



Chicago Metropolitan  
Agency for Planning

433 West Van Buren Street  
Suite 450  
Chicago, IL 60607

312-454-0400  
cmap.illinois.gov

**Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)**  
**DRAFT**  
**STP Project Selection Committee Meeting Minutes**

August 8, 2020  
Via GoToMeeting

**Committee Members Present:** Jesse Elam, Chairman – CMAP, Luis Benitez – CDOT, John Donovan – FHWA, Michael Horsting – RTA, Kevin O'Malley - CDOT, Jeffery Schielke – Council of Mayors, Jeffrey Sriver – CDOT, Eugene Williams - Council of Mayors, John Yonan – Counties

**Others Present:** Dan Burke, Lenny Cannata, Emily Daucher, Grant Davis, Jackie Forbes, Michael Fricano, Jeremy Glover, Kendra Johnson, Noah Jones, Mike Klemens, Daniel Knickelbein, Eva De Laurentiis, Matthew Pasquini, Kelsey Passi, Ryan Peterson, Leslie Phemister, Troy Simpson, Dan Thomas

**Staff Present:** Teri Dixon, Kama Dobbs, Doug Ferguson, Parry Frank, Craig Heither, Leroy Kos, Stephanie Levine, Elliott Lewis, Thomas Murtha, Russell Pietrowiak, Todd Schmidt, Jeff Schnobrich, Ryan Thompto, Mary Weber, Simone Weil

**1.0 Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 9:35 am by Chairman Elam. Ms. Dixon announced attendance for the committee members on the call.

**2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements**

Chairman Elam reminded members and other attendees of best practices for participating in a virtual format. Due to changes in the Open Meetings Act, he reminded committee members that all votes must be recorded as roll call votes.

**3.0 Approval of Minutes – July 16, 2020**

A motion was made by Mayor Williams, seconded by Mr. O'Malley, to approve the minutes of the July 16, 2020 meeting as presented. A roll call vote was conducted:

Aye Luis Benitez, CDOT  
Aye Kevin O'Malley, City of Chicago  
Aye Jeff Sriver, CDOT  
Aye Mayor Schielke, Council of Mayors  
Aye Mayor Williams, Council of Mayors  
Aye Jesse Elam, CMAP

With all in favor, the motion carried.

#### **4.0 Evaluating the Lessons Learned**

Ms. Dobbs reviewed the current methodology for bridge projects, noting that if a project involves multiple individual structures, the structure with the worst rating is deemed the 'critical structure' and is the basis for both existing condition and need scores. She also reviewed stakeholder concerns that adjustment factors disadvantage constrained urban bridges due to unachievable standards, and that the full scope of project improvement may not be captured when looking at just the overall sufficiency rating. Based on this feedback, staff proposes no changes to the existing condition scores, but is proposing changes to the improvement score methodology to focus more on the individual elements of the structures. As a result, the total improvement score is proposed to be the sum of the deck, superstructure, substructure, bridge posting, insufficient lanes, and safety features scores.

Ms. Dobbs then reviewed assumptions for determining how much improvement a project provided, discussing ratings awarded for full replacement, partial replacement and repairs to a component. She also noted that since it may not be feasible to fully replace a historical and/or movable structure, staff is proposing a 1.5 multiplier to the element improvement score for these structures. Ms. Dobbs next discussed proposed scoring for load posting, insufficient lane widths, and structure-related safety features.

Mr. Benitez requested clarification on the scoring for load posting improvements, noting that even without a full replacement, sponsors typically strive for improvements that will allow the posting to be removed. Ms. Dobbs confirmed that for rehabilitation projects, the sponsor would be responsible for providing an estimate in the change to the load posting, and if the posting was expected to be removed the score would reflect that. Additionally, Mr. Benitez noted that the NBI and IDOT bridge databases differ regarding historic designations. Ms. Dobbs stated that if the historic status was unclear in the NBI, the IDOT data would be reviewed. Ms. Dobbs also confirmed that the proposed multipliers will apply to deck, substructure and superstructure scores.

Next, Ms. Dobbs reviewed current truck route improvement project methodology. Through comments and staff discussion, it was determined that scoring does not consider geometric deficiencies, nor does it consider the negative impacts of truck traffic on surrounding areas. Therefore, staff is proposing retaining the existing condition

factors, and adding a consideration of geometric deficiencies. For improvement scoring, staff is proposing incorporating geometric improvements and mitigation of negative impacts.

Ms. Dobbs reported that geometric deficiencies will be scored by the presence of weight-restricted bridges or vertical clearance limits as well as the percentage of project length with insufficient lane width and/or turn radii. Insufficiencies will be determined by either phase 1 engineering or a planning level study. For improvement scores, staff is proposing four equally weighted factors, plus additional points for both systematic improvements as well as mitigation of negative impacts.

Mr. Sriver inquired about mitigation strategies and what qualifies as sensitive land. Ms. Dobbs clarified the key part will be how projects reroute truck traffic to avoid these areas, and that staff will put a narrative field in the application workbook for applicants to describe the mitigation strategies of the project.

Mr. Horsting asked if there has been any consideration given to truck traffic that overlaps with transit corridors, as this impacts walkability and access to transit services. Chairman Elam and Ms. Dobbs suggested that should be added to the list of examples of sensitive land use.

Ms. Dobbs next discussed how freight planning factors are applied, noting that points are awarded based on the percentage of trucks in project corridor. Staff found that this does not consider the project's role in the regional movement of goods nor does it consider the planning and policy recommendations of ON TO 2050. Staff is proposing scoring similar to complete streets and green infrastructure, with a portion of the points based on a project's location on a regional freight network and the remainder based on policies and procedures suggested by ON TO 2050, such as an online truck permitting program or delivery management policies. Mr. Sriver commended the refinements and expressed interest in the implementation results.

Finally, Ms. Dobbs reminded members that planning factors are meant to set projects up for success by encouraging supportive policies and accounting for project benefits not captured in the transportation impact analysis. She reviewed the current scoring matrix, distinguishing between points available for policies and elements. Ms. Dobbs then reviewed the proposed changes, which include adjusting the weighting of planning factors from 25% to 30% of the total score, increasing Inclusive Growth points to 15 and applying factors to new bike/ped barrier projects. Additionally, staff is proposing removing the complete streets planning factor from transit station projects and replacing them with green infrastructure. As a result of the proposed changes, the scoring matrix will allow for 30 points maximum instead of 25.

Chairman Elam emphasized the importance of these proposed changes, asking for committee feedback. Mr. O'Malley inquired about the density/parking criteria. Ms. Dobbs stated this focuses on zoning measures that encourage transit supportive densities in the areas around the station. Chairman Elam reviewed the proposed changes again, emphasizing the increase to inclusive growth points to benefit disadvantaged communities.

**5.0 Shared Fund Status Update**

There were no updates to report.

**6.0 Local Program Updates**

Ms. Weber reported that as of Tuesday, all local councils' public comment periods have closed. Final council approvals are scheduled throughout August and September. TIP amendments incorporating the new programs will be processed in early October for consideration by the MPO Policy Committee and CMAP Board at their joint meeting on October 14<sup>th</sup>.

**7.0 Other Business**

There was no other business.

**8.0 Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**9.0 Next Meeting**

Chairman Elam announced that the next meeting will be held virtually on Thursday, September 3rd at 9:30am. Discussion will include safety project scoring, council bonus points and partial funding.

**10.0 Adjournment**

There being no other business, Chairman Elam adjourned the meeting at 10:12 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Mary Weber