



UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

December 6, 2005

The meeting was held at 1:30 PM at the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission, 233 South Wacker Suite 800, Chicago, Illinois. Those present at the meeting were:

Unified Work Program Committee Members

Illinois Department of Transportation	Gordon Smith, <i>Chair</i>
Chicago Department of Transportation	David Seglin
Chicago Transit Authority	David Simmons, Ernestine Flient*
Council of Mayors	Dan Podgorski
Federal Highway Administration	Chris DiPalma
Metra	Jack Groner, Thomas Weaver*
NIPC	Ralph Coglianesse, Linda Bolte*
Regional Transportation Authority	Mark Pitstick
CATS	Mark Thomas

* Alternate Member

Interested Parties

DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference	Rick Curneal, Tam Kutzmark
Illinois Department of Transportation	Carl Mikyska
McHenry County Council of Mayors	Holly Ostdick
North Central Council of Mayors	Beth McCluskey
Southwest Council of Mayors	Vicky Smith

CATS Staff

Janet Bright
Parry Frank
Craig Heither

MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of Minutes

On a motion from Mr. Seglin and seconded by Mr. Weaver, the minutes of the October 25, 2005 committee meeting were approved without change.

B. Working Group Recommendation for Core Program

Mr. Smith summarized the tasks of the Working Group, which were to identify the core elements, estimate the number of person-months to complete the work and then apply dollar amounts to the work involved. He then presented three Core Program options for the Committee to consider.

- Scenario 1 was the initial effort of the Working Group. Tasks were divided into Core 1 (what the MPO is responsible for to meet federal certification) and Core 2 (efforts supportive of Core 1) tasks. Core program total: \$8.7M.
- Scenario 2 was developed after discussing Scenario 1 with the agencies individually and listening to their concerns. This scenario included program development work for Chicago, CTA and Metra as Core 2 tasks and some additional CATS and NIPC tasks as Core 1 work. Core program total: \$9.5M.
- Scenario 3 was developed by IDOT staff as an attempt to refocus and tighten the concept of core elements. It was based on Scenario 1 with some additional funding for CATS, CTA, Metra and NIPC. Most of the Council of Mayors (Council of Mayors) funding would move to the Competitive Selection process under this scenario. Core program total: \$7.9M.

Mr. Groner asked about the reason for developing Scenario 3. Mr. Smith stated there was a question of fairness raised by funding all of the Council of Mayors activities in Core 2. Mr. Seglin inquired about the arguments against Scenario 2. Mr. Smith stated some felt it did not reflect the true core elements and that they were looking to fund the staff needed to interface with the MPO staff to meet federal requirements. Mr. Coglianesi noted that any project not funded under the Core could be submitted for consideration in the Competitive Selection process. Mayor Podgorski asked if the mark was available yet. Mr. Smith stated the appropriations had not been passed yet but that IDOT was using a conservative estimate of \$18M.

Mayor Podgorski noted that the Working Group had not signed off on Scenario 3. Mr. Groner stated he did not agree with Scenario 3 because it said $\frac{3}{4}$ of the Council of Mayors work was not core. Mr. Seglin agreed and stated Scenario 2 treated the City and Council of Mayors equally. He also noted that scenario would leave about \$8.5M available for the Competitive Selection process which would increase opportunities to fund additional projects. Mr. Smith stated the goal was to identify the core elements and their cost, and he felt Scenarios 1 and 3 did that. Mr. Groner disagreed.

Ms. Bolte noted that Scenario 2 did not address NIPC's concerns with implementing the Framework Plan. Mr. Smith stated Scenario 2 reflected adjustments for Scenario 1 but not necessarily everything that was requested. Mr. Groner felt Scenarios 1 and 3 under funded the Council of Mayors. Mr. Pitstick stated the Working Group looked at person-months of work, not funding amounts. The person-months were adjusted and funding was calculated using unit cost information submitted to determine the incremental cost of participating in the MPO process. Mayor Podgorski stated the Council of Mayors assistance is invaluable to municipalities for programming funds and coordinating the planning and scheduling of projects. Mr. Mikyska noted the Council of Mayors staff also provides important outreach and liaison assistance between the elected officials and transportation professionals.

