Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400
www.cmap.illinois.gov

Transportation Committee

Agenda
Friday November 20, 2015,
9:30 a.m.
Cook County Conference Room
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois

1.0 Call to Order/Introductions **9:30 a.m.**

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

3.0 Approval of Minutes— September 18, 2015

4.0 Coordinating Committee Reports

The Local Coordinating Committee and the Regional Coordinating Committee each met on October 14, 2015. A report on the meetings will be given by the Transportation Committee's representatives.

5.0 FFY 14-19 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

5.1 Federal Fiscal Year 2016-2020 State/Regional Resources Table and Update to Selected Years of the TIP (Leroy Kos)

The State/Regional Resources Table has been developed for use in determining fiscal constraint. Implementers are in the process of awarding, moving or removing all FFY 2015 line items from the TIP. To assure continuation in programming, the selected years of the TIP specified in Attachment A of the TIP Change Procedures will be updated to include both FFY15 and 16.
ACTION REQUESTED: Acceptance of the FFY 2016-2020 State/Regional Resources Table and concurrence with the update of Attachment A of the TIP Change Procedures.

5.2 Amendments and Administrative Modifications (Leroy Kos)

TIP revisions that exceed financial amendment thresholds have been requested. Revisions include line items that have been awarded, moved or deleted. The TIP amendments and modifications are attached.
ACTION REQUESTED**:** Approval of TIP amendments

5.3 Proposed Meeting Dates for 2016 (Leroy Kos)

The proposed meeting dates for the Transportation Committee for 2016 are:

January 22	July 22
March 04	September 16
April 22	November 18
May 20	

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval of the 2016 meeting schedule

5.4 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program (Doug Ferguson)

Staff will update the committee regarding the CMAQ program.
ACTION REQUESTED: Information

5.5 Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP-L) Update (Doug Ferguson)

Staff will present a status update to the committee.
ACTION REQUESTED: Information

6.0 The Next Long Range Plan (Jesse Elam)

6.1 Regionally Significant Project Thresholds

This item follows up on previous discussions with the Transportation Committee and CMAP's governing boards on the types of projects to include in the plan. Staff recommends moving forward with the proposed thresholds on a trial basis by developing an early list of projects that implementers believe meet the thresholds and then reporting back to the TC in the spring on the appropriateness of the thresholds.
ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

6.2 Snapshot Report Development: Transportation Network and Trends

CMAP will be preparing "snapshot reports" to document existing conditions and trends on specific topics of importance to the region. For the transportation network and trends snapshot, the focus would be on (1) documenting travel behavior trends, (2) summarizing system characteristics and performance, and (3) summarizing historical spending trends. Staff is seeking feedback on the content of the snapshot report.
ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

6.3 Strategy Paper Development: Transportation System Funding Concepts

As part of the development of the next long range plan, CMAP staff is developing a series of strategy papers to review current policies, emerging issues, and potential future directions on various issues. One of these strategy papers will explore transportation system funding concepts, building upon the policy foundation of GO TO 2040 to research ways to ensure that the region's transportation system is adequately funded. Staff will seek feedback on the content of strategy papers as they are being developed.
ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

6.4 Outcomes from "Setting Pavement Condition Targets" Forum

In September CMAP held the first of a series of planning information forums before the Transportation Committee meeting. Staff will summarize findings from that forum.
ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

6.5 Committee Engagement Schedule

The attached memo updates the previous schedule of Transportation Committee (TC) discussions on major issues in plan development in fiscal year 2016.
ACTION REQUESTED: Information

7.0 RainReady (Harriet Festing)

The Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) has developed RainReady, a community planning process and tools that focus on affordable, tangible solutions to help communities manage urban flooding. The RainReady process links with Complete Streets and broader transport planning concepts. An overview of the program will be presented.
ACTION REQUESTED: Information

8.0 Legislative Update

8.1 Federal (Alex Beata)

Staff will present an update on federal legislative activities.
ACTION REQUESTED: Information

8.2 State (Gordon Smith)

Staff will present an update on activities of the Illinois General Assembly's current legislative session.
ACTION REQUESTED: Information

9.0 Status of the Local Technical Assistance Program

The current status report on the LTA program is attached.
ACTION REQUESTED: Information

10.0 Other Business

11.0 Public Comment

This is an opportunity for comments from members of the audience. The amount of time available to speak will be at the chair's discretion. It should be noted that the time for the public comment period will immediately follow the last item on the agenda.

12.0 Next meeting

13.0 Adjournment

Committee Members

_____ Charles Abraham	____ Adrian Guerrero	_____ Mark Pitstick
_____ Reggie Arkell***	____ Luann Hamilton	_____ Tom Rickert
_____ Michael Bolton	____ Robert Hann	_____ Leon Rockingham
_____ Darwin Burkhart	____ Scott Hennings	_____ Steve Schlickman
_____ Bruce Carmitchel	____ Emily Karry	_____ Joe Schofer
_____ Lynnette Ciavarella	____ Jennifer "Sis" Killen**	_____ Kyle Smith
_____ Michael Connelly*	____ Fran Klaas	_____ Chris Snyder
_____ John Donovan***	____ Christina Kupkowski	_____ Steve Strains
_____ John Fortmann	____ Randy Neufeld	_____ Ken Yunker
_____ Yonak Freemark	____ Holly Ostdick	_____ Rocco Zucchero

*Chair **Vice-Chair ***Non-voting

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400
www.cmap.illinois.gov

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) Transportation Committee

Draft Minutes

September 18, 2015

Offices of the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)
Cook County Conference Room
Suite 800, 233 S. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois

Committee Members Present:	Chair Michael Connelly – CTA, Charles Abraham - IDOT DPIT, Reggie Arkell – FTA, Gabrielle Biciunas – NIRPC, Bruce Carmitchel – IDOT OP&P, John Donovan – FHWA, Yonah Freemark – MPC, Luann Hamilton – CDOT, Robert Hann – Private Providers, Terry Heffron – IDOT District One, Emily Karry – Lake County, Patrick Knapp - Kendall County, Scott Hennings – McHenry County, Vice Chair Sis Killen – Cook County, David Kralik – Metra, Christina Kupkowski – Will County, Aimee Lee – Illinois Tollway, Holly Ostdick – CMAP, Mark Pitstick – RTA, Tom Rickert – Kane County, Steve Schlickman – Academic & Research, Kyle Smith - CNT, Chris Snyder – DuPage County.
Absent:	Mike Bolton – Pace , Darwin Burkhart – IEPA, Adrian Guerrero – Class 1 Railroads, Randy Neufeld – Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force, Mayor Leon Rockingham – Council of Mayors, Joe Schofer – Academic & Research, Ken Yunker – SEWRPC
Others Present:	Mike Albin, Donna Anderson, Ryan Anderson, Garland Armstrong, Heather Armstrong, Elaine Bottomley, Edward Bury, Bruce Christensen, Wally Dittrich, Jackie Forbes, Sheena Freve, Bob Ginsburg, Jill Hayes, Jessica Hector-Hsu, Mike Klemens, Jim LaBelle, Beth McCluskey, Kirsten Mellem, Lizveth Mendez, Nady Moini, Bill Morgan, Shira Orlowek, Sophia Parr, Brian Pigeon, Chad Riddle, Adam Rod, Carl Schoedel, David Seglin, Mike Walczak, Tammy Wierciak, Audrey Wennink, Barbara Zubek
Staff Present:	Alex Beata, Bob Dean, Patricia Berry, Claire Bozic, David Clark, Teri Dixon, Kama Dobbs, Jesse Elam, Doug Ferguson, Tom Garritano, Lindsay Hollander, Elizabeth Irvin, Kara Komp, Leroy Kos, Tom Kotarac, Jennifer Maddux, Elizabeth Oo, Ross Patronsky, Russell Pietrowiak, Todd Schmidt, Liz Schuh, Gordon Smith, Joe Szabo, Berenice Vallecillos.

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

Committee Chair Michael Connelly called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

None.

3.0 Approval of Minutes – July 17, 2015

A motion to approve the minutes of the July 17, 2015 meeting, as presented, made by Mr. Carmitchel, seconded by Ms. Hamilton, carried.

4.0 Coordinating Committee Reports

Mr. Connelly reported that the Regional Coordinating Committee and Local Coordinating Committee have not met since the last Transportation Committee meeting. Both coordinating committees are scheduled to meet on October 14, 2015.

5.0 FFY 14-19 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

5.1 FFY 14-19 TIP Amendments and Administrative Modifications

Mr. Kos reported that TIP revisions exceeding financial amendment thresholds have been requested. Administrative modifications, including line items that have been awarded, moved, or deleted, were provided for the committee's information. Ms. Hamilton made a motion, seconded by Mr. Rickert, to approve the FFY 2014-19 TIP Amendments. The motion carried.

5.2 Semi-Annual GO TO 2040/TIP Conformity Analysis and TIP Amendment

Mr. Kos reported that the public comment period for the semi-annual GO TO 2040/TIP conformity analysis and TIP amendment closed on August 17, 2015 and no comments were received. Mr. Rickert made a motion, seconded by Mr. Carmitchel, to recommend approval of the semi-annual GO TO 2040/TIP conformity analysis and TIP amendment to the Regional Coordinating Committee and MPO Policy Committee. The motion carried.

Mr. Kos continued that approximately $260,000 in FFY13 section 5310 funds, due to lapse at the end of this month, were released by the Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission and the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission to fund eligible section 5310 projects in northeast Illinois. The Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT), with the concurrence of RTA, the co-designated recipient for Section 5310 funds in the region, will use the funds to purchase paratransit vehicles to be awarded to eligible private, non-profit agencies and/ or Certified Public Providers through IDOT's Section 5310 competitive application process

5.3 Proposed FFY 2016-2020 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program and proposed FFY 2015 -2017 Transportation Alternative Program (TAP-L)

Mr. Ferguson reported that the public comment period for the proposed CMAQ and TAP-L programs closed on August 17, 2015. At their September 3, 2015 meeting, the CMAQ Project Selection Committee considered comments received and agreed with the staff recommendation to make no changes to the proposed CMAQ program. He reported that one comment was received on the proposed TAP-L program. That comment was from Homer Glen, in support of their project application, which was included in the proposed program. Staff does not recommend changes to the proposed TAP-L program. Mr. Snyder made a motion, seconded by Ms. Hamilton, to recommend approval of the FFY 2016-2020 CMAQ program and the FFY 2015-2017 TAP-L program to the Regional Coordinating Committee and the MPO Policy Committee. The motion carried.

