



**Regional Transportation Operations Committee
Minutes**

February 18, 2011

Offices of the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)
DuPage County Conference Room
Suite 800, 233 S. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

Chair, Claire Bozic, called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 p.m.

2.0 Approval of Minutes – January 20, 2011

The meeting minutes of the January 20th meeting were approved.

3.0 Performance Measures

Ms. Bozic described two spreadsheets containing the CMAQ project selection goals, performance measures and projects which had been submitted by RTOC members before the meeting. One list was sorted by submitter and the other was sorted by category. She explained that some of the items which had been submitted as projects were included in the list as strategies if no specific locations had been included.

Based on individual documents regarding goals, strategies and prospective performance measures submitted by the participant agencies and included as part of the meeting's materials, Mr. Murtha further summarized recommendations outlined in the RTOC Goals and Strategies Proposed CMAP Synthesis draft document to the participants. Prior to discussion amongst the group, Murtha emphasized that they would apply performance measures generated from present day conditions, not from post-plan or post-improvement modeled or projected conditions. Another project screen would be the inclusion of a proposed project as major capital project in GOTO 2040 Plan, inclusion in local/county comprehensive plans, SRA system, or primary arterial system. Following are individual points raised by participants.

David Zavatterro – must be a consistent definition of what is “congestion” or congested conditions per segment or corridor.

Steve Travia- much of what IDOT defines as a congested section is based on anecdotal observations from our traffic signal engineers (e.g. traffic needing x signal cycles to pass through an intersection).

Zavatterro – performance measures should have applicability and compatibility across all the different locations (projects) being looked at.

Zavattero also had question as to the exact equation used for the Travel Time Index performance measure. Murtha replied that used the 90th percentile (30th best day) travel speed over free flow condition (confirm). The travel time index is the ratio of average peak travel time to free-flow travel time.

In terms of using Crashes as a performance measure, Travia felt that crashes specifically by congestion had to be separated from the overall statistics and that the incident rate should reflect only those or should be adjusted appropriately.

Mike Bolton - If there is priority on Transit it should focus more on those routes that currently or will potentially operate on the higher order highway system (e.g. SRA, arterial transit system).

Interchanges – Travia stated that congestion caused by interchanges such as inability for ramp traffic to merge seamlessly into mainline flow should not be overlooked in the prioritization process.

One goal could be the ramping up isolated transit signal priority demonstration projects from demonstration projects to a system or region wide application – Murtha. Murtha cited example of IL 59 as an integrated approach corridor to alleviate the Travia-described situation where 3 lanes each direction narrows to 2.

Travia followed up Murtha’s suggestion on integrated approaches with a question about using CMAQ funds toward resolving “hour glass” segments (lane constrictions). Doug Ferguson responded that capacity expansions could not be considered for CMAQ funding.

Murtha concluded the discussion citing several additional strategies agreed upon the group. Murtha then cited speed harmonization also known as variable speed limits, congestion pricing/managed lanes, and finally incident management and related communications protocols.

John Benda responded with a clarification regarding incident management: communication is the key element between incident occurrence and resolution.

4.0 RTOC Projects

Participating agencies were also asked to define possible projects that should be considered for some form of CMAQ funding. Those appeared on tables distributed at the meeting.

Regarding the CMAQ program timeframe and the operational timeframe, Zavattero asked if RTOC needed to submit recommended projects to CMAP prior to the April 1 CMAQ deadline.

Murtha added, with Ross Patronskey concurring, that RTOC has an advisory CMAQ

project selection role. Ideally, RTOC would prioritize projects and issue recommendations prior to May 1st, following April 1st receipt of subjects. July 1 is when the ranked list of CMAQ projects will be released.

Zavaterro responded that RTOC should recommend/advocate projects for their own merits, not just solely within CMAQ framework for CMAQ funding.

End discussion 2:30pm

5.0 Regional Operations Projects – Updates

Ms. Bozic updated the group on two projects. The Regional Archive Data User Services project is underway. Draft requirements and design documents have been developed. We will have a prototype completed by June 30, 2011. The Construction Coordination Meeting was canceled because of the blizzard and was rescheduled for March 10th.

6.0 Other Business

There was no other business.

7.0 Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

8.0 Next Meeting

The Regional Transportation Operations Coalition will meet next on Next RTOC meeting: Thursday March 24, 1:00 pm.

9.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55.