



AGENDA

President and Board of Trustees
Village of Arlington Heights
Committee-of-the-Whole
Board Room

August 12, 2024
7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Proposed Windsor Drive Road Diet & Resurfacing Update

V. OTHER BUSINESS

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Any member of the public wishing to speak will be given the opportunity to do so. If the item is on the Agenda, that opportunity will be while that Agenda item is being discussed. Any member of the public wishing to speak on an item not on the Agenda will be given the opportunity during the Other Business portion of the meeting. Please limit comments to three minutes.

Persons with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services, such as an American Sign Language interpreter or written materials in accessible formats, should contact Erin Mercado, at 33 S. Arlington Heights Road, Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005, emercado@vah.com or (847)368-5793.



Committee-of-the-Whole
8/12/2024

Item: Proposed Windsor Drive Road Diet & Resurfacing Update

Department: Public Works & Engineering

In 2019, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) selected the Windsor Drive Road Diet as the highest priority project identified to achieve the Boards Strategic Priorities of "exploring new sustainable initiatives and sub priorities to "improve walkability for pedestrians" and "enhance bike friendly initiatives". In 2021, the Village Board identified and funded Phase 1 engineering study for the Windsor Road Diet.

Since 2021, Staff has been working with Civiltech Engineering, Inc. to complete the Phase I Engineering Study for the Windsor Drive Road Diet and Resurfacing Project. This project was identified in the Village of Arlington Heights Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (2017) and aims to improve the pedestrian and bicycle mobility along Windsor Drive which connects important destinations in the Village including nearby Hersey High School, Lake Arlington, and several other surrounding parks.

The project as proposed will include:

- Resurfacing of Windsor Drive from Dryden Avenue/Jane Avenue to south of Hintz Road.
- A new crosswalk with high visibility pavement markings at the west leg of the Windsor Drive and Palatine Road intersection.
- Improved pedestrian pushbuttons and signal heads on all corners of the Palatine Road Intersection.
- Widening sidewalks north of Palatine Road to a consistent 8 feet wide sidewalk.
- Between Palatine Road and Crabtree Drive, a Road Diet is proposed to modify the 4-lane cross section to provide one lane in each direction, a center landscaped median/left turn lane, and on-street buffered bike lanes.
- It is important to note, that the vehicle lane configuration from Palatine Road to Rosehill Drive is not changing, only the lane widths will be narrowed. At Rosehill Drive, northbound Windsor Drive will consist of two through lanes and a bike lane. Southbound Windsor Drive will consist of a single left turn lane, single right turn lane, single through lane, and a bike lane. The southbound lanes will continue to have the "Do Not Block" pavement marking and signage.

- On-street parking between Lillian Avenue and Dryden Avenue will also remain.

Village Staff presented this proposed project on November 11, 2023 at a Public Information Meeting and at the March 11, 2024 Committee-of-the-Whole Meeting. A number of issues were raised by the Village Board regarding the proposal based on resident input. As a result of the last meeting, Staff provided a memo, dated May 31, 2024, that provided answers to questions asked at the COW meeting and outlined several options requested by the Village Board. An updated memo is included, and the options will be discussed at the meeting.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends discussion of these topics at the COW meeting and is seeking direction from the Village Board on which of the options to pursue.



ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type
Windsor Drive Road Diet - Project Update Memorandum	



VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS

INC. 1887

Date: May 31, 2024 – Updated August 8, 2024

To: Cris Papierniak, PE, Director of Public Works & Engineering

From: Briget Schwab, PE, Senior Civil Engineer

Subject: Windsor Drive Road Diet – Project Update

Attachments: 1) Option and Budget Summary

Background

Phase I for the Windsor Drive Road Diet and Resurfacing Project was completed in December 2023. The next step to proceed with the project as initially intended, was to submit the Project Development Report (PDR) to the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) for review and approval and to begin the selection process for the Phase II and Phase III consultant.

However, Staff received concerns from the public regarding the proposed Windsor Drive Road Diet & Resurfacing project as presented at the Public Information Meeting on November 6, 2023 and Village website. Staff elected to delay submitting the PDR to IDOT and to provide residents an additional opportunity to discuss the proposed changes with the Village Board.