Mr. Carmitchel commended implementers of TAP-L projects and CMAP staff for doing a great job administering the TAP-L program.

Mr. Ferguson also noted that CMAP will be issuing press releases and conducting other outreach activities for the programs following formal approval by the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee on October 14, 2015. He introduced Mr. Garritano and encouraged committee members and implementers to reach out to Mr. Garritano for assistance with and coordination of press activities.

In response to a question from Mr. Snyder, Mr. Ferguson stated that following approval of the programs, they will be forwarded to FHWA for eligibility determination. Mr. Ferguson expects the determination by the end of October.

6.0 The Next Long-Range Plan

6.1 Defining Regionally Significant Projects – Proposed Threshold

Mr. Elam reviewed the need for developing a revised definition of regionally significant projects for the next long range plan and results of research into the definitions used by ten peer MPOs. He then explained proposed thresholds developed by staff based on the peer review, discussion at the committee's July meeting, and subsequent meetings with and comments received from members. Staff also extracted projects from the CMAP TIP database that would meet the thresholds, regardless of funding status; this resulted in a universe of about ten years of projects. Under the proposed thresholds, 117 projects currently in the CMAP TIP database would qualify as regionally significant. He noted that the proposed thresholds could lead to more frequent plan amendments. He also noted that the financial plan may be able to be structured in a way that would allow for projects to be amended into the plan without requiring other projects to be removed. He stated that staff would like to discuss the proposed definition today, and report the results

at the joint CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee meeting on October 14, 2015. Mr. Connelly stated that today's discussion is important for setting the framework of plan development going forward. The definition of regionally significant projects has implications on plan amendments and the ability of the region to demonstrate fiscal constraint in the plan.

Mr. Freemark stated that MPC sent comments to CMAP staff expressing concern that with the definition of the regionally significant network for transit projects could result in minimal improvements to the transit system being considered regionally significant. For example, one signal with transit signal priority (TSP) would be considered regionally significant if the remaining non-TSP project costs are $50 million or more. Those comments suggested that the definition should involve a corridor of a certain length, such as 1 mile. In response to concerns from Mr. Snyder regarding utilizing only cost, and not regional significance, as a threshold, Mr. Elam stated that the requirement that projects be located on a regionally significant network (proposed to be the National Highway System (NHS) for highways and transit service that includes separate rights-of-way or shared rights-of-way where transit has priority over other traffic) was meant to address the issue of regional significance. The NHS system has national significance, and therefore also has regional significance and the eligibility requirements for new starts/small starts/core capacity funding from FTA was used to inform the proposed regionally significant network for transit. Mr. Rickert asked how the total cost of projects would be determined for comparing to the threshold. He said that in Kane County, for example, there are a series of individual projects on the Randall Road corridor that individually would not qualify as regionally significant, but the corridor as a whole would. He added that $50 million seems low. Mr. Elam stated that the threshold was intended to be applied to entire projects, not individual line items within the project. Mr. Rickert stated he is also concerned about the definition of "Principal Arterials." He stated that locally, the County Board may designate a corridor as a Principal Arterial, because that is how it functions locally, but that from a regional perspective, the function is not the same. Mr. Elam stated that the intent was to use the NHS designation, not local classifications. Ms. Killen stated that she is concerned that $50 million is too high a threshold and that projects that have a large economic impact, such as creation of jobs, are regionally significant, even if the cost does not exceed $50 million. Mr. Pitstick stated that regardless of cost, new interchanges and grade separations should be considered regionally significant. Ms. Lee stated that reconfiguring existing interchanges on the tollways can easily exceed $50 million to address a local congestion issue that is not regionally significant.

Ms. Hamilton asked if a low threshold would mean that additional conformity analyses would be needed. Mr. Elam noted that projects in the plan are already conformed. Mr. Kyle Smith stated that at the last meeting, the committee talked about both cost and impact as criteria and stated that regardless of cost, impacts will

always be debated at the time of plan adoption or amendment. Mr. Freemark stated that the estimate of 117 projects seems low, as the TIP only covers the near-term projects.

Ms. Hamilton noted that in past plans, programs of projects were identified, such as the Downtown Transit Plan. She asked if programs, such as implementation of BRT, were included in the plan, would a plan amendment be required every time an individual project was being implemented. Mr. Elam stated that his opinion is that plan amendments would not be needed as long as the individual projects contained within the program were listed in the plan at the time of engineering on those projects. Mr. Connelly noted that this was a concern raised by FTA during the MPO Certification review. Mr. Arkell confirmed that individual projects, such as New Starts, should be listed in the plan.

Mr. Snyder said that the dollar threshold is too low; implementers want to maintain local control of local projects, even if they involve large dollar amounts. Mr. Pitstick noted that at the $250 million non-capacity threshold, projects intended to bring the system into a state of good repair would be excluded, even if achieving a state of good repair is the clear regional focus. Mr. Snyder asked how those projects would be determined in the plan and Mr. Pitstick noted that implementers should know which projects are likely within the plan horizon. Mr. Snyder asked if state of good repair projects should be screened for significance in some other way, rather than using the allocation of regionally significant or major capital project funding. Ms. Hamilton added that the Red/Purple Line Modernization project is a state of good repair project that will also add capacity; she wondered if the project would need to be split, or if the system would need to be gamed in some way. Mr. Snyder stated that the project should be considered as both a state of good repair and capacity project. Mr. Connelly stated that another example is CTA's purchase of 846 new rail cars. 700 of which are replacements and 146 of which are new cars that will add capacity to the system.

Mr. Snyder stated that he thinks only the new capacity cost should be considered for allocation of regionally significant project funds. Mr. Elam stated that in GO TO 2040, the assumption was that maintenance components of projects were taken care of as part of the allocation of resources for maintenance activities. Ms. Hamilton stated that the staff memo stated that total project cost, not just the cost of capacity, would be used to determine if a project met the threshold for regional significance.

Ms. Kupkowski suggested that since the cost thresholds are being debated, perhaps cost should be dropped from the definition, leaving only regional significance. She stated that low cost projects can be regionally significant and high cost projects may not be. She noted there may be a little more work to determine what is 'regionally significant', but that we wouldn't have to worry about missing projects. Mr. Snyder

added that bus on shoulders is an example of a low cost, regionally significant project. Mr. Kyle Smith agreed that the definition should be about project impacts. Mr. Kralik suggested that determining what is regionally significant would be a larger debate than cost and coming to regional consensus would be difficult. He stated that cost is a cleaner way to measure impact that all involved can live with and should be included. Mr. Freemark agreed and stated that the point of the regionally significant definition is to have a debate about the merits of projects and fitting the most important projects into the fiscally constrained plan.

Mr. Carmitchel stated that IDOT favors a higher cost threshold and that defining a dollar amount is a necessary evil for developing a long range plan. He added that having a smaller list is more manageable. In response to questions from Mr. Heffron regarding how the thresholds would affect bringing additional projects into the plan after adoption, Mr. Elam suggested that one approach would be to have budgets for State of Good Repair, capacity, and other project types and that those budgets could have buffers or other measures that would allow projects to be amended into the plan without requiring other projects to be removed. Ms. Lee asked if expressway to expressway interchanges would be considered regionally significant. Mr. Elam stated that they could be part of a corridor improvement or individual projects. CMAP staff will discuss this further with the Tollway.

Mr. Connelly suggested that if a $50 million threshold is too low, perhaps a threshold of $100 million would be appropriate. Projects totaling more than $100 million that are on the regionally significant network and are changing capacity would be included in the plan, but lower cost projects could also be identified based on regional significance or other factors if the sponsor would like. Mr. Rickert stated that $100 million is better and corresponds to the FHWA threshold for projects requiring a financial plan. He added that going beyond NHS facilities for the definition of regional significance does not make sense. Ms. Killen suggested a hybrid approach with exception procedures for projects that meet one threshold but not another.

Mr. Snyder stated that the public has an interest in knowing how the region spends money. He suggested that members could look at the 117 existing projects that staff identified as meeting the cost threshold and could say whether they are or are not regionally significant, based on the scope of the projects. Mr. Elam agreed to provide the list. Ms. Lee stated that cost is appropriate and that the plan is a tool to compel local agencies to work together to implement regional priorities.

Mr. Elam stated that staff was hoping to take comments and feedback from the committee to the joint meeting of the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee for comments and a final definition. Ms. Karry and Mr. Snyder requested that the discussion come back to the Transportation Committee one more time. In response

to a question from Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Elam stated that consensus of the committee is desired and that staff was not encouraging a vote on every individual decision during development of the plan. Mr. Snyder stated that implementers will need time once the criteria have been defined to consider their long term plans and determine what projects may need to be submitted for consideration as regionally significant. Ms. Hamilton stated that the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee depend on the Transportation Committee to vet these types of decisions. Mr. Elam stated that staff will provide a list of current projects meeting the proposed thresholds, receive feedback from the CMAP board and MPO Policy Committee, and bring the conversation back to the Transportation Committee for further discussion in November.

6.2 Socioeconomic Forecast

Mr. Clark reported that CMAP staff is in the process of developing the socioeconomic forecast that will accompany the next long-range plan. He reported that development of forecasts involves two processes: development of regional totals and allocation of the regional totals to local areas. He reviewed the procedures used for GO TO 2040 and reported on the need for greater demographic detail in the next forecast. Also, since the next plan will build on GO TO 2040, the recommendations of GO TO 2040 will be incorporated into the forecast. Mr. Clark also reported that staff conducted a review of forecasting approaches taken by peer MPOs, which confirmed the two-step approach and led to the following conclusions: two contracts will be used, one for the regional forecast, and one for local allocations, due to different levels of expertise needed for each; the regional forecast should take an econometric approach; and that the local allocations should be linked to the scenario planning process and incorporate CMAP data assets such as green infrastructure, land use, employment, and development monitoring data. He stated that the Chicago Region Socioeconomic Forecast RFP was posted on September 4, 2015 and the Local Area Allocation RFP development is in progress and should be released before the end of the calendar year.

Ms. Hamilton suggested that coordination with local governments regarding their land use plans should be in the scope of the local allocations plan. Mr. Freemark asked if it would be possible to consider multiple outcomes, such as less growth in the region leading to less projected revenue. Mr. Clark stated that the scope for the Local Area Allocation is still under development, and that staff would consider the suggestions. He added that alternate scenarios would be developed. In response to a question from Mr. Snyder, Mr. Clark stated that the regional totals would not be adjusted based on scenarios, but that the scenarios will influence the local allocations of the regional totals.

