

	<p>Technical Committee</p>	<p>March 23, 2006</p>
	<p>A meeting of the Technical Committee of the Cook DuPage Corridor Study was held on March 23, 2006 at 1:30 p.m. at the CATS/NIPC Offices, DuPage Conference Room, Sears Tower, 8th Floor, Chicago.</p> <p>This document provides a summary of the discussion for each agenda item and attendance rosters.</p> <p>I. Call to Order</p> <p>Mr. Patrick Higgins, Chair of the Technical Committee, opened the session and stated that there was a quorum. Introductions were made and all attendees completed the sign-in sheet.</p> <p>II. Approval of the March 8, 2006 Meeting Summary</p> <p>On a motion made by Jill Leary and a second by Pete Dame, the minutes from March 8, 2006 Technical Committee Meeting were unanimously approved as presented.</p> <p>Mr. Higgins recapped the outcomes of the last regular meeting of the Technical Committee held February 23, 2006:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Committee reviewed an initial draft of the Preliminary Statement of Purpose and Need for the Cook DuPage Corridor. The current revised draft was included as an informational item on the agenda. ▪ The Committee reviewed and discussed the potential goals and objectives that are intended to sharpen the focus and to serve as a basis for evaluation measures and will be used later in the corridor process. <p>Mr. Higgins stated that a Special Working Session was held March 8 to focus directly on the Goals and Objectives. Mr. Higgins commented that nearly all Committee members were present at that meeting, there was a lot of good discussion and much was accomplished during those two hours.</p> <p>III. Development of Goals and Objectives</p> <p>Mr. Higgins introduced the agenda item and thanked all Committee members for their work and contributions in the process to date. Mr. Higgins explained that the Committee would discuss and take action on the goals and objectives today.</p>	

March 23, 2006

Mr. Higgins directed the attention of the Committee to Attachment 2 of the agenda (Results from the March 8 Working Session) and reviewed the discussion format for the March 8 working session. Mr. Higgins explained that the Committee was split into two groups, a Blue Group and a Red Group, and discussions were facilitated by Mignon Allen and Tony Catalina.

Mr. Higgins introduced Mignon Allen who provided a general summary of the small group discussions.

Ms. Allen stated that the small group discussions revealed a number of points of agreement and consensus among Committee members. The results of the working session also allowed the Project Team to refine the goals and objectives based on an open and collaborative process. Points of agreement included the following:

- Goals should lead to options that maximize access and opportunities to serve target travel markets, and maximize benefits to users;
- Goals should lead to options that minimize travel times and transfers;
- I-290 is major travel corridor...part of a larger transportation network...I-290 is not a singular piece...goals and objectives must delve into improving service quality on the arterials;
- Goals should lead to options that maximize community development and economic benefits; and the
- Study process must demonstrate sensitivity to land uses, the environment and open space.

Ms. Allen explained that where points of disagreement did exist, the discussion centered on whether or not an issue should be presented as a goal or as an objective. In other cases, the groups had varying creative and innovative ideas on how to handle a particular issue.

Ms. Allen thanked the Committee members for their participation and meaningful input. Ms. Allen emphasized that the results of the discussion demonstrate that the Committee is on the same page and the goals now reflect the point of view of the Committee as a whole.

The Committee took a few moments to discuss the working session results and to provide clarifications, where needed. Chuck Abraham inquired as to what was meant by "expend CTA" in Goal 3 (page 6) and staff noted that this was a typographical error that should read "extend CTA".

Mr. Higgins directed the Committee's attention to the Revised Draft Goals and Objectives (Attachment 3) that integrated the results of the working session and solicited comments from the Committee.

Below is a summary of comments and responses:

- Our group talked a lot about the service quality of arterials. I see references in the goals and objectives to “key elements of the transportation system” which may be a euphemism for arterials. The goals and objectives also identified improving the service quality of the I-290 corridor. I think that is a fairly comprehensive way to address arterials, but I do wonder is there a definition for “access points for I-290 corridor.” Do we need to talk about what that really means? My impression is that the document tries really hard not to say the word “arterials.” Why the careful language?

