



# Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 800  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400  
[www.cmap.illinois.gov](http://www.cmap.illinois.gov)

## MPO Policy Committee

### Annotated Agenda

Thursday, October 9, 2014

9:30 a.m.

Cook County Conference Room

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800

Chicago, Illinois

- 1.0 **Call to Order and Introductions** 9:30 a.m.
- 2.0 **Agenda Changes and Announcements**
- 3.0 **Approval of Minutes—June 12, 2014**  
ACTION REQUESTED: Approval
- 4.0 **Agency Reports**
  - 4.1 Executive Director's Report
  - 4.2 CMAP Board Report
  - 4.3 Council of Mayors' Report
- 5.0 **Public Comment**

This is an opportunity for comments from members of the audience. The amount of time available to speak will be one minute and it will end at 10:30 a.m. If, at 10:30 a.m., anyone who has not yet commented still wishes to do so, they may comment at the end of the meeting. CMAP recommends that in advance each commenter submit their name, email, the nature of their comment, and the text of their written testimony [on-line](#) or by [email](#) by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, October 3.
- 6.0 **GO TO 2040 Update, FFY 2014-19 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and Conformity Determination**

The MPO Policy Committee will consider adoption of the GO TO 2040 plan update, TIP Program, and Conformity Determination. Staff recommends adoption of the plan update, which includes the materials located here:  
<http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/about/2040/update>

ACTION REQUESTED: Adoption of the FFY 2014-2019 TIP, the conformity determination, and the GO TO 2040 Regional Comprehensive Plan update.

**7.0 Nominating Committee for the office of MPO Policy Committee Vice Chair**

The report from the Nominating Committee appointed at the last meeting will be given and an election of a Vice Chair will be conducted.

ACTION REQUESTED: Election of a Vice Chair.

**8.0 Naming of Transportation Committee Chair and Vice Chair**

The Policy Committee bylaws state that the committee will appoint one of its members or alternates as the Chair and one of its members or alternates as the Vice Chair of the CMAP Transportation Committee.

ACTION REQUESTED: Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair of the Transportation Committee for calendar year 2014.

**9.0 Selection of Local Technical Assistance (LTA) Projects**

Staff recommendations for new projects to be pursued through the Local Technical Assistance (LTA) Program were presented to the Transportation Committee last week and the Local Coordinating Committee earlier this week. The Local Coordinating Committee is expected to recommend approval of those recommendations to the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval

**10.0 Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Programming and Management Policies**

CMAP Staff, with the CMAQ project selection committee and other stakeholders, has reviewed the procedures and project scoring methods used for development of the CMAQ program. Staff will present the updated programming and management policies recommended by the CMAQ Project Selection Committee that have been approved by CMAP's Transportation Working Committee. The Regional Coordinating Committee is expected to recommend approval of the programming and management policies to the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval

**11.0 Regional Exports Initiative**

John Greuling, President and CEO of Center for Economic Development in Will County will discuss a proposal to promote exporting on a regional level through a collaboration involving World Business Chicago and County economic development partners.

ACTION REQUESTED: Information

**12.0 Other Business**

**13.0 Public Comment**

**14.0 Next Meeting**

January 8, 2015

## 15.0 Adjournment

### **MPO Policy Committee Members:**

\_\_\_\_ Erica Borggren, Chair

\_\_\_\_ Kay Batey

\_\_\_\_ Frank Beal

\_\_\_\_ Forrest E. Claypool

\_\_\_\_ Tom Cuculich

\_\_\_\_ Elliott Hartstein

\_\_\_\_ Tina Hill

\_\_\_\_ R.A. Kwasneski

\_\_\_\_ Kristi Lafleur

\_\_\_\_ Christopher J. Lauzen

\_\_\_\_ Aaron Lawlor

\_\_\_\_ Wes Lujan

\_\_\_\_ John McCarthy

\_\_\_\_ Don Orseno

\_\_\_\_ Leanne Redden

\_\_\_\_ Rebekah Scheinfeld

\_\_\_\_ Jeffery Schielke

\_\_\_\_ John Shaw

\_\_\_\_ Marisol Simon

\_\_\_\_ Larry Walsh

\_\_\_\_ John Yonan





# Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

## Agenda Item 3.0

233 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 800  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400  
[www.cmap.illinois.gov](http://www.cmap.illinois.gov)

### **MPO Policy Committee**

#### **Draft Minutes**

**June 12, 2014**

#### **Cook County Conference Room**

**233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800**

**Chicago, Illinois**

#### **MPO Policy Committee Members Present:**

Ann Schneider, MPO Policy Committee Chair-representing the Illinois Department of Transportation, Aaron Lawlor MPO Policy Committee Vice Chair-representing Lake County, Michael Connelly-representing the Chicago Transit Authority, Tom Cuculich-representing DuPage County, Alicia Hanlon-representing Will County, Chris Lauzen-representing Kane County, Aimee Lee-representing the Illinois Tollway, John McCarthy-representing the Private Providers, Don Orseno-representing Metra, Leanne Redden-representing the Regional Transportation Authority, Rebekah Scheinfeld-representing the Chicago Department of Transportation, T.J. Ross-representing Pace, John Yonan-representing Cook County and non-voting members Kay Batey-representing the Federal Highway Administration, Sheila Clements-representing the Federal Transit Administration.

#### **MPO Policy Committee Members Absent:**

Frank Beal-representing the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning, Elliott Hartstein-representing the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning, Tina Hill-representing McHenry County, John Shaw-representing Kendall County, Jeffery Schielke-representing the Council of Mayors, and Wes Lujan-representing the Class I Railroads.

#### **Staff Present:**

Randy Blankenhorn, Jill Leary, Dolores Dowdle, Don Kopec, Patricia Berry, Jesse Elam, Andrew Williams-Clark, Lindsay Hollander, Holly Ostdick, Ross Patronskey, Arthur Prokosch, and Todd Schmidt.

#### **Others Present:**

Lynette Ciavarella-Metra, Tony Greep-Federal Transit Administration, Luann Hamilton-Chicago Department of Transportation, Charles Ingersoll-Illinois Department of Transportation, Dan Johnson-Midwest High Speed Rail Association, Mike Klemens-Will County Governmental League, Clairi Manley-Citizen, Mark Pitstick-Regional Transportation Authority, Tom Rickert-Kane County Division of Transportation, Chris Schmidt-Illinois Department of Transportation, David Seglin-Chicago Department of Transportation, Karen Shoup-Illinois Department of Transportation, Paula Trigg-Lake County Division of Transportation, Thomas Vander Woude-South Suburban Mayors and

Managers Association, Mike Walczak–Northwest Municipal Conference, and David Werner–Federal Transit Administration.

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

MPO Policy Committee Chair, Secretary Ann Schneider, called the meeting to order at 10:12 a.m. and asked MPO Policy Committee members to introduce themselves.