7.0 Local Technical Assistance (LTA) Program

Mr. Dean reported that the staff-recommended LTA program of 22 projects was included in the agenda packet along with project evaluation information, and basic statistics describing the distribution of the proposed program. In response to a question from Mr. Schlickman, Mr. Dean explained that the program includes direct staff assistance, consultant assistance through CMAP, and grants to local agencies. Mr. Heffron made a motion, seconded by Mr. Kralik, to recommend approval of the proposed LTA program of projects to the Local Coordinating Committee and the MPO Policy Committee. The motion carried.

8.0 The Regional Transportation Authority Capital Program Development Process

Ms. Anderson presented an overview of the 2016-2020 Capital Program development process. Mr. Schlickman commended the RTA for developing program marks early in the process without controversy. He then asked why federal funding levels were projected to grow. Ms. Anderson stated that the modest growth is consistent with historic funding and that although funding was flat under MAP-21, various proposals under consideration for a new federal transportation bill differ, and noted that the projections can be adjusted annually. In response to additional questions from Mr. Schlikman, Ms. Anderson stated that CTA bonds are backed by sales tax revenue, but are paid with federal funds. If no federal funds were available, changes to services would be necessary to reflect the redirection of sales tax revenues.

9.0 Urban Transportation Center (Steve Schlickman)

Mr. Schlickman presented an overview of the facilities, staff, and research programs of the Urban Transportation Center (UTC). He noted that although the UTC is continuously seeking funding, they also offer opportunities for partnering with local agencies through intergovernmental agreements to complete research projects and invited committee members to provide input on potential research topics. Ms. Killen stated that Cook County has undertaken projects with the UTC that have been very successful. Mr. Schlickman announced that he will be retiring as executive director of the UTC later this year, and that a search for his replacement has begun.

10.0 Legislative update

10.1 Federal

Mr. Beata gave an update on federal legislative activities. He reported that Congress extended MAP-21 through October 29, 2015. Additionally, the Senate passed its "Developing a Reliable and Innovative Vision for the Economy Act" or the "DRIVE Act." He stated that the Act is a six year bill from 2016-2021 authorizing $360 billion in federal transportation funding but has only identified funding for three years.

Mr. Beata reported that the DRIVE Act is the first federal transportation bill to provide funding specifically for freight projects. It builds out planning provisions to multimodal networks and facilities and contains formula funding for freight from the Highway Trust Fund to be spent on the highway system. In addition to the formula funding, DRIVE also contains two competitive grant funding programs for multimodal freight projects.

10.2 State

Mr. Gordon Smith reported that no progress has been made on the adoption of a state budget. He reported that HB2685, which allows the RTA to sell additional Working Cash Notes, was signed by Governor Rauner. SB2033, which contains IDOT's operating budget, was vetoed by the Governor. Since the IDOT budget includes CMAP's planning funds, CMAP has not received any reimbursements for state fiscal year 2016 activities. Mr. Smith noted that HB4166, a reappropriation of capital projects which were already approved, had a line item veto from the Governor removing $700 million for IDOT to conduct a mileage-based fees study. In response to a question from Mr. Snyder regarding the authorization for the state to distribute local MFT funding, Mr. Smith reported that HB4149 is on the third reading in the House. It is expected that the Governor will veto the bill if it passes the House. Mr. Snyder noted that now is the time of year when bids for road salt are issued, and if MFT is not distributed, some local agencies may not have funding to procure road salt. Mr. Smith noted that based on legislative procedures, it is unlikely that any action could be taken in time for the bids.

11.0 Status of the Local Technical Assistance Program and Major Capital Projects

Mr. Connelly noted that the current status reports on the LTA program and Major Capital Projects were included in the meeting packet.

12.0 Other Business

Mr. Abraham announced that Ms. Beth McCluskey had been appointed as the director of the Division of Public and Intermodal Transportation. Mr. Carmitchel added that IDOT staff welcomes Ms. McCluskey.

13.0 Public Comment

Mr. Garland Armstrong asked about the progress of sidewalks at 159th and Oak Park Avenue in Tinley Park. He also stated that Pace buses on routes 307 and 302 get behind schedule due to freight trains leaving the BNSF Yard in Cicero. He stated that if the buses knew when trains were leaving the yard, they could make the crossing before the trains arrive. He stated that it is good that the Yellow Line will be open in October, because he and his wife like taking the

holiday train. He also stated that the ADA community wants to help and be advocates for passing a state budget.

14.0 Next meeting – November 20, 2015

The next meeting is scheduled for November 20, 2015.

15.0 Adjournment

On a motion by Mr. Hennings, seconded by Mr. Heffron, the meeting adjourned at 11:34 a.m.

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

MAP-21 State / Regional Resources (All figures are in $ millions)

Draft October 2015

		FFY 2016			FFY 2017			FFY 2018			FFY 2019			FFY 2020			Summary FFY 2016 - 2020		
FHWA State Resources[1]	**TIP Code**	Federal	Match	Total	Federal	Match	Total	Federal	Match	Total	Federal	Match	Total	Federal	Match	Total	Federal	Match	Total
National Highway Performance Program	NHPP	761.620	190.405	952.025	761.620	190.405	952.025	761.620	190.405	952.025	761.620	190.405	952.025	761.620	190.405	952.025	3,808.101	952.025	4,760.127
Surface Transportation Program	STP-U	188.605	47.151	235.756	188.605	47.151	235.756	188.605	47.151	235.756	188.605	47.151	235.756	188.605	47.151	235.756	943.025	235.756	1,178.781
Highway Safety Improvement Program	HSIP	73.911	8.219	82.130	73.911	8.219	82.130	73.911	8.219	82.130	73.911	8.219	82.130	73.911	8.219	82.130	369.557	41.095	410.652
Bridge[2]	BRR	33.528	8.382	41.910	33.528	8.382	41.910	33.528	8.382	41.910	33.528	8.382	41.910	33.528	8.382	41.910	167.640	41.910	209.550
Recreational Trails	RECTP	1.532	0.383	1.915	1.532	0.383	1.915	1.532	0.383	1.915	1.532	0.383	1.915	1.532	0.383	1.915	7.658	1.915	9.573
Rail-Highway Grade Crossings	RHGC	10.380	1.154	11.534	10.380	1.154	11.534	10.380	1.154	11.534	10.380	1.154	11.534	10.380	1.154	11.534	51.899	5.771	57.670
Transportation Alternatives Program	TAP-S	18.484	4.621	23.105	18.484	4.621	23.105	18.484	4.621	23.105	18.484	4.621	23.105	18.484	4.621	23.105	92.420	23.105	115.525
Statewide subtotal[3]		1,088.060	272.015	1,360.075	1,088.060	260.315	1,348.375	1,088.060	260.315	1,348.375	1,088.060	260.315	1,348.375	1,088.060	260.315	1,348.375	5,440.300	1,301.577	6,741.877
FHWA (Regional/Urban) Resources[4]																			
STP Local	STP-L	123.797	30.949	154.746	123.797	30.949	154.746	123.797	30.949	154.746	123.797	30.949	154.746	123.797	30.949	154.746	618.985	154.746	773.731
STP Counties	STP-C	5.102	1.276	6.378	5.102	1.276	6.378	5.102	1.276	6.378	5.102	1.276	6.378	5.102	1.276	6.378	25.510	6.378	31.888
CMAQ	CMAQ	105.785	26.446	132.231	105.785	26.446	132.231	105.785	26.446	132.231	105.785	26.446	132.231	105.785	26.446	132.231	528.924	132.231	661.155
TAP Local	TAP-L	8.803	2.201	11.004	8.803	2.201	11.004	8.803	2.201	11.004	8.803	2.201	11.004	8.803	2.201	11.004	44.015	11.004	55.019
Regional Subtotal		243.487	60.872	304.359	243.487	60.872	304.359	243.487	60.872	304.359	243.487	60.872	304.359	243.487	60.872	304.359	1217.434	304.359	1,521.793
Total Available FHWA/State/Local Resources		**1,331.547**	**332.887**	**1,664.434**	**1,331.547**	**321.187**	**1,652.734**	**1,331.547**	**321.187**	**1,652.734**	**1,331.547**	**321.187**	**1,652.734**	**1,331.547**	**321.187**	**1,652.734**	**6,657.734**	**1,605.936**	**8,263.670**
Transit (FTA region-wide)[5,6] (as of 10/1/15)																			
Section 5307/5340	5307/5340	241.364	0.000	241.364	248.605	0.000	248.605	256.063	0.000	256.063	263.745	0.000	263.745	271.657	0.000	271.657	1,281.434	0.000	1,281.434
Section 5337 State of Good Repair	5337	205.541	0.000	205.541	211.707	0.000	211.707	218.052	0.000	218.052	224.600	0.000	224.600	231.338	0.000	231.338	1,091.238	0.000	1,091.238
Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities	5339	13.539	0.000	13.539	13.945	0.000	13.945	14.363	0.000	14.363	14.794	0.000	14.794	15.238	0.000	15.238	71.879	0.000	71.879
Section 5310 Seniors & Individuals with Disabilities	5310	6.472	0.000	6.472	6.472	0.000	6.472	6.472	0.000	6.472	6.472	0.000	6.472	6.472	0.000	6.472	32.360	0.000	32.360
Transit subtotals by FFY		466.916	0.000	466.916	480.729	0.000	480.729	494.950	0.000	494.950	509.611	0.000	509.611	524.705	0.000	524.705	2,476.911	0.000	2,476.911
State/RTA/Local Transit Funds[7]			17.572			17.713			12.875			26.000			26.000			100.160	
Total Available Resources for Transit				**484.488**			**498.442**			**507.825**			**535.611**			**550.705**			**2,577.071**
Total (All Resources)				**2,148.922**			**2,151.176**			**2,160.559**			**2188.345**			**2203.439**			**10,840.741**

TIP Code = fund source designation in the TIP

1. FHWA State Resources are derived from FHWA's Fiscal Management Information System (FMIS) W10A report dated 10/13/15 and IDOT (Office of Planning and Programing). FHWA resources shown in this table are based on amounts from the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2016. FHWA available obligation amounts are only for the first 29 days of FFY 16. The amounts for FFY 2016 and beyond are based on current appropriations representing only 29/366 of a full FFY 2016 appropriation. http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/directives/notices/n4520237/
2. Bridge funds are funds identified for bridges by IDOT for the seven counties in the CMAP region, in IDOT circular 2014-25.
3. Federal resources do not include Metropolitan Planning or State Planning and Research (SPR) funds. These funds are 16.237 and 20.240 in FFY16. SPR funds are deducted from NHPP, STP, HSIP, and CMAQ per MAP-21 http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/apportionment.cfm
4. Regional resources are based on FHWA suballocation of apportionment guidance (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/qandas/qasuballocation.cfm) and IDOT memorandums and circulars pertaining to regional resource allocations for STP-L, TAP-L, BRR, STP-C.
5. Transit resources are provided to CMAP by the RTA and are current as of 09/10/15. Federal transit resources are primarily FTA formula funds and do not include competitive grants such as CMAQ that the service boards are eligible to apply for.
6. FTA grants require a 20% match. To fulfill the match requirement CTA, Metra, Pace, and RTA may provide a cash match, but routinely use Transportation Development Credits in lieu of a cash match. It is anticipated that Transportation Development Credits will continue to be used as a match for the foreseeable future.
7. These funds are comprised of bonds, sales tax, local funds, etc. for use on capital projects, as reported by the

Note: The match ratio used to calculate the match amount is based on the typical match ratio for each fund source and is assumed to be available from the state and local jurisdictions.

