



## Environment and Natural Resources Committee

### DRAFT Minutes

September 4, 2013

#### Members Present:

Jack Darin-Illinois Sierra Club, Martha Dooley-Village of Schaumburg, Jon Grosshans-U.S. EPA Region 5, Martin Jaffe-UIC, Anne McKibben- CNT Energy, Stacy Meyers-Openlands, Joe Schuessler-Metropolitan Water Reclamation District, Deborah Stone-Cook County Department of Environmental Control, Mike Sullivan-, Wallace Van Buren-IAWA, Sean Weidel-Chicago Department of Transportation, Patricia Werner-Lake County Stormwater Management Commission, Nancy Williamson-IDNR, Steve Schilke (representative for Pete Harmet)-IDOT

#### Staff Present:

Bob Dean, Jesse Elam, Matt Maloney, Jason Navota, Nora Beck, Elizabeth Schuh, Drew Williams-Clark, Todd Schmidt, Alex Beata, Louise Yeung, Brian Daly, Tom Murtha, Garrett Ballard-Rosa

#### Others Present:

Mike Klemens-WCGL, Deb Spencer-MPC, Katie Kukielka-IDOT/AECOM

#### 1.0 Call to Order

Jack Darin called the meeting to order at 9:33.

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes – August 6, 2013

The minutes were approved with a motion by Sean Weidel, seconded by Stacy Meyers.

#### 3.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

Patricia Werner announced an upcoming workshop hosted by Lake County, the 2013 Deicing Workshops on October 1-2, 2013. The workshops promote sensible salting practices for roads, parking lots, and sidewalks. The first day is focused on winter maintenance of roads, the second day covers parking lots and sidewalks. Chloride pollution is major issue and Werner encouraged members to spread the word about the \$35/day event. Additional details can be found [here](#).

#### 4.0 GO TO 2040 Update Process

Referring to the August meeting agenda item and associated [memo](#), CMAP staff, Andrew Williams-Clark explained that Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP 21) requires that GO TO 2040 be updated by October of 2014. The update involves several projects and Williams-Clark outlined the process and deadlines for completing the update.

Williams-Clark emphasized that staff does not anticipate changing the text plan chapters or recommendations as part of the update. Staff have begun work updating the financial plan, major capital projects, indicators, and implementation actions to inform the plan update. These components are expected to be complete in the early spring so that the plan can be drafted for public comment release at the June 2014 meetings of the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee. Five major components of the project, include:

- *Financial Plan.* CMAP will update revenue and expenditure information and the overall fiscal constraint of the plan, to be confirmed by January 2014.
- *Major Capital Projects.* Using the projects identified in GO TO 2040 as the baseline, CMAP will re-evaluate these and other projects that are currently considered fiscally unconstrained, using the updated financial plan and updated socioeconomic forecasts. The list of projects to be evaluated will be identified by November 2013, measures used to evaluate the list will be finalized by January 2014, and the final list of both fiscally constrained and unconstrained major capital projects will be complete by April 2014.
- *Implementation Actions.* While the text of the plan will not change, the implementation action areas that describe how the recommendations will be implemented will be updated in coordination with the annual implementation reports by January 2014.
- *Indicator Updates.* The set of indicators used to track the plan's progress will be updated based on the Year 2 implementation report. CMAP anticipates that a report on the section of new indicators or confirmation of initial indicators will be final by November 2013. An updated set of indicators and long-term and short-term targets will be done by March 2014.
- *Plan Preparation.* The updated materials will be released for public comment in June 2014 for 2 months. Approvals by the various committees in the fall, final by October 2014.

Committee members asked clarifying questions about the involvement of the ENR committee. Williams-Clark explained that the Indicator Updates, like the Implementation Action Areas, will come before the committee for feedback and discussion, likely in November.

#### **a) Major Capital Projects Overview**

Referring to the [memo](#), CMAP staff Todd Schmidt explained that the update process for the major capital projects includes three components: outreach and project identification, project evaluation, and development of fiscally constrained and unconstrained list of major capital projects. CMAP staff is meeting one-on-one with the implementing agencies – IDOT, CDOT, CTA, Pace, Metra, Tollway, to develop a list of projects. Outreach will begin in September and a complete list of proposed projects is expected in November. Once the list is established, each project will be evaluated using the updated financial plan and socioeconomic forecast. Measures that will be used to evaluate the projects will be finalized by January 2014. By April, staff will develop the list of financially constrained major capital projects, those not included will be on the unconstrained project list. After committee review, the major capital project lists will go to public comment as part of the overall GO TO 2040 plan update. Committee members asked clarifying questions of whether the ENR committee would be reviewing the major capital list; Williams-Clark explained that it will be available to the committee, but on the agenda of other committees.