The Travel Market Analysis identifies “Key Transportation System Elements” for each of the nine travel markets. A key transportation system element is a specific extent of a roadway or transit service – such as an expressway, arterial, a bus route, commuter rail line or rapid transit line – that directly connects a significant concentration of work trip origins with a significant concentrations of work trip destinations within a travel market. The group indicated that they did not want to assume a particular mode of transportation [as an option].

So, the idea was that “key elements of the transportation system” was more inclusive?

Yes.

- I would go further and make it clear that there are different ways to improve service quality on I-290 with options that may not involve arterials, such as transit. Although Goal 3, Objective 6 now states “transportation system users,” the goal and its objectives appear to be written in such a way that would lead to a highway-based approach; particularly in light of the associated performance measures for this goal. Goal 3, Objective 1 addresses reducing travel times on I-290 and that presumes there will be some sort of highway option. The spirit of discussion from my group acknowledged that there are obvious problems on I-290, but this must be approached from a multimodal perspective, involving combinations of approaches both highway and transit. I still believe this is written too strictly. I advocate for unbiased, multimodal objectives that develop options to address our mobility problems. This document is a definite improvement over previous versions. I am concerned that when we measure these objectives a ‘bus on HOV lane on I-290’ option will receive a higher rating than a ‘transit extension’ option. Is it possible to revise Objective 1 to read, “Reduce travel times on I-290.”

March 23, 2006

Goal 3, Objectives 2, 3, and 4 address multiple modes of transportation. More objectives may be added, but we must be careful not to double count objectives.

- I assume there is going to be some sort of a ranking for the goals and objectives. For instance, Goal 3 would have some weight against Goal 7. When evaluating, I assume a matrix or other multi-attribute model will be used. I am not concerned about the wording of Goal 3, Objective 1 because there are a number of ways you can improve the performance or travel time of transit users on I-290. We must not narrowly define transit users as someone who is sitting on a train or a bus. We must think of transit more holistically, anything other than a single occupant vehicle (SOV). We must find a way to maximize the performance of I-290 so that it benefits people who are in SOV or bus, rail, or van shared-ride.

Yes, your assumptions are correct, and the evaluation measures can be weighted if desired. Evaluation measures are the next item on the agenda.

- I recommend keeping a big picture perspective instead of options that address particular items. I suggest a matrix evaluation where there is a higher tier of performance measures that address the four mobility needs [from the Travel Market Analysis] as a much broader means of evaluation. What we are trying to do is solve for the four mobility needs. This framework, the goals and objectives, is an important framework...it is going to govern the rest of the project...it is the hardest, but important part.
- The Committee must be sensitive to Goal 3 as it gave rise to the whole study process...we are talking about a triad of mobility, not just downtown. I believe the current language reflects multimodal options.
- If Goal 3 reads as highway oriented then it does not accurately reflect the discussion as the group intended for this goal to address multimodal options.

In addition, if you only consider Goal 3, it does not accurately reflect the whole study...all goals must be considered as an entirety. The Travel Market Analysis identified four major mobility issues, two of which were identified as potentially needing a major capital investment. From that process we moved into the next phase of the study – the development of options – where we must focus on the Problem Statement. How can we address and be cognizant of the four mobility issues within the goals and objectives framework? - That is the issue.

When we develop options there is not going to be a one-to-one relationship between mobility goals and improvement options. For example, there are going to be a number of improvements that may be included in any one option. Any one improvement is not likely to meet all the goals and objectives, but one improvement may be able to address three of these [multiple] goals. Our challenge is to develop the strongest Options - which are a combination of improvements and strategies- that achieve all of the goals. It is important to realize that goals and objectives as a whole need to include everything we need, but no one or two goals are going to achieve everything in and of themselves. Stay open minded...it is in your hands to determine the weighting of the objectives and to help capture the nuances of the conversation. The recommended changes by the project staff were suggestions on how to address these issues so we can move forward in developing a set of goals and objectives.