Attachment A

Note: FY15 and 16are the selected years of the FY 2014-19 TIP.

Fund Source	Fund Source Title
5307	FTA URBAN FORMULA
5309A	FTA NEW STARTS
5309B	FTA Section 5309 (m) (1) (A) (Rail)
5309C	FTA BUS DISCRETIONARY FUNDS
5309Cor	FTA Core Capacity New Starts
5310	FTA ELDERLY/HANDICAPPED
5337	State of Good Repair
5339	Alternatives Analysis
BRR	HIGHWAY/BRIDGE REPLACEMENT/REHABILITATION PROGRAM
BRR-AC	AC-HIGHWAY/BRIDGE REPLACEMENT/REHABILITATION
CMAQ	CONGESTION MITIGATION/AIR QUALITY
CMAQ-AC	AC-CONGESTION MITIGATION/AIR QUALITY
CTEF	Empowerment Funds
FED-GEN	Multitude of Federal Sponsored Programs
FEDGEN-AC	AC-Multitude of Federal Sponsored Programs
GEN-OP	GENERAL REVENUES
HLS	Homeland Security
HPP	HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS
HPP21	High Priority Projects in TEA-21
HPP21-AC	AC-High Priority Projects in TEA-21
HPP-AC	AC-HIGH PRIORITY PROJECTS
HPPLU	High Priority Project in SAFETEA-LU
HPPLU-AC	AC-High Priority Project in SAFETEA-LU
HSIP	Safety Funds
HSIP-AC	AC-Safety Funds
HSR-HHS	High Speed Rail Hazard Elimination
HSR-HHS-AC	AC-High Speed Rail Hazard Elimination
ICC	ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
ILL	ILLINOIS
ILLT	ILLINOIS FUNDS FOR TRANSIT
JARC	JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE GRANTS
MFT-ALL	ALLOCATED MOTOR FUEL TAXES
MFT-LOC	LOCALLY IMPOSED MOTOR FUEL TAXES
NCP	NATIONAL CORRIDOR INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT
NCP-AC	AC-NATIONAL CORRIDOR INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT
NEWF	NEW FREEDOM
NHPP	National Highway Performance Program
NHPP-AC	AC-National Highway Performance Program

NHS	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM
NHS-AC	AC-NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM
NRS	NATIONAL AND REGIONAL SIGNIFICANT PROJECTS
OTH	OTHER
PLH	Public Lands Highways
PLH-AC	AC-Public Lands Highways
PRV	PRIVATE
RECTP	Recreational Trail Program
RECTP-AC	AC-Recreational Trail Program
RHGC	Rail-Highway Grade Crossings
RHGC-AC	AC-Rail-Highway Grade Crossings
RLRIP	Rail Line Relocation & Imp Program
RLRIP-AC	AC-Rail Line Relocation & Imp Program
RTA	REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
SB	SERVICE BOARD
SEC112	Earmarked Surface Transportation Projects
SEC112-AC	AC-Earmarked Surface Transportation Projects
SEC115	Earmarked Surface Transportation Projects
SEC115-AC	AC-Earmarked Surface Transportation Projects
SEC117	Earmarked Surface Transportation Projects
SEC117-AC	AC-Earmarked Surface Transportation Projects
SEC125	Earmarked Surface Transportation Projects
SEC125-AC	AC-Earmarked Surface Transportation Projects
SEC129	Earmarked Surface Transportation Projects
SEC129-AC	AC-Earmarked Surface Transportation Projects
SR2S	SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL
SR2S-AC	AC-SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL
STP-C	STP - COUNTY PROGRAMMED
STP-C-AC	AC-STP - COUNTY PROGRAMMED
STP-E	STP - ENHANCEMENT FUNDS
STP-E-AC	AC-STP - ENHANCEMENT FUNDS
STP-L	STP - URBAN FUNDS - LOCALLY PROGRAMMED
STP-L-AC	AC-STP - URBAN FUNDS - LOCALLY PROGRAMMED
STP-R	STP - RURAL FUNDS
STP-R-AC	AC-STP - RURAL FUNDS
STP-U	STP - URBAN FUNDS - STATE PROGRAMMED
STP-U-AC	AC-STP - URBAN FUNDS - STATE PROGRAMMED
TAP-L	Transportation Alternatives Program - Local
TAP-LAC	AC-Transportation Alternatives Program - Local
TAP-S	Transportation Alternatives Program - State
TAP-SAC	AC-Transportation Alternatives Program - State
TBD	TO BE DETERMINED
TBD-LOC	TO BE DETERMINED - LOCAL FUNDS
TCSP	TRANSPORTATION & COMMUNITY & SYSTEM PRESERVATION

TCSP-AC	AC-TRANSPORTATION COMMUNITY & SYSTEM PRESERVATION
TIFIA	Transportation Infrastructure Finance Innovation A
Tiger	Transportation Investment Generating Econ Recovery
Tiger-AC	AC-Transportation Investment Generating Econ Recover
TOLL	ILLINOIS STATE TOLL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY
VPC	Value Pricing Congestion
VPC-AC	AC-Value Pricing Congestion

Advance Construction (AC) is a cash flow technique used by IDOT to maximize the use of federal funds. When a project is placed in AC status, the FHWA has authorized the project to move forward with state appropriation (or other non-federal means) with the option to seek reimbursement of federal funds at a later point. These projects must be accurately represented in the TIP, therefore an "-AC" has been added to fund sources that are eligible for advance construction.

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400
www.cmap.illinois.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: **Transportation Committee**

From: CMAP Staff

Date: November 13, 2015

Re: Status of Transportation Alternative Program – Local

As part of active program management for the Transportation Alternatives Program, CMAP staff has been tracking implementation progress on the projects awarded funding. This memo serves as an update on the projects within the program:

- Currently three of the eight projects from the FFY 2013-14 program cycle have been fully authorized and are constructed, under construction, or will begin construction soon, while another project is on schedule to authorize for construction in early 2016.
- One project has been withdrawn.
- Three projects have missed three of the milestones specified in the sponsor guidance, which are based on whether the projects require right of way or not. If a project misses three milestones, it may be considered for removal from the program to allow for obligation of the funding within the timeframe set out during programming.

Missing milestones

Two of the projects missing milestones are the Alsip and Dolton segments of the Cal-Sag Trail. Although phase I engineering was significantly complete when the projects were programmed, further coordination with IDOT's bridge engineer delayed phase I accomplishment. Phase II engineering kicked off in May of 2015 and is currently underway. Despite the delay, the projects do appear to be moving forward and the funds are not in danger of lapse.

The second project is Lake County's Deerfield Road bike path from Milwaukee Avenue to the Des Plaines River. The sponsor has indicated their commitment to completing this project by initiating phase II engineering prior to having a commitment of reimbursement from IDOT, and the funds are not presently in danger of lapsing. However, one parcel of right of way is still being negotiated while the other two parcels are secured.

Withdrawn

In early June of 2015 the Village of Bridgeview notified staff that they would be unable to move forward at this time with the Bridgeview Community Multi-use Path project and withdrew

from the funding program. No TAP funds were expended on the project. The funds from this project were reprogrammed on the Forest Preserve District of Cook County's southern extension of the North Branch Trail project which was handled through the FFY 2015-2017 TAP program development process.

At this time, CMAP observes these remaining projects as making progress towards completion and does not recommend removing any projects from the program. The next project update report will included the 18 recently approved projects that were part of the FFY 2015-2017 cycle. Initiation meetings will be held on December 3, 2015 at IDOT District One offices for the sponsors of these projects.

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400
www.cmap.illinois.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: **Transportation Committee**

From: CMAP staff

Date: November 2015

Re: Proposed projects to include in the next long-range plan

The next long-range regional plan is an opportunity to improve the definition and scope of transportation projects considered in the plan to best incorporate those that have regional impacts. Expanding the types of projects to be included can help ensure that policy makers have ready access to the best information possible to make cooperative, transparent, and prioritized investment decisions. Since this spring, the Transportation Committee (TC), CMAP Board, and MPO Policy Committee have all held discussions on alternative thresholds for projects to include in the next long-range plan. These conversations led to general, but not complete, consensus that a cost threshold should be used to help identify regionally significant projects and that some non-capacity or state of good repair projects should be included in the plan. Staff recommends moving forward with the thresholds proposed in this memo on a trial basis by working with implementers to develop an early list of projects that meet the thresholds and then reporting back to the TC in the spring on the thresholds' appropriateness.

Reconsidering Project Types included in the Long-Range Plan

CMAP currently defines "major capital projects" as capacity additions to the expressway system or comparable changes to the transit system, generally meaning a rail extension. However, this is a limited view of the region's transportation system. Projects that fall below the level of new capacity on expressways and rail lines clearly have important impacts on the region, and cumulatively they may well have a larger effect than the currently defined major capital projects. The narrowness of the definition does not fully capture the contributions and priorities of all of the region's transportation implementers. Likewise, since they are so few, the geographic distribution of major capital projects at the current threshold tends to be "lumpy" and can present a challenge in demonstrating that the entire region benefits from them. Lastly, specific investments are needed to achieve the plan indicators; to show progress on them, a larger set of project types would be helpful.

Furthermore, the CMAP Board's **guidance** resulting from its 2014 visioning session suggests a larger set of projects should be considered in the plan. Also, in its **2014 MPO certification review**, the U.S. DOT recommended that the next plan include some non-capacity

improvements and in general base the threshold for inclusion of projects on their impact rather than their scope. For example, bus rapid transit (BRT) systems may have similar service characteristics and travel benefits to rail transit, while large reconstruction or vehicle purchase projects may have significant impacts even if they do not add capacity.

