CMAQ Project Selection Committee Meeting
Annotated Agenda
Thursday April 14, 2011
2:00 p.m.
Cook County Conference Room
CMAP Offices

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions
Ross Patronsky, Committee Chair

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

3.0 Approval of February 25, 2011 Minutes
The draft minutes for the February 25, 2011 meeting are attached.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval of the minutes.

4.0 Project Changes
4.1 Cicero - Cicero Rail Yard Switch Engine Retrofit (TIP ID 05-09-0002)
The sponsor is requesting a scope change. Staff recommends discussion of this request.
4.2 City of Chicago - CDOT-Lakefront Trail-Navy Pier Flyover (TIP ID 01-01-0009)
The sponsor is requesting a scope change and transfer of funds. Staff recommends approval.
4.3 McHenry County - Virginia Rd at IL 31(southwest quadrant) (TIP ID 11-07-0001)
The sponsor is requesting a scope change. Staff recommends that the committee consider this request.
4.4 Country Club Hills – Monarch Pedestrian Path (TIP ID 07-06-0004)
The sponsor is requesting a cost increase. Staff recommends approval.

5.0 Call for Projects Update
The call for projects deadline was April 1, 2011. An update will be given.

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

6.0 Program Focus Group Update
The program focus groups continue to meet. An update will be given.

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

7.0 Transit Status Report Update
Staff has completed the analysis of the quarterly status update. A report on the update will be given.

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

8.0 Program Management Status
Staff has reviewed the status of overall obligations and apportionments. A summary of the review will be given.

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

9.0 Other Business

10.0 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 exact time for the public comment period will immediately follow the last item on the agenda.

11.0 Next Meeting
The next meeting is scheduled for June 2, 2011. Project status updates from the May sponsor reports will be discussed.

12.0 Adjournment

CMAQ Project Selection Committee Members:
___ Ross Patronsky, Chair  ___ Mark Pitstick  ___ Jeff Schielke
___ Martin Buehler  ___ Mike Rogers
___ Luann Hamilton  ___ Susan Stitt
Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program

Project Selection Committee

Draft Minutes

February 25, 2011

Cook County Conference Room

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois

Members Present: Chairman Ross Patronsky – CMAP, Marty Buehler – Counties, Bill Lenski - RTA, Keith Privett – City of Chicago, Mike Rogers – IEPA, Susan Stitt – IDOT (via phone)

Members Absent: Larry Keller – Council of Mayors

Others Present: Erasmo Berrios, Cook County Department of Environmental Control; Ashley Collins, Respiratory Health Association; Jonathan Doster, Citizens Action; Laura Fedak, CTA; Jim Fiorito, CTA; Gary Kaplan, Cook County Department of Environmental Control; John P. Mick, Baxter Woodman – representing Oak Forest; Randy Neufeld, SRAM; Charles Riddle, IDOT – BLRS – D1; Chris Staron, NWMC; Mike Sibrava, Palos Park; Mike Walczak, NWMC; Jan Ward, KKCOM; Thomas Weaver, Metra;

Staff Present: Patricia Berry, Ylda Capriccioso, Doug Ferguson, Holly Ostdick, Joy Schaad, Todd Schmidt, Drew Williams-Clark

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions
Committee Chair Ross Patronsky called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements
There were none.

3.0 Approval of December 14, 2010 Minutes
On a motion by Mr. Buehler and a second by Mr. Lenski, the minutes for the December 14, 2010 meeting were approved.

4.0 Project Changes
4.1 **Palos Park - 80th Ave from 121st St to 123rd St (TIP ID 06-09-0007)**

Ms. Ostdick stated that due to comments received from IDOT and Cook County Highway department the project sponsor is requesting a cost increase of $105,000 total $84,000 federal. The project is anticipated to be let in the spring. Staff conducted a re-ranking on the project and it dropped one spot but still above funded projects. On a motion by Mr. Buehler and seconded by Mr. Privett the change was approved.

4.2 **Franklin Park - Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad Switcher Engine Retrofit (TIP ID 04-09-0003)**

The sponsor is requesting a cost increase of $1,059,000 total and $688,350 federal because while the agreement was being developed and agreed on the costs rose. A re-ranking was completed and the project remained within funded projects in their appropriate program years. Mr. Privett asked if the committee could assume similar request from other railroads. Staff replied affirmatively. On a motion by Mr. Privett and seconded by Mr. Lenski the change was approved.

4.3 **Oak Forest - Oak Forest Sidewalks to Metra Station (TIP ID 07-06-0065)**

The sponsor is requesting a cost increase of $34,750 total and $27,800 federal. The committee approved a cost increase in 2008 as well. The project is let, and the additional funds are needed to complete the project. A re-ranking was completed and the rank remained the same. On a motion by Mr. Buehler and seconded by Mr. Privett the change was approved.

4.4 **Schaumburg - Schaumburg Commuter Rail Facility Bikeway Connector - IL 19/Irving Park Rd Bike Path (TIP ID 03-06-0002)**

The sponsor is requesting a cost increase of $248,358 total and $198,718 federal. This same project requested and received a cost increase at the November 18th meeting. The additional cost was due to a miscommunication with the original request. A re-ranking was completed and the rank remained the same. On a motion by Mr. Lenski and seconded by Mr. Privett the change was approved.

4.5 **CDOE - Chicago Diesel Fleet Retrofit Project (TIP ID 01-06-0074)**

The sponsor is requesting a scope change to reduce the number of vehicles from 242 with Diesel Oxygen Catalysts and 114 with Diesel Particulate Filters (DPF) to 121 with Diesel Oxygen Catalysts and 83 with DPFs. A re-ranking was completed but due to new analysis methods since 2006 we used more current rankings as a comparison standard. The project would have ranked first among the 2010/2011 projects. Mr. Buehler asked if it was for the municipal fleet. Mr. Privett replied affirmatively. Mr. Patronsky inquired about the viability of the DPFs. Mr. Privett stated that the project has been tested and the City of Chicago is satisfied with the testing. On a motion by Mr. Lenski and seconded by Mr. Privett the change was approved.

4.6 **Berwyn - Bicycle Parking and Marketing – (TIP ID 05-10-0001)**

The sponsor is requesting a cost increase of $12,200 total and $9,760 federal because of a change in the design of bike racks. The project is on the April letting. A re-ranking was completed and the project rank did not change. On a motion by Mr. Buehler, seconded by Mr. Privett, the change was approved.

