

## Technical Committee

April 27, 2006

A meeting of the **Technical Committee** of the Cook DuPage Corridor Study was held on **April 27, 2006** at 1:30 p.m. at the CATS/NIPC Offices, DuPage Conference Room, Sears Tower, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor, Chicago.

This document provides a summary of the discussion for each agenda item and attendance rosters.

### I. Call to Order

Mr. Patrick Higgins, Chair of the Technical Committee called the meeting to order at 1:50 p.m. and requested all attendees complete the sign-in sheet. Mr. Higgins requested Michelle Ryan provide a brief summary of the outcomes of the first meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC).

Ms. Ryan stated:

- CAC held its first meeting on April 27, 2006.
- CAC has fifteen members that represent a broad cross-section of interests including convention and visitors bureaus, bicycle groups and other interests that have varying backgrounds and knowledge of transportation.
- CAC reviewed and approved (with revisions) the Public Involvement Plan (PIP) for the Policy Committee's consideration.
- Mr. Fred Brandstrater, AIA who is with the American Institute of Architects and Board Liaison for Urban and Regional Affairs was selected as Chair of the CAC. The selection of a Vice Chair was deferred until a future meeting.
- CAC will meet again next month and Technical Committee members are welcome to attend all meetings.

### II. Approval of the March 23, 2006 Meeting Summary

Mr. Higgins reviewed the agenda items discussed at the March 23, 2006 Technical Committee Meeting:

- The Committee recommended a set of Goals and Objectives for mobility improvements
- The Committee approved an Evaluation Framework
- The Committee reviewed and discussed and updated version of the draft Preliminary Statement of Purpose and Need
- RTA project team member Tony Catalina briefly introduced some draft Evaluation Measures

Mr. Higgins explained that the Committee objectives for this meeting were to take action on the Preliminary Purpose and Need, review and discuss Evaluation Measures, and discuss the process of developing Conceptual Options.

April 27, 2006

On a motion made by Peter Godowski and a second by John Baczek, the minutes from March 23, 2006 Technical Committee Meeting were unanimously approved as presented.

### **III. Proposed Change to Recommended Goals and Objectives**

Mr. Higgins noted that there was a formal submittal of comments on the draft purpose by the Village of Oak Park and a letter from Rob Cole regarding recommended changes to the Goals and Objectives approved by the Technical Committee on March 23.

Mr. Higgins introduced Rob Cole, Interim Assistant to the Manager, Village of Oak Park, who replaced Pete Dame on the Technical Committee as a representative on behalf of the North Central Council of Mayors.

Mr. Higgins reviewed the major points raised by the Village of Oak Park, in a letter dated April 3, 2006:

- 1. Evaluation Criteria - Recommend the study follow the National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA) submittal requirements.*

Mr. Higgins noted that while it is important to reference the NEPA requirements in the study final report, we must not constrain this planning study with the NEPA requirements at this time. This study cannot be lock-step with IDOT as they are much further along in the process for I-290.

Mr. Godowski commented that while he understands where the Village of Oak Park stands in attempting to lock in on all the environmental issues, he does not think it is our mission to do an Environmental Impact Statement. He noted that [an EIS] may eventually happen based on the final projects we choose to pursue, but this study is not at that point.

- 2. Multimodal Solutions – Explicitly point to multimodal solutions.*

Mr. Higgins noted that while he believes that multimodal solutions are going to be recommended out of this Committee; he does not believe we should necessarily presume that at this point and all options should be on the table. While a single solution is not likely to result, we will study it if it does.

April 27, 2006

Mr. Cole stated that multimodal solutions are important and that if we start looking at alternatives down that road that are comparable to one another, there should be an explicit intent to select multimodal solutions over single mode solutions.

Mr. Higgins posed a question as to whether that presumes multimodal is better and whether the Committee wishes to make that assumption at this point.

Mr. Boehm, Vice Chair, responded that is too early in the process to make that assumption at this point and that he concurred with the concerns of Mr. Higgins that everything should be on the table. He reiterated that while a multimodal solution is likely to be the outcome based on the goals and objectives, but the Committee should not limit any idea from being developed.

*3. Public Participation – Allow opportunities for public input early and often.*

Mr. Higgins noted this may reflect a misunderstanding of the roles and responsibilities of the Corridor committees and sequence of event for decisions and recommendations. The Technical Committee is making recommendations to the Policy Committee. The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) will have had two meetings prior to the next meeting of the Policy Committee.

Mr. Cole noted that he had attended the CAC meeting held earlier that day and asked if his understanding was correct that the Technical Committee would review and consider CAC comments on the study documents, e.g. Goals and Objectives. Mr. Cole further inquired as to who will make a determination on whether or not there is sufficient public input or concern to warrant bringing the Goals and Objectives, for example, back to the Technical Committee for further discussion.