Proposal for Projects to Include in the Next Long-Range Plan

Given the discussion above, it is proposed that the next regional plan specifically list projects that:

1. Cost at least $100 million and (a) change capacity on the National Highway System (NHS) or that are new expressways or principal arterials, or (b) change capacity on transit services with some separate rights-of-way or shared right-of-way where transit has priority over other traffic; or

2. Cost at least $250 million, regardless of the facility type or work type.

Candidate projects would be compared to the cost thresholds based on current dollars (any conversion to year-of-expenditure cost would be carried out by CMAP when necessary to meet federal rules). The entire project cost, not just the cost of the added capacity, would be used to determine whether the project is regionally significant. Since several smaller projects in a corridor can ultimately amount to a larger project, sponsors would be encouraged to consider the cost and scope of the entire build-out expected in the corridor over the time frame of the regional plan. Note that sponsors may also elect to have a program of similar projects considered if individual projects would not meet the proposed thresholds.

Projects that change capacity are those with **non-exempt TIP work types**, in other words those that are already considered under federal rules to demonstrate air quality conformity. The non-capacity projects that the certification review encouraged the plan to contain would be captured in the second threshold of $250 million.

Conclusion

It is anticipated that these thresholds would be relatively simple to implement, would allow what is expected to be a reasonably sized universe of projects to be considered in the long-range plan, would meet CMAP Board direction in increasing the next plan's specificity with regard to transportation projects, and would address the recommendation in the U.S. DOT's certification review. Most importantly, the proposed thresholds should allow the plan to identify the most critical projects in the region and to focus resources on accomplishing them. While the projects in the TIP database that meet the thresholds provide some check on their reasonableness (see Appendix A), in order to be confident that these thresholds are appropriate for the next plan, staff recommends working with implementers over the next few months to develop an early list of projects that meet the thresholds, then reporting back to the TC in the spring on the thresholds' appropriateness.

Action requested: Discussion

Appendix A. Additional projects in TIP database meeting thresholds for consideration in next long-range plan.

During the GO TO 2040 update process, the following projects were evaluated for inclusion in the plan as fiscally constrained projects:

Project Name	Sponsor	Cost
Elgin O'Hare Western Access	Tollway	$2,150,872,706
Jane Addams Tollway (I-90)	Tollway	$1,265,000,000
IL 53/120 Tollway	Tollway	$2,141,638,188
I-294/I-57 Interchange	Tollway	$350,000,000
Elgin O'Hare Expressway Far West Extension	Tollway	$235,000,000
Elgin O'Hare Expressway West Extension	Tollway	$201,000,000
I-294 Central Tri-State Mobility Improvements	Tollway	$1,040,000,000
I-55 Stevenson Express Toll Lanes	IDOT	$400,000,000
I-290 Eisenhower Express Toll Lanes	IDOT	$1,600,000,000
Illiana Expressway	IDOT	$1,000,000,000
I-190 Access and Capacity Improvements	IDOT	$375,000,000
Circle Interchange	IDOT	$410,000,000
I-55 Add Lanes and Reconstr: I-80 to Coal City Rd.	IDOT	$839,000,000
I-57 Add Lanes	IDOT	$895,000,000
I-80 Add / Mgd Lanes - Ridge Road to US 30	IDOT	$750,000,000
I-80 Managed Lanes - US 30 to I-294	IDOT	$450,000,000
I-80 to I-55 Connector	IDOT	$100,000,000
IL 394	IDOT	$604,000,000
Red Line South Extension	CTA	$1,700,000,000
North Red/Purple Modernization	CTA	$4,200,000,000
Blue Line West Extension	CTA	$2,573,000,000
Brown Line Extension	CTA	$4,139,000,000
Circle Line South (Phase II)	CTA	$1,000,000,000
Circle Line North (Phase III)	CTA	$2,237,000,000
Orange Line Extension	CTA	$498,000,000
Yellow Line Enhancements and Extension	CTA	$294,000,000
Express Airport Train Service	CTA	$1,800,000,000
UP Northwest Extension	Metra	$584,000,000
SouthWest Service Improvements	Metra	$1,025,000,000
UP North Improvements	Metra	$447,000,000
UP West Improvements	Metra	$524,000,000
Rock Island Improvements*	Metra	$53,000,000
BNSF Extension	Metra	$840,000,000
BNSF Improvements	Metra	$447,000,000
Heritage Corridor Improvements	Metra	$199,000,000
Metra Electric Improvements	Metra	$447,000,000

Project Name	Sponsor	Cost
Metra Electric Extension	Metra	$291,000,000
Milwaukee District North Extension	Metra	$644,000,000
Milwaukee District North Improvements	Metra	$130,000,000
Milwaukee District West Extension	Metra	$422,000,000
Milwaukee District West Improvements	Metra	$447,000,000
North Central Service Improvements	Metra	$332,000,000
Rock Island Extension	Metra	$317,000,000
SouthEast Service	Metra	$830,000,000
SouthWest Extension	Metra	$328,000,000
STAR Line	Metra	$3,000,000,000
West Loop Transportation Center: Phase 1	CDOT	$837,000,000
Central Area Transitway	CDOT	$364,000,000
Mid-City Transitway	CDOT	$1,600,000,000
West Loop Transportation Center: Phase 2	CDOT	$2,094,000,000

In addition to these 50 projects, another seven projects were determined either not to be major capital projects according to the definition in use at that time, or further information suggested that the project was infeasible given other commitments or circumstances. These projects are discussed in the **GO TO 2040 update appendix on major capital projects**.

Beyond these projects already considered in the regional plan, the following table includes additional projects in the TIP, including illustrative projects, as of summer 2015 that meet the proposed thresholds for the next plan. Note also that one project (Metra Rock Island Improvements) currently considered a major capital project would not meet the proposed thresholds.

#	TIP ID	Agency	Project / Location	All Work Types	Total with Illustrative
1	17-94-0008	Pace	Pace - Purchase/Replace Fixed Rte Buses	Replace Buses/Trains	$274,856,000
2	18-08-1700	Metra	PURCHASE BI-LEVEL COMMUTER CARS	Replace Buses/Trains	$586,501,000
3	18-10-0034	Metra	Work on Transit Communication; Work on Transit Signals	Work on Transit Communication; Work on Transit Signals	$370,961,000
4	11-03-0018	McHenry County	CH V29 RANDALL RD FROM CH A46 ACKMAN RD TO COUNTY LINE RD	Add Lanes to Road; Improve Intersection	$119,829,000
5	09-96-0017	Kane County	LONGMEADOW PKWY BRIDGE CORRIDOR FROM HUNTLEY RD IL 62	Build New Bridge; Build New Road	$141,088,000

#	TIP ID	Agency	Project / Location	All Work Types	Total with Illustrative
6	09-96-0018	Kane County	STEARNS ROAD BRIDGE CORRIDOR FROM RANDALL RD TO EAST OF DUNHAM RD	Build New Bridge; Build New Road	$135,391,000
7	12-00-0035	Will County	CATON-BRUCE CORRIDOR FROM US 30 (WEST OF) TO IL 7 159th Street	Add Lanes to Road; Build New Bridge; Improve Overall Road Corridor	$547,500,000
8	01-05-0012	IDOT	CREATE EAST-WEST CORRIDOR FROM ARGO INTERLOCKING TO CP509	Improve Rail Line;	$372,359,000
9	01-05-0011	IDOT	CREATE WESTERN AVENUE CORRIDOR FROM KEDZIE INTERLOCKING TO THORNTON JUNCTION	Improve Rail Line;	$253,988,000
10	04-05-0002	IDOT	CREATE BELTWAY CORRIDOR FROM KEDZIE INTERLOCKING TO THORNTON JUNCTION	Improve Rail Line	$156,237,000
11	06-94-0001	IDOT	CENTRAL AVE FROM 63RD ST TO 87TH ST	Add Lanes to Road; Build New Bridge; Improve Overall Road Corridor	$195,160,000
12	12-07-0005	IDOT	WEBER ROAD FROM 119TH ST (RODEO RD) TO 135TH ST (ROMEO RD)	Add Bi-directional Turn Lane; Add Lanes to Road; Reconstruct Interchange; Reconstruct Road; Resurface and Widen Road; Work on Curb and Gutters;	$166,060,000
13	10-07-0001	IDOT	IL 60 IL 83 FROM IL 176 TO IL 60 IL 83 TOWNLINE ROAD	Add Lanes to Road; Reconstruct Intersection; Work on Curb and Gutters	$152,448,000

#	TIP ID	Agency	Project / Location	All Work Types	Total with Illustrative
14	10-09-0147	IDOT	IL 83 MILWAUKEE AVE FROM PETITE LAKE RD IL 120 ILL 120	Add Lanes to Road	$141,277,000
15	11-06-0018	IDOT	IL 47 FROM CHARLES RD US 14	Add Lanes to Road; Improve Intersection; Replace Bridge	$138,750,000
16	11-00-0001	IDOT	IL 31 FRONT ST FROM IL 120 ELM ST IL 176	Add Lanes to Road; Improve Intersection	$134,462,000
17	10-09-0024	IDOT	IL 131 GREEN BAY ROAD FROM RUSSELL ROAD TO SUNSET AVENUE	Add Bi-directional Turn Lane; Add Lanes to Road; Add Traffic Signals to Several Intersections; Resurface and Widen Road; Resurface Road;	$134,369,000
18	11-07-0014	IDOT	IL 47 EASTWOOD DRIVE FROM US 14 NORTHWEST HWY TO REED ROAD	Add Lanes to Road; Reconstruct and Widen Road; Reconstruct Intersection; Replace Bridge	$128,364,000
19	05-06-0016	IDOT	IL 43 HARLEM AVE FROM BNSF RR	Railroad Grade Separation	$117,500,000
20	10-02-0013	IDOT	US 45 MILWAUKEE AVE FROM IL 60 TOWNLINE RD IL 22	Add Lanes to Road	$116,590,000
21	11-00-0201	IDOT	IL 31 ALGONQUIN BYPASS FROM NORTH OF RAKOW RD TO HUNTINGTON AVE / IL RT 31	Add Lanes to Road; Build New Bridge; Build New Interchange; Build New Road;	$112,972,000
22	16-15-0005	CTA	CTA -132.056 Purchase Rail Cars - 7000's (Base Order 400 Cars)	Replace Buses/Trains	$880,000,000
23	16-98-0015	CTA	CTA - 181.500 INFRASTRUCTURE SAFETY & RENEWAL	Maintain Rail Line	$834,771,000
24	16-96-0061	CTA	CTA 031.054 REPLACE BUSES	Replace Buses/Trains	$490,737,000