- For Goal 7, Objective 3, rather than minimize long-term operating costs, I submit that we consider obtaining the "best value" for operating costs. It is unknown if these [improvements] will be publicly or privately operated. In the transit industry, the current price for operating costs, for the same service, can differ by \$25 per service hour. By addressing best value for cost an agency may use a Request for Proposals (RFP) versus a Request for Bids (RFB). In our evaluation we must ensure that we get the best possible solution for the best possible price. This would apply to both the engineering and construction process. We must have some way of measuring the value associated with costs.

The entire goal is to maximize cost effectiveness. Such a change would be redundant to the entire goal.

- It would also make the measurement process more difficult...that may be more of a qualitative measure.

The overall goal measures the most cost-effective option. If we could come up with a method to measure best value by option we would, but that would prove very difficult to do.

- Goal 7, the cost of the project does not belong in the evaluation matrix. Cost is not the most important issue...perhaps to an accountant, but not to a politician or policy maker. There are other considerations beyond cost. My idea of an alternative is not one project, but a group of improvements and we need to set aside cost and determine if it is worth it.

The highest ranked factor in the New Starts process is cost effectiveness...we should look at costs through the entire process.

If we left out cost-effectiveness as a Goal, what would that communicate to the public and to the Policy Committee?

A discussion ensued regarding the removal of Goal 7 at this time and only focus on Goals 1 through 6 and their associated benefits. Later in the process, options would be compared against Goal 7. Another alternative was also discussed regarding cost as an objective within each Goal.

John Baczek made a motion to approve the Goals and Objectives with Goal 7 remaining as a Goal to be included in the evaluation along with the other goals. The rationale was that a package of improvements may be equivalent in terms of cost, but one option may perform far better in terms of benefits. The motioned was seconded by Michael Bolton and carried unanimously.

Pete Dame then indicated he had one more comment.

- The language of Goal 6, Objective 4 needs to be revised to be more positive and reflect consistency with existing land use plans.

After further discussion, and upon confirmation that the Corridor Planning Standards effort will address consistency with local plans, the suggestion to revise the objective was withdrawn.

- The language of Goal 4, Objective 1 needs to be revised to be more positive such as "Minimize adverse impacts and promote positive benefits to existing communities, neighborhoods and people."

Peter Dame made a motion to revise Goal 4, Objective 1. Tam Kutzmark provided a second and clarified the new wording of "Minimize adverse impacts on and promote positive benefits on existing communities, neighborhoods and people." The motion carried unanimously.

IV. Development of Evaluation Measures

A. Overview of the Evaluation Framework

Mr. Bill Lenski provided an overview of the Evaluation Framework Methodology and Evaluation Matrix.

Mr. Lenski explained that the Committee must systematically and objectively track the performance of the options. The focus of this discussion topic is the methodology and overall process, not the measures themselves. We have developed a proposed evaluation methodology and framework to achieve that based

on the goals and objectives. Performance measures will be used to gives us a relative measure of how the options perform against the goals and objectives and how they perform against each other. Measures will be both quantitative and qualitative.

When measuring the conceptual options more of those measures may be qualitative rather than quantitative, but we will strive to make as many of them as quantitative as possible.

The methodology is to develop a numeric score for each option, so we can effectively compare the scores. A numeric score is also used because goals have differing numbers of objectives and performance measures and we do not want the number of objectives for a goal to distort the outcome of the evaluation process.

The methodology includes a two stage evaluation:

- o Level 1 Screening – Conceptual Options
- o Level 2 Screening – Detailed Options

The difference between each level is the level of definition of the options and the comprehensiveness of the performance measures used at each level.

The discussion to date assumes that all the goals and objectives have the same weight, but as we move forward the Technical Committee may want to revisit the concept of weighting.

