



# 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 August 22, 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, John Donovan – FHWA, Jesse Elam – CMAP, Luann Hamilton – CDOT, Tom Kelso – IDOT, Lorri Newson – RTA, Kevin O'Malley – CDOT, Mayor Leon Rockingham – Council of Mayors, Mayor Jeffery Schielke (via phone) – Council of Mayors, Chris Snyder – Counties

**Others Present:** Mark Baloga, Dave Bennett, Larry Bury, Len Cannata, Jack Cruikshank, Karen Darch, Grant Davis, Jackie Forbes, Michael Fricano, Cole Jackson, Mike Klemens, Josh Klingenstein, Tara Orbon, Dan Persky, Ryan Peterson, Leslie Phemister, Ryan Ruehle, David Seglin, Cody Sheriff, Holly Waters

**Staff Present:** Kama Dobbs, Elizabeth Irvin, Stephanie Levine, Russell Pietrowiak, Jeff Schnobrich, Gordon Smith, Simone Weil, Barbara Zubek

### 1.0 Call to Order

Mr. Elam called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m.

### 2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes or announcements.

### 3.0 Approval of Minutes – June 27, 2018

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

#### **4.0 Summer Outreach Activities**

Ms. Dobbs provided an overview of outreach activities and discussed comments received so far, including the letters in the packet from McHenry County Council of Mayors, DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference, Northwest Municipal Conference and Active Transportation Alliance. Ms. Dobbs stated that staff will prepare a response to all of the comments after the meeting.

#### **5.0 Shared Fund Eligibility and Scoring Proposal Update**

Ms. Irvin presented comments received for the draft Shared Fund application booklet. The draft was distributed to councils and CDOT as part of the summer outreach activities. Ms. Irvin explained that the comments were organized into themes. The first theme discussed was sponsor eligibility and cost threshold. Ms. Newson stated that non-municipal sponsors should not be prohibited from applying. Ms. Irvin suggested that they be encouraged to apply in partnership with local municipalities. Mayor Rockingham asked how low population communities would be determined. Ms. Irvin replied that the complexity of determining that threshold is part of why staff is not recommending adding a low population eligibility category, and instead proposing that those projects apply to their local councils.

Comments on eligible project types and the proposed rolling focus were discussed next. Mr. Snyder asked if a project has to reapply due to missing a quarterly report or obligation deadline how would reapplying work if the focus changes for the next call. Ms. Dobbs responded that if funding is removed because of lack of status that it is a good indication that the project is not moving forward and should wait until the next cycle. She added that the committee could also make the decision to allow a project in that situation to apply in the next cycle. Mr. Snyder stated that all project types should be eligible in every call. Mr. Elam stated the committee could move forward with the staff position on the proposal for the rolling focus with the understanding that in the future it might need to be modified. Mayor Rockingham asked if projects that are not of one of the rolling focus types could still apply. Ms. Hamilton stated that as a committee they can take actions for projects that apply but do not meet the rolling focus in future calls. Mr. Donovan stated that the desire is to be up front about eligibility and to have a level playing field. Mr. Snyder stated that current decision making and project readiness will be affected if calls for all projects types are not eligible in every call.

Comments received about project readiness were discussed. Mr. Snyder stated few projects will be given points for project readiness. He said there should be some graduated level of points given for starting right of way and phase two engineering. Mr. Donovan stated that it is worth rewarding the few projects that will be ready and noted

that the finer the detail in scoring, the harder it will be to separate projects for funding decisions. Ms. Newson commented that the current proposal balances the playing field because it provides an opportunity for smaller projects to get some score in this category. Ms. Irvin emphasized that it is not expected that any project will receive points across all categories.

Comments received about the transportation impact evaluation were discussed. Mr. Snyder asked if the burden will be on sponsors to select the project category when submitting applications. Ms. Irvin explained that the current staff proposal is to score projects in all potential categories, and assign projects to the category with the best score. Mr. Burke asked if there is a concern about staff time if every project will be scored in all categories. Mr. Elam stated that projects that can score in multiple categories will be flagged for evaluation in multiple categories, but not every project will be scored in every category. Mr. Donovan stated that he expects that many projects will be able to score well in multiple categories. Ms. Irvin added that projects that fit into multiple categories would be eligible to apply in multiple call cycles under the rolling focus proposal.

Mr. Snyder asked why population and job impact criteria is indexed and the other criteria are not. Ms. Irvin replied that all of the transportation impact measures are indexed. Mr. Snyder asked if a less urban or rural county will not score well in that population and jobs category. Ms. Irvin responded that projects will receive points if they are carrying travel from other parts of the region as opposed to just considering nearby population and jobs or traffic volume in order to better capture the potential regional benefit of a project.

