “A [long-range] transportation plan...shall contain, at a minimum...Operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods.” While federal law and regulation has required some focus on transportation system management and operations for a number of years, management and operations strategies such as incident response, special event planning, and work zone management have received relatively little attention. However, during the last two decades, various constraints have highlighted the need for coordination of regional operations strategies within the planning process. Among the factors making it increasingly difficult to construct new highway and transit capacity are:

- Environmental, Community, and Space Constraints - In many metropolitan areas, there are fewer opportunities for highway or transit capacity expansion along congested corridors. Often the environmental and community impacts that would result from new or widened roadways go beyond what is acceptable to the public. In some cases, there is little or no additional space within public right-of-ways. These constraints on traditional infrastructure construction have placed increased pressures on public officials and transportation agencies to find new ways of enhancing the effective capacity and reliability of the existing transportation network.
- Funding Constraints - As transportation construction costs have increased, State and local budgets have become more strained. Some transportation capacity projects move forward despite community, environmental, and space constraints, but overcoming these constraints requires longer construction periods, frequent project mitigations, and more complex construction techniques. This means that each project consumes a bigger share of available funds. At the time that project costs are increasing, many States and localities are facing infrastructure deterioration from years of deferred maintenance. These funding challenges mean that few agencies can build all of the facilities that might be desired.
- Inability to Respond to Short-term Problems - Major construction projects rarely deliver new capacity in the short term. In fact, some large-scale projects take well over a decade to complete. At the same time, transportation patterns are more diverse and less predictable than ever. New transportation challenges emerge unexpectedly as a result of economic shifts or short-term trends. Thus, there is a need for transportation solutions that can respond quickly to congestion, safety, and economic concerns.

Thus, interest in improving the reliability and operating efficiency of the transportation system is now becoming paramount in importance for MPOs. This is because an effective transportation system requires not only the provision of highway and transit infrastructure for movement of the public and freight, but also the efficient and coordinated operation of the regional transportation network in order to improve system efficiency, reliability, and safety. Furthermore, linking planning and operations is important to improve transportation decision-making and the overall effectiveness of transportation systems.

Ensuring Sustainable Security

SAFETEA-LU emphasizes that metropolitan transportation planning shall provide for consideration and implementation of projects, strategies, and services that will address increasing the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users. This section addresses the transportation security elements in the Bloomington-Normal urbanized area, the security planning processes and the resources available for transportation security management.

The *NCHRP Report 525*¹, referenced in IDOT's 2007 initiative for compliance with SAFETEA-LU in local plans and practices, makes the following distinction between safety and security:

- Safety – protection of persons or property from unintentional damage or destruction caused by accidental or natural events
- Security – protection of persons or property from intentional damage or destruction caused by vandalism, criminal activity, or terrorist events

The report suggests the following provisions to incorporate security into the transportation planning process:

- Make security a distinct factor from safety in the transportation planning process
- Provide resources for transportation-related homeland security projects that would be identified through the regular transportation planning process, including those aimed at prevention, mitigation, response and recovery
- Provide resources to improve international freight security in and around key freight gateways and hubs, including intermodal and Strategic Highway Network STRAHNET connectors.
- Provide resources to expedite urgent highway and public transportation security projects to address imminent damage or to repair damage caused by a terrorist attack against the United States, including structural hardening, relocation of roads from underneath critical structures, property acquisition to create secure zones, or repairing or replacing a bridge or tunnel that has been damaged or destroyed by a terrorist attack.
- Encourage the use of monitoring systems (such as Intelligent Transportation Systems [ITS]) to check the status or condition of key surface transportation (highway and transit) facilities.
- Inclusion into the planning process of security related stakeholders such as local law enforcement agencies, fire departments and rescue squads, federal response agencies, and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

HSTP Program Requirements

The State and the MPO must follow all the requirements contained in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) program guidance and procedures for the Section 5310, 5316 and 5317 programs. Consolidated excerpts of the program requirements and web site addresses to obtain additional information are listed below.

For Section 5310 funds, the state designates an agency with the requisite legal, financial, and staffing capabilities to receive and administer Federal funds under this program. The designated State

¹ NCHRP Report 525, *Surface Transportation Security, Volume 3, Incorporating Security into the Transportation Planning Process*.2005

agency is the recipient of all Section 5310 funds apportioned to the State, and applies to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for these funds on behalf of private non-profit agencies and eligible local governmental authorities within the State.

