MINUTES

CMAQ Project Selection Committee

Thursday, February 13, 2014 2:00 p.m.
CMAP Offices

Committee Members

Present:
Ross Patronsky, Chair (CMAP), Mark Pitstick (RTA),
Keith Privett (CDOT), Tom Rickert (Counties), William
Rodeghier (Council of Mayors), Mike Rogers, (IEPA), Chris
Schmidt (IDOT)

Staff Present:
Alex Beata, Patricia Berry, Kama Dobbs, Jesse Elam, Doug
Ferguson, Don Kopec, Russell Pietrowiak

Others Present:
Mike Albin, Reggie Arkell, Jennifer Becker (via phone), Bruce
Carmitchel, Dinny Cosyns, Zygmunt Czykiet, Chalen Daigle
(via phone), Will Dolan, John Donovan, Tim Grzesiakowski,
Luann Hamilton, Mike Kerr (via phone), Gin Kilgore, Valbona
Kokoshi, Mike Kowski, Mark Minor, Nicole Nutter, Kris
Skogsbakken, Chris Staron, Brian Stepp, Susan Stitt (via phone),
David Tomzik, Sean Wiedel, Tammy Wierciak (via phone), Tom
Vander Woude

1.0 Call to Order
Committee Chairman Patronsky called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements
None

3.0 Approval of Minutes—December 12, 2013
Mr. Pitstick offered a correction to the minutes to indicate that it was chaired by Mr.
Rogers. On a motion by Mr. Rogers and a second by Mr. Pitstick, the minutes of the
December 12, 2013 meeting were approved as corrected.

4.0 Program Monitoring
4.1 Programming Project Status Sheets
Updated status reports were included in the agenda packet. Ms. Dobbs noted that
administrative modifications made by staff since the last meeting were reflected in
the reports.
4.2 Obligation Goal
Ms. Dobb's said the obligation goal report shows nearly $11.7 million in federal CMAQ obligations so far in FFY 2014. She noted that while the region is over programmed in FFY 2014 by nearly $10 million, the $188 million currently programmed amount includes $27 million in balances from line items obligated in 2013 and earlier years. FHWA and IDOT are currently aggressively working to close out open projects and the currently programmed amount is expected to be adjusted substantially in the coming months. She concluded that reinstatement of deferrals and cost increases in FFY 2014 can continue to be accommodated.

5.0 Project Changes

5.1 Maywood – Maywood Train Station Facility (TIP ID 04-14-0002)
Ms. Dobbs reported that to expedite Phase II Engineering, the sponsor is requesting withdrawal of the federal CMAQ funds in the amount of $232,000, currently programmed in FFY15. The sponsor is requested that the funds from that phase be transferred to the Construction phase, currently programmed in FFY16 at a 50% federal share and that all funds be programmed in FFY15. The resulting federal share for Construction in FFY15 will be 62%. There is no increase in the total cost of the project ($2,411,000) and therefore no change to the project ranking. She stated that staff recommends consideration of the request to transfer funds and increase the federal match for Construction. In response to a question from Mr. Pitstick, Ms. Dobbs confirmed that there is no net change to the CMAQ funds programmed or the total cost of the project. Mr. Rickert stated that this request is an example of sponsors reacting to delays caused by long agreement processing times at IDOT, which have improved, but can still slow down the progress of projects. On a motion by Mr. Rickert and a second by Mr. Pitstick, the sponsor’s request was approved.

5.2 Tinley Park – 183rd St. at Oak Park Ave. (TIP ID 07-10-0001)
Ms. Dobbs reported that the sponsor is requesting to transfer $80,000 federal CMAQ ($100,000 total) from the ROW phase to the Construction phase, in addition to requesting an increase of $784,000 federal CMAQ ($980,000 total) for Construction. Phase I Engineering is complete, the reconstruction limits have increased and context sensitive solutions elements have been added to the project. A re-ranking was completed with the project ranking changing from 11th to 13th among all 2010 Intersection Improvement proposals. She stated that staff recommends consideration of the request to transfer and increase funds. In response to a question from Mr. Donovan, Mr. Kowski of Tinley Park confirmed that ROW costs have decreased. In response to a question from Mr. Rogers, Ms. Dobbs stated that IDOT has confirmed with FHWA that the Context Sensitive elements of the project would not be CMAQ-eligible as a stand-alone project but are eligible in this case because they are considered as part of the overall CMAQ funded project. On a motion by President Rodeghier and a second by Mr. Privett, the sponsor’s request was approved.

