



# Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 800, Sears Tower  
Chicago, IL 60606

312-454-0400 (voice)  
312-454-0411 (fax)  
[www.cmap.illinois.gov](http://www.cmap.illinois.gov)

## **Transportation Committee Draft Minutes February 22, 2008**

Offices of the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)  
Cook County Conference Room

### **Transportation Committee Members Present:**

Luann Hamilton, Chairman, CDOT  
Thomas Cuculich, Vice-Chairman, DuPage County  
Chuck Abraham, IDOT-DPIT  
Patricia Berry, CMAP  
Bill Brown, NIRPC  
Steve Coffinbarger, Kane County  
Michael Connelly, CTA  
Joe DiJohn, UIC-UTC  
Chris DiPalma, FHWA, Metro Office  
John Fortmann, IDOT-District One  
Ted Georgas, Cook County  
Jack Groner, Metra  
Robert Hann, Private Transportation Providers  
Jamy Lyne, Will County  
Mike McLaughlin, BLT  
Randy Neufeld, Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force  
Jason Osborn, McHenry County  
Joe Schofer, Northwestern University  
Holly Smith, Kendall County  
Danielle Stilz, Illinois Tollway  
Paula Trigg, Lake County  
Sidney Weseman, RTA  
Tom Zapler, Railroad Companies

### **Transportation Members Absent:**

Vanessa Adams, FTA, USDOT Chicago Metro Office  
Mayor Arlene Mulder, Council of Mayors  
Ken Yunker, SEWRPC

## Others Present

Leonard Cannata  
Kama Dobbs  
Dean Englund  
Bud Fleming  
Chalen Hunter  
Hugh O'Hara  
Beth McCluskey  
Chad Riddle  
David Seglin

Ron Shimizu  
Peter Skosey  
Chris Staron  
Emily Tapia  
Mike Walczak  
Tammy Wierciak

CMAP Staff  
Janet Bright  
Lee Deuben  
Teri Dixon

Tom Murtha  
Art Nicholas  
Holly Ostdick  
Joy Schaad

### **1.0 Call to Order and Introductions**

Ms. Luann Hamilton, Committee Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m. Members and all present introduced themselves.

### **2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements**

There were no agenda changes or announcements.

### **3.0 Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Cuculich made a motion to approve the minutes of January 18, 2008. Mr. Zapler seconded. Vote: All Ayes. Motion Carried.

### **4.0 Coordinating Committee Reports**

Ms. Hamilton stated the Planning Coordinating Committee has not met since the last Transportation Committee meeting.

Mr. Cuculich stated that the Programming Coordinating Committee did meet in February and discussed the Developments of Regional Importance (DRI) draft that was developed by CMAP staff with direction from the DRI sub-committee. The Programming Coordinating Committee decided the sub-committee should review the draft and bring it back to the full committee. He said it was anticipated that there would be eight to ten DRI projects per year. Mr. Cuculich continued to state that action on the TIP amendment was deferred to the Transportation Committee for consideration. The deferment was due to the fact that the public comment for the amendment was not closed at the time of the Programming Coordinating Committee meeting.

## **5.0 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

### **5.1 TIP Procedures**

Ms. Ostdick stated a memo regarding the draft TIP procedures and a copy of the draft procedures was distributed in the Transportation Committee's packet. She stated that under the old procedures, a TIP amendment occurred when a project was introduced or changed that triggered an air quality conformity analysis for the region and that this will continue to cause an amendment under the draft procedures and will be subject to a thirty day public comment period and approval by the MPO policy committee.

The main changes in the proposed procedures are having financial changes cause amendments. Only financial changes to federal amounts of federally funded projects or project groups will cause an amendment. There is a threshold for the changes and that is highlighted in the memo and draft procedures. In the draft procedures, under the thresholds portion, it says increase, but when we forward it to the MPO policy committee it will say change so the procedures will accommodate decreases as well as increases.

She continued to state that all financial amendments will be subject to a seven day public comment. With this in mind, suspension of the rules will no longer be able to occur, and project programmers will have to have their submittals to CMAP and abide by the TIP revision deadlines to ensure that the proper public comment time is given. After the draft procedures are finalized, they will be taken to the Citizens' Advisory Committee.

