MEMORANDUM

To: CMAP Board Members

Date: July 5, 2006

From: Randy Blankenhorn, Executive Director

Re: CMAP Governance

At its June meeting, the Board agreed to the following points regarding governance:

1. Re-designation of the MPO will not be among the September report’s recommendations.
2. For the September report, we will define a mechanism for decision making on transportation issues that shares responsibility between the MPO and the Board.
3. Staff and committee work on transportation plans and programs will be reported simultaneously to the Board and to the MPO.
4. To ensure that non-transportation issues remain a high priority for the Board, the committee structure will be designed to reflect diverse input as embodied in the NIPC commission (e.g., including representation from park districts, water reclamation districts, and other bodies).

Building on the consensus expressed by the Board, staff has continued to work with our partners regarding the details of the relationship between CATS, NIPC and CMAP, as well as the committee structure under the Board. As we move forward, it is critical to encompass the broad representation and expertise that is currently involved within the process. From our discussions, we have identified the following options for the Board’s committee structure:

- A transportation planning committee that resembles the existing Work Program Committee (WPC) and a comprehensive planning committee that includes the functional areas of NIPC; or
• Functional committees such as transportation, economic development, natural resource, land use, housing, water resources, etc.; or
• Committees aligned with our staffing--such as planning, programming and operations, economic and community development and technical analysis--with the functional areas being assigned to one committee or another.

Each of these approaches raises particular issues concerning how they might be implemented. In the first option, we have stove-piped transportation from other comprehensive planning issues. However, this might be the best way to deal with some of our immediate concerns. The second option looks at each functional area, but it misses the point of planning in a comprehensive manner.

I believe that the third option will best serve the Board. This committee structure is reflective of the management structure, mirroring the functional areas of planning, programming, economic development and technical analysis. The areas that the Board will most likely play a role in would be channeled through a committee structure that would allow for broad involvement and, more importantly critical expertise to achieve CMAP’s policy goals.

Understanding that a shared decision-making process regarding transportation issues will exist between CMAP and the MPO and that the Council of Mayors and the Citizens’ Advisory Committee will remain an integral part of the process, we need to examine the other elements of our committee operations in terms of integrating planning. I envision the committees to have co-chairs, one being a CMAP Board member and the other from our partner agencies or a NIPC Commissioner with appropriate expertise. In addition, NIPC Commissioners would be invited to participate in a committee of their choosing related to their current involvement or interests.

Following the Board’s Visioning Workshop, I think we will have a clearer understanding of our role and responsibilities, so we can continue the process of identifying a committee structure that most appropriately reflects CMAP’s policy goals.
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