The project was brought at the March 11, 2024 Committee-of-the Whole meeting and formally presented by Staff and Civiltech Engineering, the Village's consultant for Phase I Engineering.

The following questions/comments were raised by the Village Board that needed additional research:

1. What is the capacity comparison of roads that have singles lanes and a middle lane, i.e. Euclid Ave and Kensington Rd, to Windsor Dr?

The following traffic data was collected as part of the project:

Windsor Drive Resurfacing and Road Diet
Comparison of Traffic Count Data (Vehicles per Day)

	South of Palatine Road	North of Palatine Road	South of Valley Lane	North of Valley Lane	South of Crabtree Drive	North of Crabtree Drive	South of Suffield Road
June 2022	7,100	10,000	9,200	9,500	9,500	8,600	
December 2023		9,750	9,050				8,150

Notes:

- The daily number of vehicles will vary throughout the year, however the traffic volumes counted in June 2022 are consistent with the December 2023 traffic volumes.

- Traffic volumes shown in Vehicles per day

The following traffic volume data was pulled from the Illinois Department of Transportation Interactive map for Annual Average Daily Traffic:

Euclid Ave			
West of Northwest Highway	Northwest Highway to Dryden Ave	Dryden Ave to Rand Rd	East of Rand Rd
13,400	10,800	12,600	15,200

Kensington Rd		
Northwest Highway to Waterman Rd	Waterman Rd to RT 83	East of RT 83
4,650	5,800	8,150

Generally, roadways with an Average Daily Traffic (ADT) less than 20,000 to 25,000 vehicles per day can be candidates for a 3-lane cross section (one lane in each direction with a two-way left turn lane). In addition to roadway volumes, traffic level of service and delays are also evaluated to ensure sufficient traffic operation. Windsor Drive has an Average Daily Traffic ranging between 7,100 and 10,000 vehicles, well below 20,000 vehicles per day. The proposed 3-lane Windsor Drive cross section at the Valley Lane intersection and Crabtree intersection operates with comparable levels of service and delays to the existing 4-lane cross section.

Euclid Avenue between Northwest Highway and Rand Road has a traffic volume ranging from 10,800 to 12,600 vehicles per day. This volume is comparable and even slightly larger than the existing traffic volume on Windsor Drive. Within these limits, Euclid Avenue has a two-lane or three-lane cross section, similar to the proposed Windsor Drive configuration.

The volume along Kensington Road is less than the volume along Windsor, however, majority of the corridor operates with a 3-lane cross section. At the segment east of IL 83 where traffic volumes are most comparable to Windsor Drive, Kensington does consist of a 4-lane cross section to improve operation and reduce delay at the complex 6-legged Rand/IL 83 intersection. Kensington, however, does reduce back to two lanes east of Wheeling Road. The proposed Windsor Drive improvements maintains the existing lane configuration and operation at the Palatine Road intersection. Similar to Kensington, outside of the complex intersection, it is proposed to provide a 3-lane cross section along Windsor Drive.

2. What is the accident data from Euclid Ave, or other similar roadways, where it reduces from four lanes down to two lanes?

Staff conducted an analysis of crash reports spanning the previous five years along Kensington Rd, stretching from Northwest Hwy to Beverly, as well as along Euclid Ave, encompassing the section from Northwest Hwy to Walnut Ave, and specifically at the intersection of Euclid Ave and Rand Rd, where these thoroughfares transition from four or more lanes to two travel lanes with a central turn lane. This configuration bears similarity to the proposed design for Windsor Dr.

Notably, no accidents were reported along Kensington Rd attributable to lane merging.

Over the aforementioned five-year period, a total of 82 accidents were documented at the specified locations along Euclid Ave. Among these incidents, a mere four accidents, one a year between 2021 to 2024, were reported just west of Rand Rd and were linked to vehicles merging within the lane reduction zone. It is pertinent to mention that all four of these incidents were classified as minor, with no recorded injuries.

Given that accidents related to lane reduction accounted for less than 5% of the total reported incidents, and considering the minimal extent of damages and absence of injuries, it is reasonable to conclude that the roadway design is functioning as intended, without adverse consequences and similar results would be realized on Windsor Dr.

