



# Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 800  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400  
[www.cmap.illinois.gov](http://www.cmap.illinois.gov)

## Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMA) Transportation Committee

### Minutes

October 21, 2016

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

- Committee Members Present:** Chair – Sis Killen, Brian Carlson – IDOT District One, Mike Connelly – CTA, Doug Ferguson – CMA, Scott Hennings – McHenry County, Emily Karry – Lake County, Tom Kelso – IDOT Central Office, Patrick Knapp – Kendall County, Christina Kupkowski – Will County, David Kralik – Metra, Beth McCluskey – IDOT OIPI, Mark Pitstick – RTA, Tom Rickert – Kane County, Leon Rockingham – Council of Mayors (via phone), Dave Seglin – CDOT, Madeline Shepherd – MPC, Lorraine Snorden – Pace, Chris Snyder – DuPage County, Steve Strains - NIRPC, Rocco Zucchero – Illinois Tollway
- Absent:** Darwin Burkhart – IEPA, John Donovan – FHWA, Tony Greep - FTA, Jacky Grimshaw – CNT, Adrian Guerrero – Class 1 Railroads, Robert Hann – Private Providers, Randy Neufeld – Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force, P.S. Siraj - Academic and Research, Ken Yunker - SEWRPC
- Others Present:** Mike Albin, Garland Armstrong, Heather Armstrong, Len Cannata, Maria Choco Urban, Vicky Czuprynski, Jackie Forbes, Mike Fricano, Han Fung Hui, Jessica Hector-Hsu, Arnold Kasemsarn, Mike Klemens, Aimee Lee, Ashley Lucas, Kelsey Mulhausen, Brian Pigeon, Brian Plum, Peter Skosey, Kyle Smith, Chris Strom, Tammy Wierciak
- Staff Present:** Alex Beata, Anthony Cefali, David Clark, Teri Dixon, Kama Dobbs, Lindsay Hollander, Kristin Ihnchak, Elizabeth Irvin, Leroy Kos, Jen Maddox, Tom Murtha, Liz Oo, Ross Patronsky, Noel Peterson, Gordon Smith, Simone Weil, Barbara Zubek

## **1.0 Call to Order and Introductions**

Committee Chair Sis Killen called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m.

## **2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements**

There were no agenda changes or announcements.

## **3.0 Approval of Minutes**

A motion to approve the minutes made by Mr. Connelly, seconded by Mr. Seglin, carried.

## **4.0 Coordinating Committee Reports**

Ms. Killen stated that the Regional Coordinating Committee did not have a formal meeting but did talk about the change in the structure of the Regional Coordinating Committee. The committee received a presentation about the socio-economic forecast totals and local area allocation process. She stated that the next meeting date has not been scheduled.

Mr. Zucchero stated that at the last Local Coordinating Committee meeting the change in committee structure was discussed. At the meeting, there was also a presentation by CMAP staff about the training provided to the Village Planning Commission in Homer Glen. Mr. Zucchero thought the training was very effective.

He went on to say that the Local Coordinating Committee also discussed LTA project implementation, CMAP's role as an implementer, and mentioned the upcoming call for projects in May 2017.

## **5.0 Cook County Long Range Plan**

Ms. Choco Urban presented Cook County's 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan that was approved by the Cook County Commissioners on August 2016. She stated that the plan provides a framework for future transportation investments and policies, and ensures that Cook County is contributing to the mobility of goods and people through the region. It has been 76 years since Cook County last produced a long range transportation plan. In the presentation, Ms. Choco Urban showed maps of Cook County displaying Cook County roads and the entire transportation network. Cook County does not own a continuous or significant portion of the transportation system. Ms. Choco Urban stated that Cook County Board President Preckwinkle keenly understands the importance of transportation to the County's economic and community health and has advocated for the County to take on a leadership role. She stated the plan can be found at [cookcountyil.gov/transportation](http://cookcountyil.gov/transportation).

The five priorities of the plan were presented. They are public transportation, freight capital, equity, modernizing the transportation system, and increasing investment in transportation. Lack of investment in and around systems, maintaining and modernization of systems and increased investment were common themes across all the

priorities of Cook County's Long Range plan. The County will be more aggressive when applying for grants. Another strategy the County plans to employ includes blending fund sources to maximize funding. Ms. Choco Urban explained that Cook County did not wait for the plan to be finished to start work. She gave example of various projects throughout Cook County such as the Rosemont Transit Center, Lake Cook Road bike and pedestrian bridge, and the Touhy Avenue project.

