



## STP PROJECT SELECTION COMMITTEE

### MEETING MINUTES - FINAL

Thursday, September 1, 2022

9:30 AM

Please join from your computer, tablet or smartphone.

<https://meet.goto.com/630377757>

You can also dial in using your phone.

United States: +1 (571) 317-3122

Access Code: 630-377-757

#### 1.0 Call To Order

Chair Dobbs called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m., and reminded the members that as permitted by the Governor's Disaster Declaration of August 19, 2022, the determination has been made that an in person meeting is not practical or prudent for this committee. To ensure that the meeting is as transparent as possible, staff posted the meeting materials one week in advance, we will provide a recording of this meeting linked on our website, and will take all votes by roll call. Mr. Haadsma called the roll.

**Present:** Kama Dobbs, Alice Gallagher, Kevin O'Malley, Leon Rockingham, Jeffery Schielke, Jeffrey Sriver, John Donovan, Tony Greep, Jennifer (Sis) Killen, Heather Mullins, Chad Riddle, and Grant Davis

**Absent:** Dan Burke

**Staff Present:** Sarah Buchhorn, Teri Dixon, Doug Ferguson, Kate Evasic, Jon Haadsma, Noah Harris, Michael Kray, Tim McMahon, Russell Pietrowiak, Sarah Stolpe, Blanca Vela Schneider, Mary Weber

**Others Present:** Len Cannata, Kaci Crowley, Eric Czarnota, Jon Paul Dipla, Jackie Forbes, Michael Fricano, Scott Hennings, Kendra Johnson, Mike Klemens, Heidi Lichtenberger, Elliott Lewis, Brittany Matyas, Mayra Ortiz, Leslie Rauer, Gordon Smith, Brian Stepp, Freddy Vasquez, Jazmin Vega, Kyle Whitehead

#### 2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes or announcements.

#### 3.0 Approval of Minutes - August 11, 2022

[22-375](#)

**Attachments:** [DRAFT Minutes STPPSC 08112022](#)

*A motion was made by Jeffery Schielke, seconded by Leon Rockingham, to approve the minutes of August 11, 2022 as presented. The motion carried by the following vote:*

**Aye:** Kama Dobbs, Alice Gallagher, Kevin O'Malley, Leon Rockingham, Jeffery Schielke, Jeffrey Sriver, John Donovan, Tony Greep, Jennifer (Sis) Killen, Heather Mullins, Chad Riddle, and Grant Davis

**Absent:** Dan Burke

#### **4.0 STP Shared Fund Methodology**

##### **4.1 Preliminary Engineering Requirements**

[22-376](#)

**Attachments:** [STPPSC CMAQTAPPSC Methodology Memo Preliminary Engineering 09012022](#)

Ms. Dobbs summarized the four options for changes to the preliminary engineering requirements that were detailed in the agenda materials. Mr. Davis stated that options 1 and 3 make the most sense from the City's perspective because these options place the risk and responsibility on sponsors. He noted that option 2 takes away the ability of locals to make informed decisions about their project schedule. Ms. Dobbs reminded the committee that staff is not making a specific recommendation at this time and that the options would also be presented for discussion at the CMAQ and TAP Project Selection Committee meeting later in the day. Following the two meetings, staff will develop a final recommendation for discussion by the committees in November.

President Gallagher noted that all options are listed as potentially reducing the IDOT review burden, and asked if any of the options have a greater potential than others. Ms. Dobbs stated that the options are probably about equal. She stated if the requirement for applicants to reach a certain level of completion by the application deadline is removed, there should be fewer incomplete submittals to IDOT during the application period, thus reducing the burden on them. Mr. Riddle added that all projects with any federal funding have to go through the IDOT preliminary engineering review process. He stated that IDOT needs local agencies to think ahead and that IDOT does their best to work in reviews of unfunded projects, but does have to prioritize review of funded projects first. President Gallagher noted that increasing the financial burden on sponsors is listed as a risk of option 3, and that risk needs to be reduced as much as possible. Ms. Dobbs stated the risk is listed because with this option, sponsors may be funding more phases locally, but this risk is offset a bit by reducing the need to front the expense for preliminary engineering. She also reminded the committee that the region's most disadvantaged communities - those that are in cohort 4 - would remain eligible to apply for preliminary engineering funding.

