

ITRCC Minutes
May 23, 2007

Attending: Rob Robinson-IDOT OP & P, Lori Midden-DTS, John Werthwein-DTS, Gene Brenning-DTS, , Jim Garceau-IDOT, Mike Stout-DTS, Karen Magee-DTS, Joyce Schroeder-DTS, Sherri Akers-ISP, Sandy Klein-DTS, Mary Ann Paulis-DTS, Donna Smith-NHTSA, Mary Collins-IDOT BIP, Greg Piland-FHWA, Jessica Baker-DTS, Mehdi Nassirpour-DTS, Melanie McDaniel-IDOT BIP, Norm Stoner-FHWA, Dan Lee-IDPH, Mike Mayer-SOS, David Gruenenfelder-UIS, Mike Witter-NHTSA, Don McNamara-NHTSA, Susan Fitzpatrick-DTS, Kris Boyer-DTS, Roseanne Nance-IDOT BSE

Absent: Susan Avila-IDPH, John Benda-Toll Highway, Alan Burgard-ISP, Craig Cassem-Grundy County Highway, Abraham Emmanuel-Chicago EMC, Sam Gaines-IDPS, Mike Hansen-Lincolnwood Fire Department, Brooke Harmony-IDOT BSE, Steve Laffey-ICC, Jim Lamantia-Chicago EMC, Kirk Lonbom-IDP, Evelyn Lyons-IDPH, Roger Massey-IL Sheriffs Association, Steve Mattioli-FMCSA, Don McNamara-NHTSA, Cheryl Miles-IDPH, Gary Morgan, IDPH, Yanfeng Ouyang-UIC, Jack Pecoraro-IL Association of Chiefs of Police, David Piper-IDOT BSE, Paul Rizzo-Schaumburg PD, Connie Satlar-SOS, Elizabeth Buck-Peoria PD, Lou Humphey-DTS, Priscilla Tobias-IDOT BSE, Kris Minor-SOS, Mark Kinkade-IDOT BIP, Kevin Burke-IDOT Highways, John Coffman-ISP, James Hall-UIS, Jacque Gartshore-AOIC, Dan Mueller-AOIC, Elizabeth Earleywine-DTS, Dan Pippin-IDPH, Mike Gillette-IDOT BSE, Rich Forshee-IDPT, John Webber-IDOT, Tom Ambrose-UIS, Michael Handley-UIS/IDOT,

John opened the meeting for Mike Stout who joined us later.

The minutes were reviewed and approved by Lori Midden and seconded by Mehdi after John explained the video problem from the April 16 meeting.

In John Webber's absence, John presented the MOU/Charter for signature for those present. The document will be mailed to non-attending agencies for signature. He explained that all committee members had had an opportunity to comment and change this document which basically says we will all cooperate and coordinate our efforts.

John then presented the draft 408 application to the committee. He reminded those present that this is a draft and will be finalized after this meeting. The first change was to the revised mobilization citation –ISP. Additional language was inserted by the ISP

He reviewed the innocuous part of the document MMUCC and NEMSIS are explanations of where we are in compliance to date. We will make strides to do better.

Appendices are the strategic plan and the exec summary of the CHSP.

These must be included as support document not integral part of the plan.

Donna ask to comment on the document—there is a section missing. John will go to the federal registry and correct the 3rd bullet that is missing. Also will correct the word used in the 3rd bullet from top.

Section 2 is an explanation of the TRCC committee, webpage, etc. One of the criteria for the 408 grant is having a functioning group. Organization chart for the CHSP and the Charter/MOU, exec committee and committee members are included.

Section 3 is brief summary of the traffic records assessment. A full assessment report is included as an attachment.

Section 4 is the strategic plan and this is where Lori and Mehdi took the plan and they exerted the essence and updated on prioritizing the items on the strategic plan. The summary of the assessment of the findings is included in this section.

Donna asked where the benchmarks are going to be located. In previous conversations, Donna reminded that in the strategic planning document on the checklist states “identify performance-based measures and establishes benchmarks by which progress will be determined.” This is relating to the strategic plan. Some of these were voting for the project however these needed to be the benchmarks for the strategic plan. Mehdi mentioned developing benchmark won’t be a problem since we have all the necessary information to know where the main deficiencies are. We will add the benchmarks to the plan and be sure it is stand alone section.

John in the document itself there are performance measures, near term action, intermediate term action and long-term action but there have not set actual dates. We need to define these dates as per the strategic plan.

Don clarified that requirement isn’t project benchmark, it is system-wide benchmark. As the project flows out of the system the benchmarks flow forward.

John explained the prioritization process. Listing the process and then the results are given. He described how the projects are prioritized.

Greg Piland asked about page 24 ranking choices for strategic plan action items, and in explanation, John stated that was included in error and will be removed.

Section 5 traffic record improvement projects. First part is a process of project selection. One project dropped out early on. The Safety Data Mart project was dropped since the milestones occurred before project would begin.

Prioritization of projects— among all the proposed projects, EMS project tied with MCR project as it is a key pieces to be NEMESIS compliant.

John shared the ranking list the group came up with and ask their comments.

Listed on page prioritization summary—strategic plan phase steps—will check on the proper listing. Proposed budgets will be reviewed as well.

How much money we will get depends on the number of states who apply. Donna asked if you only get \$1.3 how you will divide money. John explained it is up to the committee.

