



**Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)  
STP Project Selection Committee  
Minutes  
May 2, 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:** John Donovan – FHWA, Jesse Elam – CMAP, Luann Hamilton – CDOT, Lorri Newson – RTA, Kevin O’Malley CDOT, Chad Riddle – IDOT, Mayor Leon Rockingham – Council of Mayors, Mayor Jeffery Schielke (via phone) – Council of Mayors, Mayor Eugene Williams – Council of Mayors

**Others Present:** Mark Baloga, Jen Becker, Dave Bennett, Elaine Bottomley, Len Cannata, Jack Cruikshank, Mayor Karen Darch, Grant Davis, Jackie Forbes, Mike Fricano, Scott Hennings, Emily Karry, Tom Kelso, Mike Klemens, Kelsey Mulhausen, Kevin Peralta, Leslie Phemister, Brian Pigeon, Cody Sheriff, Brent Troxell, Mike Walczak

**Staff Present:** Mandy Burrell, Teri Dixon, Kama Dobbs, Doug Ferguson, Elizabeth Irvin, Jen Maddux, Russell Pietrowiak, Melissa Porter, Tim Verbeke, Simone Weil, Barbara Zubek

**1.0 Call to Order**

Mr. Elam called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

**2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements**

There were no agenda changes or announcements.

**3.0 Approval of Minutes – March 29, 2018**

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

#### 4.0 Shared Fund Project Evaluation Criteria

Ms. Irvin presented the recommendations for the shared fund project evaluation criteria. She presented the revisions based on prior discussions. The first revision was to the eligible projects list. Ms. Hamilton suggested that “bridge replacement and reconstructions” should be “bridge and viaduct, replace, rehab, and reconstruct” and “bus speed improvements” should be “bus speed and reliability improvements.” Mr. O’Malley asked for clarification on the revision of “transit station reconstruction” to “transit station condition improvement”. Ms. Irvin and Mr. Elam explained that condition improvement could be due to reconstruction or rehabilitation. Ms. Newson stated that increased access to transit should be considered. Ms. Hamilton and Mr. O’Malley suggested that corridor or small-area studies cover this concern. Ms. Irvin added that access to transit also comes up in project evaluation.

Ms. Irvin reported the second revision was regarding proposed project eligibility. Mr. Sheriff asked if counties would be eligible to apply for projects on their own, or would need to partner with a municipal applicant and Ms. Karry asked if a county would be eligible to apply if the county was also a member of a sub-regional council. Mr. Elam stated that the inclusion of counties as a potential partner in the multijurisdictional joint application does not mean counties are not eligible to apply. For projects with a total cost of over \$5 million, partners are not needed to apply. The third revision Ms. Irvin presented was allowing all project types to be included in the initial call for projects then conducting subsequent calls using a rolling focus. Ms. Becker stated this revision was appreciated.

Ms. Irvin continued the discussion with proposed phase eligibility. Mayor Williams asked how a high need community is defined. Mr. Elam responded that it is based on the same factors used in the LTA program. Mr. Donovan noted that the list is based on census information and asked if there was any intent to reexamine the data. Mr. Elam stated that staff will investigate the availability of updated data. Mayor Williams questioned why a separation of eligibility was being considered and wondered if all sponsors should be eligible to apply for phase 1 funding, regardless of need. Mr. Elam responded that projects sometimes complete phase one and are never built. Mr. Riddle added that sponsors may decide not to move forward with projects when phase 1 determines that a larger scope that is more expensive than originally proposed is needed.

The proposed evaluation methods and scoring system, which includes points for project readiness, transportation impact, regional priorities, and bonus points for Council/CDOT support was presented. Ms. Irvin stated the first evaluation component, project readiness, consists of three scores: engineering completion and ROW acquisition, financial commitments, and inclusion in local/agency plans.

Engineering completion and ROW acquisition was discussed and Mr. Riddle stated that “phase 2 complete” needs a definition. Ms. Hamilton suggested that design should be 95% and Mr. O’Malley said with large projects, design is never taken to 100% until funds are identified. Mr. Riddle stated if phase 2 needs to be complete then many projects will score zero points on that evaluation criteria and suggested the definition should be “ready to submit pre final plans at 90%.” In response to a question from Mr. Baloga, Mr. Elam clarified that the points are either zero or five for these criteria.

