



**UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM COMMITTEE
MEETING**

MINUTES

June 19, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 AM at the Chicago Area Transportation Study, Cook County Conference Room, 233 South Wacker Drive, 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 Transit Authority	David Simmons, James Richmond*
Counties	Tom Rickert
Federal Highway Administration	Chris DiPalma
Metra	Thomas Weaver*
NIPC	Ralph Coglianesse, Linda Bolte*
Pace	Lorraine Snorden
Regional Transportation Authority	Mark Pitstick, Patty Mangano*
CATS	Patricia Berry

Unified Work Program Committee Members Not Present

Chicago Department of Transportation	David Seglin, LuAnn Hamilton*
Council of Mayors	Dan Podgorski, Arlene Mulder*
Counties	Carl Schoedel*
Federal Transit Administration	Vanessa Adams
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency	Mike Rogers
Metra	Jack Groner
Pace	Tom Radak*

* Alternate Member

Interested Parties

DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference	Tam Kutzmark
Illinois Department of Transportation OP&P	Carl Mikyska
Illinois Department of Transportation DPIT	Amy Welk
North Central Council of Mayors	Beth McCluskey

CMAP Staff

Janet Bright	Bola Delano	Parry Frank
Craig Heither	Jill Leary	

MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of Minutes

The meeting minutes from the April 4, 2006 meeting were unanimously approved on a motion by Mr. Weaver and a second by Ms. Snorden, including a correction to Mr. Smith's name on page 2.

B. SAFETEA-LU

Ms. Berry stated that the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) for Metropolitan Transportation Planning was released last week. She noted that safety and security were split into two separate items. The deadline for MPO plans and programs to be compliant with SAFETEA-LU is July 1, 2007.

Mr. DiPalma stated that the deadline for commenting on the NPRM was 90 days from June 9, 2006. He noted there are some significant changes to the MPO process but felt a lot of it would be handled through the natural process of staff integration. Mr. Coglianese stated he assumed the cost of doing this was to come out of the current budgets of UWP projects and not to modify UWP projects. Mr. Smith stated that was correct.

Ms. Snorden asked Ms. Berry to provide a summary of the changes to programs under SAFETEA-LU for the next meeting. Ms. Berry stated a summary will be provided and noted that for the TIP and RTP changes will be made to the capital programs so that they will be compliant when approved by the Policy Committee in October 2006. Mr. DiPalma noted that FHWA had done a SAFETEA-LU gap analysis with CATS staff and that it may be available.

C. Quarterly Updates

Mr. Smith stated that a listing of non-UWP funded transportation planning studies was solicited annually from implementers, and CATS staff was floating the idea of requesting the information quarterly. Mr. Coglianese asked why that would be helpful. Ms. Berry stated that the current practice of soliciting the information once a year may miss studies with a quick turnaround: they may be started and completed between solicitations. The proposal is to solicit information quarterly.

Mr. Weaver clarified that this effort is not a progress report but merely a way to get information on non-UWP funded studies. Mr. Rickert noted the difficulty his staff has in determining what studies to include. Ms. Berry suggested CATS staff could work with USDOT to develop a better description of what studies should be included. Mr. Pitstick noted there are inconsistencies between the studies listed in the UWP in terms of scope, budget, etc.

Mr. Weaver asked how much territory a study needed to cover to be significant. Ms. Berry stated there is no universal definition. Mr. Rickert asked where the line was drawn on regional significance. Mr. Smith stated a new definition was needed along with the specific pieces of information requested. Mr. Coglianese asked how the quarterly reports would be published. Ms. Berry responded they would be included on the agency website. Ms. Bolte suggested the RTP may be a useful guide on defining regionally significant projects, and that there may be different thresholds for arterial projects compared to bicycle/pedestrian projects. Mr. DiPalma wondered if inter-agency status reports were already being produced to describe activities. Ms. Bolte did

not feel it was happening systematically. Mr. Smith stated more discussion was needed on this topic and that the RTP definitions would help enlighten the committee.

D. Project Monitoring

Ms. Delano stated that one of the recommendations from the federal certification review was for CATS to establish a tracking and monitoring process for planning projects. She noted that this type of monitoring is already conducted for capital projects. Two interns are currently reviewing planning projects and in a few weeks a general critical analysis will be conducted. CATS may be one of the first agencies to conduct this type of project analysis, although it has been done in Cincinnati on a smaller scale. Ms. Delano noted that a scope of what the monitoring process will involve will be drafted and circulated for comment shortly.