5.3 IDOT – IL 43/Harlem Av at 143rd St (TIP ID 06-12-0002)
Ms. Dobbs reported that the sponsor is requesting to transfer ROW funding, currently programmed in FFY15, in the amount of $160,000 federal CMAQ ($200,000 total) to Construction, currently programmed in FFY16. The sponsor is also requesting a cost increase of $204,000 federal CMAQ ($255,000 total) for the Construction phase and to reprogram the funds from FFY 16 to FFY 14. The project is targeting letting on June 13, 2014. A re-ranking was completed with the project ranking changing from 15th to 21st among all 2012 Intersection Improvement proposals. She stated that staff recommends approval of the request. On a motion by Mr. Rickert and a second by President Rodeghier, the sponsor’s request was approved.

5.4 IDOT – IL 38/Roosevelt Rd at Ardmore Av (TIP ID 08-12-0002)  
Ms. Dobbs reported that the sponsor is requesting a cost increase of $296,000 federal CMAQ ($370,000 total) for the Construction phase, currently programmed in FFY15, due to updated estimates from the completion of Phase I Engineering. A re-ranking was completed with the project ranking changing from 46th to 54th among all 2012 Intersection Improvement proposals. She stated that staff recommends approval of the request. On a motion by Mr. Schmidt and a second by President Rodeghier, the sponsor’s request was approved.

5.5 IDOT – IL 120 at Hainesville Rd (TIP ID 10-14-0004)  
Ms. Dobbs reported that the sponsor is requesting a cost increase of $212,000 federal CMAQ ($265,000 total) for the ROW phase, currently programmed in FFY17, and a cost increase of $208,000 federal CMAQ ($260,000 total) for the Construction phase, currently programmed in FFY18 and reprogramming the ROW phase in FFY14 and the Construction phase in FFY16 to coordinate with Lake County DOT’s signal interconnect project (10-14-0008). A re-ranking was completed with the project ranking unchanged at 15th among all 2014 Intersection Improvement proposals. She stated that staff recommends approval of the request. On a motion by Mr. Rickert and a second by President Rodeghier, the sponsor’s request was approved.

5.6 Lake County DOT – Washington St Bike Path (TIP ID 10-10-0002)  
Ms. Dobbs reported that the sponsor is requesting a cost increase of $142,000 federal CMAQ ($164,400 total) for the construction phase, currently programmed in FFY14. The cost increase is the result of revised construction cost estimates developed during the engineering phases. The project is targeting construction letting on June 13, 2014. A re-ranking was completed with the project ranking unchanged at 10th among 2010 Bicycle Facilities proposals. She stated that staff recommends approval of the request. On a motion by Mr. Rickert and a second by Mr. Privett, the sponsor’s request was approved.

5.7 Lincolnwood – Lincolnwood Union Pacific (UP) Rail Line/Weber Spur Bike/Multiuse Trail (TIP ID 02-10-0001)  
Ms. Dobbs reported that the sponsor is requesting to reinstate and transfer $76,000 federal CMAQ ($95,000 total) from ROW, currently deferred in FFY14, to the Construction phase, currently reinstated from deferral in FFY14. ROW was initially programmed for $4,800,000 CMAQ federal ($6,000,000 total). There is no increase in the total cost of the project and therefore no change to the project ranking. The project is targeting letting on April 25, 2014. She stated that staff recommends approval of the
request. On a motion by Mr. Privett and a second by President Rodeghier, the sponsor’s request was approved. In response to a question from Mr. Patronsky, Mr. Privett stated that the project connects to a CDOT trail and the city appreciates the coordination with Lincolnwood and supports the project.