### **2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements**

There were no agenda changes or announcements.

### **3.0 Approval of Minutes**

A motion by Mr. Lawlor was seconded by Mr. Oseno to approve the minutes of the May 12, 2014 meeting of the MPO Policy Committee as presented. All in favor, the motion carried.

### **4.0 Agency Reports**

#### **4.1 Council of Mayors' Report**

Ms. Berry reported that the Council of Mayors Executive Committee met on May 20. They discussed most of the items on today's agenda, particularly the GO TO 2040 plan update. The mayors also discussed the current Local Technical Assistance program call for projects and were asked for input on the LTA program as it has been implemented. The response was very positive.

They considered and approved advanced STP funding, facilitating addressing the region's transportation needs and spending the federal money programmed by the local elected officials.

The Mayors heard presentations on current major capital projects from IDOT and the Illinois Tollway. The RTA discussed the agencies' current responsibilities, what the future may hold for transit in the region, and what the mayors can do to help.

With MAP-21 expiring and the dire needs of the region, it was agreed that a letter to our federal delegation on behalf of the Council of Mayors is in order. That letter, citing CMAP's reauthorization principles on today's agenda, will be sent this week.

#### **4.2 CMAP Board Report**

Ms. Redden said there have been three CMAP board meetings she would report on. The April CMAP Board meeting included the final report from the Northeastern Illinois Public Transit Task Force. The Board considered a revised MOU to allow for an alternate representative from the MPO Policy Committee, and discussed the Regional Tax Policy Principles.

In May, the CMAP Board approved the revised MOU allowing the MPO Policy Committee to appoint one of its members to serve as an alternate to the non-voting member they appoint to the CMAP Board, discussed the USDOT Certification Review, and the GO TO 2040 update.

In June, the CMAP Board discussed the budget, the GO TO 2040 update, transportation reauthorization principles, and the Regional Freight Leadership Task Force final report.

#### 4.3 CMAP Staff Report

Mr. Kopec reported that on June 2, 2014 USDOT published the proposed statewide and metropolitan planning regulations in the Federal Register. The MAP-21 continues many provisions related to transportation planning from prior laws, but also introduces some significant changes. These proposed rules implement those changes. Mr. Kopec stated there are two significant changes addressed by these regulations, one of which the region already complies with and the other we have been advocating and working on for several years. The latter addresses the issue of Performance-Based Planning and Programming, which you have heard about at CMAP for some time now. MAP-21 transformed the federal-aid highway program and the federal transit program by requiring a transition to a performance-driven, outcome-based program that provides for a greater level of transparency and accountability, improved project decision-making, and more efficient investment of federal transportation funds. The other change is a requirement that public transit providers be represented on the MPO – which we have done for decades. June 2, 2014 began a 90-day comment period on the proposed rules. He encouraged the committee to review these proposed regulations and provide comments as appropriate.

Mr. Kopec said staff is currently conducting a process review and evaluation of the CMAQ program and will be making some recommendations for improvements to the programming process. This work is being done in anticipation of the call for projects in January 2015.

The active program management policies for the CMAQ program that were put in place by the MPO Policy Committee in 2012 are proving quite effective. For the second year in a row we will likely exceed the region's obligation goal. The amount of unobligated funds in this program has been substantially reduced. Since the adoption of the policies, the unobligated balance has decreased from \$300 million to less than \$150 million.

In conclusion, Mr. Kopec reviewed some of the statistics associated with the LTA program. Currently, CMAP has:

- 137 projects funded
- 73 projects completed
- 53 projects fully underway
- 11 projects will be initiated in the near future

Among the projects are six bicycle and pedestrian projects, three parking studies, two transportation plans and a transit plan. Additionally, many of the comprehensive plans have a strong transportation component.

CMAP is currently accepting proposals for new projects in conjunction with the RTA and its Community Planning Program. A single application is used for both programs. Applications are due Thursday, June 26.

CMAP Executive Director Blankenhorn announced that this was Mr. Kopec's last MPO Policy Committee meeting as Kopec is retiring in mid-July. Blankenhorn thanked Kopec for his many years of service to CATS and to CMAP and noted that Kopec is a national leader in the field. The MPO Policy Committee and audience recognized Mr. Kopec with a standing ovation. Mr. Kopec thanked all for the good wishes.

#### **5.0 Nominating Committee for the Office of Vice Chairman**

MPO Policy Committee Chair Secretary Schneider appointed the following to serve as the nominating committee to make a recommendation to the MPO Policy Committee at its next meeting naming the vice chair:

<b>Member</b>	<b>Representing</b>
Mayor Schielke	Municipal Government or Municipal Corporation
John Yonan	Highway or Roads Administration
Rich Kwasneski	Public Transportation Agency or Other Transportation Provider
Frank Beal	Regional Planning Agency
Tom Cuculich	County Government

#### **6.0 Fiscal Year 2015 Unified Work Program (UWP)**

CMAP staff Dolores Dowdle summarized the 2015 Unified Work Program and stated that the UWP Committee and Transportation Committee recommend approval by the MPO Policy Committee. A motion by Ms. Redden was seconded by Mr. Connelly to approve the FY 2015 Unified Work Program (UWP) as had been presented. All in favor, the motion carried.

#### **7.0 Legislative Update**

CMAP staff Gordon Smith reported that there was a capital bill passed in the Illinois Legislature that contained \$100 million for local governments that was to be distributed through the motor fuel tax formula. Smith said the capital bill included \$1 billion for repairs to the state system. The legislature has added two amendments regarding the Illiana corridor to pending legislation. In response to a question from Mr. Cuculich, Smith said that last year CMAP received \$3.5 million for operations from IDOT and this year CMAP has received \$3 million. Cuculich asked about the shortfall. Mr. Blankenhorn stated that options to address the gap are being discussed and that CMAP budgeted without the gap.



## **8.0 FTA Subarea Allocation between Indiana-Illinois and Wisconsin-Illinois of Section 5307 and Section 5340 Capital and Planning Funds**

A motion to approve resolutions 14-02 and 14-03 outlining the 5307/5340 apportionment for the Chicago IL/IN and the Round Lake Beach/McHenry/Grayslake IL/WI urbanized area was made by Ms. Redden and seconded by Mr. Yonan. All in favor, the motion carried. The approved split between Indiana and Illinois allocates 4.627932% of the total amount to northwestern Indiana and 95.372068% to northeastern Illinois. The approved split between Wisconsin and Illinois is 3.942349% of the total amount allocated to southeastern Wisconsin and 96.057651% of the total amount allocated to northeastern Illinois.

The estimated Section 5307 and 5340 combined Capital and Planning funds for northeastern Illinois totals \$241,364,054. The recommended distribution to the Service Boards will be: \$125,579,499 to the CTA; \$80,590,151 to Metra; and \$35,194,404 to Pace.

