Northwest Municipal Conference
Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee
Tuesday, February 20, 2018
10:30 a.m.
NWMC Offices
1600 E. Golf Road, Suite 0700, Des Plaines

AGENDA

I. Call to Order/ Introductions

II. Approval of January 16, 2018 Meeting Minutes (Attachment A)
Action Requested: Approval of Minutes

III. Surface Transportation Program (STP) Project Selection Committee Update (Attachment B)
Staff will provide an update on the latest STP Project Selection Committee meeting. The committee will establish active program management strategies for all STP projects and will determine the methodology for selecting projects to receive STP funds from the regional Shared Fund. There are opportunities to incorporate more Complete Streets and other bicycle and pedestrian aspects into individual council methodologies.
Action requested: Informational/Discussion

IV. NWMC Multimodal Plan Update
Staff will provide an update on the status of updates to the NWMC bicycle plan.
Action Requested: Informational

V. Upcoming Events
The Illinois Bike Summit, Complete Streets Coalition Quarterly Meeting and the RTA planning workshops are all upcoming opportunities.
Action Requested: Information/Discussion

VI. Local Project Updates
Municipalities and others will be asked to provide updates on bicycle and pedestrian related projects.
Action Requested: Information/Discussion

VII. Other Business

VIII. Next Meeting
The next meeting of the NWMC Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee is scheduled for March 20, 2018 at the NWMC offices.
Action Requested: Informational

IX. Adjournment
Northwest Municipal Conference  
Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee  
Tuesday, January 16, 2018  
Draft Meeting Minutes  
10:30 a.m.  
NWMC Offices, Des Plaines

Committee Members Present:  
AC Buehler, Trustee, Village of Northbrook (co-chair)  
Anne Marrin, Village of Fox Lake (co-chair)  
Richard Bascomb, Village of Schaumburg  
Jim Baxa, Village of Northbrook  
Nellie Beckner, Village of Mount Prospect  
Mike Hankey, Village of Hoffman Estates  
Maggie Jablonski, Elk Grove Village  
Andrew Jennings, Village of Wheeling  
Natalie Nye, Village of Barrington  
Derek Peebles, City of Des Plaines  
Brigit Schwab, Village of Arlington Heights  
Harry Spila, Village of Palatine

Others Present:  
Mark Biederwolf, Village of Buffalo Grove  
Jim Hurley, City of Evanston  
Matt Lawrie, Village of Mount Prospect  
Wayne Mikes, Bike Palatine  
Martin Sobanski, Village of Northbrook  
Robert Steele, Village of Glenview  
Brian Pigeon, NWMC  
Mike Walczak, NWMC

I. Call to Order/ Introductions  
Trustee Buehler called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m. and asked those present for introductions.

II. Approval of December 19, 2017 Meeting Minutes.  
On a motion by Ms. Marrin, seconded by Mr. Bascomb, the committee voted to approve the meeting minutes.

III. NWMC Multimodal Plan Update  
Mr. Walczak discussed discussions staff has had with CMAP staff regarding the timeline for receiving grant funding for the conference bike plan update. He reported that the
funds could be available as soon as April and noted that staff would be discussing the issue with the NWMC Finance Committee. He reiterated that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee would be the steering committee for the plan and would select the project consultant. He added that there would be a kick-off event for the new plan launch and that the conference would be responsible for a 20% match for the funds.

IV. **RRFB Policy Changes**

Mr. pigeon discussed the FWHA’s decision to rescind approval of rectangular rapid flashing beacons noting that the devices were found to be patented. He noted that existing RRFBs could remain in place for their usable life but new RRFBs should not be installed. He advised municipalities with questions to contact FHWA’s local office.

V. **Invest in Cook Program**

Mr. Walczak noted that a new call of Invest in Cook projects would begin later in the year and encouraged municipalities to begin thinking of eligible projects.

VI. **Other Business**

Mr. Pigeon discussed two recent decisions made by the Illinois Supreme Court regarding municipal liability for the maintenance of off-street paths noting that these decisions provide only limited immunity for local governments. He also noted that the Complete Streets Coalition would be meeting March 9 at CMAP’s offices in Chicago and that Ride Illinois had received a state grant to continue that organization’s Bike Safety Quiz with police forces.

Mr. Baxa announced that the Village of Northbrook was working on a bike plan update and the draft existing conditions report would be available soon.

Mr. Peebles announced that Des Plaines was pursuing in-road lighting for their downtown crossing and had received initial IDOT approval.

