

	<p><b>Technical Committee</b></p>	<p>July 24, 2006</p>
	<p>A meeting of the <b>Technical Committee</b> of the Cook DuPage Corridor Study was held on <b>July 27, 2006</b> at 1:30 PM at the CATS/NIPC Offices, DuPage Conference Room, Sears Tower, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor, Chicago.</p> <p>This document provides a summary of the discussion for each agenda item and attendance rosters.</p> <p><b>I. Call to Order</b></p> <p>Patrick Higgins, Chair of the Technical Committee called the meeting to order at 1:38 PM and requested all attendees complete the sign-in sheet. Mr. Higgins welcomed a new member of the Technical Committee, Mr. David Werner from the Federal Transit Administration.</p> <p>A new roster for the Technical Committee was distributed that added Mr. Werner, indicated the “Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning” as the new organizational name for CATS and NIPC and indicated a current vacancy resulting from Ms. Jill Leary’s recent departure from West Central Municipal Conference.</p> <p><b>II. Approval of May 4 and May 18 Meeting Summaries</b></p> <p>Mr. Higgins confirmed that there were two sets of meeting summaries for committee action: the May 4 conceptual options working session summary and a May 18 business meeting summary.</p> <p>On a motion by Mr. Bob Dean and a second by Ms. Tam Kutzmark, the Technical Committee’s May 4 working session meeting summary was unanimously approved with no corrections or revisions.</p> <p>On a motion by Ms. Kutzmark and a second by Robert Cole, the May 18, 2006 Technical Committee meeting summary was unanimously approved with the following correction to page 18: “DuPage Area <del>Transportation</del> <u>Transit</u> Plan” as noted by Ms. Kutzmark.</p> <p>Mr. Higgins recapped the May 25 Policy Committee meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Policy Committee reviewed the conceptual options and several draft documents which included the Public Involvement Plan, the Goals and Objectives, and the Preliminary Purpose and Need for Mobility Improvements.</li> <li>▪ There were a few changes to the draft documents made by the Policy Committee prior to their approval to release the documents for public comment.</li> </ul> <p>Michelle Ryan specified that the following changes were made by the Policy Committee prior to the committee’s approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reference to roadway and transit were added to Goal 3, such that it now reads: Improve Roadway and Transit Service Quality in the I-290 Travel Corridor.</li> </ul>	

July 24, 2006

- The draft Preliminary Purpose and Need for Mobility Improvements document was revised to:
  - reflect the approved wording change to Goal 3,
  - add data sources to the tables and figures,
  - include an additional reference to the *2040 Framework Plan*,
  - add Grand Avenue to the list of east-west arterial highways in the corridor on page 10.

Ms. Ryan stated that while the changes were not major, the Technical Committee should be aware of them. The Policy Committee also added a third public meeting that was held in Wheaton at the DuPage County government center on Tuesday, June 27, 2006, 6:00 PM – 8:00 PM.

Mr. Higgins informed the committee that revised copies of all draft documents will be provided after the RTA completes their review of public comment and incorporates any resulting changes into the documents.

### **III. June Public Meetings and Comment**

Mr. Higgins noted that he attended the three public meetings and that several other committee members attended, as well.

Ms. Ryan provided the following report on the public meetings:

- Approximately sixty (60) people attended the meetings
- The most well attended meeting was held in Cicero
- The Cicero location was selected in an effort to reach the Hispanic population, but few Hispanic people attended. Additional outreach for future efforts will need to be discussed by the Citizen Advisory Committee.
- The Conceptual Options were well received by the public
- The public responses were very helpful
- The public feedback indicated no pressing need to weigh the Goals at this time

Ms. Ryan directed the committee's attention to Attachment 3, 'June 2006 Public Input Summary.' The focus of the public meetings was centered on two interactive exercises – one with respect to the Goals and the other for the Conceptual Options. Ms. Ryan explained that the summary of the responses - while not statistically significant - reflect very meaningful input.

The Committee reviewed Table 1 which presented the public responses to the Goals. He noted that while there was not a large attendance by the general public, it was important for the RTA to provide the opportunity for comment.

July 24, 2006

Mr. Higgins stated it was clear that Reverse Commute, Transit and Roadway Improvements along I-290, and Maximize Community and Corridor Benefits were identified as the goals most important to meeting participants.

Ms. Ryan explained that each participant was asked to indicate which three (of the seven) goals they thought were most important. Generally, citizens who lived in the eastern portion of the corridor prioritized Goal 1 to develop transit options for the Reverse Commute Goal 2 to address the Intersuburban Commute, and those who lived in the central and western areas of the corridor indicated the opposite priority.

