Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)
DRAFT
STP Project Selection Committee Meeting Minutes
July 18, 2019

Committee Members Present:

Others Present:
Elaine Bottomley, Len Cannata, Maggie Catania, Maria Choca Urban, Jack Cruikshank, Karen Darch, Emily Daucher, Jackie Forbes, Mike Fricano, Kendra Johnson, Emily Karry (via phone), Josh Klingenstein, Daniel Knickelbein, Augustina Krapp, Kelsey Mulhausen, Tara Orbon, Dan Persky, Ryan Peterson, Leslie Phemister, Suzette Quintell, Tom Rickert, Dave Seglin, Troy Simpson, Chris Snyder, Kyle Whitehead

Staff Present:
Erin Aleman, Teri Dixon, Kama Dobbs, Doug Ferguson, Stephanie Levine, Jen Maddux, Tim McMahon, Martin Menninger, Todd Schmidt, Jeff Schnobrich, Matt Stern, Ian Warren, Simone Weil, Barbara Zubek

1.0 Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 9:39 a.m. by Chairman Elam.

2.0 Agenda Changes
There were no agenda changes or announcements.

3.0 Approval of Minutes
A motion to approve the minutes of the April 11, 2019 meeting, as presented, made by Mayor Williams, and seconded by Mr. Yonan, carried.
4.0  **Performance Data Collection Update**  
Mr. Schmidt updated the committee on the status of the datasets that will be used in calculating the performance-based funding distribution for the STP-Local program. The datasets include: bridge condition data, Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) travel information, crash data, congestion data, and pavement condition data. He stated that CMAP is currently processing the data and that it will be rolled out for review beginning in August.

5.0  **Local Program Methodology Development Update**  
Ms. Dobbs provided an update on the progress of local methodology development. She stated that throughout the summer the councils have been releasing their methodologies for public comment via their websites and/or the CMAP website. Mr. Davis confirmed that CDOT will seek public comment in late August to early September. Comments received by each individual council and CDOT will be considered for inclusion in final methodologies that must be adopted by each before September 30, 2019.

6.0  **Staff Recommended Active and Contingency Programs**  
Ms. Dobbs provided a recap of the applications received, the scoring process, and program development process. She stated that the staff recommended program includes seventeen projects throughout the region, with $31 million programmed for communities in the highest need cohort. Three projects are being recommended for phase 1 engineering funding only, and staff is recommending programming transportation development credits in lieu of local match for these three projects. She closed by requesting the committee’s approval to release the staff recommended program for public comment through August 16th and reviewed the timeline and next steps for final program approval.

Mr. O’Malley stated a goal of the program was to use a data-driven, transparent process, and that was done and it generally worked to get the right projects funded. However, he questioned staff’s decision to skip projects that could not be fully funded. He also noted that some bonus points seem to have gone to projects that wouldn’t have otherwise been funded. He stated the city would have preferred that project sponsors be given a chance to respond on whether they could accept partial or multi-year funding each time staff came to a project in the list that could not be fully funded.

Ms. Newson commended CMAP staff for a job well done and stated that, with the large number of submitted projects, it was not an easy job and that there is no perfect way to create the program. Mr. Yonan applauded CMAP’s effort for trying to be as equitable as possible and said that he believed it was a fair and transparent process. Mayor Schielke agreed and stated CMAP did a great job and he commented on the great efforts to communicate with the subregional councils during the entire process. Mr. Rickert also stated he agrees and acknowledged the tremendous effort CMAP staff put into developing the program and honoring the direction they were given. He expressed
concern about the way that bonus points were used and suggested that the committee should revisit the use of these points before the next call for projects.

Ms. Catania stated that she is concerned about equity in the scoring methodology. She said that the Village of Robbins was not able to get the full inclusive growth points on their project despite being a Cohort 4 community. She added that the Village of Robbins was not able to score points in various categories because it was difficult for their project to get started in the application process.

Mayor Darch stated that the fund did what it was intended to do and clarified that the bonus points for the Barrington project came from the Northwest Council and McHenry Council, which is an adjacent council.

Mr. Whitehead applauded staff for the transparent process and said he wishes all transportation funding programs had a similar process. He added that the Active Transportation Alliance is disappointed in the number and size of transit projects and especially the lack of service improvement projects. Mr. Whitehead suggested that service improvements are needed to increase ridership and should be given preference over station rehabilitation projects. He stated that there should be more points dedicated to complete streets and is concerned about road expansion projects.

Mr. Snyder stated that there were some concerning things in the scoring methodology such as the project readiness score which was difficult because IDOT will not look at plans if there is no funding for a project. He added that, without bonus points, the program would have looked different and, hence, he does not think the bonus points are appropriate.

Mr. O’Malley stated that the City of Chicago gave bonus points to a project that was taken off the list due to not being able to be fully funded and said that the City would have never given points to that project if they knew that projects requesting over $40 million in a single year would not be funded. He said projects should not be skipped due to not being able to be fully funded and suggested that partial funding should have been considered. Chairman Elam stated that the intent of the program was to fill funding gaps, rather than to create them and said that allowing projects to be partially funded would make the active program management policies difficult to implement. Mr. O’Malley suggested that an alternate program be released for public comment. Ms. Dobbs stated that CMAP staff is concerned that an alternate program will delay the entire process because of the time needed to contact other sponsors on the list, one-by-one in rank order, regarding their ability to budget for partial funding.

Ms. Newson stated that the committee needs to be cautious and not make a major shift in the selection process. Mayor Williams stated that there would be winners and losers no matter how the program ends up and stressed the importance of not delaying the start of the program. Mr. Yonan stated that an alternate program would take a lot of
time and there is too much at stake. Mr. Donovan stated that the FHWA expects a program to be adopted in October and he believes that the proposal is what the committee defined. He added that the entire process has been fair and open, but he said that it would be appropriate to bring the idea of partial funding to public comment. Mr. Sriver stated that he understands the process was spoken, but it was never written.

Chairman Elam introduced new CMAP Executive Director, Erin Aleman. Ms. Aleman commented that this is an entirely new process and is a work in progress, but we need to move forward with this opportunity to implement something new. She stated CMAP has a history of evaluating processes and making improvements and that staff and the committee are committed to doing so. She also noted it would be difficult to build an alternative program and for most sponsors to make commitments to partial funding without delaying the process.

Mr. O’Malley asked if an alternate program can be created and be open to public comment. Mr. Elam stated that language could be added to the public comment announcement seeking comments on the idea of developing an alternate program. Ms. Newson stated she is opposed to adding that language and said it is not the best approach. Mr. O’Malley stated that the Canal St. viaducts are critical and the project ranked highly. Mr. Rickert asked if funding from a lower-ranked CDOT project could be moved to this project that is most critical to CDOT. Mr. Donovan suggested that continuing to debate the program development methodology would likely not solve anything at this meeting and suggested that seeking public comment is appropriate.

A motion to release the draft recommended active and contingency programs with added language asking for comments on the idea of using partial funding in the program was made by Mr. O’Malley and seconded by Mayor Williams. With all in favor, the motion carried.

7.0 Other Business
Mr. Elam noted that evaluation of the process to determine the lessons learned would be a topic for future meetings. Mr. Sriver suggested a structured approach to evaluation.

8.0 Public Comment
There was no additional public comment.

9.0 Next Meeting
The next meeting is scheduled for September 5, 2019.

10.0 Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Elam at 10:46 a.m.