



Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312 454 0400
www.cmap.illinois.gov

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) Transportation Committee Minutes May 20, 2016

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

- Committee Members Present:** Chair – Sis Killen, Vice Chair Rocco Zuchero – Illinois Tollway, Charles Abraham - IDOT DPIT, Jennifer Becker - Kendall County, Darwin Burkhart – IEPA (via phone), Brian Carlson – IDOT District One, John Donovan – FHWA, Doug Ferguson – CMAP, Yonah Freemark – MPC, Luann Hamilton – CDOT, Scott Hennings – McHenry County, Emily Karry – Lake County, David Kralik – Metra, Christina Kupkowski – Will County, Leah Mooney – CTA, Randy Neufeld – Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force, Mark Pitstick – RTA, Tom Rickert – Kane County, Christopher Schmidt – IDOT OP&P, Chris Snyder – DuPage County, P.S. Sriraj – Academic & Research, Steve Strains – NIRPC, David Tomzik – Pace, Mayor Eugene Williams – Council of Mayors,
- Absent:** Darwin Burkhart – IEPA, Adrian Guerrero – Class 1 Railroads, Robert Hann – Private Providers, Joe Schofer – Academic & Research, Jacky Grimshaw - CNT, Ken Yunker – SEWRPC
- Others Present:** Mike Albin, Garland Armstrong, Heather Armstrong, Bruce Christensen, Jackie Forbes, Rick Harnish, Jessica Hector-Hsu, Janell Jensen, Sidney Kenyon, Mike Klemens, Patrick Knapp, Dennis Latto, John Loper, Ashley Lucas, Tara O’Malley, Brian Pigeon, Dave Seglin, David Spacek, Brad Thompson, Mike Walczak, Sarah Wilkinson, Barbara Zubek
- Staff Present:** Bob Dean, Teri Dixon, Kama Dobbs, Jesse Elam, Lindsay Hollander, Kristen Ihnchak, Elizabeth Irvin, Leroy Kos, Jen Maddux, Angela Manning-Hardimon, Martin Menninger, Tom Murtha, Russell Pietrowiak, Melissa Porter, Liz Schuh, Gordon Smith, Berenice Vallecillos, Simone Weil

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

Committee Chair Sis Killen called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

Ms. Killen announced that CMAP's Future Leaders in Planning (FLIP) program application deadline has been extended through June 3. FLIP engages local high school students interested planning topics and contributing to a better future for the region. The program will meet for six days total over two weeks in July. Ms. Killen asked Committee members to reach out to high school students in the CMAP region to encourage them to apply.

3.0 Approval of Minutes – April 22, 2016

A motion to approve the minutes of the April 22, 2016 meeting, as presented, made by Mr. Strains, seconded by Mr. Snyder, carried.

4.0 Coordinating Committee Reports

Mr. Zucchero stated that the Local Coordinating Committee met on May 11, 2016 and gave a summary of items discussed. He reported that the committee discussed two current LTA projects: a community vision plan for the Chinatown neighborhood and CMAP's zoning work. He also reported that staff updated the committee on the impacts of the state budget on the LTA program, confirming that numerous projects are delayed and that the call for projects for this year has been cancelled.

5.0 FFY 14-19 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

5.1 eTIP Database and TIP Amendments and Administrative Modifications

Ms. Dobbs gave a presentation and demonstration of CMAP's recently launched eTIP database. Ms. Dobbs reported that the TIP amendments were published on the [eTIP web site](#) May 12, 2016 for committee review and public comment. She also reported that with concurrence from RTA and IDOT the State/Regional Resources Table was updated using FAST Act information.

Ms. Hamilton made a motion, seconded by Mr. Synder, to approve the formal TIP amendment 16-03 and to concur with the updated State/Regional Resources Table. The motion carried.

5.2 FTA Subarea Allocation between Indiana-Illinois and Wisconsin-Illinois of Section 5307/5340 Capital and Planning Funds, 5337 State of Good Repair Funds and 5339 Bus Funds

Mr. Kos reported that FTA published its Fiscal Year 2016 Apportionments, Allocations, and Program Information and the RTA Board approved the splits of all 5307/5340, 5337 and 5339 funding with northwestern Indiana and southeastern Wisconsin and between the CTA, Metra and Pace.

