



# Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 800, Sears Tower  
Chicago, IL 60606

312-454-0400 (voice)  
312-454-0411 (fax)  
[www.chicagoareaplanning.org](http://www.chicagoareaplanning.org)

## Unified Work Program Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday November 9, 2010

10:00 AM

Offices of the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning  
DuPage County Room  
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800, Sears Tower  
Chicago, IL 60606

### Committee Members Present:

\*Alternate Member

Matt Maloney (CMAP), Mark Pitstick (RTA), Beth McCluskey (Metra), John Donovan (FHWA), Brian Giblin (CTA)\*, David Seglin (City of Chicago), Leon Rockingham (Regional Council of Mayors), Tom Rickert (Kane County), David Tomzik (Pace), Paula Trigg (Lake County), Jim Fiorito (CTA), Reginald Arkell (FTA), Susan Stitt (IDOT), Tom Radak (Pace)\*

### Staff Present:

Hala Ahmed, Janet Bright, Bob Dean, Lindsay Hollander, Joey Silberhorn

### Others Present:

Chalen Daigle (McHenry County), Kama Dobbs (DMMC), Tammy Wiercak (WCMC), Len Cannata (WCMC), David Raso (Metra)

### 1.0 Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. by Beth McCluskey.

### 2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes.

### 3.0 Approval of the Minutes-April 13, 2010

The minutes were approved.

#### **4.0 FY 2012 UWP Development Calendar**

Mr. Maloney presented the calendar for the FY 2012 UWP development process to the committee.

#### **5.0 Livable Communities Technical Assistance Program**

Hala Ahmed and Bob Dean were present to update the committee on the UWP funded program, which is one of CMAP's priorities for FY11. CMAP is working closely with the RTA on their existing community planning program to expand eligibility/criteria for projects, making it easier for communities to apply, and using an existing application process and form that people are familiar with. Some of the projects will be funded by the RTA and some by CMAP, but the overall process will be unified and consolidated. The call for projects will be in April, with the deadline in June, which is the same as previous years. The process that communities will go through to apply will be the same as it has been previously; the changes will come after the deadline in deciding which projects get funded. The funding will be based on if the projects are transit focused, which would be funded by the RTA, and those that are transportation focused but outside of RTA's scope would be funded by CMAP. CMAP will be working to brand the program and differentiate it from the Sustainable Communities Initiative program, which is funded by HUD and will entail CMAP staff working directly with local governments rather than direct grants. CMAP staff will continue to update the UWP committee on the progress as they move forward.

#### **6.0 FY 2011 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Progress and Expenditure Reports**

Mr. Maloney inquired if there are any projects, especially from FY08, that are in danger of lapsing – if so, the funds could be potentially be added to the overall funding mark for the upcoming year, as was done for FY11. Mr. Pitstick raised a concern that on both the core/competitive side, some agencies are not spending money, and that this could be used as a guide in selecting new projects for the following fiscal year. Mr. Seglin gave an update on Pedestrian Plan Phase II and the Chicago South Lakefront Transportation Study – both projects have contracts approved and will be moving forward quickly. The Preliminary Planning money for CDOT will be expended soon as they are moving forward with projects; the FY11 money is not available to them yet. For the Central Area BRT project, the money will start to be expended as meetings have begun. Mr. Rickert inquired about CMAP and CTA having projects from FY08 and FY 09 that show 0% expended, and asked for clarification. For CMAP, Mr. Maloney explained that FY 08 was when the agency was being formed and that they did expend 100% on the scopes of work in question, but that staff was simply billing to different project numbers, which is somewhat

difficult to express coherently in this particular table. Mr. Seglin asked whether these issues needed to come back to the committee and Mr. Maloney replied that it is not necessary since the scopes have not changed. Rather, this is a case simply of charging to a different project number. Mr. Maloney expressed that this issue has been brought to the committee's attention already multiple times before and that CMAP's financial framework today is much more reflective of the UWP. Mr. Giblin said the CTA's Optimize Customer Access to Real Time Info project is moving forward, with bids for the RFP being evaluated now, and a contract is expected to be in place soon.

## **7.0 FY 2012 Project Priorities and Selection Process**

Mr. Maloney discussed how other committees, including Transportation and Programming, suggested last year that the UWP committee should reevaluate criteria for how projects are selected, including scoring. The attached memo reflects CMAP's first attempt at designing a process for prioritizing projects, as well as aligning priorities of the committee with those set forth in the GO TO 2040 plan. The attached matrix lists selected transportation related action areas from GO TO 2040, the potential lead implementers, and whether the work is already in progress by CMAP. Mr. Maloney suggested ranking the actions as high, medium or low, as a way to move the conversation toward the creation of a list of priorities.

Mr. Seglin raised the issue that previous attempts at ranking priorities have not been very successful. Mr. Pitstick asked if the actions are sometimes more programming related rather than planning related, and should other committees look at them. Mr. Rickert inquired as to how this affects the core vs. discretionary process and whether CMAP is making a recommendation on those within the memo and if this prioritization exercise was geared more towards the discretionary portion. Mr. Maloney said that he is not making a recommendation one way or the other, but feels the core vs. discretionary is mostly working well at this time, and that he does see this primarily affecting the discretionary portion, rather than the core, which largely remains the domain of federally required MPO activities. He also stated that as UWP funds make up a large portion of CMAP's budget, that CMAP likes to give a complete picture of their operating budget in the core process, and that CMAP will likely continue to submit all its projects in the core.

Mr. Donovan suggested that the priorities should be analyzed on a larger scale, multiyear level to help minimize the annual debate over funds. Mr. Rickert said that he thinks the committee often misses the mark on the discretionary funds and they should align better with the regional goals. Ms. Stitt said that the discretionary process should be examined to see

whether the funding is filling in gaps that exist, and also making sure it does not duplicate what is being funded in the core.

The committee decided to rank the actions as high (3), medium (2) or low (1) in terms of short vs. long term actions, rather than importance. The due date for the rankings is November 30. Mr. Maloney will add a ranking and notes column and send to the committee. This will be a first step to prioritizing which will then be presented to the Transportation and Programming Coordinating Committees early next year.

**8.0 Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**9.0 Next Meeting – December 7, 2010**

**10.0 Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:37 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matt Maloney", with a large, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Matt Maloney  
CMAP