



Unified Work Program Committee Meeting Notes – September 19, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 10:12 AM at the CMAP Offices, DuPage County Conference Room, 233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800, Chicago, Illinois. Those present at the meeting were:

Unified Work Program Committee Members

Chicago Department of Transportation
Chicago Transit Authority
Federal Highway Administration
Illinois Department of Transportation
McHenry Department of Transportation
Pace
Regional Transportation Authority
CMAP

Dave Seglin
David Simmons, Jim Richmond*
Chris DiPalma
Les Nunes, *Chair*
Jason Osborn
Lorraine Snorden, Tom Radak*
Mark Pitstick, Patty Mangano*
Gordon Smith

Unified Work Program Committee Members Not Present

Chicago Department of Transportation
Council of Mayors
Counties
Federal Transit Administration
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
Metra
CMAP

LuAnn Hamilton*
Dan Podgorski, Arlene Mulder*
Thomas Rickert
Vanessa Adams
Mike Rogers
Jack Groner, Tom Weaver*
Linda Bolte*

*Alternate Member

Interested Parties

Center for Neighborhood Technology
Chicago Metropolis 2020
DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference
Kane Kendall Council of Mayors
Northwest Municipal Conference
Will County Government League

Jacky Grimshaw
Jim LaBelle, Matt Maloney, Maria Urban
Tam Kutzmark
Erin Willrett
Mike Walczak
Hugh O'Hara

CMAP Staff

Randy Blankenhorn
Don Kopec
John Allen
Bola Delano

MEETING SUMMARY

A. Metropolis 2020 UWP Evaluation

Maria Urban, Matt Maloney and Jim LaBelle from Chicago Metropolis 2020 presented the results of a study they conducted over the last several months on the UWP allocation process and what happens after funds are allocated. Their study also looked at the UWP processes for six other urban areas across the country.

Ms. Urban said the study looked at the processes from 2003-2007 and the research was based on source documents such as the CATS website and project proposal packages.

The first finding of the study is that funding levels by agency had remained stable – the agencies receive approximately the same percentage of UWP funds every year. She said the UWP Committee began a new way of allocating funds in 2005 called Core/Tier 2, but that this process didn't have a demonstrable impact on allocations to agencies or programs.

The second finding is that there is no tracking system for where allocations are spent. She said spending reports go directly to the Illinois Department of Transportation. CATS didn't see them, and therefore couldn't evaluate what was done.

Ms. Urban then highlighted how six other cities conduct their UWP processes. "We're not recommending that their approaches are solutions for Chicago," she said. "They're examples of what can be done."

In New York, the UWP process begins with 30 regional hearings. A prospectus is then developed that lets agencies know what the needs are and what their priorities should be. A Transportation Coordinating Committee later conducts a peer review of funding applications.

San Diego starts with a retreat where MPO board members set goals and objectives. The MPO staff then translates those into criteria to evaluate proposals. Mandated programs and those with dedicated funding become the core of the UWP. Discretionary proposals are then reviewed and ranked, and all proposals are sent to the full board for approval.

In Portland, the RTP's policy chapter is used to set planning priorities. Projects must cite a mandate from the RTP in order to be funded.

On staff funding, Ms. Urban said San Diego, Atlanta and Portland keep 100 percent of the UWP funds for the MPO. In Chicago, Dallas and Boston, varying percentages are used.

Based on the study, Metropolis 2020 had the following recommendations:

1. The regional policy makers should provide leadership in crafting a clear vision that communicates what we want to achieve.
2. Project selection criteria should be developed by CMAP staff and committees.
3. A project tracking and evaluation system should be established by CMAP staff to inform the process in the future.
4. Oversight of the UWP process should be expanded beyond the UWP Committee to include the CMAP board and Citizens Advisory Committee.

Metropolis 2020 also made the following funding recommendations:

1. Augment federal highway and transit funds with other federal, state and local planning funds.

2. Establish a source of local funds.
3. Adopt an integrated budget for regional planning that reflects all programs and their funding sources.

A general question-and-answer session followed, with committee members asking about various aspects of the study.

Ms. Snorden then moved, with Mr. Seglin seconding, that the report be made available to the Work Program Committee. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Approval of the Minutes

The minutes from September 7, 2006 meeting were unanimously approved on a motion by Ms. Snorden, seconded by Ms. Mangano.

C. FY06 Issues

CMAP Executive Director Randy Blankenhorn said the CMAP Strategic Report on Visioning, Governance and Funding outlines what the issues are and what needs to be done, adding that core elements need to be looked at in another way.

Mr. Seglin said the CMAP report's regional focus areas ([attached](#)) tie in with some of the problem statements ([attached](#)) submitted by UWP member agencies, adding that it looked like only three agencies submitted statements.

Mr. Smith said this was correct.

Mr. Pitstick said the regional focus areas are more like categories and almost anything could fit under them.

Mr. Blankenhorn agreed, adding "when we say 'congestion relief,' what does that mean? It's up to you to say these are the types of projects that best address your concerns."

Mr. Pitstick asked if there were an in-between step. Mr. Blankenhorn said there is and that the committee needs to look at the list and say what it can do in the short-term and long-term and decide what major issues need to be addressed in the next year.

Mr. Seglin asked if the committee should look at the focus areas as questions that need answers and then "cherry-pick" what needs to be done.

Mr. Blankenhorn said there's more to it than that. "We need to look at the transportation system and figure out what we don't know," he said. "How do we influence transportation investments through the planning process?"

Mr. Pitstick said he hoped the CMAP staff could show the committee areas that aren't being addressed.

Mr. Blankenhorn said staff could do that, but hadn't done so as yet. "We're waiting for direction from this committee," he said. "Do you want us to do more work in this area or not?"

Mr. Pitstick said the committee needs to align the problem statements with the issues, and that CMAP staff could align the problem areas with the focus statements.

Mr. Smith asked if all the agencies should resubmit their problem statements to align them with the focus areas.

Mr. Blankenhorn responded that there needs to be a schedule, asking if UWP proposals will be submitted in January or February. He said the agencies should resubmit problem statements by Friday, Sept. 29, and that staff would have a response ready by mid-October.

Mr. Pitstick noted that the committee is scheduled to meet again on Oct. 24. He added that he isn't sure how this exercise fits the committee's mission. "Will it help form both the core and discretionary proposals for the UWP?" he asked.

Mr. Kopec said he thinks so and that core proposals are things that absolutely have to be accomplished.

Mr. Blankenhorn said the committee needs to have a significantly better definition of what is core.

Mr. Nunes asked committee members to resubmit their problem statements to Mr. Smith, and Mr. Smith said he'd have them correlated to the focus areas.

Mr. Pitstick said the committee needs to define core proposals, and Mr. Nunes asked what had been used in the past to define core.

Mr. Seglin said things that meet federal mandates were defined as core.

Mr. Pitstick said the MPO staff should define core.

D. Discussion of RTP and Framework Plan Goals

There was no discussion of this agenda item, as Mr. Nunes said it had been covered under Item C.

E. Next Steps

There was no discussion of this agenda item, as Mr. Nunes said it had been covered under Item C.

F. Discussion of Core Project Proposal Form

Mr. Smith said the staff had recommended using the same selection form for both the core and competitive proposal processes. He said the staff would adapt the form to fit whatever process is developed.

G. Other Business

No other business.

H. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 24, at 10 a.m. On a motion by Mr. Weaver, seconded by Ms. Snorden, the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.