4.7 **Oak Park – Bike Lanes – (TIP ID 04-10-0001; 04-10-0002; 04-10-0003)**

The sponsor is requesting to combine the projects and a cost increase of $20,600 total and $14,500 federal. The increase is due to the increase in cost of pavement marking materials since the funds were originally requested. A re-ranking was completed and the combined rank ranks 1st for that year. On a motion by Mr. Privett, seconded by Ms. Stitt, the change was approved.
4.8 Carol Stream - Kuhn Rd Bike Path from Lies Rd to The Great Western Trail (TIP ID 08-07-0013)
The sponsor is requesting to move remaining ROW funding to Construction. Staff undertook this as an administrative modification.

4.9 Oak Forest - Oak Forest Metra Station Bike Access and Parking (TIP ID 07-00-0024)
The sponsor is withdrawing the project from the program. Staff undertook this as an administrative modification.

4.10 Kane County DOT - IL 64 from Randall Rd to Burlington Rd – (TIP ID 09-09-0013)
The sponsor is requesting to put the arterial management center portion of the project into a separate TIP number. A question came up about what constitutes the arterial management center portion. Ms. Ward said the project is for a very small control center housed in the Kane County DOT offices. Staff undertook this as an administrative modification.

4.11 CDOT-Streeterville-Illinois Center Signal Interconnect – (TIP ID 01-97-0085)
The sponsor is requesting to move funding from construction into engineering. Staff undertook this as an administrative modification.

4.12 Northlake - Grand Ave Sidewalk from Northwest Ave to Rhodes Ave – (TIP ID 04-08-0002)
The sponsor is requesting to reinstate PHI engineering. Staff undertook this as an administrative modification.

5.0 Cook County Department of Environmental Control – Cook County Fleet Diesel Retrofit (TIP 13-09-0001)
Ms. Ostdick reported that this project received funding in 2009 and 2010. The 2009 funds are obligated. Status updates were requested in May and October and were not received in October. Staff recommended the project for removal from the program because no update was received. When the committee considered removing the project from the program, a representative of Respiratory Health stated that Cook County was working on obtaining SEP funds for the local match and asked that the committee defer the decision on the project. Ms. Collins of Respiratory Health stated that Cook County is waiting on the SEP agreement and once that is reached, a 30 day public comment will occur. Mr. Berrios of Cook County stated if the SEP funds somehow become unavailable they will use some Cook County funds from their environmental fund to cover the local match for part of the project and withdraw the remainder of the project.

6.0 GO TO 2040 Focused Program Approach

Mr. Patronsky stated that three of the four program focus groups have met: RTOC, Bike/Ped, and the ad hoc transit group. He stated the RTOC has actually met twice and grasped the concept well. They will be using performance measures to evaluate projects. Their next meeting they will be looking at plans and programs for projects that support the performance measures.

The Transit group was looking to how the projects will relate to other groups and will put together a similar document to the one approved by RTOC for goals and strategies.
The Bike/Ped taskforce met in early January and will be looking at the Regional Trail and Greenways plan and also working on developing how projects will be prioritized. Mr. Privett said a sub-taskforce will complete the review. Mr. Neufeld commented from the audience that he had expected another Task Force meeting.

The Direct Emissions Reduction Ad hoc group has yet to meet but will soon.

7.0 Transit Status Report Update
Ms. Ostdick stated that staff has collected the requested information from transit project sponsors. Due to the cross of grant numbers and TIP IDs the information received is rather confusing. Staff is currently working with the transit agencies and CDOT to gather further information. The request for fourth quarter reports will be distributed after the third quarter data is clarified.

8.0 2011 Meeting Schedule
The proposed meeting schedule was distributed with the committee packets. The dates accommodate the program development schedule and IDOT letting dates. The committee agreed on the proposed dates.

9.0 Public Comment
Mr. Neufeld stated that in future authorizations of the transportation bill, CMAQ may be revised to take other performance measures into account.

10.0 Other Business
There was no other business.

11.0 Next Meeting
The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday April 14, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. at CMAP.

12.0 Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Holly Ostdick
Associate Planner
MEMORANDUM

To: CMAQ Project Selection Committee
Date: April 14, 2011
From: Russell Pietrowiak, Associate Planner
Re: CMAQ Project Change Requests

4 projects have been submitted for changes. The net change in the federal CMAQ amount programmed is $714,750 total ($711,800 federal). The sponsors’ requests are attached.

For Committee Consideration:

Cicero – Cicero Rail Yard Switch Engine Retrofit (TIP ID 05-09-0002)
The sponsor is requesting a scope change. The sponsor is requesting to change the type of engine for this project from a GenSet engine to a Tier II switch locomotive engine. The committee has previously expressed its desire to have the sponsor switch to a Tier III switch locomotive engine in place of the GenSet engine. The sponsor has indicated that Tier III switch locomotive engines are available only in the most preliminary form and that manufacturers are just now testing them in real world line-haul applications, but no switchers have been produced yet. The sponsor has raised concerns about implementing an untested technology at this time, but is open to considering a Tier III switch engine for late 2012 or 2013. If moving this project into 2012 is not an option then the sponsor is again asking to change to a Tier II switch locomotive engine. Total CMAQ funding for this project is programmed at $2,800,000 total ($1,820,000 federal). The Tier II evaluation resulted in the dollar per KG of VOC eliminated increasing from $372 to $599 and the rank changed from 11th to 12th among 2009 Diesel Emissions Reduction projects.

Recommendation to the CMAQ Project Selection Committee:
Discuss the possibility of changing the Federal Fiscal Year for this project to 2012 and/or the scope change from a GenSet engine to a Tier II switch locomotive engine (TIP ID 05-09-0002).

City of Chicago CDOT – Lakefront Trail-Navy Pier Flyover (TIP ID 01-01-0009)
The sponsor is requesting a scope change and transfer of funds. This project consists of three segments (north, central, south). CMAQ funds were to be used on the North and South segments with other funds (primarily private funds associated with the development of the Chicago Spire) being used for the central segment. The sponsor is now requesting to include
the central segment as part of this CMAQ funded project. The sponsor is also requesting to
transfer $9,000,000 total ($7,200,000 federal) that has been designated for construction of the
south segment to construction of the central segment.

Recommendation to the CMAQ Project Selection Committee:
Recommendation to approve the change in scope, to include the central segment and to
transfer $9,000,000 total ($7,200,000 federal) designated for the south segment to the central
segment (TIP ID 01-01-0009)

McHenry County – Virginia Rd at IL 31 (southwest quadrant) (TIP ID 11-07-0001)

The sponsor is requesting a cost increase of $700,000. The cost increase being requested is the
result of revised cost estimates and increased construction costs. The project was originally
programmed in FFY 2008 at $350,000. This project was funded at 100% federal. The sponsor
is asking for an increase of $700,000 federal bringing the project total to $1,050,000 federal. A re-
ranking was completed and the project dropped from 1st to 8th, below two other projects that
were not been funded in 2008.

