

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** UWP Committee

**From:** CMAP Staff

**Date:** July 12, 2023

**Subject:** CMAP Unified Work Program Development Methodology

**Purpose:** An overview of the core program development process, potential revisions to the competitive program, and results from the MPO peer review will be provided and discussed.

**Action Requested:** Discussion

---

---

Since the committee last met, staff has been working to develop recommendations for revisions to the core program development process, has conducted a peer review, and has developed a set of ideas for revisions to the competitive program for committee discussion. This memo provides an overview of those activities to prepare the committee for discussion.

### The Core Program

As discussed at the committee's April meeting, CMAP must, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Northeast Illinois region, carry out certain core planning activities and produce specific work products to meet federal Metropolitan Planning requirements, including development of a Metropolitan Transportation Plan, a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), a Public Participation Plan, a Congestion Management Process, and establishing performance targets. This work is carried out primarily by CMAP staff, but some core program functions are also performed by these partner agencies: the Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT), the seven counties within the CMAP planning area (Cook, DuPage, Kane, Kendall, Lake, McHenry, and Will), the eleven subregional Councils of Mayors (Central, DuPage, Kane/Kendall, Lake, McHenry, North Central, North Shore, Northwest, South, Southwest, and Will), the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), and the three transit service boards (CTA, Metra, and Pace).

Staff recommends that the core program be committed to funding on-going work, not one-time studies or projects, completed by the above partners. Occasionally, consultant support may be needed to complete core program work; however, the majority should be completed by staff. Administrative and operational support staff, commodities, professional services, and general operating costs for the MPO that are provided by CMAP are also a part of the overall core program budget. Recognizing the unique and very specific role of the subregional councils of mayors in the region's planning process, staff recommends that the additional responsibilities, activities, and expenses they incur be defined for inclusion in the core program.

To develop the core program, staff recommends that eligible partner agencies annually submit a budget proposal for their anticipated work to assist the MPO with the completion of core activities. Initial proposals should include an estimate of staff hours/rates and anticipated eligible expenses for each of the core activities. CMAP staff will determine final allocation of core funding based on input from the UWP committee and will present that allocation to the Transportation Committee for their consideration for recommendation to the MPO Policy Committee. After MPO Policy Committee approval, agencies would be provided with a final scope of work for the fiscal year, including deliverables that they have committed to, and a not-to-exceed funding allocation from which they would develop their final detailed budgets and contract documents. CMAP's final detailed budget would be determined by the CMAP Board to ensure that adequate staff support is provided to carry out the activities described in the UWP, as required by the MOU between the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee. The CMAP Board cannot budget federal metropolitan planning funds for activities that are outside of the scope of the UWP and cannot alter the scope of work or funding allocated to partner agencies by the MPO Policy Committee.

Staff recommended core activities, the work tasks within them, and eligible expenses are attached.

### Peer Review

CMAP staff conducted a UWP peer review to develop an understanding of both the state of practice and best practices related to UWP development. This UWP peer review was conducted in two phases. The first phase was a broad scan of 21 peer MPO's UWPs, only based on information and documents available online. The second phase was comprised of virtual interviews with a subset of those peer MPOs from phase one, to allow for deeper engagement and specific questions for the interviewees. The attached Table 1 and Table 2 show the agencies reviewed for each peer scan phase.

During the initial scan, staff used the below research questions to identify the state of practice and best practices for UWP development. The research questions focused specifically on if and how peer MPOs may award UWP funds to external agencies.

1. Does the MPO award funds to external agencies?
2. What types of external plans/studies are funded?
3. What is the process of awarding UWP funds?
4. What committees, if any, are involved in the process?
5. How is performance of UWP funded external projects measured and tracked?
6. What is the public engagement process?

Of the agencies reviewed, about one third appear to award funds to external agencies. External plans and studies are typically focused on transportation projects, neighborhood- or area-level studies (such as local complete streets studies), or other specific programs related to long-range plan goals. The level of documentation detailing the process of awarding, tracking, and conducting public engagement for externally funded projects varies greatly. Several MPOs use a committee to guide the project selection process, and some use committees to conduct engagement and solicit public input. The most common method through which MPOs track progress of external projects is through progress reports (usually quarterly).

