

**MCHENRY COUNTY COUNCIL OF MAYORS  
PROGRAMMING AND PROCEDURES REVIEW COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

FRIDAY, APRIL 5, 2019

1:30 PM

MCHENRY COUNTY DIVISION OF TRANSPORTATION

16111 NELSON ROAD

WOODSTOCK, IL 60098

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Mack called the meeting to order at 1:30 P.M.

A. Roll Call/Introductions (Sign-In Sheet)

Committee Members Present:

1. Village of Ringwood – Rick Mack, Chairman
2. Village of Bull Valley – Emily Berendt
3. City of Crystal Lake – Abigail Wilgreen
4. Village of Huntley – Tim Farrell
5. City of McHenry – Troy Strange
6. City of Marengo – Josh Blakemore
7. Village of Algonquin – Michele Zimmerman
8. McHenry County – Jeff Young

Staff Present:

1. McHenry County Council of Mayors – Scott Hennings, Principal Transportation Planner
2. McHenry County Division of Transportation – Susan Borucki, Senior Planner

Others Present:

1. CMAP – Kama Dobbs
2. Woodstock Transportation Commission – Andrew Celentano

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment

**3. MCCOM METHODOLOGY**

Mr. Hennings explained that based on input received from the March 1<sup>st</sup> Committee meeting, the DRAFT STP methodology was updated and now available for review by the Committee. He asked that the Committee review several areas of importance for further direction.

The first item discussed was the **local match ratio**. Mr. Hennings explained that based on direction from the Committee Phase I and Phase II engineering is now proposed to be eligible for STP funding at a 50/50 ratio. Discussion ensued regarding the positives and negatives to funding preliminary engineering and the Committee ultimately decided to fund engineering but place a cap of \$300,000 in federal STP towards Phase I and Phase II engineering during each call for projects, with a maximum amount awarded to a single project capped at \$100,000. It was also determined that resurfacing projects would not be eligible for STP for Phase I or Phase II engineering. Right of way acquisition remains ineligible for federal funding, while construction and construction engineering remain funded at 80/20. Projects remain capped at \$1.5 million in federal STP funding, inclusive of all phases.

Next, the Committee discussed the topic of allowing **flexibility** in the Council's decision making, through a variance process. It was determined that when ranking projects applications during a call, the project selection methodology should be used to prioritize projects. However, if a sponsor wants the Council to consider a project for inclusion in the five-year program, it will require a 2/3rds majority of the member present to approve a project for reasons outside the ranking system.

Next, the Committee discussed allowing STP-L to be used for projects on **State roads**. It was determined that even though the primary purpose of the program is to improve municipal roads, a local sponsor may choose to sponsor an intersection project where a municipal road intersects with a State road.

Next, the Committee discussed the use of **Transportation Development Credits for Highways (TDCHs)**. If allowed by the Council, TDCHs can be used by disadvantaged communities in place of their local match, however doing so will reduce the overall availability of STP funding for the remainder of the Council. After a long discussion the Committee approved the use of TDCHs by communities in cohort 4 (CMAP) to allow them to reduce their local match to only 10%.

Next, the Committee discussed a replacement for the "**Small Communities**" list that was used in the old methodology. Mr. Hennings explained that 20/29 municipalities were considered small communities in the old methodology. Of these, only 6 are included in CMAP's list of cohort 4 (disadvantaged) communities. There was discussion about how to provide help to high-need communities to make the distribution of scarce STP dollars more equitable. Direction was given to provide bonus points to communities in cohort 2, 3 and 4, which together make up 18/28 municipalities (not including the County) in the MCCOM. There will also be language added stating that the MCCOM is targeting 30% of its annual allotment of STP to be directed to high need communities (cohort 2, 3, & 4).

Next, the Committee discussed **project eligibility types** for STP funds. It was determined that Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) would not be eligible for STP funding. Otherwise, most other project types would be eligible for funding.

Next, the Committee turned their attention to the application process. First discussing **roadways and intersection projects**, Mr. Hennings explained that much of the previous application has been maintained. CMAP mandates that 25 bonus points be awarded for ONTO2050 priorities, and the MCCOM agreed that these would be “project sponsor has a complete streets policy” and “project uses green infrastructure to manage stormwater”. Other point categories include: Regional Impact, Traffic Volume, Safety, Road Condition, Multi-modal Infrastructure Components and Project Readiness. There was direction to potentially consolidate regional impact with traffic volume categories, look to add more points for safety, and explore how to incorporate pavement preservation into the road condition category instead of awarding more points for bad condition.

Looking at **resurfacing projects**, Mr. Hennings explained that the scoring criteria is different than for roadways and intersections. In the DRAFT application, points will be awarded to Road Condition, Traffic Volume, Safety, Nonmotorized Accommodations, and ONTO2050 Measures. There was again discussion about moving away from worst-first road condition scoring. The ONTO2050 measures include “project sponsor has adopted a complete streets policy and/or green infrastructure policy”. There was also discussion about how to award points to projects that implement safety countermeasures instead of just awarding points for resurfacing a roadway that has safety concerns.

Finally, the Committee discussed how projects will be ranked and included in the **Council’s five-year program**. Mr. Hennings explained that the highest scoring projects will be included in the active program, while other projects will be included in the contingency program. During the next call for project, the contingency program would be forced to reapply. The first call for projects will be for five years (2020-2024) while all subsequent calls will be for two additional years (2025-2026, etc.).

To end the meeting, Mr. Hennings reviewed the **schedule** going forward.

- May 16 MCCOM Meeting – provide overview to full Council
- May/June – Committee meets one more time to finalize methodology
- July MCCOM Meeting – MCCOM review of DRAFT methodology
- September MCCOM Meeting – MCCOM approves methodology
- September 30, 2019 – Deadline for submitting to CMAP
- January, 2020 – Call for Projects opens
- March, 2020 – Ranking of project applications.

#### 4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting concluded at 3:30 p.m.