



# Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 800, Willis Tower  
Chicago, IL 60606

312-454-0400 (voice)  
312-454-0411 (fax)  
[www.cmap.illinois.gov](http://www.cmap.illinois.gov)

## Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning Transportation Committee Minutes **DRAFT MINUTES** April 23, 2010

**Cook County Conference Room**  
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800, Willis Tower  
Chicago, Illinois

**Members Present:** Chair Chris Snyder-DuPage County, Leanne Redden- RTA, Chuck Abraham-IDOT DPIT, John Biessel- Cook County, Bill Brown via phone-NIRPC, Brian Carlson- IDOT District One, Michael Connelly-CTA, Maria Choca-Urban-CNT, John Donovan-FHWA, Henry Guerriero-Illinois Tollway, Jack Groner-Metra, Robert Haan-Private Providers, Luann Hamilton-CDOT, Don Kopec-CMAP, Jamy Lyne-Will County, Jason Osborn-McHenry County, Leon Rockingham-Council of Mayors, Keith Sherman-IDOT OP&P, Peter Skosey-MPC, Lorraine Snorden-Pace, Mike Sullivan-Kendall County, Vonu Thakuria-UIC, Paula Trigg-Lake County, Jan Ward-Kane County

**Members Absent:** Randy Neufeld-Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force, Mike Rogers-IEPA, Joe Schofer-Northwestern, David Werner-FTA, Ken Yunker-SEWRPC, Tom Zapler-Class 1 Railroads

**Others Present:** Josh Anderson, Garland Armstrong, Heather Armstrong, Kristen Bennett, Lenny Cannata, Bruce Christensen, Lynette Ciavarella, Rob Cole, Chalen Daigle, Kama Dobbs, Bud Fleming, Grace Gallucci, Preston Keefe, Valbona Kokoshi, Christina Kupkowski, Clarita Lao, Ed Leonard, John Paquet, Dan Podgorski, Tom Rickert, David Seglin, Chris Staron, Vicky Smith, Emily Tapia, Mike Walczak, Mary Wells, Tammy Wierciak, Mike Williams, Kathleen Woodruff

**Staff:** Randy Blankenhorn, Patricia Berry, Bob Dean, Teri Dixon, Doug Ferguson, Jill Leary, Matt Maloney, Tom Murtha, Holly Ostlick, Ross Patronsky, Joy Schaad, Gordon Smith

## **1.0 Call to Order and Introductions**

**9:30 AM**

Chris Snyder, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order.

## **2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements**

There were no changes. In additions to the publication provided by CNT, there was also a letter and resolution from West Central Municipal Conference.

## **3.0 Approval of the Minutes-January 6, 2010**

Paula Trigg motioned for the minutes to be approved, seconded by Keith Sherman. All ayes, motion approved.

## **4.0 Coordinating Committee Reports (Luann Hamilton and Leanne Redden)**

The Planning Coordinating Committee met March 10th and discussed publications associated with *GO TO 2040*, including a large distribution of a graphic heavy publication for the general public and a longer detailed version of the plan, with specific target groups and an interactive web site. The transportation plan, financial plan, and major capital projects will be subject to ongoing discussions. CMAP's comments on the Sustainable Communities Initiative program between USDOT, USEPA, HUD was discussed.

On March 10<sup>th</sup> the Programming Coordinating Committee met. Comments on the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program were discussed. It was explained that the MPO coordinated with the RTA and other regional agencies to develop comments on this program. Some comments were that the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is well positioned as a lead agency applicant or partner applicant for this program and regions with completed comprehensive plans should pre-qualify for funding opportunities. It was stressed that this is not a stimulus program but a new funding opportunity through HUD. CMAP's Chicago Region Retrofit Ramp-up (CR3) proposal was submitted to U.S. Department of Energy as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. CMAP applied for \$75 million. The successful applicants were announced this week, and CMAP and the region were awarded \$25 million. The proposed work plan for the Regional Transportation Operations Coalition (RTOC) was presented. A summary of the Full Circle community mapping and planning project administered by CMAP was also presented. Examples of Full Circle work from 5 communities were described and the asset mapping and community planning tools that are available to local communities to collect data were demonstrated. The committee also discussed the \$8.7 billion rescission that happened when SAFETEA-LU expired.

