



TRI-COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

EST. 1958

AGENDA

Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Technical Committee

Wednesday, February 18, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. CT

456 Fulton St, Room 420

Peoria, IL 61602

Microsoft Teams

[Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 236 170 102 689

Passcode: fbRi7f

Dial in by phone

[+1 929-346-7201,445459996#](tel:+19293467201,445459996#)

[Find a local number](#)

Phone conference ID: 445 459 996#

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Public Comment
4. Approval of Meeting Minutes of January 21, 2026
5. Recommend to Commission the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments
 - a. Project PC-24-03 Radnor Road
 - b. Project S-26-23 Highway Lighting Maintenance / Replacements
 - c. Project C-27-01 Sycamore Street Shared Use Path
6. Recommend to Commission the FY 2027 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)
https://tricountyrpc.org/wp-content/uploads/Draft_FY27UPWP_TCRPC.pdf
7. Recommend to Commission the FY 2027 Joint Funding Agreement
8. Recommend to Commission the Combined Call for Projects Selection Criteria
9. Updates
 - a. MPO Certification Review
 - b. IDOT Special Programs Assistance Conference
 - c. IDOT
 - i. Local Roads
 - ii. Central Office
 - d. FHWA
10. Other
 - a. Next meeting scheduled for March 18, 2026
11. Adjournment

The MPO receives federal funding and may not discriminate against anyone on the basis of race, color, or national origin according to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For more information or to obtain a Title VI complaint form, please call 309-673-9330.

Tri-County Regional Planning Commission strives to provide an environment welcoming to all persons regardless of physical or mental challenges, race, gender, or religion. Please call 309-673-9330 to request special accommodations at least two days in advance.

MINUTES
Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Technical Committee

Wednesday, January 21, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. CT
 456 Fulton St, Suite 420
 Peoria, IL 61602

1. Call to Order

a. Chairperson Conrad Moore called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

2. Roll Call

Member	Present	Absent	Member	Present	Absent
Amy McLaren Peoria County	X		Dennis Carr City of Washington		X
Jeff Gilles – VICE CHAIR Peoria County		X	Jon Oliphant* City of Washington	X	
Cale Thompson* Peoria County		X	Patrick Meyer Village of Bartonville	X	
Paul Augspurger Tazewell County	X		Dan Corp IDOT-D4	X	
Dan Parr Tazewell County	X		Karen Dvorsky* IDOT-D4		X
Conrad Moore - CHAIR Woodford County	X		Kinga Krider City of West Peoria	X	
Andrea Klopfenstein City of Peoria	X		Charles Hess* City of West Peoria		X
Paola Mendez City of Peoria		X	Craig Loudermilk Village of Morton		X
Sie Maroon City of Peoria		X	Josh Harken City of Chillicothe	X	
Cindy Loos* City of Peoria		X	LD Chaney Village of Creve Coeur		X
Simon Grimm City of Pekin		X	Kofi Kisseeh CityLink		X
Josh Wray* City of Pekin		X	ShamRA Robinson* CityLink		X
Ty Livingston City of East Peoria	X		Eric Miller TCRPC	X	
Bret Tucker* City of East Peoria	X		Ann Doubet Village of Germantown Hills		X
Mark Lee Village of Peoria Heights	X		Gene Olson, Ex-officio MAAP		X
Dustin Sutton* Village of Peoria Heights		X			

• = Alternate

V = Virtual

Also in attendance, in-person:

TCRPC Staff: Michael Bruner, Reema Abi-Akar, Ray Lees, Else Hayes, Isaiah Hageman, Gavin Hunt, Adam Crutcher, and Lori Reynolds

IDOT: Doug DeLille, Al Barrae Shebib, and Reema Sweidan

Member of the public: Jeff Counsil

Virtual: Debbi La Rue, TCRPC; and Steve Kotecki, member of the public

3. Public Comment

None

4. Approval of Meeting Minutes of November 19, 2025

Patrick Meyer made a motion to approve the November 19, 2025 meeting minutes, and Mark Lee seconded. Motion carried.

5. Discussion and Recommendation on Next Combined Call for Projects

Mark Lee made a motion to approve recommendations for the next Combined Call for Projects, seconded by Patrick Meyer.

a. Unspent STBG and TA Funds from Previous Program Years

Michael Bruner presented the following:

From the years of conservatively estimating our federal transportation allotments and past projects coming in under budget, the Commission's STBG, TA, CRO, and Section 5310 balance of unprogrammed funds has grown.

The region's largest balance is STBG with \$4,058,347, which results in \$3,246,678 in Traditional STBG Funding (Reconstruction/New Construction) and \$811,669 in Preservation Set-Aside Funding.

The next largest balance is Transportation Alternative Set-Aside Funding at \$264,426.

For CRP, the region has a balance of \$11,891, and for Section 5310, the balance is \$17,039.

Staff would like to survey the Technical Committee's opinions on how to proceed. Some possible options are:

- Utilize the carryover balance to fund additional projects from the FY 2024 Combined Call for Projects, or
- Hold the additional funding for the next Combined Call for Projects, which should occur this spring.

Patrick Meyer stated that he would prefer to roll it over to spring. Doug DeLille stated that there is a letter coming out soon regarding STBG allotments for the upcoming fiscal year, so he will see what it says. There was a brief discussion, and all agreed to roll it over to spring.