Mr. Strains made a motion, seconded by Mr. Schmidt, to recommend approval of the subarea allocations between Northwestern Indiana-Northeastern Illinois and Southeastern Wisconsin- Northeastern Illinois and concurrence with financial calculations for CTA, Pace, and Metra to the MPO Policy Committee. The motion carried.

Mr. Kos announced that the semi-annual GO TO 2040 TIP conformity analysis and TIP amendments are due by Friday, June 10, 2016. The Committee will be asked to release the analysis and amendment for public comment at the July 22, 2016 meeting.

5.3 Transportation Alternatives Program

Mr. Ferguson gave a summary of staff's proposal for programming FFY 2018-2020 TAP funding as well as new general policies for management of the program. He reported that CMAP anticipates a call for projects in January, 2017. Mr. Ferguson reported that there are two proposed changes in the project evaluation and selection criteria: to consider the measure of population density in quintiles instead of quartiles and to have the CMAQ Project Selection Committee review and recommend projects. Mr. Ferguson also reported that the proposed changes in program management are to use the same process applied in the CMAQ program and to use the CMAQ Project Selection Committee in the review and approval of project changes. He stated that a simplified process would allow for more efficient use of staff time and an alignment of the program with the CMAQ program would allow eligible projects to move between the programs to meet obligation goals.

Mr. Freemark asked if the buffer used in the analysis is one mile, and Mr. Ferguson confirmed that the buffer is one mile around the proposed facility. Ms. Hamilton asked whether unobligated funds programmed for the current phase of the project would be deferred if the project experienced delay. Mr. Ferguson replied that CMAP does not typically defer funds from a phase already in progress but defers the funds programmed in the following phases. Ms. Hamilton suggested that the program guidelines state that the unobligated portion of funding in the active phase will not necessarily be deferred, but potentially could be. Mr. Snyder asked how the change from quartiles to quintiles would change project rankings, specifically for suburban projects. Mr. Ferguson replied that the ranking should not be affected greatly, and that the quintile method simply adds gradation to scoring that is useful for projects that are near the cut-off line for funding. The top ranked projects will remain at the top. Ms. Killen asked what the timeline would be to formalize the changes in procedure. Mr. Ferguson replied that this will be brought to the CMAQ Project Selection Committee as part of the regular review of the CMAQ selection process in September.

6.0 RTA Mapping & Statistics (RTAMS) Website and Visioning Process

Mr. Thompson gave a presentation on RTAMS. The RTA is reaching out to RTAMS users, requesting input through an online survey, which will be open for one month beginning May 20, 2016.

Mr. Tomzik asked whether the survey can be taken on a mobile device, and Mr. Thompson confirmed that it can from a link on the RTA's website. Mr. Tomzik stated that RTAMS is a great asset, which Pace staff and consultants use frequently, and that he would encourage everyone to take the survey. Mr. Thompson concurred that it is a great tool for everyone and that the RTA is taking a holistic approach to get input from users across the region.

7.0 ON TO 2050

7.1 Regionally Significant Projects Update

Mr. Elam gave an update on the proposed thresholds for regionally significant projects that were developed following discussions with implementers. He reported that staff recommends an adjustment to the non-capacity project threshold to only include state of good repair projects of more than \$250 million on specific train lines and stations as major capital projects and to include systemwide state of good repair projects as programmatic line items within the financial plan. Mr. Elam stated that, using the recommended thresholds, 106 projects would initially be considered for the major capital project list in ON TO 2050, about double that of GO TO 2040. Next, Mr. Elam proposed that the Committee begin discussion of elements of the evaluation of capital projects for ON TO 2050, including the evaluation framework and whether implementers can nominate projects outside their jurisdictions. The Committee discussed the implications of the thresholds.