#	TIP ID	Agency	Project / Location	All Work Types	Total with Illustrative
25	16-02-0004	CTA	CTA - 141.273 RECONSTRUCT RAIL STATIONS	Maintain Rail Line	$489,214,000
26	16-14-0007	CTA	CTA – Your New Blue - Blue Line O'Hare Branch between the Grand and O'Hare stations Project 12.5-mile stretch AT	Improve Disability Access to Facility; Improve Rail Line; Modernize Rail Station; Upgrade Traffic Signals	$408,714,000
27	16-99-0002	CTA	CTA - 073.500 Improve Facilities	Maintain Multi-Modal Center	$367,650,000
28	16-00-0006	CTA	CTA - 022.903 RAIL CAR OVERHAUL & MIDLIFE	Rehabilitate Buses/Trains	$273,722,000
29	16-00-0030	CTA	CTA - 121.500 REPL/UPGRADE DISTRIB&SIGNAL	Work on Transit Power	$253,988,000
30	01-00-0059	CDOT	WACKER DR (NORTH/SOUTH) FROM RANDOLPH ST TO CONGRESS PKWY	Improve Pedestrian Facility; Reconfigure Bridge	$436,706,000

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400
www.cmap.illinois.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: **CMAP Transportation Committee**

From: CMAP staff

Date: November 2015

Re: Scope of snapshot report on transportation network and trends

---

As during development of GO TO 2040, CMAP will be preparing "snapshot reports" on a number of topics for the next long-range plan. These reports are meant to be succinct, data-driven analyses of existing conditions and trend assessments on specific topics of importance to the region. They should assess progress on existing GO TO 2040 indicators as well as lay the groundwork for new technical approaches or indicators for the next plan. For the transportation network and trends snapshot, the focus would be on (1) documenting travel behavior trends, (2) summarizing system characteristics and performance, and (3) summarizing historical spending trends. Although each of these topics could be explored in great detail, it is expected that the final document produced will be a fairly high-level picture of conditions on the system.

Staff is seeking feedback on the content of the snapshot report. This snapshot is due in final form in June 2016. A draft pre-design snapshot should be shared with the Transportation Committee and discussed at its April 2016 meeting. Freight trends will be handled in a separate snapshot report, also due next summer. That report is being discussed in the Freight Committee.

Travel behavior trends

One of the most important elements of the snapshot is to give an overview of the travel trends in the region and their implications for planning. The key task is to tell a clear story of how travel patterns are (or are not) changing in the region. It is expected that topics will include an exploration of trends in mode share, vehicle miles traveled, travel time/distance trends by trip purpose, as well as in car ownership and in drivers licensure, among others. It will also include an exploration of trends in shared use mobility to the extent that enough information is available.

System characteristics and performance

Using the basic categories of mobility, safety, infrastructure condition, reliability, and accessibility, this section will present a high-level overview of conditions on the transportation

system. Current conditions will be presented in map form as much as possible while trend information will be presented in a more aggregate form. For highways, the focus would primarily be on the National Highway System, but for mobility and reliability trends, reporting will probably have to be restricted to the expressway system because of data availability. The report will pay particular attention to trends in the GO TO 2040 indicators. While less information is currently available for the transit network, such as disaggregate travel time reliability and asset condition data, it is hoped that the report can paint as complete a picture as possible. In coming weeks, CMAP intends to make requests to the RTA and service boards for additional data as needed.

Historical spending trends

It is critical to understand how the region has been investing its transportation funds to help inform plan recommendations. This section will try to document spending trends over the past decade or so, subject to data limitations, with the primary source of data being the obligation/award estimates from CMAP's obligation reports. The primary focus of this section would be on the uses of funds rather than the sources or amounts of funding. It is expected that the major categories will be highway, transit, bicycle, and other (as in the obligation reports) with minor categories within each.

Action requested: Discussion

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400
www.cmap.illinois.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: CMAP Transportation Committee

From: CMAP staff

Date: November 20, 2015

Re: Next Long Range Plan: Transportation System Funding Concepts

---

As part of the development of the next regional plan, CMAP staff is currently putting together a series of strategy papers – reviewing current policies, emerging issues, and potential future directions – on various issues. One of these strategy papers will explore transportation system funding concepts, building upon the policy foundation of GO TO 2040 to research ways to ensure that the region's transportation system is adequately funded.

Financial planning in GO TO 2040

The financial plan illustrates the region's ability to afford the maintenance, operation, enhancement, and expansion of the region's transportation system over the planning horizon. Its revenue sources are largely based on projections of existing sources, along with a relatively small set of reasonably expected revenues that align with CMAP policy positions. The financial plan's expenditures are based largely on projections of existing maintenance and operations practices, along with prioritizing the remaining funds between specific major capital projects and an undefined group of state of good repair/enhancement work.

Transportation funding analysis since GO TO 2040

Where feasible, analyses will build on CMAP's existing body of work in this area. When applicable, staff will also review established GO TO 2040 policy and relevant staff work since the adoption of GO TO 2040. That discussion is summarized below for alternatives to the motor fuel tax (MFT), congestion pricing, public-private partnerships, and value capture.

Alternatives to the state MFT

To provide adequate revenue in the long term, the state MFT needs to be replaced. Vehicles have become increasingly fuel-efficient, and further improvements in fuel economy are expected well into the future. In recent years, fuel consumption has been declining more

steadily and faster than total vehicle travel. Even a substantial rate increase for the state MFT would be insufficient to keep revenues growing with the cost of construction.

GO TO 2040 recommends that the state MFT be increased by 8 cents and indexed to an inflationary measure in the short term. In the long term, it recommends the implementation of a replacement to the state MFT, and further specifies that this replacement account for growth in construction costs, as well as overall growth in the transportation system, over time.

CMAP published a research brief in May 2015 that evaluated three alternatives to the state MFT - a mileage-based user fee, a motor fuel sales tax, and a vehicle registration fee - against several criteria, including revenue-based criteria, economic factors, and feasibility. The evaluation does not make any recommendations, but found that the mileage-based user fee does relatively well against most criteria examined because it would provide sufficient, stable, and growing revenue. However, implementation remains a significant hurdle for this revenue source due to the substantial investments in technology it would require, as well as privacy concerns it may raise. On the other hand, a motor fuel sales tax would not be difficult to implement, but is relatively volatile and only provides fair growth because it is still based on motor fuel consumption. Motor vehicle registration fees would not be sufficient to replace the MFT but could be used to supplement another replacement. CMAP staff has been sharing this research with its stakeholders over the past several months.

Congestion pricing

Congestion pricing is a major policy emphasis in GO TO 2040, and the Financial Plan for Transportation includes revenues from the implementation of congestion pricing on a portion of the region's existing expressway network. Note that any congestion pricing associated with new major capital projects in GO TO 2040 is not included in that revenue estimate; rather, congestion pricing is assumed to reduce the public share of the costs of those projects within the financial plan. In addition, the plan's implementation action areas call for all new expressway capacity to be congestion priced, for the eventual congestion pricing of all existing expressway capacity, and for the excess revenues raised from pricing to be invested into transit and local road improvements in priced corridors.

Since the adoption of GO TO 2040, CMAP has advocated strongly for congestion pricing. These efforts have included quantitative modeling, an outreach campaign, including both media and stakeholder engagement, and additional policy research. There are no active congestion-pricing projects in the region, although pricing has been considered for some major capital projects currently under development.

Public-private partnerships

GO TO 2040 is supportive of what it terms "appropriate" public-private partnerships (PPPs). It acknowledges their potential benefits, but notes the complexity of PPP arrangements and stresses that they must be handled on a case-by-case basis and with a high degree of transparency and care. The original emphasis within the plan's implementation action areas had been securing broad enabling legislation for PPPs at the state level, an item that was

implemented in 2011 with the passage of the Public-Private Partnerships for Transportation Act. The remaining items call for the careful review of PPP proposals and the consideration of PPPs as part of the project development process.

The Financial Plan for Transportation recognizes that PPPs could result in cost efficiencies on a project-by-project basis, reducing the public share of the costs for those projects. To the extent that utilizing a PPP reduces the cost of a major capital project, it reduces the cost that must be fiscally constrained in the financial plan. CMAP staff worked with implementers to incorporate these estimates into the major capital project costs.

CMAP has continued to provide policy research and analysis on public-private partnerships since the adoption of GO TO 2040. Much of this effort occurred over 2011-2012, when staff published a four-part series of Policy Updates exploring the issues in more detail. CMAP supported the state Public-Private Partnerships for Transportation Act, providing broad enabling legislation for IDOT and the Illinois Tollway to enter into various types of public-private agreements.

Value capture

GO TO 2040 encourages the exploration of value capture to fund new or expanded transportation infrastructure. Value capture assumes that nearby property owners will benefit from the construction of a new or improved transportation facility through increased rents, sales, and land values, and seeks to harness some portion of these benefits to pay for the cost of the facility. In Illinois, value capture mechanisms can include tax increment finance (TIF) districts, special assessment (SA) districts, impact fees, and special local taxes such as sales or hotel taxes.

GO TO 2040 assumes that value capture will be used to partially fund two major capital projects: the IL 53/120 extension and the Red/Purple Line Modernization project. CMAP staff has been involved in analysis regarding the use of value capture on both of these projects. Recently, the IL 53/120 Finance Committee has discussed the possibility of a fund that would capture 25 percent of the increased revenue due to growth in non-residential property value within a 1-mile radius of the corridor and a 2-mile radius of the interchanges of the project. Regarding the Red/Purple Line Modernization project, Senate Bill 277, which passed the Senate in May 2015 and is awaiting consideration in the House, would allow for value capture to be used for transit facility improvements within the City of Chicago.

Research questions

CMAP staff will explore strategies related to transportation system funding by considering different concepts for funding the next comprehensive regional plan. The next plan could rely on a different set of revenues than the GO TO 2040 financial plan and it could also provide different policy guidance for transportation funding topics. The transportation system funding concepts strategy paper is an opportunity to revisit past work, analyze trends, and think through these questions. To better understand these concepts, CMAP staff is currently researching the following topics:

- Alternatives to the state motor fuel tax (MFT)
- Congestion pricing and express toll lanes
- Expenditure efficiencies
- Non-user fee revenues
- Public-private partnerships
- Variable transit fare pricing
- Value capture

Staff's research into these topics is primarily literature review. CMAP will research several revenue sources, including an investigation of the recent trend toward non-user fee revenue such as those that have recently been used to fund state capital programs. In addition, expenditure efficiencies will be explored, such as methods for improved construction processes and innovative procurement policies.