## **9.0 Title VI Plan**

CMAP staff Patricia Berry reported that CMAP has updated its Title VI Plan and is required to do so every three years. A motion to approve the updated Title VI Plan was made by Mr. Connelly and seconded by Ms. Hanlon. All in favor, the motion carried. In response to a question by MPO Policy Committee Chair Schneider, Berry reported that she is the Title VI officer.

## **10.0 GO TO 2040 Plan Update**

CMAP staff Andrew Williams-Clark reported that the GO TO 2040 plan update is in final draft form and is available with the committee packet. Williams-Clark said the plan update will be released for public comment from June 13, 2014 to August 1, 2014 with 12 open house public meetings being held over the region. Comments can be made during those meetings, online, or in person. In response to a question from Mr. Ross, the Chair stated that Illinois is a donor state in that it collects more revenue into the highway trust fund than it receives, although Illinois' portion increased in MAP-21. The donor/donee issue is included in IDOT's reauthorization principles. Mr. Cuculich stated the committee might want to add that as a reauthorization principle, too.

## **11.0 Proposed Federal Fiscal Year 2014-19 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

CMAP staff Holly Ostdick reported that the TIP update is also available. The TIP is one of the many implementation vehicles for GO TO 2040 as well as a tool for sharing information with the implementers and stakeholders around the table and the general public. Ostdick then reviewed the contents of the TIP, noting that in addition to the projects there are five chapters and several appendices. She reviewed the materials that comprise the TIP document. The list of projects anticipated to be completed within the next five years includes over \$12 billion in projects and more than 2,300 line items for 1,100 projects. The TIP document and project list will be available for public comment from June 13 to August 1, 2014 with the GO TO 2040 update.

## **12.0 Conformity Analysis**

Mr. Patronskey summarized the information included in the packet, noting that part of the adoption of the plan/program is insuring that federal and state air quality requirements are met. The Transportation Conformity Analysis document will be available for public comment from June 13 to August 1, 2014 with the GO TO 2040 update.

## **13.0 Transportation Reauthorization Principles**

Executive Director Blankenhorn summarized the reauthorization principles for transportation approved by the CMAP Board. They include:

- The federal government should provide sustainable, robust funding for surface transportation, including both highways and transit.
- The federal government should implement performance-based funding.
- The federal government should provide regions with appropriate tools to support the transportation system.
- The federal government should support a robust freight program.

Ms. Redden recommended that the principles should clarify these are for highway and transit. Mr. Cuculich asked if project delivery streamlining should be included. Mr. Lauzen questioned if congressional leaders should be invited to attend a future meeting to understand the body of their constituents. A motion by Ms. Redden was seconded by Mr. Lauzen to endorse the transportation reauthorization principles as amended. All in favor, the motion carried.

## **14.0 Freight Leadership Task Force Report**

Former CMAP Board member and Task Force Chair Michael Gorman summarized the Regional Freight Leadership Task Force Report. Mr. Cuculich asked if the recommendation of the report included the authority to bond. While the report does not include a specific recommendation, bonding was discussed and will continue to be a topic of conversation. Mr. Ross expressed concern regarding the absence of addressing safety, Mr. Cuculich and Mr. Orseno concurred. Ms. Scheinfeld commended the report and stated any project selection that results from this report should follow the CMAQ Project Selection Committee model. Chairman Schneider commended the report as well. She noted that work on a National Freight Policy makes clear there is a strong need for regional planning and discussions on how to role that into the state and national policies is underway.

## **15.0 Alternate Representative to the CMAP Board**

MPO Policy Committee Chair Secretary Schenider stated that given that the CMAP Board approved the revised MOU to allow for an alternate representative, the MPO Policy Committee should consider the revision. A motion by Mr. Cuculich was seconded by Ms. Redden to revised the MOU. All in favor, the motion carried. A motion by Ms. Hanlon was seconded by Ms. Redden to name Mr. Yonan as alternate representative. All in favor, the motion carried.

#### **16.0 Other Business**

MPO Policy Committee Chair Secretary Schneider thanked the transit agencies and the city of Chicago for their assistance during the construction that will temporarily shut down the Kennedy expressway.

MPO Policy Committee Chair then asked if the members would be comfortable their meeting time from 10:00 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. All concurred and future meetings will begin meeting at 9:30 a.m.

#### **17.0 Public Comment**

Mr. Dan Johns of the Midwest High Speed Rail Association addressed the committee to encourage CrossRail Chicago be included as an unconstrained major capital project in the GO TO 2040 update.

#### **18.0 Closed Session – IOMA Section 2 (c)(11)**

A motion to adjourn the regular MPO Policy Committee meeting to a closed session was made by Mr. Lawlor and seconded by Mr. Connelly. All in favor, the motion carried.

A motion by Ms. Redden was seconded by Ms. Scheinfeld to end the closed session. All in favor, the motion carried.

#### **19.0 Next Meeting – Wednesday, October 8, 2014 at 9:30 a.m.**

#### **20.0 Adjournment**

A motion by Mr. Lawlor was seconded by Mr. Yonan to adjourn the regular meeting at 11:35 a.m. All in favor, the motion carried.





# Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

## Agenda Item No. 6.0

233 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 800  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400  
www.cmap.illinois.gov

### MEMORANDUM

**To:** CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee

**From:** CMAP Staff

**Date:** October 1, 2014

**Re:** Recommendation to Adopt GO TO 2040 Plan Update

---

---

At your October meetings, the CMAP Board and the MPO Policy Committee will be asked to consider adoption of the GO TO 2040 plan update. Revisions to the full plan update, based on public comments, were discussed at the September meetings of the Board and its committees. Several minor edits were made to the document based on these discussions. These changes include clarifying that the A-2 flyover remains under evaluation as part of the Metra UP West major capital project, updating data on the number of completed CREATE projects, and updating the graph depicting the age of the region's municipal comprehensive plans.

GO TO 2040 was adopted after a four year effort to reach consensus around a series of policies that will guide the region toward a vision of sustainable prosperity through mid-century and beyond. In 2010, the plan's major capital projects were evaluated and selected based on their ability to implement those policies. The fiscally constrained projects remain the same in the final draft plan update. The only exceptions are the three completed projects that have been removed from the fiscal constraint and the two new projects added by amendment in 2013. The final adoption draft can be found on the [plan update website](#). Copies will be available for you at your meeting next week and the final version will be sent to the printer following the plan's adoption.

Additionally, two other technical components of the GO TO 2040 plan update require consideration as part of the plan's adoption: an updated Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the conformity determination. A full update to the TIP and associated documentation was undertaken in the spring. The TIP implements the transportation recommendations of the GO TO 2040 plan update, and provides accountability for the use of federal transportation dollars in the region. The documentation can be found on the [TIP website](#).