Patrick Meyer made a revised motion to roll the unspent STBG and TA funds over for the Spring Call for Projects. Mark Lee seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

b. Current Balances and Programming STBG funds out to FY 2029 and FY 2030

Michael Bruner presented the following:

As of the 2024 Combined Call for Projects, STBG funds have been programmed through FY 2028, with the current Federal Transportation Bill set to expire September 30, 2026. At the moment, it is unclear how Congress will address this issue. It sounds like if a new bill is passed, it would be a more traditional highway bill.

A balance sheet for the four federal transportation programs is included as Exhibit A in the provided memo.

With the uncertainty with the continuation of the Federal Transportation Bill, staff would like to survey the Technical Committee's opinions on how to proceed with the Spring 2026 Combined Call for Projects. Some possible options are:

- Continue programming out to FY 2029 and FY 2030 using estimated numbers based on previous years (assuming the IIJA will be reauthorized, or a similarly funded bill will arise).

- Do not program FY 2029 or FY 2030 STBG funding. Wait until the next calendar year to confirm how much federal transportation funding will be available. Still include FY 2026 TA, CRP, and Section 5310 in this Spring's Combined Call for Projects.

Ty Livingston suggested waiting to see what is in the bill, since the rumors are that there will be significant changes. Doug DeLille stated that Rockford is waiting to see what the bill says. After brief a discussion, all agreed to wait.

Kinga Krider made a motion to wait before programming the budgeted balances for FY 2029 and FY 2030. Patrick Meyer seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

6. Discussion and Recommendation of Reviewing and Modifying Selection Criteria.

Michael Bruner presented the following:

With the FY 2024 Combined Call for Projects completed, the recent passing of the 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan, and the development of the Tri-County Comprehensive Safety Action Plan, the Selection Criteria for the next Combined Call for Projects should be updated to avoid several redundancies and ensure alignment with the region's most recent core planning documents.

Staff would like to survey the Technical Committee's opinion on how to proceed. Some possible options are:

- Ask TCRPC staff to create a draft showing proposed selection criteria modifications based on past experiences and updated planning documents and bring it to the February 18 Technical Committee to discuss and vote on, or
- Form a subcommittee comprised of Technical Committee members to discuss and propose recommendations for modified criteria based on experiences from the 2024 Combined Call for Projects, the 2050 LRTP, and Tri-County CSAP, with the goal to have a recommendation at the February 18 Technical Committee meeting.

After a brief discussion, all agreed that staff should go over the criteria and create a draft and bring it to the next Technical Committee meeting to be voted on.

Ty Livingston made the motion to allow staff to create a draft of updated criteria, and it was seconded by Dan Parr.

Motion carried.

7. Updates

a. IDOT

- **Local Roads**

Al Barae Shebib reported on the following:

1. Introduction of new IDOT staff Reema Sweidan.
2. STBG numbers are coming out soon, so exact allotments will be available shortly.
3. There is a funding opportunity due at the end of the month for grade crossing protection; more information can be found in Circular 2025-16.

4. Save the date for the Special Programs Informational Session for the ITEP program on May 13-14.
5. Greg Upton and Tim Peters have retired. IDOT is hoping to have Tim back part-time. The new Deputy Secretary is Ryan Mitchell.
6. The seasonal internship program is open; the Peoria office is looking for about 18 college students needing a summer job.

- **Central Office**

Doug DeLille reported the following:

1. In answer to Patrick Meyer's question, the state Motor Fuel Tax is not being impacted by a Senate bill. The sales tax on motor fuel is a different one that goes directly into the general revenue fund that is used for IDOT road projects throughout the state. That is the one that is going to Chicago transit. Doug said that the local Motor Fuel Tax is not impacted.
2. This year will be the last round of Safe Routes to Schools unless they do a reauthorization, so if anyone is planning to do implementation projects, that call comes out around April or May.
3. Amy McLaren asked when ITEP would open. Doug stated if they keep the same schedule, it should be around August. Al Barrae Shebib stated he was not aware if there would be any changes, perhaps just some modifications in criteria.

- a. **FHWA** — Nothing to report.

8. Other

- a. Eric Miller reported that Wayne Aldrich is retiring, and we received a request from one of TCRPC's board members to recognize him at the Commission meeting for the contribution he has brought to this organization on behalf of the Village of Peoria Heights. Amy McLaren made a motion to approve Resolution 26-31 recognizing Wayne Aldrich for the work he has done with Tri-County Regional Planning Commission. Mark Lee seconded the motion, and the motion carried.
- b. BUILD request – Eric Miller reported that Tri-County received a letter from Peoria Heights indicating they wanted a letter of support for a BUILD grant for Prospect Rd., which staff is happy to provide, and asked if there are any other BUILD grants on the horizon. They are due at the end of February, and Tri-County will do what is possible to push projects forward. Andrea Klopfenstein stated that Peoria is submitting for a Downtown Complete Streets initiative, so she will send Tri-County staff details.
- c. Patrick Meyer asked Michael Bruner about the grant for guardrails. Michael explained that the guardrail projects that had already been funded but not completed were not eligible, that this grant was for projects in new jurisdictions, or new projects in the previous jurisdictions. So if they applied for additional funds but were denied, that was the reason. Patrick asked if he could get a meeting with the decision-makers to get clarification on what is eligible. Al Barrae Shebib stated he believes that person is Stephane Seck.
- d. Next meeting scheduled for February 18, 2026

9. Adjournment

Patrick Meyer made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Andrea Klopfenstein. The motion carried, and the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 a.m.