## **5.0 Transportation Improvement Program (Holly Ostdick)**

### **5.1 TIP Amendments and Administrative Modification**

Ms. Ostdick stated that there were no public comments on the non-exempt and exempt TIP amendment and modification reports.

The revisions included awarding line items for ARRA funds to low bids. This was done so that extra remaining funds resulting from the difference between the estimated cost and the low bid can be reprogrammed. Approval of TIP revisions was moved by Jack Groner seconded by Paula Trigg, the committee approved the TIP amendments. All ayes.

## **5.2 FFY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program Development**

Ms. Ostdick requested that the committee approve both FFY10 and 11 as the selected years for the new FFY2010-2015 TIP, currently under development. Mike Connelly moved, seconded by Keith Sherman, for committee approval of FFY10 and 11 as the selected years of the FFY10-15 TIP. All ayes.

## **6.0 SFY 2011 UWP**

Mr. Maloney presented an overview of the UWP program for approval. A summary of the SFY11 UWP process was also provided. RTA, while supporting the motion to approve the SFY11 UWP program, requested that the procedures for awarding UWP funds be reviewed next year. Ms. Redden stated that due to the heavy emphasis on transit, RTA should have received some funding in this process. She went on to say that since the UWP project selection process lacked focus and had no clear direction or critique on projects, CMAP and RTA were almost completely boxed out of the competitive funds. She wanted to push the discussion up to the programming coordinating committee, encouraging them to spend some time and effort examining the criteria for submitting and evaluating the projects in this program. Ms. Choca Urban also expressed concern there was no funding of RTA in the UWP, especially with the focus on transit policy in *GO TO 2040*. From the CNT perspective, TOD have not flourished. CNT also wanted some consideration of how UWP projects will advance the priorities of *GO TO 2040*. Mr. Skosey also asked if there a written process for allocation of funds. Mr. Maloney stated that this is a 2 tier process, which treats core and non-core projects (discretionary) separately. There is a quantitative and deliberative process focusing on 10 regional themes. Following its adoption, the UWP should be reviewed to align with *GO TO 2040*. Realigning the UWP with the long range plan is a normal process. Mr. Groner said that, historically, this is what happened. Ms. Thakuriah urged that the information about the current process be circulated. Mr. Snyder asked whether development of the UWP flowed through the Transportation Committee. Mr. Maloney confirmed that can be the case in the future. Mr. Guerriero asked how the creation of CMAP has altered the distribution of these funds. Mr. Groner confirmed from the transit end funding seems diluted; and that this is a concern for transit agencies. Ms. Ward stated that the counties have also expressed concern that the RTA did not receive funding since the UWP is a logical source of funding. She expressed concern about how the UWP process would target funding in the future. Mr. Seglin, who is a member of the UWP Committee, stated that one of the current directions given to the committee is that the UWP program is not intended to fund agencies, it funds projects. If the direction given to the committee needs to be changed, then the MPO Policy Committee can make that

change, but as long as the current directive was in place the committee would continued to work within the existing parameters. Ms. Choco Urban agreed that agencies should not be guaranteed a share of the pie just because they are agencies, but expressed concern that the RTA application was not as strong as it could be. She said that there is a lot of important work around transit supportive land use at the regional level that needs to be done. She also stated that the funding spent on Metra's boarding and alighting counts would be better spent on investing in an automatic process, since it is more expensive to do manual counts every few years. Mr. Groner replied that one of the FTA New Starts requirements is that counts are carried out, verified, and validated through surveys. Mr. Maloney stated that after *GO TO 2040* is approved, the UWP program will be examined and modified to align with the projects and priorities of the region. On a motion by Mr. Connelly, seconded by Ms. Trigg, the UWP was released for public comment. All Ayes.

