

May 24 and 31, 2007

Technical Committee

A meeting of the **Technical Committee** of the Cook DuPage Corridor Study was held on **May 24, 2007** at 1:30 p.m. at 175 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago and was continued on **May 31, 2007** at 10:00 am to complete discussion of agenda Item III.A. This document provides a summary of the discussion for each agenda item that took place on May 24 and May 31, as well as a roster of those who attended.

I. Call to Order and Introductions

Committee Chair Patrick Higgins confirmed a quorum and called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. He welcomed and introduced new and alternate members to the Technical Committee. Mr. Higgins requested that all attendees complete the sign-in sheet.

II. May 3, 2007 Meeting Summary

Mr. Higgins requested if there were any changes to the May 3, 2007 Technical Committee meeting summary. Tam Kutzmark offered a motion to approve the minutes as presented, with a second by Bob Dean. The meeting summary was approved by unanimous vote.

III. Formulation of Recommendations to the Policy Committee

Mr. Higgins reminded those present that at the committee’s May 3 meeting, the list of potential options for further consideration had been narrowed from 11 to the following six:

- 1. Main Line System – Option 1
- 2. Main Line System – Option 2
- 3. Main Line System – Option 4
- 4. Concentric System – Option 1
- 5. Concentric System – Option 2
- 6. Radial Reliant System - Option 1

Mr. Higgins stated that the objective of today’s meeting is to develop a recommendation to the Policy Committee based on a further consideration of these six options. Also, the committee will consider supporting recommendations that apply generically to the common components of all options: Major investments, Smart Corridors, connectors, circulation/distribution systems, strategic roadway improvements and related policy issues.

Mr. Higgins indicated that RTA staff and consultant Mignon Allen designed small group activities to facilitate the committee’s development of recommendations today. He noted that the agenda reflected the planned discussions. Mr. Higgins then invited Ms. Allen to initiate the small group discussions.

A. Develop a Recommended Shortlist of Options

(1) Small Group Discussion 1: Assessment of Options

The purpose of the first group discussion was to develop consensus for the key strengths and weaknesses of each of the six options.

Prior to the meeting, each committee member was asked to identify from Attachment 2: Draft Option Assessment Summaries (dated May 18, 2007) three to five strengths that they considered the greatest advantages of each Option, as well as the three to five most significant areas of concern. Revised Assessment Summaries for the six options (dated May 24, 2007) were distributed to the tables. The revised Assessment Summaries re-ordered the items listed under 'strengths' and 'areas of concern' in accordance with the responses received in advance of the meeting. The number of times an item was selected by a responding committee member was shown in brackets at the end of each item, and all items that were selected by at least one respondent was shown in bold.

Committee members were informed of the assigned table number at which they were seated: Table 1, 2 or 3. Each table was then assigned four of the following six options to serve as the focus of their discussion: Main Line (ML) 1, ML 2, ML 4, Concentric (Con) 1, Con 2, and Radial Reliant (RR) 1. Each option was assigned to two tables.

Table members were then asked to review the bolded items on the revised Assessment Summaries for their four assigned options and to respond as a group to the following questions:

- Does your group generally agree that the first three bolded items are the key 'strengths' of the option? Why or why not?
- Does your group agree that the first three bolded items represent the critical 'areas of concern'? Why or why not?

Each table recorded their responses on a handout and reported out to the group. The facilitator briefly recapped points of agreement among the two tables responding to each option and committee members discussed any changes that should be made. A summary of the exercise results is on file at the RTA.

(2) Small Group Discussion 2: Project or Segment Issues

The second small group discussion was a two-part exercise intended to assist the committee formulate recommendations in light of the key strengths and concerns from the preceding exercise, as well as their perceived strengths and concerns for specific parts of each option.

Part 1

Large maps of the six Options were displayed on the wall. For the first part of this exercise, each committee member was given green stickers and yellow Post-It notes to indicate on the maps their individual responses to the following two questions:

- What segments within each Option do you think are most critical to move forward for the success of the option?
- What segments (or pieces) of each Option do you have reservations about moving forward with and why?

Staff then summarized the overall results for the group.

At this point, Mr. Higgins expressed concern that time constraints would not allow for sufficient discussion and attention to the second part of the exercise and the subsequent formulation of major capital recommendations. The Chair suggested that Agenda Item III.A be continued at another time. Staff identified May 31 as a potential date, with the time to be determined. The Chair then returned to the May 24, 2007 agenda and proceeded with Item III.B: Supporting Recommendations.

On May 31, 2007 at 10:00 a.m., Agenda Item III.A was continued, picking up with Part 2 of Small Group Discussion 2, as follows:

Part 2

Each of three tables were designated one system for the focus of their group discussion: Table 1 - Main Line System, Table 2 - Concentric System, Table 3 - Radial Reliant System. Each table was asked to discuss and respond as a group to the following question:

If one or more options within your assigned system were short-listed, what recommendations would your group propose, taking into account the strengths, concerns and segment issues?

