



MINUTES

CMAQ Project Selection Committee

Thursday, May 15, 2014 2:00 p.m.
CMAP Offices

Committee Members Present: Ross Patronsky, Chair (CMAP), Luann Hamilton (CDOT), Mark Pitstick (RTA), William Rodeghier (Council of Mayors), Mike Rogers, (IEPA – via phone), Chris Schmidt (IDOT), Chris Snyder (Counties),

Staff Present: Patricia Berry, Kama Dobbs, Jesse Elam, Doug Ferguson,

Others Present: Bruce Christensen, John Donovan, Tony Greep, Terry Heffron, Valbona Kokoshi, Keith Privett, Tom Rickert, Kyle Smith, Chris Staron, Brian Stepp, David Tomzik, Tom Vander Woude, Mike Walczak, Tom Weaver

1.0 Call to Order

Committee Chairman Patronsky called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

None

3.0 Approval of Minutes - April 3, 2014

Mr. Rickert requested revision of his statement on page 6 of the minutes regarding a staff recommended program. On a motion by Mr. Rodeghier and a second by Mr. Snyder, the minutes of the April 3, 2014 meeting were approved as revised.

4.0 Program Monitoring

4.1 Programming Project Status Sheets

Ms. Dobbs stated that updated status reports were included in the agenda packet.

4.2 Obligation Goal

Ms. Dobbs stated that an updated Program Summary and Obligation Goals report was included in the agenda packet. A copy of the CMAQ Obligation Report brochure was distributed and Ms. Dobbs noted that the Council of Mayors Executive Committee would be receiving a report on CMAQ obligations at their meeting on May 20.

4.3 May Status Updates

Ms. Dobbs reported that status updates were received for 347 line items. She thanked the planning liaisons and all involved for their timely, complete and realistic responses. 80 of the updates included changes to the programmed year. Of those, 29 line items are subject to deferral. She reported that staff determined that all of the reprogramming requests as a result of the updates could be accommodated and that staff will work with project sponsors to reprogram these line items in the TIP. Staff anticipates the need for some flexibility in TIP programming to meet fiscal constraint requirements. She noted that updated Program Status reports were distributed showing the changes based on the update responses. The results of the reprogramming indicate that the FFY 2014 obligation goal can still be met.

5.0 Project Changes

5.1 IDOT – IL 68/Dundee Rd at North Wilke Rd (TIP ID 03-12-0007) IDOT – IL 68/Dundee Rd at Kennicott Ave (TIP ID 03-12-0008)

Ms. Dobbs summarized the sponsor request. In response to question from Mr. Snyder, Mr. Heffron explained that there have been several cost increase requests from IDOT due in part to basing estimates during the application process on bid prices at that time which turned out to be unusually low. He noted that as plans for the projects are being finalized; the cost estimates are updated based on current bid price trends. On a motion by Mr. Snyder, seconded by Ms. Hamilton, the sponsor request to combine 03-12-0007 with 03-12-0008 along with the requested cost increase of \$720,000 federal CMAQ (\$900,000 total) for the Construction phase, for a total project cost of \$1,440,000 federal CMAQ (\$1,912,500 total) for IDOT – IL 68/Dundee Rd at Kennicott Ave (TIP ID 03-12-0008) was approved.

5.2 IDOT – IL 47/72/Higgins Rd at US 20 (TIP ID 09-12-0003)

Ms. Dobbs reported that items 5.2 and 5.3 are related and summarized the requests. In response to a question from Mr. Snyder, Mr. Heffron explained that the two projects have separate plan sets and will be constructed under separate contracts on the same letting. He added that the locations are adjacent, but are physically separated by a railroad underpass. On a motion by Mr. Snyder, seconded by Ms. Hamilton, the sponsor request to transfer \$160,000 federal CMAQ (\$200,000 total) for ROW from 09-12-0003 to 09-12-0007, a cost increase of \$1,120,000 federal CMAQ (\$1,400,000 total) for Construction for a project total of \$3,760,000 federal CMAQ (\$4,962,500 total) for IDOT – IL 47/72/Higgins Rd at US 20 (TIP ID 09-12-0003), and a cost increase of \$1,440,000 federal CMAQ (1,800,000 total) for Construction for a project total of \$3,360,000 federal CMAQ (\$4,387,500 total) for IDOT – IL 47/72/Higgins Rd at US 20 (TIP ID 09-12-0007) was approved.

5.3 IDOT – IL 47/72 at US 20 (TIP ID 09-12-0007)

This request was approved jointly with item 5.2.