## **7.0 HireAct (Doug Ferguson)**

Doug Ferguson reported on the Hire Act, signed into law on March 18th. He explained that the Hire Act extends federal authorization through the end of the calendar year, three months beyond the end of the federal fiscal year. The act transferred \$19.5 billion from the General fund into the Highway Trust fund, which is intended to keep it solvent through the end of year and into 2011. It restored the funds previously subtracted by the \$8.7 billion dollar rescission. However, it restores contract authority but not obligation authority. It also allows the Highway Trust Fund to accrue interest on balances, and set 2010-2011 at the pre-rescission FY2009 level of \$42 billion, not the \$30 billion levels of the smaller extensions. Mr. Snyder asked whether this had any impact on the actions that the committee previously took regarding rescissions. Ms. Berry stated that regarding STP, IDOT has stated that corrections and adjustments will be made in 2012. The CMAQ "A list" was initially developed to deal with rescissions, but is now a tool to move projects forward. Mr. Snyder is concerned that changes will result in the region ending up with the appearance of a high balance, and that the cyclical problems with CMAQ would reoccur.

## **8.0 GO TO 2040**

### **8.1 GO TO 2040 Recommendations (Bob Dean and Matt Maloney)**

Bob Dean stated that there are two recommendations he would like the committee to discuss. He stated they are policy recommendations for public transit and transportation finance and contain more detail than will ultimately be included in the *GO TO 2040* plan. He stated the plan will be released for public comment on June 11<sup>th</sup> but the due date for comments on recommendation is May 14<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Maloney discussed transportation finance. He stated that the revenue the region receives is inadequate, especially since costs have increased over time. *GO TO 2040* recommends increasing and indexing the state gas tax, pay as you drive fees, congestion pricing, managed lane strategies, and parking pricing. Some innovative financing recommendations that should

be explored include public private partnerships (PPP), value capture and transit impact fees. The region must also work on finding cost/investment efficiencies, using transparent evaluation criteria for capacity adding projects, coordination with IDOT, CMAP, RTA and the service boards. The region should also be shifting to integrated models (transportation, land use, economic) that are more comprehensive tools to make educated and thoughtful investment decisions. GO TO 2040 also endorses system modernization, supported with more flexibility to fund investment in existing infrastructure, not just expansion. Reliance on bonding may be placing undue burdens on future generations. Ms. Thakuria asked what the purpose of the policy recommendations is. She stated that it would be of more value if feasibility of these recommendations were analyzed. Ms. Choca-Urban acknowledged that earlier versions of the document Mr. Maloney presented did include calculations, and factor in assumptions. To conclude, Mr. Maloney stated that these recommendations will be included in the draft plan for June. There was discussion about what should be included in the plan. One member suggested citing benefits that occurred in other parts of the country.

One suggestion within the recommendation was that the State abandon their arbitrary 45/55 split between downstate and Northeastern Illinois, this would lead to more predictable and sustainable funding. Chairman Snyder asked Mr. Sherman if replacing the 45/55 split would assure Northeast Illinois of 45% of funding. Mr. Sherman stated that normally IDOT District 1 does not account for more than a 45% of pavement/bridge backlog needs. Mr. Sherman stated that since the region needs do not account for its the full split, the region is made whole during the course of allocating funding to the districts.

The CMAP recommendation included in the meeting materials also suggests an \$.08 increase in Motor Fuel Tax (MFT). Even if the MFT increase occurred there is no certainty that it would be given back to the region. Legislators can divert funding.

Ms. Redden asked who the audience for the documents is. The staff at RTA felt there was a mixed tone in the language of the document, with RTA readers wondering if it was meant for the public at large or oriented to stakeholders and other agencies. RTA staff thought that there needed be a consideration of which audience this document is for. Ms. Redden also stated that cost efficiencies recommended in the document are necessary,

but the document does not highlight that some costs are beyond the control of everyone. She was concerned that the document might be interpreted as suggesting mismanagement, and that we need to be prepared to deal with this issue. Mr. Skosey interjected that another way to distribute the funding would be to use population. He stated that an arbitrary split should not be used, and felt that flipping the percentages to 55/45 would be just as arbitrary. Mr. Sherman stated that competing statewide is probably not the solution. He was not sure that competing state-wide would change the formula and that there was the possibility that the region might not get the desired results. Mr. Skosey said that resources should be used where the investment would get the best return. As a state, it would be healthier if we could work out a good policy for resource allocation. Mr. Osborn inquired what the risk was of asking for the 55/45 formula to be reevaluated.

