



**Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)
STP Project Selection Committee Meeting Minutes**

June 25, 2020

Via GoToMeeting

Committee Members Present: Jesse Elam, Chairman – CMAP, Dan Burke – CDOT, John Donovan – FHWA, Lorri Newson – RTA, Kevin O’Malley - CDOT, Tara Orbon – Counties, Leon Rockingham – Council of Mayors, Jeffery Schielke – Council of Mayors, Jeffrey Sriver – CDOT

Others Present: Elaine Bottomley, Len Cannata, Grant Davis, Jackie Forbes, Michael Fricano, Jeremy Glover, Noah Jones, Mike Klemens, Daniel Knickelbein, Matthew Pasquini, Kelsey Passi, Leslie Phemister, David Seglin, Troy Simpson, David Tomzik, Audrey Wennink

Staff Present: Laurent Ahiablame, Aaron Brown, Teri Dixon, Kama Dobbs, Doug Ferguson, James Gross, Jane Grover, Craig Heither, Leroy Kos, Elliott Lewis, Martin Menninger, Russell Pietrowiak, Todd Schmidt, Tina Smith, Mary Weber, Simone Weil

1.0 Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:03 pm by Chairman Elam.

2.0 Agenda Changes

There was one agenda change. Due to overlapping meetings, Item 4.4, the Inclusive Growth presentation, was moved ahead of Item 4.1. Chairman Elam also reminded members and other attendees of best practices for participating in a virtual format.

3.0 Approval of Minutes – January 30, 2020

A motion by Mayor Schielke, seconded by Mayor Rockingham, to approve the minutes of the January 30, 2020 meeting as presented, carried.

4.0 Evaluating the Lessons Learned

4.1 Eligibility Criterion: Inclusion in Plans

Ms. Dobbs discussed draft language for the application booklet regarding the addition of Inclusion in Plans as an eligibility criterion. She stated that this language will be inserted into the section that discusses match and phase 1 engineering requirements. Ms. Dobbs reminded members that the language will not apply to applicants requesting funding for only phase 1 engineering. However, as in the last call, the requirement is either that the specific project or type of project be included in a plan. Ms. Dobbs then referenced the table in the memo, which details typical plan types found on agency websites, and those completed through CMAP's LTA program and RTA's community planning program. As the table is not all-inclusive, Ms. Dobbs stated that CMAP plans to designate specific planning staff contacts to answer applicants' questions about eligibility. Ms. Dobbs then asked committee members for their general concurrence with this approach. She stated that formal approval will occur when the final application booklet is approved in the fall.

4.2 Project Categories

Ms. Dobbs reminded committee members that, as discussed in January, staff suggests requiring applicants to identify the project category that their application should be evaluated under. She noted that the memo in the meeting packet contains the draft guidance language. Ms. Dobbs stated that, like the previous agenda item, staff is seeking the committee's general concurrence with this approach. While the table reflects current methodology, with one exception, Ms. Dobbs indicated that the information may change based on this committee's continued discussion of the transportation impact scoring later this summer. That one exception, she explained, is related to the bicycle/pedestrian project category, which is scheduled as an agenda item at the next meeting on July 16th.

In response to a question from Mr. Sriver, Ms. Dobbs confirmed that an applicant could select more than one evaluation category, based on the needs being addressed by the project. Chairman Elam highlighted the addition of bicycle/pedestrian category, noting that exact parameters for scoring need to be determined.

Mr. O'Malley asked staff to research federal eligibility criteria regarding categories that are not included. Chairman Elam responded that in general STP funding can be used for pretty much anything except transit operating costs. Ms. Dobbs added that primarily the typical local STP funded projects are maintenance projects that this committee determined should not be included in the regional shared fund program. Mr. Tomzik asked via the meeting chat function if the transit station category includes bus facilities such as Pulse stations and transit centers and stated that pedestrian access at these locations is

also a concern. Chairman Elam responded that transit stations were originally thought of as rail stations, and Pulse projects may be better covered under bus speed improvements.

4.3 Project Readiness

Ms. Dobbs stated that during the development of the shared fund methodology in 2018, the committee had several discussions regarding appropriate scoring for engineering and ROW completion. She directed the committee to the memo in the packet, which includes proposed modifications to the application booklet in the project readiness section. Ms. Dobbs explained that language was added to highlight IDOT's review policies, which notes that although most applicants will not receive maximum points in this category, those that have met the milestones will be rewarded with points. Additionally, language and criteria were also added for transit projects that will be processed through FTA to establish a clearer way for these projects to receive points for meeting milestones. Ms. Dobbs said that following the release of scores during the first call for projects, staff received several questions from applicants regarding the Financial Commitment scores. While no changes to the methodology are being proposed, staff is proposing inserting the examples shown in the memo into the application booklet to illustrate how points are calculated. Chairman Elam emphasized that this is something CMAP wants to work with IDOT on in order to match their process.

Mr. Knickelbein inquired about phase 2 engineering, noting that since IDOT has stated they won't move forward with phase 2 unless federal funding is secured, could this will result in projects that have other fund sources receiving additional points. Ms. Dobbs said that IDOT will review plans that are progressing according to the federal process; however, most locally funded projects would not go through IDOT. Ms. Dobbs then reiterated that most projects won't reach the highest level of readiness but this scoring is meant to reward those that do. Mr. Davis inquired how temporary easements impact scoring. Ms. Dobbs indicated that the application will ask if a project will require right of way. If it's known at the time of the application that funds will be spent on temporary easements, it should be acknowledged in the application. Ms. Orbon suggested that the term 'land acquisition' be used instead of 'right of way.' She stated this would be more inclusive and would encompass anything that would go through the Bureau of Land Acquisition for right of way certification. Ms. Dobbs stated that the language can be changed throughout the application booklet based on this suggestion.