VII. **Next Meeting**

Chair Buehler announced that the next meeting was scheduled for February 20, 2018 at the NWMC offices.

VIII. **Adjournment**

On a motion by Mr. Bascomb, seconded by Ms. Marrin, the committee adjourned at 11:25 a.m.
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MEMORANDUM

To: NWMC Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee
From: Mike Walczak, NWMC Transportation Director
Subject: Surface Transportation Program Project Selection Committee Update
Date: February 20, 2018

The Surface Transportation Program (STP) Project Selection Committee has held two meetings. The responsibilities of the committee are: establish active program management strategies for all STP projects; determine the methodology for selecting projects to receive STP funds from the regional Shared Fund; and, approve the program of Shared Fund projects and monitor their progress. The committee consists of seven members: three Council of Mayors representatives; three representatives from the City of Chicago; and, a CMAP staff member who chairs the committee. Non-voting members represent IDOT, the counties, RTA and the Federal Highway Administration. The committee plans to meet monthly throughout 2018 and 2019.

At the first meeting in December, the committee established a meeting schedule and reviewed its charge. The committee also discussed the importance of developing regional consensus for the Shared Fund program, the need for the support of IDOT in agreement processing and plan reviews, as well as the importance of input from the councils in the process. The possibility of councils making recommendations on a project or group of projects for the Shared Fund was also brought up and will likely be discussed more at a future meeting.

At the January meeting, the committee discussed potential active program management tools designed to more efficiently spend STP funds and streamline project timelines (see attached slideshow). A set of active program management rules has been in place since 2014 for the CMAQ and TAP programs. Examples were also given from other regions around the country.

The development of the Shared Fund methodology will begin in February and will determine which project types will be eligible for funding and how projects will be scored. Local municipalities and the City of Chicago will all be eligible to apply to the Shared Fund program.

Both the active program management and Shared Fund methodology are scheduled to be approved in September, 2018. During this time, the committee will also determine what assistance should be given to disadvantaged communities. Once the active program management rules are set, individual council methodologies can be updated. Changes to the individual council methodologies must be completed by the end of September, 2019 to be followed by a call for new projects to be programmed starting in FY 2021. The call for projects for the Shared Fund will be in January, 2019. The projects will be scored and a proposed program released in June, 2019. Final approval will be in October, 2019.
NWMC is working with the other regional councils to inform our Council of Mayors representatives on the committee as well as CMAP staff of our comments and concerns. During the development process, these included:

- Recommend conducting a periodic review (i.e. every two years) and analysis of the projects selected by the committee to ensure that the past projects chosen meet the goals of the memorandum’s signatories and the regional comprehensive plan.

- During the first five-year update of the performance-based data, CMAP and the signatories to the memorandum undertake an evaluation of this new system to measure success and allow for changes to be made.

- Include language in the active program management rules acknowledging delays from factors beyond the control of municipalities and ensure that no municipality or council loses funding due to these factors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>January</strong></td>
<td><strong>January</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Program Management: Issues &amp; Options</td>
<td>Issue call for 2020 – 2024 Shared Fund Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February</strong></td>
<td><strong>February</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Fund Methodology: Project Types &amp; Criteria Categories</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Program Management: Draft Proposal</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April</strong></td>
<td><strong>April</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Fund Methodology: Draft Selection Criteria &amp; Scoring Proposal</td>
<td>Project rankings released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Program Management: Revised Proposal</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June</strong></td>
<td><strong>June</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Fund Methodology: Revised Selection Criteria &amp; Scoring System Proposal</td>
<td>Staff recommended program review and release for public comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD Feedback from councils/partners</td>
<td>TBD Public comment period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August</strong></td>
<td><strong>August</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD Feedback from councils/partners</td>
<td>Review comments and recommend program to MPO Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September</strong></td>
<td><strong>September</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve Active Program Management System &amp; Shared Fund Methodology</td>
<td>Approve local program distribution and programming marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October</strong></td>
<td><strong>October</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD Begin local methodology updates</td>
<td>TBD MPO Policy Committee Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November</strong></td>
<td><strong>November</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review shared fund application materials</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December</strong></td>
<td><strong>December</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO MEETING</td>
<td>NO MEETING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items in italics are activities by others, including CMAP staff, other CMAP committees, and the councils and CDOT.

*DRAFT* December 12, 2017
Today’s goals

- Review why APM is needed
- Review brainstorming sessions and make additions
- Consider peer review
- Identify most important issues that can be addressed with APM
- Get a sense of options available
Why APM?