Mr. Rickert expressed appreciation for staff time spent on this as well as concern about the focus of major projects in the region being lost, the plan amendment process and fiscal constraint. He asked what would happen if the threshold was increased from \$100 million to \$150 million. Mr. Elam replied that if a project is in an urbanized area with high traffic and it has needs, the needs will show up but it depends on the other competing projects. Mr. Elam noted that with performance measures in place, a good project should rise to the top. Ms. Killen noted that the threshold amount is closely linked with the plan amendment process. Mr. Elam stated that the plan amendment process is also linked with the financial plan and both need more work. Mr. Snyder expressed concern for the arterial system and asked how a corridor improvement project that is in a local plan but not the regional plan would move forward. Mr. Tomzik clarified that the Bus Rapid Transit Network program of projects is a \$2.5 billion suburban investment with 1,000 miles of new service including the 24 Pulse corridors as well as 11 highway-based corridors.

Mr. Freemark suggested that CMAP could play a bigger role in highlighting major projects none of the implementers are talking about and engaging the public early in this process. Mr. Rickert stated that CMAP will be involved in the evaluation and he wants to hear from the public what the needs are, and the initial approach should be more holistic. Mr. Rickert noted that, historically, the public nominated projects. Mr. Rickert asked if the Committee could get a list of the projects put forward by implementers and whether there is a public outreach process for initial consideration on the list. Mr. Elam responded that there will be a committee process around the development of a list of major capital projects and public engagement will be around the plan as a whole. Mr. Freemark stated that there should be an opportunity for the public to say what major projects they want to add to the initial list, rather than being asked to comment after the agencies have submitted final lists. Ms. Killen suggested that implementers should be engaging the public as part of their planning processes and noted that regional needs should be considered regardless of jurisdiction. Mr. Snyder agreed that local plans are often multi-modal and multi-jurisdictional and the public engagement process should start at the local level.

Ms. Hamilton stated her belief that in the past there was a more open process for nominating projects, specifically transit projects. She went on to say that it is a public plan, there is room for public input and, at minimum, there should be public outreach focused on the initial list of projects. Mr. Freemark stated that he supports the role of local agencies in collecting public feedback and believes that it is essential that CMAP have a way for the public to see and respond to the initial list of projects. He went on to say that regional priorities should be considered and there should be a process that reflects the regional role of ON TO 2050.

Mr. Carlson stated that allowing inter-agency recommendations is an excellent idea. He went on to say that CMAP identification of regional needs is an outstanding idea. Mr. Carlson cautioned that initial public opposition may try to kill particular projects, though there will be a separate public engagement process for each project. Ms. Kupkowski echoed that she would hate for the public input to be overrun by opposition to a single project that may not ultimately be included in the fiscally constrained plan. Mr. Elam responded that CMAP also does not want that to happen but recognized that the public engagement process allows for opposition. Mr. Neufeld stated that there is a need to manage the input received. Mayor Williams cautioned that some confusion may be caused because not everyone understands the process. Ms. Killen stated that staff is doing a good job of delicately balancing this issue and more work should be done.

7.2 Layers

Mr. Elam gave a presentation on a “universe” of potential layers, which will use maps, data, and contextual information to provide more specific, subregional guidance in ON TO 2050 for key policy areas. He reported that staff has begun

preliminary work on two pilot layers – high quality natural areas and high priority reinvestment areas – as well as the entire potential “universe” of layers.

Mr. Snyder asked how the layers will be used. Mr. Elam responded that the layers will be a tool to communicate the plan recommendations and noted that some layers will serve as data inputs for analysis which may better convey regionally significant projects or influence local land use decisions. Ms. Hamilton asked how complete streets fit into the layers and stated that she wanted to make sure pedestrian accessibility will be given careful consideration. Mr. Elam responded that a previously considered layer related to pedestrian accommodation did not have enough data and that discussions are needed to determine the appropriate data for a pedestrian access layer. Mr. Neufeld stated that when considering non-motorized transportation, the default is to look at the trail system, noting that much of non-motorized travel does not occur on the trail system. He went on that there are some new measures, such as network connectivity, that could be useful as a layer. Mr. Elam agreed. Ms. Mooney asked what the accessibility layer is and Mr. Elam responded that it could be a lot of things but staff initially considered it to be pedestrian accessibility. Ms. Mooney stated that considering ADA accessibility is a critical priority for CTA. Mr. Carlson echoed that the access layer should include not only pedestrian access but also ADA accessibility, noting that being 100% ADA accessible is one of IDOT’s strategic goals.