The air quality impacts of transportation projects in GO TO 2040 and the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2014-2019 TIP were evaluated through a conformity analysis. This analysis found that

The GO TO 2040 plan update and the FFY 2014-2019 TIP meets all applicable requirements for conformity to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) and applicable provisions of the Clean Air Act. The documentation is available on the [plan update website](#).

Concurrent with the GO TO 2040 public outreach, a formal comment period on the TIP and conformity analysis was held from June 13 to August 1. No comments were received on either the FFY 2014-2019 TIP or conformity analysis. There were inquiries and discussions about various TIP projects that staff responded to at the public hearing meetings. The TIP Document was updated to further detail the sub-allocation process for federal transit funds. The language on environmental justice was revised to clarify the analyses completed.

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Adoption of the FFY 2014-2019 TIP, the conformity determination, and the full GO TO 2040 Regional Comprehensive Plan update by the CMAP Board and the MPO Policy Committee.

###



# Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

## Agenda Item No. 9.0

233 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 800  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400  
[www.cmap.illinois.gov](http://www.cmap.illinois.gov)

### MEMORANDUM

**To:** CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee

**From:** Bob Dean, Deputy Executive Director for Local Planning

**Date:** October 1, 2014

**Re:** Local Technical Assistance (LTA) Project Selection

---

---

Attached to this memo is a document that describes staff recommendations for selection of Local Technical Assistance (LTA) projects. This document describes the rationale for the staff recommendations, lists the recommended projects, and provides basic information about project distribution across communities.

The Transportation Committee is being asked to recommend approval at their meeting on October 3, and the Local Coordinating Committee is being asked to recommend approval at their meeting on October 8.

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Approval of the Local Technical Assistance (LTA) program







## **Local Technical Assistance (LTA) Program: Recommendations for Project Selection**

Following the adoption of GO TO 2040, CMAP established the Local Technical Assistance (LTA) program to direct resources to communities to pursue planning work that helps to implement GO TO 2040. During the most recent call for projects, which ended on June 26, CMAP received 104 applications for assistance. Further information on applications received is available at: <http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/programs-and-resources/lta/call-for-projects>.

The CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee will be asked to approve the staff recommendations for the LTA program at their joint meeting on October 8. Prior to the Board and MPO Policy Committee meeting, the Local Coordinating Committee will be asked to recommend approval by these groups. The Transportation Committee will also be asked to recommend approval at their meeting on October 3.

The purpose of this memo is to present CMAP staff recommendations for the treatment of each application received. It is divided into four sections:

- Staff recommendations for projects to be undertaken through the LTA program.
- Basic statistics concerning the projects recommended for selection.
- Evaluation process.
- Full lists of projects that are recommended and not recommended.

### **LTA recommendations**

In total, 25 new projects are recommended to be pursued through the LTA program. These projects were selected by applying CMAP's selection criteria: alignment of the project with the recommendations of GO TO 2040; local need for assistance; feasibility and ability to implement; collaboration with other groups, including neighboring governments and nongovernmental groups; input from relevant Counties and Councils of Government (COGs); and geographic balance.

Additionally, as CMAP has completed LTA projects, the implementation of completed projects has become an increasing priority. Several of the applications received help to implement projects that had been previously undertaken through the LTA program; many of these projects are recommended for selection.

For organizational purposes, recommended projects are presented below in groups.

### **Regional infrastructure projects**

Several applications this year related to regional transportation infrastructure priorities. Two of these covered the entire metropolitan area. One application, submitted jointly by all seven of

the region's Counties, involves a *regional truck permitting plan*. This project will be scoped and managed by CMAP, but external funding will be needed to develop the actual plan. Another regional project, submitted by the *Chicago Metro Metal Consortium*, a coalition of Counties, manufacturing industry representatives, economic developers, and others, will help this group to review and evaluate the impact of potential infrastructure investments on the region's metal manufacturing cluster.

Two other large-scale projects focused on the O'Hare area. A multijurisdictional application led by *Franklin Park* will improve truck access in an 11-community area in west Cook, northwest Cook, and DuPage Counties, addressing issues such as disconnected truck routes, poor roadway conditions, and congestion. Multijurisdictional transportation planning was also the focus of a project submitted by *DuPage County* which will address bicycle and pedestrian improvements in coordination with the new Elgin O'Hare Western Access facility. A number of municipalities are involved in both of these multijurisdictional projects.

### County-level economic development

Two countywide projects are recommended for selection, both with focuses on economic development. *Kendall County* requested a study of the market for industrial development across the county, which includes assessing transportation infrastructure needs. *McHenry County* is participating in a multi-county Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) in coordination with the Rockford region; CMAP was asked to assist with the McHenry County portion of this multijurisdictional project. Both of these projects were also submitted in 2013 and made improvements to their 2014 submittals, including incorporating transportation as a central element.

### Planning priorities reports

Planning priorities reports are a relatively new type of LTA project; three of them were done during the first several years of the program. These reports involve interviews with numerous local stakeholders, review of past planning work, and examination of current demographic, economic, transportation, and other conditions. Based on this information, planning priorities reports then recommend what sort of assistance a community needs. This may be a comprehensive plan, zoning ordinance update, corridor plan, or similar planning product; or it may be a training series for elected officials, a shift in departmental responsibilities, a new business development program, or many other options. Planning priorities reports are ideally suited for communities with limited staff or new administrations, and they can be useful in both identifying planning priorities for a community and confirming local commitment to a future full-scale planning process.

Four planning priorities reports are recommended this year. Two, in *Calumet Park* and *Steger*, are in communities with few professional staff but significant planning needs. Another, in *Fox Lake*, will be designed to help a new village administrator strategically implement a recent comprehensive plan. The fourth report will be conducted for the *Endeleo Institute*, a nonprofit organization on Chicago's south side, and will examine planning opportunities along 95<sup>th</sup> Street near the Red Line station.

### Capital Improvement Programs (CIPs)

Two communities requested assistance with developing Capital Improvement Programs (CIPs), which are multi-year infrastructure investment programs. Both of these applications, from *Blue Island* and *Richton Park*, are recommended to be selected. In both of these communities, the CIPs will be used to help implement recently-completed comprehensive plans. CIPs are becoming an increasing area of emphasis for the LTA program, as they can be effective links between planning and infrastructure investment.

### Zoning and regulatory process improvements

Like CIPs, updates to zoning ordinances, subdivision regulations, and development review processes are important methods to implement past plans. Several projects in these categories are recommended this year. Full zoning rewrites are recommended in *Bensenville* and *Villa Park*, and a downtown-focused zoning revision is recommended in *Huntley*. In *South Elgin*, the community requested zoning training for elected officials; this request will be linked with the ongoing development of the Unified Development Ordinance which CMAP selected for assistance in 2013. Finally, *Lemont* requested assistance with reviewing and suggesting changes to their development approval process. This is the first project of its type to be recommended for selection through the LTA program, but may be a more common project type in the future.