Mike Bolton made a motion to approve the Evaluation Framework Methodology. The motion was seconded by Jill Leary. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Development of Evaluation Measures

Mr. Tony Catalina brought to the Committee’s attention a handout distributed at the meeting with the heading, “Table 1.1: Goal No. 1.”

Mr. Catalina explained that the handout included the full set of evaluation criteria including the proposed evaluation measures. Common categories for the measures are effectiveness (how well they solve the mobility needs identified), impacts (positive and negative), financial feasibility (costs and availability of funds), and equity (how costs and benefits will be distributed across various populations).

March 23, 2006

To illustrate the meaning and applicability of the evaluation measures, Mr. Catalina reviewed Goal 1.0 and each of its associated performance measures.

Members of the Committee raised questions regarding assumptions for types of transit services, employment distributions around transit stations, and travel markets captured.

Mr. Higgins affirmed that the Committee was not being asked to accept the proposed evaluation measures at today's meeting.

Michelle Ryan clarified that the study team intends to bring the proposed Goals, Objectives and Evaluation Measures before the Policy Committee in May to request approval to release these items for review by the public at the June scoping meeting. Ms. Ryan explained that the purpose of this is to provide all the background information – Problem Statement, Purpose and Need Statement, Goals, Objectives and Evaluation Measures – to the public to increase their understanding of the conceptual options. The committee is not being asked to approve (finalize) these items, only to release them for public review.

Mr. Higgins requested that the study team develop a memorandum to accompany the matrix of goals, objectives and performance measures that would provide a brief narrative for each evaluation measure.

Ms. Ryan requested all comments on the evaluation measures be submitted to the RTA by April 3, 2006.

V. Updated Draft Preliminary Statement of Purpose and Need

Mr. Higgins indicated that the update of the Statement of Purpose and Need was well done and confirmed that the Problem Statement remained unchanged since the last meeting. Mr. Higgins invited Committee members to make additional comments on the statement.

The table on the following page provides a summary of the comments, study team response, and Committee action taken, where applicable.

Section	Title	Comment	Outcome
1.1	Summary of Purpose and Need	The second paragraph lists two additional needs...how are these two needs being addressed?	Introductory phrase, "the Travel Market Analysis identified four mobility needs..." to be added to Section 1.1.
1.2	Background	Revise first sentence: "...to address the mobility needs in Chicago's west side and western suburbs."	Change to be made.
1.3	Relationship to Regional Transportation Plans	The relationship between the Cook DuPage Corridor Study and the RTP needs to be emphasized.	While some discussion was included in Section 1.2it will be repeated in Section 1.3 as well.
1.3.1	Relationship to Regional and Local Transportation Plans	Subheading should read, "Regional Plans"	Change to be made.
1.3.1	Regional Plans	Remove the sentence, "Historically, CATS has undertaken this responsibility..."	Change to be made.
1.3.2	Local Plans	Revise first sentence: "Most of the counties and many municipalities in Northeastern Illinois have adopted comprehensive, land use and/or transportation plans."	Change to be made.
2.3.6	Arterial Roadways	Explain the list of arterial roadways. No limits are included and it seems like the corridor is getting bigger and bigger.	The list represents the key arterial system elements for the nine travel markets. .

Mr. Higgins requested Committee members submit any additional comments to Michelle Ryan by April 3 and indicated that a revised Draft Preliminary Statement of Purpose and Need will be brought back to the Technical Committee at the April 27, 2006 meeting and presented to the Policy Committee in May 2006.

VI. Report on Corridor Committees

Michelle Ryan provided an update on the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). The CAC will meet next month (April 2006) for a lunch meeting prior to the Technical Committee meeting. Ms. Ryan requested that Technical Committee members inform her if they plan to attend the CAC meeting.