- Obligation History
- Implementation Issues
- Transparency
  - Sponsor Expectations
  - GATA
Obligation History

STP-L marks, allotments, and expenditures history

Source: CMAP STP-L Obligations spreadsheet.
So what?

- STP funds used to be protected from rescission – not anymore
- Projects are programmed, even more projects are needed, but they’re not getting done
Brainstorming

- Three sessions
  - CMAP staff
  - Planning Liaisons
  - IDOT D1 Local Roads

- Developed “Issues & Options”
Issues

Projects don’t start on time
Repeat offenders
Agreement delays
Funds are “reserved” for projects that are delayed
Sense of “entitlement” to funding
“Saving up”
Sponsors won’t start project without “guarantee” for construction
Time needed to save up match $
Early phases using local funds make construction “come out of nowhere”
Inaccurate cost estimates

ROW delays can be significant and are not controlled by sponsor
Changing local priorities/politics
Lack of awareness of project status by decision/policy makers
Lack of applications - filling programs with LAFO
Lagging projects or phases
Unrealistic/speculative project applications
Balance keeping funding local vs. replenishing the shared fund
Projects don’t start on time

Repeat offenders

Agreement delays

Funds are “reserved” for projects that are delayed

Sense of “entitlement” to funding

“Saving up”

Sponsors won’t start project without “guarantee” for construction

Time needed to save up match $

Early phases using local funds make construction “come out of nowhere”

Inaccurate cost estimates

ROW delays can be significant and are not controlled by sponsor

Changing local priorities/politics

Lack of awareness of project status by decision/policy makers

Lack of applications - filling programs with LAFO

Lagging projects or phases

Unrealistic/speculative project applications

Balance keeping funding local vs. replenishing the shared fund
Issues

Active Program Management
Projects don’t start on time
Lagging projects or phases
Agreement delays
Funds are “reserved” for projects that are delayed
ROW delays can be significant and are not controlled by sponsor
Changing local priorities/politics
Lack of awareness of project status by decision/policy makers
Early phases using local funds make construction “come out of nowhere”
Balance keeping funding local vs. replenishing the shared fund

Project Selection Methodologies
Inaccurate cost estimates
Repeat offenders
Different PMs/Consultants known to be more accurate with estimates
Sense of “entitlement” to funding
“Saving up”
Lack of applications - filling programs with LAFO
Sponsors won’t start project without “guarantee” for construction
Time needed to save up match $
Unrealistic/speculative project applications
Issue: Lag between programming & implementation

- 20% of current projects were programmed more than 10 years ago

Source: eTIP database. Year projects entered TIP determined from TIP ID.
Issue: Lag between programming & implementation

- 25% of projects had their first obligation more than 5 years after entering the TIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First obligation relative to entering TIP</th>
<th>Number of projects</th>
<th>Percent of projects</th>
<th>Amount of STP-L “reserved” for these projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>$75M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 14 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$280M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 9 years</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$475M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>$714M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CMAP STP-L Obligations spreadsheet. 880 projects entering TIP in 1994 or later, with at least one STP-L obligation.
Issue: “Reserved” funds

- When delays occur, the “reserved” funds are going unspent
- There are different ways that we “reserve” funds:
  - By council with our distribution formula
  - By call for projects cycle when we create an “approved program”
  - By project when estimates or bids are low
Issue: Agreement delays

- Funds cannot be obligated and project phases cannot be started without an agreement
- Delayed start of early phases can cause a snowball effect on later phases.
- Good news - Majority of delays are preventable!

AGREEMENT DELAYS
- Submitted prior to PPI approval
- PPI, Agreement & TIP (do not match)
- Submitted w/o Design Approval
- Missing Exhibits
- Signed Agreements not dated
- Incorrect Resolution
- Project Scope Change
- Fund Source Changes

REASONS FOR DELAY ON ENGINEERING AGREEMENTS
- Incomplete submittal
- Payroll Rate/Classifications missing or do not match the Current Payroll Rate listing
- Sub-Consultant not Pre-Qualified
- Profit formula not consistent
- Not submitted w/ LPA Agreements
- Project description must match the TIP

Source: IDOT D1 BLRS presentation at recent STP workshop
Issue: ROW delays

- Can be significant
- Can legitimately be “beyond sponsor control”
  - Condemnation process can be long
  - Cost can escalate, causing delay while funds are secured
Issue: Changing local priorities