### Comprehensive and subarea plans

Finally, a number of comprehensive and subarea plans, which are familiar LTA project types, are recommended for selection. Comprehensive plans in three communities – *Brookfield*, *Roselle*, and *South Holland* – are recommended; these all demonstrated a high level of local commitment and good consistency with GO TO 2040.

Three neighborhood-level plans in the City of Chicago are recommended. One of these, for a transportation plan to support the proposed *Pullman National Historical Park*, was submitted by the National Parks and Conservation Association and will be conducted in partnership with the City's historic preservation division. Another is a *neighborhood plan* for several neighborhoods on Chicago's northwest side which will focus primarily on transportation and stormwater management. This project was inspired by applications from two applicants – the Center for Neighborhood Technology and the North River Commission – that covered a similar geography, and Chicago DPD and Chicago DOT will both be involved in the plan. The final project will support the *Chicago Neighborhoods 2014* strategic planning effort of Chicago DPD, and will consist of a corridor or subarea plan in one focal point in the City.

Two subarea plans in other communities are also recommended: a downtown walkability plan in *Aurora*, CMAP's first project in this municipality; and a plan for the Preston Heights neighborhood in unincorporated *Will County*, which will be similar the Fairmont plan that CMAP conducted during the first year of the LTA program.

### Projects that are not recommended

Projects were considered lower priority for LTA assistance for a number of reasons, described in general terms below.

- Priority for assistance was given to communities that had lower incomes or were smaller in size, meaning that more prosperous or larger communities were less likely to receive assistance. Lower-need communities generally had to present an innovative project or one that aligned especially well with a specific CMAP priority in order to be recommended.
- CMAP made a particular effort this year to assess local commitment, including follow-up calls and in some cases site visits. Only projects for which there was enthusiastic support were recommended this year.
- Some projects were good concepts but would benefit from further development by the project sponsor. In some cases, additional multijurisdictional partners would give a project a greater chance of success.
- Applicants that submitted multiple projects had only one project recommended. Also, in general, applicants that already have active, ongoing LTA projects were also not recommended (although there were exceptions to this for multijurisdictional projects).
- Some projects were simply not a good fit for the local technical assistance program, as they did not demonstrate the full support of affected local governments, or did not demonstrate alignment with the recommendations of GO TO 2040.
- In some cases, projects were at a stage that made them not entirely relevant for LTA assistance. A few transportation-related projects appeared to need assistance with facility design and preliminary engineering, rather than the higher-level planning that the LTA program offers.
- Finally, a number of projects beyond the list of 25 recommended in this memo are positive and viable projects, but were beyond available resources this year. CMAP will encourage communities who submitted projects that were just outside resource constraints to resubmit in future years, in some cases with modifications that will improve their chances of selection.

A full list of applicants that are not recommended to receive assistance is included at the end of this document.

## Statistics of recommended projects

In the following section, basic statistics are provided for the distribution of projects by geography and community need.

### Geographic distribution

In the design of the local technical assistance program, an effort was made to identify projects to be pursued in many different parts of the region. In the following table, the distribution of higher priority projects by geography is summarized. Projects may be reported in multiple geographies, and these are noted below the table.

	Chicago	Cook total	N and NW Cook	W Cook	SW Cook	S Cook	Collar total	DuPage	Kane	Kendall	Lake	McHenry	Will	Total
Selected applicants	4	10	3	3	2	5	14	6	3	1	1	3	3	23
Total applicants	13	29	9	5	4	15	41	17	7	4	6	10	7	76

Notes:

- The two regional projects (CMMC and regional truck permitting) and one project submitted by an ineligible applicant are not shown in this table.
- Four projects are recommended in the City of Chicago, and some of these are co-sponsored by multiple applicants. For simplicity, this is reported in the table above as four selected applicants.

Recommended projects included in multiple geographies are:

- Blue Island CIP (S and SW Cook)
- DuPage County DOT (NW Cook, W Cook, and DuPage)
- Huntley (Kane and McHenry)
- Fox Lake (Lake and McHenry)
- Franklin Park (NW Cook, W Cook, and DuPage)
- Lemont (SW Cook, DuPage, and Will)
- Roselle (NW Cook and DuPage)
- Steger (S Cook and Will)

As the above table shows, recommended projects are relatively well-distributed throughout the region. Two counties – Kendall and Lake – have only one project recommended each. In the case of Kendall, the recommended project was submitted by the County itself, and the other unsuccessful projects were submitted by municipalities that are primarily outside Kendall. In the case of Lake, there were several other good applications from communities in the County, but it should also be noted that the largest single LTA project to date, the IL 53/120 land use plan, is still actively underway and affects many Lake County communities.

In the first several years of the program, the most significant geographic imbalance involved a relatively low level of investment in the City of Chicago. Over the first three years of the LTA program, only 10-15% of resources were devoted to projects in Chicago. In 2014, four of the 23 recommended non-regional projects are located in Chicago, and these are expected to be large projects; it is estimated that about 20-25% of available resources in the 2014 program are devoted to projects in Chicago.

### Community need

An important factor in the review process was the need of the community for assistance. The program is meant to prioritize projects in communities that have limited resources and would not have the ability to undertake the project without CMAP's assistance. Communities were divided into five categories based on these factors, ranging from "very high" to "low" need. Many communities in the "low" and "moderate" need category submitted excellent projects and could still certainly benefit from assistance, but priority was given to communities with lower median incomes and tax bases, as well as to smaller municipalities. The following table and chart summarize the distribution of recommended projects by community need.

	Very high need	High need	Moderately high need	Moderate need	Low need	Total
Selected applicants	5	4	6	5	3	23
Total applicants*	15	10	17	17	17	76

\* Regional projects, and one project which was submitted by an ineligible applicant, are not included in these totals.

Regionwide, approximately 28% of the region's municipalities are classified as "very high" or "high" need communities; applicants in these need categories are recommended to receive nearly 40% of the projects in this year's LTA program. As in past years, the LTA program is directing resources to higher-need communities, but also provides opportunities for lower-need communities to participate if they submit innovative or multijurisdictional applications.

## Evaluation process

To evaluate each project, staff reviewed the applications and other background materials and also scheduled phone calls with each applicant to discuss their ideas. Questions were meant to gauge consistency with GO TO 2040, local commitment, internal and external support, and the project's overall feasibility. Additional follow-up phone calls and site visits were also conducted in a number of cases.

Applications were also reviewed with a variety of groups in July and August. Each working committee discussed the LTA applications at least once. Special meetings were also held with transit agencies, county planning directors, the City of Chicago, and technical assistance providers. Councils of Government (COGs) and Councils of Mayors (COMs) were encouraged to submit comments via email, and several of them did. Comments and expressions of support from these groups were used in part to determine the recommendations for selection.