Ms. Hamilton asked if a project is in the TIP with no federal money and \$150,000 is added of federal money if that would cause an amendment. Ms. Ostdick replied affirmatively, stating that according to the thresholds, if a project begins with zero federal dollars and federal dollars are added that would be 100% cost change and would cause an amendment.

Mr. DiPalma explained that through the Tier II Consultation process the group determined that amendments would only be triggered for federal costs versus total costs.

Ms. Hamilton continued to ask if moving between Phase I engineering and Phase II engineering would trigger an amendment. Mr. DiPalma stated that adding Phase II engineering with federal funds would cause an amendment, however if Phase II engineering is already in the TIP with federal funds than it would not cause an amendment.

Ms. Berry stated that Mr. Carlson of IDOT has asked about grouping safety and maintenance projects. Ms. Berry stated that USDOT has been receptive to that comment and has allowed for the thresholds to apply to groups of exempt projects rather than to individual projects. However, if a grouped project has no federal funds and federal funds are being added – that will not be considered an amendment.

Mr. Groner stated that he is concerned with the time of submitting a revision to the TIP and when that revision is approved by the appropriate agencies. Mr. DiPalma stated that USDOT, IDOT, and CMAP will work to get the appropriate approvals in a timely fashion. Mr. Blankenhorn gave a brief synopsis of how TIP amendments used to be approved; he stated that once the MPO made approval it was usually a few days until the implementers received notification from CMAP/IDOT.

Mr. Georgas asked if limit changes to projects will trigger an amendment. Ms. Ostdick stated it matters whether the project is an exempt or not-exempt project. If the project is not exempt project, CMAP staff will work with the Tier II Consultation team to determine if it is an amendment and follow the necessary steps for its approval. Ms. Berry added that CMAP should be made aware of changes as soon as possible so staff can take the appropriate steps to ensure a speedy approval process. Some changes to non exempt projects can be handled through the tier II consultation team and do not require a full conformity analysis with associated 30 day public comment.

Mr. Osborn asked how public comments will be handled. Ms. Ostdick stated that CMAP will provide a summary of the comment and implementer's response for the transportation committee. A copy of the comment and response will be included in the packet as well.

Mr. Connelly made a motion to recommend approval of the TIP procedures to the MPO Policy Committee. Mr. Cuculich seconded the motion. Vote: All Ayes. Motion carried.

## **5.2 TIP Changes**

Ms. Ostdick thanked the committee and stated that the TIP Revision attachment included in the committee's packet highlighted amendments by changing them to red. She stated that amendments were determined using the previously discussed procedures and was released for public comment on February 15, 2008 and that no comments were received. Ms. Lyne made a motion to approve the TIP revision attachment. Ms. Trigg seconded the motion. Vote: All Ayes. Motion carried.

## **5.3 Update to Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), TIP amendment, and Conformity Analysis**

Ms. Ostdick stated that the Transportation Committee released an RTP update, TIP amendment and conformity analysis for public comment at its last meeting.

A TIP amendment resulting in a conformity analysis and RTP update is requested for I-355 from 75th Street to I-88. An RTP update is requested for this project because adding an extra lane within these limits is not included in the RTP.

As for the Prairie Parkway, IDOT is requesting that a section of the entire Prairie Parkway be moved into completion year 2012. To clarify, only the section of the Prairie Parkway from IL 71 to US 34 is being moved into completion year 2012 where as the rest of the Prairie Parkway is still in analysis year 2030.

The attached conformity analysis shows that the results fell below State Implementation Plan emission budgets for each analysis year and were very similar to emission estimates from the current conformity analysis documentation for the RTP and TIP.

Two public comments were received regarding the Prairie Parkway and a summary is provided at the committees seats.

Mr. Neufeld asked if thresholds should be developed for investments. Mr. Groner stated that occurs at the Regional Transportation Plan development level. Mr. Neufeld asked if this is the level where transportation investments should be discussed. Mr. Blankenhorn stated

that this is the level where it should be discussed but just not at this juncture. The short term investments should be discussed during the TIP development. Mr. Neufeld continued to state that this committee should develop a threshold where if a project is adding a certain amount of funding we should determine if it is the best use of the money. Mr. McLaughlin said with performance management of all project and a cost/benefit analysis of the Prairie Parkway and other major projects we should also rank projects. Mr. Fortmann stated the Prairie Parkway is an earmarked project and the funds cannot be used for any other project. Mr. McLaughlin said we can't do anything about Congressman Hastert's earmark, but hopefully we will have a better idea of performance measures and performance indicators will be used for projects in the future.