5.8 Lincolnwood – Lincolnwood Commonwealth Edison (ComEd) Utility ROW/Skokie Valley Bike/Multiuse Trail (TIP ID 02-10-0002).
Ms. Dobbs reported that the sponsor is requesting a cost increase of $104,000 CMAQ federal ($130,000 total) for the Construction phase, currently reinstated from deferral in FFY14. The project is targeting letting on April 25, 2014. A re-ranking was completed with the project ranking changing from 6th to 7th among 2010 Bicycle Facilities proposals. She stated that staff recommends approval of the request. On a motion by Mr. Privett and a second by Mr. Rickert, the sponsor’s request was approved. Mr. Privett noted that this project also connects to a CDOT trail at Devon Ave.

5.9 Administrative Modifications
Mr. Patronsky reported that staff completed eleven administrative modifications, including two transfers of sponsorship, reinstatement of deferred funds for three projects, one phase transfer, three program year changes, and two project withdrawals, as described in the attached CMAQ Project Change Requests memo. Mr. Pitstick thanked IDOT for taking on sponsorship of Pace’s I-55 Bus on Shoulders project implementation. Mr. Rickert stated that he has concerns that sponsors that have started phases in earlier years are being penalized by having their sunset year changed to a corresponding earlier year. Mr. Patronsky stated that Active Program Management policies are meant to encourage sponsors to commit to the obligation of funds within the established time frame. Ms. Dobbs added that the policies encourage realistic scheduling to meet deadlines and sponsor requests to reprogram phases should not occur until those phases are ready and can meet the Active Program Management time frame. She added that no project phase that has started early so far has been deferred.

6.0 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) project accomplishments
Mr. Patronsky reported that the CMAQ program has funded a number of TDM efforts over the years. A review of these individual efforts to see what their impact has been, how they can be coordinated, and how they can support GO TO 2040 and performance-based programming is underway. He stated that sponsors of active TDM projects will present a brief overview of project accomplishments.

Ms. Gin Kilgore of the League of Illinois Bicyclists (LIB) presented an overview of the Schaumburg sponsored Bike-to-Metra Guides project (TIP ID 03-12-0013). She reported that LIB staff verify and map routes to Metra stations based on rider comfort with assistance from local cyclists. She stated that the cost of production of the brochures is kept low by the use of LIB staff and local cyclists acting as models for the photographs in brochures. She reported that guides have been produced for over 30 communities, eight more are in progress and one or two more can be produced with the current funding. Mr. Rickert asked if LIB plans to continue producing guides and will request additional CMAQ funds in the future. Ms. Kilgore responded that they would like to continue and that future CMAQ funding is certainly an option they will consider.
Mr. Kris Skogsbakken of Pace presented an overview of the Pace Regional Rideshare Program (TIP ID 17-12-0002) that began in 2006 when administration of the regional rideshare program was transferred from CATS to Pace. He reported that at that time Pace inherited the ShareTheDrive.org website with 700 users and that in 2008 PaceRideShare.com was launched using third-party software. In 2013 the site was updated under a five-year contract through 2017, funded through the UWP, for an annual cost of $27,000.

He reported that the CMAQ funds are used for a $308,000 marketing campaign launched in July 2013 that targets adults age 18-54. $16,000 is used for non-media applications including radio commercials, images and designs, and flash banner ads. $292,000 is used for media including $149,000 for radio ads on 24 stations, $45,000 for TV traffic sponsorships and $98,000 for digital banner ads, Facebook ads and search engine ads. He reported that in 2013 approximately 100 million impressions resulted from the campaign, the website had over 47,000 visitors of which 39,000 were new or unique, and over 2,300 users were added. He noted that Pace aggressively cleans the user database by requiring continued interaction to remain active and that since 2008 there have been 15,000 cumulative users.

In 2013, 209 carpools were added bringing the active total to 277, which equates to over 150,000 carpool rides. He concluded that rideshare matching services support the formation and retention of Pace vanpools and that those vanpools have played a key role in regional TDM by providing service in areas without traditional transit options. There have been 53 vanpool matches, with 20 placed and 33 wait-listed, and 37 commuter vanpools were added in 2013 bringing the total to 324 with ridership of over one million. In response to questions from Mr. Rickert and Mr. Donovan, Mr. Skogsbakken confirmed that Pace utilizes both UWP and CMAQ funding. The UWP funding supports 2 Pace staff members. The CMAQ funding supports ridesharing marketing. The overall Pace marketing budget is around $2 million, including the CMAQ funds of $350,000 for ridesharing.

