



UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

July 28, 2005

The meeting was held at 9:15 AM at the Chicago Area Transportation Study, Cunningham-Williams Conference Room, 300 West Adams, 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
Metra	Thomas Weaver*
NIPC	Linda Bolte*
Pace	Lorraine Snorden
Regional Transportation Authority	Mark Pitstick, Patty Mangano*
CATS	Mark Thomas

* Alternate Member

Interested Parties

Pace	Tom Radak
Center for Neighborhood Technology	Janice Metzger
McHenry County Council of Mayors	Holly Ostdick
North Central Council of Mayors	Beth McCluskey

CATS Staff

Parry Frank	Bill Kiley	Jose Rodriguez
Craig Heither	Gerald Rawling	Joy Schaad

MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of Minutes

On a motion from Mr. Pitstick and seconded by Mr. Simmons, the minutes of the June 28, 2005 committee meeting were approved without change. Ms. Schaad suggested combining members and alternate members in to one category of attendees in the future.

B. FY 2007 UWP Procedural Discussion

The UWP Committee continued its discussion on developing a project selection methodology for the FY 2007 UWP. Mr. Thomas described a graphic that represented the base allocation vs. competitive selection options that were discussed in the last meeting. The committee agreed to focus on options #2 Base Allocation + Competitive Selection or #3 Base Planning + Competitive Selection. The following table clarifies the discussions about the two options under consideration.

<u>(#2) Base Allocation + Competitive Selection</u>	<u>(#3) Base Planning + Competitive Selection</u>
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. CATS staff, Council of Mayors staff and transportation portion of NIPC staff receive UWP funding.2. Other UWP Committee member agencies each receive a funding allocation.3. Remaining UWP funds are distributed based on a competitive process.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. CATS staff, Council of Mayors staff and transportation portion of NIPC staff receive UWP funding.2. Remaining UWP funds are distributed based on a competitive process.

Mr. Thomas also described a new graphic that is intended to represent the UWP Development Process. The two sections of the graphic represent the “Core Elements” discussion that would happen in the fall time frame and the “Competitive Selection” discussion that would happen in winter. The graphic was also intended to provide a step by step path for discussion of base allocation and core elements.

Mr. Smith felt that one of the biggest issues the Committee has to address is whether TIP development work for agencies other than CATS is a core element that should receive UWP funding. Mr. Weaver noted that projects can be made up of both core elements and non-core elements. Mr. Smith agreed and stated it is up to the Committee to determine how the region wants to use these planning funds. Ms. Bolte noted that in other areas around the country core functions performed by Metra would not be funded with UWP dollars, and that this region is unique in recognizing that transit operators, land use agencies and the Council of Mayors need financial support to participate in the process. Mr. Weaver stated this region is also more politically fragmented than most. Mr. Simmons felt that this broadly-inclusive process resulted in better planning for the region and that the core elements discussion was somewhat divisive.

Mr. Pitstick felt the Committee would not be able to resolve the issue and stated the real issue is whether funding for Preliminary Planning and TIP Development work should automatically come from UWP money. He stated the Work Program Committee (WPC) and Policy Committee (PC) should provide direction on the issue. He also stated that a competitive selection process should take into account agency need along with project merits.

Mr. Smith asked the Committee if the use of emphasis areas should be continued. Mr. Pitstick felt they should continue to be used because they reflect a type of need. Mr. Simmons stated the number of emphasis areas should be limited and better focused. Mr. Smith stated he would like to vet the emphasis areas through the WPC and PC so they can provide direction. Mr. Seglin noted that the FY2006 emphasis areas were developed too late in the project development process as most agencies had already begun development of proposals.

Mr. Pitstick suggested that the project selection methodology graphic prepared for the Committee meeting could be given to the WPC to help their discussion. Mr. Seglin agreed the WPC should be shown the chart at their August 12th meeting so they can provide feedback. He suggested the UWP Committee could then make a recommendation to the WPC on the project selection methodology at the September 30th meeting. Ms. Metzger suggested the Committee develop a list of pros and cons for both of the remaining project selection options to give to the WPC to help foster their discussion. Ms. Schaad proposed the Committee also prepare a summary of the differing viewpoints on the TIP development issue for the WPC.

The Committee developed the following list of pros and cons:

(#2) Base Allocation + Competitive Selection

- Pros:
- Provides funding stability to agencies for staff and planning purposes.
 - Ensures the full participation of UWP member agencies in the process.
 - Helps agencies to meet otherwise unfunded mandates and recapture some costs.
 - Ensures essential functions get done.
- Cons:
- Difficulty of deciding on what criteria will be used for allocating funds.
 - Base allocation of a dollar figure for agencies would result in some loss of flexibility in UWP Committee directing planning priorities for the region.
 - If all agencies completely identified core elements there may not be enough money to fund the core.

(#3) Base Planning + Competitive Selection

- Pros:
- Provides a clear picture of short-term regional planning priorities for both agencies and the public
 - Allows more dollars to address emphasis areas.
- Cons:
- Sets Council of Mayors above other UWP member agencies. (Easier to justify priority treatment for CATS and NIPC staffs.)
 - TIP development by agencies would occur anyway

The committee discussed two approaches for base allocation among the agencies. Mr. Seglin suggested a relatively small dollar amount that would be guaranteed and agencies would provide a discussion on how they would spend the funds. Mr. Thomas suggested that for CATS/CoM/NIPC, the discussion would start with the identification of projects that would address core elements (handed out at the meeting), and that other agencies could do the same providing core work such as Preliminary Planning or TIP Development as a discussion point to define the base allocation. The dollar guarantee approach would be a simpler process for the committee, but the core elements discussion would allow greater flexibility in the committee directing planning priorities. There was no resolution on this issue.

Another point of discussion focused on the mechanism's that would be used to rate the competitive selection process. Mr. Thomas suggested that emphasis areas could be used as a guide and Mr. Seglin suggested that there are other issues that should be addressed such as multi-year project continuity. Mr. Pitstick suggested that the committee could actually develop generic project ideas without a specific agency in mind that would address the emphasis areas.

The following materials will be developed for the WPC meeting on August 12th. CATS staff will provide draft versions for the Committee in time to get additional input.

- Mr. Thomas will update the project selection options graphic for the WPC.
- Mr. Thomas will distribute the list of project selection options pros and cons to Committee members for review and comment prior to it being sent to the WPC.
- Mr. Thomas will develop a summary of the differing viewpoints on the TIP development issue based on Committee discussions and will distribute it to Committee members for review and comment prior to it being sent to the WPC.
- Mr. Pitstick will draft a generic project proposal with a generalized scope that would be intended to address a proposed emphasis area
- Mr. Smith will direct the TIP development issue to the WPC and will seek direction from the WPC on emphasis areas.

C. Other Business

Ms. Snorden inquired about the upcoming MPO certification review. Mr. Smith stated there will be a meeting at the Metropolitan Planning Council on August 9th for agencies to discuss what the MPO does. The on-site CATS review will be August 10-11. He did not know whether the FHWA and FTA representatives would engage the WPC in a dialogue at the August 12th meeting.

On a motion from Mr. Weaver and seconded by Ms. Snorden, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM.

NEXT MEETING - The UWP Committee will meet Thursday, September 15, 2005 at 1:00 PM in the main conference room at CATS.