Ms. Ryan clarified that public input and comments that affect the work of Technical Committee will come back to the Technical Committee (in terms of revising study documents), and that as Project Manager for the Cook DuPage Corridor Study, she will be carefully reviewing all comments and directing them to appropriate Committee for further review and consideration, as appropriate.

April 27, 2006

Next, Mr. Higgins reviewed the comments submitted by the Village of Oak Park, in a letter dated April 20, 2006:

1. Goal 3. Improve Service Quality in the I-290 Corridor – Add new objective, “Avoid/mitigate adverse impacts on local communities and enhance local economic development.”

Mr. Baczek suggested that the Committee should not bind ourselves to “mitigate impacts”, as we are not in the NEPA process. “Avoid impacts” makes sense, but mitigate is not the direction we should follow.

Mr. Cole offered that mitigate strikes an important point, as it is naïve to assume that moving forward, there will not be adverse affects resulting from the decisions that we are making. The concept of mitigation points to the need to not only to avoid or minimize negative impacts but wherever possible, to come up with constructive and creative concepts that will actually act to mitigate those effects that we know or should know are going to take place.

Ms. Bozic stated that there are objectives that currently address these issues:

- Goal 4. Objective 2: Enhance economic development/redevelopment opportunities
- Goal 4. Objective 3. Consider extent of and minimize adverse impacts of land acquisition

While Mr. Cole acknowledged that there is some duplication between the proposed objective and the objectives already included in Goal 4, he expressed concern that typically the objectives beneath a goal establish the logic for goal attainment, thus the absence of minimizing/mitigating language under goal 3 may encourage goal attainment at all costs. He noted that he recommended the addition of this objective to Goal 3 - which addresses improving service quality on I-290 - because none of the existing objectives for Goal 3 contemplates minimizing or mitigating adverse affects. One of the objectives in improving I-290 service quality should be specifically to avoid or minimize or mitigate adverse affects associated with enhancements we might propose.

Mr. Higgins requested how many Committee members were in favor of the proposed additional objective to Goal 3; no committee members expressed a desire to make the change.

Ms. Ryan noted clarified that the objectives are collective. Goal 4, Objective 1 “minimize adverse impacts on and promote the benefits on existing communities, neighborhoods, and people,”

	will address and evaluate Mr. Cole's concern regarding adverse impacts of each of the Options.	
		April 27, 2006

April 27, 2006

Ms. Bozic commented that the Options will include different kinds of projects, and that we should not have special measures exclusively set aside for I-290. Ms. Bozic suggested that a reordering of the Goals, where Goal 4 precedes Goal 3, could increase the public's understanding of the importance and emphasis on communities in the Goals and Objectives.

Ms. Kutzmark stated that to add another objective to Goal 3 focusing on communities may dilute impact of the Goal's current objectives and their intent to improve the transportation system service.

Mr. Cole indicated that he recognized the while the proposed change is not widely accepted at this juncture, mitigation is an important component of this approach. It is not unusual in planning or development when you consume a certain amount of acres to mitigate that effect by re-planting elsewhere. He stated that mitigation is not a foreign concept and to ignore it in our Goals and Objectives does a disservice to the process; Mr. Cole requested that the Committee reconsider.

Mr. Baczek emphasized that mitigation in planning speaks to Phase 1 of the NEPA planning process, and that mitigation is not appropriate for this process.

Discussion of the item concluded with no changes to Goal 3. The Committee then turned their attention to the second change proposed by Mr. Cole.

2. Goal 4: Community and Corridor Benefits – Add new objective, "Maximize integration with and compliment county and/or local plans."

Mr. Higgins called forth the March 23, 2006 meeting summary and identified where Mr. Dame withdrew his request to revise this objective. Discussion of the item concluded with no changes to Goal 3.

3. Goal 6: Minimize Adverse Environmental Impacts – Add new objective, "Avoid/mitigate adverse impacts to national, state, or local parks as well as historic properties."

Mr. Higgins noted that parks and green space are included in the existing language of Goal 6 Objective 4, but historic structures are not specifically identified. The committee concurred with adding historic properties to the objective. On a motion made by Mr. Baczek and a second by Rick Boehm the Committee unanimously approved the objective to read:

“Avoid/minimize adverse impacts to sensitive land uses, historic properties and open space.”

The discussion of Mr. Cole’s proposed changes concluded. Ms. Kutzmark then made an additional suggestion to revise Goal 4, Objective 4, “Maximize achievement of Corridor Planning Standards” to read “Implement or apply Corridor Planning Standards.”

