



Minutes
Transit Focus Group for CMAQ
Thursday June 16, 2011 - 1:30 pm
CMAP Offices

Attendees: Maria Choca Urban-CNT; John Donovan- FHWA Bob Huffman-Pace (via phone); Valbona Kokoshi Lake County DOT; Bill Lenski-RTA; Mark Pitstick-RTA; Keith Privett-CDOT; Jake Rattner – CNT (I-GO) David Tomzik-Pace; Jan Ward-Kane County DOT; Thomas Weaver-Metra:

CMAP Staff: Jose Rodriguez (chair); Thomas Murtha; Ross Patronsky; Joy Schaad

1. Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 1:40 by Chairman Rodriguez and the attendees introduced themselves.

2. Meeting Minutes from May 23, 2011

The minutes of the May 23, 2011 meeting were discussed and approved as written.

3. Conclusion of Scoring Using on Evaluation Matrix

i. Inclusion of TOD – adding specific action areas ranging from 3 to none:

Chairman Rodriguez explained the evaluation matrix handout where he had added three strategies columns for discussion: 1.) Identify and exploit opportunities for TOD, 2.) Pursue value capture strategies, and 3.) Use livability principles to plan for land use in the new development near transit. Several of the members noted that the scores seem to be about the same regardless of which one was used and that adding all three might be duplicative. They discussed the wording of the livability action area and suggested various changes to it. On a motion by Maria Choca Urban and a second by Mark Pitstick the focus group voted to add just one new action area to the rating matrix: *Use livability principles to encourage development near transit*. Chairman Rodriguez offered to re-score the applications based on that decision.

ii. Adjustment of Score for CNT's Peer to Peer Carsharing Proposal

Jake Rattner of CNT explained the reasons that CNT believed the scoring characterizations (definitely, likely, indirectly and no) for several action areas should be

reconsidered for the Peer to Peer Carsharing proposal. The Committee discussed each one and explained the reasoning and compared to the scoring on similar projects. In the end the committee agreed to increase the score by one point for two action areas: *establishes seamless coordination between modes* and *implement high priority transit projects*. In the course of the discussion it was noted that Pace's Community Vehicles should have an increase for *establishes seamless coordination between modes* as well. It was also agreed that *between modes* should be changed to *among modes* for clarity. On a motion by Mr. Privett and a second by Mr. Pitstick, the focus group voted to make the wording change to the action area and to make the three score changes (two on car-sharing and one on community vehicles).

iii. Adjustment of Score – Pace's I-90 corridor enhanced markets proposal

Dave Tomzik provided history on the project and explained that the Toll Authority has changed the scope of the Jane Addams work from resurfacing to reconstruction and the implementation of managed lanes. ISTHA is convening a corridor council to help study what improvements should be made in conjunction with the reconstruction work including the provision of transit services. Because managed lanes is a specific high priority in GO TO 2040, Pace feels this projects should have a rank of 'definitely' rather than "likely" for implement high priority transit projects. On a motion by Mr. Tomzik and a second by Mr. Privett, the focus group voted to make the score change.

4. Project Narrative for CMAQ Project Selection Committee (PSC)

Tom Murtha proposed a concept for a package of priority projects that implement GO TO 2040 to forward to the CMAQ PSC; a package of "showcase" projects that is limited in scope, but big impact. He suggested six projects that focus on modernization of the transit system and span both city and suburbs. He went on to describe the six:

- A new CTA elevated station at Washington and Wabash to replace both the Randolph and Madison stations (\$63.6 million) .
- A new LaSalle and Division entrance for the CTA's Clark/Division station on the Red Line (\$28.64 million)
- The RTA's Regional Transit Signal Priority Integration Plan Implementation (\$32.0 million)
- The RTA's Information Systems for Priority Interagency Transit Transfer Locations (\$3.36 million)
- Paces' I-90 Corridor Enhanced Markets (\$39.0 million)
- Paces' I-55 Corridor Enhanced Markets (\$2.16 million)

There was discussion on the particulars of the projects as well as benefits and readiness status of each. Maria Choca Urban noted that a secondary theme to modernization tying these six projects together is economic development, as all six will significantly enhance travel to and from major employment areas. Dave Tomzik pointed out that funding the two Pace proposals would allow the region to implement major new concepts of *shared use* and *reusing existing infrastructure*.

Mr. Murtha said that he would prepare a draft write up with the overall modernization and economic development themes. There was agreement with submitting these six projects and the themes, but members suggested that he also discuss *access to transit* and *livability* in the submittal as

well. He said that the CMAP staff would need to get this and the other information from the focus groups out to the CMAQ committee on June 30 for the July 7th meeting. On a motion by Maria Choca Urban and a second by Dave Tomzik, the group voted their concurrence. It was pointed out a couple of the projects have significant readiness challenges that should be highlighted, apart from the project readiness notes for each project.

5. Schedule for completion of Transit Focus Group Recommendations.

It was agreed that Tom Murtha would write up both the proposal for the six GO TO 2040 marquee projects and the transmittal for the scoring and readiness information that has been developed on all the transit applications. Tom said he would have the draft concept submittal out to the members by Thursday, June 23 for review. He said that he would adjust the write up in light of comments he receives, and a conference call was tentatively set up for Wednesday June 29th at 11:30 in the event a group discussion becomes necessary.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:09 p.m.