## b) Implementation Actions Overview

Referring to the [memo](#), CMAP staff Alex Beata explained the process for reviewing the implementation action tables at the end of each of the twelve chapters of GO TO 2040. The tables will be updated to reflect their implementation status. The project does not envision drafting new implementation action areas, but some actions may be added within areas. CMAP staff is currently reviewing the plan's implementation actions and will be coming back to the committees, including ENR, to present their findings in October. At the October meeting, the ENR committee will be asked to provide feedback on a subset of action items given the expertise of the group (mostly in the Livable Communities chapter). A revised set of tables will be presented to the working committees in November. A committee member asked if they should be reviewing all of the implementation actions in advance of the October meeting; and suggested sending the memo out at least 10 days in advance given the content. Williams-Clark explained that a more tailored list matched to the committee member expertise will be sent out in advance.

## 5.0 Review of LTA Applications

Referring to the [memo](#), CMAP staff Bob Dean reported that CMAP received 67 applications in the latest call for projects that it held with RTA. Dean explained that there were a wide range of projects, including more bike/ped projects, with a good geographic mix from around the region. He stated that ENR committee members have participated in sending feedback on the applications in August and that this meeting was one last chance to comment on the projects in advance of the staff recommendation. Staff will be sending their recommendations to the Local Coordinating Committee in advance of sending it to the CMAP Board in October. Dean then highlighted a sample of the projects that were submitted:

- Glenview, Review and update *A Plan for Nature in Glenview*
- Park Forest, Active transportation plan and retail & housing market analysis, both of which are outgrowths from the CMAP assisted Sustainability Plan
- Prairie State College and Governor's State University, both submitted green infrastructure plans
- SSMMA, green manufacturing plan
- DuPage County, sustainability plan
- Campton Hills, zoning update, outgrowth of CMAP assisted Comprehensive Plan
- Kane County, Health Impact Assessment, emerging field
- Lake County communities, fielded a number of comprehensive and multijurisdictional plans from this area.
- Algonquin, River Access study, complements two CMAP assisted plans

A committee member asked about the trend of fewer environmentally focused submissions, compared to last year. Dean explained that during last year's call for projects, staff solicited more water-focused projects given the greater degree of flexibility with HUD funding. This year, the funding sources are less flexible. If CMAP can secure funding in the future for this work, we will encourage more submissions in the next round. A committee member asked if the LTA projects are primarily staff led. Dean explained that approximately two-thirds of the projects are led by staff and one-third is either by a consultant or a grant to the community. Staff led projects often involve

consultants for a portion of the work.

## **6.0 Update on Transportation Alternatives program**

Referring to the [memo](#), Jesse Elam explained that under MAP-21, MPOs with populations over 200,000 were given the responsibility to program part of each state's apportionment under the new Transportation Alternatives Program. CMAP staff held a call for projects in July and August. CMAP received 11 applications, and will include an additional 28 potential projects previously solicited through the earlier CMAQ call for projects.

Elam explained that staff is now seeking committee input on the criteria with which to evaluate the proposals. He described the proposed evaluation criteria and asked for comments. With some minor modifications, the criteria are a subset of those used previously by the Bike and Ped task force. The criteria would be scored on a 100-point scale, with the first three criteria weighted equally and receiving 90 points total. The remaining 10 points would be assigned based on the remaining two categories.

- Completion of Regional Greenways and Trails Plan (also a GO TO 2040 indicator).
- Market for facility (user base, using population and employment density).
- Facility design quality (described as a semi-quantitative measure, see memo for further details).
- Additional considerations in project readiness.
- Additional match above the 20% required.

One committee member wondered if the criteria were cancelling each other out, discussion of tradeoffs. Another committee member asked if environmental design features, such as construction materials and stormwater management could be included. Elam stated that given the application design, this information is not currently available in this round but could be included in future years. Another member wondered if the market for facility criteria could be updated to include information on currently available trail access. A potentially fairer process would recognize if an area already has a number of facilities and award the project to a community that lacks these amenities. Another committee member asked about the long term sustainability of the projects, especially in regards to maintenance. Elam responded that this is not specifically addressed, but the proposals are required to be part of a larger plan, indicating a level of commitment. As a side note, committee members discussed the need to add wayfinding to local amenities into trail development to help with economic development. Elam asked the committee to send additional comments to him.

## **7.0 Proposed amendment to GO TO 2040 - Illiana Corridor**

Jack Darin reviewed the focus of last month's meeting, when CMAP staff presented their evaluation of the proposed amendment to include the Illiana Expressway as a fiscally constrained major capital project in GO TO 2040. Darin reviewed that the working committee, via its representation on the Regional Coordinating Committee, is being asked to discuss their position on this proposed amendment. A lengthy discussion ensued. Committee members had several comments and questions.