## Project listing

### Recommended:

Sponsor	Project
Chicago Metro Metal Consortium	Infrastructure Investment Prioritization
City of Aurora	Downtown Master Plan*
City of Blue Island	Capital Improvement Program
City of Chicago	Northwest Side Neighborhood Plan**
City of Chicago	Chicago Neighborhoods 2014
City of Chicago	Pullman National Historic Park***
DuPage County DOT	Elgin-O'Hare Bicycle-Pedestrian Plan
Endeleo Institute	Planning Priorities Report
Kendall County	Industrial Market Study
McHenry County	Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy
Village of Bensenville	Zoning Update
Village of Brookfield	Comprehensive Plan



<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Project</b>
Village of Calumet Park	Planning Priorities Report
Village of Fox Lake	Planning Priorities Report
Village of Franklin Park	Truck Route Subregional Plan
Village of Huntley	Zoning Code Update
Village of Lemont	Analysis of Development Review Process
Village of Richton Park	Capital Improvement Program
Village of Roselle	Comprehensive Plan
Village of South Elgin	Elected Official Zoning Training
Village of South Holland	Comprehensive Plan
Village of Steger	Planning Priorities Report
Village of Villa Park	Zoning Code Update
Will County	Preston Heights Neighborhood Plan
regional application submitted by all Counties	Regional Truck Permitting Plan

\* This project will also address elements of Aurora's application for a downtown arts district by incorporating arts-based placemaking into the downtown plan.

\*\* This project consists of elements of applications submitted the Center for Neighborhood Technology and the North River Commission, and will involve both Chicago DPD and Chicago DOT.

\*\*\* This project was initially submitted by the National Parks Conservation Association.

#### **Not recommended:**

Please note that the below table lists some projects which are recommended for inclusion in the program after some re-scoping by CMAP and the project sponsor. These are noted where relevant. For communities that submitted some requests that are recommended and some that are not recommended, this fact is noted as well.

<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Project</b>
Blue Island Park District	Parks Master Plan
Bridgeport Business Association	Halsted Street Vision Plan
Center for Neighborhood Technology	Rain Ready – Chatham; Rain Ready – Midlothian (a similar application is included in the northwest side neighborhood plan in Chicago, which is recommended)
Chicago Department of Transportation	Sidewalk Pedestrian Level of Service; Truck Planning Study; Livable Streets Master Plan
City of Aurora	Sustainability Plan Update (a Downtown Master Plan is recommended)
City of Berwyn	Stormwater Management Plan
City of Blue Island	Development Review Process (a CIP is recommended)
City of Chicago Heights	Zoning Update
City of Des Plaines	Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance
City of Elmhurst	Sustainability Plan
City of Harvey	Comprehensive Plan
City of Joliet	Zoning Code Update
City of Warrenville	Comprehensive Plan

<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Project</b>
City of Woodstock	Route 47 Corridor Plan
Cook County Department of Planning and Development	Unincorporated Areas Comprehensive Plan
DuPage County Health Department	Health Plan
Far South Community Development Corporation	Roseland Culture and Arts Plan
Forest Preserve District of DuPage County	Feasibility Study – West Branch DuPage River Trail
Forest Preserve District of Will County	Will County Bikeway Plan
Fox River Study Group	Community Specific Plans
Kane County	Health Chapter – Comprehensive Plan; Health Impact Assessment – Priority Transit Network
Lake County	Robert McClory Bike Path Greenway Corridor Enhancement Plan
Mary Ann Kaufman	Future Landscapes for Achievable Planning
McHenry County	Agricultural Resource Guide
McHenry County Convention and Visitors Bureau	Wayfinding Signage Master Plan
Northwest Municipal Conference	Bike Share Feasibility Study
Rogers Park Business Alliance	Clark Street Corridor; Sheridan Road Streetscape and Parking Plan
South Loop Neighbors and Greater South Loop Association	Pre-development Support
South Shore Planning and Preservation Coalition	South Shore Visioning Plan; Marketing Strategy
South Suburban Mayors and Managers Association	Chicago Road Corridor Plan; Comprehensive Retail Development Strategy; Tax Impact Assessment
Sustainable Englewood Initiatives	Englewood Line
Village of Bull Valley	Green Infrastructure and Commercial Development Plan; Strategic Action Plan
Village of Calumet Park	Comprehensive Plan; Zoning Code Update (a Planning Priorities Report is recommended)
Village of Cary	Zoning Ordinance Update
Village of Clarendon Hills	Southside Comprehensive Plan
Village of Fox Lake	Development Review Process and Zoning Code Update; Parks and Recreation Master Plan (a Planning Priorities Report is recommended)
Village of Glen Ellyn	Zoning Code Update
Village of Grayslake	Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
Village of Gurnee	Comprehensive Plan
Village of Lake Zurich	Comprehensive Plan
Village of Lakemoor	Town Center Plan
Village of Lemont	State Street Corridor Plan; Subarea Plans; Water Supply Plan (Analysis of Development Review Process is recommended)
Village of Matteson	Comprehensive Plan; Zoning Ordinance Update
Village of Mokena	Comprehensive Traffic and Transportation Plan
Village of Montgomery	Comprehensive Plan Implementation / Zoning
Village of Niles	Comprehensive Arts and Culture Plan
Village of Northbrook	Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan



<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Project</b>
Village of Oak Park	Zoning Update
Village of Oakwood Hills	Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Revisions
Village of Olympia Fields	Zoning Ordinance Update
Village of Palos Park	Zoning Code Update
Village of Richmond	Comprehensive Plan
Village of Richton Park	Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan; Richton Park and Matteson Fire Service Consolidation Plan (a CIP is recommended)
Village of Riverdale	Zoning Code Update
Village of Sauk Village	Comprehensive Plan
Village of Schaumburg	Comprehensive Plan Update; Green Action Plan Update
Village of South Chicago Heights	Zoning Update
Village of South Holland	Interstate Zoning District (a Comprehensive Plan is recommended)
Village of Steger	Comprehensive Plan (a Planning Priorities Report is recommended)
Village of Wayne	Zoning Update
Village of Willowbrook	Subarea Comprehensive Plan
Village of Winfield	Zoning Code Update
Will County	Local Food Plan
Woodlawn Consortium	Broadband Study

###





# Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

## Agenda Item No. 10.0

233 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 800  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
312 454 0400  
[www.cmap.illinois.gov](http://www.cmap.illinois.gov)

### MEMORANDUM

**To:** CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee

**From:** CMAP Staff

**Date:** October 1, 2014

**Re:** Draft changes to *CMAQ Programming and Management Policies*

---

---

The *CMAQ Programming and Management Policies (Policies)* set out basic guidance for the CMAQ program and were last approved by the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee in 2012. Over the past year, CMAP has been reviewing various aspects of the program, during which time staff have had extensive discussions with the Project Selection Committee (PSC). At its June, July, and August 2014 meetings, the PSC considered draft changes to the *Policies*. Comments received at those meetings and in individual discussions with stakeholders have been addressed in the present draft. The draft *Policies* are being presented to the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee for approval, as recommended by the Transportation Committee at its September meeting.