Ms. Ryan then reviewed the public responses to the Conceptual Options exercise, in which participants were asked to identify which concept (of five) they preferred (1) most, (2) least, (3) and why. Ms. Ryan indicated that meeting attendees indicated preference for the Multiple Hub and Spoke and the Grid Network conceptual options. The option that clearly stood out the most in terms of being least preferred by the public was the Point-to-Point concept. Ms. Ryan noted that the public was also provided comment forms to explain their likes and dislikes for each concept, as well as to provide feedback on the draft documents. Ms. Ryan indicated a listing of comments from the public comment forms were provided beginning on page 3 of Attachment 3.

Ms. Ryan requested confirmation from the Technical Committee for the study team to focus attention on the Multiple Hub and Spoke and Grid Network conceptual options based on the public input received.

Committee members Kutzmark and Cole expressed concern that given the limited number of participants that attended the meeting, the sentiment of these respondents may not accurately reflect the preferences of the entire region.

Claire Bozic inquired whether the public was offered adequate opportunity for public input. RTA consultant team member Mignon Allen noted that when public meeting attendees were asked how they heard about the meeting, many responded that they heard about it through the radio and newspaper. The extensive media outreach for mass communication purposes was effective in the effort to inform the public of the opportunity to provide input; the meeting attendance was due to people opting not to exercise that choice. Ms. Ryan noted that aside from the public meetings, people also provided comments through other means such as the website, email and letters.

Ms. Ryan noted that the public input event was early in the options development process and that staff recognizes - and the Citizen Advisory Committee anticipated - that at this conceptual stage there is not usually as much attendance [at public meetings]. Participation

July 24, 2006

and interest tends to increase in the later stages of the process when there is something more concrete to review. She indicated that it is nevertheless important to use public input that was collected to guide our thinking as we move forward to develop detailed options. Albert Benedict of CNT and member of the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), noted that the CAC and discussed their expectations regarding turn-out and had anticipated an attendance of approximately seventy-five people.

Ms. Ryan noted that later in this meeting (Agenda Item VI) staff would present initial working versions of the detailed options. The detailed options are hybrids of the concepts that rely relatively more on the concepts of Hub and Spoke and grid, than Point-to-Point, based on the public input received. Ms. Ryan requested that the Technical Committee provide feedback on whether or not the RTA is on the right track with the working versions of the detailed options during discussion of that agenda item.

Mr. Higgins requested that newspaper articles resulting from the media outreach be posted on the website and/or included in the future meeting packets. Ms. Allen indicated that the articles have been collected in Adobe PDF format and that the consultant team will post them on the website along with a summary of the outreach efforts and public meetings.

Mr. Higgins then inquired whether committee members desired to eliminate the Point-to-Point Service option and expressed his concern for eliminating anything at this point. Mr. Higgins indicated that the problem with Point-to-Point is people understand it as getting caught in the same congestion and gridlock as other modes. Ms. Ryan added that responses to the conceptual options indicate that people believe a Point-to-Point system would offer fewer places to connect to than a grid or hub network. Ms. Ryan noted that it's possible to emphasize the hub and grid concepts in the Detailed Options, while including all concepts at least to some extent.

Ms. Ryan reported that a number of letters were received during the public comment period. The RTA is still processing this input and will present staff recommendations to the Technical Committee in August, but would like early guidance from the Technical Committee on a few specific public comments:

- A public comment stated that the wording of the Goals suggests more of a task than a desired end result. For example for example, develop transit options to major employment centers for reverse commuters is a task and more appropriate wording for a goal may be, 'Improve mobility to employment centers....' Staff is inclined to revise the wording of each goal slightly based on this comment

July 24, 2006

and bring the revised Goals back to the Technical Committee for review and approval. *The Technical Committee agreed with the staff recommendation to revise the wording.*

- Another public comment was either to replicate an objective within several goals or to make it clear in the Evaluation Framework Methodology that the goals are equally weighted. *The Technical Committee agreed with the staff's intended direction to update the Evaluation Methodology Framework rather than to replicate objectives.*
- Citizens for Appropriate Transportation (CAT) suggested an alternative means for evaluating the options. The RTA staff recently met with the CAT representatives, but have not yet had the opportunity to evaluate the positive and negative impacts of applying the proposed alternative methodology or the resources required to apply it.

Mr. Hazlett inquired whether the evaluation criteria will be applied to options, which are a combination of projects, or applied to individual projects. Ms. Ryan responded that the intention is to apply the evaluation criteria to the entire option and to the variations of specific elements within an option.