3. Why was Windsor Dr widened in the 1980's and what resulted on other roadways?

After considerable research of limited available documents, there was information found in the minutes of the October 25, 1988 Finance Committee meeting that provide some insight into the conditions of Windsor Rd when it was a two-lane roadway.

Meeting minutes state that in April of 1987 the average daily traffic of Windsor Dr north of Palatine Rd was 9100 vehicles per day. There was considerable discussion about future projections being much greater and a four-lane roadway would eventually be needed to accommodate the increased traffic. Unfortunately, there was no mention of the exact amount it was expected to increase and Staff was unable to locate the 1988 Phase I Engineering Final report for the Windsor Rd widening project to know the traffic projections they were using. But, one can surmise that these traffic projections were not realized as the current ADT in 2022 was 10,000 and in 2023 only 9,750, which is a minimal increase over 37 years.

Another issue discussed at the 1988 Finance Committee meeting was the Village would lose Federal funds if the four-lanes were not installed, which is no longer a concern.

4. Explore an alternate design that includes a shared-use path instead of on-street bike lanes.

As recommended in the 2017 Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, the scope of services requested for Phase I included only the study of a road diet to implement an on-street bike lane. Therefore, an off-street shared-use path design alternative was not explored under the current contract for Phase I.

To explore the shared-use path design, the Village will be required to restart much of the Phase I process. Additional work efforts are summarized below:

- An Addendum Environmental Survey Request (AESR) and associated reports due to project scope change, additional tree removals, extended construction limits, etc.
- A full project topographical survey and base map preparation. It should be noted, that this will eventually need to be completed for the design as currently proposed, but was included in a later phase that received Federal grant funding.
- Update Crash Analysis that includes the most recent 5-year crash data, collision diagrams, wet/dry crash analysis, and lighting warrant analysis, evaluate safety improvement needs and countermeasures in a report.
- Update Traffic Analysis to include uncontrolled pedestrian crossings at Crabtree Dr and Suffield Dr and proposed crossing treatments without the added bike lanes and pedestrian refuge median.
- Alternate Geometric Studies which will include the horizontal and vertical design for shared-use paths along the east and west side of Windsor Drive, cross section analysis to define grading limits, and potential right-of-way acquisition.

- Revised Drainage Study and update the Location Drainage Technical Memo to IDOT.
- Section 4(f) Evaluation and Documentation because it is anticipated that there would be some impact on the Arlington Heights Park District properties.
- Draft a Project Development Report following the new guidelines outlined IDOT's Bureau of Local Roads & Streets (BLRS) issued Circular Letter 2024-04 on February 13, 2024.
- Agency Coordination including IDOT, FHWA, Arlington Heights Park District, and the Village.
- Additional Public Information Meetings to present the design alternatives and provide an opportunity for public input.
- Additional Supervision, Administration, and Project Coordination

The overall projected cost to explore the off-street shared-use paths as defined above, is estimated to cost \$130,914 and would likely add 12 months for Phase I Design Approval to the project timeline.

5. Provide a detailed funding split of the project costs and identify the overall Village costs for the project.

The Surface Transportation Fund (STP) grant was awarded to the Village in 2020. The STP funding is specifically for the resurfacing and ADA improvements and only included construction and construction engineering funds. Per the grant agreement the funding is 75% federal and 25% local.

With the assistance of Civiltech Engineering, the Village successfully applied for and was awarded the Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program (ITEP) and the Transportation Alternative Program (TAP-L). ITEP requires a 10% local match and TAP-L requires a 20% local match.

The most current construction estimate was completed in 2023 and at \$3,713.00 with construction engineering estimated at \$429,100. The current construction costs are estimated to be less than what the Village has received in funding. However, the current estimate does not include the addition of the Rapid Flashing Beacon at Suffield Dr, or extending the road diet to Suffield Dr. In addition, based on the current market, we do anticipate construction costs increasing, so Staff has not rescinded the TAP-L grant at this time, but may in the future if construction increases are not realized.

Table 1 illustrates the total grant funding that has been awarded to the Village along with the funding breakdown for each funding source, assuming full grant amounts are applied. Table 2 illustrates the total funding responsibility for each agency, if full grant amounts are applied. Table 3 illustrates the total estimated cost for each phase which is less than the grant funding the Village has been awarded.