Ms. Dinny Cosyns of Northstar Marketing provided an overview of the IEPA sponsored Partners for Clean Air Marketing-Public Information Campaign (TIP ID 13-97-0002). She reported that the campaign supports outreach and marketing to build awareness of air quality issues and encourage voluntary actions by individuals and corporations throughout the seven county region to reduce emissions. The campaign encourages transit and car-pooling as alternatives and promotes Pace, Metra and CTA by name in mass media advertising.

During the summer of 2012, “Breath Easy, Save Easy” was launched as a twelve month program utilizing English and Spanish mass media with the idea that saving money makes it easier to promote transit use over car use to individuals. The campaign included games and events featuring Breathe Easy Man, with monthly sweepstakes for green-themed prizes valued at $250 donated by companies such as IKEA, Motorola and the Brookfield Zoo. The campaign also included school flag program and a contest for high school students to develop a 30 second clean air video. The campaign includes a corporate effort targeting over 20 organizations. Surveys of citizens and businesses were conducted to determine the right motivation for voluntary action. For individuals, saving money was identified and for businesses promoting healthy lifestyles was identified. Businesses will be participating in a June luncheon featuring a panel sharing best practices for clean air.

She reported that in 2013 web site analytics were reviewed and cleantheair.org was re-launched and refined for the vehicle types that people prefer, resulting in 300-800 visits to the
site per day, which is up from 10-20 per day. Social media is also utilized. Breathe Easy Man has a Twitter account and Facebook likes were up from 14 to 3000 in three months, with a reach of over 100,000 per week. She concluded that the campaign is targeting more members and more engaged members and is seeking to grow Clean Air Counts corporate members in 2014.

In response to questions, Ms. Cosyns confirmed that the funding for the marketing is primarily CMAQ. Mr. Patronsy added that CMAQ funds the media purchases, and IEPA provides staff support for this program that has been ongoing for 20 years. In response to a question from Mr. Schmidt, Mr. Patronsy noted that this project falls into the Other category of projects, which are traditionally difficult to rank on emissions reduction.

Mr. Rickert said today’s presentations are helping the committee to understand what TDM projects the region has already funded with CMAQ funding, and it is important to look at how such projects will be assessed in future rounds. Mr. Schmidt stated that $3 million over the next four years is committed to these types of projects.

Mr. Sean Wiedel of CDOT provided an overview of the CDOT sponsored New Resident/Student Bike Marketing Program (TIP ID 01-01-0011). He reported that the project totals $1.25 million, including local match, over five years for targeted individual marketing with the goal of reducing drive alone trips by increasing walking, bicycling and transit use. The program will target five selected neighborhood areas over the five years by offering free resources, activities and support to residents to encourage walking, bicycling and transit use.

The first area selected in 2013 was Bronzeville. Mr. Wiedel distributed a program flyer and reported that the Go Bronzeville program kicked off in August and concluded in November, but will be re-launched in April of 2014 because of the late start. From June to November of 2014 the Pilsen neighborhood will be targeted. The program partners with the community to plan events, provides individuals with “go kits” on request that include an area map, transit schedules and other promotional items, includes a custom web site and Facebook page, and sends paper promotional items, including calendars, to all households in the neighborhood.

CDOT will be evaluating the success of the program in each community and as a whole at the end of the project. In response to a question, Mr. Weidel said that in the case of Bronzeville, CDOT was targeting distributing go kits to 10% of the 7500 residents and that through November 600 had been distributed with the help of community ambassadors that were hired to help assemble and distribute the kits. Mr. Wiedel confirmed Mr. Donovan’s statement that the project is a one-time multi-year effort.

Mr. Pitstick reported that the final four TDM projects to be presented are sponsored by the RTA and date back to 2005. He added that none of the project ideas were generated by the RTA, but that the RTA was convinced to take on sponsorship. The Clean Air Commuter Challenge and Chicagoland Commute Options projects were brought to the RTA from the Active Transportation Alliance, the Transit Use Campaign was initiated by IDOT at the time of the Dan Ryan reconstruction and the DuPage County project was transferred to the RTA from the County as an outgrowth of the county’s transit plan.