Recommendation to the CMAQ Project Selection Committee:
Consider the cost increase of $700,000 for McHenry County – Virginia Rd at IL 31 (southwest
quadrant) (TIP ID 11-07-0001).

Country Club Hills – Monarch Pedestrian Path (TIP ID 07-06-0004)

The sponsor is requesting a cost increase of $14,750 total ($11,800 federal) for total project cost of
$134,750 ($107,800 federal). The cost increase was necessitated due to an increased scope of
work. The project has already been completed and the final costs are included in the sponsor’s
request. A re-ranking was completed and the rank remained the same.

Recommendation to the CMAQ project Selection Committee:
Recommendation to approve the cost increase of $14,750 total ($11,800 federal) for Country
Club Hills – Monarch Pedestrian Path (TIP ID 07-06-0004).
From: Mills, Ryan J <Ryan.Mills@BNSF.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2011 3:17 PM

To: Holly Ostdick; 'Johnson, Jason L'

Cc: 'Lupton, Greg S'; 'Harpring, Jeff L'; Seep, David C; 'jalvarez@thetownofcicero.com'; Ross Patronsky; Stanfill, Michael G (Env Dept); Doug Ferguson; Russell Pietrowiak

Subject: RE: CMAQ BNSF-Cicero Project

Holly,

I talked this over with BNSF's locomotive director, and he stated that we would consider Tier III locomotives if we could move the project into 2012. There is some very preliminary testing on Tier III locomotive engines now, and they are expected to be more widely available sometime in 2012. We would plan on taking receipt of Tier IIIs under this grant in late 2012 or 2013 if that is the direction CMAP chose to pursue.

Thank you,

Ryan Mills

Mgr Environmental Operations

BNSF Railway

785-435-2257 Office

From: Holly Ostdick [mailto:Hostdick@cmap.illinois.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, April 05, 2011 11:54 AM

To: Mills, Ryan J; 'Johnson, Jason L'

Cc: 'Lupton, Greg S'; 'Harpring, Jeff L'; Seep, David C; 'jalvarez@thetownofcicero.com'; Ross Patronsky; Stanfill, Michael G (Env Dept); Doug Ferguson; Russell Pietrowiak

Subject: RE: CMAQ BNSF-Cicero Project

Ryan:
While CMAP staff reviewed your BNSF request to switch from GenSets to Tier II switch engines. We noticed that in your previous email you mentioned some of the concerns that BNSF has with the current status of Tier III switch engines. CMAP would like to know if BNSF is interested in moving this project into 2012 in order to allow more time for testing and development of Tier III switch engines at which time BNSF would then pursue Tier III switch engines instead of GenSet engines. We are pre-emptively asking BNSF this so we have a response if they committee recommends this action.

Thanks,

Holly

Holly A. Ostdick

312-386-8836

From: Mills, Ryan J [mailto:Ryan.Mills@BNSF.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2011 12:57 PM
To: Holly Ostdick; 'Johnson, Jason L'
Cc: 'Lupton, Greg S'; 'Harpring, Jeff L'; Seep, David C; 'jalvarez@thetownofcicero.com'; Ross Patronsky; Stanfill, Michael G (Env Dept); Doug Ferguson
Subject: RE: CMAQ BNSF-Cicero Project

Holly,

The contract reviews and negotiations were delayed until we received clear approval on our repower request. I recently received a draft of the updated contract language from Jason Johnson. We will need to re-review the terms to make sure they are agreeable prior to signatures.

Thanks,

Ryan Mills

Mgr Environmental Operations

BNSF Railway

785-435-2257 Office
From: Holly Ostdick [mailto:Hostdick@cmap.illinois.gov]

Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2011 11:02 AM

To: Mills, Ryan J; 'Johnson, Jason L'

Cc: 'Lupton, Greg S'; 'Harpring, Jeff L'; Seep, David C; 'jalvarez@thetownofcicero.com'; Ross Patronsky; Stanfill, Michael G (Env Dept); Doug Ferguson

Subject: RE: CMAQ BNSF-Cicero Project

Ryan:

Before we bring it to the committee, I would like to check the status on the development/agreement of the contract between BNSF and IDOT.

Thanks,

Holly

Holly A. Ostdick

312-386-8836

---

From: Mills, Ryan J [mailto:Ryan.Mills@BNSF.com]

Sent: Friday, March 25, 2011 9:21 AM

To: Holly Ostdick; 'Johnson, Jason L'

Cc: 'Lupton, Greg S'; 'Harpring, Jeff L'; Seep, David C; 'jalvarez@thetownofcicero.com'; Ross Patronsky; Stanfill, Michael G (Env Dept); Doug Ferguson

Subject: RE: CMAQ BNSF-Cicero Project

Holly,

Unfortunately, neither I nor the other people within BNSF that would attend are available on the 14th. Please let me know how it goes and we can proceed from there.

Thank you,

Ryan Mills
From: Holly Ostdick [mailto:Hostdick@cmap.illinois.gov]

Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2011 1:56 PM

To: Mills, Ryan J; 'Johnson, Jason L'

Cc: 'Lupton, Greg S'; 'Harpring, Jeff L'; Seep, David C; 'jalvarez@thetownofcicero.com'; Ross Patronsky; Stanfill, Michael G (Env Dept); Doug Ferguson

Subject: RE: CMAQ BNSF-Cicero Project

Thank you.

You are invited to attend the 4/14/11 meeting if you are interested in hearing and participating in the discussion.

Thanks,

Holly

Holly A. Ostdick

312-386-8836

From: Mills, Ryan J [mailto:Ryan.Mills@BNSF.com]

Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2011 1:08 PM

To: Holly Ostdick; 'Johnson, Jason L'

Cc: 'Lupton, Greg S'; 'Harpring, Jeff L'; Seep, David C; 'jalvarez@thetownofcicero.com'; Ross Patronsky; Stanfill, Michael G (Env Dept)

Subject: RE: CMAQ BNSF-Cicero Project
Holly,

Yes, we are still interested in going with Tier IIs over gensets. Please keep me updated on what the committee recommends.