Mr. Sriraj stated that an important layer to include is parking, both passenger and freight, from a connectivity perspective. Mr. Schmidt asked if there was a way for the vulnerable populations layer to be multifaceted to include those with limited access to transit and ADA accessibility. Mr. Elam responded by saying that is a great idea and there are many ways to approach the vulnerable populations layer. Mr. Freemark stated that he also liked Mr. Schmidt’s idea and added that there should be a layer to express where transportation needs are greatest, explicitly where commute times are long, where access to employment opportunity is low, and where there is limited transit access. He continued that the high priority reinvestment areas layer has a lot of potential for orienting the way the region invests, and there should be further discussion about upon which areas in the region future investment should be focused.

Mr. Zuccherro stated that funding and financing should be considered, specifically where funding is currently committed compared to where potential projects might be located. Mr. Elam stated that the eTIP database has the capacity to show where funding is allocated. Mr. Zuccherro responded that not everything shows up in the TIP. Mr. Rickert suggested that adopted local plans be incorporated as a layer. Mr. Elam responded that the high priority reinvestment areas layer has started from areas identified in local comprehensive plans. Mr. Sriraj suggested that the RTAMS effort be leveraged in the layers approach. Mr. Elam responded that RTAMS is a great resource for transit data and CMAP should start there for the transit layers.

Mr. Tomzik stated that the pedestrian environment is critical and suggested looking at pedestrian crossing data in addition to considering sidewalks. He went on to suggest reviewing local land use and whether it supports transit. Mr. Tomzik asked if all the layers can be viewed together to get a complete picture and Mr. Elam responded that that is the purpose of the layers. Ms. Mooney commented that the intended audience may drive the prioritization of layers and that the layers should be accessible to the public. Mr. Elam replied that the intended audience may vary by layer but overall should appeal to everyone who will have a stake in the plan.

7.3 Critical Urban Freight Corridors

Ms. Killen announced that this was listed in the agenda as an item for recommendation; however the action requested was discussion.

Mr. Murtha gave a presentation on proposed corridors for the designation of “critical urban freight corridors” (CUFC) as part of the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN). Under the FAST Act, the designations in northeastern Illinois are to be made by CMAP in consultation with IDOT. He reported that the staff recommended CUFC totaling about 168 miles.

Mr. Carlson commented that the “Truck Light Congested Hours 2015” map indicated no truck congestion on I-80. Mr. Murtha responded that on average, truck speeds are fine on I-80, but reliability is lower. A few committee members stated that they were confused. Mr. Zucchero asked if the interstate system cannot be designated as CUFC, noting that U.S. 83 and U.S. 41 are recommended CUFCs that run parallel to I-294 and I-94 in some areas, respectively. Mr. Murtha replied that I-294 and I-94 are in the NHFN and there is more congestion on IL 83 today. Mr. Zucchero stated that he was concerned about the effect on the large investments in both the western bypass around O’Hare and the Central Tri-State. Mr. Murtha stated that the analysis did not consider additional capacity on the Central Tri-State and continued that the importance of IL 83 will not be diminished by the western access or Elgin-O’Hare expressway. Mr. Zucchero agreed that truck congestion is heavy on IL 83 near O’Hare because it is the only option to access that area. Mr. Murtha stated that the CUFC designation is done on a rolling basis and, in the event that truck congestion on IL 83 is alleviated, other corridors can be designated as CUFCs. Mr. Zucchero stated that he does not understand the implications of the CUFC on eligibility for funding. Mr. Murtha noted that there are a number of recommended CUFCs on the south side of Chicago (Harlem Ave, Cicero Ave, Pulaski Rd, Kedzie Ave, and Western Ave) that are parallel to one another because they all provide access to intermodal facilities and when they become congested, the Stevenson Expressway becomes congested. Ms. Killen asked if the CUFC designation makes roads eligible for certain funding and Mr.

Murtha replied that the network is useful for planning purposes and would be eligible for certain federal funds.