Table 1: Total Project Grant Funding Received

Cost	Total Funding By Phase	Local Only	STP		ITEP			TAP-L CMAQ	
			Fed (75%)	Local (25%)	Fed (80%)	State (10%)	Local (10%)	Fed (80%)	Local (20%)
Phase I	\$104,516	\$104,516	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Phase II	\$296,000	-	-	-	\$236,800	\$29,600	\$29,600	-	-
Construction	\$5,604,600	-	\$1,350,150	\$450,050	\$1,520,480	\$190,060	\$190,060	\$1,523,040	\$380,760
Phase III	\$714,700	-	\$108,000	\$36,000	\$228,080	\$28,510	\$28,510	\$228,480	\$57,120
Totals by Source =		\$104,516	\$1,458,150	\$486,050	\$1,985,360	\$248,170	\$248,170	\$1,751,520	\$437,880

Table 2: Total by Agency Participation

	Federal	Local	State	TOTAL
Phase I		\$104,516		\$104,516
Phase II	\$236,800	\$29,600	\$29,600	\$296,000
Construction	\$4,393,670	\$1,020,870	\$190,060	\$5,604,600
Phase III	\$564,560	\$121,630	\$28,510	\$714,700
Totals by Agency Participation =	\$5,195,030	\$1,276,616	\$248,170	\$6,719,816

Table 3: Estimate Project Cost

	Phase I	Phase II	Construction	Phase III
Resurfacing	\$104,516	\$108,000	\$1,800,200	\$144,000
Bike/Ped Improvements		\$188,000	\$1,912,800	\$285,100
Total Project Cost by Phase	\$104,516	\$296,000	\$3,713,000	\$429,100
Total Overall Estimated Cost				\$4,542,616.0

Phase I Preliminary Engineering cost a total of \$104,516 and was fully funded by the Village. In addition, the Village has paid Civiltech Engineering \$7000 under a separate contract for the ITEP grant and \$4,975 under a separate contract for the TAP-L grant. The Village fully funded Phase I and the grant applications for a total of \$116,491.

Phase II Design is estimated to cost \$296,000. The Village's portion of Phase II is estimated to be \$29,600.

Construction and Phase III Construction Engineering. If all grant funding is used, the Village's portion of Construction would be \$1,020,870 and Phase III Construction Engineering is estimated at \$121,630. However, the grant funding assumes a construction cost \$5,604,600 and \$714,700 for Phase III Construction Engineering which exceeds the current estimate of \$3,713,000 for construction and \$429,100 for Phase III Construction Engineering, so the Village's portion may go down if construction increases are not realized.

6. How will the funding be impacted if the Village did not move forward with the proposed improvements related to the road diet.

The total Village cost of the project as currently designed and estimated is \$839,956. The funding breakdown is illustrated in Table 4. If the Village proceeds with resurfacing and existing ADA ramp improvements only (west leg crossing of Palatine Rd not included), the STP funds will still be available. The Village cost for just resurfacing and ADA improvements would be \$698,566. The funding breakdown is illustrated in Table 5.

Table 4: Road Diet and Resurfacing

	Phase I	Phase II	Construction	Phase III
Village Only Cost (100%)	104,516			
ITEP - Fed Share (80%)		236,800	1,530,240	228,080
ITEP - IDOT Share (10%)		29,600	191,280	28,510
ITEP - Village Share (10%)		29,600	191,280	28,510
STP - Fed Share (75%)			1,350,150	108,000
STP - Village Share (25%)			450,050	36,000
TAP - Fed Share (80%)			Funds Not Used Currently Over Funded	
TAP - Village Share (20%)				
Total Project Cost by Phase	\$104,516	\$296,000	\$3,713,000	\$136,510
Total Village Cost by Phase	\$104,516	\$29,600	\$641,330	\$64,510
Overall Project Village Cost				\$839,956

Staff and IDOT reviewed the project funding source to determine if the ITEP and TAP-L grants would still be available if the Village installed shared-use paths in lieu of the road diet. IDOT forwarded the request to the Federal Highway Association (FHWA) for consideration. FHWA's response was that removing the road diet from the application would be far too extreme as a scope change and current funding would be rescinded. The FHWA did encourage re-application of the ITEP grant for the shared-used path in the right-of-way.

