



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

June 27, 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: Dan Burke – CDOT, Grant Davis – CDOT, Teri Dixon – CMAP, John Donovan – FHWA, Luann Hamilton – CDOT, Lorri Newson – RTA, 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, Len Cannata, Kevin Carrier, Jack Cruikshank, Karen Darch, Jackie Forbes, Mark Fowler, Mike Fricano, Emily Karry, Tom Kelso, Mike Klemens, Kelsey Mulhausen, Tara Orbon, Kevin Peralta, Dan Persky, Ryan Peterson, Leslie Phemister, Brian Pigeon, Cody Sheriff, Mike Walczak, Kyle Whitehead

Staff Present: Anthony Cefali, Kama Dobbs, Doug Ferguson, Elizabeth Irvin, Erin Kenney, Stephanie Levine, Jen Maddux, Paul Mizner, Melissa Porter, Todd Schmidt, Jeff Schnobrich, Tim Verbeke, Barbara Zubek

1.0 Call to Order

Ms. Dixon called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes or announcements.

3.0 Approval of Minutes – May 23, 2018

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

4.0 Shared Fund Scoring System Proposal

Ms. Irvin presented the Shared Fund scoring system proposal and handed out a sample project evaluation spreadsheet, beginning with project readiness. Mr. Davis asked how the project readiness score will work with projects that are in segments. Mr. Riddle stated that the best approach would be to apply for funding by segment. President Darch asked if some points can be given to large projects that have phase two partially complete because phase two can be expensive. She stated that the project readiness score works against large projects of regional significance. Ms. Irvin responded that transportation impact, which is the majority of the project score, will balance large projects. She explained that projects with the highest value will rise to the top because the financial commitment is only five points. Ms. Irvin stated that the project readiness score is all or nothing because the goal is to make sure projects are ready before limited funds are committed to them.

Ms. Irvin continued her presentation with a discussion of transportation impact criteria. Mayor Darch commented that it is imperative that school buses are also considered for bus speed improvements. Mr. Whitehead asked if the improvement score also accounts for the increased VMT related to roadway expansion. Ms. Irvin responded that changes to the Travel Time Index will be used to determine the improvement score.

Ms. Irvin next presented the proposed planning factors scoring. Mr. Fowler asked why no points are given to grade separation projects for freight movement. Ms. Irvin explained that those projects receive points for freight movement in the transportation impact score and the goal is to not double count the benefits. Ms. Karry asked for clarification of the definition of "heavy vehicles". Ms. Irvin stated that the IDOT IRIS classification was used. Ms. Karry asked if green infrastructure meant stormwater detention or rain gardens and similar treatments. Ms. Irvin stated it could be both and that staff would like to hear from stakeholders this summer on what the definition should be. Ms. Hamilton noted that one of the sample projects had green infrastructure elements but wasn't awarded points. Ms. Irvin noted that staff did not try to research project details that were not included in the TIP for the sample exercise. Ms. Hamilton asked if the equal weight of complete streets and green infrastructure was taken into consideration, versus 2.5 points for complete streets and 5 points for green infrastructure because complete streets is probably a higher priority for these projects. Ms. Irvin replied that the goal was to round out the numbers and not give different types of projects different amounts of points so that the scores are not too complicated.

Mr. Donovan asked if the sample scoring worked out as expected. Ms. Irvin replied that no project received all possible points, which was by design, and that even in the small sample there is clear separation in the points allocated. She added that there will need to be a discussion about how to go from the scoring rubric to making a multi-year program and eventually considering moving on to the rolling focus for future calls.

5.0 Proposal for Use of TDCs

Ms. Dixon reported that discussions are still ongoing with IDOT regarding the timing, definitions, and impacts statewide.

6.0 Summer Outreach Activities

Ms. Dobbs presented the draft summer outreach calendar and encouraged committee and audience members to reach out to staff if additional outreach is desired.

7.0 Other Business

There was no other business.

8.0 Public Comment

There was no public comment.

9.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for June 27, 2018.

10.0 Adjournment

On a motion by Mayor Rockingham, seconded by Mr. Burke, the meeting adjourned at 10:10 a.m.