Ms. Ryan noted that if the Options were to be evaluated with this recommended change, each Option would then receive a “yes” or “no” for having applied Corridor Planning Standards. “Maximize achievement of” would result in a measure of the extent to which an Option meets or exceeds the goal.

Ms. Bozic inquired whether the Corridor Planning Standards would relate to context-sensitive solutions or how a project will be implemented or designed. Mr. Lenski replied that Corridor Planning Standards are intended to address the look and feel of projects and how they would be designed, but is broader than context-sensitive design. The planning standards refer to multiple criteria for what corridor communities would like to see and what they value in the way of mobility and travel options – where people want to connect to, origins and destinations that need to be served, what the options should look and feel like for the communities. The objective is written well enough to measure how well the Options do or do not achieve the planning standards (whatever they turn out to be.)

Mr. Higgins suggested that staff include language explaining corridor planning standards for the purposes of public education and understanding.

The Committee determined that retaining current language would be preferable. No further comments, questions or proposed changes were put forth by the Committee.

**IV. Draft Preliminary Statement of Purpose and Need**

Mr. Higgins introduced Mr. Lenski to review the most recent version of the Preliminary Statement of Purpose and Need.

Mr. Lenski indicated that the RTA received a number of comments to the document. Revisions have been made to respond to the comments and also to improve the overall flow and content of the document.

Mr. Lenski provided highlights of changes to the following sections of the Purpose and Need Statement:

- *Introduction*...better explained what constitutes and Option – to make clear that an Option is not just capital projects, but also new and enhance transit services, TM&O and ITS strategies.
- *Summary of Purpose and Need*...added more context to clarify that the Purpose and Need Statement is based on broad corridor mobility needs based on the Travel Market Analysis and no specific action requiring federal funding is proposed at this time; however, the Purpose and Need Statement may serve as the basis for such a statement as the study progresses. Also, expanded the summary section to include the four major mobility needs identified in the Travel Market Analysis.
- *Relationship to 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)*...strengthened connection between Cook DuPage Corridor and the RTP to integrate the various strategies and projects.
- *Goals and Objectives*...added goals and objectives considered by the Committee.

On a motion by Rick Boehm and a second by Beth McCluskey, the Draft Preliminary Statement of Purpose and Need was unanimously approved, as amended by the previous discussion (Agenda Item III), for consideration of the Policy Committee.

**V. Status of Evaluation Measures**

Mr. Higgins directed the attention of the Committee to Attachment 5, a listing of the evaluation measures and corresponding goals and objectives, and Attachment 6, a brief description of each intended evaluation measure. Mr. Higgins informed the Committee that the current version of the evaluation measures incorporate comments provided by Mr. Dean.

Mr. Higgins referenced a recent memorandum to the Technical Committee dated April 24, 2006, in which he cautioned against formal Committee approval as it would limit the flexibility of the process and impede RTA staff and consultants at too fine a grain of detail. Mr. Higgins emphasized that the performance measures and evaluation framework are a work in progress and as the study progresses more creative and informative ways to measure the goals and objectives may arise.

No additional comments or questions were raised by the Committee.

**VI. Development of an “Illustrative” Conceptual Option**

Mr. Higgins requested Mr. Lenski provide an overview of the Conceptual Options.

Mr. Lenski described the role and involvement of the Technical Committee in the Options Development Process. The purpose of the agenda item was to introduce the idea of what is an option and what goes into the development of an option. The purpose of the upcoming [May 4] working session is to work through and develop an illustrative option using the tools and information that will be explained in the presentation. Following the working session, the RTA and consultants will construct a set of options that are developed to the same level of composition as the "illustrative" option. The set of options will come back through the Technical Committee at its next business meeting [May 18] for consideration prior to submittal to the Policy Committee.

Tony Catalina then explained the "Conceptual Options Development Process", assisted by a PowerPoint presentation; a summary of which follows:

- An option is a package of improvements that appear to meet the goals sufficiently well, are clearly defined, and represent different ways of achieving the same intent.
- Elements anticipated for inclusion in options are: major capital projects; alternative operational and congestion management strategies; Transportation System Management (TSM); new and enhanced transit services; and transfers and access points including new interchanges.
- Conceptual Development Process includes five steps:
  - Step 1: Major Element
  - Step 2: Mid-Major Element
  - Step 3: Minor Elements
  - Step 4: Circulation and Distribution Elements
  - Step 5: Infill and Support Elements
- Many pieces of data and information must be considered in the development of options including, but not limited to:
  - Trip Origin Densities,
  - Trip Destination Densities,
  - Work Travel Flows,
  - Non-Work Travel,
  - Employment Densities,
  - Population Densities,
  - Land Use Maps,
  - RTP Projects,
  - Corridor Travel Markets,
  - Environmental Justice Communities,
  - Corridor Purpose and Need
  - Corridor Goals and Objectives

April 27, 2006

Mr. Catalina also reviewed a series of maps and displays posted around the room related to origins, destinations, work travel flows, travel markets, population and employment densities, etc..

