



CHICAGO AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY

UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

February 21, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 9:35 AM at the Chicago Area Transportation Study, Cook Cunningham-Williams Conference Room, 233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 800, Chicago, Illinois. Those present at the meeting were:

Unified Work Program Committee Members

Illinois Department of Transportation	Gordon Smith, <i>Chair</i>
Chicago Department of Transportation	David Seglin
Chicago Transit Authority	David Simmons, James Richmond*
Council of Mayors	Dan Podgorski
Counties	Tom Rickert
Federal Highway Administration	Chris DiPalma
Metra	Thomas Weaver*
NIPC	Ralph Coglianesi
Pace	Lorraine Snorden, Tom Radak*
Regional Transportation Authority	Mark Pitstick, Patty Mangano*
CATS	Patricia Berry

* Alternate Member

Interested Parties

DuPage County	John Loper
DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference	Rick Curneal
Illinois Department of Transportation	Carl Mikyska
Kane/Kendall Council of Mayors	Holly Smith
McHenry County	Jason Osborn
North Central Council of Mayors	Beth McCluskey
Northwest Municipal Conference	Chalen Hunter
South Suburban Mayors and Managers	Joe Heinrich
Southwest Council of Mayors	Vicky Smith

CATS Staff

Janet Bright	Don Kopec
Parry Frank	Tom Vick
Craig Heither	

MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of Minutes

The meeting minutes from the December 6, 2005 UWP Committee meeting and the January 17, 2006 Work Group meeting were unanimously approved on a motion by Mr. Seglin and a second by Mayor Podgorski.

B. Funding Mark for FY07

Mr. Smith stated the funding mark for the region is \$17.6 million which includes the matching funds. The Core funding has already programmed \$9.5 million.

C. Discussion of Submittals

Mr. Smith offered Committee members another opportunity after the meeting to provide written comments on the proposals, then opened the floor to members to discuss the submittals. Ms. Snorden asked if CATS staff wanted to discuss the Rideshare project. Mr. Smith noted that the regional rideshare program is currently housed at CATS, but following discussions between CATS and Pace, the program will be transferred to Pace. As a result, the Core funding CATS received for rideshare will go to Pace.

Patricia Berry noted the TIP Procedures Committee had submitted a letter in support of proposal #127 (TIP Public Information Activities) which involves an upgrade to the TIP internet mapping system. Ms. Snorden, chair of the TIP Procedures Committee, noted that the project was vital in meeting federal mandates regarding public outreach. Mr. DiPalma stated this proposal was in line with recommendations from the federal certification review and with the upcoming visualization requirements of SAFETEA-LU. He felt this project would put the region in a good position to meet the federal requirements. Mr. Coglianesse expressed NIPC's support of the project, and noted that his agency had undertaken similar efforts and would provide whatever assistance they could. Ms. Snorden reiterated that this project meets a federal mandate.

Mr. Seglin asked when the Committee would receive the dollar amounts for each submittal. Mr. Smith stated his understanding from the last meeting was that the Committee was going to prioritize the proposals prior to seeing the amounts requested. Ms. Snorden agreed with Mr. Smith's assessment. Mr. Seglin noted the necessity of developing a fiscally constrained program and stated dollar amounts can help in assessing the benefits of projects. Mr. Smith stated the Committee's job is to prioritize the projects.

Mr. Pitstick stated that Pace had provide a comment on project #905 (RTAP Community Transit Improvement Plans) about coordinating restructuring efforts and community service planning. He clarified that this project addresses transit-oriented development dealing with bus service improvements (where there is no rail station) and that they work with the relevant agencies including Pace. Project #906 (RTAP Station Area Planning – Transit Oriented Development Studies) is the complementary station area planning study with funds for local municipal studies for rail stations.

Mr. Seglin asked about CATS project #126 (Post-Implementation Evaluation of Emissions Benefits of CMAQ Projects) and noted this was already a requirement for demonstration projects

receiving CMAQ funds. Ms. Berry stated this project would review the methodology to evaluate non-demonstration projects. Mr. Simmons asked if this project would be eligible for CMAQ funding. Ms. Berry stated it may be but that the CMAQ Project Selection Committee prefers to fund projects on the ground, and would seek UWP funding for this project.

Mr. Coglianese explained that NIPC is trying to create a single land use model for the region in project #615 (Land Use Modeling). They will be talking to municipalities to find out local uses of a land use model and then they will develop a model that meets these needs through a common denominator approach. The hope of this effort is that the municipalities in the region will have a useful land use model for their individual applications and there will not be a need to buy and develop individual models.

Mr. Pitstick asked about project #619 (Regional Report Card) submitted by NIPC. Mr. Coglianese explained that land use is the base that transportation planning is done from. The 2040 Framework plan attempts to change the straight line projection of the way land is developing. The idea is that the framework plan should drive the transportation plan. The report card will evaluate the region and see if the region is changing through ordinances and other local impacts that will get the region to the vision of the 2040 Framework. The report card will measure land use patterns compared to the 2040 Plan. Mr. Seglin asked if this project will assign fault. Mr. Coglianese responded that this issue is not yet decided; as the project develops this decision will be reached. The report card project will however, identify areas that are doing land use planning well. Mr. Seglin asked what specifically would be graded – agencies, projects or the region as a whole? Mr. Coglianese stated the region as a whole, but that groups of communities may be graded.