Mr. Dame inquired if CAC members would have the opportunity to review and comment on the Goals and Objectives. Ms. Ryan responded that if the Technical Committee believes the CAC should review the goals that may be possible. The CAC has less of a technical role and should maintain its role as providing a community-perspective on the public involvement program, communicating with citizens,

March 23, 2006

promoting awareness and monitoring the effectiveness of the outreach efforts.

Mr. Dame asserted that it would be helpful if the CAC provided this input. In accordance with the Public Involvement Plan, the study must strive to provide meaningful and regular opportunity for review and comment by the public.

Ms. Ryan reiterated that all study materials, including the Problem Statement, Draft Statement of Purpose and Need, and Goals and Objectives are posted on the website and are available for public review and comment.

VII. Other Business

Mr. Dame announced that he has accepted the position of City Manager for Gross Pointe, Michigan and this would be his last meeting. Mr. Higgins thanked Mr. Dame for his participation.

Mr. Higgins informed the Committee that the next meeting (April 27, 2006) may be longer than previous meetings as work begins on potential options for submittal to the Policy Committee. This effort may also require an additional working session on May 4 or May 11, 2006. Committee members indicated there are no known conflicts with those dates at this time.

VIII. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

IX. Attendance Rosters

Technical Committee				
Present	Absent	Name	Title	Organization
✓		Abraham, Chuck	Program Support Chief	IDOT, Division of Intermodal and Public Transportation
	✓	Alvarez, Jose Luis	Grant Director, Town of Cicero	North Central Council of Mayors
✓		Avery, Mark	Chief of Traffic Planning and Programming	DuPage County Center
✓		Baczek, John	Consultant Studies Unit Head	IDOT - District 1, Division of Highways
	✓	Boehm, Rick	Village Manager, Village of Oak Brook	DuPage Council of Mayors
✓		Bolton, Michael	Deputy Executive Director, Strategic Services	Pace
✓		Bozic, Claire	Director of Plan Implementation	Chicago Area Transportation Study
✓		Ciavarella, Lynnette	Director, Office of Planning and Analysis	Metra
✓		Dame, Peter J.	Deputy Village Manager, Village of Oak Park	North Central Council of Mayors
✓		Dean, Bob	Transportation Planner, City of Naperville	DuPage Council of Mayors
	✓	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
✓		Kutzmark, Tam	Transportation Planning Liaison, DMMC	DuPage Council of Mayors
✓		Leary, Jill	Planning Coordinator, WCMC	Central Council of Mayors
	✓	McCampbell, Roy	Comptroller and CFO, Village of Bellwood	North Central Council of Mayors
✓		McCluskey, Beth	Council Liaison	North Central Council of Mayors
✓		Mehta, Jignesh	Senior Planning Analyst	Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission
✓		Montazery, Yadollah	Assistant Director	Chicago OEMC
*		Shiffer, Michael	Vice President, Planning and Development	Chicago Transit Authority
✓		Smith, Gordon	Senior Metropolitan Planning Manager	IDOT, Office of Planning and Programming
	✓	TBD		Federal Transit Administration

* Jeffrey Busby served on behalf of CTA in place of Mike Shiffer.

Others in Attendance

Present	Name	Organization
✓	Barber, David	Village of Downers Grove
✓	Benedict, Albert	Center for Neighborhood Technology
✓	Busby, Jeffrey	CTA
✓	Cole, Rob	Village of Oak Park
✓	Flood, John	Village of Hillside
✓	Parker, Andrew	Pace
Staff		
✓	Allen, Mignon	Dovetail Consulting
✓	Catalina, Tony	American Consulting Engineers
✓	Doenges, Dan	Wilbur Smith and Assoc.
✓	Kukreja, Charu	RTA
✓	Lenski, Bill	RTA
✓	Mitchell, Gary	Wilbur Smith and Assoc.
✓	O'Holleran, John	American Consulting Engineers
✓	Ryan, Michelle	RTA
✓	Seeger, Nancy	Nancy Seeger Assoc.