Title	TIP #	Section #	Location	Action	Source	Share	Cost			
Radnor Road	PC-24-03	24-00143-00-EG	Radnor Road from Alta Ln to IL-6 (FAS 0387) and IL-6 to Willow Knolls Rd (FAU 6645), and Willow Knolls Road (FAU 6644) from 0.095 mile east of Radnor Road to RR bridge W of Radnor Road	Phase 1 Preliminary Engineering	CDS*	36%	\$ 500,000.00			
					ST-Rural**	23%	\$ 320,000.00			
						0%				
					State	0%				
					Local*	9%	\$ 125,000.00			
					Local**	33%	\$ 462,000.00			
					Total		\$ 1,407,000.00			
Requesting agency:		Peoria County								
Reason for amendment:		Moving from FY 2025 to 2026 Program, Adding Willow Knolls location and additional Federal ST-Rural funds								

Title	TIP #	Section #	Location	Action	Source	Share	Cost			
Highway Lighting Maintenance / Replacements	S-26-23		I-74 from Sterling Ave in Peoria to East Washington St in East Peoria	High-Mast Light Tower Foundation Replacements	NHPP	90%	\$ 1,350,000.00			
						0%				
						0%				
						0%				
					State	10%	\$ 150,000.00			
					Local	0%				
					Total		\$ 1,500,000.00			
Requesting agency:		IDOT								
Reason for amendment:		Addition to FY 2026 Program. Currently Scheduled for the 6/12/26 letting.								

Title	TIP #	Section #	Location	Action	Source	Share	Cost			
Sycamore Street Shared Use Path	C-27-01	25-00045-00-BT	Sycamore Street from 1300' West of Bradley Ave to Benedict Street	Engineering, ROW, and construction for shared use path		0%				
						0%				
						0%				
						0%				
					State	100%	\$ 935,000.00			
					Local	0%				
					Total		\$ 935,000.00			
Requesting agency:		City of Chillicothe								
Reason for amendment:		Adding to FY 2027 Program. Awarded IDOT's FY24 Local Public Funding. Anticipated Letting Date is March 5, 2027.								



MEMORANDUM

TO: MPO Technical Committee

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: Draft FY 2027 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

DATE: February 18, 2026

Action needed:

Recommend to Commission the FY 2027 Unified Planning Work Program and Joint Funding Agreement.

Background:

Staff have developed the draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for FY 2027. The UPWP is one of the core federally required documents for the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). The UPWP is updated annually to maintain a transportation planning program that is continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive, addressing the multimodal needs of the Greater Peoria area. It outlines the programs, projects, and products that the Commission intends to undertake and accomplish during the fiscal year, spanning July 1 through June 30.

The UPWP is developed in collaboration with our transportation partners, including the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) and the Greater Peoria Mass Transit District. It details the region's federal, state, and local transportation planning funds and their anticipated expenditures. The document guides the MPO's day-to-day transportation planning activities and ensures compliance with federal regulations under 23 CFR Part 450.308.

The draft FY 2027 UPWP is available on Commission's website at the following link:
https://tricountyrpc.org/wp-content/uploads/Draft_FY27UPWP_TCRPC.pdf.

JOINT FUNDING AGREEMENT – UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM FY 2027

This Joint Funding Agreement (“Agreement”) is entered into by and among the participating agencies of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Peoria–Pekin Urbanized Area. For purposes of this Agreement, the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (“Commission”) serves as the designated MPO in accordance with Section 134 of the *Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA)*.

The purpose of this Agreement is to establish the procedures and methods by which sufficient local matching funds will be provided to support the receipt and use of Federal Metropolitan Planning (PL) funds for Fiscal Year 2027. The Peoria–Pekin Urbanized Area is anticipated to receive **\$992,315.10** in Federal PL funds, which require a 20 percent non-federal match. The total required non-federal match for FY 2027 is **\$248,078.78**. It is further agreed that the Greater Peoria Mass Transit District (GPMTD) will contribute \$3,800 as a pass-through membership fee for participation in the metropolitan transportation planning process.

Federal PL funds and local matching funds shall be used to carry out the work and services identified in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), as adopted by the Commission. If State Metropolitan Planning funds are available to offset the required non-federal match, the local dollars collected by this Agreement will be programmed by the Commission in a separate local work program, as appropriate.

Each participating agency identified herein agrees to remit its full local share to the MPO no later than November 1, 2026, unless otherwise approved by the Commission. The MPO shall deposit all local funds into a dedicated account. Withdrawals from this account shall be made solely for reimbursement of eligible work performed under the designated UPWP tasks or separate work program. The MPO shall provide monthly reports to the Full Commission accounting for expenditures incurred under the UPWP. Federal and State funds shall be requested by and disbursed directly to the MPO in accordance with applicable agreements with the State of Illinois and the Greater Peoria Mass Transit District.