Table 5: Resurfacing Only - Using STP Funding - Updated 8/8/2024

	Phase I	Phase II	Construction	Phase III
Village Only Cost (100%)	\$104,516	\$108,000		
ITEP - Fed Share (80%)		ITEP Funds received for Bike/Ped Improvements Only		
ITEP - IDOT Share (10%)				
ITEP - Village Share (10%)				
STP - Fed Share (75%)			\$1,350,150	\$108,000
STP - Village Share (25%)			\$450,050	\$36,000
TAP - Fed Share (80%)		TAP Funds received for Bike/Ped Improvements Only.		
TAP - Village Share (20%)				
Total Project Cost by Phase	\$104,516	\$108,000	\$1,800,200	\$144,000
Total Village Cost by Phase	\$104,516	\$108,000	\$450,050	\$36,000
Overall Project Village Cost				\$698,566

7. Would the Village be able to provide Rapid Flashing Beacons (RFBs) at the Crabtree Dr and Suffield Dr crossing without the road diet?

Staff analyzed the IDOT requirements for RFBs and the cursory review indicates that these improvements would still be feasible without the road diet. Given the pedestrian volumes and positive resident feedback, staff does recommend the inclusion of the RFBs at both Crabtree Dr and Suffield Dr. However, the final design and placement would be required in Phase II which costs are not covered in the breakdown above. In addition, the RFBs were not included in the grant request for the STP funds, so additional funding may be needed for installation as well.

Options to Consider – (Updated 8-8-204 - see attached Option and Budget Summary)

Staff is seeking direction for the next steps on this project and presents the following options for consideration:

Option #1 – Proceed with submitting the PDR to IDOT that reduces the number of vehicular lanes from four to two to provide on-street bicycle lanes, and have Staff begin the selection process for Phase II and Phase III consultants. Estimated construction is late 2026 or early 2027.

Total estimated total cost of the project for Option #1 for all phases is around \$4,600,000. Village total participation is estimated near \$900,000

Option #2 – Eliminate the road diet specific elements of the proposed project. Leaving Windsor Drive a four-lane roadway, with no dedicated on-street bicycle facilities, but provides a consistent 8-foot shared-use path on both sides of Windsor Rd. This option does not include a west leg crossing at Palatine Rd or RRFBs at Crabtree Dr and Suffield Dr.

Due to the project scope change, the Village will need to rescind the ITEP and TAP-L grants. The Village will need to approve Supplement# 4 in the amount of \$130,914 to complete the necessary Phase I work efforts for the off-street shared-use paths on the east and west side of Windsor Dr, and Phase II would be all locally funded. With approval from the Village Board, Staff will seek new grant funding, with consultant assistance, for the construction costs of the shared use path. We anticipate construction starting late 2027 or early 2028, but that schedule is dependent on the additional Phase I approval timeline.

Total estimated total cost of the project for Option #2 for all phases is roughly \$4,300,000. Village total participation would be \$1,400,000, if the Village has a successful ITEP application, or approximately \$2,800,000 if the Village does not receive ITEP funds.

Option #3 – Maintain the existing cross section with no road diet elements, but still include the west leg pedestrian crossing at Palatine Rd and the RRFBs at Crabtree Dr and Suffield Dr. This option leaves Windsor Drive a four-lane roadway, maintains the existing variable width (five to eight feet) sidewalk, and does not include on-road or off-road bicycle accommodations. Staff would proceed with resurfacing, ADA ramp improvements as outlined in the STP grant application, and pursue the design and installation of the west leg pedestrian crossing at Palatine Rd and the RRFBs at Crabtree Dr and Suffield Dr.

Due to the project scope change, the Village will need to rescind the ITEP and TAP-L grants. Some additional Phase I funding may be needed to adjust the Project Development Report, and Phase II would be all locally funded. We anticipate construction starting late 2027 or early 2028, but that schedule is dependent on the additional Phase I approval timeline.

