

**CHICAGO AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY  
TIP PROCEDURES COMMITTEE**

11:30 AM February 25, 2002

Minutes (approved 8/13/02)

Attendees:

Jack Groner, Metra, Chair	Vance Hultgren, ISTHA
Vanessa Adams-Donald, FTA	Don Kopec, CATS
Patricia Berry, CATS	Megan Mack, CATS
Randy Blankenhorn, IDOT/OPP	Carl Mikyska, IDOT/OPP
Claire Bozic, CATS	Tom Palzer, CATS
Dick Brazda, Pace	Ross Patronsky, CATS
Christine Bridges, CDOT	Pat Pechnick, IDOT/District 1
Michael Connelly, CTA	Mark Pitstick, RTA
John DeLaurentis, RTA	Thomas Rickert, Kane County, representing Counties
Michelle Dick, DMMC	Chad Riddle, IDOT-LR
Teri Dixon, CATS	Mike Rogers, IEPA
Rocky Donahue, Pace	Pat Schroeder, McHenry COM, representing COM
Peter Elliott, CATS	Gerri Scott, Pace
Neil Ferrari, IDOT-DPT	Dave Seglin, CDOT
Jacky Grimshaw, CNT	David Simmons, CTA
Natashia Holmes, DMMC	John Tomczyk, CDOT

Chairman Groner called the meeting to order at 11:30 AM. For those that were not in attendance at the January 17 Policy Committee meeting, Mr. Groner reviewed the discussions there and reported that at the subsequent Work Program Committee meeting, the TIP Procedures Committee had been charged with recommending procedural changes to address inconsistencies between the five year program of the RTA and the region's TIP. He distributed and reviewed a summary he had developed of some of the FTA and RTA requirements, noting that the requirements are not inconsistent. Projects must be in the TIP before they can go forward and projects must be in an approved RTA program before they can go forward. Mr. Groner reviewed the two scenarios included in the summary and the most recent instance of timing issues with the RTA Board meeting on February 28. His proposal would allow CATS to make a conditional approval when a TIP change has not yet been approved as part of the RTA Program. Mr. Groner then opened the floor for discussion.

Mr. DeLaurentis said that the conditional approval proposal is an interesting administrative convenience, but the program approvals should be through a bottom-up approach. He said that there is a principal that locally approved programs need to be in place before they are submitted to the federal agencies. In terms of authority, the RTA Act goes beyond the federal requirements and shows we are really coordinated. When projects go to the federal agencies, they should be rock solid.

Ms. Adams-Donald asked what conditional approval would mean. Mr. Groner said it would mean that upon RTA approval, TIP changes that have been conditionally approved would need no further formal

CATS action in order to proceed. It would mean that timing issues would not impede the progress of projects. Ms. Adams-Donald said the federal agencies would not act on any project until it is part of the region's TIP. Mr. DeLaurentiis asked if such changes would have gone to the board of the Service Board prior to being considered at CATS. He said that in a way, this approach would be a reversal and the Board should approve any changes first. Mr. Groner agreed. He said the purpose of the proposal was to avoid delays in the program. He noted that RTA requires program revisions five weeks in advance of RTA Board consideration and CATS requires TIP Changes to be submitted a month ahead of time. Sometimes the timing of these submittals overlaps. Mr. DeLaurentiis noted that the RTA amends its program every twenty eight or twenty nine days and said that since unanticipated projects do not pop up often, the Service Boards should be able to keep their programs consistent. Mr. Groner said that as an example, fund source changes require approvals and do occur regularly and the timing of submittals may be an issue. Mr. Tomczyk noted that timing issues between the transit and highway programs had been around for a long time and the region must be sure that neither program be delayed. He said that Mr. Groner's proposal seems a reasonable way to address the timing issues.

Mr. DeLaurentiis agreed and said it would be interesting to have a TIP Procedures Committee to discuss the timing of highway projects. He asked if the city of Chicago's projects go to the City Council before coming to CATS and Mr. Tomczyk said they generally did not on individual basis but were included in an annual comprehensive ordinance. Mr. Tomczyk asked if RTA is proposing that there be no approved transit components of the TIP until RTA has approved its capital program? Mr. DeLaurentiis said no; the programs should be approved at the same time. Ms. Adams-Donald asked if her interpretation, that the region would be setting aside those conditionally approved revisions until RTA approval when submitting its TIP, is correct. Mr. Tomczyk said yes, and that is what we are proposing. Mr. DeLaurentiis said conditional approval would not mean anything. Ms. Adams-Donald said that under this proposal, it means that CATS would have to take no further formal action. Mr. Blankenhorn said that this is a timing issue and the region does not want the processes to get in the way of accomplishing the capital projects that we need. He said that if there were numerous conditional approvals, the TIP Procedures Committee might have to get back together and look at this issue again.

