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)
Environment and Natural Resources Committee
Minutes
Wednesday, April 2, 2014

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

Committee Members
Present:, Martin Jaffe - UIC, Anne McKibben – Elevate Energy, Joe Schuessler – MWRD, Deb Stone – Cook County Department of Environmental Control, Mike Sullivan – Kane / Kendall Council of Mayors, Sean Wiedel – Chicago Department of Transportation, Patricia Werner – Lake County Stormwater Management Commission, Wallace Van Buren – IAWA

Absent: Martha Dooley – Village of Schaumburg, Jon Grosshans – U.S. EPA, Jack Darin – Illinois Sierra Club, Stacy Meyers – Openlands, Nancy Williamson – IDNR, Melinda Pruett-Jones – Chicago Wilderness, Ed Collins – MCCD, Pete Harmet – IDOT

Staff Present: Louise Yeung, Drew Williams-Clark, Lindsay Hollander, Jesse Elam, Simone Weil, Jason Navota, Emily Plagman, Nora Beck

Others Present: Edith Makra, Mary Ann Kaufman

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions
Committee co-chair, Sean Wiedel, called the meeting to order at approximately 9:35 a.m.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements
Legislative update: CMAP Staff Simone Weil briefly stated her purpose of coming to the ENR Committee to hear committee members thoughts on specific legislative bills. CMAP is currently following several bills that would impact the implementation of GO TO 2040. The Committee was asked if they are aware of other legislation CMAP should be following. The committee discussed the following:

- HB 3251: Local Government Dissolution. Weil explained that CMAP is now opposing this bill given an amendment that will prevent the creation of new units of government that result from the consolidation of two or more existing units of government.
- SB 2829: Civil Procedure. Weil stated CMAP would look into this bill.
- HB4599: Bans Coal Tar Sealant. CMAP is not taking a position on this bill, but is working with partners on this issue. Patty Werner questioned this approach;

finding the response that the CMAP board focuses on legislation that impacts transportation remiss given the water quality objectives in GO TO 2040.

Conservation Design Resource Manual: CMAP Staff Nora Beck updated the committee on the status of this project given their role as the project steering committee. CMAP is currently launching a new LTA project in the Village of Campton Hills to update their zoning and subdivision ordinance to reflect conservation design principles. Given this project, CMAP staff had decided to coordinate the update of the Conservation Design Resource Manual with the Campton Hills project. As a result, the update of the manual will follow a longer timeline.

LTA Call for projects, May 2: Beck announced that CMAP will be launching the annual LTA call for projects on May 2 and that Bob Dean will be providing more details at the next committee meeting in May.

3.0 Approval of Minutes – February 5 and March 5, 2014

A motion to approve the minutes of the February 5 meeting as presented was made by Mike Sullivan, seconded by Sean Weidel, and with all in favor, carried. A motion to approve the minutes of the March 5 meeting as presented was made by Martin Jaffe, seconded by Anne McKibben, and with all in favor, carried.

4.0 2014-2015 Future Leaders in Planning (FLIP) program – Louise Yeung, CMAP Staff

Yeung provided a brief summary of CMAP's Future Leaders in Planning (FLIP) program; a leadership development program that offers high school students the opportunity to contribute to a better future for our region. The FLIP program is accepting applications until Friday, May 30, 2014. Yeung referred to the FLIP webpage, where you find the 2014-2015 application. Please feel free to contact Ricardo Lopez at rlopez@cmap.illinois.gov with any questions.

5.0 GO TO 2040 Update – Drew Williams-Clark, CMAP staff

Federal regulations mandate the update of GO TO 2040 by October of 2014. Drew Williams-Clark explained that staff are updating the financial plan, major capital projects, indicators, and implementation actions to inform the plan update. These components are expected to be complete in the spring so that the plan can be drafted for public comment release at the June, 2014 meetings of the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee.

At the March meeting, the committee provided constructive feedback on some of the indicators and their new targets. Williams-Clark explained that staff normalized the data to provide per capita metrics where possible, specifically the greenhouse gas emissions indicator which was a committee recommendation. He explained that in response to the committee's concern on the indicator pertaining to acres of land harvested food for human consumption and how this number is impacted by population growth, CMAP staff investigated the possibility of presenting both acreage and acreage per capita. Staff felt that the trend lines were so similar that the per-capita measure added little value. Martin Jaffe said normalizing with a per capita metric provides people with information that acreage is keeping up with population growth.

a. **Financial Plan** - Lindsay Hollander, CMAP Staff

Lindsay Hollander provided an overview and update on the Financial Plan. Referencing the memo, Hollander first stepped through the forecast of revenues and expenditures, which can be found in Table 1, page 2. CMAP staff estimates that the expenditures for operating and maintaining the transportation system will exceed core revenues over the planning horizon of 2015 – 2040 by approximately $4.5 billion. Federal guidance permits the inclusion of reasonably expected revenues, and these are outlined in Table 4, page 6. Hollander then described each of the five reasonably expected revenue sources in greater detail and identified policy changes associated with each one: State Motor fuel tax increase and long-term replacement; Congestion pricing on the existing system; Performance-based funding; Regionally-imposed vehicle registration fee; and Variable parking pricing. Hollander closed by explaining that CMAP staff are now drafting a funding allocation in the next few weeks. The committee discussed the following:

- **State Motor fuel tax increase and long-term replacement.** Anne McKibben asked if any state has replaced the Motor Fuel Tax. Hollander explained that there are a few states (PA and VA) with a sales tax (which fluctuates with price of fuel), and Oregon (which is experimenting with a VMT program). Deb Stone asked how CMAP Staff determined the estimated amount coming from the long-term replacement. Hollander explained that they worked backwards by calculating the amount generated from the MFT if fuel economy was held at a steady state (instead of continuing to increase in efficiency).
- **Use of the word Highways.** Hollander clarified that the word 'Highways' in the memo refers to all roads, including local streets, arterials, collectors, interstates, etc. Patty Werner recommended adding a footnote to define it as such. Transit could also be defined.
- **Total of reasonably expected revenues.** Werner asked if that was a number that CMAP staff wanted to reach or if that is what you reasonably expect. Hollander confirmed that that number was what was reasonably expected.
- **Reducing costs.** Mary Ann Kaufman asked if the forecast assumes work will be done to lower costs on projects, specifically with land acquisition. Hollander responded that land acquisition is often not a large portion of the costs associated with maintenance and operations. She also explained that at the regional scale, CMAP staff are using unit costs and assuming these are the same across the various counties.
- **Contingency amount.** Joe Schuessler asked if the forecast included a contingency amount. Hollander explained that there's a lot of uncertainty and that's why the federal guidelines call for the financial plan to be updated every four years. She also explained that the forecast is there to help prioritize investments in the system.
- **Reaching indicator targets.** Stone, referring to the recent report that should that Chicago was spending a lot less on transit investments that New York and other cities, wondered if CMAP staff have run an analysis for what it would take to bring transit up to the desired level. She wondered if the federal guidelines are positioning the conversation so that the actions are less ambitious. Williams-Clark responded that CMAP goes beyond the federal template in a lot of ways; but yes, figuring out what it would cost to reach the plan targets is something the staff has been talking a lot about. It would be a new exercise and it is a conversation to continue in the next regional plan. CMAP staff is already starting to figure out how to do this and weaving it into their workplan. Werner suggested that this project should apply to other GO TO 2040 indicators, not just the transportation ones. Williams-Clark agreed and stated that staff will have to figure out the methodology for doing so, especially the revenues, not just

the costs for specific projects. Werner stated that when you do this transportation financial plan, it has a way of bringing money to the table; so using it for other plan objectives could help in that regard as well.

b. **Major Capital Projects and Congestion Pricing Policy** – Jesse Elam, CMAP Staff
Jesse Elam provided a brief summary of what CMAP staff has done over the past four years on congestion pricing. Referring to the memo, Elam presented a draft policy for consideration that includes two items: 1) to adopt the implementation of congestion pricing on the new capacity associated with GO TO 2040 major capital projects, with the exception of short or isolated add-lanes projects; 2) to adopt the longer-term goal of tolling and implementing congestion pricing on existing limited-access highway capacity. Elam defined congestion pricing (a variable toll that responds to demand) and explained that it extends the value of capacity additions through management. CMAP is recommending that the generated revenues be used to pay for operations and maintenance of that specific roadway and, if there is excess, those funds could be used to repay upfront construction costs, with a strong preference given to transit elements of the project.

Elam explained that with the adoption of such a policy, projects could screen out alternatives faster and could skip non-tolled alternatives. He also brought up the local impacts and equity concerns; adding managed lanes doesn't have equity impacts as the non-managed lanes still exist. But the longer-term proposal of adding managed lanes to existing highways would require some mitigation to alleviate local impacts and equity issues. CMAP will need to study how to do this, but there are a variety of methods. In terms of the policy framework, managing new capacity could happen today, but adding congestion pricing to existing lanes will require a policy change. The committee asked a number of clarifying questions, including whether the existing roads could include both base toll lanes and variable toll lanes and whether the payment mechanism could be incorporated into the manufacturing of vehicles. The committee discussed flipping the price points so that the tolls were lower in areas where the region wants to promote infill development. Mary Ann Kaufman asked if there was a time component that could also help deter people from choosing far flung locations. Later in the spring, staff will present a recommended list of major capital projects to fit within the plan update's fiscal constraint.

6.0 Tipping Point, an online guide to watershed planning -- Martin Jaffe, UIC
Jaffe explained that a consortium of Great Lakes Sea Grant programs, under GLRI funding, has been developing an on-line guide to watershed planning: www.tippingpointplanner.org The guide employs a "tipping point" concept that relates land use indicators to ambient water quality based on the degree of urban, agricultural and forested land available in a watershed. The website also addresses land planning goals and objectives that could affect water quality, and provides examples of local implementation measures that could be considered to address these impacts. Jaffe explained that it allows for "what if" scenarios and could be used by CMAP and other planners to help communities. Jaffe went through the Action Plan feature of the website and showed how the community prioritized different goals and what that meant for their future land use plan and water quality impacts. The HUC level depends on which Great Lakes state you are working in. Jaffe asked for feedback and whether anyone could envision using this resource. Jason Navota asked clarifying questions on the inputs and outputs of the program and stated that he could see application in the 53/120 project as they try to

compare different land use scenarios. Mary Ann Kaufman asked how often the data is updated; Jaffe responded that updates are dependent on future funding but that the current set of data has a lifespan of about 5-10 years. Elam asked if the program tied into regulatory requirements, like the clean water act. No, it starts from the land use side. Jaffe encouraged everyone to check out the website and send feedback.

7.0 Next Meeting

The ENR Committe is scheduled to meet next on Wednesday, May 7, 2014.

8.0 Adjournment

A motion to adjourn at 10:55 am, made by Wallace Van Buren, seconded by Deb Stone and with all in favor, carried.