Thank you,

Ryan Mills
Mgr Environmental Operations
BNSF Railway
785-435-2257 Office

From: Holly Ostdick [mailto:Hostdick@cmap.illinois.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2011 12:57 PM
To: Mills, Ryan J; 'Johnson, Jason L'
Cc: 'Lupton, Greg S'; 'Harpring, Jeff L'; Seep, David C; 'jalvarez@thetownofcicero.com'; Ross Patronsky; Stanfill, Michael G (Env Dept)
Subject: RE: CMAQ BNSF-Cicero Project

Ryan:

Tier 2 as stated in your original request. My understanding is you are requesting to change the scope of the project from Gen Sets to Tier II Single Engine Locomotives. We brought this to the committee, they requested we ask you to purchase Tier III locomotives and your company has some concerns regarding Tier III. We are going to inform the committee of your concerns, and see how they would like to proceed. Before we bring it to the committee I wanted to reconfirm that you are interested in still changing the scope from Gen Sets to Tier II Single Engine Locomotives.

Thanks,

Holly
Holly A. Ostdick
312-386-8836
From: Mills, Ryan J [mailto:Ryan.Mills@BNSF.com]

Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2011 12:49 PM

To: Holly Ostdick; 'Johnson, Jason L'

Cc: 'Lupton, Greg S'; 'Harpring, Jeff L'; Seep, David C; 'jalvarez@thetownofcicero.com'; Ross Patronsky; Stanfill, Michael G (Env Dept)

Subject: RE: CMAQ BNSF-Cicero Project

Holly,

Are you referring to Tier 2 or Tier 3 engine repowers for this grant?

Thanks,

Ryan

Ryan Mills
Mgr Environmental Operations
BNSF Railway
785-435-2257 Office

From: Holly Ostdick [mailto:Hostdick@cmap.illinois.gov]

Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2011 11:33 AM

To: Mills, Ryan J; 'Johnson, Jason L'

Cc: Lupton, Greg S; Harpring, Jeff L; Seep, David C; 'jalvarez@thetownofcicero.com'; Ross Patronsky

Subject: RE: CMAQ BNSF-Cicero Project

Mr. Mills:

We plan on bringing this to our committee at its April 14th meeting. Are you still interested in the original request?

Thank you,
Holly
Holly A. Ostdick
312-386-8836

From: Mills, Ryan J [mailto:Ryan.Mills@BNSF.com]
Sent: Monday, September 20, 2010 12:30 PM
To: Holly Ostdick; 'Johnson, Jason L' Cc: Lupton, Greg S; Harpring, Jeff L; Seep, David C; 'jalvarez@thetownofcicero.com'; Ross Patronsky
Subject: RE: CMAQ BNSF-Cicero Project

Ms. Ostdick,

Per the voicemail I left you previously, I am told by our locomotive people that Tier IIIs are available in the most preliminary form. The manufacturers are just now testing them in real world line-haul applications, but no switchers have been produced yet. There is concern about implementing an untested technology in our rail yard. If the locomotive fails or does not perform to BNSF's standards, we would have to find some way to address the obligations of our agreement. Perhaps you and your team have some time free this week to discuss this with us on a conference call?

Ryan Mills
Mgr Environmental Program Development
BNSF Railway
785-435-2257 Office

From: Holly Ostdick [mailto:Hostdick@cmap.illinois.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 31, 2010 3:07 PM
To: Mills, Ryan J; 'Johnson, Jason L' Cc: Lupton, Greg S; Harpring, Jeff L; Seep, David C; 'jalvarez@thetownofcicero.com'; Ross Patronsky
Subject: RE: CMAQ BNSF-Cicero Project

Mr. Mills:

After discussions with various manufactures and the CMAQ PSC we understand that Tier III technology is available. The committee requested we contact BNSF to determine if you would be willing to specify Tier III technology even though the USEPA is currently not certifying to this standard.

Please contact me with any questions, I look forward to your response.

Holly

Holly A. Ostdick
312.386.8836

From: Mills, Ryan J [mailto:Ryan.Mills@BNSF.com]
Sent: Monday, July 12, 2010 12:56 PM
To: Holly Ostdick; 'Johnson, Jason L'
Cc: Lupton, Greg S; Harpring, Jeff L; Seep, David C; 'jalvarez@thetownofcicero.com'; Ross Patronsky
Subject: RE: CMAQ BNSF-Cicero Project

Hello Ms. Ostdick,

In conversations with our mechanical people that handle locomotive purchasing, the cost for a Tier II switch locomotive is approximately $1.2 million. We are not opposed to the usage of Tier III locomotives in our switch yards. The problem, however, is that these locomotives are not currently available. Tier IIIs are not expected to be ready for purchase until 2012, and Tier IV locomotives are due in 2015. The manufacturers are still in the process of developing and testing these new technologies. I am told that the expected cost of a Tier III switcher is between $1.3 and $1.4 million. My request to alter our agreement for a Tier II single engine was based on the current availability of the technology. If you would like to extend the project into 2012, this is certainly something that we can discuss. Let me know if you have any other questions.
Thank you,

Ryan Mills
Mgr Environmental Program Development
BNSF Railway
785-435-2257 Office

From: Holly Ostdick
[mailto:Hostdick@cmap.illinois.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 08, 2010 10:36 AM
To: Mills, Ryan J; 'Johnson, Jason L'
Cc: Lupton, Greg S; Harpring, Jeff L; Seep, David C; 'jalvarez@thetownofcicero.com'; Ross Patronsky
Subject: RE: CMAQ BNSF-Cicero Project

Mr. Mills:

Your request was delayed until the next CMAQ project selection committee (July 29) because they requested more information on the change. Specifically a cost for Tier II locomotives. After we talked with EPA it also appears all new locomotives should be at minimum a Tier III and that even California is requesting Tier IV locomotives. Is BNSF opposed to using the funding for Tier III or Tier IV locomotives? Please provide a cost and whether BNSF is open to Tier III or Tier IV locomotives. If you would like this request to be considered at the July 29th meeting we do need a response before July 16th.