For Section 5316 and 5317 funds, the state must designate a public entity to be the recipient for JARC and New Freedom funds. In urbanized areas with populations less than 200,000 and in non-urbanized areas, the State is the designated recipient. For these areas, the designated State agency is responsible for administering the JARC and New Freedom program. Section 5310 (Elderly and Disabled) funds are apportioned among the States by a formula based on the number of elderly persons and persons with disabilities in each State.

Of the total Section 5316 (JARC) funds available, FTA apportions 60 percent among designated recipients in large urbanized areas; 20 percent to the States for small urbanized areas; and 20 percent to the States for rural and small urban areas under 50,000 in population. JARC funds are apportioned among the recipients by formula. The formula is based on the ratio that the number of eligible low-income and welfare recipients in each such area bears to the number of eligible low-income and welfare recipients in all such areas.

Of the total Section 5317 (New Freedom) funds available, FTA apportions 60 percent among designated recipients in large urbanized areas; 20 percent to the States for small urbanized areas; and 20 percent to the States for rural and small urban areas under 50,000 in population. New Freedom funds are apportioned among the recipients by formula. The formula is based on the ratio that the number of individuals with disabilities in each such area bears to the number of individuals with disabilities in all such areas.

Human Services Transportation Plan Development Process

SAFETEA-LU established a series of requirements for the development of the HSTP:

- A. A locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan (“coordinated plan”) identifies the transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes, provides strategies for meeting those local needs, and prioritizes transportation services for funding and implementation. Local plans may be developed on a local, regional, or statewide level. The decision as to the boundaries of the local planning areas should be made in consultation with the State and the metropolitan planning organization (MPO), where applicable. The agency leading the planning process is decided locally and does not have to be the State. A coordinated plan should maximize the programs’ collective coverage by minimizing duplication of services. Further, a coordinated plan shall be developed through a process that includes representatives of public and private and non-profit transportation and human services transportation providers, and participation by members of the public. Members of the public should include representatives of the targeted population(s) including individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes. While the plan is only required in communities seeking funding under one or more of the three specified FTA programs, a coordinated plan incorporating activities offered under other programs sponsored by Federal, State, and local agencies greatly strengthens its impact.
- B. Projects shall be derived from a coordinated plan that minimally includes the following elements at a level consistent with available resources and the complexity of the local institutional environment:

- An assessment of available services that identifies current transportation providers (public, private, and non-profit);
- An assessment of transportation needs for individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes. This assessment can be based on the experiences and perceptions of the planning partners or on more sophisticated data collection efforts, and gaps in service;
- Strategies, activities, and/or projects to address the identified gaps between current services and needs, as well as opportunities to achieve efficiencies in service delivery; and
- Priorities for implementation based on resources (from multiple program sources), time, and feasibility for implementing specific strategies and/or activities identified.

Coordination Requirements

Projects selected for funding under Sections 5310, 5316 and 5317 must be derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan developed through a process that includes representatives of public, private, and non-profit transportation and human service providers, participation by the public, and representatives addressing the needs of older adults, individuals with disabilities and low-income individuals.

Planning Requirements

Section 5310, 5316 and 5317 projects in urbanized areas must be included in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Projects outside urbanized areas must be included in, or be consistent with the Statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan and must be included in the STIP.

Program of Projects

The program of projects (POP) for Section 5310, 5316 and 5317 identifies the sub-recipients and projects for which the State or designated recipient is applying for financial assistance. The annual POP the State submits to FTA for approval must indicate the total number of sub-recipients; identify each sub-recipient and indicate whether they are governmental authorities, or private non-profit agencies. In addition, the POP must include a brief description of each project, which includes the counties served by the project. The POP must show, for each project, the total project cost and the Federal share. The total Federal funding level for the POP cannot exceed the total amount of Section 5310 funds available. The program of projects must be identical to, or consistent with, listings contained in the applicable TIP and STIP.