Each table reported to the full committee the resulting system recommendation developed by their group, inviting discussion and potential modifications from the other members present. Michelle Ryan then reviewed the three resulting recommendations:

The Main Line System recommendation was essentially to move forward with Main Line Options 1, 2 and 4, with the differences between them serving as specific alternatives within the I-290 Corridor.

Specific projects comprising the Main Line System recommendation are listed on the following page.

1. Elgin – O’Hare Expressway east extension; and
2. DuPage J-Line BRT; and
3. Mid-City Transitway BRT; and
4. The following I-290 Corridor alternatives:

Alternative A (from option 1)

- A.1 I-290 BRT as J Route connector; and
- A.2 I-290 HOV Lanes

Alternative B (from option 2)

- B.1 Blue Line extension to Oak Brook

Alternative C (from option 4)

- C.1 I-290 HOV Lanes; and
- C.2 I-290 BRT as J Route connector; and
- C.3 Blue Line extension to 1st Avenue

Committee members also suggested that less capital-intensive alternatives to the J Line and the Mid City should be evaluated, as well as phasing opportunities.

The Concentric System recommendation was primarily the combination of investments evaluated as Concentric 1 with some elements borrowed from Concentric 2, a change in the managed lane strategy applied to the proposed additional lanes on I-290 and specific alternatives for further analysis in the I-88/I-290 corridor, including a further west extension of the Blue Line (to Lombard) than had undergone evaluation. Specifically,

1. IL 59 BRT (I-88 to 95th Street); and
2. I-355 BRT; and
3. I-355 HOT; and
4. IL 83 BRT; and
5. 1st Avenue ART (*less capital intensive version of the 1st Ave. BRT evaluated in Concentric 1*); and
6. Inner Circumferential DMU (*from Concentric 2*); and
7. Mid-City Transitway BRT; and
8. Elgin – O’Hare Expressway east extension; and
9. The following I-88/I-290 Corridor alternatives:

Alternative A

- A.1 I-88 HOT; and
- A.2 I-290 HOT + Extension HOT (*rather than HOV evaluated*);
and
- A.3 I-88/I-290 + Extension Express Bus (*less capital intensive version BRT evaluated*); and
- A.4 Blue Line extension to Highland Ave. (*this mode/extent was not evaluated*)

Alternative B
B.1 I-88 HOT; and
B.2 I-290 + Extension HOT (rather than HOV evaluated); and
B.3 I-88/I-290 + Extension Express Bus (less capital intensive version of the BRT on I-290 and I-88 evaluated)

Alternative C
C. 1 Blue Line extension to Highland Ave. (this mode/extent was not evaluated)

The Radial Reliant System recommendation was the combination of investments evaluated as Radial Reliant 1:

1. Milwaukee District West Line upgrade; and
2. Union Pacific West Line upgrade; and
3. BNSF upgrade; and
3. Blue Line extension to 1st Avenue; and
4. I-290 Eisenhower Expressway HOV + I-290 Extension reversible HOV (reverse commute orientation); and
5. I-88 HOT; and
6. I-290 / I-88 BRT; and
- 7 – I-355 BRT; and
- 8 – I-355 HOT; and
- 9 – IL 83 BRT

It was also noted that north-south connections in western DuPage should be revisited and potentially improved upon, and that new stations along the Metra rail lines within Chicago and improvements to existing stations may be needed.

It was suggested that fare integration and coordination policies be applied in further consideration of this system, as transfers between Metra and CTA are important to the Radial Reliant system's success. The physical and operational feasibility of BNSF and MD-W upgrades at assumed levels was noted as very uncertain and would require extensive further examination.

Committee members also acknowledged the relatively high potential for environmental issues with respect to this system, noting that environmental issues would need to be thoroughly addressed through later stages of planning, project development and environmental processes.

(3) Recommend Shortlist of Options

In Mr. Higgins absence on May 31, Vice Chair Tam Kutzmark inquired if the committee as a whole was comfortable with the three system recommendations. Committee members indicated that they were.

Ms. Ryan inquired if any of the three systems should not be recommended, in light of the considerable feasibility concerns raised by committee members with respect to the Radial Reliant system, or for any other reason. It was the consensus of the committee that all three system recommendations should be forwarded to the Policy Committee.

A motion to approve the resulting three recommendations was made by Rich Hazlett and seconded by Peter Fahrenwald. While there was unanimous consensus among the committee members present, the attendance on May 31 was one member short of quorum to take formal action. The committee concluded their discussion of Agenda Item III.A. on May 31 at 11:30 a.m., with the understanding that RTA staff would request concurrence from committee members not present. Subsequently, several committee members not present on May 31 offered their concurrence on the committee's three recommendations via e-mail, including: Mr. Higgins (Chair), Mr. Abraham, Mr. Avery, Mr. Baczek, Mr. Godowski and Ms. McCluskey.