Local matching funds shall be provided by each participating agency based on the proportionate share of Motor Fuel Tax (MFT) funds received by that agency during the previous fiscal year. The table on the following page depicts each member jurisdiction MFT allotment and their portion of the local matching funds.

Any surplus of local matching funds, including accrued interest, shall remain on deposit in the dedicated account managed by the MPO along with any excess funds from prior fiscal years. Such surplus funds may be used for purposes and projects as designated by the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, consistent with applicable federal and state requirements.

JOINT FUNDING AGREEMENT – UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM FY 2027

Community	MFT Allotment	MFT %	Contribution
Peoria County	\$ 2,155,640.84	22.54%	\$ 55,051.41
Tazewell County	\$ 1,701,027.55	17.78%	\$ 43,441.36
Woodford County	\$ 585,371.96	6.12%	\$ 14,949.41
Bartonville, Village of	\$ 131,767.49	1.38%	\$ 3,365.12
Chillicothe, City of	\$ 135,823.57	1.42%	\$ 3,468.70
Creve Coeur, Village of	\$ 109,359.26	1.14%	\$ 2,792.85
East Peoria, City of	\$ 498,344.87	5.21%	\$ 12,726.88
Germantown Hills, Village of	\$ 75,625.02	0.79%	\$ 1,931.33
Morton, Village of	\$ 379,388.43	3.97%	\$ 9,688.94
Pekin, City of	\$ 703,299.30	7.35%	\$ 17,961.07
Peoria, City of	\$ 2,507,904.40	26.22%	\$ 4,047.63
Peoria Heights, Village of	\$ 130,947.41	1.37%	\$ 3,344.17
Washington, City of	\$ 356,204.44	3.72%	\$ 9,096.86
West Peoria, City of	\$ 94,486.93	0.99%	\$ 2,413.04
GPMTD	N/A	N/A	\$ 3,800.00
Total	\$ 9,565,191.47		\$ 248,078.78

JOINT FUNDING AGREEMENT – UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM FY 2027

Participating Agency Signature Page

By signing below, the undersigned certifies that they are duly authorized to execute this Joint Funding Agreement on behalf of the participating agency identified below and agrees to the terms and conditions set forth herein.

Participating Agency:

Authorized Signature:

Printed Name and Title:

Date:



MEMORANDUM

TO: MPO Technical Committee

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: Unified MPO Competitive Project Selection Framework

DATE: February 18, 2026

Action Needed

Discussion and recommendation to the Commission the Unified MPO Competitive Project Selection Framework.

Background

The Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (TCRPC) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Peoria-Pekin Urbanized Area. One of the responsibilities of the MPO is to program federal funds allocated to TCRPC. These federal funds are allocated on an annual basis to the MPO and include the Carbon Reduction Program (CRP), Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities (Section 5310), Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG), and Transportation Alternative (TA) Set-Aside.

It is the practice of the Commission to hold a Call for Projects for Commission-allocated federal transportation funds on a biennial basis. The most recent Call for Projects combined all Commission-allocated federal transportation programs into a single, consolidated Call for Projects and was released in Spring 2024. Tri-County intends to continue this approach and release its next Combined Call for Projects in Spring 2026.

January MPO Technical Committee Meeting Outcomes

At the MPO Technical Committee's January meeting, the upcoming Combined Call for Projects was discussed. During this meeting, the Technical Committee recommended the following actions in preparation for the 2026 Combined Call for Projects:

1. Include the carryover balances of all federal transportation funds in this year's Call for Projects
2. Pause the programming of funding beyond the current federal transportation authorization
3. Direct staff to review the current selection criteria and return with recommended modifications based on lessons learned from the 2024 Combined Call for Projects and the recently adopted Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Comprehensive Safety Action Plan (CSAP).

Rationale for Consolidation

The purpose of this memorandum is to document the process used to consolidate six separate program-specific scoring frameworks (CRP, Section 5310, STBG – New Construction, STBG – Pavement Preservation, STBG – Reconstruction, and TA) into a single, comprehensive, performance-based scoring system for MPO-allocated federal transportation funds.

The consolidated framework ensures consistency with federal regulations and regional MPO policy documents:

- 23 U.S.C. §133 – Surface Transportation Block Grant Program
- 23 U.S.C. §133(h) – Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside
- 23 U.S.C. §134 – Metropolitan Transportation Planning
- 23 U.S.C. §150 – Performance-Based Planning and Programming
- 23 U.S.C. §175 – Carbon Reduction Program
- 23 CFR Part 450 – Metropolitan Planning Regulations
- 29 U.S.C. § 794 – Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973
- 42 U.S.C. § 2000d et seq. – Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
- 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. – Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
- 49 U.S.C. § 5310 – Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities
- The Tri-County 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)
- The Human Services Transportation Plan (HSTP)
- The Congestion Management Process (CMP) Update
- The Comprehensive Safety Action Plan (CSAP)

Historically, each funding program utilized its own scoring framework. While this approach reflected individual program objectives, it resulted in:

- Redundant evaluation criteria (e.g., safety, connectivity, and readiness repeated across programs)
- Inconsistent weighting methodologies
- Difficulty comparing projects across funding sources
- Increased administrative burden
- Potential subjectivity in scoring

Because federal metropolitan planning is performance-based and multimodal in nature (23 U.S.C. §134(c)), maintaining separate scoring systems for programs that ultimately serve regional system goals was no longer operationally efficient or policy-aligned.

