



Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 800, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606

312-454-0400 (voice)
312-454-0411 (fax)
www.cmap.illinois.gov

Unified Work Program Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, March 10, 2009

10:00 AM

Offices of the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
DuPage County Room
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606

Committee Members Present:

*Alternate Member

Matt Maloney (CMAP), Jim Stack* (IDOT) Dan Podgorski (CoM Executive Committee), David Seglin (City of Chicago), Tom Rickert (Counties), Beth McCluskey (Metra), David Simmons (CTA), Mark Pitstick* (RTA), John Donovan* (FWHA), Lorraine Snorden (Pace), Brian Giblin (CTA)*

Staff Present:

Randy Blankenhorn, Dolores Dowdle, Janet Bright, Annie Byrne

Others Present:

John Loper (DuPage County), Bruce Christensen (Lake County), Jen Ward (KKCOM), Len Cannata (WCMC), Kama Dobbs (DMMC), David Raso (Metra), Chris DiPalma (FWHA), Tammy Wiercak (WCMC), Tatiana Jane (RTA)

1.0 Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 AM by Jim Stack, in Les Nunes' absence.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes or announcements. Brian Giblin (CTA) is the new alternate on the Committee for CTA.

3.0 Approval of the Minutes-February 3, 2009

The February 3rd meeting minutes were unanimously approved by the Committee.

4.0 FY 2010 UWP Competitive Proposals

The committee discussed the submitted competitive proposals, which have a federal share total of \$3,280,000. Each committee member with a competitive project proposal provided a description and prioritization of their proposals; the purpose being to have a discussion prior to scoring and to identify any possible duplications or areas for coordination of regional efforts.

The City of Chicago submitted six projects presented in order of priority: 1) West Loop Terminal Area Plan, 2) Crosswalk Treatment Method, 3) Chicago Sustainable Infrastructure Design Standards, 4) Smart Corridor Interconnect Prioritization Study, 5) Downtown Freight Study: Congestion Mitigation, 6) Chicago Regional Railroad Traffic Profile. Mr. Maloney asked why the two freight rail projects are the lowest priority. Mr. Seglin responded that the downtown study will provide good data but there is currently no specific use for this. The Regional Railroad Traffic profile will further the already completed first version of the downtown freight study. Mr. Rickert asked for clarification on how these projects compare to projects undertaken through CREATE. Mr. Seglin explained CREATE addresses the issues studied in these reports on a case-by-case basis while the proposed projects will provide a more comprehensive evaluation.

Mr. Maloney mentioned that CMAP is involved in regional freight issues, and these projects would likely provide regional benefit. He then asked why UWP funds are requested for the West Loop Terminal study and the Crosswalk study, the top two priorities. Mr. Seglin explained the West Loop study has a regional focus as it will include coordination with Amtrak and Metra. The Crosswalk study is a national importance issue and the City will share the results with others in the region. Mr. Maloney stated that the committee should feel free to discuss and debate how individual agencies choose to prioritize their projects, especially in terms how regionally-focused the projects appear to be.

The Council of Mayors submitted one competitive project proposal for Subregional Transportation Planning, Programming, and Management. Mayor Podgorski explained this is similar to the funded proposal for the past two years; the project funds the Planning Liaison (PL) program which enables communication between Mayors and CMAP. The funding for this in the Core UWP program is focused on transportation, while the competitive proposal is to allow the PLs to expand to non-transportation

issues, including public participation in the GO TO 2040 plan, which will be a major activity in FY2010. Randy Blankenhorn (CMAP) added that this program is moving in the right direction and gave the example of the PL's involvement in the DRI process.

The CTA proposed four projects, in order of priority: 1) Study of Limited Bus Stop Service, 2) North Main Line Corridor Demand Study, 3) Fundamentals of Transportation Decision Making, 4) Customer Experience Tracking Survey. The projects were briefly explained and Mr. Stack commented that the 3rd and 4th priority seem very similar. Mr. Simmons explained that the decision making study will help determine what to plan for and the survey will follow-up and substantiate the effects. The survey will supplement the bi-annual rider and non-rider behavior survey.

Pace submitted two project proposals; the number one priority is the Development and Land Use Guidelines, followed by the Hastus Data Coordination. It was questioned whether the Hastus Data Coordination is a planning or business study, as it deals directly with internal costs.

RTA submitted two project proposals. Mr. Pitstick left the prioritization to the Committee's discretion. The Regional Transit Technology Plan will assist in greater implementation of the regional ITS strategic plan. It was noted that there is a connection between this and the City of Chicago's Smart Corridor program and coordination is likely.

Ms. Jane of RTA described the purpose of the other proposal, the Regional Coordination of Transit Customer Satisfaction Surveys. Ms. Jane explained that every agency does surveys, all with a different methodology, which makes it very difficult to aggregate results. This project would establish a shared methodology for all agencies allowing RTA to track customer satisfaction on a regional level, as required. It was questioned if it makes sense to halt current surveys until a regional methodology is created, so as to prevent data collection that will not be as useful. Ms. McCluskey commented this is a big project involving collaboration with the service boards and Ms. Jane agreed that buy-in is essential but is hopeful considering the shared benefits. Mr. Maloney pointed out there are four surveys in the past UWP programs with zero percent funds expended and if this project is going to be funded, coordination with these existing projects will be necessary.

A proposal submitted by DuPage County project was described by John Loper. The proposal is for the DuPage County Pavement Management Program which will allow analysis of different pavement methods and costs. This is an easily transferable project and as Mr. Rickert emphasized, will address the growing importance of road construction costs. It was

questioned if SPR funds would be an appropriate funding source for this project, as it is a State issue. Mr. Stack and Mr. Donovan agreed this is something that should be researched.

Lake County presented its proposal for a Lake County 2040 Transportation Plan which is an update to the last plan developed in 2002. This plan will include several updates, including forecast data from CMAP and more focus on transit and inclusion of ITS. Mr. Rickert commented that UWP funds are typically the primary funding source for county long-range transportation planning.

Mr. Stack relayed a message from Les Nunes on the approval to extend the current Lake and Kane County projects. The committee discussed the cause of this and it was decided that contractual agreements are two year projects and this needs to be negotiated with IDOT. The possibility of structuring the funding differently to be programmed over a multiple years for multi-year projects, similar to CMAQ, was mentioned.

Mr. Maloney asked if information on SPR fund availability for the DuPage County project will be provided prior to scoring; Mr. Donovan responded it is doubtful and others discussed this would be more of a State project with DuPage as a pilot, and it is doubtful a decision would be made in the next couple weeks.

It was asked how local match affects prioritization and Mr. Podgorski suggested committee members be prepared at the next meeting for the potential of increasing local match so as to allow for a greater number of projects to be approved.

5.0 Public Comment

There was no public comment.

6.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting is March 24th, 1:00 pm.

7.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:20am.

Respectfully submitted,



Matt Maloney
CMAP

3/10/09