The most significant changes to the 2012 *Policies* are as follows:

- Project readiness requirements have been clarified to indicate that design approval, submission of a final Project Development Report (PDR), or submission of a preliminary PDR (if IDOT indicates that cost and scope are adequately defined) will be taken to show that Phase I Engineering is substantially complete.
- Bicycle projects are now required to be identified in a state, local, regional, or subregional plan. Other types of projects are not required to be found in planning documents.
- The *Policies* now provide guidance on how to score projects, indicating that scoring will take into account the cost-effectiveness of emissions reduction, transportation impact, and regional priorities.
- The portion of engineering costs for transit projects that is eligible for CMAQ funding has been revised from 50% to 70%.

- Policies related to match have been clarified, including the use of soft match and the match percentage allowed for private entities proposing to use CMAQ funds for purchase of lower-emitting vehicles or engines. References to 100% CMAQ funding have been eliminated based on current federal law.
- The class of “extraordinary” projects has been eliminated as an option for meeting the annual obligation goal.
- Additional detail on semi-annual update requirements has been provided.

These changes have been highlighted in the current draft of the Policies, attached below. Numerous other small edits and text reorganizations make it impractical to show tracked changes. However, a document with tracked changes is available for review on the Project Selection Committee website.

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Approve the updated CMAQ Programming and Management Policies

###



## CMAQ PROGRAMMING AND MANAGEMENT POLICIES

### DRAFT UPDATE

#### A: Programming of CMAQ Funds for New Projects

##### 1) APPLICATION MATERIALS AND REQUIREMENTS

- a) The applicant is solely responsible for application completeness.
- b) Applications submitted without the following will be rejected:
  - i) Complete project financing & CMAQ funding request section;
  - ii) Input Module Worksheets for traffic flow improvement projects only;
  - iii) Pedestrian/Parking Deck Supplements, if applicable;
  - iv) Sign-off by the applicable Planning Liaison (PL), for municipal agency sponsors only (see section A:1)e)).
- c) Applications must meet the following screening criteria:
  - i) For projects requiring Phase 1 Engineering, that phase must be substantially complete. Projects for which design approval has been received by the date indicated in the application materials meet this requirement. This requirement may also be met by IDOT certifying that a final Project Development Report has been submitted for signatures by the date indicated in the application materials or that a preliminary Project Development Report has been received by the same date with an accurate cost and clear scope established.
  - ii) For transit projects that require engineering, the sponsor must demonstrate that sufficient work has been completed to establish accurate cost information and a clear scope.
  - iii) Bicycle facility projects must be featured in at least one formally adopted or approved bike plan, comprehensive plan, or other plan by a local government, subregional council, CMAP, or the State of Illinois.

- iv) Milestone schedules must be realistic and consistent with project phase accomplishment goals. Each project phase will have the federal fiscal year in which it is programmed, plus two additional years (three years total) in which to meet the phase accomplishment goal.
- v) All projects must have an air quality benefit. Projects without air quality benefits are not eligible and will not be scored on any other criteria.
- d) If an application is missing other information, only one attempt will be made to collect that information (notice will be via a “read receipt” e-mail). The deadline for submission of missing information is 30 days from the date of the emailed notification from CMAP. If the sponsor does not respond by the deadline, the application will be rejected.
- e) Project applications submitted by municipal agencies (villages, cities, counties, park districts, school districts, forest preserve districts, townships, etc.) are required to be reviewed by their Council of Mayors PL.
  - i) The individual PLs are responsible for reviewing applications and advising the sponsor of missing information.
  - ii) The PL sign-off is incorporated into the application form.
  - iii) The deadline for submission for PL review is two weeks in advance of the deadline for submission to CMAP. The deadline for submitting applications to the PLs will be included in the CMAQ program development schedule.

## **2) EVALUATION CRITERIA, SCORING, AND PROJECT SELECTION**

- a) Projects will be scored based on the criteria and weighting system stipulated in application materials posted on the CMAP website prior to the call for projects.
- b) Project applications will be initially evaluated on the cost effectiveness of emission reduction basis with projects ranked within each project eligibility category. Secondly projects will be evaluated and scored on other criteria including measures related to transportation impacts and regional priorities. Raw data for each criterion will be available for inspection.
- c) Input from the four modal focus groups (Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force, Regional Transportation Operations Coalition, Direct Emissions Reduction Focus Group and the Transit Focus Group) or other CMAP committees will be solicited during development of the draft program. Focus group input on a project or group of projects will be a qualitative description of challenges and benefits not captured by the scoring. Project

scoring will not be adjusted. Focus group deliberations will be documented and made available to the Project Selection Committee.

- d) Project scores and focus group input -- together with regional equity, project readiness, sponsor capacity, project mix, and other factors -- will be used to develop a recommended program for Project Selection Committee consideration. Reasons for elevating a low scoring project or projects and/or not funding a high scoring project or projects will be documented.

### **3) PROGRAMMING THE FUNDS**

- a) The CMAQ program mark for a given federal fiscal year will be the State's federal apportionment adjusted by the Project Selection Committee to account for programming balances.
- b) Phase I engineering will be the responsibility of the project sponsor to complete without CMAQ funding.
  - i) A sponsor can request funding for phase I engineering based on financial hardship.
    - (1) When funds for Phase I Engineering are awarded based on hardship, CMAQ funding for future phases is dependent on successful competition in a future CMAQ program cycle.
    - (2) All remaining eligible phases will be programmed at a maximum level of 80% federal funding.
- c) Phase II engineering, right-of-way acquisition (ROW), construction and implementation are eligible for CMAQ funding at 80% federal participation, with the following exceptions:
  - i) For transit proposals where phase I and phase II engineering are not clearly defined, 70% of the engineering costs will be eligible for CMAQ funding at an 80% federal participation rate with all of the costs of the remaining phases eligible for up to 80% federal participation.
  - ii) For signal interconnect projects, phase II engineering costs will not be eligible for CMAQ funding.
  - iii) For proposals involving private corporations in which an entire vehicle or engine is being purchased to replace a higher-emitting vehicle or engine, the funding levels will be addressed on a case-by-case basis up to a maximum 65% federal share. For proposals involving private corporations in which only the cost difference between a lower-emitting version of a vehicle/engine and a conventional one is being funded, an 80% federal share is acceptable.