5.4 IDOT – Barrington Rd at Bode Rd (TIP ID 03-12-0006)

Ms. Dobbs summarized the sponsor request. On a motion by Mr. Pitstick, seconded by Mr. Snyder, the sponsor request for a cost increase of \$80,000 federal CMAQ (\$100,000 total) for the Construction phase for a total project cost of \$464,000 federal CMAQ (\$640,000 total) for IDOT – Barrington Rd at Bode Rd (TIP ID 03-12-0006) was approved.

5.5 Pace – I-90 Corridor Enhanced Markets (TIP ID 17-12-0001)

Ms. Dobbs summarized the sponsor request. Mr. Tomzik added that the project has evolved due to cooperation between local communities, Pace and the Tollway. He explained that through the design process for the Barrington Road interchange, the proposed Park and Ride lot can be located within Tollway right of way, allowing buses to not have to exit the tollway, saving approximately 5-6 minutes per trip. He stated the lot will also be connected to the local bicycle and pedestrian network, allowing direct access to residential, commercial and office locations surrounding the interchange. In response to a question from Mr. Pitstick, Mr. Tomzik stated that Pace intends to group all of the remaining phases of the project into one FTA grant in FFY 2015 and that beyond the transfer of funds being requested, the remaining programmed amounts per phase are still appropriate. On a motion by Mr. Pitstick, seconded by Mayor Rodeghier, the sponsor request to transfer \$1,000,000 federal CMAQ (\$1,250,000 total) from Phase 1 Engineering to Construction for a total project cost of \$38,360,000 federal CMAQ (\$47,950,000 total) and to reprogram the Phase 2 Engineering, Construction and Implementation phases from FFY 2014 to FFY 2015 was approved.

5.6 Administrative Modifications

Ms. Dobbs reported that staff completed three administrative modifications, including a request to combine two projects, a voluntary deferral and a project withdrawal, as described in the CMAQ Project Change Requests memo.

6.0 CMAQ Program Process Evaluation and Transformation

Mr. Elam reviewed the status of the process evaluation and explained the timeline laid out by the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee. There has been an evolution in the selection process over the last few years with the formation of the focus groups and that the process being proposed continues this evolution, using the Committee for project selection but not ranking, and formalizing the focus groups' recommendations with rankings. In response to the Committee's requests, staff evaluated the 2014 applications using the proposed scoring system and reviewed the results, which were similar to the program as adopted, with the biggest funding gain in the transit category due to the addition of the Brown Line track modernization project, which scored high on the asset condition criterion. Mr. Elam noted that the VOC reduction resulting from the entire program of projects developed with the new criteria was similar to the adopted program. While there are many similarities between the two programs, they do not necessarily consist of the same projects. He also pointed out that while there was a 20% reduction in funding to the direct emissions category, the federal requirement for spending 25% of

funds on PM_{2.5} reduction would still be met. Mr. Elam reviewed technical changes to the methodology, criteria and weighting made since the last Committee meeting. He noted that a summary of interviews conducted with members was also provided as requested by the Committee. Staff is addressing the concerns of committee members, though not all had the same concerns. Other CMAP working committees may also weigh in.

In response to a question from Mr. Rickert, Mr. Elam clarified that the re-scoring was based on applying VOC reduction scoring to all projects and applying transportation impact criteria scores to appropriate project types. Mr. Rickert asked if staff had considered retaining comparison within categories and noted that the Committee members have an understanding of what the needs are for each type of project and use that understanding and professional judgment, not just numbers to select projects. Mr. Elam stated that the numbers are not envisioned to be the sole selection criterion; the Committee would still make recommendations using their expertise. Mr. Rickert stated that the concept that the Committee has the discretion to select projects based on other factors should be clearly written in the final policy. Mr. Privett added that while it was teased out a little in the memo, specific examples of factors such as project readiness, geographic equity, modal balance, etc. should be provided in application materials. Mr. Elam said it would be one thing to start at the top of the list and then skip a project here and there based on professional judgments, but it would be something else if members want to go from the 30th ranked project to the 80th. Mr. Rickert concurred with Mr. Privett that other factors need to be addressed in the written policies.

Mr. Snyder stated that in past process reviews that he has participated in, there was a stated problem, the review and then recommendations. He stated that the problem that led to recommending a points system is unclear. He added that the focus groups need data up front to use to make their recommendations and that they should also use professional judgment within their mode to make recommendations to the Committee. Mr. Snyder said that with only numbers, professional judgment cannot be applied and the program loses cohesion. Mr. Elam stated that staff agrees and that the staff rankings will be provided to the focus groups and recommendations will go from there. Mr. Patronsky noted that in past cycles, the focus groups did not get the emissions benefit information; their task was to assess how the projects implement GO TO 2040 and the intent was that the focus groups looked only at transportation benefits. Staff is not intending to select projects based on numbers alone. Mr. Snyder said the staff function in the CMAQ program and the selection committee function in the CMAQ program should be addressed. Mr. Donovan requested clarification of the flow of information from staff to the focus groups to the Project Selection Committee and stated that the role of the focus groups needs to go beyond accepting or rejecting the staff rankings. Mr. Elam stated that the focus groups are the experts and will be asked to review the technical rankings as a quality control and to consider any other information that is available. Mr. Greep suggested that staff provide an illustration of the workflow envisioned. Mr. Schmidt agreed that an illustration would be very useful.