Total estimated total cost of the project for Option #3 all phases is roughly \$3,000,000 Village total participation is estimated at around \$1,500,000.

Option #4 – Is a hybrid of Option #3 and #4 and would eliminate the road diet specific elements of the proposed project. Leaving Windsor Drive a four-lane roadway, with no dedicated on-street bicycle facilities, but provides a consistent 8-foot shared-use path on both sides of Windsor Rd. It would also include the west leg pedestrian crossing at Palatine Rd and the RRFBs at Crabtree Dr and Suffield Dr.

Due to the project scope change, the Village will need to rescind the ITEP and TAP-L grants. The Village will need to approve Supplement# 4 in the amount of \$130,914 to complete the necessary Phase I work efforts for the off-street shared-use paths on the east and west side of Windsor Dr, and Phase II would be all locally funded. With approval from the Village Board, Staff will seek new grant funding, with consultant assistance, for the construction costs of the shared use path. We anticipate construction starting late 2027 or early 2028, but that schedule is dependent on the additional Phase I approval timeline.

Total estimated total cost of the project for Option #4 for all phases is roughly \$4,600,000. Village total participation would be \$1,500,000, if the Village has a successful ITEP application, or approximately \$3,200,000 if the Village does not receive ITEP funds.

Option #5 - Staff to proceed with resurfacing and existing ADA ramp improvements only, as outlined in the STP grant application. This option would not include on-road or off-road dedicated bicycle facilities. There would be no west leg of Palatine pedestrian crossing and RRFBs would not be installed at Crabtree Dr and Suffield Dr.

Due to the project scope change, the Village will need to rescind the ITEP and TAP-L grants, and approve local funds in Phase II. Estimated construction is late 2026 or early 2027.

Total estimated total cost of the project for Option #5 for all phases is around \$2,200,000. Village total participation is estimated at near \$700,000.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Village Board motion to approve Option #1 and direct Staff to proceed with submitting the PDR to IDOT that reduces the number of vehicular lanes from four to two to provide on-street bicycle lanes, include the addition of the RRFB at Suffield Dr, and have Staff begin the selection process for Phase II and Phase III consultants.

Total estimated total cost of the project for Option #1 for all phases is around \$4,600,000. Village total participation is estimated near \$900,000. Estimated construction is late 2026 or early 2027.

This option is consistent with the recommendation outlined in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan adopted by the Village Board in 2017, was identified by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) as the highest priority project to help achieve the Village Boards Strategic Priorities of "exploring new sustainable initiatives and sub priorities to "improve walkability for pedestrians" and "enhance bike friendly initiatives".

CC: Michael Pagones, PE, Village Engineer

Windsor Dr Road Diet and Resurfacing Project Options and Budget Summary

Options Summary

	Phase I	Phase II	Construction	Phase III	Total Cost		STP	ITEP	TAP-L
Option #1	\$104,516	\$296,000	\$3,713,000	\$429,100	\$4,600,000		Y	Y	Y
Option #2	\$235,430	\$262,000	\$3,364,000	\$378,000	\$4,300,000		Y	R/R	Rescind
Option #3	\$104,516	\$171,000	\$2,433,000	\$240,000	\$3,000,000		Y	N	N
Option #4	\$235,430	\$290,000	\$3,652,000	\$420,000	\$4,600,000		Y	R/R	Rescind
Option #5	\$104,516	\$108,000	\$1,800,200	\$144,000	\$2,200,000		Y	Rescind	Rescind

Note 1: Cost Estimates are for budgeting purposes and assumes the following:

- Option 1: Resurfacing Windsor and Construction of Road Diet, as outlined in initial Phase I Study
- Option 2: Resurfacing Windsor and Construction of 8-foot shared-use paths on both sides of Windsor, No Palatine West Leg and No RRFB Crossing Improvements.
- Option 3: Resurfacing Windsor and Construction of Palatine West Leg and RRFB Crossings
- Option 4: Resurfacing Windsor and Construction of 8-foot shared-use path on both sides of Windsor with Palatine West Leg and RRFB Crossing Improvements.
- Option 5: Resurfacing Windsor Only

Note 2: In Option 2 and 4, the bike accommodations are shifted to the 8-ft shared-use path, so then we need to design the path to accommodate bikes (profile, curve requirements, offset requirements, etc.) and requires additional cross section analyses for the shared-use paths to determine if permanent or temporary right-of-way acquisition will be necessary. Right-of-way costs are not included in the cost estimates.