4.4 Inclusive Growth

Ms. Grover presented the results of the staff evaluation of the inclusive growth elements included in the FFY 2020-2024 Shared Fund application process. She

noted that this presentation was a first discussion, and that CMAP staff will bring a proposal for committee consideration at a future meeting. Ms. Grover explained that the evaluation sought to determine if the inclusive growth elements of the methodology results in more participation in the program by disadvantaged communities and more benefits to disadvantaged persons, while also considering if certain criteria, such as financial commitment and project readiness, had a negative impact on the disadvantaged.

She reported that staff concluded that there is evidence that the inclusive growth factors changed the mix of projects programmed, that scoring for financial commitment and project readiness did not work against disadvantaged communities, and that eliminating local match and offering preliminary engineering funding appears to have had a positive effect on encouraging low-capacity local governments to submit proposals. Chairman Elam asked for feedback from the committee on whether and how the scoring should be adjusted for the next call for projects to continue to prioritize and promote inclusive growth.

Mayor Rockingham said the presentation showed that those communities with greater disadvantages are applying more. He was in favor of continuing with the current criteria. Ms. Newson agreed that the current methodology should be retained and suggested that staff continue to monitor future application cycles to see if there is an increase in the number of disadvantaged communities applying and if so, how many are approved. Mayor Schielke stated the staff has done a very nice job of exposing factors the region didn't initially invest enough time in understanding. He added that he hopes the committee will keep this as a work in progress especially as the region continues to see the financial impacts of COVID. Mayor Schielke also stated that he had received several calls recently from local governments, and there seems to be a high degree of concern regarding the future levels of available funding. Mr. Donovan stated he finds these results very encouraging and he found the increase in awards for disconnected communities a positive first step. Mr. O'Malley commented that the positive outcome is great. He added that he'd like to keep the conversation going, and as staff prepares more analysis, he'd be open to changes to the process.

Chairman Elam stated that Ms. Wennink noted via the meeting chat that the council bonus points far exceed the inclusive growth points and suggested staff evaluate the impact of bonus point on equity. Chairman Elam noted that discussion of the bonus points and their effect on programming will occur later this summer.

4.5 Additional Scoring Criteria

Ms. Dobbs explained that with the shifting of inclusion in plans to an eligibility criterion, ten points are now available to be either redistributed among other existing scoring criteria or for a new scoring category. She clarified that staff was not proposing any new criteria at this time, but if the committee had any suggestions that staff should look into, now was an opportunity to discuss those. Mr. O'Malley said the city had written a memo, and included the other committee members, regarding ideas they had about the existing scoring criteria. He asked if there was time in the future this could be discussed. Chairman Elam responded that all of the comments in the letter will be addressed at one or more of the meetings in the future. Mr. O'Malley concluded that he feels the criteria are correct but further discussion about implementation is needed.

5.0 Shared Fund Status Update

Ms. Dobbs stated that the April program reports were posted with the meeting packet and that June status updates are currently in progress and that about half had been received. An updated report will be published before the next meeting in July.

Ms. Dobbs then discussed some changes since the publication in April, which include sponsors requesting, and staff granting, obligation deadline extensions for all FFY 2020 phases, with one exception. The City of Countryside requested to have their project moved to the contingency program. As a result, she said, a little over \$900 thousand was available for reprogramming in FFY 2020. Per the active program management policies, staff reached out to the CTA – as the sponsor of the highest-ranking contingency project seeking funds in FFY 2020 - and offered the available funds to them. Ms. Dobbs reported that CTA did accept the partial funding and identified Rebuild Illinois bond funds to make up the funding difference. She noted that while the CTA project was overall the 4th highest ranked project on the contingency list, the three higher ranked projects are seeking construction funding in later years and as of the March status updates, had not started phase 2 engineering. Therefore, she explained, these three projects would be unable to obligate funds for construction within FFY 2020.

Ms. Dobbs then reported that cost increases were accommodated in FFY 2020 for the ROW phase of Plainfield's 143rd St. project and in FFY 2021 for the construction phase of Streamwood's Irving Park Rd. at Bartlett Rd. project. Furthermore, about \$7,000 was moved from right of way in FFY 2021 to phase 2 engineering in FFY 2020 for plats and legals work for Batavia's Prairie St. Project.

6.0 Local Program Updates

Ms. Dobbs reported that nearly 375 applications were received by the councils and CDOT, with 95 additional projects being grandfathered. She noted that several councils' and CDOT's programs are currently available for public comment, with the remainder scheduled for release in the next few weeks. The programs are available on individual

council websites and the CMAP website. Additionally, she stated, the CMAP weekly update email contains an announcement and CMAP has been making social media posts and issuing targeted press releases announcing the opportunities for comment.

7.0 Other Business

There was no other business.

8.0 Public Comment

There was no public comment.

9.0 Next Meeting

Chairman Elam announced that the next meeting will be held virtually on Thursday, July 16th at 9:30am. Discussion will include staff's proposal for bicycle and pedestrian project scoring as well as complete streets planning factors and project scoring for the transit category.

10.0 Adjournment

On a motion by Mayor Rockingham, seconded by Mayor Schielke, the meeting adjourned at 1:55 p.m.