Mehdi asked if other state allocate their funds. Do we fund all the selected projects or fund only top 2-3 projects? Donna responded that depends on the committee on how you want to allocate.

We have not asked the project sponsors to go into a lot of detail. Like a project charter, when we know how much money we get it will change

Witter asked if projects have blended money or if this is their only source. Mehdi explained that we have a section for other project people have with funding sources.

John opened it up to the committee for discussion. We have struggled with putting together the milestones and the performance measure. It is very difficult to develop reasonable milestones and performance measures. Currently we have four projects left to complete. We need your help and suggestions.

John asked Mehdi to go over the four projects (ISP citation, MCR AIS, and CIS) and discuss their milestones and performance measures. Mehdi discussed some of the issues related to these four projects. The main issue was with the ISP project since this project proposed to do a need assessment of the current citation tracking system in Illinois. The main focus of this project is to hire consultant to conduct a need assessment before they develop a comprehensive plan during the second year funding. Sherri explained that this is a critical step to connect the ISP, locals, judges, circuit clerks to help traffic safety data. Identifying stakeholders is difficult and hiring a consultant is critical to central statewide tracking system. 2nd and 3rd year will be difficult to determine until we take the 1st step. Mehdi asked if NHTSA dollars can be spent to do a need assessment.

Don McNamara indicated that the 408 grant can be used for a need assessment project.

Then Mehdi raised the question on how we are going to measure the progress on this project. Dan Lee mentioned that accessing records by stakeholders after the tracking system is implemented would be a good performance measure.

Sherri asked how we measure stakeholders who require access—this is just a requirement portion no development or deployment –just gathering of information so we can sit down with TRCC and explain this is who need the information. Jim said we need to identify which of the 102 counties actually want to be a part of this project. Jim suggested a performance measure be a percentage of stakeholders interviewed. Dan suggested breaking down into sections. Requirement gathering is done—once it is complete, what is the plan to get all 102 counties. Circuit clerk—

NHTSA perspective, John asked how we show benchmarks. Establish the benchmarks and start after that. John explained that after the first year this part will be done. Donna said what you actually want to know and make that your benchmark. Perhaps the number of stakeholders for areas that can be used as a benchmark. Donna will do research to see if there are other states in the same situation. John explained that the MCR printer grant request want to make sure there are compliant in the future.

Mehdi mentioned that the expansion project needs milestone definition “ongoing” activities are ongoing and shouldn’t be listed on the grant application. Performance measure ties to “ongoing” and we will need measures that are more specific. Can we

spend \$ to maintain what we have? Donna explained that dollars that if it evaluates and improves data collection it can be used. If it addresses the 6 pack yes.

Under performance measure we do not have all the items we have filled out. How do we measure these—how reasonable the days are. How do we determine the way? No scientific way on how we set up—Donna says, use knowledge and make sure it is realistic.

John asked if there is a number of benchmarks for each project. Donna says we do not have to address each of the 6 pack for each project since they do not apply.

Witter—MCR you want the accuracy covered. Jim –MCR is to get the data in—CIS is the quality project. Timeliness for MCR is huge—CIS is accuracy Witter says we are stuck on 14%--what else do we measure with MCR—it's been too slow. Jim says it actually is moving up. And he is feeling confident. We need to work on re-training agencies where data is not coming in correctly.

Is the MCR project where we are giving printer included in the 408? No it is a separate project. (Donna)

CIS—milestones are ongoing—will call them expansion. (Needs new definition) Donna asked about the budget of CIS what if you don't get the funding. We are going to be desperately looking for funding. It was cut from our FY 2008 funding.

AIS—John asked if the performance measures and benchmarks reasonable? Donna said they are. AIS \$226,000—which is more important AIS is the repository for the documentation. CIS is where we pull out the data. One begets the other.

AIS is old technology and the hardware isn't supported anymore-works but not sure what the longevity. If AIS fails, CIS goes down as well.

John says AIS benchmarks are for 1 year—maybe we should do that for ISP for one year. There is a yearly report-progress report. What are the reporting methods—DTS will be at the TRCC meeting. NHTSA is yearly. When you submit the 2nd year you must submit a progress report (Donna).

John asked for comments on other projects. At the end of the project list we listed "Other Projects" related to traffic records. Donna asked that these projects be put in the same format as the original nine proposed project. Mike Witter asked if there could be dollar amounts assigned to these projects. John agreed. We will add in milestones in the strategic plan.

Donna reminded that the review committee may/will have questions. NHTSA will let us know how many we will need.

Melanie gave a quick update on the safety data warehouse. External access/BIP/TRS will be sending out usernames and id today/tomorrow. Other data marts—road construction, etc. approval has been given and we will begin.

Mehdi mentioned that CODES meeting was yesterday. For the first time, we were able to link our crash data to hospital discharge data. We have very interesting results and

he distributed a copy of the CODES presentation to the group. Susan Fitzpatrick will get results very soon after a few changes are made.

Mike asked how long Illinois has been a CODES project. Mehdi replied 2 years—thanks to Dan Lee's help.

Witter gave applause to all who worked--Illinois is well beyond other states. Susan Fitzpatrick deserves much credit.

BIP—will be scheduling a meeting soon. Busy schedule

Next meeting, August 20, 2007, 9:00 am.