



## UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM COMMITTEE MEETING

### MINUTES

June 28, 2005

The meeting was held at 10:00 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 Members**

<b>Gordon Smith, <i>Chair</i></b>	<b>Illinois Department of Transportation</b>
<b>Ralph Coglianesi</b>	<b>NIPC</b>
<b>Christopher DiPalma</b>	<b>Federal Highway Administration</b>
<b>Mark Pitstick</b>	<b>Regional Transportation Authority</b>
<b>Dusty Powell</b>	<b>Lake County</b>
<b>Mike Rogers</b>	<b>Illinois Environmental Protection Agency</b>
<b>David Simmons</b>	<b>Chicago Transit Authority</b>
<b>Lorraine Snorden</b>	<b>Pace</b>
<b>Mark Thomas</b>	<b>CATS</b>

#### **Unified Work Program Alternate Members**

Linda Bolte	NIPC
Ernestine Flient	CTA
Patty Mangano	RTA
LuAnn Hamilton	Chicago Department of Transportation
Arlene Mulder	Council of Mayors
Thomas Weaver	Metra

#### **Transportation Operators, Planning Officials and Interested Parties**

Chuck Abraham	IDOT DPIT
Bob Dean	DMMC
Beth McCluskey	NC Council of Mayors
Janice Metzger	CNT
Jason Osborn	McHenry County DOT
Tom Radak	Pace
Vicky Smith	SW Conference of Mayors
Doug Sullivan	Pace

#### **CATS Staff**

Craig Heither	Tom Murtha	Tom Vick
Bill Kiley	Joy Schaad	

## **MEETING SUMMARY**

### **A. Approval of Minutes**

On a motion from Mr. Powell and seconded by Mr. Pitstick, the minutes of the April 8, 2005 committee meeting were approved without change.

### **B. FY 2007 UWP Procedural Discussion**

Chairman Smith stated that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss ideas on the procedures that will be used by the committee to develop the FY 2007 UWP. Ms. Snorden asked how the potential CATS-NIPC merger will affect UWP development. Mr. Smith stated that the two agencies will co-locate in the Sears Tower during FY 2006 and that the Regional Planning Board has until September 2006 to develop a funding strategy for the combined agency. Mr. Coglianese added that the Regional Planning Board may provide direction on the use of UWP funds. At this point the impact on UWP development is uncertain.

Mr. Thomas presented the following four project selection methodologies as talking points to begin the committee discussion:

1. Agency Allocation – each agency receives a certain portion UWP funding based on some criterion. Council of Mayors funding is distributed in this way: each council receives an equal amount of base funding, with the remaining funds allocated based on council population.
2. Base Allocation + Merit – each agency receives a base level of UWP funding and the remaining funds are distributed to projects based on their merit.
3. Base Planning Staff + Merit – MPO staff, Council of Mayors staff and the transportation portion of NIPC staff receive UWP funding, and the remaining funds are distributed to projects based on their merit.
4. Project Merit – all projects are evaluated for their regional significance and funds are distributed base on project merits. The CMAQ program distributes funding in this way by ranking proposals within project categories.

Mr. Weaver suggested that “competitive” may be a better term than “merit” since everyone will be competing for the same funding dollars. Mr. Pitstick agreed competitive was a better term and felt this selection methodology description was helpful in focusing the committee discussion. He stated the RTA argues for methodology #3, and feels that methodology #2 is the closest description of how the process unfolds. Mr. Pitstick stated that the committee should move away from choosing one project over another and should instead focus on the planning needs of the region, which would lead to a definition of the work that needs to be done.

Mr. Powell stated the committee first needs to determine what it takes to run the MPO so that those activities can be funded. Then the committee will know how much money is available to fund other projects. He stated the UWP should be guided by the TIP and the RTP. Mr. Pitstick agreed and stated defining the work that needs to be done would identify what it takes to run the MPO. Mr. Simmons stressed the importance of maintaining a strong regional infrastructure, and suggested it may be helpful to think in terms of a baseline so that funding could be increased or decreased depending on how well needs are being met. Mr. Weaver and Ms. Hamilton discussed the cyclic nature of the annual process varies to meet the requirements for multi year efforts such

as the RTP, TIP and Air Quality Conformity. Mr. Weaver stated that the number of federal requirements is increasing and our resources have to shift to meet these requirements.

