



CMAP Transit Focus Group Meeting Minutes Wednesday, October 24, 2012 1:30 p.m.

Lake County Conference Room 233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800 Chicago, Illinois

Teleconference: 800-747-5150 Access Code: 3868806

In attendance: Caitlyn Costello, Metra; Brian Stepp, Metra; Peter Fahrewald, RTA; Mark Pitstick, RTA; Valbona Kokoshi, Lake County DOT; Keith Privett, CDOT; Thomas Murtha, CMAP; Don Kopec, CMAP; Doug Ferguson, CMAP; Alex Beata, CMAP; Jose Rodriguez, CMAP (Via Teleconference:) David Tomzik, Pace; Bob Huffman, Pace; Jan Ward, Kane County DOT; Daniel Thomas, DuPage County DOT

1.0 Call to Order

Jose Rodriguez, Chair called to order at 1:34pm

2.0 Approval of Meeting Notes – July 11, 2012

Valbona Kokoshi noted that Evaluation Criteria #1 noted in the draft minutes was correctly revised to state "Implementing Major Capital Transit Projects" – this was not reflected in the agenda item below. David Tomzik also spotted this discrepancy between the draft minutes and the current meeting's agenda. Change was made and will be reflected in future listings of evaluation criteria.

ACTION: Agenda approved with above change.

3.0 Evaluation Criteria Update

Rodriguez summarized the results of the last meeting in regards to the TFG reaching consensus on the following eight evaluation criteria. Prospective projects will be expected to meet one of the following criteria, and may be evaluated on a scale of 1 to 4 for each of these:

Table with 2 columns: High Priority Projects, Modernizes the Transit System. Rows include: Implements high-priority Major Capital Transit Projects, Includes transit components of major highway projects, Focus investment on Invests in modernization, Adopt best practices in new technologies.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize among potential transit service increases, extensions, and new service using regionally consistent criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement traveler information systems
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish seamless coordination between modes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider user perception in vehicle purchases and station design

As noted in the above agenda item 2.0, wording for criteria 1 was changed to “Implements Major Capital Transit Projects”.

Rodriguez informed the group that CMAP staff had concerns about the ability of the 8th criteria “Consider user perception in vehicle purchases and design” to translate into improved ridership and other performance measure data. Keith Privett mentioned that methods outlined in CTPP stated-preference research was regarded as valid toward assessing the capability of user perception to influence (improve) ridership. Don Kopec followed up on CMAP concerns by stating that FTA did not look favorably on the stated preference data obtained by CTA and provided in support of earlier projects. Kopec also stated that the consideration of aesthetic factors should not inadvertently advance a project in a community more capable of funding such improvements (e.g. Glenview) over a project not as capable of funding those same type of improvements (e.g. West Chicago). Privett was also quick to note that the Transit Focus Group ranking(s) derived from these 8 criteria were ancillary and did not replace or alter the base CMAQ air quality benefit calculation process. Privett also felt the 1 to 4 scoring with 7 other criteria being evaluated would minimize the likelihood of the user perception criteria heavily impacting a project’s overall transit focus group evaluation. Murtha also emphasized that the criteria were in place to assure the advancement of the GOTO 2040 plan through the CMAQ selection process. Ultimately, the user perception criteria as written for this meeting’s agenda remained in place to be scored on a scale of 1 to 4 and weighed in the same proportion in relation to the other criteria.

Tomzik also felt the wording of criteria “Focus investment on modernization” could be interpreted to refer only to existing transit services and that new services would not be seen as eligible for funding consideration. Later in the meeting, Kopec recommended that this be changed to “Invests in modernization” so as to remove the word focus. Kopec felt the third criteria “Prioritize among potential transit service increases, extensions and new service” addressed the eligibility of new services that funding may be sought for.

4.0 Performance Measure Update

At the July 11 meeting, the following were identified to be discussed as potential performance measures:

- RIDERSHIP
- SERVICE RELIABILITY (e.g. On Time Performance)
- SERVICE SPEED

- STATE OF GOOD REPAIR

Staff has also discussed with the transit agencies and others that it would be seeking to encourage development of the route/corridor/subregional performance measures, and that CMAP was willing to help develop specific measures more fully even if those efforts needed time beyond the upcoming CMAQ call. Tom Murtha asked if Metra and Pace had specific boarding and alighting data more recent than the most recently available year 2006 dataset. Murtha noted the example of CTA having boarding/alighting data in the form of a shapefile. Specifically Tom Murtha wanted to know the ability of Pace to produce a database of “stop” level data to derive ridership, et al. Tomzik stated that ridership by route segment, and ridership by direction are usually used to support the need for an improvement in a service corridor, in part due to the flag stop (as opposed to a posted stop) system on many current routes. Tomzik noted that Pace’s Bob Gardner has been working with CMAQ’s Matt Stratton in providing ridership data that can be incorporated into CMAP modeling systems. Huffman also noted that Automated People Counting (APC) and Intelligent Bus Systems (IVS) also enable Pace to more accurately isolate data for ridership, service reliability and speed. IVS devices are installed on 35% of the Pace bus fleet and can be deployed to obtain data on selected routes. Murtha added that the resulting dataset(s) would have multiple uses within other Focus group (e.g. bike-ped in regards to whether proposed improvements are a given distance from a transit stop) and other CMAP activities.

5.0 Preparations for Upcoming CMAQ Project Call

CMAP Staff recommended that a meeting be scheduled between October 30 (next scheduled CMAQ Project Selection Committee) and the end of the year. The primary objective of this meeting would be for implementers to identify transit projects likely to be submitted for CMAQ funding. There was general agreement to have the group evaluate and score the projects earlier in the submittal process than for the last project call, and several members felt it would be more beneficial to use the next Transit Focus Group meeting to vet projects that may not initially score well and use the group’s input to improve the project’s application. Mark Pitstick cited the example of the I-90 Bus Service project recommended by the group for the FFY 2012-16 program; as originally submitted it was not among the top of ranked projects, but after some changes, Pace did make the application more robust and reflective of the Transit Focus Group’s objectives.

Doug Ferguson was asked about the CMAQ call’s program development schedule. Call for projects will begin December 10 and February 8 will be the submission deadline for all project proposals. Ferguson was also asked about the specific requirements for applicants in regards to Transit project Engineering costs (50% match required).

6.0 Other Business

7.0 Public Comment

8.0 Next Meeting

Prospective Dates in Early December to Be Submitted to TFG Members via Doodle Internet Scheduling Tool

9.0 Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 2:35pm

Transit Focus Group Members:

___ Michael Connelly / Scott Wainright

___ Valbona Kokoshi

___ Mark Pitstick / Peter Fahrewald

___ Keith Privett

___ Daniel Thomas

___ David Tomzik

___ Jan Ward

___ Thomas Weaver / Caitlyn Costello