Mr. Simmons gave an overview of the CTA project submittals and emphasized the customer satisfaction survey (#408) which they use to improve service. CTA would like to re-establish this survey, which had been conducted every two years for a number of years. Ms. Snorden expressed Pace's support for this project and noted they have the same issue. Mr. Seglin stated that he was supportive of both project #414 (Rail System Planning Using On-Track Simulation Software) and the customer satisfaction survey. Mr. Seglin requested that project #411 (CTA Bike & Ride User Survey) coordinate with CDOT's bicycle user program. Mr. Simmons noted the project is an attempt to identify what bicycle riders want and meet their needs and to reach out the general community of bicyclists. Mayor Podgorski asked if they would try to quantify the number of users and Mr. Simmons stated they would get an idea of where bicycle riders are using the system and under what conditions.

Mr. Seglin asked if the Metra proposal (#503 – Origin-Destination Survey) would consider downtown rail stations. Mr. Weaver responded by stating that it would not but instead would look at where people are coming from and what lines they are using. Mr. Weaver explained that New Starts may alter usage patterns on Metra by riders. Mr. Seglin explained that CDOT is interested in knowing which downtown stations are being used and the level of use. From CDOT's perspective, they would like to know what the next mode of transportation is after passengers depart from the trains (cabs, water taxi, etc.). Mr. Weaver stated that Metra used to do boarding/alighting counts more often, but due to fiscal constraints it has not been done recently. With the new starts, Metra believes that this study is needed. In the past, Metra used to do station by station surveys every two years and then it became every three to four years. Mr.

Weaver suggested that Mr. Seglin talk to the Metra planners and coordinate their information needs.

Ms. Snorden commented on both projects #113 (Rideshare Services Program Supplement) and #705 (Pace Paratransit Coordination). She explained that Pace is excited to have both of these projects but pointed out that they came to Pace so funding will be needed. She further explained that both the Rideshare and Paratransit projects fit well with Pace. Ms. Snorden addressed Pace's customer satisfaction survey (#704) and like Metra and CTA, this is a big project for Pace. Ms. Snorden addressed project #703 (Arterial Rapid Transit Concept Evaluation) and explained that Pace is looking ahead to 2020 and this project will consider new technologies, express bus, etc. Mr. Seglin stated that he supports #703 and the paratransit coordination project. Mr. Coglianesi also expressed support for project #703.

Mr. Seglin asked what NIPC was expecting to produce from project #620 (Visualization as a Public Participation Tool). Mr. Coglianesi responded by saying that this is an attempt to create 3-D exhibits that can show how transit friendly and corridor planned development would look. NIPC feels there is a need to produce visualizations that will help people understand the impacts and outcomes of these planning efforts when they are implemented. Generally these would be computer generated visuals.

Mr. Osborn stated McHenry County submitted two projects: #802 (McHenry County Traffic Model and Two Sub-regional Studies) and #803 (McHenry County North-South Arterial Study). He stated #802 is to develop a traffic model for the county to do what-if planning scenarios and to perform sub-regional studies for the southeastern and southwestern parts of the county. Currently the county is budgeted to spend about \$500,000 over the next 5 years on scenario planning.

Mr. Pitstick asked about CATS' project submittals for supplemental funding. Ms. Berry explained that not all of CATS' staff time is covered in the Core funding. The supplements are to cover the additional funding for CATS staff and to provide for limited expansion of agency staff.

D. Approach to Selecting Tier II Projects

Ms. McCluskey asked when comments are due and asked when the Committee would receive the funding request amounts, as this would create better and more relevant comments. She asked if the Committee would meet its schedule for developing a program without knowing the funding request. Mr. Smith stated the Tier II requests were around \$9 million more than the amount available.

Mayor Podgorski suggested that everyone submit their comments to Carl Mikyska and also submit a listing of projects in three equal-sized groups, categorized as A, B and C. This would allow the committee to see how the votes come in for each project and then dollar amounts could be tallied to see what funding remained. Mr. Rickert noted in the past the Committee has looked at costs and reduced dollar amounts, and asked when the Committee would get to that stage. Mr. Smith reiterated that the group had decided to make merit-based choices without funding amounts. Mr. Seglin stated he thought they were to receive the dollar amounts after making initial comments so they could prioritize projects. Mr. Pitstick voiced his support for the

Mayor's suggestion. Mr. Weaver stated he would like to see more comments before prioritizing projects but that he did not have a problem with the Mayor's idea. Mr. Loper asked how the votes would be tallied. Mr. Smith stated each agency on the Committee would have one vote.

The Committee decided that comments are to be due Friday, February 24th, Close of Business to Carl Mikyska. Mr. Mikyska will receive the comments and will remove the identities of the submitters before redistributing them to the entire committee. Voting will take place the following week in categories. Mr. Mikyska will assemble a template for voting that can be used by member agencies. The summary of comments will go out on the following Wednesday, March 1st. The voting of projects into three categories (A, B and C categories) will be due back by Friday the 10th to Mr. Mikyska. The voting will be tabulated and redistributed along with the dollar amounts by the 15th of March to the committee. The next meeting will be on March 21st at 9:30 AM.

E. UWP Recommendations from Federal MPO Certification Review

Mr. DiPalma gave an overview of the comments that related to the UWP process from the federal certification review. He explained that the USDOT comments asked that there be a tracking database that would provide a qualitative analysis of past UWP projects. They would like to see what the outcomes of projects were/are and how they are changing planning or transportation investments. Another item in the federal certification report was USDOT's desire to see the UWP efforts linked to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), specifically identifying how UWP studies relate to RTP goals. Mr. Seglin felt that the Committee had started addressing that issue through the use of the emphasis areas. Mr. Smith stated that the Committee should be aware that some level of reporting on UWP projects would be required from here on out.

F. Other Business

No other business was brought before the committee.

G. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 21st at 9:30 AM at the combined CATS/NIPC offices. On a motion by Mr. Weaver and seconded by Mr. Rickert, the meeting was adjourned at 10:50 AM.