Ms. Irvin presented the proposed financial commitment score and provided examples. In response to questions from Ms. Hamilton and Mr. Sheriff, Ms. Irvin and Mr. Elam explained that any funds beyond the required local match that are secured, including local STP program funds, would be considered a commitment and that the intention is to reward sponsors that have leveraged other fund sources. Mr. Kelso commented that high need communities will score low if they cannot provide a high match. Mr. Donovan stated that a benefit of the committee is the ability review the scores and make decisions if projects come close to each other in rankings. Mr. Riddle added that scores will guide committee discussion. President Darch stated that this structure looks like INFRA and seems like sponsors are being penalized for asking for a larger federal share. Mr. Riddle suggested that the committee consider the whole picture, rather than focusing on one element of the scoring system. Mr. Donovan noted that TIGER is structured similarly to this proposal to encourage stretching limited funds.

Ms. Irvin reported that projects that are included in local or agency plans, or are supported by policies of those plans, would receive points. In response to a question from Ms. Phemister, Mr. Elam stated that “support” means that the plan contains policies that support the concepts of the project. Mr. O’Malley wondered if sponsors would just adjust their local plans in order to receive these points.

The transportation impact evaluation component, which includes existing condition and need, population and job benefits, and improvement measures, was discussed next. Ms. Irvin explained that the total points in this component would be the same for all project categories, but the specific measures would vary by category. Mr. Bennett requested more details on the breakdown of points. Ms. Irvin explained that staff would like to meet with partners in May and June to discuss these details. President Darch asked how a project is in multiple categories would be treated. Ms. Irvin stated that the primary type may be the best to evaluate and Mr. Elam added that there are examples from the CMAQ and TAP programs where the project could be evaluated in each category and use the best evaluation as the final score. Mr. Donovan and Mr. Riddle reiterated that the scores are presented to the committee, and the committee will be asked to make decisions based on the scores. Mr. Bennett asked if sponsors would be able to appeal a scoring decision. Mr. Elam stated that is for the committee to decide and that the evaluation and ranking could be a two step process.

Ms. Irvin explained that the proposed population/job benefit score would be developed based on the number of households and jobs within each project's travel shed, similar to the ON TO 2050 regionally significant project evaluations, in order to be able to evaluate the mobility impacts beyond the immediate project area. In response to questions from Ms. Newsom and Mr. Troxell, Ms. Irvin explained that evaluations will occur after applications are received and that all evaluations will be published. President Darch asked if project sponsors are expected to submit the numbers for the evaluations. Mr. Elam responded that the evaluation will use the same process for all applications for uniformity and stated that the goal is to minimize the burden on applicants. In response to questions from Mr. Troxell and Mayor Williams, Mr. Elam noted that staff considered technical precision versus a simple evaluation that anyone can do from their home or office, and is recommending the more technical approach. Ms. Hamilton suggested that CMAP publish the methodology and that if results seem weird to take a closer look.

The proposed regional priorities score was discussed. Mr. O'Malley stated requiring ordinances for complete streets could be problematic. He stated that CDOT has aggressive complete streets policies but does not have an ordinance. Ms. Hamilton suggested that staff complete a dry run with past projects to see how projects rank with the proposed methodology. Mayor Williams asked how points would be assigned on projects with multiple partners if only one partner had policies in place. Mr. Riddle commented that it seems reasonable to be given points in that case. Mayor Darch asked why freight movement was not suggested as a regional priority to score grade crossing projects. Ms. Irvin stated that staff believes this would be double-counting benefits for these types of projects.

Ms. Irvin presented two options for councils and CDOT to provide bonus points for project applications they support. Ms. Karry noted that as presented, this scoring element seems to imply that non-municipal sponsors can apply without council support. Mr. Elam agreed, and noted that the bonus point proposal would allow councils and CDOT to tip the scales on projects that are important to them. Mr. Donovan added that nobody can be excluded from having an opportunity to access federal funding, but he hope that if a project is not supported by the community or council it is located in, that would come out in the scoring. Mr. Elam stated the scoring is still up for discussion and requiring sponsors to get support from the councils along with the bonus points could be considered. Mayor Rockingham stated that all project sponsors should have support from the councils. Mr. Elam stated more discussions with the planning liaisons and other stakeholders will need to take place and a recommendation will be brought back to the committee in June.

## **5.0 Other Business**

There was no other business.

**6.0 Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**7.0 Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for May 23, 2018.

**8.0 Adjournment**

On a motion by Ms. Hamilton, seconded by Mayor Williams, the meeting adjourned at 11:04 a.m.