Attachment A includes a graph that shows the equivalent criteria across the previous program specific criteria and the unified category.

Consolidation Methodology

The consolidation process (1) inventoried existing criteria, (2) identified overlapping factors, (3) aligned with federal regulations and adopted plans, (4) eliminated redundancies, and (5) developed a program-neutral scoring framework.

1. Each program's prior criteria were reviewed and grouped into common themes:
 - a. Regional significance
 - b. Safety
 - c. Multimodal connectivity
 - d. Asset condition / purpose and need
 - e. Environmental benefits
 - f. Project readiness
 - g. Accessibility / nondiscrimination
2. Identified the overlapping factors that were revealed through the grouping process.
3. Each scoring theme was cross-referenced with relevant MPO- and program-specific federal regulations and regionally adopted policy plans.
4. The criteria were further refined, and redundancies were removed by combining similar metrics into structured subfactors.
5. The results of the previous four steps were used to develop a draft unified scoring framework with clearly defined subfactors.

Proposed Unified Scoring Framework

The proposed consolidated criteria are:

Criterion	Maximum Points
Regional Significance	20
Safety	20
Multimodal Connectivity	15
Purpose & Need	15
Environmental Sustainability	10
Local Priority & Project Readiness	10
Nondiscrimination & Accessibility	10
Total Possible Points	100

Regional Significance

This criterion has been allocated 20 points. Projects shall be evaluated based on their measurable contribution to the regional transportation system, including mobility, accessibility, economic vitality, environmental performance, and system connectivity.

Consideration shall include, as applicable:

- Function as a regional connector, critical system link, or corridor identified in the LRTP, CMP, or CSAP
- Access to major employment centers, educational institutions, healthcare facilities, or essential services
- Support of regionally significant transportation facilities (e.g., freight corridors, logistics centers, transit hubs, airports, intermodal terminals)
- Demonstrated regional benefit across jurisdictional boundaries
- Closure of a critical network gap or improvement to regional multimodal continuity
- Contribution to regional emission reduction, system efficiency, or mobility for vulnerable populations
- Consistency with adopted land use, redevelopment, or economic development strategies

Projects that demonstrate measurable regional mobility, economic vitality, system continuity, or accessibility benefits beyond a single jurisdiction or neighborhood shall receive priority consideration.

This criterion advances metropolitan planning requirements under 23 U.S.C. §134, including development of an integrated, multimodal transportation system that increases accessibility and mobility of people and freight, and supports the investment priorities of the 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan.

Regional Significance is scored using four subfactors (0 to 5 points each), amounting to a maximum score of 20 points. To aid with scoring, numeric thresholds are supplied for each of the four subfactors.

Regional System Impact

Score Definition

0	Localized benefit only; no identifiable regional impact
2	Improves subregional mobility, accessibility, or connectivity
3	Improves an identified LRTP, CMP, or CSAP corridor or system
5	Demonstrates measurable system-level impact (mobility, safety, emissions, or access) across multiple jurisdictions or user groups

Mobility & Accessibility Benefit

Score Definition

0	Minimal change to mobility or access
2	Improves access for a single mode or user group
3	Improves multimodal access or access to essential services
5	Significantly enhances regional mobility, multimodal continuity, or access to employment, education, healthcare, or transit

Economic & Community Impact

Score Definition

0	No documented economic or community benefit
2	Supports local economic or community facility access
3	Supports identified employment center or redevelopment area
5	Supports regionally significant economic drivers, freight movement, workforce access, or coordinated growth strategies

Network Continuity & Integration

Score Definition

0	No improvement to system integration
2	Minor network connection improvement
3	Closes identified gap in transportation network
5	Eliminates critical gap, enhances multimodal integration, or strengthens system redundancy/resilience

Safety

This criterion has been allocated 20 points. Projects shall be evaluated based on demonstrated safety need and anticipated safety benefit.

Consideration shall include:

- Documented crash frequency and/or crash rate
- Severity of crashes (fatal and serious injury emphasis)
- Inclusion within a High Injury Network (HIN) or CSAP priority corridor
- Alignment with the Tri-County CSAP
- Incorporation of evidence-based or systemic safety countermeasures

Projects addressing fatal and serious injury trends shall receive priority consideration.

This criterion advances federal safety performance management requirements under 23 U.S.C. §150(c)(4) and 23 CFR Part 490, supports Goal 18 of the 2050 LRTP, aligns with the Safety Goal in the CMP Update, and implements priorities identified in the CSAP.

Safety is scored using four subfactors (0 to 5 points each), amounting to a maximum score of 20 points. To aid with scoring, numeric thresholds are supplied for each of the four subfactors.