Thank you,

Holly

Holly A. Ostdick
312.386.8836
Ms. Ostdick,

As Jason Johnson mentioned to you by phone, BNSF would like to request a change of scope in our CMAP project to purchase two gensets for operation in the town of Cicero. We have several gensets operating in Texas and have found that they present significant maintenance and performance issues. My management has recommended that we seek single engine locomotive options for any grant opportunities that we have available. At this time BNSF does not have the cost of a Tier II switch locomotive, but we are in the process of requesting proposals for these on a different project. I would anticipate that it would be comparable to that of a genset, but I can provide you with further information once our scope change request is approved and we get proposals back from the manufacturers. Please let me know if there is any additional information that you need. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Regards,

Ryan Mills

Mgr Environmental Program Development

BNSF Railway

785-435-2257 Office
Cc: Holly Ostdick; Lupton, Greg S; Harpring, Jeff L

Subject: CMAQ BNSF-Cicero Project

Ryan:

To follow-up on our conversation yesterday, I called Holly Ostdick of CMAP and relayed to her what you told me; i.e. that BNSF is not satisfied with GenSet performance, and wishes to convert the CMAQ BNSF-Cicero GenSet locomotive retrofit project to an EMD ECO710-type engine and appurtenances retrofit. Holly stated that this would be a “scope change” to the project and requires CMAP Committee approval. This scope change request needs to be in writing. You can submit it by emailing the message to Holly requesting the scope change and the reason for the change. Her email address is: Hostdick@cmap.illinois.gov Please cc: the email to me and the Town of Cicero.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me, or Holly at (312) 386-8836.

Thank you,

Jason

+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

Jason L. Johnson, P.E.
Rail Safety Technician
Illinois Dept. of Transportation
Bureau of Local Roads & Streets
2300 S. Dirksen Pkwy., Rm. 204
Springfield, Illinois 62764
Phone (217) 557-1399
FAX (217) 782-3971
Email: Jason.Johnson@illinois.gov
April 1, 2011

Mr. Ross Patronsny  
Ms. Holly Ostdick  
CMAQ Program  
Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning  
233 S. Wacker, Suite 800  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Re: Lakefront Trail – Navy Pier Flyover (TIP ID – 01-01-0009)  
Request to Transfer Dedicated Funding from  
South Segment to Central Segment

Dear Mr. Patronsny and Ms. Ostdick:

The Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT) respectfully requests to transfer the $9M in CMAQ funding, which is currently dedicated to the south segment of the Navy Pier Flyover, to the central segment.

The Navy Pier Flyover was initially split into three phases because the Chicago Spire was required to develop the adjacent DuSable Park, including the central segment of the Flyover project. CDOT therefore requested funding for the north segment and the south segment (the Lake Shore Drive Chicago River Bridge segment), as the central segment would be built by others.

CDOT is currently moving forward with design of the central segment because of the demise of the Chicago Spire project. In addition, CDOT is further along with engineering design of the central segment than the south segment (currently finalizing Phase 1) and intends to overlap the construction phases of the north and central segments to provide a continuous project for the new multi-purpose bridge.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have further questions, you may contact me at 312-744-1987 or Keith Privett at 312-744-1981.

Sincerely,

Luann Hamilton  
Deputy Commissioner

DM
From: Jason Osborn <jjosborn@co.mchenry.il.us>

Sent: Monday, April 04, 2011 2:58 PM

To: Russell Pietrowiak

Cc: Walter Dittrich; Chalen Daigle; Holly Ostdick

Subject: FW: Virginia @ Il 31 Park N Ride CMAQ Question

Here you go!

The McHenry County Division of Transportation requests $700,000 in additional CMAQ funding to finish designing and building the park and ride lot.

Sincerely,

Jason J. Osborn, AICP
Principal Transportation Planner
McHenry County Division of Transportation
16111 Nelson Road
Woodstock, Illinois 60098
(815) 334-4981

From: Walter Dittrich

Sent: Monday, April 04, 2011 2:55 PM

To: Jason Osborn

Subject: FW: Virginia @ Il 31 Park N Ride CMAQ Question

Jason, Here is a summary of the request broken out by phase (sorry for the confusion earlier):

The extra Phase II work is due to additional Environmental Survey Request updates and Design Alternatives Analysis (with respect to site layout and access).
Phase II Eng = $25K Supplement
Phase III Eng = $75K Supplement
Construction = $600K supplement
So its an even $700K increase request.

From: Holly Ostdick [mailto:Hostdick@cmap.illinois.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2011 12:53 PM
To: Walter Dittrich
Cc: Sarah Chadderdon; Chalen Daigle; Ernest Varga; Jason Osborn
Subject: RE: Virginia @ Il 31 Park N Ride CMAQ Question

Do you still plan on the cost increase submittal?
If so, I would need the information by tomorrow.

Thanks,
Holly
Holly A. Ostdick
312-386-8836

From: Holly Ostdick
Sent: Tuesday, March 01, 2011 12:46 PM
To: 'Walter Dittrich'
Cc: Sarah Chadderdon; Chalen Daigle; Ernest Varga; Jason Osborn
Subject: RE: Virginia @ Il 31 Park N Ride CMAQ Question

Thank you Wally-

We suggest you submit a cost increase.

The e-mail below should work fine if you would prefer, with a few follow up questions.
1.) Did material costs go up or was the engineering cost estimate just incorrect?
2.) When is the anticipated letting?

Thanks,
Holly
Holly A. Ostdick
312-386-8836

From: Walter Dittrich [mailto:wrdittrich@co.mchenry.il.us]
Sent: Tuesday, March 01, 2011 11:31 AM
To: Holly Ostdick
Cc: Sarah Chadderdon; Chalen Daigle; Ernest Varga; Jason Osborn
Subject: RE: Virginia @ Il 31 Park N Ride CMAQ Question
Importance: High

Holly,

The engineering and construction estimate based on the CMAP park-and-ride lot study for the Virginia Road and Illinois Route 31 intersection was low. McHenry County was happy to apply for and be awarded funding from the CMAQ selection committee to cover 100% of the project costs specifically based on the fact that CMAP wished to build a park-and-ride lot at this
location but has no ability to construct and maintain a park-and-ride lot. This is how the County presented the project to the CMAQ selection committee and this is why the County requested this project to be funded 100%. The engineering process has identified the cost estimate to be roughly 2-3 times the original estimate ($600K to $900K vs. $300K). The County is poised to build and maintain a park-and-ride lot at Virginia Road and Illinois Route 31 and seeks a funding increase of up to $675,000 (additional $600K for construction + $175K for construction engineering) from the CMAQ selection committee to fund 100% of the construction costs as intended by the CMAQ selection committee.

Please advise if we should put in for a funding increase or apply with this call for projects.