Mr. Sherman indicated that a multi-factor formula is already used to distribute funds among Downstate districts. Mr. Sherman said that considering lane-miles or usage of the system would result in only a slight change in what would come to northeastern Illinois. A bigger issue is that northeastern Illinois has worse winters, and this is already incorporated into the factors used.

There are some factors that would change northeastern Illinois funding. For example, gross product is not included in the analysis that the State presently uses. IDOT looks at road conditions, etc. and 95% of resources are used to maintain the existing system. IDOT District 1 also has conformity issues that have to be considered. The roadway system is an asset and IDOT is maintaining that investment. Ms. Choca-Urban stated that it appeared that there was an undervaluing of assets in this region in terms of how it supported the entire state. Mr. Kopec reminded everyone that Secretary Hannig has stated that northeastern Illinois is the economic engine of the state and that the Secretary had said that he would make sure that the economic engine was funded correctly. Mr. Sherman stated that a minimum level of service equity for the entire state is a goal. While he speculated that state highway density in northeastern Illinois was denser than downstate that fact did not offset the total miles of state highways outside of Northeast Illinois. Staff is very concerned about the arbitrary split and recommended a "needs-based" approach.

Mr. Dean stated staff is advocating for public transit in this region and feels that it is a major priority. Financing, including new revenue sources, devoting a portion of

the gas tax, and investing congestion pricing revenues in transit to help deal with the potential inequitable impacts of current policies. It will be important to develop stable and regular funding to meet transit needs. The region should not have to demand occasional programs for this. The region must also address costs and the transit agencies have to try to limit cost increases. *GO TO 2040* should address these issues. The region should improve service, maintain the system to a state of good repair, improve facilities (upgrade where possible), improve user perceptions of transit – a mode of choice not last resort, and increase and expand service where needed. Implementing Arterial Rapid Transit or Bus Rapid Transit on some corridors will be necessary.

*GO TO 2040* will also support land use planning with a strong local government role. *GO TO 2040* will additionally support more land use planning and small scale infrastructure improvements. The UWP includes a planning grant program, building from the RTA community planning model. State STP could be a source of resources for this program. The Federal government is currently moving in this direction with sustainable communities funding. There will be a shorter plan version which is user friendly. The other in-depth document will be for educated readers. Ms. Thakuriah brought up the 1<sup>st</sup> mile/last mile transit issue; which is a major factor contributing to why people do not use transit. She wondered where a bike sharing program or other novel approaches would fit in. RTA staff thought that the broad themes were acceptable, and that regular stable capital funding was a must. Transit agencies understood that costs do need to be controlled, and are consistently mindful of them and how they have to be addressed over the long haul. They agreed that a state of good repair was necessary for transit, and supported limited but appropriate transit system expansion. Ms. Redden pointed out that transit was the means to an end, and struggled with comments about cost and service cuts. The inherent tension between trying to control costs and trying to increase service was clear. She detected a tone indicating that transit agencies were not looking for enhancements and efficiencies already. She also thought that it was unclear that the policy is asking for increased transit funding, in contrast to how funding for high speed rail is clearly recommended. The document did not clearly tie all the transit recommendations together. The recommendation also seemed to include the theme that RTA should focus on financing but not programming. Finally, Ms. Redden said that RTA will send in more comments. Mr. Dean explained that a part of the challenge is that the links between the pieces have not yet been drawn. Mr. Osborn stated that these issues should also be linked to land use impacts and relationships with other CMAP topics like education. McHenry County currently spends \$30 million annually on school busing. Ms. Choca-Urban said that there are opportunities in the recommendation sections to broaden list of implementers, and wanted to know where RTA and CMAP are in planning and implementation? She went on to say that page 9 includes alternative pieces of public transportation systems, yet car sharing is not mentioned. For CNT, this is a

critical strategy. She also inquired about the graphic of major capital projects on Page 11, and wanted to know what the short orange transit segment was. Mr. Skosey stated that it is probably the West Loop Transportation Center.

## **8.2 Major Capital Projects**

Mr. Kopec presented an update on major capital projects in *GO TO 2040*. Staff has met with many stakeholders whose comments will be shared. Projects that attracted comments from stakeholders so far include:

Illiana Expressway – Will and South Suburban Cook were concerned about this project not being included in the constrained list of projects, especially since it is a joint project with local support. Mr. Kopec said that this project needs more study, especially regarding finances. The initial analysis assumed that this would be a toll road, and that the tolls would have to be significantly higher than existing regional tolls in order to finance the facility. All of the existing studies assume the western connection is where I-355 meets I-80, which is impossible now because of the development that has taken place in that area. Instead, the proposal would have the new expressway continue west to I-55, creating a new segment.