Mr. Zucchero complimented the plan and stated that he thinks the plan is engaging and visually appealing. Ms. Shepherd commended Cook County for including equity as a priority. Mr. Connolly stated he is looking forward to working with Cook County in the future.

## 6.0 ON TO 2050

### 6.1 Infill/TOD Snapshot

Ms. Oo gave a presentation on the Infill/TOD Snapshot that staff is currently working on. She explained that a snapshot is a highly visual, data-driven summary of current conditions and region wide trends. She presented findings, including an evaluation of regional progress towards infill development. She stated the definition of infill is the construction of new buildings or redevelopment of existing properties on vacant, abandoned, or underutilized land in built up areas with existing infrastructure. She presented maps of the region to show three baseline categories for areas which were minimally infill supportive, moderately infill supportive, and highly infill supportive.

Mr. Seglin asked for a definition of the word underutilized. Ms. Oo stated that CMAP has evolved in their definition of underutilized and acknowledged that the underutilized portion is difficult to identify and define. Mr. Seglin noted that in the region there is good prime farmland that is utilized to its best use. Ms. Oo stated that is a good sign of the need to define some of the components even better, including "underutilized." The [Lands in Transition](#) strategy paper will tackle strategies to preserve agricultural, natural, and open lands, and where and how to develop previously undeveloped lands.

Mr. Seglin stated that there are some areas in the region that are not completely infill supportive but the category minimally infill supported implies there is still some level of infill supportiveness. Ms. Oo responded by noting that map areas colored white do not support infill. The geographic scale of analysis, block groups, are very large at the edges of the region. These large block groups might have some small pockets of built-out areas with existing infrastructure and any development that takes place in or adjacent to these built out areas would be considered infill. However, the large size of some block groups would obscure the infill supportiveness of these small pockets so the category is labeled as "minimally" infill supportive to acknowledge the data limitations of the unit of analysis.

Mr. Strains asked if brownfields are identified. Ms. Oo responded by saying CMAP created a strategy paper about brownfields several years ago and she said she will distribute the report. Mr. Strains stated that sometimes there is a reason for a property not being developed. Mr. Connelly suggested that Ms. Oo post or link the [brownfields strategy paper](#). Mr. Rickert asked how much CMAP has spoken with municipalities that are in the areas that are less infill supportive and wanted to know if there are strategies or methods that can help support some of the infill planning activities. He stated that the courts do not support protection of undeveloped lands and comprehensive planning activities. He would like to know where this is going and if there have been discussions with municipalities on the outskirts. Ms. Oo stated that there are several strategy papers that answer his question. One is the reinvestment and infill strategy paper and the other is the lands in transition paper. Ms. Oo will connect Mr. Rickert with Nora Beck, the lands in transition strategy paper's project manager.

Mr. Connelly said that one of his concerns is development not occurring where the current transit system has already been built. This might result in transit agencies being pressured to extend to areas where there is currently no transit. Mr. Connelly also stated that it is helpful for the region to see where we have underutilized assets that we can potentially steer development towards. Ms. Killen agreed and stated that we should continue to direct development to areas with existing infrastructure rather than providing transit when development occurs outside these areas.

## **6.2 Local Area Allocation Process**

Ms. Ihnchak gave a brief overview of the local area allocation process. She explained that CMAP is federally-required to create a forecast that informs the region's planning activities and it is also useful to find the trends and provide the information to municipalities for their planning efforts. The local area allocation will take the regional socioeconomic forecast total for population, households, and jobs and disaggregate it to the local level, ultimately providing county and municipal total projections at 5-year intervals.

There will be a workshop from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. on November 18 to discuss more details; stakeholders are invited to provide feedback on the different strategies and trends that will drive the tool's results. In January or February initial totals will be reviewed with counties and major municipalities to make sure the results make sense. In February there will be another workshop to review results and get feedback from stakeholders.

Mr. Rickert stated that about six months ago, Kane County started updating some of their socio-economic data and in that process they utilized the 2040 numbers. He stated that some municipalities are concerned with where the numbers are coming from and a lot of them want to be engaged. He stated that the workshops seem to be for the county level planning and asked if there will be an opportunity for direct municipal input. Ms.