There being no further discussion on the amendments, Mr. Fortmann made a motion to recommend approval of the TIP amendment, RTP update, and conformity analysis to the MPO Policy Committee and CMAP Board. Mr. Georgas seconded the motion. Vote: All Ayes. Motion Carried.

#### **5.4 Active Program Management**

Ms. Ostdick stated that an STP expenditure report for the suburban STP program was included in the committee's packet. The active program management initiative began to highlight the suburban council's need to spend unobligated balances. CMAP staff has met with all the Council of Mayors Executive Committee members and sub-regional staff (aka planning liaisons aka PLs) to discuss the issue and they have made changes to the way they program and track individual projects. A primary responsibility of the planning liaisons (PLs), as extensions of the CMAP staff, is to ensure appropriate progress on the locally programmed STP projects. The changes the PLs made have led to great amounts of spending and another issue has come up. That issue, as it is highlighted in the handout is the state appropriation. CMAP staff anticipates creating similar reports for all funding sources in the TIP. Ms. Ostdick requested that if the committee would like particular information included in the report of funding that they contact her at [Hostdick@cmap.illinois.gov](mailto:Hostdick@cmap.illinois.gov)

#### **5.5 State/Regional Resources Table**

Ms. Ostdick stated the previously distributed State/Regional Resources table has been updated and the most recent version is available at

everyone's seats. She continued to state that staff worked with IDOT and RTA to develop the table. The RTA board approved new marks for the service boards at their meeting on February 21, 2008 and those are reflected in the table. The table is used to program projects against in the TIP to determine fiscal constraint. Mr. Groner made a motion to accept the table. Mr. Fortmann seconded. Vote: All Ayes. Motion Carried.

## **6.0 City/Suburban Split**

Ms. Berry stated that the city suburban split sub-committee group met on February 5, 2008 before the Council of Mayors Executive Committee. The sub-committee discussed the possibility of taking five percent off the top of the total allocation for regional projects that are located within the City of Chicago, and the remainder of the money will be split between the City and suburbs at 45% for the City and 55% for the suburbs. The City will produce a list of possible projects for the first five percent. The Council of Mayors Executive Committee approved the split contingent on the list developed by the City. The actual split was discussed, which comes to 52.25% for the suburbs and 47.75% for the city.

## **7.0 New Freedom Resolution**

Ms. Ostdick stated that due to renegotiations between Northwest Indiana, Southeast Wisconsin, and CMAP a revised split for New Freedom funds for Federal Fiscal Year 2008 was determined. There was a minor change in the distribution between Northwest Indiana and Southeast Wisconsin. The committee asked what the change was and what New Freedom funds are used for. Ms. Ostdick stated the funds are used for transit programs to support seniors and that the change was one millionth of a percentage point but in order for the change to take affect the MPO Policy Committee needs to approve the resolution. Mr. Cuculich made a motion to recommend approval of the resolution to the MPO Policy Committee. Mr. Fortmann seconded. Vote: All Ayes. Motion Carried.

## **8.0 Follow-up Federal Energy Bill**

Mr. Patrosky described for the Committee the relevant provisions of the Energy Bill (HR 6) passed in December, 2007: a) all CMAQ project obligated between the passage of the legislation and the end of federal fiscal year 2009 must be obligated at a minimum federal share of 80%, and b) at the discretion of the state, CMAQ projects obligated during this period may be obligated at a federal share up to 100%.

Mr. Patronskey said that most CMAQ projects in northeastern Illinois are programmed at an 80% federal share, so the minimum federal share requirement will not have a significant immediate impact. Some projects receive CMAQ funds for a portion of the total project cost, as with grade separations. Federal guidance to date indicates that only the "CMAQ portion" of such projects will be considered when determining the 80% federal share.

An area of concern is the implications for cost increases; if a project requires additional funds for completion, the region may be required to fund the entire increase. The potential impact of this is uncertain, but may be on the order of \$30 million.

