



Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

Agenda Item No. 3.0

233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400
www.cmap.illinois.gov

Unified Work Program (UWP) Committee

Minutes

February 15, 2017—9:00 a.m.

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

Committee Members Present (*Alternate):

Tom Kelso-Chair (IDOT), Philip Banea* (CDOT), John Donovan (FHWA), Angela Manning-Hardimon (CMAP), Marlise Fratinardo (CTA), Tony Greep (FTA), Emily Karry* (Lake County), Jason Osborn* (Metra), Mark Pitstick (RTA), Tom Rickert (Collar Counties), Eugene Williams (Council of Mayors), Dave Seglin (CDOT), and Tom Radak* (Pace), Holly Waters (Metra)

Staff Present:

Stanley Ryniewski, Dan Olson and Sherry Kane

Others Present:

Jennifer Becker (Kane Co.), Abraham Emanuel (CDOT), Luann Hamilton (CDOT), Scott Hennings and Janell Jensen (McHenry County), Dennis Latto (SSMMA), Leah Mooney (CTA), Erin Ponce (Metra), and Mike Walczak (NWMC)

1.0 Call to Order

The Chairman, Tom Kelso, called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. Members introduced themselves.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes or announcements.

3.0 Approval of the Minutes – October 12, 2016

A motion by Mark Pitstick was seconded by Mayor Eugene Williams to approve the minutes of the October 12, 2016 meeting, as presented. A clarification was asked regarding Item 6.0, the inclusion of the Counties request categorized as a competitive project (versus core), and FHWA having reported there is no real distinction between the two. Chairman Kelso explained that the Competitive/Core issue is CMAP's. Deputy Executive Director of Finance and Administration Angela Manning-Hardimon also gave a historical accounting that for some time the Counties, while categorized as core

programming, were receiving funding the competitive category that allows for multiple years to spend. All in favor, the motion carried.

4.0 FY 2018 UWP Core and Competitive Proposals

Chairman Tom Kelso, beginning with the Core program, asked that each of the member agencies present their respective proposals. Each gave a brief description of the activity and the cost breakdown, as follows:

CORE PROPOSALS			
Agency	Activity	Comments, follow up, etc.	Total Project Cost
CMAP	MPO Activities	An increase of 5.2% over the previous year, the program supports required MPO activities related to policy, research and analysis, TIP, local planning, communications and outreach, with the increase largely related to the need to update the household travel and activity survey and costs associated with the development of the ON TO 2050, the region's long-term plan.	\$16,775,195
CDOT	Planning and Programming	Standard core proposal that funds regionally and nationally focused planning activities. Slightly higher than last year's request at \$660,000, having run out of money in FY 2017 to support the program. Additional work is expected around requirements of the FAST Act, development of performance measures, and project selection criteria.	\$670,000
Counties	McHenry County	Covers the costs associated with an update to the county's transit plan, last conducted in 2012, includes an analysis of: county-wide transit growth, growth potential and demographics, conducting survey and stakeholder focus groups, data analysis and development of service options to consider, and costs to implement the options.	\$160,000
Council of Mayors	Subregional Transportation Planning, Programming and Management	An increase of about 5% (last increase in 2013); scope remains the same as in previous years, with the exception of activities related to the new Federal bill.	\$2,035,466
CTA	Program Development	Supports activities related to the implementing the capital plan and tracking the use of capital project source funds. Activities include the development of a budget book, presenting the 5-year capital plan, and tracking use funds.	\$593,750
Metra	Program Development	A \$50,000 increase over last year's levels, due to increased responsibility brought about by FAST Act (staffing) to address performance measures, transit asset management in addition to the RTA capital program among other activities.	\$450,000

CORE PROPOSALS			
Agency	Activity	Comments, follow up, etc.	Total Project Cost
Pace	Rideshare Service Program	Up from \$75,000 from previous year's request to support hiring a new full time person to work with ride-matching software.	\$100,000
Pace	TIP Development and Monitoring	Unchanged from previous levels.	\$75,000
RTA	Regional Transit Strategic Planning Staff Support	Staff time to support the development of the 2018 strategic plan over the summer, public comment period through fall and anticipated board approval early next year, with focus then shifting to implementation	\$200,000