Mr. Schmidt commented that IDOT is formulating comments on the recommended CUFC network and they have contacted the other large MPO in the state. He went on to say that it is critical to understand that the goal of the FAST Act is to help with other issues in the future, including permitting and land use, so it is important to consider not only current truck congestion levels. Mr. Murtha responded that the designation is flexible so what is designated today can be changed in the future. Mr. Schmidt agreed. Mr. Rickert asked if there is a hierarchy within the CUFC. Mr. Murtha replied that there are questions about the language in the law, but that funding must be used on the NHFN and may be used on the CUFC.

7.4 Transportation System Funding Concepts Strategy Paper

Ms. Hollander reported that staff is requesting that comments on the draft strategy paper be submitted within three weeks.

8.0 CMAP Agency Funding Recap

Mr. Dean provided an update on CMAP's ongoing efforts to address its funding situation. He reported that CMAP will offer an incentive to Councils of Mayors that collect dues on behalf of the agency and that CMAP is exploring waivers for municipalities who have very small dues amounts or municipalities who are unable to pay. He stated the dues are meant to be a lasting solution to CMAP's overreliance on state matching funds. He stated that if legislation passes to provide a secure funding source, the dues levels will be reevaluated; noting that even with a state commitment, the dues structure would not be abandoned but perhaps reconsidered annually. Mr. Dean also reported that the approved FY17 UWP includes a larger CMAP share than in past years because it was assumed that CMAP would receive no state funding. He stated that if CMAP receives state money, the distribution of UWP funds will be reconsidered and reallocated, most likely to competitive projects not included in the FY17 UWP. Finally, Mr. Dean reported that the FY17 budget was considered by the CMAP Board last week and will be modified if the FY17 UWP is modified.

9.0 State Legislative Update

Mr. Smith discussed CMAP's state legislative agenda and presented an update of ongoing state legislative issues. He reported that CMAP is seeking legislation to reinstate the Comprehensive Regional Planning Fund. Mr. Smith stated that bills have been introduced in both the Senate and the House, both with amendments to increase the amount to \$6 million, indexed to inflation with continuing appropriation authority. He noted that CMAP is hoping to be part of the final budget solution, and organizations statewide support the advancement of the legislation.

Mr. Snyder stated that the Illinois Association of County Engineers supports the legislation. Mr. Strains stated that there is a long list of supporters and asked if there are any detractors. Mr. Smith replied that members of the General Assembly are aware of the additional stress that the legislation puts on the General Revenue Fund, which is the only concern heard.

10.0 Status of Local Technical Assistance Program

Ms. Killen stated that a memo on the status of the Local Technical Assistance Program is available in the packet.

11.0 Other Business

Ms. Hamilton announced that CDOT and CTA will be leading a tour after the July 22, 2016 Transportation Committee meeting and everyone is encouraged to participate. As space is limited, those that plan to attend should let Teri Dixon at CMAP know they plan to attend.

Mr. Freemark announced that MPC will be hosting an event with peers from San Francisco and New York to discuss lessons from their respective regions compared to the Chicago region on June 2.

12.0 Public Comment

Mr. Armstrong stated that tourists, especially those with disabilities, need to know how to get to transit at O'Hare and signage should be improved. He also stated that there are not enough sidewalks along Randall Rd in Lake in the Hills and Carpentersville and suggested adding more sidewalks and bus shelters. Finally, Mr. Armstrong stated that he will be an advocate for transportation issues in Springfield.

Mr. Harnish stated that the Midwest High Speed Rail Association believes the process for selecting regionally significant projects is broken and should be rethought. He stated that many priorities are listed in GO TO 2040, including an airport express train and rapid rail transit. Mr. Harnish said that if the agencies would not look only at their own projects with a narrow focus, these could all be packaged as a single program to make them all more viable and allow for an increase in the market share of transit. Mr. Harnish stated that they brought this to CMAP's attention during the GO TO 2040 update and it was made clear that they, representing the public, had no standing because an implementing agency did not recommend that this program be considered. He stated that he is disappointed to hear that again public comment will not be taken until the initial list is made for ON TO 2050. Mr. Harnish requested that CMAP reconsider the process and engage the public at the beginning, noting that he believes it would be easier to ask the public for project funding if they were included in the process from the beginning.

13.0 Next Meeting

Ms. Killen stated that the next meeting will be on July 22, 2016.

14.0 Adjournment

On a motion by Mr. Schmidt, seconded by Mr. Zuccherro, the meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.