- When priorities change, programming often doesn’t follow suit

Issue: Lack of awareness

- Decision-makers that budget and schedule often aren’t in the loop:
  - On status of projects
  - On rules/procedures for spending
Other issues?
Agreement: Provisions to Consider for APM System

- Deadlines for projects to be initiated
- Deadlines for project phases to be obligated
- Grace periods for local reprogramming of funds
- Policies for project and phase eligibility
- Policies for re-distribution of unobligated funds
Peer Review

- Five MPOs, our CMAQ/TAP program, and existing council policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO/Council</th>
<th>Require Status Updates</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Deadlines</th>
<th>Grace Periods/Extensions</th>
<th>Penalties</th>
<th>Immediate Reprogramming</th>
<th>Training/Project Mgmt</th>
<th>Other provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC Capital Area MPO (CAMPO)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EW Gateway</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Council</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAP (CMAQ/TAP)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuPage</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane/Kendall</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Annual program status report
  - Projects are “Advancing”, “Delayed”, or “Dropped”
- Deadlines based on programmed year
- Delays > 1 year cause subsequent phases to move out of program
- New applications are limited for sponsors of delayed projects
- Deliverability assessment completed with funding application
One request for 6 month extension allowed, based on ability to progress, not reason for delay, limited to ROW and CON phases

Aggressive contingency list for immediate reprogramming

- Projects receiving reprogrammed funds must be “immediately ready to obligate”
- Hierarchy: prioritized contingency list, subsequent phases of previously funded projects, projects with other federal funds in the TIP

If miss deadline, funds removed and reduced # of new applications allowed next call
Capital Area MPO (Raleigh)

- Programming/management changes in response to 2009 rescission
- Program 2-years in future, every year
- Agreements for programmed phases signed by local and state in September (before start of programmed FFY), or funds reprogrammed
- Project selection includes consideration of past project delivery performance
  - Limit number of new applications based on number of projects delayed in past
- Project managers and training required
East-West Gateway

- Monthly status reports
- One chance to reprogram (IMP or CON only) if delay beyond sponsor control and a strategy is in place to obligate funds
- Missed deadline/no extension: funding forfeited and prior phase(s) federal funds repaid by sponsor
Metropolitan Council (Twin Cities)

- Request extension 6 mos. before deadline
- Unforeseen delay and project progressing
- Projects that miss deadline are not carried into new TIP
- No automatic inflationary cost increase for extended phases.
High Level Options

- Realistic programming
- Project sunsets
- Frequent status updates
- Active reprogramming
- Regular and uniform calls for projects
- Standardized implementation procedures
Realistic Programming

- Ask for funds when project/phase(s) will be ready, not in current/next year
- Use IDOT milestone schedule and previous experience as a guide
- Creates foundation for success

Issues addressed:
- Delayed start
- Agreement & ROW delays
- Time to save match
Project Sunsets with Serious Penalties

- Set deadlines based on programmed year
- Tie to letting and milestone schedules
- Milestones must be met well ahead of the end of the FFY in order to ensure obligation within that same year
- Motivates sponsors to make progress or risk losing funding for project and for council

Issues addressed:
- Starting on time
- “Reserved” funds
- Agreement & ROW delays
Frequent Status Updates

- Forces awareness of progress – keeps project at the forefront
- Confirmation of progress
- Early identification of delays – before a sunset milestone is missed
- Flexibility to modify schedule during a regular call for projects
- From beginning – not just beginning of federally funded phase

Issues addressed:
- Phase delays
- Predictable schedule for securing match
- Less “surprise” construction
- Changing local priorities
- Lack of awareness
Grace Periods and Active Reprogramming

- Delays do happen – must be reasonable when making progress
- Provides flexibility to move a project(s) forward when another is delayed
- Creates a pipeline a viable projects

Issues addressed:
- “Reserved” funds
- Delays beyond sponsor control
- Changing local priorities
- Keeps funds local
Standard Implementation Procedures

- Uniform call for projects schedule
- Published, consistent policies across the region
- Frequent and comprehensive training

Issues addressed:
- Lack of awareness
- GATA requirements
Active Program Management System development timeline

- Selection Committee discussion
  - Jan 2018: issues & options
  - Mar 2018: initial proposal
  - May 2018: revised proposal
  - Summer 2018: council and partner feedback
  - Sep 2018: Approval

- Programming cycle begins with call for shared fund projects in Jan 2019 and local program projects in Jan 2020
STP Active Program Management:

Issues & Options

January 24, 2017