Mr. Catalina concluded the presentation with an overview of the five-step option development process using a hypothetical option.

Ms. Ryan indicated that the goal of the working session is for the Committee to develop one option to the point of general agreement and comfort about what "is" an option. Only then will we have the consultant team move forward with the development of a full set of options for release by the Policy Committee for public review.

Ms. Ryan further noted that when the Committee "approves" a set of options for the Policy Committee's consideration, it is not a final approval of the substance of the options. It is a recommendation that a set of conceptual options is ready to put forth for public review and comment.

Ms. Kutzmark inquired as to the type of input desired from the Committee at this time. Mr. Higgins responded that input on what tools and data are needed to develop the options at the Working Session. Ms. Kutzmark requested that the Committee revisit the PowerPoint presentation to better assist the RTA in identifying what data/tools relate to the ingredients that make up an option. Therefore, let us reconsider the ingredients that make up an option. [Mr. Catalina reviewed the applicable slides of the presentation.]

Ms. Bozic requested whether it possible to revise the maps and displays to reflect the existing service. Staff responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Mehta requested presenting features, specifically the centers, from the 2040 Regional Framework Plan. Ms. Ryan requested Mr. Mehta provide the RTA with the applicable information within the next few days, so that it could be included in the May 4 working session.

Mr. Godowski requested clarification regarding the intent of the collector/distributor circles on the "illustrative" option map. Mr. Catalina explained that the circles represent undefined collector/distributor systems within a ½ mile "capture" area. For this study, the capture area is best defined as major employment or activity centers. In the detailed options phase of the study, specific details regarding bus or other circulator options will be developed. He noted that it will be important for transit users to be able to arrive at a major employment center and have options to reach their final destination - which most likely will involve a rubber-tire option.

Mr. Mehta recommended that staff review a UIC study by Daniel McMillan regarding employment centers and offered to forward a copy of the study to RTA.

Consultant Team member Mary Lupa offered that issues beyond the alignment including service frequency, fare structure, wait times, connections to circulators, and reliability of commute times will also be considered – but further along in the process.

Ms. Bozic requested that the DuPage Area Transit Plan and traffic signal inventory be added to the list of data and information to be considered when developing an option.

Mr. Higgins wrapped up the discussion by confirming the date, time and location of the next Technical Committee working session:

- Date: Thursday, May 4
- Time: 12:30 p.m. (early start)
- Location: CATS/NIPC offices

At the request of Ms. Kutzmark, Ms. Ryan agreed to provide the Conceptual Option related meeting PowerPoint presentation on the Corridor website for further Technical Committee review and preparation prior to the May 4<sup>th</sup> working session.

Mr. Higgins also confirmed the date, time, location of the next business meeting of the Technical Committee which must occur prior, to the May 25<sup>th</sup> Policy committee:

- Date: Thursday, May 18, 2006
- Time: 1:30 p.m.
- Location: CATS/NIPC offices

#### **VII. Corridor Committees Report**

Ms. Ryan briefly informed the Technical Committee of the next Policy committee meeting date, time and location:

- Date: Thursday, May 25
- Time: 3:00 p.m.
- Location: Elmhurst City Hall

Technical committee members will receive an agenda, and are encouraged but not required to attend.

#### **VIII. Other Business**

There was no additional business.

#### **IX. Next Meetings**

Please see discussion in Agenda Items VI and VII.

#### **X. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 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
✓		Cole, Robert	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

\*David Kralik served on behalf of Metra.

\*\*Brenda McGruder served on behalf of CDOT.

\*\*\*Peter Farhenwald served on behalf of CTA.

---

---

**Others in Attendance**

---

Present	Name	Organization
✓	Benedict, Albert	Center for Neighborhood Technology
✓	Kralik, David	Metra
✓	McGruder, Brenda	Chicago Department of Transportation

**Staff**

✓	Allen, Mignon	Dovetail Consulting
✓	Catalina, Tony	American Consulting Engineers
✓	Holeman, Eric	Wilbur Smith and Associates
✓	Kukreja, Charu	RTA
✓	Lenski, Bill	RTA
✓	Lupa, Mary	Wilbur Smith and Associates
✓	O'Holleran, John	American Consulting Engineers
✓	Ryan, Michelle	RTA