



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) Environment and Natural Resources Committee Minutes Wednesday, June 4, 2014

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

Committee Members

Present: Ed Collins – MCCD, Martha Dooley – Village of Schaumburg, Jack Darin – Illinois Sierra Club, Jon Grosshans – U.S. EPA, Martin Jaffe - UIC, Anne McKibben – Elevate Energy, Stacy Meyers – Openlands, Joe Schuessler – MWRD, Deb Stone – Cook County Department of Environmental Control, Mike Sullivan – Kane / Kendall Council of Mayors, Wallace Van Buren – IAWA, Sean Wiedel – Chicago Department of Transportation, Patricia Werner – Lake County Stormwater Management Commission

Absent: Pete Harmet – IDOT, Harlan Spiroff – Spiroff & Gosselar, Ltd., Nancy Williamson – IDNR

Staff Present: Louise Yeung, Andrew Williams-Clark, Simone Weil, Jason Navota, Kristin Ihnchak, Bob Dean, Jesse Elam, Randy Blankenhorn, Doug Ferguson, Nora Beck

Others Present: Dominic Brose – MWRD, Beata Welsh – RTA, Gary Cunnen – Seven Generations Ahead, Marcella Bondie – Elevate Energy, Elena Savona – CB&I

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

Committee co-chair, Sean Wiedel, called the meeting to order at approximately 9:31 a.m.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

Legislative update: CMAP Staff Simone Weil briefly updated the committee on the legislative session on four items and solicited comments or other feedback.

- The budget passed, including \$3 million within the IDOT budget for CMAP, which only partially matches federal funding.
- The \$1.1 billion capital bill passed which will be paid for with general obligation bonds. It includes \$100 million for grants to municipalities and \$1 billion for the state under general purposes.
- There were two amendments to facilitate a public-private partnership agreement for the Illiana Expressway, but neither of them passed. These bills could be considered in the fall's Veto session.
- Another bill establishes a Use and Occupation Tax Reform Task Force to study modernizing the sales tax structure, modify existing provisions on sales tax

sourcing. The bill also provides for penalties for local governments that do not report sales tax rebate agreements to the IDOR, and transfers funds for the purposes of additional audit and compliance staff at IDOR.

3.0 Approval of Minutes – May 7, 2014

Joe Schuessler asked for an amendment to the minutes, removing a sentence in section 4.3. A motion to approve the minutes of the May 7 meeting as amended was made by Mike Sullivan, seconded by Martin Jaffe, and with all in favor, carried.

4.0 Draft GO TO 2040 plan update – Andrew Williams-Clark, CMAP Staff

As required under MAP-21, staff has been in the process of updating the GO TO 2040 plan since the summer of 2013. Staff has prepared a draft plan update consisting of a summary document and a series of appendices that describe each of the key elements of the project in technical detail. As discussed at previous meetings, none of the plan's recommendations have been revised.

Andrew Williams-Clark, referring to a [memo](#) and the corresponding links to the plan update documents, explained that staff anticipates release of the draft for public comment on June 13. Outreach meetings have been [scheduled across the region](#) through the end of the public comment period on August 1. Staff anticipates adoption of the final plan update at the October meetings of the Board and MPO Policy Committee. Given the timing of this committee meeting, if the committee as a group would like to make a comment on the update, they should do so at the July 2 meeting. Jack Darin asked that the summary document and appendices be sent out to the committee in advance of that date.

5.0 LTA Program Evaluation, Part 1: Program Statistics and External Surveys – Bob Dean, CMAP Staff

Bob Dean explained that CMAP, working with the working committees and other partners, will be evaluating the first three years of the LTA program. The intent of the evaluation is to focus future resources most effectively. Dean explained the evaluation schedule and anticipates coming back to the committee in July and September to talk about additional layers of the review.

Referring to a [memo](#) and using a [PowerPoint presentation](#), Dean then reviewed the basic program information and statistics, as well as external survey results. He concluded that this part of this first phase of the review revealed positive results of the program and reinforces the level of local support, but does not provide much to help evaluate and focus the program in future years. Future phases of the review will hopefully provide more direction. The committee then asked clarifying questions and made several comments:

- **Consultant vs. Staff led projects.** Martin Jaffe asked if there is a substantial difference in the output between staff and consultant led projects. Dean believes that it is a mix and stated that this will be part of the internal review where he is hoping to see if one group is better on certain types of projects.
- **Templates.** Jaffe asked if, with 70 completed projects, if planning templates have been developed to help streamline work. Dean explained that staff have streamlined the existing conditions analysis, including a report template and a data tool to help with this effort. He explained that there is less interest in plan templates as these need to be tailored to the locality. Stacey Meyers agreed with

that philosophy and saw the engagement aspect an important part of the planning process.