With respect to 100% federal funding, Mr. Patronskey noted that a few CMAQ projects currently are programmed at a 100% federal share under current guidelines. The broader provisions of the energy bill could apply to any already-programmed project, or to projects programmed in FY 2009 if they could obligate their funds within the fiscal year. A few FY 2009 proposals include a request for 100% federal funding; the best approach to handling these will be discussed at the CMAQ Project Selection Committee meeting.

Mr. Neufeld advised the Committee that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force had considered the issue, and recommended that bicycle and pedestrian projects not receive a federal share over 80% - providing the local share was viewed as an important demonstration of a community's commitment to a project.

## **9.0 Jobs-Housing Balance**

Ms. Deuben gave a presentation on preliminary findings on a snapshot on the Jobs/Housing balance. Analyzing U.S. Census data, CMAP forecasts, and the Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP), the research identifies the current jobs housing balance, the projected jobs-housing growth rate and the forecast jobs-housing ratio in 2030. Further, the research identifies current concentrations of affordable housing throughout the region, and the proximity of such to employment sub-centers. Mr. Cuculich questioned whether the snapshot will address the implications of transportation initiatives? Mr. Osborn asked if apartment availability versus home availability is being studied. Ms. Deuben stated that those are both excellent questions and will be researched. Dr. Schofer stated that new survey data



will be available soon and will be more comprehensive. He suggested review of Pisarski's Commuting in America.

#### **10.0 Parking Management Strategy Analysis**

Tom Murtha reviewed congestion management work to date regarding a strategy analysis of parking management. To begin, Mr. Murtha reviewed available data, including on-street arterial parking and off-street parking derived from the CoSTAR on-line database. He noted known data gaps and reviewed plans for additional study. He then reviewed parking management principles and the benefits to accrue to the region from parking management. He provided examples of parking management applications, including the application of existing regulatory frameworks to new policies, the application of new technology, improved designs, and using the price mechanism where appropriate.

A number of questions were raised, focusing on data collection activities (commuter parking and downtown parking, prices, and existing management practices). Mr. Murtha said he would try to address these as the study moved forward.

#### **11.0 Update Reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU**

Ms. Berry gave a brief overview of the dissenting opinion of the report the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission released earlier in the year. She stated that the minority report objects to an unnecessary large role of the USDOT in transportation funding and researching opportunities for charging drivers by Vehicle Miles Traveled rather than an increase in the gas tax. Mr. Cuculich said there was a good discussion of this topic yesterday and if we're going to have a paradigm shift, we're going need more economists involved in the discussion. Mr. Schofer said we need to do more sensible project evaluation and take advantage of existing expertise. Mr. McLaughlin said performance measures are strongly supported.

#### **12.0 Other Business**

Ms. Hamilton asked if a presentation on complete streets will be able to be made at the next meeting. Mr. Fortmann stated IDOT is trying to understand the interesting bill. Ms. Dixon stated that IDOT is working on a presentation for the committee and will present as soon as they are able.

Several committee members asked IDOT to present on the state's proposed capital bill at the next meeting.

Ms. Berry reiterated the need for timely submission of TIP revisions. The deadline for revisions to be considered at the March 28 Transportation Committee is March 11.

### 13.0 Public Comment

There was no public comment.

### 14.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for March 28.

### 15.0 Adjournment

A motion was made by Ms. Berry and seconded by Mr. Groner to adjourn the meeting. Vote: All Ayes. Motion Carried.

### Transportation Committee Members

___ Vanessa Adams ***	___ Don Kopec	___ Dick Smith
___ Tom Cuculich**	___ Paul Losos	___ Jeffrey Sriver
___ Chris DiPalma ***	___ Mike McLaughlin	___ Steve Strains
___ Rocky Donahue	___ Jan Metzger	___ Vonu Thakuriah
___ Neil Ferrari	___ Arlene Mulder	___ Paula Trigg
___ John Fortmann	___ Randy Neufeld	___ Mary Wells
___ Bruce Gould	___ Jason Osborn	___ Ken Yunker
___ Rupert Graham Jr	___ Leanne Redden	___ Tom Zapler
___ Jack Groner	___ Thomas Rickert	
___ Luann Hamilton*	___ Mike Rogers	
___ Fran Klaas	___ Joe Schofer	
*Chair	**Vice-Chair	***Non-voting