Federal transit law, as amended by SAFETEA-LU, requires that projects selected for funding under the Sections 5310, 5316 and 5317 be “derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan” and that the plan be “developed through a process that includes representatives of public, private, and non-profit transportation and human services providers and participation by members of the public.” The experiences gained from the efforts of the Federal Interagency Coordinating Council on Access and Mobility (CCAM), and specifically the United We Ride (UWR) Initiative provide a useful starting point for the development and implementation of the local public transit-human services transportation plan.

Measuring Performance of the Regional Transportation System

One of the critical components in developing regional management and operational strategies is establishing performance measures. Performance measurement involves the act of developing specific transportation system performance criteria and quantitatively tracking those measures.

Performance measures have many functions and can be used to:

Identify what attributes of the transportation system are most important

Provide information on current system conditions and performance

Evaluate the success of implemented and on-going projects and programs

Provide a metric for communicating with decision-makers and the public about past, current, and expected future transportation system conditions

Serve as criteria for investment decisions made in the transportation planning process

Efforts to focus on system performance often result in better recognition of the value associated with management and operational improvements. Data on system performance can highlight the value of investments in programs that minimize incident-related delays, provide information on real-time travel conditions, and improve emergency response times by showing how they can improve transportation system reliability and reduce travel times for riders.

Environmental Mitigation Strategies and Procedures

Section 4(f) Lands

Section 4(f) of the USDOT Act of 1966 applies to any USDOT funded project which involves the use of any significant publicly owned public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge and any land from an historic site of national, state or local significance. Special environmental analyses are required to determine if there is a feasible or prudent alternative to taking the proposed action involving the use of the 4(f) property. In addition, the project sponsor must demonstrate that all possible planning to minimize harm has occurred. These measures to minimize harm, which include mitigation, will be documented in the 4(f) evaluation. IDOT, as part of its Bureau of Design and Environment (BDE) manual has procedures in place for completing 4(f) evaluations that document these findings.

Section 6(f) Land Conversion

Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 applies to any USDOT funded projects which involve the use of lands which have Land and Water Conservation (LAWCON) or Open Space Land Acquisition and Development (OSLAD) funds involved in their purchase or development. IDOT, as part of its BDE manual has procedures in place for handling 6(f) lands when developing highway projects. These procedures focus on early and on-going coordination with local officials as well as the Illinois Department of Natural Resources.

Cultural Resources (Historic Properties and Archaeological Sites)

When IDOT develops a federal funded/regulated project, appropriate measures are taken to avoid and/or minimize impacts on properties that are included in/or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Where such properties will be affected, the Advisory Council on Historic

Preservation shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to comment prior to project approval. Special efforts shall be made to minimize harm to any National Historic Landmark. The BDE manual contains specific procedures for minimizing harm to historic resources in cooperation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the State Historic Preservation Officer.

Threatened and Endangered Species/ Natural Areas

In the development of a project, special studies and coordination are required when the action may affect Federally-listed threatened and endangered species. Studies and coordination also are required for actions that may adversely impact State-listed species. IDOT also conducts studies and coordination activities on actions that may adversely impact areas included in or eligible for the Illinois Natural Areas Inventory. It is IDOT's policy that in the development of a project, an assessment shall be made of the likely impacts on species of plants or animals listed in the Federal and/or State level as threatened or endangered and on State-designated Natural Areas. Every effort is made to minimize the likelihood of jeopardizing the continued existence of listed threatened or endangered species or the destruction or adverse modification of a Natural Area. Efforts are also made to avoid negative impacts on areas of habitat designated as critical habitat or essential habitat. The BDE manual specifies procedures for avoiding and/or mitigating impacts on endangered or threatened species and Natural Areas including consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Illinois Department of Natural Resources.

Farmlands

In the development of a project, consideration is given to the impacts that the action will cause in conversion of farmland to non-farm uses. Under certain circumstances, coordination must be initiated with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service and/or the Illinois Department of Agriculture to evaluate the impacts on farmland and obtain the views of those agencies on alternatives to the proposed action. Proposed actions will be developed to be compatible with state, local government and private programs and policies to protect farmland. The BDE manual outlines coordination procedures and defines those lands subject to these provisions.

Wetlands Preservation

Protection and preservation of wetlands is an important environmental goal of IDOT. In this area, mitigation efforts are coordinated with other state and federal agencies and are clearly defined in both policy and procedures.