Outreach and timeline

Feedback on this project will be sought from CMAP's Transportation Committee (TC), as well as other stakeholders. However, TC's agenda over the course of the fiscal year may not allow sufficient time for detailed discussions. In that case, CMAP staff may convene other meetings of interested parties from TC, as well as other stakeholders, to discuss issues in more detail. These meetings would likely occur in early winter, and may be coordinated with other outreach efforts as part of the larger plan development process. Staff anticipates this will include a forum on January 22, 2016 to discuss expenditure efficiencies, potentially to be followed up with additional outreach to stakeholders in February 2016.

Staff intends to begin this analysis with a literature review, followed by an iterative review of research products with TC over the winter. A draft report will be developed in the spring.

Discussion questions

Staff is interested in feedback on this project. Specific discussion questions include the following:

- Do you believe that any significant funding concepts are missing from the list provided in this memo? Should any of the proposed concepts be removed from the list?
- What is your overall reaction to the funding concepts listed in this project? Do some concepts require more information? For example:
    - What alternatives to the MFT might be prioritized?
    - What further congestion pricing work would be desired?
    - What elements should be included in PPP policy guidance?

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

Meeting Notes
Planning Information Forum: Setting Pavement Condition Targets -- September 18, 2015

Attendees (non-CMAP)

Name	Organization
Bruce Carmitchel	Illinois Department of Transportation
John Sadler	Chicago Department of Transportation
Emily Karry	Lake County Division of Transportation
Jill Hayes	Cook County Department of Transportation and Highways
Kevin Kerrigan	Lake County Division of Transportation
Tom Rickert	Kane County Division of Transportation
Bill Vavrik	Applied Research Associates, Inc. (Illinois Tollway)
Tammy Wierciak	West Central Municipal Conference
John Donovan	Federal Highway Administration
Mike Drake	Chicago Department of Transportation
Bill Morgan	Illinois Department of Transportation
Patrick Knapp	Kane County Council of Mayors
Jackie Forbes	Kane County Council of Mayors
Wally Dittrich	McHenry County Division of Transportation
Jim Werner	McHenry County Division of Transportation
Scott Hennings	McHenry County Division of Transportation
Mike Albin	DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference
Carl Schoedel	Kane County Division of Transportation
Christina Kupkowski	Will County Division of Transportation
Bridget Malinowski	AECOM (Illinois Tollway)
Chris Snyder	DuPage County Division of Transportation

Summary of presentations

- **Kane County Division of Transportation** (Tom Rickert). Like most of the counties in the CMAP area, Kane County now has a pavement management program, which it implemented starting in 2010. It uses a vendor to collect data to calculate Condition Rating System (CRS), International Roughness Index (IRI), as well as another measure, and then forecasts deterioration based on age. Condition and age are used to identify the most appropriate pavement preservation strategies. Kane County has seen a 15 – 20 percent cost savings from its pavement preservation program.

- **IDOT Office of Planning and Programming** (Bill Morgan). IDOT's main pavement measure is CRS. IDOT collects and rates up to 15,000 centerline miles of data on pavement condition each year and all of the National Highway System (NHS) has now

been rated. Under the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) proposed pavement condition rule, IDOT will need to report on and meet targets for IRI, rutting, faulting, and cracking on the National Highway System, about three-quarters of which is under IDOT jurisdiction. IDOT expects to continue to develop and use CRS values but will collect other required measures under MAP-21. Less of the interstate system is in good or excellent condition using IRI criteria in comparison to CRS while more is considered to be in fair condition. IDOT indicated that its 2015 pavement data collection program would capture some of the local system, including local arterials, and that the Illinois Roadway Information System would begin to include pavement thickness information.

- **Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning** (Jesse Elam). For the GO TO 2040 financial plan, CMAP used typical capital maintenance intervals to forecast resurfacing and reconstruction costs. This approach could be improved by being based on pavement condition and being tied to achieving pavement condition targets. CMAP has set up the Highway Economic Requirements System – State Version (HERS-ST) model to forecast pavement investment needs for the next long-range plan and to estimate the degree to which projects programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) help achieve plan targets. The presentation showed initial results for these two analyses. First, achieving the GO TO 2040 plan target – to have 90 percent of centerline miles on the NHS in acceptable condition (IRI ≤ 170) -- would require a 15 percent higher expenditure than to keep condition constant. Second, the analysis of the projects in the TIP suggested pavement condition would decline rather than helping achieve the targets.

Discussion

- There was considerable discussion on the value of IRI as a measure. In FHWA's proposed pavement condition rule, the IRI value defining acceptable conditions in urban areas was changed from 170 to 220 to accommodate the fact that urban areas typically have lower speeds (making IRI less relevant as a measure) and more underground utilities (causing roughness). One of the forum participants said that MPO and DOT comments on the proposed rule have repeatedly noted the limited usefulness of IRI as a performance measure. A participant noted that some pavement preservation techniques actually reduce ride quality even though they extend the life of the pavement.

- MAP-21 calls for MPOs to show "to the maximum extent practicable" how their TIPs would help meet performance targets. CMAP staff proposed to do this by forecasting pavement condition at the end of the period covered by the TIP based on the projects included in the TIP. However, several participants indicated that they do not include their resurfacing projects in the TIP since they are funded only by motor fuel tax or other non-federal sources.

- Since many jurisdictions are moving toward pavement preservation, participants noted that it is problematic to use a model that only deals with resurfacing and reconstruction, as HERS-ST does. A need to include widening and reconstruction projects in the analysis was also voiced.

- One participant wondered how the CMAP targets were set and whether they could be reconsidered for the upcoming plan, which staff indicated were based on IDOT's statewide goal of 90 percent acceptable pavement condition.

- A county representative urged IDOT to coordinate with local governments on pavement data collection to ensure that efforts are not being duplicated.

- Several participants mentioned that they collect data to generate a Pavement Condition Index. IRI is a factor used in calculating the Pavement Condition Index.

Considerations for next long-range plan

Based on the discussion at the forum, staff suggests that the Transportation Committee (TC) consider the following:

- While CMAP will need to set targets for whatever metric is ultimately chosen by FHWA to measure pavement condition, there is no restriction on using supplemental measures. For example, one area of need is a measure that captures pavement structural health, such as remaining service life. Once the national metrics are finalized, staff can make a recommendation to TC on any appropriate supplemental measures.

- It will not be possible to estimate whether adequate investment is being made in pavements on the NHS if some projects are missing from the TIP. All improvements, including resurfacing, reconstruction, and pavement rehabilitation projects on the NHS should be included in the TIP regardless of their fund source.

- Staff will review the HERS-ST model to determine if pavement preservation techniques and widening and resurfacing projects can be modeled indirectly.

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400
www.cmap.illinois.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: **CMAP Transportation Committee**

From: CMAP staff

Date: November 2015

Re: Update on committee engagement for plan development in FY 16

This memo updates a previous schedule of Transportation Committee (TC) discussions on major issues in plan development in fiscal year 2016. Please note that this schedule will evolve over time. Again, the focus is on preparatory steps in plan development to be discussed at the following TC meetings:

- November 2015
  - Recommendation on definition of regionally significant projects
  - Scope for system funding concepts strategy paper
  - Scope for transportation network and trends snapshot report
  - Report back on post-TC forum on pavement condition
- January 2016
  - Strategy paper updates
  - Pre-TC forum on cost-efficiencies in project delivery
- March 2016
  - Update on ridership growth study (see **FY 16 CMAP work plan**, p. 36 for description)
  - Pre-TC forum on transit asset condition
- April 2016
  - Draft snapshot report on transportation trends
  - Pre-TC forum with presentations from other MPOs on financial planning
- May 2016
  - Strategy paper update
  - Update on universe of regionally significant projects
  - Pre-TC forum on highway bridge condition (provisional)

Action requested: Information

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400
www.cmap.illinois.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: CMAP Board and Committees

From: CMAP Staff

Date: November 4, 2015

Re: Local Technical Assistance Program Update

The CMAP Board and committees receive regular updates on the projects being undertaken through the Local Technical Assistance (LTA) program, including those receiving staff assistance and grants. To date, 169 local projects have been initiated. Of these, 116 projects have been completed, 48 are fully underway, and 5 will get actively underway in the near future.

Further detail on LTA project status can be found in the attached project status table. Projects that appear in this document for the first time, or that were recently completed, are noted and highlighted in italics.

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

Projects Currently Underway

Project	CMAP lead	Timeline	Assistance type	Status and notes
Algonquin-Carpentersville Fox River corridor plan (see website)	Brian Daly	May 2014-Jan. 2016	Staff assistance	Village staff and the steering committee have reviewed the draft corridor plan. Each village will be hosting a public open house to present the plan in November.
Arlington Heights bicycle-pedestrian plan (see website)	John O'Neal	May 2014-Jan. 2016	Staff assistance	Work on draft plan continues, including review and incorporation of Arlington Heights Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee ideas for potential infrastructure improvements.
Aurora downtown plan (see website)	Lindsay Bayley	May 2015-July 2016	Staff assistance	Steering Committee meeting held on October 30. Stakeholder interviews and existing conditions analysis underway.
Barrington area bikeway feasibility study	*John O'Neal*	*June 2014-Oct. 2015*	*Consultant assistance*	*Newly completed. CMAP and local partners are investigating potential for implementation.*
Bensenville zoning update	Jake Seid	Oct. 2015-Dec. 2016	Staff assistance	The internal kick-off meeting took place in early October where we discussed major zoning issues and initial steps for public outreach. A kick-off meeting with the Steering Committee is scheduled for early December.
Berwyn parking study (see website)	Lindsay Bayley	Nov. 2013-Dec. 2015	Staff assistance	Revised draft plan sent to Steering Committee in mid-October, accepting comments through the end of October. Formatting of plan underway.
Berwyn zoning revisions (see website)	Kristin Ihnchak	Jan. 2013-Feb. 2016	Staff and consultant assistance	No update.
Blue Island capital improvement plan (see website)	Evy Zwiebach	Apr.-Dec. 2015	Staff assistance	Staff has drafted a report outline, as well as several chapters, based on initial scoring results. Scoring results and draft materials will be discussed at the steering committee meeting in November.
Brookfield comprehensive plan	Nora Beck	Dec. 2015-Dec. 2016	Consultant assistance	RFP responses are currently being reviewed by Village and CMAP staff.
Calumet Park planning priorities report	Sam Shenbaga	May 2015-Feb. 2016	Staff assistance	Plan being drafted.
Campton Hills zoning and subdivision regulations	Kristin Ihnchak	Jul. 2014-Jan. 2016	Consultant assistance	A meeting with Village staff to discuss the recommendations memo took place on October 5. CMAP staff reviewed feedback on the memo with the consultant.
Carol Stream comprehensive plan (see website)	Trevor Dick	Feb. 2014-Jan. 2016	Staff assistance	Changes are being made to the Draft based upon Village Department Head review of the draft plan. A steering committee meeting will be scheduled for November for review prior to a public open house.