Comments received on the planning factors evaluation were discussed. Mr. Peterson asked if the inclusive growth evaluation criteria could be calculated by evaluating users as a percentage of the population by using the proportion of people of color in the community. Ms. Irvin replied that measure does not look at the area around the project, but uses the travel model to assess the demographics of people using the project segments. President Darch expressed concerns about the inclusive growth map and how users are determined. She noted there was a gap in the northwest and western suburbs and asked why the inclusive growth factor was used for every project. She also asked why freight movement is not a planning factor for highway and rail grade crossing improvements. Ms. Irvin replied that the truck benefit and train impact are both captured in the transportation impact score for grade crossing and truck route projects. The freight movement planning factor was intended to capture the freight movement on projects that have not already been assessed in the transportation impact evaluation. She also noted that President Darch had previously commented about adding school bus data to the scoring, and that staff has found that school bus data is not readily available

throughout the region. Ms. Irvin also explained that the inclusive growth evaluation on the roads is based on the percent of travelers, not the travel volumes. Mr. Snyder asked if the map is a data set that will be available in advance. Ms. Irvin said that the data will be available and if a project consists of multiple links, the score would be averaged across those links. Mr. Elam commented that the reason why inclusive growth is ten points across all categories is because of the importance of inclusive growth in ON TO 2050. The scoring is a meaningful way to bring inclusive growth into capital programming without overshadowing other issues. He added that across the region there is significant travel by people under the poverty line and people of color and many projects would be able to benefit from this planning factor. Ms. Newson stated that it is the committee's responsibility to be objective and make sure that communities that are impacted by economic challenges are given the opportunity to thrive and the inclusive growth planning factor is one way to do that.

Comments received on bonus points were discussed. Mr. Kelso asked if CDOT can award their points to their own projects. Ms. Irvin replied that a council or CDOT can use their points on any projects.

#### **6.0 Active Program Management Proposal Update**

Ms. Dobbs presented the comments received for the draft Active Program Management Policies document. The draft was distributed to councils and CDOT for comment as part of the summer outreach activities. Mr. Snyder said that he is concerned with the six month time frame to get a project to obligation. Ms. Dobbs clarified that obligation occurs six weeks prior to the letting and a project cannot go to an obligation if the pre-final plans, which are due six months in advance, are not submitted. She commented that there may be exceptions for individual projects that will need consideration. Mr. Snyder asked for clarification on the penalty for missing the six month obligation extension. Ms. Dobbs replied that a project would move to the contingency program and funds would be redistributed to the shared fund with the ability to access those funds if not already used by another project. Mr. Snyder asked if it is a formal process to get out of the contingency program because the process could delay projects. Ms. Dobbs stated the goal of the program is to move projects to obligation and there needs to be flexibility, councils could confirm with CMAP staff that funds are available for a project ready to obligate and avoid further delay. If needed due to limited fund availability, a hierarchy would be used if multiple projects came in the same time. Contentious projects would be brought to the committee. Mr. Elam commented that the goal is to have projects ready to obligate. Mayor Rockingham asked what would happen if a project that has been waiting on the contingency list and a recently added project to the contingency list are both ready obligate. Mr. Elam stated that the committee should be able to rely on the expertise of staff to bring projects that are ready to obligation. Ms. Hamilton stated the goal of the committee is to advance projects.

## **7.0 Proposal for Use of TDCs**

Mr. Elam stated that IDOT and CMAP have been working together to develop the proposal for the use of TDCs as match for high need communities. The proposal is still undergoing internal review at IDOT. The committee will continue to be updated on the status of this item.

## **8.0 Other Business**

Mr. Elam stated that there was a discussion at the Council of Mayors Executive Committee meeting about membership on the STP Project Selection Committee. It was suggested that the Council of Mayors rotate members on the committee. Mayor Schielke said it would be an opportunity to be inclusive in the decision-making and there would be value in rotating members.

Mayor Schielke then commented that the DuPage Mayors and Managers Association copied him on a letter addressed to Joe Szabo about taking a position on granting all cities in the region home rule. Mr. Baloga clarified that the letter from DMMC to CMAP was not intended to request that CMAP make changes to the home rule status of Illinois municipalities. Rather, the relevant statement in that letter was intended to provide comment on a specific provision in the Draft ON TO 2050 Plan regarding possible changes to the distribution of revenue by the state to municipalities. That comment in the letter suggests that CMAP should seek solutions which allow municipalities more individual authority to generate revenue rather than options that remove current revenue from some municipalities for redistribution to other municipalities, and that one way to pursue this would be for CMAP to support state legislation which grants more authority to non-home rule municipalities or removes completely the limitations of non-home rule status.

## **9.0 Public Comment**

President Darch commented that she agrees with Mr. Snyder that partial credit should be given in project readiness if phase two engineering is started. She also commented that it may be important to have council bonus points before projects are ranked, not after a program is developed so that the committee can see the importance of projects to the councils.

## **10.0 Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for September 26, 2018. The committee will be asked to take action on both the Shared Fund application booklet and APM Policies.

## **11.0 Adjournment**

On a motion by Ms. Hamilton, seconded by Mr. Snyder, the meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.