B. Supporting Recommendations

On May 24, Mr. Higgins turned the committee's attention to Attachment 3 that presented draft Supporting Recommendations for the following items:

- Major Capital Investments
- Smart Corridors
- Connector Services
- Distribution/Circulation Services
- Strategic Roadway Improvements
- Policy Issues

He noted that the supporting recommendations were intentionally developed at a high-level and that details such as who, how or when would be developed later, for the supporting recommendations ultimately approved by the Policy Committee.

Mr. Higgins inquired whether committee members generally agreed with the draft supporting recommendations presented in the attachment, or if the small group discussions were necessary. Committee members indicated their general agreement and Mr. Higgins then opened the floor for committee discussion.

Committee members suggested the following changes:

- Add "fiscally responsible" in the first supporting recommendation of major capital investments regarding the future planning and implementation of recommended options.
- Include flexible reverse commute distribution services such as car-sharing and bicycle programs under the Distribution/circulation services section.

- Include the provision of pedestrian networks in employment center distribution areas and along connector routes.
- Include achieving a user-perceived seamlessness of the transportation system in the policy issue section.

A motion to approve the supporting recommendations with the above listed changes was made by Michael Bolton, with a second provided by Mr. Hazlett. The supporting recommendations were approved by unanimous vote.

IV. Committee Report and Other Business

There was no discussion on this agenda item.

VI. Next Meeting

It was noted that the May 24 meeting would be continued on May 31 at a time to be determined for the purpose of completing Agenda Item III.A. (NOTE: The results of the May 31 discussion are included in this summary under Agenda Item III.A).

VII. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

X. Attendance Rosters

Committee Members in Attendance				
Present May 24	Present May 31	Name	Title	Organization
		Abraham, Chuck	Program Support Chief	IDOT, Division of Intermodal and Public Transportation
		Alvarez, José Luis (on Leave of Absence)	Grants Director, Town of Cicero	North Central Council of Mayors
*		Avery, Mark	Chief of Traffic Planning and Programming	DuPage County
		Baczek, John	Consultant Studies Unit Head	IDOT - District 1, Division of Highways
✓	✓	Bolton, Michael	Deputy Executive Director, Strategic Services	Pace
✓	✓	Bozic, Claire	Director of Plan Implementation	Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
*	*	Ciavarella, Lynnette	Director, Office of Planning and Analysis	Metra
✓	✓	Cole, Robert	Interim Assistant to the Village Manager, Village of Oak Park	North Central Council of Mayors
✓	✓	Dean, Bob	Regional Planner	Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
		DiPalma, Christopher	Metropolitan Planning Engineer	Federal Highway Administration
		Godowski, Peter	Highway Engineer, Bureau of Transportation and Planning	Cook County Highway Department
✓		Guerriero, Henry	Traffic and Revenue Analyst, Planning Department	Illinois State Toll Highway Authority
✓	✓	Hazlett, Richard	Coordinating Planner	Chicago Department of Transportation
✓		Higgins, Patrick	Village Manager, Village of Western Springs	Central Council of Mayors
✓	✓	Hulseberg, David	Asst. Village Manager/Director of Community Development, Village of Lombard	DuPage Council of Mayors
✓	✓	Kutzmark, Tam	Transportation Planning Liaison, DMMC	DuPage Council of Mayors
		McC Campbell, Roy	Comptroller and CFO, Village of Bellwood	North Central Council of Mayors
✓		McCluskey, Beth	Director of Transportation and Planning, WCMC	North Central Council of Mayors
	*	Montazery, Yadollah	Assistant Director	Chicago OEMC
		Nunez, Les	Bureau Chief, Urban Program Planning	IDOT, Office of Planning and Programming
✓	*	Robles (Ryg), Karyn	Transportation Planner, City of Naperville	DuPage Council of Mayors
*	*	Shiffer, Michael	Vice President, Planning and Development	Chicago Transit Authority
		Werner, David	Community Planner	Federal Transit Administration
✓	✓	Wierciak, Tammy	Planning Coordinator, WCMC	Central Council of Mayors

*Alternates present:

Carmen Carruthers served in place of Karyn Ryg for Naperville

David Kralik served in place of Lynnette Ciavarella for Metra.

Abraham Emmanuel served in place of Yadollah Montazery for Chicago OEMC.

Peter Fahrenwald served in place of Michael Shiffer for CTA.

Others in Attendance

Present May 24	Present May 31	Name	Organization
	✓	Benedict, Albert	CNT and CAC Liaison
✓		Brandstrader, Fred	American Institute of Architects and CAC Chair
✓	✓	Parker, Andrew	Pace
✓	✓	Perna, Laura	Illinois Department of Natural Resources
	✓	Tempesta, Dan	Cambridge Systematics

Staff

Present May 24	Present May 31	Name	Organization
✓		Allen, Mignon	Dovetail Consulting
✓	✓	Lenski, William	RTA
✓		O'Holleran, John	Entran
✓	✓	Ryan, Michelle	RTA