



## UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM COMMITTEE MEETING

### MINUTES

March 21, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 9:31 AM at the Chicago Area Transportation Study, Cook Cunningham-Williams 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>Tom Rickert</b>
<b>Federal Highway Administration</b>	<b>Chris DiPalma</b>
<b>Metra</b>	<b>Thomas Weaver*</b>
<b>NIPC</b>	<b>Ralph Coglianesi</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>Don Kopec</b>

\* Alternate Member

#### **Interested Parties**

DuPage County	John Loper
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
North Central Council of Mayors	Beth McCluskey
South Suburban Mayors and Managers	Joe Heinrich
Southwest Council of Mayors	Vicky Smith
West Central Municipal Conference	Jill Leary

#### **CATS Staff**

Janet Bright	Bill Kiley
Parry Frank	Ross Patronsky
Craig Heither	Tom Vick

## **MEETING SUMMARY**

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

The meeting minutes from the February 21, 2006 meeting were unanimously approved on a motion by Mr. Rickert and a second by Ms. Snorden with the following changes under Item C:

- Mr. Pitstick requested the following changes – “He clarified that this project addresses transit-oriented development dealing with bus service improvements (where there is no *rail* station) and that they work with the relevant agencies *including Pace*. Project #906 (RTAP Station Area Planning – Transit Oriented Development Studies) is the complementary station area planning study with funds for local municipal studies for *rail* stations.”
- Mr. Weaver requested the following change – “Mr. Weaver stated that Metra used to do *boarding/alighting counts* more often, but due to fiscal constraints they have not been done recently.”
- Ms. Snorden requested the following change – “Ms. Snorden, chair of the *TIP Procedures Committee*, noted that the project was vital in meeting federal mandates regarding public outreach.”

### **B. Discussion of Tier II Submittal Rankings**

Mr. Smith asked if Committee members had any concerns with the proposal ranking exercise. Mr. Coglianese felt it went well but wondered how applying different values to the three categories (A-5, B-3, C-1) would affect the rankings. He also noted there was \$18 million worth of Tier II submittals, \$11 million of which was for consultants. Mr. Weaver stated that the Core funding should have picked up the critical staff time.

Mr. Seglin felt that the ranking exercise was a useful tool but hoped the Committee was not going to fund the program solely by the rankings. Mr. Rickert agreed and noted that the counties had coordinated their efforts in submitting projects. He stated that the rankings alone would leave county projects out of the program and he would like to see the UWP continue moving county projects forward.

Mr. Simmons distributed a handout of the CTA’s proposal for the Tier II portion of the program. He started with each agency’s Core funding amounts and included every project with a ranking of 31 or higher. Additional high-ranked projects were added to the program to ensure each agency received at least as much funding as the FY06 program. The intention was to provide continuity of agency programs. Funding for the joint CATS-NIPC proposals was included in the CATS amount.

Mr. Rickert asked if the Core funding portion of the program was in place. Mr. Smith stated it was as far as the UWP Committee was concerned but it had not been officially approved by the Work Program Committee. He stated the FY07 mark for northeastern Illinois is \$17.84 million, slightly higher than previously announced. Mr. Seglin noted the CTA proposal left about \$90,000 on the table, based on the updated mark.

Mr. Kopec stated that while he liked the exercise, the rankings were just a starting point. He also noted that projects amounts needed to be reviewed. He noted that project #129 (Economic Development Aspects of Transportation Planning and Programming) did not finish in the top of the rankings, but that the Policy Committee chair had directed CATS to pursue this. He felt this project would be in the UWP even if it was not in the Committee's recommendation. He also felt two other projects that ranked high (29) should be included: #101 (Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning) and #126 (Post-Implementation Evaluation of Emissions Benefits of CMAQ Projects). He stated that bicycle/pedestrian planning deserves greater investment by the region and that USDOT would like to see more work in this area, and that the CMAQ project addresses a recommendation from the federal MPO certification review.

Mr. Seglin felt several City of Chicago projects should be included in the program: #206 (Central Area Pedestrian Counts), #203 (Airport Rail Coordination and Plans) and #210 (West Loop Transportation Center Phase 2) which will coordinate with Metra, Pace, CTA and Amtrak. Mr. Weaver stated Metra supported those projects, especially the pedestrian count. Mr. Rickert stated the counties were giving their support to two projects: #801 (DuPage County Traffic Accident Database System) and #802 (McHenry County Traffic Model and Two Sub-regional Studies). He stated the traffic model and sub-regional studies in the McHenry County proposal could be split into separate submittals if it would improve the rankings.

Mr. Pitstick stated that #905 (RTAP Community Transit Improvement Plans) and #906 (RTAP Station Area Planning – Transit Oriented Development Studies) both support municipalities and counties. He asked that they not be overlooked because they both ranked 29 but were listed last alphabetically in that group. Mr. Weaver and Ms. Snorden stated their agencies support the RTAP projects.

Mr. Seglin asked if NIPC proposal #615 (Land Use Modeling) could be phased in over a couple of years since the request is \$1.1 million. Mr. Coglianese stated that is a phased amount and that additional funding would be requested in the future. Mr. Seglin stated his concern that the UWP would be paying for the entire project not just the transportation portion. Mr. Coglianese responded that this is the only funding source available but he would be interested in learning about other sources. He stated the project supports transportation modeling efforts and funding half of a model will not make it workable. Mr. Rickert noted that historically the UWP Committee has only funded NIPC's transportation work and the state has assisted with the rest. Mr. Smith stated IDOT has helped NIPC cover the shortfall and IDOT has committed to the region that the level of support will not diminish until other funding sources are identified.