Mr. Smith suggested Mr. Thomas could identify the core elements for the MPO and send them to members, who could identify federally mandated activities for their own agencies such as Safe Routes to School. Mr. Pitstick questioned whether those mandated activities have to be funded using UWP money and again stressed looking at the planning work for the region as a whole. Ms. Snorden agreed that UWP money may not be the only way to fund some requirements, and suggested reviewing the federal regulations for what must be done. Mr. Smith reiterated Mr. Pitstick's concept of identifying planning activities needed for next year, and then identify who will carry out the work.

Ms. Bolte noted that requirements are not one-dimensional and can involve different levels of effort such as with public involvement, or be done at different frequencies as is the case with data collection efforts. She stated the committee will need to decide on the appropriate level of effort for many of the planning elements in the region. Mr. Weaver cautioned against how much deliberation the committee should have on the frequency of these activities. Mr. Pitstick stated the committee needs to decide what should be a priority for UWP funds. Mr. Powell stated the level of effort is being defined by the amount of funding projects are receiving. Mr. Coglianesse suggested that in designing the UWP there is a balance between meeting federal requirements and addressing planning elements that the region has identified as needed.

Ms. Bolte noted there are issues the committee members agree on and issues where there are differences of opinion (such as whether agencies other than CATS should receive UWP funding for TIP and RTP development work). She stated the committee should develop a recommendation for the Policy Committee to vote on. Mr. Thomas stated that there are two controversial issues that may be interrelated. The first is UWP funding for member agencies participating in the development of MPO requirements and the second is changing shares of funding for agencies. Ms. Snorden suggested that these issues be addressed separately and that once an agreement was developed, the core elements could be identified and the regional elements can be considered.

Ms. Flient feels that methodology #2 or #3 is the most likely outcome for the process, and that the controversial issues fall between these two options. There was general agreement among the members and Mr. Coglianesse suggested that even the core elements will need some merit type discussion. Mr. Thomas described a possible two step annual process where merit and level of effort on core elements would be developed by the committee first, and then the competitive phase for remaining dollars would be developed afterward. Mr. Coglianesse also stated that the issue of sharing resources such as aerial photography could be brought to the surface in this type of process.

Ms. Metzger liked the idea of identifying core elements and a narrow range of priorities for the UWP. She emphasized the need to make sure that work CATS and NIPC staff performs that crosses modal or geographic boundaries, such as freight planning or bicycle and pedestrian planning, would not get lost in a competitive funding process.

Mayor Mulder noted the importance of making sure every part served by the MPO is touched, and that while everyone must represent their group, the committee needs to focus on the region

as a whole. She emphasized the cooperative planning process already established in the region and stressed that the process must be fair and equitable, which does not mean that some agencies won't get more funding in some years and less funding in other years.

Mr. Thomas stated that the RTP Committee will be discussing the issue of emphasis areas and will have some recommendations for the UWP Committee. Mr. Smith stated the committee needs to present a project selection approach and emphasis areas to the Work Program Committee at its September 30<sup>th</sup> meeting. That will allow for a recommendation to the Policy Committee at its October 13<sup>th</sup> meeting that members can vote on and will lay the groundwork for selecting FY 2007 UWP projects.

CATS and NIPC staff will meet and develop a list of MPO core elements. This list will be sent to committee members who can add agency requirements to the list.

### **C. Carryover**

Mr. Thomas noted that there was no carryover included in the FY 2006 UWP. Funds that have not been invoiced are no longer considered to be carryover as long as they have been obligated.

### **D. Budget Adjustments**

Ms. Flient stated that the CTA was requesting a budget adjustment in the FY 2004 UWP by moving approximately \$58k from Market Expansion (#6335.60) to Preliminary Development (#2351.03). Both projects have been completed. On a motion from Mr. Coglianese and seconded by Mr. Powell, the adjustment was approved.

Mr. Thomas requested budget adjustments in the FY 2005 UWP for CATS projects. On a motion from Mr. Weaver and seconded by Mr. Simmons, the adjustment was approved. Mr. Weaver requested that in the future all budget adjustments be supplied to committee members prior to the meeting.

On a motion from Mr. Coglianese and seconded by Mr. Powell, the meeting was adjourned at 12:05 PM.

**NEXT MEETING** - The UWP Committee will meet Thursday, July 28, 2005 at 9:00 AM in the main conference room at CATS.