Thanks,

Wally

Walter R. Dittrich, P.E.
Design Manager

McHenry County Division of Transportation
16111 Nelson Road, Woodstock, IL  60098
Direct: 815.334.4980 | Main: 815.334.4960 | Fax: 815.334.4989
wrdittrich@co.mchenry.il.us | www.mchenrycountydot.org

Jason J. Osborn, AICP
Principal Transportation Planner
McHenry County Division of Transportation
16111 Nelson Road
Woodstock, Illinois 60098
(815) 334-4981
From: Chalen Daigle

Sent: Thursday, February 17, 2011 11:30 AM

To: Jason Osborn; Walter Dittrich; Sarah Chadderdon

Subject: FW: Virginia @ Il 31 Park N Ride CMAQ Question

FYI, Chalen

From: Holly Ostdick [mailto:Hostdick@cmap.illinois.gov]

Sent: Thursday, February 17, 2011 11:22 AM

To: Chalen Daigle

Subject: RE: Virginia @ Il 31 Park N Ride CMAQ Question

How much is the cost increase – normally if it is a big cost increase and/or doesn’t re-rank well we suggest applying during the next call. I know that CMAP picked the spot for the park n ride through our regional park n ride study (which I participated in while working at McHenry County), however since McHenry County applied, it is a McHenry County project

Holly A. Ostdick

312-386-8836

From: Chalen Daigle [mailto:CLDaigle@co.mchenry.il.us]

Sent: Thursday, February 17, 2011 11:15 AM

To: Holly Ostdick

Subject: Virginia @ Il 31 Park N Ride CMAQ Question

I was going to email you today anyway. McHenry County would like to request more money for the Virginia at IL 31 Park N Ride lot. It is technically a CMAP project, but they are taking the lead and wanted to know if they should just ask for a cost increase at a future meeting or put together another application as part of the Call for Projects.

Any thoughts?

Chalen
Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning  
CMAQ Cost Increase Analysis  

**TIP ID:** 11-07-0001  
**Description:** McHenry County - Virginia Rd at IL 31 (southwest quadrant) (TIP ID 11-07-0001)

### Ranking Computation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008 Approved</th>
<th>2011 Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kg VOC eliminated</td>
<td>1,668.2527</td>
<td>1,668.2527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$/Kg VOC eliminated</td>
<td>$219</td>
<td>$629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal Share</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Federal %</th>
<th>Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008 Approved</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>Approved Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Request</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>Letter from Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Amount</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>CMAQ ID</td>
<td>Facility to be Improved</td>
<td>Project Total</td>
<td>Application Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry</td>
<td>CP11082900</td>
<td>McHenry County Division of Transportation-Virginia Rd</td>
<td>$ 366,000</td>
<td>$ 350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>CP12082919</td>
<td>Joliet-Joliet Metra Lot 1 at Washington St</td>
<td>$ 374,000</td>
<td>$ 272,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>CP12082883</td>
<td>Lockport-Lockport Commuter Parking Lot</td>
<td>$ 730,000</td>
<td>$ 480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore</td>
<td>CP02082889</td>
<td>Glenview-The Glen of North Glenview Station Commuter</td>
<td>$ 1,521,000</td>
<td>$ 1,200,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>CP07082922</td>
<td>Hazel Crest-New Commuter Parking Lot on the NW corn</td>
<td>$ 565,000</td>
<td>$ 452,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionwide</td>
<td>CP13082911</td>
<td>Pace-Rideshare/Carpool Lots at Area Interchanges</td>
<td>$ 3,413,700</td>
<td>$ 3,063,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionwide</td>
<td>CP13082918</td>
<td>Pace-Rideshare/Carpool Lots at Area Interchanges - We</td>
<td>$ 4,073,000</td>
<td>$ 4,073,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised Rank $ 629

- Will CP12082924 | Plainfield-Plainfield Pace Park and Ride Lot at 143rd St : | $ 1,069,000 | $ 799,200 | $ 698
- Kane CP09082920 | Aurora-IL 59 Commuter Station Parking Lot Addition at | $ 2,370,785 | $ 1,896,628 | $ 950
- DuPage CP08082901 | Lombard-Hammerschmidt Rail Commuter Parking Lot E: | $ 1,689,640 | $ 1,275,000 | $ 1,118
- Chicago CP01082927 | CDOT-91st St Station (RI-Bev) Park & Ride Expansion | $ 4,125,000 | $ 3,300,000 | $ 2,600
- Northwest CP03082908 | Rolling Meadows-Commuter Parking Lot Access Drive o | $ 972,000 | $ 778,000 | No Benefit

11-07-0001 revised rank 4/4/2011
Holly Ostdick  
Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning  
233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 800  
Chicago, IL 60606

Subject: City of Country Club Hills – Monarch Pedestrian Path  
Section No. 06-00031-00-SW  
Project No. CMM-8003(622)  
TIP No. 07-06-0004

Dear Ms. Ostdick:

The City of Country Club Hills has completed the construction of the Monarch Pedestrian Path sidewalk project on 187th Street and 186th Place.

As shown in the attachment, the final cost for the project is $109,649.42. The City would like to request $11,800.00 in additional CMAP funds to fully fund the project at the current division of cost. This would increase the project funds to $124,750.00 ($99,800.00 Federal share). Additional funds are needed for increased scope of work not anticipated at the time of the original CMAQ application.

If you have any additional information or have any questions please contact me at (708) 705-8826.

Very truly yours,

Dan Barr  
City of Country Club Hills

Enclosure

C. Christopher Holt, IDOT, District One Local Roads and Streets  
Thomas Slattery, P.E. Baxter & Woodman, Inc
## Illinois Department of Transportation