Mr. Seglin asked if IDOT is funding part of proposal #901 (Cook-DuPage Corridor Alternatives Analysis). Mr. Pitstick stated he did not know. Mr. Smith stated IDOT has supported the project and did not think it would diminish, but he could not discuss the specifics. Mr. Weaver asked if the study was centered on the Union Pacific-West line, which Metra was already studying. Mr. Pitstick stated it is but is a much broader study. Ms. Snorden stated Pace supports the Cook-DuPage study.

Mr. Seglin asked what Committee members thought of the CTA's proposed Tier II program. Mr. Weaver stated it was intriguing provided the numbers work. Mr. Rickert felt it was good information and would like to see FY04 and FY05 UWP funding to see the trend for each agency. He felt he did not have enough time to compare the requested amounts to the scope of work in the submittals. Mr. Pitstick noted there seemed to be a desire to go beyond the top-ranked projects. He suggested an alternative was for agencies to overmatch projects so more could get funded. Mr. Loper asked if IDOT held any money back for emergencies. Mr. Smith stated IDOT does not and obligates as much as possible. Mr. Weaver noted there is an incentive to keep costs low so agencies don't have to absorb an overage. Mr. Seglin stated the problem with overmatching is that if an agency had the money they could do the project themselves. Mr. Coglianesse noted NIPC has no source of overmatch funds.

Mr. Smith reiterated that projects costs needed to be reviewed. Mr. Kopec stated projects with large costs should be examined and stated he could revisit some of the CATS numbers. Mr. Simmons asked if he wanted to shuffle projects around to raise some lower-ranked projects into funding because it is important to CATS. Mr. Kopec responded he did. Ms. Snorden wondered if there were any partnering opportunities. Mr. Smith noted that both CATS and RTA included projects for a regional traffic signal inventory. While the level of effort in the CATS proposal did not meet the RTA's needs, both parties were agreeable to CATS amending their effort to include additional information RTA desires. Mr. Pitstick noted the RTA submitted the project because it is important to the region, not that the RTA necessarily needs to do it. Mr. Kopec stated CATS would coordinate with them as much as possible. Mr. Pitstick suggested leaving the RTA proposal as a stand-alone project and moving some funding to CATS, probably for a lesser amount than was originally requested.

Mr. Seglin asked what project #1002 (Regional Planning Board Support) would do. Mr. Kopec stated the RPB will need administrative staffing and the Board will get actively involved in planning activities during FY07. He stated he has spent many hours on this. Integrating land use and transportation was submitted as its own project.

Mr. Weaver stated CATS and NIPC have the flexibility to move UWP funds within their respective programs as long as projects are funded, even at a reduced level. He stated that getting essential studies into the UWP list is more important than the amount they are funded at because the UWP Committee cannot micromanage the agencies. He noted that budget revisions are always approved.

Mr. Seglin stated he liked the CTA's proposal and Metra's idea. He noted that extra money available could fund CATS' economic development project, and stated Chicago would like to get the pedestrian count funded. Mr. Seglin asked Mr. Pitstick if money could be freed by phasing the Cook-DuPage corridor study. Mr. Pitstick stated possibly but stressed the whole program would need to be examined because RTA would be starting from a different point if the Cook—DuPage study cost was cut in half and money for the traffic signal study was moved to CATS. Mr. Seglin stated agencies need a stable funding source for long-range planning and that the historical trend had to be examined. Mr. Pitstick felt that was addressed in the Core funding. Mr. Seglin noted the CMAQ program looks at the geographic distribution of funds as well as rankings, and would like the UWP Committee to make that acknowledgement.

Mr. Weaver stated he would like agencies to work off of the CTA's proposal and see if they can make adjustments to ensure projects get into the UWP. Mr. Coglianese stated NIPC would like to review their costs and possibly shift some to other projects. Mr. Smith noted agencies have always been allowed flexibility within their programs.

Following a short break, Mr. Smith asked Committee members to re-examine their projects requesting \$500,000 or more, and determine which of their projects needed to be done in FY07. Members are to provide their project priorities and any revised costs to Carl Mikyska by the end of the day Tuesday, March 28<sup>th</sup>. IDOT staff will combine the priorities into a proposed Tier II program and will send it to the members on Friday, March 31<sup>st</sup>.

### **C. Discussion of FY08 MPO Funding**

Mr. Heither stated this item was on the agenda to get members thinking about the fact that there will be some funding differences for the FY08 UWP when CATS and NIPC are combined under the RPB. The RPB funding report is due to the state legislature in September. Mr. Kopec felt the RPB would be submitting projects as one agency next year. Mr. Coglianese noted that NIPC currently has a voting seat on the UWP Committee and that issue would need to be addressed as well.

### **D. Other Business**

No other business was brought before the committee.

### **E. Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 4<sup>th</sup> at 9:30 AM at the combined CATS/NIPC offices. On a motion by Mr. Seglin and seconded by Mayor Podgorski, the meeting was adjourned at 11:13 AM.