Documented Safety Need

Score	Definition
0	No documented crash history or safety concern
2	Documented crash history below regional average or limited to property damage only
3	Demonstrated pattern of injury crashes or above-average crash rate
4	Documented serious injury crashes (K/A level) within past 5 years
5	High-crash location or corridor with fatal and/or multiple serious injury crashes; identified in a Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP), CSAP or local safety plan

Anticipated Safety Effectiveness

Score	Definition
0	No demonstrated safety countermeasure component
2	General safety improvement with limited evidence base
3	Includes Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-recognized safety countermeasure
4	Includes multiple proven countermeasures with documented crash reduction factors (CMFs)
5	Demonstrates quantifiable crash reduction estimate or aligns with Proven Safety Countermeasures / Safe System Approach

Systemic Risk Reduction

Score	Definition
0	Location-specific improvement only
2	Addresses a localized risk condition
3	Addresses corridor-level risk factors
4	Addresses system-wide risk pattern (e.g., pedestrian crossings, rural curves, transit access points)
5	Implements systemic safety treatment across multiple locations or user groups

Protection of Vulnerable Road Users and Accessibility

Score	Definition
0	No identifiable safety or accessibility benefit for vulnerable road users
2	Includes minor improvements for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, seniors, or individuals with mobility limitations
3	Addresses documented crash patterns or risk exposure involving pedestrians, bicyclists, seniors, individuals with disabilities, or transit-dependent users
4	Located in an area with demonstrated elevated crash rates involving vulnerable road users or improves safe access to essential destinations (schools, medical facilities, employment centers, transit stops)
5	Demonstrates measurable reduction in exposure risk for vulnerable road users and/or significantly improves safe and accessible travel consistent with the Safe System Approach and ADA accessibility standards

Multimodal Connectivity

This criterion has been allocated 15 points. Projects shall be evaluated based on improvements benefiting all transportation system users.

Consideration shall include:

- Bicycle and pedestrian connectivity
- Transit integration and stop accessibility improvements
- Freight system support and goods movement efficiency
- Closure of identified network gaps
- Traffic calming and context-sensitive design elements

Priority shall be given to projects that improve safe access across multiple modes and enhance system integration.

This criterion advances multimodal planning requirements under 23 U.S.C. §134(c) and supports Goals 1–9, 14–17, 20–21, and 23–24 of the 2050 LRTP, the Multimodal Goals of the CMP Update, and implementation of CSAP strategies.

Multimodal Connectivity is scored using three subfactors (0 to 5 points each), amounting to a maximum score of 15 points. To aid with scoring, numeric thresholds are supplied for each of the four subfactors.

Bicycle / Pedestrian Connectivity

Score	Definition
0	No multimodal component
3	Improves connectivity or fills minor gap
5	Closes critical gap or improves system-level safety

Transit / Freight Integration

Score	Definition
0	No transit / freight relevance
3	Improves access to transit stop or freight route
5	Enhances transit corridor/hub, freight corridor, or intermodal facility

Traffic Calming and Corridor Compatibility

Score	Definition
0	No user safety design features
3	Includes traffic calming or context-sensitive design
5	Incorporates comprehensive complete streets design

Purpose & Need

This criterion has been allocated 15 points. Projects shall be evaluated based on demonstrated need and contribution to system preservation, operational efficiency, or congestion mitigation.

As applicable, consideration shall include:

- Average daily traffic (ADT)
- Volume-to-capacity ratio
- Bottleneck reduction
- Inclusion within CMP-identified corridors
- ITS deployment or operational improvements
- Pavement or bridge condition data
- Transit asset condition, considering a Transit Asset Management Plan (TAMP)
- Use of preservation or lifecycle cost strategies
- Estimated community use or public benefit

Projects demonstrating documented performance deficiencies or state of good repair needs shall receive higher scores.

This criterion supports federal asset management and congestion management requirements under 23 CFR Part 490 and 23 CFR §450.322, as well as Goals 22 and 25 of the 2050 LRTP and the Operations Goal of the CMP Update.

Purpose & Need is scored using four subfactors with varying maximum points, amounting to a maximum total score of 15 points. To aid with scoring, numeric thresholds are supplied for each of the four subfactors.

Documented Transportation Deficiency

Score	Definition
0	No documented deficiency
2	General narrative need only
3	Data-supported need (ADT, V/C, asset condition, delay, service gap)
5	Quantified performance deficiency documented using CMP, asset data, or system analysis

Applicable data examples are ADT, V/C ratio, pavement and bridge condition, transit asset condition, CMP-identified bottleneck, travel time reliability, etc.

Operational or Asset Condition Benefit

Score Definition

0	No measurable improvement
2	Improvement anticipated but not quantified
4	Quantified improvement to capacity, condition, reliability, or service life

Examples of quantified improvements are pavement life extension, reduced delay, improved reliability, etc.

Congestion or Reliability Improvements

Score Definition

0	No impact
1	Minor localized benefit
3	Measurable corridor or system reliability improvement

System Performance Improvements

Score Definition

0	No measurable performance improvement
1	Minor localized improvement
2	Corridor-level improvement
3	Demonstrated system-level performance improvement supported by data

Examples of performance improvements are travel time reliability improvements, freight movement efficiency, improved redundancy in network, ITS deployment improving operations, etc.

Environmental Sustainability

This criterion has been allocated 10 points. Projects shall be evaluated based on anticipated environmental and resiliency benefits.