The Illinois Interagency Wetland Policy Act of 1989 (IWPA) includes the identification and delineation of jurisdictional wetlands. The Wetlands Group within the Illinois Natural History Survey performs this work under a statewide contract with the IDOT. Under the CWA (Clean Water Act) and IWPA, the IDOT must demonstrate that all measures were taken to first avoid and then minimize impacts to wetlands to the fullest extent practicable. Unavoidable impacts are mitigated by way of wetland compensation through either restoration or creation of wetlands. Methods used by the IDOT to restore or create wetlands follow the Illinois Wetland Restoration and Creation Guide. In addition to the INHS Wetlands Group the Wetlands Geology Section at the Illinois State Geological Survey provides technical assistance to the IDOT in locating, evaluating and monitoring compensatory wetlands. All IDOT wetland compensation plans include a commitment to monitor planned wetlands for attainment of performance standards. Departmental procedures for ensuring compliance with the CWA and IWPA are detailed in the IDOT Wetlands Action Plan.

Floodplains

In the development of a federally funded project, special requirements are imposed by Executive Order 11988 when the project will entail a significant floodplain encroachment. These requirements are in addition to floodplain permit requirements and the special hydraulic analyses associated with determining bridge and culvert heights and widths for projects located in floodplains. A project that will result in significant floodplain encroachment will require the preparation of an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement. Both the BDE manual and the IDOT Water Quality Manual provide additional information and procedures for projects involving floodplains.

Noise Abatement

Federal laws and regulations require that it is necessary to undertake special technical analyses to identify and evaluate the potential noise impacts a project will involve. Once a noise impact is identified, IDOT will evaluate feasible and reasonable noise abatement methods to reduce traffic noise impacts. Traffic noise can potentially be reduced by addressing the noise source, noise path or noise receiver. The BDE manual includes specific guidance and procedures for determining the need for noise abatement evaluations and the types of mitigation strategies that are appropriate for a variety of situations. The manual also specifies coordination requirements with local government and public participation procedures.

Air Quality

All transportation plans, programs, and projects which are funded or approved under Title 23 USC must be determined to conform with State or Federal air implementation plans as required by the Clean Air Amendments of 1990 and subsequent federal regulations. Such implementation plans describe how air quality standards will be achieved in those areas of a State in which standards are being exceeded. This requirement helps regulate projects and guarantees that any new projects may not cause or contribute to new violations of air quality standards, exacerbate existing violations, or interfere with the timely reduction of emissions as reflected in the State Implementation plan. Some changes in air quality standards in coming years may impact Bloomington-Normal and require additional transportation planning activities in response.

Illinois has areas in which standards are being exceeded for one or more criteria pollutants. Transportation-related criteria pollutants include ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide as well as both particulates and fine particulates (PM 10 and PM 2.5). These pollutants are modeled in non-att

Section 4(f) Lands

Section 4(f) of the USDOT Act of 1966 applies to any USDOT funded project which involves the use of any significant publicly owned public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge and any land from an historic site of national, state or local significance. Special environmental analyses are required to determine if there is a feasible or prudent alternative to taking the proposed action involving the use of the 4(f) property. In addition, the project sponsor must demonstrate that all possible planning to minimize harm has occurred. These measures to minimize harm, which include mitigation, will be documented in the 4(f) evaluation. IDOT, as part of its Bureau of Design and Environment (BDE) manual has procedures in place for completing 4(f) evaluations that document these findings.

Section 6(f) Land Conversion

Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 applies to any USDOT funded projects which involve the use of lands which have Land and Water Conservation (LAWCON) or Open Space Land Acquisition and Development (OSLAD) funds involved in their purchase or development. IDOT, as part of its BDE manual has procedures in place for handling 6(f) lands when developing highway projects. These procedures focus on early and on-going coordination with local officials as well as the Illinois Department of Natural Resources.

Cultural Resources (Historic Properties and Archaeological Sites)

When IDOT develops a federal funded/regulated project, appropriate measures are taken to avoid and/or minimize impacts on properties that are included in/or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Where such properties will be affected, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to comment prior to project approval. Special efforts shall be made to minimize harm to any National Historic Landmark. The BDE manual contains specific procedures for minimizing harm to historic resources in cooperation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the State Historic Preservation Officer.