Mr. Smith asked how often the monitoring would be conducted. Ms. Delano stated that once the system is in place it will be part of the project management process. Mr. Smith asked if it would require monthly or quarterly reporting. Ms. Delano stated quarterly reporting was a possibility. Mr. Weaver asked if this would apply only to planning projects or if it would include capital projects. Ms. Delano clarified that it would only apply to planning projects but capital projects could possibly be included at some later stage. Ms. Bolte stressed the challenges of getting people to prepare quarterly reports and suggested a simple form could be developed to facilitate getting the information. Ms. Delano agreed that the reporting procedure should not be cumbersome to use.

Mr. Pitstick asked if this was a way of managing funding and noted that quarterly reimbursement reports are submitted to IDOT. Ms. Delano stated that this process is not about financial monitoring but is concerned with whether or not a project is completed and what the outcomes are. Mr. Rickert asked if the monitoring was focused only on federally-funded projects. Ms. Delano stated that it was and that the process would provide accountability for federal funding received. Mr. Weaver noted that the monitoring and reporting for capital projects was all based on federal requirements. Mr. Pitstick stated that the monitoring of projects and the financial information should not be done separately.

Mr. Smith felt IDOT takes the current reports and integrates them into something useful. Ms. Bolte noted that the rest of the region does not see that narrative, but that this monitoring process may help in identifying what projects were completed and what value was received from them. Ms. Delano noted that projects from 2004 were being reviewed to report on what has been completed. Mr. Rickert asked if IDOT's financial reporting may be restructured. Mr. Smith stated that function is handled by the Bureau of Business Services and that he did not have an answer.

E. Carryover

Ms. Berry noted that in the last couple of years PL funds have not been carried over and some funds have been de-obligated. Mr. Simmons asked what the time limit was for using FTA funds before they lapse. Mr. Weaver stated they will lapse at the grant expiration date. Mr. Mikyska noted that IDOT includes an expiration date on its contracts. He also noted that certain funds have a limited amount of time during which they can be billed. Mr. Smith stated that IDOT alerts agencies if funds are subject to lapse and felt there had not been a problem with FTA funds. Mr. Pitstick noted that the contract with IDOT is the obligation and that those funds do not then need to be reported in the following year's UWP.

F. Development of the FY2008 Program

Mr. Smith recommended that development of the FY 2008 UWP follow the same schedule as the FY 2007 program and asked about any concerns. Mr. Coglianese stated significant questions are the RPB and its role, and its funding requirements. Mr. Smith stated those are policy questions that will not be answered by the UWP Committee and that the committee should continue its work. Ultimately CATS and NIPC staff will be RPB staff and the committee will need to request guidance from the Work Program Committee. Ms. Bolte noted that the UWP Committee will exist in some format within the coordinated committee structure developed by the RPB, CATS Policy Committee and NIPC Commission.

Mr. Simmons inquired about the RPB timetable. Mr. Smith stated the financial plan to the General Assembly is due in September and the legislation allowed three years to merge the CATS and NIPC staffs. Mr. Coglianese noted that one year of the three-year period will be up in August, and stated that the report will address finance and governance issues. Mr. Smith stated the report will focus on the relationship of the CATS Policy Committee and NIPC Commission to the RPB, and a first draft is expected in mid-July. Mr. Coglianese stated it is not known if NIPC will be a freestanding agency in FY 2008 but that the products it produces will still be needed.

Mr. Weaver stated the issue is whether the proposed development schedule is the right one to proceed with and if pushing it back would help the RPB. Mr. Smith stated the UWP Committee needs to proceed with the schedule and that the RPB will be made aware of the schedule. On a motion from Mr. Rickert and seconded by Mr. Weaver, the committee approved the proposed development schedule. Mr. Simmons stated he assumed the committee would be using the same process as for development of the FY 2007 program. Mr. Smith suggested the committee proceed with the same time table following the direction of the WPC. Mr. Rickert stated the WPC had given direction but hoped significant changes were not needed. Ms. Berry stated the WPC felt the committee was moving in the right direction but had not quite reached its goal with respect to the Core elements.

Ms. McCluskey suggested that CATS staff compile a list of objectives that the committee will discuss at the next meeting. Ms. Bolte noted that the committee had started that discussion last year. Mr. Smith asked if this referred to the description of Core activities. Ms. Bolte stated these issues lead into the Core elements. Ms. McCluskey stated these are the issues dealing with UWP funding for program development and preliminary planning. Mr. Smith stated that the next meeting would be a debriefing meeting and that committee members should submit their concerns to CATS staff for discussion. Ms. Berry stated the discussion of the non-UWP funded projects could be concluded. Ms. Delano stated there would be something to report on the project monitoring effort.

G. Other Business

No other business was brought before the committee.

H. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, August 15th at 10 AM. On a motion by Mr. Weaver and seconded by Ms. Snorden, the meeting was adjourned at 11:20 AM.