Mr. Hazlett noted that at some point the concepts will become more concrete and getting people to the many places they want to go becomes a cost issue, particularly for Point-to-Point service. He suggested that the committee could set a limit, for example \$2 billion, for all projects included in an option. (The committee contemplated the suggestion but no further discussion took place.)

#### **IV. Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) Housing and Affordability Index**

Mr. Higgins introduced the next agenda topic, a presentation by Albert Benedict from the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT). Mr. Higgins referenced the May 18 Technical Committee meeting, at which a letter from Mr. Benedict was distributed. The letter suggested that CNT's housing and transportation affordability index tool could serve as one of the evaluation criteria. On May 18, the Technical Committee requested that RTA staff follow up with CNT to learn more about the index and report back to the committee at today's meeting.

Ms. Ryan reported that staff from RTA and CNT had since met to discuss the potential applicability of the tool to the Cook DuPage Corridor study. The RTA and CNT are still thinking through how the tool might apply the upcoming Cook DuPage Corridor Alternatives Analysis study phase or to the RTA's Strategic Plan (a separate and on-going regional effort). Ms. Ryan stated the purpose of today's special briefing was to provide the committee with a better sense of

what the tool is, as the issue may be brought to the Technical Committee for further consideration at some future point.

Mr. Benedict distributed a slide presentation handout, "*Household Transportation Affordability*" and a brochure, "*The Affordability Index: A New Tool for Measuring the True Affordability of a Housing Choice*" and presented the definition, variables and assumptions used to construct the Housing and Affordability Index. Following the presentation, Mr. Benedict responded to questions from the Technical Committee:

*Ms. Kutzmark: Could you explain the high, medium, and low use? Mr. Benedict: It applies to how much non-auto commuting was done in the ½ mile around the transit stations.*

*Ms. Kutzmark: What is the definition of a transit zone? Mr. Benedict: A half-mile around a transit station.*

*Ms. Bozic: Would you say that this tool is most appropriate for rail transit or is the model valid for buses? Mr. Benedict: We advocate the use of the tool for all modes...we did validate bus connectivity.*

*Mr. Higgins: One of the things we identified early on in this study was nine different travel patterns. Does the index accommodate these travel patterns or is it just applicable to the traditional commute of into the City and out? Mr. Benedict: The model is an econometric tool that is neutral to travel patterns, but it could consider them.*

*Jignesh Mehta: How much validity does the model have when looking into the future, for example, the year 2030? Mr. Benedict: We are developing that right now. We will run the model for the Chicago region and determine what the region would look like with greater densities and how that will affect transportation and household costs.*

*Mr. Pappas: Is the model based on trip origins? Mr. Benedict: No, the model is based on urban form and neighborhood characteristics... essentially the model is descriptive.*

Mr. Higgins encouraged CNT to continue to work with the RTA and consultant team to determine how the index could be used.

#### **V. Guest Presentation: I-290 Cap the Ike Project**

Mr. Higgins introduced committee member Mr. Cole who explained that Bob Andrews from the URS Corporation has been working closely with Oak Park to develop an approach to cap I-290 and in doing so, enhance transit opportunities and ameliorate any public health and environmental impacts that may result from the final I-290 reconstruction project.

Mr. Andrews provided a PowerPoint presentation and status update on the I-290 Cap the Ike project. A handout of the presentation was distributed. Following the presentation, Mr. Andrews responded to the following questions from the Technical Committee:

**Mr. Higgins:** *So essentially the project is a structural system. Mr. Andrews:* *Effectively, it is a bridge.*

**Mr. Higgins:** *It does not appear that additional lanes are accommodated in your diagram. Mr. Andrews:* *Since that project is not done, what we tried to do was get these concepts down on paper so they can be considered by Illinois Department of Transportation in the Environmental Analysis phase.*

**Beth McCluskey:** *What is the length of the project and the estimated project cost? Mr. Andrews:* *The length is 1 ½ miles and the estimated cost is \$800 million.*

**John Baczek:** *Is that cost just the cap or reconstruction? Mr. Andrews:* *Just the cap, including safety systems, earth, water and drainage...building costs are not included.*

**Ms. Bozic:** *Have you looked into funding? Mr. Andrews:* *We have looked into funding sources for operations. This is a difficult issue because Parks and Recreation does not have the funding to operate more parks although they would like more.*

**Chuck Kadlec:** *Is this Phase I and will there be another phase? Mr. Andrews:* *We would like our information to be incorporated into IDOT's Environmental Assessment.*

**Bill Lenski:** *Do you have an estimate of operational costs? Mr. Andrews:* *The biggest ticket item is fire protection.*

After inviting any further questions, Mr. Higgins thanked Mr. Cole and Mr. Andrews for the presentation.