Threatened and Endangered Species/ Natural Areas

In the development of a project, special studies and coordination are required when the action may affect Federally-listed threatened and endangered species. Studies and coordination also are required for actions that may adversely impact State-listed species. IDOT also conducts studies and coordination activities on actions that may adversely impact areas included in or eligible for the Illinois Natural Areas Inventory. It is IDOT's policy that in the development of a project, an assessment shall be made of the likely impacts on species of plants or animals listed in the Federal and/or State level as threatened or endangered and on State-designated Natural Areas. Every effort is made to minimize the likelihood of jeopardizing the continued existence of listed threatened or endangered species or the destruction or adverse modification of a Natural Area. Efforts are also made to avoid negative impacts on areas of habitat designated as critical habitat or essential habitat. The BDE manual specifies procedures for avoiding and/or mitigating impacts on endangered or threatened species and Natural Areas including consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Illinois Department of Natural Resources.

Farmlands

In the development of a project, consideration is given to the impacts that the action will cause in conversion of farmland to non-farm uses. Under certain circumstances, coordination must be initiated with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service and/or the Illinois Department of Agriculture to evaluate the impacts on farmland and obtain the views of those agencies on alternatives to the proposed action. Proposed actions will be developed to be compatible with state, local government and private programs and policies to protect farmland. The BDE manual outlines coordination procedures and defines those lands subject to these provisions.

Wetlands Preservation

Protection and preservation of wetlands is an important environmental goal of IDOT. In this area, mitigation efforts are coordinated with other state and federal agencies and are clearly defined in both policy and procedures.

The Illinois Interagency Wetland Policy Act of 1989 (IWPA) includes the identification and delineation of jurisdictional wetlands. The Wetlands Group within the Illinois Natural History Survey performs this work under a statewide contract with the IDOT. Under the CWA (Clean Water Act) and IWPA, the IDOT must demonstrate that all measures were taken to first avoid and then minimize impacts to wetlands to the fullest extent practicable. Unavoidable impacts are mitigated by way of wetland compensation through either restoration or creation of wetlands. Methods used by the IDOT to restore or create wetlands follow the Illinois Wetland Restoration and Creation Guide. In addition to the INHS Wetlands Group the Wetlands Geology Section at the Illinois State Geological Survey provides technical assistance to the IDOT in locating, evaluating and monitoring compensatory wetlands. All IDOT wetland compensation plans include a commitment to monitor planned wetlands for attainment of performance standards. Departmental procedures for ensuring compliance with the CWA and IWPA are detailed in the IDOT Wetlands Action Plan.

Floodplains

In the development of a federally funded project, special requirements are imposed by Executive Order 11988 when the project will entail a significant floodplain encroachment. These requirements are in addition to floodplain permit requirements and the special hydraulic analyses associated with determining bridge and culvert heights and widths for projects located in floodplains. A project that will result in significant floodplain encroachment will require the preparation of an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement. Both the BDE manual and the IDOT Water Quality Manual provide additional information and procedures for projects involving floodplains.

Noise Abatement

Federal laws and regulations require that it is necessary to undertake special technical analyses to identify and evaluate the potential noise impacts a project will involve. Once a noise impact is identified, IDOT will evaluate feasible and reasonable noise abatement methods to reduce traffic noise impacts. Traffic noise can potentially be reduced by addressing the noise source, noise path or noise receiver. The BDE manual includes specific guidance and procedures for determining the need for noise abatement evaluations and the types of mitigation strategies that are appropriate for a variety of situations. The manual also specifies coordination requirements with local government and public participation procedures.

Air Quality

All transportation plans, programs, and projects which are funded or approved under Title 23 USC must be determined to conform with State or Federal air implementation plans as required by the Clean Air Amendments of 1990 and subsequent federal regulations. Such implementation plans describe how air quality standards will be achieved in those areas of a State in which standards are being exceeded. This requirement helps regulate projects and guarantees that any new projects may not cause or contribute to new violations of air quality standards, exacerbate existing violations, or interfere with the timely reduction of emissions as reflected in the State Implementation plan. Some

changes in air quality standards in coming years may impact Bloomington-Normal and require additional transportation planning activities in response.