Consideration shall include:

- Estimated greenhouse gas emission reductions
- Congestion mitigation benefits
- Reduction of vehicle idling through operational improvements (e.g., roundabouts)
- Incorporation of green infrastructure (bioswales, permeable pavement)
- Stormwater runoff reduction and water quality improvements
- Erosion control measures, including bluff stabilization
- Planting of native trees and vegetative buffers

Priority shall be given to projects demonstrating measurable emission or environmental performance benefits.

This criterion advances objectives of the Carbon Reduction Program under 23 U.S.C. §175 and supports Goals 10–13, 19, and 22 of the 2050 LRTP.

Environmental Sustainability is scored using four subfactors with varying maximum points, amounting to a maximum score of 10 points. To aid with scoring, numeric thresholds are supplied for each of the four subfactors.

Emissions or Energy Reduction[^]

Score	Definition
0	No impact
2	Qualitative reduction anticipated*
4	Quantified GHG, fuel, or idling reduction**

*A qualitative reduction means the project logically reduces emissions or fuel consumption based on design or function, but the reduction is not supported by a quantified estimate, such as modeling, emission calculator, etc. Project examples are installation of a roundabout expecting to reduce idling time or adding sidewalks expected to encourage walking.

**A quantified reduction means the applicant provides a measurable estimate of emissions or fuel savings using accepted methodology, such as modeling results, FHWA Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) emissions calculator results, etc.

[^]Note that the following two subfactors in the Environmental Sustainability category may not be applicable to projects that do not involve infrastructure. Therefore, for non-infrastructure projects, all 10 points will be allocated to the Emissions or Energy Reduction subfactor, with respective point values of 0, 5, and 10 rather than 0, 2, and 4.

Stormwater and Water Quality

Score Definition

0	No improvements
1	Standard compliance measures
2	Enhanced green infrastructure (bioswales, permeable pavement, runoff reduction)

Natural Resource Protection

Score Definition

0	No benefit
1	Limited site-specific benefit
2	Demonstrated measurable protection or restoration benefit

Examples of natural resource protection are erosion control, habitat connectivity, native vegetation improvements, etc.

Resiliency and Long-Term Sustainability

Score Definition

0	No resilience considerations
1	Basic resilience incorporated
2	Demonstrated resilience benefit (flood mitigation, tree canopy, slope stabilization, etc.)

Local Priority & Project Readiness

This criterion has been allocated 10 points. Projects shall be evaluated based on demonstrated local commitment and readiness for implementation.

Consideration shall include:

- Documented public involvement efforts
- Inclusion in the jurisdiction's adopted comprehensive or long-range plan
- Status of Phase I and Phase II engineering
- Right-of-way acquisition status
- Verified local match commitment
- Realistic project schedule and ability to obligate funds within required timeframes

Projects demonstrating advanced design completion and secured match commitments shall receive priority.

This criterion supports fiscal constraint and obligation requirements under federal-aid program administration and reflects established MPO selection practices.

Local Priority & Project Readiness is scored using five subfactors (0 to 2 points each), amounting to a maximum score of 10 points. To aid with scoring, numeric thresholds are supplied for each of the five subfactors.

Subfactor	0 Points	1 Point	2 Points
Public Involvement	None	Limited	Documented
Plan Consistency	Not included	Referenced	Adopted in plan
Engineering Status	Conceptual	PE I completed	PE II Completed
ROW Status	Unknown	Partial	Secured
Match Commitment	Not verified	Pending	Verified

PE = Preliminary Engineering

ROW = Right-of-way

Nondiscrimination & Accessibility

This criterion has been allocated 10 points. Projects shall be evaluated based on anticipated benefits to disproportionately impacted communities and improvements in accessibility.

Consideration shall include:

- ADA compliance improvements
- Above-and-beyond accessibility enhancements
- Removal of barriers along pedestrian accommodations
- Improved access to essential services, employment, and education
- Benefits to seniors and individuals with disabilities
- Benefits to under-resourced and disadvantaged populations

Projects shall demonstrate consistency with:

- 23 U.S.C. §134 planning factors
- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (42 U.S.C. §2000d)
- Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. §794)
- Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. §12101 et seq.)
- 49 CFR Parts 21, 27, 37, and 38

This criterion supports Goals 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 18, 20, 21, and 23 of the 2050 LRTP, the Multimodal Goals of the CMP Update, and implementation of CSAP priorities.

Nondiscrimination & Accessibility is scored using four subfactors with varying maximum points, amounting to a maximum score of 10 points. To aid with scoring, numeric thresholds are supplied for each of the four subfactors.

ADA Compliance and Accessibility Improvements

Score Definition

0	No accessibility improvement
1	ADA compliance only
3	ADA plus enhanced accessibility beyond minimum requirements

Access to Essential Services and Employment

Score Definition

0	No accessibility improvement
1	Limited localized access
3	Significant improvement to essential destinations

Benefits to Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities

Score Definition

0	No direct benefit
1	Indirect benefit
2	Direct, demonstrable mobility improvement

Removal of Physical or Mobility Barriers

Score Definition

0	No barrier removal
1	Minor improvement
2	Significant barrier removal improving network continuity

Examples of removal of physical or mobility barriers are removal of obstructions (such as utility poles in the middle of sidewalks), closure of sidewalk gaps, installation of curb ramps, improvement of crossing safety, etc.