Ihnchak stated that CMAP will develop a strategy to engage municipalities after the February meeting but is not sure what form that will take.

### **6.3 Trends for Scenario Development**

Ms. Oo explained that alternative futures scenario planning is an approach that helps identify trends and explained that for this project CMAP is looking at macro trends. She stated that CMAP is focusing on five futures related to mobility, land use, climate change, public resources and regional economy.

CMAP is currently collecting feedback on the five futures and will be identifying and reviewing strategies to address the impacts of the futures. CMAP will host futures workshops around the region to gather public input on impacts and strategies. Ms. Oo asked the committee what they are wary of and most excited about. Ms. Killen stated that maybe many people in the room are wary about the diminished resources but this is alongside the technological advances which are exciting. Mr. Strains asked if these are the only futures that CMAP will be asking about. Ms. Oo responded that these are the five futures that CMAP will focus on. Mr. Pitstick stated that suburban office parks and strip malls becoming less utilized is troubling. Mr. Zucchero stated that with more opportunities for working from home, it might not encourage urban living. He also stated with climate change, urban living might not be the most attractive when people might not need to own a car or to leave their house. Mr. Rickert stated that this is different from what CMAP has done in the past with alternatives and he glad that staff is looking at these five areas.

Mr. Connolly stated that he would be cautious about the rate of technological change. For example, ten years ago people focused on electric cars. Technology might not move as fast as predicted. Mr. Connelly also stated that Northeastern Illinois is more desirable than other areas such as Florida and New Jersey which are losing land area to rising sea levels as climate change occurs. Mr. Connelly stated he is concerned about the lack of tools to measure impacts of vehicle miles traveled. He gave an example of ordering something on Amazon instead of going to the suburban malls. Mr. Connelly said we do not have a way to measure that VMT impact of online retail. Ms. Shepherd said that economic restructuring is an important issue especially when looking at the geographic component and how it changes land uses, where the workforce is located and the impact on disadvantaged classes. Mr. Kralik stated that there is incredible opportunity for policy to shape the wide range of possibilities such as the future of the autonomous cars.

### **6.4 Public-Private Partnerships**

Mr. Beata presented a proposed approach for addressing public-private partnerships in ON TO 2050. He reviewed the current language in GO TO 2040, subsequent staff efforts, and recent national trends in the PPP industry. Based on this analysis, staff proposes largely retaining the current language, with various updates and clarifications to reflect the changing regulatory and industry context, better articulate the public interest in PPP

agreements, and ensure that PPP facilities fit into the regional transportation network. The Transportation Committee agreed that the staff proposal is a reasonable way to discuss PPPs in the new plan. Ms. Killen stated that CMAP is on the right track with getting the updates together.

### **6.5 Utility Coordination**

Mr. Beata presented a memo on improved coordination with utilities that included three potential avenues for improvement: better access to data, formal coordination councils, and statutory changes. The goal is to reduce construction delays for transportation projects. The Transportation Committee agreed that coordination with utilities is a major cause of delay, that early planning with utilities is advantageous, and that avoiding utilities in the first place is a preferable approach. Some members noted that they have successful coordination efforts already, while others noted that utilities are unwilling to coordinate early on in the planning and programming process.

Ms. Killen said utilities are a significant cause of project delays. On the construction side, delays drive up the cost and dictate the schedule. She stated that looking at things on a regional level would help because everyone deals with the same players. Ms. Karry stated that Lake County has a utility coordination council and they start coordination early in phase one but there are still a few non-responsive players, which has raised costs. Ms. Karry stated that Lake County charges utilities a fee for putting facilities in their right of way. She stated that some utilities do not know where their facilities are located. She said that she would like to exploring strengthening statutory language more. Mr. Snyder stated that this is a problem for every transportation agency that deals with utilities. He stated that in DuPage County they are beginning a process to look at their permitting, specifically utilities. He stated that their goal is not to relocate the utilities but to avoid utilities. He also stated that contacts at utility companies change too often. Ms. Kupkowski stated that the biggest issue in Will County is that utilities will not review plans until they have reached the pre-final stage and the project is scheduled for letting. Mr. Carlson said IDOT has the same issue. Mr. Rickert stated that he does not know how much of this issue can be addressed by the time ON TO 2050 is released. He stated that there are many complex issues and he said he does not think there is enough time to address them before ON TO 2050 is adopted. Ms. Killen stated that Cook County has a utility council where the utility companies are informed of Cook County's five-year plan. She said that both the utility companies and the local agencies need to inform each other about what their plans.

