



CHICAGO AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY

UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

September 15, 2005

The meeting was held at 1:00 PM 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 Transit Authority	David Simmons, Ernestine Flient*
Council of Mayors Executive Committee	Dan Podgorski
Counties	Dusty Powell
Federal Highway Administration	Chris DiPalma
Metra	Thomas Weaver*
NIPC	Ralph Coglianese, 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
Illinois State Toll Highway Authority	Henry Guerriero
North Central Council of Mayors	Beth McCluskey

CATS Staff

Claire Bozic	Craig Heither	Tom Vick
Parry Frank	Joy Schaad	

MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of Minutes

On a motion from Mr. Pitstick and seconded by Ms. Snorden, the minutes of the July 28, 2005 committee meeting were approved without change.

B. Core Elements Discussion

Mr. Thomas stated that the UWP development process discussed at the last committee meeting was presented to the Work Program Committee on August 12th for comment. At the WPC's request, the list of core elements was distributed to WPC members for comment. Three comments were received. DuPage County felt the list was comprehensive and McHenry County was concerned about the relationship between transportation and the conversion of farmland. Ms. Snorden summarized Pace's comments that the UWP funds available for core elements should be limited to a certain percentage to ensure funds are available for the competitive selection process.

Mr. Thomas stated the core elements list was intended for guide UWP submittals that are designed to meet MPO requirements. He noted the elements on the list were not specific to an agency or a project. The following changes were also described.

- Planning for recreation and tourism, and consistency with energy conservation were removed as they are no longer required.
- Several items were moved from the RTP category as they also serve the development of the TIP.
- Global competitiveness should be added to the first bullet under RTP.
- Integration and interconnectivity and promote mobility and access should be added to the third bullet under RTP.
- A "Major Products Financial Planning" bullet should be added under the fourth category (efforts that roll into Major MPO Products) that will include public/private partnerships, innovative projects and illustrative projects.
- Electronic availability of documents should be added under Public Involvement.
- Ms. Metzger suggested the phrase "Planning with Protected Populations" rather than "for" them.

Mr. Pitstick felt that multimodal corridor planning should be added to the core elements list because it links the RTP to the TIP. Mr. Smith believed that subject would fall under the competitive selection process rather than core elements. Mr. Weaver agreed and stated core elements are not optional. Studies, on the other hand, may be postponed in a bad year. Mr. Coglianesi asked if the core elements had to be done every year. Mr. Weaver stated that some don't occur on the same scale every year but CATS has staff time devoted to each. He suggested the elements listed under "efforts that roll into major MPO products" may be more about coordination and that CATS staff generally addresses coordination needs.

Mr. DiPalma suggested the core elements list could be used to review UWP submittals that are selected for funding. It would not allow a "free pass" to proposals but could be used to verify that all of the core elements had been addressed to some degree, recognizing that there may not be a separate project for each item on the core elements list. Mr. Coglianesi stated he thought the point of this discussion was to identify core elements so they could get funded, and the committee could then see what funding remained. Mr. Smith agreed that the core element list could be used to check that nothing was missed, and whatever is missed could be put at the top of the competitive selection process.

Mr. Powell stated he sees the core elements as being at the global level – something that touches everyone. Core elements represent the minimum effort necessary to meet federal requirements, and some language to that effect should be added to the list. Mr. Powell believes the core elements represent a group of efforts required to run an MPO, and that other planning studies could cover emphasis areas identified by the Policy Committee. He also suggested that this understanding would lead to a greater amount of funds left over for planning studies. Ms. Snorden stated there should be a limit set on the amount of core element funding in order to achieve that goal. Mr. Coglianese did not want to limit the funding in that way.

Mr. Weaver suggested the core element decision may be guided by looking at whether the funds are paying for staff time or consultant time. Mr. Thomas stated CATS may ask for funding for increased staffing and feels that the agency should be able to use core element funding for consultants.

Mr. Powell stated he is concerned about the amount of funding going to TIP development by the agencies. He wants to know what it truly costs including the specific identification of FTEs (full time *employee* equivalents). Mr. Weaver stated every agency should provide justification that an activity is a core element. He suggested that CATS be funded 100% for its core elements and that all others receive a percentage based on what needs to be held over for the competitive selection. Mayor Podgorski agreed and stated the committee needs to maintain a regional perspective and everyone must justify their core elements. He described budgeting in the Village of Lansing as having a similar process where core work, police, fire, public works, etc. is budgeted first, but that core budgets must be justified. There are no blank checks.

CATS staff will make the discussed changes to the core elements list, add some language on the intent of the core elements list and distribute it to the committee members.

C. Call for Core Elements Projects

Mr. Thomas suggested the committee proceed by calling for core elements projects to be submitted. Mr. Weaver stated the committee needed to elicit information that would help it determine if a project fits in Tier I or Tier II. Ms. Bolte asked if the form could be simplified, and suggested that required fields include the budget amount, along with preliminary staffing and consultant costs. Mr. Powell commented it could ask for the FTEs devoted to the project and what they do.

Mr. Thomas suggested the following schedule for the core elements projects:

- October 18 – core elements proposals due
- October 19 – proposals distributed to UWP Committee
- October 25 – UWP meeting to discuss proposals
- November 15 – UWP meeting to finalize core elements program

This proposed schedule will be presented to the WPC for approval at the September 30 meeting. Due to the Executive Committee meeting schedule, Ms. Schaad stated the Council of Mayors proposals would have preliminary budget amounts that may need to be revised after November 15.

CATS staff will redesign the core elements submittal form based on committee discussion and will distribute it to members for comment.

D. Other Business

The committee agreed to add multimodal corridor planning to the list of potential emphasis areas for the FY07 UWP.

On a motion from Mr. Weaver and seconded by Mr. Coglianese, the meeting was adjourned at 2:58 PM.

NEXT MEETING - The UWP Committee will meet Tuesday, October 25, 2005 at 10:00 AM in the main conference room at CATS.