Attachment A

Previous Program Criteria	CRP	5310	STBG New	STBG Recon	STBG Pres	TA	Unified Category
Crash Frequency	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Safety – Systemic Risk Reduction
Crash Severity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Safety – Documented Safety Need
Alignment with Safety Plan	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Safety – Documented Safety Need
Proven Countermeasures	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Safety – Anticipated Safety Effectiveness
Emissions Reduction	✓	–	✓	✓	–	✓	Environmental Sustainability – Emissions or Energy Reduction
Congestion Reduction	✓	–	✓	✓	–	–	Environmental Sustainability/Purpose & Need
Pavement Condition	–	–	✓	✓	✓	–	Purpose & Need – Operational or Asset Condition Benefit
Bridge Condition	–	–	✓	✓	✓	–	Purpose & Need – Operational or Asset Condition Benefit
Transit Asset Condition	–	✓	–	–	–	–	Purpose & Need – Operational or Asset Condition Benefit
Connectivity	✓	✓	✓	✓	–	✓	Multimodal Connectivity
ADA Improvements	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Nondiscrimination & Accessibility
Service to Seniors/Disabled	–	✓	–	–	–	–	Nondiscrimination & Accessibility
Stormwater Mitigation	✓	–	✓	✓	–	✓	Environmental Sustainability – Stormwater and Water Quality
Readiness	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Local Priority & Project Readiness
Regional Impact	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Regional Significance

February 13, 2026

In Reply Refer To:
HPA-IL

Mr. Chuck Nagel
Full Commission Chair
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission
456 Fulton Street, Suite 401
Peoria, IL 61602

Subject: Peoria, Illinois Transportation Management Area Federal Certification Review

Dear Mr. Nagel:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) will be conducting a Certification Review of the transportation planning process for the Peoria metropolitan area over the next several weeks. Consistent with Federal regulations, a Certification Review is required at least every four years as part of continuing oversight of the transportation planning process for Transportation Management Areas which are defined as an urban area with a population over 200,000. The last Federal Certification of the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (TCRPC) was finalized on May 2, 2022.

A Certification Review is accomplished through three phases: a desk review, a site visit, and documentation of the process in a report. The intent of the desk review is for FHWA and FTA to identify any items or issues requiring specific discussion during the site visit. FHWA and FTA staff will review TCRPC's planning documents and provide TCRPC staff with a list of topics and questions to prepare for the site visit.

As coordinated and confirmed with TCRPC staff, the site visit is scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 2026. The visit will be held at TCRPC's office where staff from FHWA Illinois Division and FTA Region V will meet with TCRPC staff, representatives of area transit operators, as well as the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT). In coordination with TCRPC staff, a virtual meeting option will be made available for any individuals who will not be able to attend in person.

The Certification Review will involve an opportunity for the public, including key Metropolitan Planning Organization committee members and stakeholders, to provide comments to FHWA and FTA on the transportation planning process. A final agenda will be sent prior to the onsite review containing information on how to participate in the Certification Review and public comment.

The Federal Review Team will prepare a report documenting the desk review and site visit. This report will include a summary of the subjects discussed and any corresponding findings. Accompanying the delivery of the final report, FHWA and FTA will also provide a joint certification finding.

We will continue to work with your staff in this process to finalize activities surrounding the site visit. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact, Anna Musial, FHWA, at (217) 492-4620 or Mark Kane, FTA, at (312) 353-1552.

Sincerely,

Anna M. Musial
Transportation Planning Specialist

cc: Ms. Holly Bieneman, Office of Planning & Programming, IDOT
Mr. Mike Vanderhoof, Bureau of Planning, IDOT
Mr. Brandon Geber, Bureau of Planning, IDOT
Mr. Doug Delille, Bureau of Planning, IDOT
Mr. Eric Miller, TCRPC
Mr. Michael Bruner, TCRPC
Ms. Kelley Brookins, FTA Region V
Mr. Tony Greep, FTA Region V
Mr. Mark Kane, FTA Region V

ALL ABOUT ITEP



SPECIAL PROGRAMS ASSISTANCE CONFERENCE

The Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program Cycle 17 will open Aug. 1, 2026.

Mark your calendars now and plan to attend **SPAC 2026 – All About ITEP** to learn about exciting changes being made for this next cycle of funding!

More information and links for registration will be available on our webpage in the coming weeks!

<p>APRIL 14–15 IDOT Central Office Springfield</p>	<p>MAY 27–28 McHenry County Government Center Woodstock</p>
<p>APRIL 22–23 Edwardsville Public Safety Building Edwardsville</p>	<p>JUNE 3–4 Greater Egypt Regional Planning Office Marion</p>
<p>MAY 5–6 Tuscola Community Building Tuscola</p>	<p>JUNE 8–9 IDOT District 3 Headquarters Ottawa</p>
<p>MAY 11–12 Orland Park Civic Center Orland Park</p>	<p>JUNE 11–12 Effingham County Emergency Management Agency Effingham</p>
<p>MAY 13–14 Peoria Public Library North Branch Peoria</p>	<p>JUNE 17–18 Dixon High School Dixon</p>
<p>MAY 18–19 IDOT District 1 Headquarters Schaumburg</p>	



Illinois Department
of Transportation