Mr. Groner asked how 12 person-months of work were determined for Metra program development in two of the scenarios. Mr. Mikyska stated the number of CATS staff working on the TIP was used as a basis. He noted the process was not perfect and was intended as a starting point for discussion. Ms. Bolte noted this process was an attempt to draw the line between project-level work agencies would do anyway and the work done to meet federal MPO requirements. Mr. Groner stated he could accept Scenario 2 because it funds the Council of Mayors appropriately.

Mr. Seglin made a motion to recommend Scenario 2 to the WPC as the Core Elements portion of the FY07 UWP. It was seconded by Mr. Simmons. The motion was passed on a vote of five in favor (Chicago, CTA, Council of Mayors, Metra, NIPC), with one abstention (RTA). Two voting members (Counties, Pace) were not present at the meeting.

When asked, Mr. Smith stated that he will present all three scenarios in the recommendation to the WPC on December 16th so members can see the work that has been done.

C. Competitive Selection Program Development Schedule

Mr. Thomas described the development schedule for the Competitive Selection process, which was approved by the Policy Committee:

Call for Proposals	December 20, 2005
Proposals Due	January 24, 2006
Distribute proposals	February 7, 2006
UWP Meeting – Discuss Proposals	February 21, 2006
Staff review/public comment period deadline	March 20, 2006
UWP Meeting – Finalize Program	March 21, 2006
Work Program Committee action	April 28, 2006
Submit to funding agencies	April 28, 2006
Policy Committee action	June 8, 2006

D. UWP Emphasis Area Discussion

Mr. Thomas reviewed the five emphasis areas developed by the UWP Committee and the two Policy Committee recommendations on safety and arterial management used for the FY06 UWP. He also presented for discussion four ideas that had been suggested for the FY07 program:

- Context sensitive solutions (RTP Committee)
- Implementation of Major Capital Recommendations (RTP Committee)
- Transportation policy on land use [farmland] (McHenry County)
- Study of Multi-Modal Corridors (RTA)

Mr. DiPalma noted that SAFTEA-LU language separates security from safety in the metropolitan planning emphasis areas. Ms. Bolte asked if USDOT had made a distinction of facility security versus what is in the planning purview. Mr. DiPalma felt the difference would be whether it was a project basis or a study basis. For instance an MPO might study the effectiveness of security measures but not actually implement the measures. Ms. Bolte stated security should be added in the context of MPO activities if it is included in the emphasis areas. Mr. Coglianesse proposed two emphasis areas. The first is integrating land use and transportation which would encompass the McHenry County emphasis area – Transportation Policy on land use/farmland. He stated that this emphasis area was the reason behind the development of the new Regional Planning Board. And second, address environmental mitigation activities on a regional basis.

Mr. Smith felt regional significance should play a role in the competitive selection process. Mr. Weaver wondered if that would preclude county projects from being funded. Mr. Coglianesse stated that would depend on the project itself not the area it applied to. Mr. Groner noted that some projects may be transferable to other areas. Mr. Pitstick noted the RTAP program is regional because it affects communities throughout the region, even if it is not directly transferable from one location to the next. Mr. Pitstick seconded Mr. Coglianesse's emphasis area dealing with land use, but was concerned about Implementation of Major Capital Recommendations because the word implementation suggests engineering or design. Mr. Seglin felt facilities should be included with the study of multi-modal corridors. The word "facilities" could be changed to "areas" so that facility design would not be implied. Mr. Weaver stated the Committee should be open about what is being studied as long as the work does not fall into the design or engineering phase.

E. Other Business

Mr. Smith felt a Working Group should be formed to develop the criteria that will be used to select projects during the Competitive Selection process. Mr. Mikyska stated the Committee could give the group some direction on what the criteria would be prior to the call for projects. Due to the time constraint with the upcoming Call for Proposals, project selection criteria will be developed by any committee members who wish to participate in quantifying selection criteria. Mr. Mikyska proposed an e-mail exchange could be used to generate a list of initial ideas. Mr. Smith stated CATS staff will compile a list of potential emphasis areas and evaluation criteria, and distribute it to members. Mr. Thomas added the WPC may provide additional input for the Working Group. The Working Group will meet Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 9:30 AM at the CATS/NIPC offices.

On a motion from Mr. Weaver and seconded by Ms. Bolte, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30 PM.

NEXT MEETING - The UWP Committee is scheduled to meet Tuesday, February 21, 2006 at 10:00 AM at the CATS and NIPC offices.