MEMORANDUM

To: CMAP STP Project Selection Committee

From: CMAP Staff

Date: September 19, 2018

Re: Summary of comments, responses, and recommendations

CMAP Staff presented the proposals for the STP Shared Fund and Active Program Management (APM) policies at more than a dozen council, committee, COG, or special meetings from June through September. Members of all eleven councils had the opportunity to attend at least one of these meetings, which reached:

- 153 unique municipalities;
- All seven county DOTs;
- 33 consulting firms; and
- Numerous other partners including RTA, Pace, Metra, the Tollway, and IDOT.

The Council of Mayors Executive Committee also received an overview presentation in August.

The attached document is a log of both formal comments submitted via letters and emails to CMAP staff and additional comments that were made during various presentations. A draft APM policies document and draft Shared Fund project application booklet were also distributed to councils via the planning liaisons and to CDOT staff for comments. Line numbers throughout the comment log refer to the line numbers within those draft documents. Comments and responses are grouped by topic, and similar comments are grouped together with a single response provided.

Changes to Shared Fund Methodology and Program Management

There are a number of proposed actions as a result of the comments, most of which are the addition of clarifying text in the draft documents. Three significant changes to the staff proposal for the Shared Fund and two significant changes to the staff proposal for Active Program Management are being recommended for committee consideration:
Shared Fund Project Readiness Evaluation
Revise scoring based on IDOT review status:

- Preliminary plans submitted: 2.5 points
- Pre-final plans submitted: 5 points

Preliminary plans must meet the requirements of Chapter 63 of the IDOT BD&E Manual, section 63-1.02(b). Pre-final plans must meet the requirements of Chapter 63 of the IDOT BD&E Manual, section 63-1.02(c).

Shared Fund Complete Streets Planning Factor Evaluation
Insert text, line 272-273 [Shared Fund application booklet], “…and the other half if the project contains complete streets elements, or has documented an exception to complete streets policies during phase 1 or phase 2 engineering.”

Shared Fund Transit Supportive Densities Planning Factor Evaluation
Insert text, line 308 [Shared Fund application booklet]: “CMAP staff will also consider additional information provided by applicants that notes where potential transit users within a ½ mile of a station or stop may be higher than the non-residential zoning might suggest.”

Active Program Management Contingency Programs
Revise text, lines 75-77 [APM Policies], to: “Projects requiring a conformity determination cannot be included in any contingency program, unless those projects that are not already included in the current conformed TIP may be included in contingency programs, but cannot be reprogrammed into the current year of the active program after the TIP change submittal deadline for the spring semi-annual conformity analysis. These projects can be reprogrammed into an out year of the active program.”

Active Program Management Obligation Deadlines
Insert text, line 187: “If the end of the six-month extension period has been reached, and the phase remains unobligated solely due to agreement review, and the agreement was submitted to IDOT before August 1st of the prior year in a good faith attempt to ensure timely obligation of funds within the programmed FFY, an additional three-month extension will be automatically granted for that phase. The additional extension will be to June 30 for engineering and right-of-way phases, and to the federal authorization date for the August state letting for construction/construction engineering phases.”

Longer Term Actions
Additionally, staff is recommending several longer term actions in response to comments. The first of these actions is to complete an evaluation of the results of the first Shared Fund call for projects to determine the demand for certain project types so that the STP PSC can consider implementing rolling focus and/or considering additional project types in future calls for projects. Other actions include consideration of changes to evaluation criteria prior to future calls, evaluation of the success of programs in meeting the intentions of the October 2017 agreement, and a commitment to update the determination of community need on the same cycle as updates to funding distribution data.
Changes to PSC Composition

Finally, at the suggestion of some its members, the Council of Mayors Executive Committee will consider establishing rotating membership on the PSC to ensure broad regional participation and to bring a full range of municipal perspectives to the PSC.

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion
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