Based on the phase 1 scan, in June of 2023, CMAP staff conducted interviews with the four selected peer MPOs in Table 2. These agencies represent a diversity of approaches when working with external partners through the UWP development process. Below are the research questions used to guide the discussions, and summaries of the interviews are attached:

1. Do you award UWP funds to external agencies through a competitive program? If so, what are the parameters of that competitive program?
2. What reporting requirements do you have in place for UWP-funded external projects?
3. Do you have any data-sharing recommendations or requirements for UWP-funded external partners or projects?
4. What is your level of participation in UWP-funded external projects? How do you ensure that you have a seat at the table?
5. Do you award funds to partner agencies to participate in the regional planning process? If so, what are the benefits and drawbacks (higher levels of participation from partners, etc.)?

In general, when funding external agencies, the peer MPOs that were interviewed are conducting programs that are similar to CMAP's Local Technical Assistance program. There are three areas where CMAP could consider practices identified during the peer review: project selection, funding projects, and project management and accountability.

Potential Practices for Project selection:

- Conduct a regional workshop to collectively brainstorm and discuss ideas for UWP-funded external plans/studies
- Collect ideas for UWP-funded plans/studies from the public, and present the ideas to the committee for consideration
- Establish data governance policies and data-sharing requirements for UWP-funded external plans/studies, to support CMAP's role as a regional data hub and provider

Potential Practices for Funding projects:

- Establish set-aside programs from other federal fund sources (STP, CMAQ, etc.) programmed through the TIP for external plans/studies that help implement the LRTP
- Prioritize funding for proposed deliverables that are able to be utilized by multiple peer agencies
- Prioritize funding for projects that support multiple peer agencies/municipalities

Potential Practices Project management and accountability:

- Require CMAP procurement and contract management for UWP-funded external plans/studies, to ensure alignment with the LRTP and to prevent delays
- Establish a group of pre-qualified consultants for UWP-funded external projects/studies and/or post task orders directly to that group, to support efficient project delivery.
- Require that UWP-funded external projects are formally adopted by the governing body of the project sponsor

These peer scan interviews allowed for focused discussions on the above identified practices, which helped to inform new ideas for the proposed competitive program, as outlined below. The scan and the interviews also reaffirmed that funding regional cooperation and collaboration through a competitive program is desirable, and together with a strong core can ensure a comprehensive regional transportation planning environment. CMAP staff intends to continue engaging with peer MPOs as they also evolve their UWP development processes, to allow for ongoing identification of best practices for consideration.

The Competitive Program

In addition to the core planning activities and work products, CMAP and its partners may also complete one-time planning studies or activities that support, implement, inform, and/or complement the MPO's required work, and are aligned with CMAP's Strategic Direction and federal planning factors but are not core activities. These activities have typically been funded through an annual competitive program.

CMAP is committed to establishing a minimum annual funding level of \$1 million for the competitive program. This includes the 2.5% complete streets funding, which must be used for complete streets activities described in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) § 11206(c). Additional funding could become available in any FY if all proposed core activities are fully funded and there is a leftover balance, or if active program management provisions are established that would allow for carryover and/or redistribution of funding to the competitive program.

While staff does not have a full methodology recommendation, the ideas below are meant to start the committee's discussion so that staff will have more direction for a full methodology proposal.

- All agencies eligible for the core program, plus individual local governments, should be eligible for the competitive program.
- Minimum and maximum project costs should be established. Staff suggests \$75,000 - \$750,000.
- Projects must be fully scoped, have all deliverables defined, and have a complete schedule and budget to apply for funding.
- A call for projects should be conducted every two years to fill a five-year program and a contingency program of projects should be established during each call to provide a way for the region to successfully utilize funding if projects experience delays, particularly in getting started.
- In multi-year programming, no funding beyond the upcoming current year is guaranteed. The funding mark is an estimate and changes to the actual funding available may cause changes to the multi-year program. If project budgets need to be reduced, or projects delayed, priority could be given to higher scoring projects.
- Planning studies conducted by sponsor agency staff or consultants and one-time purchase of data, software, or other planning tools (no annual subscriptions or recurring purchases) are potential eligible activities.
- Projects should be required to result in deliverables that can be utilized by the sponsor agency and by CMAP. Projects that result in deliverables that can be utilized by multiple partner agencies could be given priority.
- Potential scoring criteria:
  - Project advances CMAP's Strategic Direction
  - Project addresses federal planning factors
  - Project will influence upcoming statewide planning efforts
  - Project addresses an issue area(s) identified by CMAP to inform the 2060 plan
  - Project deliverables will be used by multiple jurisdictions or agencies
  - Project increases cost effectiveness, increases efficiency, or reduces/prevents redundancies in the region
- Projects should be able to be completed within one fiscal year. Projects that may extend beyond one year must have a distinct budget for each year of work. Funding must be spent in the year it is budgeted. Multi-year contracts should be written in such a way that activities beyond year 1 are subject to funding availability and should include provisions for terminating activities on the final day of year 1.
- For projects requiring procurement, that procurement must begin within 1 month of MPO Policy Committee approval of the UWP and shall be advertised as contingent upon execution of contracts between IDOT, CMAP, and the procuring agency. Consultant contracts must be executed within 14 days of the start of the fiscal year, or within 28 days of the execution of contracts between CMAP and IDOT, whichever is later. All contract work must be completed by the final day of the fiscal year (June 30). Extensions may be requested during development of the next UWP, and all extensions must be included in that document to be eligible for reimbursement.