COMPETITIVE PROPOSALS			
Agency	Activity	Comments, follow up, etc.	Total Project Cost
CDOT	CREATE Program Planning Support	Total project cost is at \$300,000 with local match; used to continue the CREATE program support services, representing the region and the City (since 2003), with IDOT, the railroad industry, and FHWA. Services focus on technical support (Cambridge Systematics) and advocacy (Metro Strategies), the current team under contract.	\$300,000
CDOT	Video Analytics Utilized for AADT Collection	Using the city's camera system to develop traffic counts, last conducted in 2006, this collection would pull data from about 27,000 cameras through OEMC, and can be shared with other agencies. Travel time data might also be derived from the collection.	\$250,000
Metra	Station/Train Boarding and Alighting Counts	On/off counts allow for data collection with literally an army of people at every station—conducted every 2 years, the program is considered the bedrock for which all other planning is done.	\$507,283
Metra	Origin-Destination Survey	This program is important for modelling purposes, coupled with on/off counts is the basic for planning. ¹	\$464,467
CMAP/RTA coordination	Local Technical Assistance and Community Planning Programs	The requested funding helps to fund CMAP's LTA program, as well as the RTA's community planning program, both of which provides assistance to local governments, counties and multi-	\$750,000

¹ Metra's presentation sparked a conversation among members primarily related to the amount of funding requested and the amount of funding available, as well as the reliance of discretionary funding for a relatively essential planning tool.

COMPETITIVE PROPOSALS			
Agency	Activity	Comments, follow up, etc.	Total Project Cost
		jurisdictional groups translating principles of regional planning to the local level. ²	
CTA	Blue Line Traction Power Study	A new project to study the increased demand on the Blue Line. CTA has increased rail service and adding a new generation of rail cars that places more demand on the traction power system that impacts the performance of the system. ³	\$625,000
CTA	Next Phases- Red and Purple Line Modernization (RPM) Core Capacity Expansion	Considered a critical project to move forward and define the next phases of the RPM, funding would be used for technical resources to help support analysis of what the next phase should be.	\$800,000
Pace	Cost Benefit Analysis of Pace Rapid Transit Program	Will try to use FTA's STOPS (Simplified Trips-on-Project Software) model to evaluate the expressway-based service, Pulse service and Arterial-Based Rapid Transit services	\$200,000
Pace	Pace 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update	An update to Vision 2020 that was last updated in 2000. About 70% of the plan is complete. The update will include the rapid transit program, ride share and ART and Pulse service.	\$275,000

Next steps would include scoring instructions and sheets for the competitive program projects that are due to CMAP by February 27 and presented at the next meeting.

The following questions and comments were raised:

- is there a contingency plan related to the state's fiscal year (funded through June 30, the same strategy as was used last year with a plan B and at that time revise the program accordingly);
- how accurate is the mark at approximately \$2,000,000 (used 7 months of FY 2017 as multiplier to calculate);
- one RTA project came in under budget by about \$50,000 that might be available for reprogramming (yes, although perhaps premature, those funds might be available for reprogramming).

² When queried, it was reported that last year's funding of \$450,000 along with this request would respond to anticipated increased need, since last year's call for proposals had been cancelled. The funding request has historically been at this level (or very near it), but cut short because of the level of available funding.

³ Questions and comments included: whether the study covers the entire blue line (yes); if it's tied to the vision study (it feeds directly into that effort); is the amount requested scalable (maybe); it seems like an engineering-type study would might come under a capital program versus planning (provides planning that relates to slating capital); this is a good starting point for presenting all planning work; and finally, when would the project commence (ready to go now).

- finally members were asked to prioritize multiple submissions or if there is any indication that you might be able to settle for less than was requested, to please include that information as well.

5.0 Next Meeting

The UWP Committee meets next on March 8, 2017.

6.0 Other Business

There was no other business before the UWP committee.

7.0 Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

8.0 Adjournment

A motion to adjourn at 10:06 a.m. by Tom Rickert, seconded by Mark Pitstick, and with all in favor, carried.

Respectfully submitted,



Angela Manning-Hardimon, CMAP

/stk
02-21-2017

Approved as presented, by unanimous vote, March 8, 2017