Project	CMAP lead	Timeline	Assistance type	Status and notes
Chicago Albany Park neighborhood plan	Brian Daly	Nov. 2015-Mar. 2017	Staff assistance	CMAP has completed the scope for the project and is planning internal kickoff meetings.
Chicago Pilsen-Little Village neighborhood plan (see website)	Evy Zwiebach	Dec. 2013-June 2016	Staff assistance	No update.
Chicago Pullman National Historic Park transportation plan	Lindsay Bayley	June 2015-Sept. 2016	Consultant assistance	The second TAC/CAC meeting is scheduled for November 9 and will include a "walkshop" tour of North Pullman. Existing conditions research continues.
Chicago West Pullman neighborhood plan (see website)	Evy Zwiebach	Oct. 2014-Dec. 2015	Consultant assistance	The consultant team is finalizing the plan and marketing sheets to assist with implementation. The plan is expected to go to Plan Commission by the end of the calendar year.
Cicero comprehensive plan (see website)	Jonathan Burch	Apr. 2014-Dec. 2015	Consultant assistance	A public meeting on the draft plan was held on October 28 to finalize implementation priorities. The consultant will finalize the plan shortly after and proceed to adoption.
Crete comprehensive plan	Sam Shenbaga	May 2014-Jan. 2016	Consultant assistance	Draft Plan submitted to Village staff and CMAP for review late October. Steering Committee meeting scheduled for November 2.
Crystal Lake transportation plan (see website)	Nora Beck	Mar. 2014-Jan. 2016	Staff assistance	Steering committee confirmed direction outlined in a recommendations memo. CMAP staff currently drafting plan.
DuPage County / Hanover Park Homes for a Changing Region (see website)	Kendra Smith	Nov. 2014-Jan. 2016	Consultant assistance	Project team is planning community workshops for mid November/early December to complement the recently completed project community outreach website designed by Teska Associates.
DuPage County Elgin-O'Hare Corridor Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (see website)	John O'Neal	May 2015-Sept. 2016	Consultant assistance	As part of initial public outreach, project website was created. Website includes online survey and interactive map, through which the project team can receive public input. Project logo also created. Flyer and press release for upcoming public open house, scheduled for November 10. Existing Conditions Report currently in development.
Elmwood Park zoning assessment	Patrick Day	Nov. 2014-Dec. 2015	Staff assistance	Drafting of assessment memo is currently underway.
Endeleo Institute planning priorities report (see website)	Kendra Smith	Feb.-Dec. 2015	Staff assistance	Draft planning priorities report is underway. CMAP staff will report initial findings in early November at Endeleo's Annual Meeting. Planning underway for early December community open house.
Franklin Park comprehensive plan (see	John Carlisle	Apr. 2015-June 2016	Staff assistance	Drafting of the existing conditions report is in progress.

Project	CMAP lead	Timeline	Assistance type	Status and notes
website)				
Governors State University green infrastructure plan	Holly Hudson	June 2015-May 2016	Consultant assistance	At the October 23 steering committee meeting, the consultant presented an overview of their existing conditions analyses and potential opportunities regarding the stormwater management and natural areas restoration and management components of the plan. A vegetation survey and habitat assessment report was submitted. The consultant also requested additional data and information from committee members by mid-November.
Harvard comprehensive plan (see website)	Nora Beck	May 2014-Nov. 2015	Staff assistance	On October 29, over 40 residents attended a public Open House to review the draft comprehensive plan. Comments received will be considered by the steering committee, with an updated version expected to go to the Harvard Planning and Zoning Commission in January 2016.
Huntley zoning update	Patrick Day	May 2015-Apr. 2016	Consultant assistance	A Community Workshop was held October 26. Drafting of preliminary recommendations memo is underway.
Joliet Chicago Street plan	Stephen Ostrander	TBD	Consultant assistance	CMAP staff completed draft scope for project and forwarded to City of Joliet for review.
Kendall County industrial market study	Don Hughes	Aug. 2015-Mar. 2016	Staff and consultant assistance	Key informant interviews were held on October 6 and October 14. Follow up interviews are ongoing. VSKA is now summarizing the responses from key informants. A draft of the key informant memo is expected by November 6.
Lake County Route 53/120 land use plan (see CMAP website and project website)	Jason Navota	Nov. 2013-Dec. 2015	Staff and consultant assistance	The land use planning effort is approximately 90% complete. A draft plan has been shared with the Land Use Committee and the public, open houses were conducted on October 14 and 15, and the comment period has closed. The next, and potentially last, Land Use Committee meeting will be held on November 5.
Lake County / Round Lake Homes for a Changing Region (see website)	Stephen Ostrander	July 2014-Feb. 2016	Staff assistance	Project team (CMAP, MPC, Mayors Caucus, and Lake County Community Foundation) continued with drafting of full plan recommendations.
Lemont development review process analysis	Jake Seid	Jan.-Nov. 2015	Consultant assistance	Final project deliverable has been completed and provided to the Village and CMAP for review. The consultant will revise the deliverable based on comments from the Village and CMAP, and will present the project to the Village Board upon completion.
Lower Salt Creek Watershed-based Plan	*Holly Hudson*	*Jan. 2016-Dec. 2017*	*Staff assistance*	*Newly added to monthly report. Resolution and MOU are underway.*
McHenry County	Jonathan	Jan.-Nov.	Staff and	CMAP staff will review the draft plan the first week of November and

Project	CMAP lead	Timeline	Assistance type	Status and notes
Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (website)	Burch	2015	consultant assistance	assist EDDNI and McHenry County with public outreach beginning in late November.
Metropolitan Planning Council Great Rivers project	*Louise Yeung*	*TBD*	*Staff assistance*	*Newly added to monthly report. Scoping underway.*
North Chicago comprehensive plan (see website)	Jake Seid	May 2014-Jan. 2016	Staff assistance	The recommendations memo was completed in late September and presented to the project Steering Committee and City Council. Drafting of the Comprehensive Plan has begun and will continue through October and November.
O'Hare area truck route coordination	Bob Dean	Nov. 2015-Dec. 2016	Consultant assistance	RFP development is underway, and comments from partners continue to be addressed and incorporated.
Park Forest zoning revisions (see website)	Kristin Ihnchak	June 2013-Feb. 2016	Staff and consultant assistance	The draft UDO was discussed with Village staff on October 13. A follow up meeting with staff and a review meeting with the Steering Committee are scheduled for November 10.
Pingree Grove comprehensive plan	*Sam Shenbaga*	*Aug. 2014-Oct. 2015*	*Consultant Assistance*	*Newly completed. Village Board formally adopted Plan on October 19.*
Regional truck permitting project	Alex Beata	Jan. 2015-June 2016	Consultant assistance	Cambridge Systematics has met with County transportation staff and permitting engineers, as well groups of municipalities, and held an October 23 meeting of the Steering Committee to discuss initial findings. Planning is underway for a January 2016 visioning session with the Steering Committee and other stakeholders.
Richton Park capital improvement plan (see website)	Brian Daly	June 2015-Feb. 2016	Staff assistance	CMAP is reviewing the Village's capital project wish lists and performing a fiscal analysis.
Richton Park zoning revisions (see website)	Jake Seid	Nov. 2014-Nov. 2015	Consultant assistance	The Ordinance was reviewed by the Village Board at two meetings in October and will be adopted in early November.
Roselle comprehensive plan (see website)	Dan Olson	Feb. 2015-Mar. 2016	Consultant assistance	Consultant presented ECR and second phase of initial recommendations to Steering Committee meeting on October 19. Steering Committee and CMAP staff comments and recommendations included in revised draft. The second public forum was held on October 28 to discuss the ECR and allow for public input.
Rosemont comprehensive plan (see website)	Sam Shenbaga	Oct. 2013-Nov. 2015	Staff assistance	Public hearing scheduled for November 10.

Project	CMAP lead	Timeline	Assistance type	Status and notes
South Elgin zoning update (see website)	Patrick Day	Oct. 2014-May 2016	Staff assistance	Existing conditions analysis and development of preliminary recommendations are currently underway.
South Holland comprehensive plan (see website)	Stephen Ostrander	Apr. 2015-July 2016	Staff assistance	CMAP staff completed market analysis research and began drafting corresponding analysis for upcoming Existing Conditions Report, along with completing report section analyzing community input gathered through key stakeholder interviews and focus groups.
SSMMA Complete Streets plan (see website)	John O'Neal	July 2014-June 2016	Staff assistance	Mid-point, local coordination meeting held. Review and incorporation of bicycling clubs focus group meeting materials and ideas currently underway.
Steger planning priorities report (see website)	Jonathan Burch	Feb.-Nov. 2015	Staff assistance	Adoption meeting is being scheduled.
Sugar Run Creek area plan (see website)	Trevor Dick	May 2015-May 2016	Staff assistance	Staff is currently finalizing a draft of the existing conditions report. A steering committee meeting to review the report will be scheduled for November.
Villa Park zoning ordinance	Patrick Day	July 2015-Oct. 2016	Consultant assistance	Steering Committee met October 10. Consultant presented a draft Project Direction & Outline Report and facilitated discussion.
West Suburban Chamber of Comm. and Industry cargo-oriented development plan	Evy Zwiebach	June 2014-Nov. 2015	Staff assistance and small contract	Staff and partners are reviewing the draft summary report of the Technical Assistance Panel's findings and recommendations. Staff continues to work with ULI and the Chamber on the planning of the "Developers Dialogue" on best practices in industrial development.
Westchester zoning ordinance	Kristin Ihnchak	Nov. 2014-Jan. 2016	Consultant assistance	The consultant reviewed second module of the zoning ordinance with Village staff on October 1.
Winthrop Harbor comprehensive plan (see website)	Sam Shenbaga	Sept. 2014-Dec. 2015	Staff assistance	Steering Committee meeting to discuss draft plan scheduled on November 4.
Zion comprehensive plan (see website)	*Nora Beck*	*Feb. 2014-Oct. 2015*	*Consultant assistance*	*Newly completed. City Council formally adopted the Comprehensive Plan on October 20.*