Next steps

Following discussion by the committee, staff anticipates developing a full methodology document for additional committee discussion in September. That methodology will include a proposed implementation schedule that will align with the deadlines established by IDOT for development of the FY 2025 UWP.

## **Proposed Core Metropolitan Planning Activities, Major Tasks, and Eligible Expenses**

### Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

The work performed in this category helps create and maintain a prioritized, fiscally constrained transportation improvement program for northeastern Illinois, which is consistent with the metropolitan transportation plan (currently ON TO 2050), functional plans, and federal rules. Development and documentation of the transportation programming process, implementing the process through the development, monitoring, and updating of the fiscally constrained project listing utilizing the eTIP database, and reporting on the accomplishments, including the annual obligation of federal funds, are major tasks within the category. This category also includes the direct programming of certain federal fund sources and participating in, monitoring and reporting on project implementation progress.

### CMAP Activities:

Day-to-day management of the TIP, including managing TIP project entry and changes within the eTIP online database and processing TIP amendment approvals through CMAP committees, establishing amendment schedules and procedures, and maintaining and updating TIP documentation and inputs. Training and assisting programming partners through development and maintenance of a repository of TIP programmer resources. Management of the eTIP database consultant contract and activities to ensure the operations, maintenance, and enhancement of the database. Development and management of the agency's CMAQ, CRP, and TAP programs and the agency's and Council of Mayors' STP programs. Support of the RTA's Human Service Transportation Planning process and 5310 project selection efforts. Tracking programmed and obligated funds. Organizing and overseeing programmed project status assessments and participating in state and federal coordination meetings for the Councils of Mayors, CDOT, IDOT, and other programmers.

Expenses may include staff travel expenses and the eTIP database contract.

### Partner Activities:

Direct entry of the partner agency's project scope, schedule, and funding data into CMAP's online eTIP database, including during a CMAP or Council of Mayors' call for projects that is utilizing the eTIP database and providing the agency's annual (by FFY) obligation data to CMAP staff. Other activities may include attending CMAP training sessions regarding the TIP, conducting TIP-related training within the partner agency, and coordinating within the agency to obtain the data and information needed from agency staff and/or consultants to complete eTIP entries and obligations reporting. Direct assistance with CMAP's public participation activities related to the implementation, update, or development of the TIP, including staffing public meetings or activities, development, completion, or promotion of surveys, polls, web pages, social media posts, etc. are also eligible activities. Activities to develop the RTA's 5310 program, and activities by CDOT to develop their local STP program are also eligible.

Expenses, including travel, to attend and participate in TIP-related training sessions are eligible. Because the eTIP database does not require any non-standard computer hardware or software, these types of expenses are not eligible under this activity.

### Additional Council of Mayors Activities:

As the coordinators between the MPO and local municipalities, councils of mayors are responsible for preparing, reviewing, and submitting quarterly status updates for federally funded projects, PPI forms, and other IDOT forms to CMAP and/or IDOT on behalf of municipalities. CoM staff are expected to schedule, attend, and participate in coordination meetings between local agencies and IDOT and/or FHWA. Activities for councils to develop their local STP programs.

Expenses, including travel, to attend training sessions and participate in project meetings are eligible. Expenses for the purchase of data or software necessary to evaluate STP project applications are eligible, subject to data sharing provisions described later in this document.