### Engineer's Payment Estimate

**Estimate: No. 2 and Final**

**Payable To:**  
Name: Davis Concrete Construction Company  
Address: 11633 South Mayfair Avenue, Alsip, IL 60803

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Awarded</th>
<th>Add/Deduct</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X0025665</td>
<td>INLET FILTER CLEANING</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>360.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X0201345</td>
<td>SHOULDER REMOVAL</td>
<td>SQ YD</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>1,095.00</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X0201666</td>
<td>SANITARY MANHOLE ADJ.</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2,450.00</td>
<td>(7.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X0229973</td>
<td>SED CONT SILT FENCE</td>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>1900.00</td>
<td>3,430.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X0232874</td>
<td>SED CONT SILT FN MAIN</td>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>1960.00</td>
<td>3,430.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X0976600</td>
<td>END SECTIONS REMOVED</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>450.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0016400</td>
<td>DRAINAGE DITCH ADJ.</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2,100.00</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0101000</td>
<td>TEMPORARY FENCE</td>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>530.00</td>
<td>2,250.00</td>
<td>(170.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0101200</td>
<td>TREE ROOT PRUNING</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>660.00</td>
<td>(11.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0101400</td>
<td>NITROGEN FERT NUTRIENT</td>
<td>POUND</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>(3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0101600</td>
<td>PHOSPHORUS FERT NUTRIENT</td>
<td>POUND</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>(3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0101800</td>
<td>NITROGEN FERT NUTRIENT</td>
<td>POUND</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>(3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0101700</td>
<td>SUPPLIES WATERING</td>
<td>UNIT</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>220.00</td>
<td>(2.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0203000</td>
<td>EARTH EXCAVATION</td>
<td>CU YD</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0203900</td>
<td>REM &amp; DISP UNS MATI</td>
<td>CU YD</td>
<td>407.00</td>
<td>14,240.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0403100</td>
<td>FURNISHED EXCAVATION</td>
<td>CU YD</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>768.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0201900</td>
<td>TREND BACKFILL</td>
<td>CU YD</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>2,170.00</td>
<td>(21.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0101515</td>
<td>TOPSOIL F &amp; P 4</td>
<td>SQ YD</td>
<td>1450.00</td>
<td>4,950.00</td>
<td>108.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0103100</td>
<td>GRADING AND SHAP DITCH</td>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>1,245.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0203400</td>
<td>NITROGEN FERT NUTRIENT</td>
<td>POUND</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>(2.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0203600</td>
<td>PHOSPHORUS FERT NUTRIENT</td>
<td>POUND</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>(2.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0200600</td>
<td>POTASSIUM FERT NUTRIENT</td>
<td>POUND</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>(2.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0200912</td>
<td>SODDING SALT TOLERANT</td>
<td>SQ YD</td>
<td>1450.00</td>
<td>7,250.00</td>
<td>108.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0200200</td>
<td>SUPPLIES WATERING</td>
<td>UNIT</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>2,200.00</td>
<td>(44.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0200300</td>
<td>TEMP DITCH CHECKS</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>(4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0200510</td>
<td>INLET FILTERS</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>(4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0101600</td>
<td>AGG BASE CSE B</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>(10.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z0101600</td>
<td>AGG BASE CSE B</td>
<td>SQ YD</td>
<td>1075.00</td>
<td>5,213.75</td>
<td>(29.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42020200</td>
<td>PC CONC SIDEWALK 5</td>
<td>SQ FT</td>
<td>6110.00</td>
<td>24,440.00</td>
<td>3597.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42020200</td>
<td>PC CONC SIDEWALK 4</td>
<td>SQ FT</td>
<td>355.00</td>
<td>1,704.00</td>
<td>(355.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42020200</td>
<td>PC CONC SIDEWALK 3 SP</td>
<td>SQ FT</td>
<td>3175.00</td>
<td>14,287.50</td>
<td>(3175.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42020200</td>
<td>PC CONC SIDEWALK 3 SP</td>
<td>SQ FT</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>2,800.00</td>
<td>(14.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44020300</td>
<td>CURB REM</td>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>(15.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48010200</td>
<td>AGGREGATE SHLDS B</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>1,040.00</td>
<td>45.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price</td>
<td>Unit Cost</td>
<td>Adj. Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P CUL 1 CS/A CP 12</td>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>42.60</td>
<td>2,319.00</td>
<td>(10.00)</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P CUL 2 CS/A CP 18</td>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>3,250.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEEL END SEC 12</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1,800.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEEL END SEC 18</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2,200.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN TA 4D W/SPL FR CL</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2,200.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMB CGAG TM SPL ASP</td>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1,250.00</td>
<td>(16.00)</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILIZATION</td>
<td>L SUM</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR CONT &amp; PROT 70/1601</td>
<td>L SUM</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1,800.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR CONT &amp; PROT 70/1601</td>
<td>L SUM</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THPL PVT MK LINE 12</td>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>280.00</td>
<td>2,980.00</td>
<td>(40.00)</td>
<td>240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THPL PVT MK LINE 24</td>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>320.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAVT MARKING REMOVAL</td>
<td>SQ FT</td>
<td>154.00</td>
<td>779.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>161.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenses and Credits</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Miscellaneous Expenses and Credits</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Value of Completed Work</td>
<td>109,649.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deduct Retainage</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Due on Completed Work</td>
<td>109,649.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miscellaneous Costs</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Miscellaneous Costs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET AMOUNT DUE</td>
<td>109,649.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed: ____________________________  Date
Dennis Dzros, P.E.
Project Manager, Baxter & Woodman, Inc.

Signed: ____________________________  Date
Dan Barr
City of Country Club Hills

3-15-11  Date
Russell,

Yes I agree with the amounts that you have indicated. I spoke with the engineer at Baxter and Woodman (Tom Slattery) and he confirmed that the numbers submitted in the request DID NOT include the Phase 1 Engineering. Therefore, the actual amount should reflect $10,000 cost ($8,000 Fed Participation) added to the request.

Bud

From: Russell Pietrowiak [mailto:RPietrowiak@cmap.illinois.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 05, 2011 4:48 PM
To: bud.fleming@ssmma.org
Cc: Doug Ferguson; Holly Ostdick
Subject: RE:

Bud, based on our conversation the new total project cost for all phases of this project is $134,750 ($107,800 federal), with Construction/CE being $124,750 ($99,800 federal) and Phase I engineering at $10,000 ($8,000 federal). Funding for this project originally was $120,000 ($96,000 federal). The cost increase being requested is $14,750 total ($11,800 federal). Do you concur with this?

- Russell J. Pietrowiak

From: Holly Ostdick
Sent: Tuesday, April 05, 2011 3:13 PM
To: bud.fleming@ssmma.org
Cc: Russell Pietrowiak; Doug Ferguson
Subject: RE:

Bud-

I forwarded it to Russell for inclusion. He will get back to you.

Thanks,
Holly

Holly A. Ostdick
312-386-8836

From: Bud Fleming [mailto:Bud.Fleming@ssmma.org]
Sent: Tuesday, April 05, 2011 12:38 PM
To: Holly Ostdick
Cc: 'Thomas M. Slattery'; Dan Barr
Subject:

Holly,

Attached is a letter from Dan Barr of Country Club Hills with all of the backup data, requesting additional consideration for funding to close out their project. The project, TIP #07-06-0004 has been completed
and has an additional cost for which they are requesting an additional $11,800 to help pay for the additional work that was unforeseen at the time the project was started.

Please review and submit for consideration at the next meeting. It will be appreciated.