Southeast Service – The South Suburban Mayors and Managers Association is concerned that the Southeast Service has not been included on the constrained list, even though the alternatives analysis will be complete soon and a locally preferred alternative will be approved later this year. They are worried that selection of the locally preferred alternative may be delayed and funding may be impacted. They still need more information on what the impacts of not being on the constrained list will be.

I-290 Managed Lanes – There is concern about this project. CMAP received a letter from the West Central Municipal Conference about potential community impacts of a managed lane on I-290. Mr. Kopec encouraged implementers to be sensitive to community concerns, and to use context sensitive solutions or other appropriate involvement by the community. The letter expressed concern that construction of managed lanes might preclude additional transit in the corridor and that any design of a managed lane facility should not preclude additional transit.

Central Lake County Corridor – Environmental stakeholders also encouraged implementers to be sensitive to environmental concerns and to design of the facility consistent with its context in Lake County.



Star Line, Yellow Line, North Central Service – Individual stakeholders made comments on these transit lines.

Mr. Kopec continued by saying that at previous meetings, staff discussed the net effect of individual additional projects on the system. He referenced a table showing the impact of the combined projects, broken out by scenarios where the last column listed project impacts. Although the combined effect of the projects showed some negative impacts on air quality, the projects in total are consistent with the preferred scenario and supportive of economic development, congestion reduction, increased transit ridership, and in-fill development throughout the region.

Mr. Kopec talked about the further categorization of the projects on the fiscally unconstrained list. The list is now divided into 2 categories, those in the accelerated list would use the \$100 million set aside in the plan to support project planning and development. He said that the projects recommended for accelerated movement need funding for further studies, the remaining unconstrained projects should focus on corridor protection or land use work. The scheduled release of the projects for public comment is June 11<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Hamilton expressed concern about the division of unconstrained projects. CDOT had concerns about the logic behind the split, and the rationale for why some projects are accelerated and why others are not. She said it was inappropriate to state that there might be a less expensive solution for projects that have completed alternatives analysis and have identified a preferred alternative. The study would have already taken into consideration other potential solutions and found this preferred alternative to be the most cost effective. Mr. Connelly articulated similar concerns about creating two levels of unconstrained projects, when the two levels really have no distinction. A project is either on the fiscal constrained list or not. Mr. Kopec responded that staff has heard both sides of this discussion, and could leave projects as simply constrained or unconstrained. However, staff felt that it was important for unconstrained projects to be further characterized by where they were in the project development process. Ms. Hamilton reiterated that there was a lack of supporting logic behind the decisions about which unconstrained projects should be accelerated and which should not. Mr. Groner said there were two issues from Metra's perspective 1) the descriptions of Metra's projects and accuracy of project

information should be reviewed and corrected; and 2) they had concerns about the relative amount of funding for highways vs. transit and for maintenance vs. expansion. Metra supports the concept of sustaining the current system, but felt that the allocation for expansion is too low for the size of the region. He was also bothered because he thought that the description of the differentiation between constrained and unconstrained. He said CMAP staff mistakenly stated that if a project was in the unconstrained list, a transit implementer can advance to preliminary engineering. FTA stated that in fact that is incorrect even though funds have been appropriated and authorized. Funds cannot be applied for without the project being in the TIP, and the project can't be in the TIP unless it is on the constrained list. Metra will complete alternatives analysis on several projects by the end of the summer, using FTA criteria and these projects will not be able to move forward. No preliminary engineering will be approved by FTA until the project is included in the constrained project list. Mr. Kopec assured Mr. Groner that the incorrect CMAP statement has been corrected in the minutes of the Policy Committee. Mr. Groner again stated that given the size of this region the amount of money for expansion is not proportionately correct. Mr. Snyder said that the cost issue on the highway side had been addressed by a small working group. Initially, the committee was pleased with the \$385 billion available, but once costs were examined using a standard of safe and adequate or a state of good repair as criteria, there was only \$10 billion left for expansion. As a region, we have tapped all new revenue sources. Mr. Groner replied that he does not deny that there is a need, but just believes the share for maintenance is disproportionate. According to Mr. Groner, as a region we have always been very progressive and this plan is not progressive, because it does not promote system expansion.