Ms. Nicole Nutter of the RTA provided an overview of the RTA sponsored DuPage County Transit Service Marketing (TIP ID 08-05-0002) program. She reported that the project was
initially sponsored by DuPage County DOT in 2005, but they were having difficulty getting started, so RTA took over the project in 2012. With help from the county, the DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference (DMMC), Pace and Metra, the project scope has been developed for consultant selection with a focus on filling in gaps not met by others. She reported that the $600,000 project includes $120,000 match from RTA, with 60% of the funding for media and $150,000 for consultant project management. She reported that DuPage County and DMMC requested development of a primer for DuPage transit and prioritization of locations for way-finding signs as part of the project. $120,000 is budgeted for brochures and television ads under the two-year grant and materials will be developed at least six months from now. DMMC has formed a committee to steer the project and to be project ambassadors. In response to a question, Ms. Nutter clarified that the project doesn’t include installation of way-finding signs.

Mr. Mark Minor of the RTA provided an overview of the RTA sponsored Transit Use Campaign (TIP ID 13-06-0003) project. He reported that the project was initiated by IDOT at the time of the Dan Ryan reconstruction to help drivers navigate around the construction and to promote general transit use. Since this effort was not implemented in time, the project was transferred to the RTA. After considerable discussion, the DriveLessLiveMore.com web site was developed. From 2007 to 2009, $1 million was spent on festivals, radio and other advertising. Following the construction, the main vendor for the project went under. In 2011 and 2012 RTA refocused the grant to promote the RTA Trip Planner, launched as GOROO, through the second quarter of 2013. $130,000 from CMAQ and the RTA was spent for radio and online advertising. The CMAQ funds for the project have been fully expended and the marketing campaign has concluded, although the trip planner is still in service. In response to a question, Mr. Minor reiterated that with the funds fully expended, there will be no further advertising of the trip planner, but it will remain active. In response to another question, Mr. Minor reported that use of the trip planner is continuing to grow, without the paid advertising, due mostly to web links from third-party sites such as the Chicago Cubs, who encourage fans to take transit to games at Wrigley Field. Mr. Minor added that a widget has been developed and the RTA is working with destinations throughout the region to include that widget, which auto-populates the trip planner with the destination address, on their web sites. In response to another question regarding whether or not the committee considered the scope change, Mr. Patronsky stated that the initial project scope was broad enough to cover the change.

Mr. Minor next provided an overview of the RTA sponsored Clean Air Commuter Challenge (TIP ID 13-10-0011) project. He reported that the project included creating and administering a challenge to encourage mode shift and that the Active Transportation Alliance administered the project, which had two components. The first was to attract regular commuters to log their trips on the web site to be entered in monthly drawings for donated prizes. The second was to conduct challenges around existing campaigns to boost users and encourage mode shift. Four challenges were held during existing campaigns including Bike-to-Work week and Car Free week. The website was active from November of 2012 to December of 2013. 6,000 commuters logged over 200,000 trips and 20% reported those trips were in single occupant vehicles before signing up. He concluded that the program required a lot of administration, therefore the RTA decided not to continue and noted that it was hard to retain users between campaigns and that the concept may work better as part of a coordinated regional TDM program. In
response to a question from Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Minor stated that a spike in site usage occurred during bike-to-work week.

Finally, Mr. Minor provided an overview of the RTA sponsored Chicagoland Commute Options (TIP ID 13-12-0004) project. He reported that the purpose of the project is to create a regional TDM strategy and to define and develop tools. The Metropolitan Planning Council (MPC) conducted a pilot program over the last two years, with a presentation to the region in December 2013. The second year of the pilot program was funded by the RTA utilizing $75,000 of the CMAQ funds programmed to this project.

