CMAQ Project Selection Committee
Minutes – Thursday, September 1, 2016

Committee Members: Ross Patronsky, Chair (CMAP), Luann Hamilton (CDOT), Mark Pitstick (RTA), President William Rodeghier (Council of Mayors), Christopher Schmidt (IDOT), Chris Snyder (Counties)

Staff Present: Jesse Elam, Doug Ferguson, Tom Kotarac, Jen Maddux, Russell Pietrowiak, Alvaro Villagran, Barbara Zubek

Others Present: Brian Carlson, Bruce Christensen, John Donovan, Janell Jensen, Brian Stepp, David Tomzik (via phone), Mike Walczak, Steve Weinstock, Michael Weiser

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

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements
There were no agenda changes or announcements.

3.0 Approval of Minutes—July 7, 2016
Mr. Pitstick noted two changes, in agenda items 4.4 and 6.0, to the minutes of the July 7, 2016 meeting. On a motion by Mr. Pitstick and seconded by President Rodeghier, the minutes of the July 7, 2016 meeting were approved as amended.

4.0 Program Monitoring

4.1 Project Programming Status Sheets
Mr. Ferguson reported that the recurring reports on the programming status of active and deferred projects and the line item changes since the last meeting of the Project Selection Committee were included in the meeting packet.

4.2 Programming Summary and Obligation Goal
Mr. Ferguson reported that an update on CMAQ obligations for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2016 was included in the meeting packet. He stated that just over $33 million has been obligated in FFY 2016, almost double what had been obligated since the July 7, 2016 meeting but about $90 million away from the obligation goal.

Mr. Patronsky asked whether IDOT has processed all FTA transfer requests, and Mr. Schmidt replied that IDOT recently completed the FTA transfers. Mr. Patronsky
asked whether the FTA transfer amount is included in the obligation information, and Mr. Ferguson replied that it is not included.

5.0 Project Changes
5.1 CDOT – Walk to Transit (TIP ID 01-06-0005)
Mr. Pietrowiak reported that the sponsor is requesting a reinstatement of the deferred series 3 phase 1 and phase 2 engineering funds in the amount of $252,000 federal ($315,000 total) in FFY 2017. Mr. Snyder asked whether the series 3 engineering was deferred due to series 1 and 2 being delayed, and Ms. Hamilton confirmed that is the case. Mr. Patronsky noted that once a single project phase is deferred, all subsequent project phases are deferred. On a motion made by Mr. Snyder and seconded by Mr. Schmidt, the requested reinstatement of deferred funds was approved.

5.2 Maywood – Maywood Metra Station (TIP ID 04-12-0002)
Mr. Pietrowiak reported that the sponsor is requesting a cost increase of $225,000 federal ($282,000 total) for construction in FFY 2016. On a motion made by President Rodeghier and seconded by Mr. Pitstick, the requested cost increase was approved.

5.3 Mundelein – Maple Ave Bike Path (TIP ID 10-16-0001)
Mr. Pietrowiak reported that the sponsor is requesting a cost increase of $23,000 federal ($29,000 total) for phase 2 engineering in FFY 2017 and a transfer of funds from construction to construction engineering in the amount of $80,000 federal ($100,000 total) in FFY 2018. On a motion made by Ms. Hamilton and seconded by Mr. Snyder, the requested transfer of funds and cost increase were approved.

5.4 Algonquin – Randall Road Pedestrian Crossing (TIP ID 11-12-0006)
Mr. Pietrowiak reported that the sponsor is requesting a scope change to change the project from a bridge to an underpass and move the project 700 feet south on Randall Road due to property owner concerns and major utility conflicts. Mr. Pitstick stated, on behalf of Mr. Tomzik, that Pace would like to review the project plans and wants to add a bus stop. Ms. Jensen said she would relay the request to the project sponsor. On a motion made by Mr. Snyder and seconded by President Rodeghier, the requested scope change was approved.

