



Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400
www.cmap.illinois.gov

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

Minutes

March 28, 2018

Offices of the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)
Cook County Conference Room
Suite 800, 233 S. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois

Committee Members Present: Grant Davis – CDOT, John Donovan – FHWA, Jesse Elam – CMAP, Luann Hamilton – CDOT, Lorri Newson – RTA, Chad Riddle – IDOT, Mayor Leon Rockingham – Council of Mayors, Mayor Jeffery Schielke – Council of Mayors, Mayor Eugene Williams – Council of Mayors, John Yonan – Counties

Others Present: Erin Aleman, Mark Baloga, Alex Beata, Jen Becker, Dave Bennett, Ryan Bigbie, Elaine Bottomley, Larry Bury, Len Cannata, Jack Cruikshank, Karen Darch, Kristi DeLaurentiis (via phone), Michael Fricano, Emily Karry, Tom Kelso, Kevin Peralta, Leslie Phemister, Brian Pigeon, David Seglin, Cody Sheriff, Mike Sullivan

Staff Present: Anthony Cefali, Teri Dixon, Kama Dobbs, Doug Ferguson, Elizabeth Irvin, Melissa Porter, Liz Schuh, Gordon Smith, Barbara Zubek

1.0 Call to Order

Mr. Elam called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes or announcements.

3.0 Approval of Minutes – February 28, 2018

A motion to approve the minutes as presented, made by Mayor Williams, seconded by Mayor Rockingham, carried.

4.0 **Active Program Management Policies**

Ms. Dobbs presented an overview of the initial staff proposal for active program management policies for the shared fund and local programs.

Ms. Dobbs first summarized the proposal and briefly described each of the four components of the proposal that include program development, project management, program management, and additional provisions. After the summary, Ms. Dobbs discussed the details of each component of the proposal.

The first component discussed was program development. A uniform schedule for the shared fund, council programs, and CDOT programs was presented. Samples of how to apply project rankings, program marks, and a contingency list were presented.

Mayor Schielke commented that there should be a presentation or briefing materials about how the STP process works at a basic level for local officials. Mr. Elam agreed and noted that this summer staff will be presenting the proposal details to stakeholders throughout the region. Mr. Riddle added that the information about the process is available, but getting the right people in the room is a challenge.

The second component discussed was project management. Training, designated project managers, and quarterly status updates were proposed. Mr. Pigeon asked if project managers can be the same person. Ms. Dobbs responded that it depends on the structure of the local municipalities, but could work that way.

The third component discussed was program management. Proposals for obligation deadlines, active reprogramming, carryover limitations and redistribution of unobligated funds were presented. In response to a question from Ms. Hamilton, Ms. Dobbs stated that the proposal calls for the contingency program to be in ranked order. Mr. Yonan asked for clarification of what is proposed for projects that have missed a deadline. Ms. Dobbs explained that through active reprogramming, delayed projects can be moved to the contingency program, or be reprogrammed in an appropriate out year of the active program prior to missing a deadline. However, she added, as an incentive to actively reprogram, staff proposes that funding be removed from programs for projects that move forward to, but miss, a deadline. She explained that moving a project to the contingency list essentially stops the clock on that project.

Mr. Bury asked why funds from the shared fund are not proposed to be moved to the local programs if a deadline is missed by a shared fund project. Ms. Dobbs responded that staff anticipates that there will be a large contingency program for the shared fund from which projects can move forward to obligation if an active program project is delayed. Ms. Karry asked if the same obligation deadline rules apply to the shared

fund and if funds can move back to the local councils. Ms. Dobbs explained that the proposed deadlines apply to local programs and the shared fund. She added that staff proposed that shared fund projects should not be able to proceed at their own risk, lowering the likelihood of unobligated funds in that program. Ms. Becker asked if councils could direct their unobligated funds to other councils needing additional funds. Ms. Dobbs stated that it may not be unreasonable to consider, but that the logistics of borrowing between the councils and CDOT would be complex. Mayor Schielke commented that as long as the Council of Mayors were aware of the borrowing, then it should be possible. He added that it could help further the idea of regional cooperation and working together. Mr. Elam commented that this should be discussed the next time the planning liaisons meet.

President Darch stated it is critical to assess the patterns of delays, but often it is because of issues such as right of way. She stated there is a concern if funding will potentially leave councils for reasons they cannot control. Mr. Elam responded there is no assumption that delays are the sponsors' fault and the point of active program management is to promote realistic programming. Ms. Dobbs added that the proposed deadlines are to start each individual project phase. The goal is to recognize delays early in the process and to shift projects around to utilize the funding as expeditiously as possible. If there is nothing to fill the holes in a program, that is when funds would be reallocated to the region.

Ms. Hamilton asked why the extensions cannot be one year. Ms. Dobbs noted that since the deadlines are for the start of each phase, not the completion, if a project needs an additional year to get started, it probably should have been programmed in the next year. Mr. Yonan commented that contingency should be available to cover construction cost increases. Mr. Davis commented that the proposal to carry over obligation remainders might encourage over programming.

The fourth component discussed was the additional provisions such as Grant Accountability and Transparency Act (GATA) requirements, Qualifications Based Selection (QBS), assistance for disadvantaged communities, methodology considerations, and special provisions for initial calls for projects. Ms. Hamilton asked if transportation development credit (TDC) eligibility can be considered on a case-by-case basis by the STP project selection committee. She explained that the City of Chicago currently uses TDCs for CMAQ-funded transit station projects. She added she would not want to completely exclude certain Chicago community areas from using TDCs for STP projects. Mr. Elam stated that staff will look into it further and get back to the committee.

Mr. Riddle commented that if pre-final plans are in by the due date, most of the time the only issue that delays projects being let is the right-of-way certification. He

suggested 3 to 6 months might not cover the extended time frame needed for projects requiring right-of-way.

Ms. Dobbs reviewed the active program management system development timeline. She stated staff will schedule meetings with the planning liaisons and the City of Chicago to further discuss and refine the details of the proposal and will present revisions to the committee at their May 23 meeting.

Ms. Aleman commented that similar discussions happen at the state level when developing the statewide program. The balance between tying up funds for planned projects and moving forward with ready to implement projects is challenging. She commended the committee for working together on this difficult task.

5.0 Other Business

There was no other business.

6.0 Public Comment

There was no public comment.

7.0 Next Meeting

Mr. Elam announced the next meeting will be rescheduled due to a conflict for multiple committee members. The rescheduled meeting date is May 2, 2018.

8.0 Adjournment

On a motion by Mayor Schielke, seconded by Ms. Hamilton, the meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.