With the remaining CMAQ funds, the RTA wants to work with other stakeholders in the region to develop regional TDM. The RTA is engaged in discussions of scope and budget with a core group consisting of IDOT, CDOT and MPC with the intention of providing seed money to bring the region together, not to fund the regional effort. In response to questions, Mr. Minor added that MPC found a need to do one-on-one outreach to employers. He also noted that as a region we need to determine how to centralize our efforts and how to utilize existing programs, tools and websites to develop a place for people to go for resources and customized help. He stated that we should not be looking to start new programs but should be looking for a mechanism to get people to existing programs and services.

Mr. Patronsky stated that IDOT has an interest in developing TDM and invited Ms. Stitt to elaborate on that interest. Ms. Stitt stated that basically IDOT wants to work with RTA, CDOT and other partners to determine how to develop a common brand and common tools to tie together the variety of existing programs and to point folks to existing resources in the region that are underutilized. She stated that our region should be a model for other areas in the state to utilize to develop TDM tools.

Mr. Patronsky noted that at the recent MPC forum they talked about funding these efforts and asked if IDOT was going to commit resources to the effort. Ms. Stitt stated that as we just heard in these presentations, staffing is an issue and these programs have done great things with little staff. She stated that adequate resources are needed for a multi-year effort and that the level of resources depends on the scope agreed to by the partners and that when that is determined IDOT will see what can be done about funding.

Ms. Hamilton stated that CDOT hasn’t pulled the trigger on any projects, but is participating in forums and other efforts with Mr. Weidel as the point person, and remains interested in the development of regional programs.

Mr. Patronsky summarized, noting that coordination of the regional TDM projects, particularly those funded through CMAQ, has been discussed previously, clearly the time has come for another holistic review, particularly in light of the CMAQ process review, the ongoing CMAQ-funded projects and the upcoming CMAQ programming cycle. He thanked the presenters and noted that TDM in the region will be an ongoing conversation.

7.0 CMAQ Program Process Evaluation and Transformation

Mr. Elam reviewed the memo recommendations on CMAQ criteria and the project ranking process distributed with the packet. He started with the “why” of the process review and recommendations, particularly noting the direction of the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee to use a performance-based approach to programming. Mr. Elam said the focus
groups have made big strides in developing criteria to evaluate projects, and the current effort is the next step in the evolution of the CMAQ programming process.

Mr. Elam continued, providing more detail on the proposed point-based ranking system which is to be combined with committee deliberation to produce the program of CMAQ projects for Board and MPO Policy Committee approval. He explained that staff is proposing that half of the points reflect the cost effectiveness of emissions reduction, another 30% of the points come from transportation impact criteria and the final 20% are from regional priorities such as parking pricing, major capital projects completion, transit-supportive land use and geographic targeting of funds. The proposed scoring is not an attempt to shift funding from any type of project to another type, but is intended to provide the committee with a broader range of information to make programming decisions.

Ms. Hamilton stated that she is uncomfortable that the criteria are not solidly defined and is unclear on what innovation is, is concerned that transit station projects are disadvantaged by the criteria, is concerned that density is not a criteria and feels that the urban centers/geographic targeting language is “spongy”. Mr. Elam noted that geographic targeting would be based on locations voluntarily adopting and enforcing targets for density and other criteria and that points would be awarded to locations that do. He noted that Mr. Rickert is serving on a committee discussing the concept. Ms. Hamilton was concerned that locations like the city of Chicago that are already densely populated would not receive those points. Mr. Rickert added that he has concerns about the concept and initially thought set-asides were being proposed. Mr. Elam noted that the staff proposal states that the concept needs to be further developed and likely would not be included as a measure in the next CMAQ cycle calling for 2016-2020 CMAQ projects.

In response to a question from Ms. Hamilton regarding where TDM projects fit in the point system, Mr. Elam responded that the committee will continue discussions on these types of projects and they fall into the “other” category on page 7 of the memo. Additional criteria could be developed. Mr. Tomzik noted that vanpools, which are a TDM strategy, wouldn’t rank well on GO TO 2040 categories as transit projects, but would rank well based on emissions reduction as other projects and so we should consider where to evaluate them. He also asked how BRT or ART projects would be scored for existing asset condition. Mr. Elam responded that these projects would receive points under ridership increase and travel time reliability.