Mr. DeLaurentiis suggested that this proposal would put the RTA in the position of having difficulty defending its decision if it disagreed with a project. Conditional approval could be interpreted as saying that the whole region thinks this is a great project. Ms. Mack said that the Council of Mayors asks for what could be termed conditional approval when there are timing issues with the Work Program Committee and Council or Executive Committee meetings. TIP Changes are submitted pending approval by the Council or Executive Committee. Mr. DeLaurentiis said that if there wasn't a law, we could do that in this case, too. Ms. Dick said that the analogous Council of Mayors situation would be if the city of Naperville went to CATS without going to the DuPage Council. She suggested putting a time limit, perhaps thirty days, within which the RTA action must occur. If the RTA did not act to include the revisions, they would be dropped and have to come before the Work Program Committee again.

Mr. Ferrari said that there is no question that we all would like the RTA capital program and the region's TIP to be consistent. The question is can there be concurrent approvals between CATS, RTA and the Service Board, or must they be sequential? He said that each entity reviews program revisions

from a different standpoint. Under Mr. Groner's proposal, service board program revisions that have not been approved by the RTA Board are put in a holding place, held in abeyance. Mr. DeLaurentiis said the Work Program Committee should not take an action that results in a project being eligible but not approved. Ms. Adams-Donald said that from a regional perspective, the MPO would have looked at this proposed program change. Mr. DeLaurentiis agreed and said that would result in the scenario he described earlier, where the RTA Board is put in an undesirable position. Mr. Blankenhorn said that since RTA would have a good reason for disapproving any program revision, this would not be a concern. Mr. Simmons said the conditional approval would not compel the RTA Board to discharge its role in any way other than what it intends. Mr. Blankenhorn said that since the TIP Procedures Committee does not deal with programming issues they should recommend putting the proposed process in place to address the Work Program and Policy Committees' concerns. Mr. Pitstick said that by setting aside Pace's Capital Cost of Contacting project, the Pace submittal for the last Work Program Committee meeting had all kinds of inconsistencies with the RTA Capital Program. There are minor inconsistencies between the CTA and Metra programs included in the TIP and the RTA Capital Program. Mr. Brazda said that Pace's intention in submitting those TIP changes was to work toward the new marks.

Mr. Ferrari said that when the FTA is presented with an application from a Service Board it must be consistent with the TIP and so the Service Boards want to make sure their programs are consistent with the TIP. Mr. DeLaurentiis agreed and said the Service Boards should be sure the program that goes before the RTA Board, the Service Board and into the TIP is the same. Mr. Pitstick asked who would be responsible for doing the consistency check. Mr. Blankenhorn said he assumed it would be RTA. Mr. DeLaurentiis said that based on his reading of the federal regulations, he disagreed.

Mr. Kopec said there would be two classes of TIP changes—those that are consistent with the RTA Program and those that are not. The Service Board will identify which are not. Mr. Groner agreed. Mr. DeLaurentiis asked if this would be a self-certification by the Service Boards. Mr. Groner said yes. Mr. Blankenhorn repeated that he hoped it would be a rare occurrence that things would come before the CATS committees prior to RTA approval.

Mr. Pitstick said there are lots of sources for error in the proposal at hand. Mr. DeLaurentiis said the RTA proposes a linear process. Mr. Blankenhorn said if the proposed process doesn't work and RTA comes back six months down the road and says the Service Boards said their TIP and RTA programs were consistent and they are not, then this approach would have to be re-thought. A discussion of whether "conditional approval" was the appropriate term to describe the proposed process ensued. Mr. Ferrari suggested that it be made clear that a project would not be included in the region's TIP until after RTA Board action and that the date of inclusion in the TIP be the same as the date of the RTA action. CATS staff was directed to draft language revising the TIP Change and Project Grouping Procedures to incorporate the proposal on the table. Ms. Berry said the proposed revisions would be faxed out to the TIP Procedures Committee as soon as so that the agreed to language can be included in the Work Program Committee mailing.

Mr. Ferrari asked what action would be taken at the March 13 Policy Committee meeting if this approach is approved. Mr. Blankenhorn said the FY 02-06 TIP would be adopted with the disputed

Pace project not included as part of the official TIP. Mr. DeLaurentiis thanked everyone for their diligence and interest.