



**UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM COMMITTEE  
MEETING**

**MINUTES**

April 4, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 AM at the Chicago Area Transportation Study, DuPage County Conference Room, 233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 800, Chicago, Illinois. Those present at the meeting were:

**Unified Work Program Committee Members**

<b>Illinois Department of Transportation</b>	<b>Gordon Smith, <i>Chair</i></b>
<b>Chicago Department of Transportation</b>	<b>David Seglin</b>
<b>Chicago Transit Authority</b>	<b>David Simmons, James Richmond*</b>
<b>Council of Mayors</b>	<b>Dan Podgorski</b>
<b>Counties</b>	<b>Jason Osborn*</b>
<b>Metra</b>	<b>Thomas Weaver*</b>
<b>NIPC</b>	<b>Linda Bolte*</b>
<b>Pace</b>	<b>Lorraine Snorden, Tom Radak*</b>
<b>Regional Transportation Authority</b>	<b>Mark Pitstick, Patty Mangano*</b>
<b>CATS</b>	<b>Patricia Berry</b>

\* Alternate Member

**Interested Parties**

DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference	Tam Kutzmark
Illinois Department of Transportation	Carl Mikyska
Illinois Department of Transportation DPIT	Amy Welk
Kane/Kendall Council of Mayors	Erin Willrett, Holly Smith
North Central Council of Mayors	Beth McCluskey
Southwest Council of Mayors	Vicky Smith

**CATS Staff**

Bola Delano	Craig Heither
Parry Frank	Don Kopec

***MEETING SUMMARY***

**A. Approval of Minutes**

The meeting minutes from the March 21, 2006 meeting were unanimously approved on a motion by Mr. Weaver and a second by Mr. Podgorski.

## **B. Discussion and Approval of FY07 Tier II portion**

Mr. Smith stated that the UWP process did not end up where IDOT felt it should but that important strides were made and a more thorough review of projects was conducted. He briefly described the proposed UWP IDOT developed at the committee's request. All projects scoring 31 points or higher in the Tier II ranking exercise were included and added to the Core program approved by the committee in December. The remaining funds were balanced based on agency priorities leaving an unspent balance of \$166,588. Agencies have the flexibility to assign final dollar amounts to specific projects within their Tier II allotments and Mr. Smith asked that members provide the final project amounts to CATS staff by April 7<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Seglin stated the City of Chicago would like some of the remaining funds to conduct Central Area pedestrian counts. He noted that Chicago is a focus city of the FHWA based on high pedestrian fatality rates and that pedestrian counts and flow information were needed. He stated CATS had volunteered \$80,000 of its UWP funding for the project and that an additional \$100,000 would fund it entirely. Mr. Weaver and Mr. Simmons were both supportive of the project.

Ms. Bolte asked if there were any areas of interest to the RPB that were not covered in the UWP. Mr. Smith did not know of any such areas. Ms. Bolte stated one option was to not program the balance and to let the RPB use it.

Mr. Osborn stated he would like to receive some funding for a traffic model McHenry is developing. He stated CATS staff time is limited but the counties must do long-range planning and rely on CATS for modeling. Mr. Weaver asked if the funding would go to CATS. Mr. Osborn stated the county would coordinate with CATS but the money would help fund a consultant for the county. Mr. Weaver asked if this would set a precedent for the other counties and noted that Metra had consciously stuck with CATS modeling. Mr. Osborn stated CATS staff does not have time to run scenario testing and cited an example of an arterial extension across the Union Pacific line where traffic estimates from CATS were much lower than when new housing developments were factored in.

Ms. Bolte and Mr. Smith both stated CATS staffing has been restricted. Mr. Smith asked what impact the McHenry model would have on CATS. Mr. Kopec stated this would give the county the modeling capability to supplement what CATS provides. He noted that some other counties have this ability and that there was precedent for using UWP funds. Mr. Weaver stated he would like to see a regional solution to the problem if CATS is not serving the counties at the level they need and asked if providing additional resources to CATS would help. Ms. Berry stated CATS could not acquire staff as quickly as McHenry County needs. Mr. Kopec and Mr. Smith both agreed that the project was eligible for UWP funding.

Mr. Weaver stated the region should make CATS more responsive to the counties as a general policy. Mr. Smith stated the RPB will address the staffing issues and suggested the committee give \$100,000 to CDOT for the pedestrian counts and \$66,588 to McHenry County for its traffic model. Ms. Bolte pointed out NIPC's funding issues and Mr. Smith reiterated that IDOT would not diminish its level of support until the RPB has addressed funding the new agency. Mr. Weaver asked about a schedule for merging CATS and NIPC staffs. Mr. Smith noted that the funding report to the General Assembly is due in September, which should have a plan for

merging the staffs. Mr. Simmons asked if CATS staff will be state employees following July 1<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Kopec and Mr. Smith stated that had not been determined yet.

Mayor Podgorski made a motion to accept IDOT's recommendation on the Tier II portion of the program and to give an additional \$100,000 to CDOT for pedestrian counts and \$66,588 to McHenry County for its traffic model. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pitstick and was unanimously approved.

### **C. Approval to Recommend FY07 UWP to Work Program Committee**

Mr. Seglin made a motion for the committee to send the Core program and Tier II recommendations to the Work Program Committee (WPC) for approval as the FY07 UWP. The motion was seconded by Mayor Podgorski and was unanimously approved. Ms. Bolte stated Mr. Coglianesse wanted to be sure the WPC received all proposals, not just those selected for funding. Mr. Smith stated they will be given all of the proposals.

### **D. Discussion of Local Agency Contributions/FY08 MPO Funding**

Ms. Berry noted that the topic of local agency contributions to CATS had been discussed at the SAFETEA-LU Subcommittee meeting and that the contribution schedule had not changed since 1971. She stated the subcommittee had referred the issue to the RPB Transition Committee, which is dealing with funding the RPB, and that CATS staff had been instructed to send out the contribution letter for FY 2008. Mr. Seglin noted that some CATS members voluntarily contribute to CATS, for instance the City of Chicago contributes \$40,000 to CATS as well as \$140,000 to NIPC annually. He stated expenses have definitely changed since 1971.

### **E. Discussion of UWP Document Preparation**

Mr. Frank noted that CATS staff will need some additional information from the agencies in order to finalize the UWP document, including the non-UWP funded transportation planning studies to be undertaken in FY07. Staff will start with the SPR-funded studies and is attempting to develop a more comprehensive listing of transportation planning studies than has been compiled in the past. Mr. Heither noted staff will also need to request information for other UWP appendices, such as agency overhead rates and Title VI requirements. CATS staff will coordinate the information to be requested from each agency and will send the request in the next couple of weeks.

### **F. Other Business**

Ms. Delano stated that she will be working with staff to implement a project monitoring system for UWP projects. This effort will not involve financial monitoring but will examine the impacts and effectiveness of implementing projects. Mr. Smith stated that this would address the tracking database recommendation in the federal certification review and that UWP Committee members' assistance was appreciated.

Ms. Snorden noted that the committee began the UWP development process earlier this cycle. Mr. Smith stated a more thorough review of the projects was conducted this time. He stated that the FY07 UWP recommendation would go to the WPC on April 28<sup>th</sup> and the Policy Committee on June 8<sup>th</sup>.

**G. Next Meeting**

The UWP Committee is on-call and no next meeting was scheduled. The meeting was adjourned at 10:35 AM.