Mr. Osborn requested a point of clarification on the interaction between the TIP and the long range plan. Most of the projects in TIP are not mentioned in the long range plan. Mr. Guerriero stated that the long range transportation plan can be revised, and if it does any project change or addition to the fiscally constrained part of the long range transportation plan can be included in the TIP. Mr. Kopec replied that the vast majority of funding goes to all the other projects in the TIP and supports the initiatives highlighted in the long range transportation plan, not just the major capital projects we are discussing. The smaller projects not listed in the plan are also within the fiscal constraint, and support the plan, but are not listed as part of the major capital project element. Mr. Groner added that if a major

capital project on the transit side is not in the long range plan, you cannot include it in the TIP and therefore it cannot receive federal funding. Mr. Donovan confirmed that if a project is not in the TIP it cannot receive federal approvals. Mr. Kopec responded that there is a difference between the transit process and the highway process - highways can go through phase I engineering but transit cannot. Ms. Redden stated the region is held to two different standards, if transit is a priority in the region, why is transit being held to a higher level of accountability. Mr. Kopec replied that this is a federal issue. Mr. Osborn stated that on the highway side, it is a bit less cumbersome for projects to be included. Mr. Kopec reminded the committee that early on in the development of the financial plan, the method of project review was discussed and the committee agreed to use this method of analysis of the 2030 RTP projects. Everyone was aware that many projects that were previously included in the 2030 long range transportation plan would not be included in *GO TO 2040*.

## **9 RTA Update**

There was no update and Ms. Redden requested that this item be deleted from future agendas.

## **10 Other Business**

## **11 Public Comment**

Heather Armstrong made a comment asking if work was to be completed on the Heritage Corridor. Staff responded that the project was not included in the fiscally constrained list but was identified for advanced engineering.

Mayor David Pope of Oak Park stated that he was attending the meeting as a representative of the West Central Municipal Conference (WCMC). He referenced a letter send from the West Central Municipal Conference stating that the I-290 managed lane project should not be included in the fiscally constrained list of projects. He added that the WCMC has 41 diverse communities and the letter was approved unanimously. The U.S. Conference of Mayors sustainable communities' initiative was referenced, including the critical role of land use and transportation planning to benefit the region. Ninety-four percent of economical enhancements will be in metro areas, accounting for only 6% of the land mass. He stated the I-290 managed lanes project is currently undergoing phase 1 engineering and is not at a point at which it has been studied enough to be included in the fiscally constrained list. He additionally stated the Cook/DuPage corridor study is undergoing phase 3 alternatives evaluation. He stated once those planning endeavors are complete, the I-290 managed lanes concept could be amended into the fiscally constrained

plan. He stated that the I-290 managed lanes project costs over \$2 billion, and if this project was removed other projects could be included.

## 12 Next Meeting

With consensus by the committee that next meeting of the TC will be June 4, 2010 thus canceling the May 21<sup>st</sup> 2010 transportation committee meeting.

## 13 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

## Transportation Committee Members

_____ Charles Abraham	_____ Fran Klaas	_____ Keith Sherman
_____ Rocky Donahue	_____ Don Kopec	_____ Peter Skosey
_____ Maria Choco Urban	_____ Jamy Lyne	_____ Chris Snyder*
_____ Michael Connelly	_____ Arlene J. Mulder	_____ Steve Strains
_____ John Donovan***	_____ Randy Neufeld	_____ Vonu Thakuriah
_____ John Fortmann	_____ Jason Osborn	_____ Paula Trigg
_____ Rupert Graham, Jr	_____ Leanne Redden**	_____ David Werner***
_____ Jack Groner	_____ Tom Rickert	_____ Ken Yunker
_____ Luann Hamilton	_____ Mike Rogers	_____ Tom Zapler
_____ Robert Hann	_____ Joe Schofer	_____ Rocco Zuccherio

\*Chair

\*\*Vice-Chair

\*\*\*Non-voting