Option #1

	Phase I	Phase II	Construction	Phase III
Village Only Cost (100%)	104,516			
ITEP - Fed Share (80%)		236,800	1,530,240	228,080
ITEP - IDOT Share (10%)		29,600	191,280	28,510
ITEP - Village Share (10%)		29,600	191,280	28,510
STP - Fed Share (75%)			1,350,150	108,000
STP - Village Share (25%)			450,050	36,000
TAP - Fed Share (80%)			Funds Not Used Currently Over Funded	
TAP - Village Share (20%)				
Total Project Cost by Phase	\$104,516	\$296,000	\$3,713,000	\$429,100
Total Village Cost by Phase	\$104,516	\$29,600	\$641,330	\$64,510
Overall Project Cost				\$4,542,616
Overall Project Village Cost				\$839,956

Option #2

	Phase I	Phase II	Construction	Phase III
Village Only Cost (100%)	235,430	262,000		
ITEP - Fed Share (80%) Not Guaranteed State will Fund 10% Local Match			1,251,040	187,200
ITEP - Village Share (20%)			312,760	46,800
STP - Fed Share (75%)			1,350,150	108,000
STP - Village Share (25%)			450,050	36,000
TAP - Fed Share (80%)				
TAP - Village Share (20%)				
Total Project Cost by Phase	\$235,430	\$262,000	\$3,364,000	\$378,000
Total Village Cost by Phase	\$235,430	\$262,000	\$762,810	\$82,800
Overall Project Cost				\$4,239,430
Overall Project Village Cost Assumed Successful ITEP App				\$1,343,040
Overall Project Village Cost Assumed Unsuccessful ITEP App				\$2,781,280

Option #3

	Phase I	Phase II	Construction	Phase III
Village Only Cost (100%)	104,516	171,000	632,800	96,000
ITEP - Fed Share (80%)				
ITEP - IDOT Share (10%)				
ITEP - Village Share (10%)				
STP - Fed Share (75%)			1,350,150	108,000
STP - Village Share (25%)			450,050	36,000
TAP - Fed Share (80%)				
TAP - Village Share (20%)				
Total Project Cost by Phase	\$104,516	\$171,000	\$2,433,000	\$240,000
Total Village Cost by Phase	\$104,516	\$171,000	\$1,082,850	\$132,000
Overall Project Cost				\$2,948,516
Overall Project Village Cost				\$1,490,366

Option #4

	Phase I	Phase II	Construction	Phase III
Village Only Cost (100%)	235,430	290,000		
ITEP - Fed Share (80%) Not Guaranteed State will Fund 10% Local Match			1,481,440	220,800
ITEP - Village Share (20%)			370,360	55,200
STP - Fed Share (75%)			1,350,150	108,000
STP - Village Share (25%)			450,050	36,000
TAP - Fed Share (80%)				
TAP - Village Share (20%)				
Total Project Cost by Phase	\$235,430	\$290,000	\$3,652,000	\$420,000
Total Village Cost by Phase	\$235,430	\$290,000	\$820,410	\$91,200
Overall Project Cost				\$4,597,430
Overall Project Village Cost Assumed Successful ITEP App				\$1,437,040
Overall Project Village Cost Assumed Unsuccessful ITEP App				\$3,139,280

Option #5

	Phase I	Phase II	Construction	Phase III
Village Only Cost (100%)	104,516	108,000		
ITEP - Fed Share (80%) ITEP - IDOT Share (10%) ITEP - Village Share (10%)				
STP - Fed Share (75%)			1,350,150	108,000
STP - Village Share (25%)			450,050	36,000
TAP - Fed Share (80%)				
TAP - Village Share (20%)				
Total Project Cost by Phase	\$104,516	\$108,000	\$1,800,200	\$144,000
Total Village Cost by Phase	\$104,516	\$108,000	\$450,050	\$36,000
Overall Project Cost				\$2,156,716
Overall Project Village Cost				\$698,566