### Metropolitan Transportation Plan

The work performed in this category comprises the planning, research, data collection, modeling, analysis, and regional coordination required to develop, evaluate, update, and implement the region's long-range metropolitan transportation plan. Other planning work that implements the broader regional comprehensive plan and addresses the federal planning factors in Title 23 § 450.306, such as increasing the safety, security, resiliency, or reliability of the transportation system, supporting the economic vitality of the region, and protecting and enhancing the environment, promoting energy conservation, improving the quality of life, and promoting consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth, housing, and economic development patterns, is also included in this category. Local technical assistance is provided to transit partners, counties, and municipal partners within this category.

### CMAP Activities:

Plan development and ongoing research, data collection, and tools that will inform development of future plans and updates such as: advanced travel model implementation, UrbanSim land use model implementation, transportation modeling services, advanced emissions modeling, small area traffic forecasts, small area estimates of employment, regional socioeconomic forecast, census data coordination, the Northeast Illinois development database (NDD/NIDD), traffic, bicycle, and/or pedestrian count data collection, bikeways inventory, land use inventory, regional transportation investment strategy, project analysis tool development, household travel survey, data applications development, GIS working group, regional climate strategy planning, flood susceptibility index, regional heat vulnerability index, transportation conformity, regional emissions mitigation plan, EV infrastructure planning, regional transportation vulnerability assessment, freight emissions mitigation planning, local truck routing, grade crossings feasibility analyses, the regional ITS architecture, the regional housing initiative and regional housing coordination plan, housing choice analyses, coordination with and participation in the transportation planning activities of the state and neighboring states and regions, and other work necessary to prepare for plan development. Plan implementation activities, such as: regional project collaborations, DRI requests, the community cohorts evaluation tool, regional economic development analyses, public opinion polls, federal and state legislative analyses, strategies, and engagement, programs to promote and encourage plan implementation such as best practices in planning and regional awards, and Local Technical Assistance (LTA) and other municipal capacity-building programs to develop road safety plans, safety action plans, corridor plans, capital improvement programs, master plans, etc. that implement the recommendations of ON TO 2050, increase the capacity of municipalities to implement the plan, and can be used to update forecasts and scenarios for future plan updates.

Expenses may include staff travel expenses, collection and purchase of data, specialized software and services, and consultant costs.

### Partner Activities:

Direct contribution of data or information necessary for the MPO to complete the socio-economic and/or financial forecasting, transportation and emissions modeling, scenario planning, or other activities above that contribute to the development and implementation of ON TO 2050. Work to

ensure that the partner agency's planning activities are coordinated with, supported by, and supportive of the MPO's Plan.

Expenses, including travel, for staff to complete these activities are eligible. Collection and purchase of data, specialized software and IT services may be eligible, subject to data purchase and sharing provisions described later in this document. Consultant services are not eligible unless those services are for a general contract(s) for the purpose of serving as or supplementing agency staff and were specifically identified in the initial budget proposal.

Additional Council of Mayors Activities:

None.

Congestion Management Process

The work performed in this category defines the congestion management process (CMP) that provides for safe and effective integrated management and operation of the multimodal transportation system through the use of travel demand reduction, job access projects, and operational management strategies. The CMP describes an ongoing, systematic method of managing congestion that provides information about both system performance and potential alternatives for solving congestion-related problems.

CMAQ Activities:

Development and implementation of the CMP, including data collection and analyses.

Expenses may include staff travel expenses, collection and purchase of data, specialized software and IT services, and consultant costs.

Partner Activities:

Direct contribution of data or information necessary for the MPO to develop and implement the CMP.

Expenses, including travel, for staff to complete these activities are eligible. Collection and purchase of data, specialized software and IT services may be eligible, subject to data purchase and sharing provisions described later in this document. Consultant services are not eligible unless those services are for a general contract(s) for the purpose of serving as or supplementing agency staff.

Additional Council of Mayors Activities:

None

Performance monitoring

The work performed in this category allows the MPO to collect and analyze the data necessary to establish targets for the measures established under 23 CFR part 490, 49 U.S.C. 5326(c), and 49 U.S.C. 5329(d), to track progress toward achieving the targets, to consider capital programming and policy implications and alignment for achieving the targets, and to report on that progress, including providing a system performance report as part of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Work to support ON TO 2050 indicator and performance monitoring is also included.