- iv) Projects which qualify for a higher federal participation rate under federal guidelines will be considered on a case by case basis.
- d) Soft match, including Transportation Development Credits, will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Federal requirements may restrict the situations in which soft match can be used, and IDOT policies must be followed. Sponsors must identify on the application form if soft match is requested.
- e) Proposals that are not selected for funding but are shown to have air quality benefits will be included in a “Vetted” project list that can be used to help meet the annual obligation goal described in further details under section B:4).
- f) All sponsors will be required to attend a project initiation meeting. The meeting will include distribution of necessary forms and information needed to initiate the project(s) and review of general project schedules and deadlines. Unless specific approval has been granted by CMAP, project consultants may not attend in the stead of project sponsors. Consultants are encouraged to accompany the project sponsors. Failure to attend will subject the project to removal from the program. This decision will be via recommendation of the Project Selection Committee to the Transportation Committee and MPO Policy Committee.

## **B: Active Program Management of Projects**

### **1) EVERY PHASE OF AN APPROVED PROJECT WILL BE SUBJECT TO AN ACCOMPLISHMENT SUNSET. EACH PHASE WILL HAVE THE FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR IN WHICH IT IS PROGRAMMED PLUS TWO ADDITIONAL YEARS (3 YEARS TOTAL) TO MEET THE ACCOMPLISHMENT GOAL FOR THE PHASE.**

- a) For FTA administered projects, accomplishment is FTA grant approval for the phase.
- b) For those projects administered through the Federal Highway Administration, accomplishment is defined as:
  - i) Phase I engineering - design approval
  - ii) Phase II engineering - Pre-final plans submitted to IDOT District 1
  - iii) ROW - ROW certified by IDOT District 1
  - iv) Construction - Has been let for bid
  - v) Implementation - Federal Authorization
- c) If a phase is not accomplished in the year it is programmed plus two years, all remaining unobligated CMAQ funds for the phase and all subsequent phases (regardless of the sunset year of those phases) will be removed from the guaranteed program and the



project will be considered a deferred project. More information on deferred projects is available in section B:4)c)ii).

**2) A REVIEW OF THE STATUS FOR ALL PROJECTS WITH PHASES IN THE CURRENT FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR WILL BE CONDUCTED AT LEAST SEMI-ANNUALLY.**

- a) Due dates for semi-annual updates will be included in the Project Selection Committee meeting calendar which is approved prior to the start of each calendar year. Updates will generally be requested in late spring (May/June) and fall (October).
- b) CMAP staff or the Project Selection Committee may request additional status updates at any time.
- c) Semi-annual updates will be required for all project phases meeting any of the following conditions. All projects meeting these conditions that fail to provide a semi-annual status update will be subject to removal from the CMAQ program.
  - i) Deferred phases.
  - ii) Phases sunsetting at the end of the current federal fiscal year.
  - iii) Phases programmed in the current federal fiscal year, regardless of sunset date.
- d) Every effort will be made to provide a list of phases requiring status updates and instructions for completing the updates to PLs (for municipal agency sponsored projects) and other project sponsors (service boards, RTA, IDOT, and IEPA) at least three weeks prior to the due date, but a shorter lead time may be needed in some cases.
- e) Status updates may also be requested, or may be submitted without a request, for phases programmed in out years in order to assist with programming decisions for meeting the annual obligation goal.

**3) TRANSIT PROJECTS THAT HAVE BEEN OBLIGATED WILL BE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT AN EXPENDITURE UPDATE WITHIN 45 DAYS OF THE END OF EACH CALENDAR QUARTER UNTIL THE PROJECT IS 100% COMPLETE.**

**4) AN ANNUAL OBLIGATION GOAL WILL BE SET TO ENSURE THE REGION IS SPENDING ITS CMAQ APPORTIONMENT.**

- a) The goal will be set prior to the start of the federal fiscal year.
- b) The goal will be based on the anticipated apportionment for the next federal fiscal year and the anticipated unobligated balance.

- c) If the obligation goal cannot be met through implementation of projects incorporated in the CMAQ program through the regular selection process, then other projects (listed below in priority order) that have demonstrated readiness as defined in B:6)b) will be selected for contingency funding to accomplish the goal:
- i) Out Year – projects programmed in the out years of the program will be moved into the annual element. This can occur at any time if funding is available.
  - ii) Deferred – projects that had their funding removed for failure to meet accomplishment sunset deadlines can have their funding reinstated one phase at a time. This can occur at any time if funding is available.
  - iii) Vetted – includes:
    - (1) Projects that were analyzed in a prior programming cycle and showed an air quality benefit but were not included in the program, or
    - (2) Partially funded CMAQ projects that have other funding for which CMAQ funds can be substituted.
- d) If the actual obligation amount is expected to be within \$5 million of the goal as determined by CMAP staff, then no action to implement other projects will be considered.

**5) THE REVIEW PROCESS FOR DETERMINING IF THE OBLIGATION GOAL WILL BE MET, OR IF OTHER PROJECTS NEED TO BE SELECTED WILL BEGIN IN THE SPRING OF THAT FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR.**

**6) PROJECTS SELECTED FOR CONTINGENCY FUNDING MUST MEET THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- a) Be ready to obligate within the federal fiscal year.
- b) Demonstrate readiness as defined below.

	Local Projects	CDOT	Transit Capital Projects	Transit Non-Capital or CDOT Projects	IDOT
Phase I Engineering	Locally Executed Local Agency Agreement sent to IDOT Central Office for Execution	Locally Executed IPA sent to IDOT Central Office for Execution	Inclusion in the RTA Program	Submitted draft TEAM/TrAMS application for review	n/a

	<b>Local Projects</b>	<b>CDOT</b>	<b>Transit Capital Projects</b>	<b>Transit Non-Capital or CDOT Projects</b>	<b>IDOT</b>
Phase II Engineering	Locally Executed Local Agency Agreement sent to IDOT Central Office for Execution	Locally Executed IPA sent to IDOT Central Office for Execution	Inclusion in the RTA Program	Submitted draft TEAM/TrAMS application for review	n/a
ROW Acquisition	Locally Executed Local Agency Agreement sent to IDOT Central Office for Execution	Locally Executed IPA sent to IDOT Central Office for Execution	Inclusion in the RTA Program	Submitted draft TEAM/TrAMS application for review	When ROW is included in the IDOT program
Construction	Pre-final Plans at IDOT BLRS for Review	Locally Executed IPA sent to IDOT Central Office for Execution	Inclusion in the RTA Program	Submitted draft TEAM/TrAMS application for review	When Design Approval is achieved or when Construction is included in IDOT program.
Implementation	Case by case basis, in general – locally executed agreement sent to IDOT Central Office for Execution	Case by case basis, in general - Locally Executed IPA sent to IDOT Central Office for Execution	Inclusion in the RTA Program	Submitted draft TEAM/TrAMS application for review	n/a

c) Construction is the preferred phase for contingency funding.

d) Vetted projects must meet the following phase funding minimum requirements.

- i) \$1 million for phase II or ROW acquisition
- ii) \$5 million for construction
  - (1) A combination bid of connected or related projects which total the above minimums is acceptable.
- iii) Limits do not apply to out-year or deferred projects

###