Chair Dobbs invited comments from members of the audience. Mike Klemens, Lake County DOT and the Lake Council of Mayors, stated that the county also prefers options one and three. He stated that their biggest concern is with the definition of "underway" included in the memo, which requires Bureau of Design and Environment (BDE) review of the Environmental Survey Request (ESR) to be complete. He provided a specific project example and noted that finding a balance is necessary. Ms. Dobbs noted that exceptions, such as the example Mr. Klemens gave, can always be brought to the committee for discussion, and that language can be added to the application to give applicants a means to describe project-specific situations that should be considered.

Ms. Killen asked if there will be consistency in the policies across STP, CMAQ, and TAP. Ms. Dobbs stated that all three programs will use the same criteria and that so far the two committees have been consistent in their comments. Similar agencies participate in both committees, so staff doesn't expect significant disconnect, but if needed, a joint meeting to reach consensus could be held. Ms. Dobbs asked the committee members if they had more of a preference for option 1 or option 3. Ms.

Killen noted that for most local agencies, securing funding for future phases in the out years is probably the most helpful. Mr. Davis stated that CDOT doesn't have a strong preference. Ms. Dobbs thanked the committee for the discussion and stated that staff has noted that this committee prefers either option 1 or option 3.

#### 4.2 Minimum scores for funding consideration

[22-378](#)

**Attachments:** [STPPSC Methodology Memo Minimum Scores 09012022](#)

Ms. Dobbs presented a summary of the staff recommendations contained in the memo included in the meeting materials. Upon concluding the summary she asked for confirmation that the committee wants to set thresholds for defining need and if the thresholds proposed by staff are the correct thresholds. Ms. Killen noted that the counties agree with the intent of the proposal but asked if the current program was compared to these thresholds to determine what applying the criteria means for unlocking opportunities or precluding opportunities. For example, when considering roadway expansion projects, the tools in the toolbox are different in the collar counties than in Cook County and the City of Chicago where intersection improvements and auxiliary lanes are used verses actually expanding a roadway. She stated this leads to concern that a project could be eliminated from funding consideration if there is only a need shown using one of the congestion measures, because the three measures capture different things. Ms. Dobbs suggested that replacing "or" in the proposal with "and" would alleviate this concern. She noted that staff did not test all of the projects from the last application cycle against this proposal, but stated that there were some applications submitted in the bicycle pedestrian barrier elimination category that did not include a physical barrier, and that in the first application cycle when projects were scored in multiple categories, there was at least one project that showed a safety need but the scope of the project did not address the crash type identified. She stated that staff doesn't anticipate these proposals having a significant impact on the pool of projects, but that the comments received regarding setting thresholds was valid and it probably makes sense to set minimum thresholds.

Mr. O'Malley stated that we should definitely be funding projects with the most need, and that setting thresholds is appropriate. President Gallagher stated that setting thresholds saves everyone time and money in the long run by helping applicants to identify what are appropriate projects to submit for this funding. Ms. Dobbs stated that staff will take a look at past applications to verify that there would be no unintended consequences of the proposed thresholds.

Chair Dobbs invited comments from members of the audience. Mike Klemens from Lake County DOT noted a concern with the SRI being used as a threshold for safety improvements because that data doesn't necessarily align with crash data. Also, in the road expansion category, the age of the data sets is a concern. Ms. Dobbs noted that staff is working to update the data sets and if those updates are completed before the call for projects they will be updated. She added that if data is missing for a project location, staff makes every attempt to calculate values for those locations. There being no further discussion, Ms. Dobbs stated that staff will verify the thresholds make sense based on the last application cycle and will incorporate the thresholds into the application booklet in each project category.

**4.3 Status Review and Next Steps**[22-383](#)

Ms. Dobbs provided a review of the status of methodology change proposals that have been discussed by the committee to date and provided a preview of what to expect for the committee's November meeting. In response to a question from Mr. O'Malley, Ms. Dobbs noted that final approval of the application booklet is likely to occur in December.

**5.0 Other Business**

There was no other business.

**6.0 Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**7.0 Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 3, 2022 at 9:30 a.m.

**8.0 Adjournment**

*A motion was made by Jeffery Schielke, seconded by Leon Rockingham, to adjourn the meeting at 10:22 a.m.. The motion carried unanimously.*