Steve Schilke, representing Pete Harmet in his absence, stated that under federal regulation, this proposed new highway facility must be included in GO TO 2040 in order to complete the upcoming Tier 2 Environmental Impact Statement. Schilke emphasized

the importance of this corridor for truck movements and indicated that other alignments for the roadway, specifically to the north, would result in larger population shifts. He reviewed the strong local support for the project, including Wilmington and Will County. Schilke also discussed the financial analysis that has gone into the project and how P3 [public-private partnerships] projects are strongly encouraged in GO TO 2040.

***Timeline and process:*** One committee member asked about the timing of this amendment and why the project was not evaluated during the GO TO 2040 update process. Schilke responded that the Illiana project is further along and he outlined the project timeframe so far. To wait for the GO TO 2040 update would mean a 9-month delay, postponing the completion of the Tier 2 EIS until October 2014. With the P3 process, that delay would make the project less desirable. A committee member asked why does the P3 process have to happen now; why would a 9-month delay make or break the project? Schilke responded citing the timeframe of the EIS, working for a 3-year timeframe when it normally takes 5 years. Some major capital projects move more slowly because of a lack of local consensus. For the Illiana, the local consensus exists.

***NEPA process:*** One committee member disagrees with how IDOT has positioned the issues stating that to not build the project would mean a waste of money spent on the studies done so far. The member stated that studying a project [as part of NEPA] does not mean that the project must be completed; it is designed to help figure out *if* the project should be completed.

***Consistency with GO TO 2040:*** Reflecting on the process to create the GO TO 2040 plan – a committee member stated that IDOT is attempting to rewrite the project list. Referring to a memo submitted by 19 organizations as part of the public comment period, there are a number of reasons environmental, civic, and conservation organizations are speaking out against the proposal: green infrastructure vision, prairie parklands, lack of a noise study as part of the EIS, and the potential disruption of the expressway on birds.

***Freight:*** Another committee member reviewed the approach Cook County is taking with freight and cargo-oriented development; the importance of building jobs in locations accessible to housing and transit. This approach is seen as a more sustainable option for the region; in contrast, the Illiana proposal is not following this model. Schilke responded that the Illiana corridor makes this area more competitive and reflected on the locational decisions recently made by CSX. Schilke stated they were looking to locate in SW Cook County but I-80, despite widening, is still congested and so they located elsewhere.

***Fiscally-constrained project list:*** Some committee members expressed concern that the inclusion of the Illiana corridor would result in the reshuffling of the existing set of major capital projects included in GO TO 2040. CMAP staff Matt Maloney stated that to the extent that there is a public cost associated with the project – the amount of which is unknown at this time – something would have to come out of the fiscally-constrained list. In October, the board would have to consider the project list.

***I-55 Managed Lanes major capital project:*** A committee member asked for clarification on a recent news item (referenced in a recent CMAP weekly update) involving the I-55 managed lanes major capital project. Included in GO TO 2040, this project involved a full,

4-lane reconstruction of I-55 for \$1.320 billion. IDOT is revising the scope of this project to be a rehabilitation of the shoulder for \$0.4 billion. CMAP staff is analyzing this issue and does not have information on it yet. The I-55 Managed Lanes project is included in the maintenance and modernization budget and, if redistributed to cover the Illiana Corridor, would be a shift of funding from the maintenance and modernization budget to the expansion budget. This would be a policy change and would trigger another process. Discussion included clarification on conformity. Another committee member asked when more information about the costs would become available. Schilke responded after the project goes to bid.

*Motion:* Darin reviewed the matter before the committee, stating that the ENR committee needs to determine how it would like to be represented when the Regional Coordinating Committee gives a recommendation on the proposal to the CMAP Board in October. Martin Jaffe proposed a motion that the project not be added to the fiscally-constrained list until adequate information is provided. This motion was further amended by Stacy Meyers and Patricia Werner: *The ENR committee does not support the Illiana corridor as an amendment to GO TO 2040 and the fiscally-constrained major capital project list at this time based on the information currently available.* During the course of the discussion, a number of committee members stated that they need to abstain from the action. Darin called a vote: seven voted for the motion, two against, five abstained, and two were absent. The motion carried.

## **8.0 Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

## **9.0 Miscellaneous**

Dooley asked about the status of the Sustainability Plan template, Dean explained that it is part of the work plan for this fiscal year. In the meantime, Dean referred to the recently Climate Adaptation Guidebook, Park Forest's and Niles' Sustainability Plans as potential resources.

## **10.0 Next Meeting**

The committee meets next on October 2, 2013, at 9:30 am.

## **10.0 Adjournment**

At 10:59 a.m., a motion to adjourn by Nancy Williamson was seconded by Martin Jaffe. All in favor, the motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Nora June Beck  
CMAP staff liaison