CMAQ Activities:

Data collection and analyses to support target and indicator development, monitoring and reporting on the progress toward meeting the targets, and planning activities that can move the region toward accomplishment of performance targets, such as development of local agency pavement management plans and the Safe Travel for All Roadmap (STAR) program.



Expenses may include staff travel expenses, collection and purchase of data, specialized software and IT services, and consultant costs.

Partner Activities:

Direct purchase, collection, or development of data or information, such as asset condition, facility use, ridership, etc., that is necessary for the MPO to develop, monitor, and report on federal performance targets and ON TO 2050 indicators, if collected or developed for the sole purpose of meeting MPO requirements. Supplemental purchases, collection of additional data, and/or additional processing of data or information in order to meet CMAP requirements.

Expenses, including travel, for staff to complete these activities are eligible. Collection and purchase of data, specialized software and IT services may be eligible, subject to data purchase and sharing provisions described later in this document. Consultant services are not eligible unless those services are for a general contract(s) for the purpose of serving as or supplementing agency staff.

Additional Council of Mayors Activities:

Activities to coordinate sharing of locally collected or developed data that can inform the region's performance target development and monitoring.

Public Participation

All MPO activities must be conducted in an open and transparent manner, and the public must be able to easily participate in the planning activities of the MPO. To ensure that this occurs, the MPO must develop and implement a public participation plan that defines the process for providing individuals, affected public agencies, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved.

CMAP Activities:

Development and implementation of the Public Participation Plan (PPP), CMAP committee support, the CMAP website, CMAP Data Hub and data library, community data snapshots, and all communications and outreach activities including, FLIP, CMAP Updates (newsletters), CMAP Talks webinars, the ON TO 2050 exhibit, the annual State of the Region, Leadership Academy, and capacity building collaboratives.

Expenses may include staff travel expenses, specialized software and IT services, specialized equipment, such as keypad polling, microphones, projectors, etc., and consultant costs.

Partner Activities:

Activities that assist CMAP with involving the public in the metropolitan planning process that would not otherwise be conducted by the partner agency, such as direct assistance with CMAP's public participation activities related to the implementation, update, or development of the TIP, LRTP, CMP, or performance targets, including assisting with staffing public meetings or activities to promote, develop, complete, and follow-up on CMAP's public participation activities.

Expenses may include staff travel expenses to participate in these activities.

Additional Council of Mayors Activities:

As an extension of CMAP, when carrying out the scope of federally funded activities, the CoMs must provide the same reasonable opportunities for public participation in their processes. Because CoMs are housed within other agencies, and those agencies may not otherwise be required to have a public

process, expenses for hardware, software, services, materials, and other commodities necessary to provide for public participation are eligible expenses.

Additional expenses may include specialized software and IT services, and specialized equipment, such as microphones, projectors, etc.

#### Operational Expenses

Administrative activities, commodities, services, and general operating expenses are encompassed in this category.

#### CMAP Activities:

Agency management, finance and administration, human resources, information technology, and communications staff activities and the commodities, services, and general operating expenses necessary to complete the MPO's scope of work.

#### Partner Activities:

None

#### Additional Council of Mayors Activities:

That portion of council management, finance and administration, human resources, information technology, and communications staff activities and the commodities, services, and general operating expenses necessary to support the Planning Liaisons and complete the contracted scope of work are eligible.

#### Data purchases and sharing

Data purchased by partner agencies using federal metropolitan planning funds as part of the core or competitive program must be shared, in raw and processed formats, with CMAP to the maximum extent feasible and reasonable, unless expressly prohibited by the provider of the data. Processed formats may include spreadsheets, databases, GIS shapefiles and/or feature layers, etc.

Prior to procuring any data, software, software as a service, etc. with federal metropolitan planning funds, partners must coordinate through CMAP's Data Science Program Lead, Director, or Deputy of Transportation Research, Analysis, and Programming, to determine if it would be appropriate and beneficial to the regional transportation planning process to purchase additional licenses, accounts, etc. for use by other partner agencies.