In response to a question from Mr. Tomzik regarding how transit asset condition applies to new facilities, Mr. Elam stated that if the region gives more weight to modernizing the

existing system, that is a trade off, and new facilities would likely need to demonstrate large benefits in order to rank high. Mr. Smith added that CMAQ is one of the few sources of funding available for train station improvements which aid in Transit Oriented Development in the region.

Mr. Rogers thanked staff for incorporating some of the suggestions and expressed significant concern regarding decreased funding for direct emissions reduction projects and asked if staff could provide the individual project ranking spreadsheet. Mr. Elam confirmed that staff could provide the spreadsheet online. In response to a question from Mr. Donovan, Mr. Ferguson stated that, similar to the increase for transit projects being from one project, the reduction in direct emissions projects was due to the cost effectiveness of the CTA vehicles project. In response to a question from Mr. Privett, Mr. Elam noted that there was no change to the type of projects that would reduce PM_{2.5} emissions and that the approved program contained more than the minimum of 25% required. Mr. Rickert agreed that it would be good to see the actual spreadsheet. He said members would like to see how a project receives a one, a two or a three and noted that there is substantial concern over comparing across categories.

In response to a question from Mr. Weaver, Mr. Elam noted that the program developed using the proposed method was not entirely based on the rankings, but also applied factors such as readiness that would be expected to be used, based on the knowledge staff had about the projects at the time of the applications. In response to a question from Mr. Patronsky, Mr. Elam clarified that the totals summarized in the memo were based on ranking all projects types together, not within their individual categories. In response to a question from Mr. Donovan, Mr. Elam stated that there has been no meaningful impact from the priority development measure since it has not been fully fleshed out, and that staff is not proposing including this measure as part of the upcoming program development cycle. In response to a request from Mr. Snyder to add definitions to table 2, Mr. Elam noted that these definitions were included in the memo to the Committee in February and at Mr. Privett's suggestion, those could be re-sent to the Committee with the ranking spreadsheet. Mr. Rickert stated that he believes that municipalities will be concerned about the "On CMP Network" criteria, but that since IDOT and the counties need to address arterials, they would probably be fine with it. He said that it is essential that the details be fleshed out and trade-offs discussed.

Mr. Elam reviewed staff action items, including developing a clearer explanation of the professional judgment criteria for application materials, illustrating the workflow, discussing appropriate measures for new facilities with transit representatives, providing more explanation of the comparison between project types and posting the ranking spreadsheet and criteria definitions for the Committee members to review. In response to a question from Ms. Kokoshi, Mr. Patronsky noted that a call for projects is anticipated in January; therefore, policies need to be adopted by the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee in October and that the Committee needs to meet as often as needed to finalize policy changes.

Mr. Snyder noted that potential applicants need as much advance notice of the policies as possible. In response to a question from Mr. Smith, Mr. Patronsky stated that there is no required public comment period for policy changes. Partners are encouraged to attend the Project Selection Committee meetings and participate in the discussions as Mr. Smith has been doing. Mr. Snyder suggested that an additional Committee meeting in June should be considered to continue discussions. In response to a question from Mr. Schmidt, Mr. Patronsky stated that the normal procedure would be for the committee to vote to make a recommendation to the Transportation Committee, which in turn would make recommendations to the Regional Coordinating Committee and MPO Policy Committee.

7.0 MAP-21

Mr. Donovan reported that Planning Rules, including requirements for reporting on CMAQ projects, are a few months away. In response to a question from Mr. Schmidt, Mr. Donovan noted that there has been no clarification on the types of projects that are considered to directly reduce PM_{2.5} emissions and that this clarification was conspicuously absent from interim guidance that has been issued.

8.0 Other Business

None.

9.0 Public Comment

None.

10.0 Next Meeting

The Committee's next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, July 17, 2014 at 2:00 p.m. Staff will poll the Committee to save a date in June to further discuss the process evaluation and transformation.

11.0 Adjournment

On a motion by Mr. Snyder, and a second by Ms. Hamilton, the meeting adjourned at 3:39 p.m.