### **6.6 Plan Indicators Development Scope**

Mr. Peterson gave an overview of the plan indicators development project. He stated that the goal of the project is to create a set of indicators that will both quantify the goals of and measure the implementation progress of ON TO 2050. He stated there are three major components: to re-evaluate and refine the indicators in GO TO 2040, develop new indicators for ON TO 2050, and set near-term and long-term targets for all indicators in

the plan. He stated that towards the end of the fiscal year he will come back to the committee to get feedback on the proposed set of indicators.

Mr. Snyder made a comment that when the goal is to have 10% structurally deficient bridges, the public thinks it should be 0%. He stated that he thinks it should be turned into a positive by saying not structurally deficient. Mr. Murtha stated that new federal regulations are going to change how some data are collected or reported, which could impact existing indicators.

Mr. Rickert stated that there are some bridges that have been built in the last five years that are structurally deficient because they do not meet the shoulder requirement or for other reasons. Mr. Peterson stated that Mr. Rickert is referring to the functionally obsolete classification and said those are not included in the measure of structurally deficient. Mr. Carlson stated that public perception is that a structurally deficient bridge is unsafe, when in fact it only means that it needs more frequent inspections.

## **7.0 Regional Greenways and Trails Plan**

Mr. Daly gave a progress report the update of the Regional Greenways and Trails Plan, last updated in 2009. CMAP worked with County DOTs and Planning Departments, Forest Preserve and Conservation Districts, and subregional councils to update the plan to reflect more current regional and subregional trail priorities. The proposed plan has 3,161 miles of trails.

Mr. Strains asked how many links connect to Northwest Indiana. Mr. Daly replied that there are about ten connections to Indiana. Mr. Snyder asked how many of the 3,161 miles are built. Mr. Daly replied about 40% of the total mileage of trails is completed. Mr. Rickert made a motion, seconded by Mr. Strains to approve the updated map of the Regional Greenway and Trails Plan to guide the funding recommendations of the Transportation Alternatives Program. The motion carried.

## **8.0 Legislative Updates**

### **8.1 USDOT MPO Coordination and Planning Area Reform Rule**

Mr. Smith stated that the comment period has been extended to October 24. He said that he anticipates USDOT to move forward with this rule, despite the concerns. USDOT staff will compile the comments and assemble a report. He stated that once that happens it will be shared with the committee. Mr. Snyder asked what can be done at the legislative level about this amendment. Mr. Smith responded that Congress can restrict the funding for that effort or states can sue the USDOT for overstepping their authority.

### **8.2 Constitutional Lockbox Amendment**

Mr. Smith gave a quick summary of the Constitutional Lockbox Amendment and the concerns about the ambiguities in the amendment. He stated that regional planning is not explicitly identified in the language as eligible for funding. Mr. Smith stated that

CMAP is continuing discussions with partners about strategies to address the amendment on the implementation side. Mr. Seglin noted that Cook County has ended diversions of transportation funds without having to amend the constitution. Mr. Snyder asked if the real amount of diverted funds is known. Mr. Smith replied that the proponents identified \$6 billion diverted over a ten-year period of time. CMAP staff came up with \$520 million. Mr. Snyder stated that he thinks that there will be a public perception that previously diverted money will be returned, but the amendment only impacts future funding.

**9.0 2017 Proposed Transportation Committee Meeting Schedule**

Ms. Killen stated that the proposed dates will be brought forward for consideration at the November Transportation Committee meeting.

**10.0 Status of the Local Technical Assistance Program**

Ms. Killen stated that there is an update in the packet.

**11.0 Other Business**

Ms. Killen stated that Mr. Strains is retiring at the end of the month and thanked him for his service.

**12.0 Public Comment**

Mr. Armstrong stated that he was concerned about utility coordination. He said that local agencies need to communicate with utility companies and to have a backup plan. Ms. Killen stated that she agrees that the coordination with utility companies is ongoing and the expectations are continuing to be defined.

**13.0 Next meeting**

The next Transportation Committee meeting will be held on November 18, 2016.

**14.0 Adjournment**

On a motion by Ms. Karry, seconded by Mr. Snyder, the meeting adjourned at 11:37 am.