Ms. Hamilton noted that it would be difficult for smaller communities to provide the supplemental data required to receive transit supportive points. Mr. Elam responded that if smaller communities are pursuing these points, they should have the capabilities to provide the data. Mr. Pitstick added that for years RTA has been working with communities that are interested to assist them in developing transit supportive plans. He also noted that geographic targeting and transit-supportive seem to go together as a commitment to certain policies and that criteria are needed for both. He went on, saying it seems counter-intuitive that bike projects located where transit access is high get more points, since bicycle facilities can increase transit access from farther away. Mr. Privett added that when the Bicycle and Pedestrian focus group introduced high transit access as a criterion, it was intended more for pedestrian facility proposals than bicycle facilities in order to disqualify neighborhood sidewalks that did not serve multiple modes. Mr. Privett further noted that the memo does not mention pedestrian facility projects.
Mr. Rickert stated that the counties are concerned that the point system will make the process more confusing and that smaller local communities will be less and less involved in the CMAQ program. He stated that much of what is included in the memo is already being done and to now put numbers to it is a concern to the counties. The counties want to understand if the region as a whole supports a number-based point system approach. There is concern that attempts to weight all projects on a 100 point scale will be impossible to assess and that the historical diversity of projects programmed by looking at individual categories will be lost.

Mr. Elam stated that staff hopes that points will provide equally good or better transparency in the process and reiterated that the points will be used to develop a staff recommendation for the committee, the Board and the MPO Policy Committee to consider. He noted that the point system is a way to say up front the kinds of applications the region is looking for and that if we aren’t capturing those types of projects, the criteria will need further discussion.

Mr. Rickert stated he is concerned we may find that this process doesn’t work and that a lot of effort is going into the development when the current process is not broken. Ms. Hamilton added that the region has only recently adopted and made programming adjustments to address the Active Program Management policies, including not funding Phase 1 Engineering and is now facing another change. In response to a question from Mr. Schmidt regarding whose decision it was to explore this, Mr. Elam reiterated that staff initiated the review based on Board and MPO Policy Committee direction in the 2014 work program regarding performance based programming.

Mr. Privett suggested that if this point scoring system is pursued, presenting the qualitative scores side-by-side, but separately from the emissions benefits may assist the project selection committee in the next cycle. Mr. Donovan stated that the region has taken on a lot of change in the program and that tough decisions will need to be made moving forward. He noted that the points system is not entirely different and may assist staff in looking at a range of GO TO 2040 issues. The project selection committee will take the information provided by staff and use it or ignore it as appropriate when making a recommendation.

In response to a question regarding the role of the focus groups, Mr. Elam said the focus groups would be asked to help better define point values for the criteria in the coming months and would be asked to review applications for fatal flaws, but would not be asked to provide programming recommendations to the Project Selection Committee. Ms. Kilgore, a member of the Bicycle Pedestrian focus group, noted that there is a question of pots of money versus regional priority and stated that the task force had a lot of internal debate about criteria versus the goals of the CMAQ program. She noted that everyone wants a piece of the CMAQ funding but the program cannot address all projects.

Mr. Rogers stated that the current process functions well and he would hate to see it turn into a numbers game. He suggested maintaining a gradation of categories and noted that based on emissions scores, direct emissions reduction projects will outscore all other categories, but recognizes that all issues need to be addressed in the region. He added that he likes the idea of separating the emissions scoring from the other criteria and suggested making emissions reduction 60% of the score and reducing transportation impact criteria from 30% to 20% and suggested using the actual tons for the emissions reduction score. He also stated he has a concern about the innovation criteria.
Mr. Pitstick stated he likes the idea of two scoring columns and likes the idea of receiving values from the focus groups as opposed to a yes or no. Mr. Privett added that there are peer best practices to support this methodology.

The discussion concluded, with Mr. Elam thanking the group for their input and reviewing the next steps. Further discussion will occur at the focus group meetings and the project selection committee’s next meeting.

7.0  MAP-21  
No update.

8.0  Other Business  
None.

9.0  Public Comment  
None.

10.0  Next Meeting  
The committee’s next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 3, 2014 at 2:00 p.m.

11.0  Adjournment  
Chairman Patronsky adjourned the meeting at 4:28 p.m.