Illinois has areas in which standards are being exceeded for one or more criteria pollutants. Transportation-related criteria pollutants include ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide as well as both particulates and fine particulates (PM 10 and PM 2.5). These pollutants are modeled in non-attainment areas in order to determine the required conformity with air quality requirements. The Bloomington-Normal urbanized area is currently designated as an attainment area for the purposes of these standards. However, MCRPC will begin a process to examine air quality challenges and increase public awareness of the issue, to anticipate any revisions in the air quality designation.

ainment areas in order to determine the required conformity with air quality requirements. The Bloomington-Normal urbanized area is currently designated as an attainment area for the purposes of these standards. However, MCRPC will begin a process to examine air quality challenges and increase public awareness of the issue, to anticipate any revisions in the air quality designation.

Mitigation Activities during Construction

IDOT strives to reduce the negative impacts of highway construction and rehabilitation projects by requiring contractors to adhere to related provisions in their Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction. This document includes specific requirements in a number of areas related to the environment:

- Protection of existing plant material
- Removal of waste
- Temporary erosion control

In addition to these general provisions, some highway projects also include additional construction mitigation requirements that are consistent with the location and magnitude of the project, the types of impacted resources and other project specific issues.

Planning for Operations

“Planning for operations” can be defined as a set of activities with the intent of making investment decisions and/or establishing and carrying out plans, policies, and procedures that enable and improve transportation systems management and operation. For a regional transportation system Management and Operations (M&O) program to be effective, those directly responsible for operating the system must agree on what measures to use to assess performance, a concept for how the system should be operated on a regional basis, and how to make changes to achieve desired improvements in system operating performance.

The statutes and regulations that govern the transportation planning process have the flexibility to accommodate and, in fact, encourage M&O solutions. It has become clear that MPOs, State DOTs, and other agencies that lead transportation planning efforts can use the planning process as an important forum and tool for collaboration between planners and operators. Coordination between planners and operators helps ensure that regional transportation investment decisions reflect full consideration of all available strategies and approaches to meet regional goals and objectives.

SAFETEA-LU and the associated implementing regulations include “promote efficient system management and operation” as a required planning factor in the MPO planning process. SAFETEA-LU also states that “A [long-range] transportation plan... shall contain, at a minimum... Operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods.” While federal law and regulation has required some focus on transportation system management and operations for a number of years, management and operations strategies such as incident response, special event planning, and work zone management have received relatively little attention. However, during the last two decades, various constraints have highlighted the need for coordination of regional operations strategies within the planning process. Among the factors making it increasingly difficult to construct new highway and transit capacity are:

- Environmental, Community, and Space Constraints - In many metropolitan areas, there are fewer opportunities for highway or transit capacity expansion along congested corridors. Often the environmental and community impacts that would result from new or widened roadways go beyond what is acceptable to the public. In some cases, there is little or no additional space within public right-of-ways. These constraints on traditional infrastructure construction have placed increased pressures on public officials and transportation agencies to find new ways of enhancing the effective capacity and reliability of the existing transportation network.
- Funding Constraints - As transportation construction costs have increased, State and local budgets have become more strained. Some transportation capacity projects move forward despite community, environmental, and space constraints, but overcoming these constraints requires longer construction periods, frequent project mitigations, and more complex construction techniques. This means that each project consumes a bigger share of available funds. At the time that project costs are increasing, many States and localities are facing infrastructure deterioration from years of deferred maintenance. These funding challenges mean that few agencies can build all of the facilities that might be desired.
- Inability to Respond to Short-term Problems - Major construction projects rarely deliver new capacity in the short term. In fact, some large-scale projects take well over a decade to complete. At the same time, transportation patterns are more diverse and less predictable than ever. New transportation challenges emerge unexpectedly as a result of economic shifts or short-term trends. Thus, there is a need for transportation solutions that can respond quickly to congestion, safety, and economic concerns.

Thus, interest in improving the reliability and operating efficiency of the transportation system is now becoming paramount in importance for MPOs. This is because an effective transportation system requires not only the provision of highway and transit infrastructure for movement of the public and freight, but also the efficient and coordinated operation of the regional transportation network in order to improve system efficiency, reliability, and safety. Furthermore, linking planning and operations is important to improve transportation decision-making and the overall effectiveness of transportation systems.