- **Map recommendation.** Patty Werner recommended color-coding the map of LTA projects (Figure 5 in the memo) to include project status.
- **Evaluation criteria for new projects.** Werner asked what criteria the current call for projects will be evaluated against. Dean explained that this current round will use the same six criteria that have been used since the program has been established, but they may emphasize some criteria over others. The evaluation process will help inform future calls and the criteria, if updated, will be presented in the call for project materials.
- **Lack of Chicago projects.** Schuessler wondered if the lack of Chicago-based projects was due to existing capacity levels. Dean discussed how most of the submitted projects (mostly from NPOs) haven't fit into an overall strategy.
- **Funding.** Werner asked about funding and project types. Dean explained that CMAP is looking strategically for funding that will help support the existing program and, to date, has raised \$900,000 from external sources (Federal, State, and philanthropic organizations) so that the funding isn't all coming from transportation dollars.

6.0 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program – Jesse Elam , CMAP Staff

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) program is a federal transportation funding source that CMAP programs through a competitive regional process. Staff are undertaking a review of the evaluation and ranking process used in the program and are seeking working committee feedback. Using a [PowerPoint presentation](#), Jesse Elam provided an overview of CMAQ and how the current selection process operates. CMAP staff conducted a review of CMAQ programs at peer MPOs and have drafted an initial proposal for changes which was outlined in the presentation.

Elam asked five questions of the committee and a discussion followed. Committee members recognized the difficulty in issues of equity, recognizing the different capacity levels of municipalities as well as different demand for services. Committee members saw value in clearly communicating the criteria for rankings so that it's not an arbitrary decision-making process, but also warned about not relying too much on the rankings and giving the program some flexibility. Werner cited the Lake County Stormwater Management Commission's process of establishing a minimum score for projects. Committee members discussed the regional priorities and wondered if allocating a certain amount of money for each of them would work (i.e., may not get proposals for the tough projects). The connection between the LTA program and CMAQ funds was discussed, and while CMAP will not help write proposals to itself, the LTA projects can help communities identify which programs are most applicable to specific projects. The committee discussed adding carbon to the air quality cost-effectiveness analysis in light of new rules; while recognizing that projects that reduce the currently tracked emissions probably also reduce carbon emissions. The committee also discussed adding additional environmental co-benefits which may be hard to capture if not looking for them – like reducing water quality impacts or using recycled construction materials. Elam closed the discussion stating that this is part of a longer conversation and he is looking for ways to engage CMAP's working committees on this matter.

7.0 Sustainability Plan Toolkit – Kristin Ihnchak , CMAP Staff

At the Committee’s March meeting, CMAP staff presented ideas for core sustainability topic areas to be included in the Toolkit and also reviewed a draft document outline. Using a [PowerPoint presentation](#), Kristin Ihnchak provided a quick summary of the intent and structure of the Toolkit. The toolkit will provide a strategy menu with corresponding indicators for each of the core topic areas. Ihnchak explained the philosophy behind indicator section; that they are easy to understand, provide information on overall progress toward sustainability goals, are easy and cost effective to aggregate data on a regular basis, and are relevant for driving policy, strategy, and budget decisions.

Core indicators relating to the Transportation and Mobility, Energy, Waste, Water, and Open Space and Ecosystems sections were tested at two Toolkit-related sessions at the recent GreenTown conference for feedback. Ihnchak reported on those results and asked the committee for further feedback:

- **Benefits.** Referring to the format of the strategy menus for each indicator, which includes an assessment of cost, staff involvement, and complexity, Meyers noted the absence of a column devoted to the benefit of the strategy and suggested presenting both the cost and benefit in the same location.
- **Sidewalks.** Audience member Marcella Bondie wondered if the indicator focused on increasing sidewalks could indicate greenfield development.
- **Open Space and Ecosystems Indicators.** The committee discussed potentially different interpretations of the indicators among the GreenTown audience given the different results between walking to parks, parks per capita and increase acreage of open space.
- **Water.** Meyers suggested “de-wonkifying” the indicator focused on reducing impaired waterways. Darin wondered if there were other metrics that could be used here, since substantial reductions in pollution may not de-list a waterway. Deb Stone asked for clarification on whether water loss would be included in the overall indicator of reducing consumption of water.
- **Energy.** Carbon reduction is covered in the Air Quality and Climate topic, not the energy one. Discussion on how the new buildings built to green standards may miss the mark because it says nothing about how the building is eventually operated and given that most of our buildings are already built.
- **Economy.** While not presented today, Darin suggested that the number of green jobs created or the number of new green businesses started could be good indicators for that topic area.

Ihnchak explained that a draft of the toolkit is anticipated at the end of Summer and plans to come back to the committee for more feedback.

7.0 Public Comment

No public comments.

8.0 Next Meeting

The ENR Committee is scheduled to meet next on Wednesday, July 2, 2014.

9.0 Adjournment

A motion to adjourn at 11:10 am, made by Sean Wiedel, seconded by Martha Dooley and with all in favor, carried.