#### **IV. Detailed Options**

RTA staff presented a progress report on the development of the Detailed Options. Mr. Lenski reported that since the public meetings, the RTA has been working to translate the Conceptual Options into more concrete transportation improvement options. He explained that the options are currently in working draft form and that there is much more work ahead.

Mr. Lenski distributed a series of maps that provided a general description, employment centers access/served, major capital investments, other transit investments, other highway investments, transfers and access points, and potential variations for select elements within each Detailed Option. Ms. Ryan commented that as discussed earlier, the Hub-and-Spoke and Grid concept are reflected in

July 24, 2006

all working version options. The study team is seeking input on specific improvements that may require more or less emphasis, and confirmation that the team is moving in the right direction.

Mr. Lenski described Option A, assisted by a PowerPoint presentation to explain the various components.

Mr. Higgins noted that it was a lot of information to absorb in this meeting. He suggested the committee meet the following Thursday (Aug. 3) for a special meeting that focused solely on the four options to more fully understand each option. Committee members were receptive to the proposed special meeting.

Rick Boehm suggested that it would also be helpful if the components of each option were broken down into layers in the hand out materials, as they are in the PowerPoint.

Mr. Dean requested that the travel markets and employment centers served be included on the description for each Detailed Options. Ms. Ryan responded that that the information can be included but we will not be able to describe how well the travel markets or employment centers are served at this point.

Ms. Kutzmark sought clarification of what determined if a project was a major capital investment versus other transit investment and Ms. Ryan explained that a major capital investment is a physical improvement anticipated to cost over \$100 million while other transit investments are physical and/or service improvements that are anticipated to be less than that amount.

Ms. Ryan noted that there was still much work to be done and announced four topical small group working sessions at the RTA offices, desired core participants for each discussion and an anticipated schedule:

1. Improvements to the I-290 Corridor  
When: Monday, August 7, 1:30 p.m.  
Who: IDOT, CTA, Pace, Oak Park and WCMC  
Focus: To better understand ROW and existing conditions
2. Transportation Management and Operations  
When: Monday, August 7, 3:00 p.m.  
Who: Naperville, PACE, CTA, IDOT, Tollway, Metra, Cook Co., DuPage Co.  
Focus: To understand what TM&O strategies to consider in developing the TM&O component and what is already in place.

3. J Route Tail

When: Tuesday, August 8, 9:00 a.m.

Who: Tollway, Naperville, IDOT

Focus: To deal with the western segment (tail) of the proposed J Route

4. Circulator Distribution Systems

When: Tuesday, August 8, 10:30 a.m.

Who: Pace, DMMC, CTA, Oak Park, Downers Grove (as shuttle operators) CNT, bicycle organizations

Focus: To determine how to address circulator systems in the Cook DuPage Corridor study

Ms. Ryan encouraged committee members to extend an invitation to other staff within their organization who may have particularly relevant expertise. She indicated that she would send a follow-up email and further information to core participants and committee members.

**VII. Other Business**

This agenda item was not addressed.

**VIII. Next Regular Meeting: August 24**

Mr. Higgins reviewed the dates of the next two Technical Committee meetings: August 3 (special review session of working version Detailed Options) and August 24 (regular business meeting). He also noted the August 7 and 8 working session dates.

Final comments:

**IX. Adjourn**

On a motion by Mr. Dean, and a second by Mr. Boehm, the Committee adjourned the meeting at 3:11 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
	✓	Vacant	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
✓		Werner, David	Community Planner	Federal Transit Administration

\* Alternate(s) present:

Chuck Kadlec served on behalf of IDOT-DIPT, in place of Mr. Abraham  
 Nick Pappas served on behalf of DuPage County, in place of Mr. Avery  
 Jack Bauer served on behalf of Metra, in place of Ms. Ciavarella  
 Peter Fahrenwald served on behalf of CTA, in place of Mr. Shiffer

---

---

**Others in Attendance**

---

Present	Name	Organization
✓	Fera, Dorin	Village of Downers Grove
✓	Lee, Aimee	Chicago Transit Authority
✓	Parker, Andrew	PACE

**Staff**

✓	Allen, Mignon	Dovetail Consulting
✓	Berman, Gidon	RTA
✓	Catalina, Tony	American Consulting Engineers
✓	Lenski, Bill	RTA
✓	Mitchell, Gary	Wilbur Smith Associates
✓	O'Holleran, John	American Consulting Engineers
✓	Ryan, Michelle	RTA
✓	Seeger, Nancy	Nancy Seeger Associates