Thank you, Bud
Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
CMAQ Cost Increase Analysis
TIP ID: 07-06-0004
Description: Country Club Hills - Monarch Pedestrian Path (TIP ID 07-06-0004)

Ranking Computation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 Approved</th>
<th>2011 Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kg VOC eliminated</td>
<td>0.2254</td>
<td>0.2254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$134,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$/Kg VOC eliminated</td>
<td>$532,387</td>
<td>$597,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal Share</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Federal %</th>
<th>Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006 Approved</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>Approved Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Request</td>
<td>$107,800</td>
<td>$134,750</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>Letter from Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Amount</td>
<td>$11,800</td>
<td>$14,750</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubType</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>CMAQ ID</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Application Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>BP01062605</td>
<td>CDOT-Walk to Transit - Pedestrian Improvements to Intersections near CTA Rail Stations</td>
<td>$965,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>DuPage</td>
<td>BP08062592</td>
<td>Westmont-Miscellaneous Sidewalks</td>
<td>$386,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>BP05062607</td>
<td>Brookfield-Pedestrian Bridge over Salt Creek</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>DuPage</td>
<td>BP08062572</td>
<td>Villa Park-South Villa Ave Sidewalk from Wildwood Ave to Park Blv</td>
<td>$219,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>BP10062589</td>
<td>Deerfield-Deerfield Rd Sidewalk</td>
<td>$240,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>BP07062599</td>
<td>Country Club Hills-Monarch Pedestrian Path</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised Rank

| Pedestrian | North Central | BP03062608 | Des Plaines-Golf Rd Sidewalk from Des Plaines River Rd to Third Ave     | $197,000          | $158,000            | $709,630                | $158,000         |
| Pedestrian | North Central | BP04062600 | Northlake-City of Northlake Sidewalks - Citywide                         | $420,500          | $336,400            | $950,136                | $336,400         |
| Pedestrian | North Shore  | BP02062594 | Northfield-Happ Rd Sidewalks from Willow Rd to Village Limit             | $154,704          | $123,763            | $1,485,552              | $123,763         |
| Pedestrian | South       | BP07062604 | Country Club Hills-Environmental Trail                                   | $206,600          | $165,300            | $4,578,698              | $165,300         |
| Pedestrian | North Central | BP04062595 | Schiller Park-Crystal Creek Ped Bridge and Sidewalk Improvements         | $171,500          | $137,200            | $4,733,736              | $137,200         |
| Pedestrian | DuPage      | BP08062606 | Wheaton Park District-Union Pacific Pedestrian Overpass                   | $538,311          | $430,649            | $7,217,172              | $430,649         |
| Pedestrian | Lake        | BP10062597 | Lincolnshire-Half Day Rd Pedestrian Path                                 | $394,000          | $315,000            | $8,282,066              | $315,000         |
| Pedestrian | Southwest   | BP06062588 | Palos Heights-135th St Sidewalk Extension                                | $79,000           | $63,200             | $11,447,448             | $63,200          |
MEMORANDUM

To: CMAQ Project Selection Committee

Date: April 5, 2011

From: Joy Schaad, Sr. Transportation Planning Engineer

Re: Transit Quarterly Updates

In an effort to gain a better understanding of the actual accomplishments of CMAQ transit projects that have been obligated (i.e. approved in FTA grants), the Committee instituted a new policy in the fall of 2010 requiring transit sponsors to submit updates of expenditures quarterly. After a discussion of what information would be most useful to the Committee and easily obtainable for the transit agencies, an on-line form was developed and a reminder sent out for the 3rd quarter (ending September 30, 2010). CMAP requested updates on 128 projects/phases that were not yet closed in CMAQ records.

Below is a summary. For simplification, we have provided the status summary by TIP project IDs ignoring separate approvals for different phases or individual projects appear in separate FTA grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Number of Projects (by TIP ID)</th>
<th>Number Complete</th>
<th>Active Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metra</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some projects contain multiple years of independent funding, such as #17-94-0002, Pace’s Vanpool program, that was funded several times from 1992 to 2008 and has projects in 14 different FTA grants.

The first update proved challenging both for the sponsors and for CMAP. It was later decided that the online form was making both submission and analysis more difficult; information was not received for many projects. It was agreed that CMAP would revise the request and the method of collection, and clean up the data before requesting the next update. Most of that work has been completed and a request for 1st quarter 2011 will be issued shortly.
MEMORANDUM

To: CMAQ Project Selection Committee
From: Holly A. Ostdick, Associate Planner
Date: April 14, 2011
Re: Unobligated Balance/Lapse Potential

Problem
CMAQ’s unobligated balance is over $200 million. This unobligated balance is a huge risk for Northeastern Illinois. At the present time, over $140 million could lapse at the end of FFY13. (No funds are at risk of lapsing in FFY 11 or 12.) While the majority of the lapse is attributable to the restoration of $83 million that was rescinded at the end of SAFETEA-LU, a significant amount is still due to the large number of projects that are not being obligated. This figure will be reduced by obligations between now and then, but historic obligation rates are not nearly enough to prevent a lapse.

Current Practices
Multi-year programming, which was implemented in 2007, has helped in increasing obligations, but not enough to spend down the balance. Active Program Management policies implemented in 2009 have also assisted in removal of projects that are not moving forward. They also have brought attention to projects that were lying dormant. The implementation of the CMAQ A list at the end of FFY09 allowed the flexibility to give cost increases to projects moving forward, implement projects on the B list, and also brought attention to projects that are not moving forward.

All of these attempts at spending down the unobligated balance have helped; however they are just not enough.

Here is a summary of obligations over the past four years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY 07</td>
<td>$28.126M</td>
<td>$5.948M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 08</td>
<td>$45.065M</td>
<td>$5.953M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 09</td>
<td>$53.484M</td>
<td>$26.416M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 10</td>
<td>$65.849M</td>
<td>$6.720M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$192.524M</td>
<td>$45.037M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Obligations have increased. Although IDOT appropriation for local projects were not enough at the onset IDOT staff have, to this point, found extra appropriation for our use and no CMAQ projects have been held up due to a lack of IDOT appropriation. In other words, IDOT is providing the appropriation for as many projects as the region has been able to produce.

**Options**
Given the risk of lapsing funds other measures should be considered. The committee has continued to implement various procedures to increase awareness of project movement and readiness. The committee should consider selecting different project types, sizes, or sponsors. Transit projects are quickly obligated. IDOT has large projects that do not use local CMAQ appropriation and has an excellent track record for accomplishing projects. Several major implementers also have large projects nearly ready for implementation that are partially funded with CMAQ or other federal funds that could be fully funded with the addition of CMAQ funding, for example, CREATE projects.

**Conclusion**
CMAQ has over $200 million in unobligated funds. It is anticipated that $143 million will lapse at the end of FFY13. The committee has implemented various procedures to reduce the unobligated balance and increase obligations. Obligations have increased with these procedures in place, however, not enough to spend down the entire unobligated balance. Other options for spending down the unobligated balance should be considered to avoid losing the region’s CMAQ funds.