



## **CMAP Transit Focus Group**

### **Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, July 11, 2012**

**1:30 p.m.**

**DuPage County Conference Room**

**233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800**

**Chicago, Illinois**

**In Attendance:** Mark Pitstick, RTA; Peter Fahrenwald, RTA, David Tomzik, Pace; Jan Ward, Kane County DOT, Valbona Kokoshi, Lake County DOT, Caitlyn Costello, Metra; Jose Rodriguez CMAP (Chair); Claire Bozic, CMAP; Thomas Murtha, CMAP; Bob Huffman, Pace (via teleconference); Keith Privett, CDOT (via teleconference).

### **1.0 Call to Order**

Meeting was called to order at 1:35pm

### **2.0 Approval of Meeting Notes—May 16, 2012**

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval

### **3.0 Performance Measures**

CMAP staff was seeking to examine project effectiveness following implementation based on the following measures:

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

Dave Tomzik (Pace) confirmed with Tom Murtha (CMAP) the general purpose for identifying and utilizing the measures. Mr. Tomzik noted that Pace presently uses ridership, reliability and on-time performance, but also noted a need for measuring effectiveness of infrastructure elements such as bus turnouts or signal bypasses that may enhance transit performance but not impact these measures. Bob Huffman later expanded on this by stating that Pace calculates passengers-per-hour, on-time performance, and service speed on a monthly report. Jan Ward also expressed concern that service speed measure might not account for the differences in expected service resulting from the type of bus route e.g. a BRT on an arterial versus a community-based service. Tom Murtha stated that current data could support the need for improving reliability through improving access – reducing boarding times, vehicle wait times, to the transit service being improved or how a new service can increase ridership, improve the reliability and improve on-time performance of a connected transit service. Both Peter Fahrenwald and Caitlyn Costello indicated the need of a fourth measure to reflect

existing state of repair or anticipated useful life cycle. Mark Pitstick offered to share some RTA measures that reflect infrastructure condition. Keith Privett (CDOT), while agreeing in general with the 3 measures, wanted to clarify whether the benefits of a project such as a park and ride would be reflected as capable of improving ridership, reducing delay, and improving travel time. Tom Murtha stated that the measures should reflect the project's positive input not just on the specific service line, but also the entire system. As far as measurement of travel speed, Claire Bozic suggested the use of AVL technology that is increasingly available on Pace's bus fleet. Bob Huffman interjected and stated that at present, AVL is available on only 40% of the Pace fleet. Much of these buses are at 3 collar county garages – Aurora, Elgin and Waukegan, though some AVL-equipped buses are rotating across the region specifically for performance measurement data collection. Bozic then stated that existing performance measures could be used to identify locations in need of infrastructure to support improved transit. Valbona Kokoshi (LCDOT) and Jan Ward (KCDOT) asked whether these measures could only be applied to improvement of existing services and not to demonstrate effectiveness of new services. Murtha replied that new services would be beneficial if they could be shown to augment other services or improve system ridership.

ACTION: Specific examples of performance measures from the transit agencies should be prepared for next meeting.

#### 4.0 Project Evaluation Criteria

CMAP staff suggested that the following project evaluation process, in which a maximum score of 32 points would be achieved by receiving a score of 1 to 4 for each of the underlying 8 action areas:

High Priority Projects (maximum score of 12 points):

- (1) Implements ~~high priority~~ **major transit capital** projects
- (2) Includes transit components of major highway projects
- (3) ~~Prioritize among potential~~ **Is a transit service increase, extension, or new service that has been prioritized** using regionally consistent criteria

Modernizes the Transit System (maximum score of 20 points):

- (4) Focus investment on maintenance and modernization
- (5) Adopt best practices in new technologies
- (6) Widely implement traveler information systems
- (7) Establish seamless coordination between modes
- (8) Consider user perception in vehicle purchases and station design

Mark Pitstick (RTA) felt this was an adequate streamlining of the evaluation criteria, although his preference for projects of an interagency and/or multimodal emphasis would have to be attained through scoring in distinct action areas 2., 6. and 7. Explanation was needed in for action area 3. Prioritize. Murtha clarified this criteria as being excerpted directly from the text of GOTO 2040 and that it maintains that transit improvements should be prioritized from sound planning processes and study efforts. There was also concern about how smaller first mile/last mile projects would be prioritized. There was also concern about how smaller first mile/last mile projects would be prioritized.

Transit Focus Group Page 2 of 3 July 11, 2012

mile services would grade out (expressed by Huffman). Mr. Murtha (CMAP) clarified that if the first mile/last mile project supported a high priority project, it would be viewed in light of being part of a high priority project. Similar concerns were voiced by Jan Ward regarding “off the ground” services. Pitstick recommended a re-wording of 3. And Rodriguez recommended a rewording of 1. as shown.

ACTION: APPROVED

## 5.0 Public Comment \ Other Business

Local Technical Assistance Program – Mr. Rodriguez (CMAP) distributed a memorandum featuring examples of municipalities respective comprehensive and other plans where CMAQ-eligible or feasible transit projects were recommended. Berwyn (Cermak Road ART) and Park Forest (overall expansion of transit offerings) were cited as particularly strong examples. In response to comments from the TFG, Mr. Pitstick expressed a willingness to develop a similar document for discussion highlighting communities and proposed projects where RTA has conducted technical assistance. Mr. Pitstick plans to produce such a document for next meeting.

CMAP staff and several TFG members expressed an interest in seeing maps of major project corridors. CMAP staff also expressed interest in preparing maps indicating congestion or other performance indicators. In addition, TFG members wanted to highlight individual agency plans as had been done with CMAP’s LTA program.

ACTION: Highlighting of specific projects from agency and agency-assisted plans will take place next meeting, along with mapping of project corridors and where feasible congestion-related performance on given segments.

## 6.0 Next Meeting

As a result of consensus following adjournment of this meeting, the next meeting date was scheduled for September 12, 2012.

## 7.0 Adjournment

### Transit Focus Group Members:

\_\_\_ Michael Connelly

\_\_\_ Valbona Kokoshi

\_\_\_ David Kralik

\_\_\_ Mark Pitstick

\_\_\_ Keith Privett

\_\_\_ David Tomzik

\_\_\_ Jan Ward