5.5 Hanover Park – Hawk Hollow Multi-Use Trail (TIP ID 08-16-0003)
The sponsor is requesting a cost increase of $11,800 federal ($14,752 total) for phase II engineering in FFY 2016. On a motion made by Mr. Schmidt and seconded by President Rodeghier, the requested cost increase was approved.

6.0 Program Development
Mr. Patronsky reported that the program application booklet for the next CMAQ and TAP-L call for projects was included in the meeting packet. Mr. Pitstick asked for clarification on the funding for engineering for transit projects, noting that the scoring related to asset condition indicates a new facility would receive a score of zero. Mr.
Pitstick stated that there is justification for building new transit facilities and that the CMAQ program is one source of funding for transit expansion projects. Mr. Ferguson responded that it is possible to make adjustments after scoring.

Mr. Schmidt stated that the scoring for highway projects includes a component for benefiting transit service – a possible five points if the project has existing bus service along the highway improvement. Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Carlson questioned whether bus service alone is the appropriate evaluation criteria or whether existing rail service would also warrant the five points for a highway project benefitting transit service, noting that highway projects may improve access to both bus and rail service. Mr. Schmidt asked whether the word “bus” could be changed to “transit” under this scoring component. Mr. Ferguson asked how a benefit to rail service would be shown and Mr. Carlson suggested it is up to the applicant to show. Mr. Elam stated that the existing bus service criteria has a level of simplicity and questioned whether there is an objective way to say a highway project benefits transit, in general. Mr. Donovan noted that the rest of the scoring criteria in the application booklet are not up for interpretation. Mr. Carlson suggested that the applicant could include an engineering analysis to show how a project would benefit transit. President Rodeghier stated that it is better to leave that criteria open to interpretation and let the committee make decisions. Mr. Snyder stated that if the applicant can prove a transit benefit then he supports changing the language in the booklet.

Mr. Tomzik stated that the scoring component should also have a provision for future transit service. Mr. Ferguson countered the suggestion, noting that the evaluation includes current air quality benefits and future service may never happen. Mr. Patronsky resolved that the committee is in support of replacing the word “bus” with “transit” under the Benefiting Transit Service section on page 10 of the proposed application booklet.

Ms. Hamilton asked whether the scoring for safety on highway projects can be broadened to include high crash areas other than an IDOT 5 percent report location. Mr. Elam stated that the IDOT 5 percent report is not specific to only IDOT roads. There is an IDOT 5 percent report for local roads that the applicant can use. On a motion made by Mr. Pitstick and seconded by Mr. Schmidt, the application booklet for the FFY 2018-2020 CMAQ and 2018-2020 TAP-L call for projects was approved as amended.

7.0 FAST Act

Mr. Donovan reported that comment period for the notices of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) regarding performance measures and the CMAQ program closed August 20, 2016 and FHWA is responding to comments. He noted that the NPRM regarding MPO coordination would likely be considered first, with a final rule on performance measures considered second. Mr. Snyder asked whether the comment period for the MPO coordination NPRM was extended. Mr. Kotarac responded that CMAP was notified on the last day of the comment period that the comment period would not be extended. (Note: on September 23rd, the comment period was extended an additional 30 days.)
8.0 Other Business
Mr. Patronsky announced that CDOT will be requesting a cost increase of $68,000 federal ($85,000 total) at the next Transportation Committee meeting on September 16, 2016. The cost increase is for the Carroll Avenue corridor study for transit use, first funded in the 2004 CMAQ program. Ms. Hamilton reported that the Alternatives Analysis project is moving along but noted that the complex movements on Michigan Avenue require a complex modelling. Mr. Ferguson stated that the CMAQ program can accommodate the cost increase.

9.0 Public Comment
Mr. Weiser made comments regarding the benefits of the Tango car, noting that he is working with the inventor to promote the car. Mr. Weiser expressed interest in a CMAQ-sponsored demonstration project and noted that he is happy to hear the Committee discussing congestion.

10.0 Next Meeting
Mr. Patronsky stated that the committee’s next meeting is scheduled for November 3, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.

11.0 Adjournment
On a motion made by Ms. Hamilton and seconded by President Rodeghier, the meeting was adjourned at 2:43 p.m.
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