## **Tables of Peer Review Agencies**

*Table 1. Agencies Reviewed for Peer Scan Phase 1*

1.	Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)
2.	Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)
3.	New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (NYMTC)
4.	Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)
5.	North Central Texas COG (NCTCOG)
6.	Houston-Galveston Area Council (H-GAC)
7.	New Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA)
8.	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)
9.	National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB)
10.	Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC)
11.	Southeast Michigan COG (SEMCOG)
12.	Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG)
13.	Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)
14.	Boston Region MPO
15.	Denver Regional COG (DRCOG)
16.	San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)
17.	Metropolitan Council
18.	Baltimore Regional Transportation Board (BRTB)
19.	Miami-Dade MPO
20.	East-West Gateway Council of Government (EWGCOG)
21.	Sacramento Area COG (SACOG)

*Table 2. Agencies Interviewed for Peer Scan Phase 2*

1.	Baltimore Regional Transportation Board (BRTB)
2.	Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG)
3.	Boston MPO
4.	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Council (DVRPC)

## Peer Review Interview Summaries

### BALTIMORE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION BOARD

#### Agency Details

Name	State/Region	Major City	Notes
Baltimore Regional Transportation Board (BRTB)	Maryland / 6-county region	Baltimore	

#### UPWP Funding Types

FHWA PL Funds	Name in UPWP	FTA Section 5303 Funds	Name in UPWP	Other
x	Title 1, Section 112 metropolitan planning funds	x	Title III, Section 5303 metropolitan planning funds	20% match provided by the Maryland Department of Transportation, Local sources

#### Present:

- **BRTB:** Regina Aris (Assistant Director of Transportation Planning), Todd Lang (Director of Transportation Planning)
- **CMAP:** Noah Harris, Alex Ensign, Kama Dobbs

#### Findings

BRTB described their development process as a “member driven” UPWP. They begin by sending two people from each member agency to the AMPO annual conference (around 20+ staff), to learn about what MPOs are and what kinds of supplemental planning activities might be useful for their next UPWP. Ideas for studies to include in the program are then discussed at the Technical Committee and with the public. This year, BRTB did also solicit ideas from the public. CMAP could adopt a similar ideation approach through a regional workshop format.

BRTB used to make UPWP funding available (beyond what is needed for the MPO activities) to external local partners for projects that assist in executing the UPWP. The overall criteria for projects included: delivery dates, supports regional planning, focuses on regionally significant transportation, serves two or more jurisdictions, focuses on regionally significant activities, meets federal guidance. However, a few years ago, the Board decided it was not useful to have local agencies fighting for those dollars. As such, BRTB shifted towards managing the contracts for each of those externally identified projects.

This approach allows for faster procurement when it is managed by the MPO, while local and state representatives still serve on a consultant selection panel. However, it has been challenging to secure the local match for these projects. When a local agency or consultant is authoring a UPWP product, they must credit the use of UPWP funds in the product, and the MPO requires reviewing the final product to then publish it on its website (to ensure that money spent leads to an actual final product). Additionally, communications and engagement staff are usually involved. To ensure that each of these projects is

contributing to regional and coordinated planning, BRTB urges that at least one part of product is shareable with other partners. This applied particularly for data collection and analysis components of studies.

Counties are paid through the UPWP for their participation in certain regional studies, such as an upcoming EV charging study. One of the main challenges of this is complex billing. BRTB does also manage a small [Transportation and Land Use Connection](#) grant program, which is similar to CMAP’s LTA program.

Practices for CMAP’s consideration:

- A regional retreat to collectively brainstorm and discuss ideas for UWP-funded external plans/studies
- CMAP procurement and contract management for UWP-funded external plans/studies, to ensure alignment with the LRTP and to prevent delays
- Prioritize funding for proposed deliverables that are able to be utilized by multiple peer agencies

## **DENVER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS**

### **Agency Details**

<b>Name</b>	<b>State/Region</b>	<b>Major City</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Denver Region Council of Governments (COG)	Colorado / 9-county region	Denver	MPO is within COG boundaries

### **UPWP Funding Types**

<b>FHWA PL Funds</b>	<b>Name in UPWP</b>	<b>FTA Section 5303 Funds</b>	<b>Name in UPWP</b>	<b>Other</b>
x	Consolidated Planning Grant	x	Consolidated Planning Grant	Consolidated Planning Grant carryover

### **Present:**

- **DRCOG:** Todd Cottrell (Project and Program Delivery Manager), Josh Schwenk (Planner), Nora Kern
- **CMAP:** Noah Harris, Kama Dobbs

### **Findings**

DRCOG generally does not award UPWP funds to external agencies. However, the MPO does manage a few set-aside pilot programs, which they are experimenting with through the UPWP and intend to transition to set-aside programs using STBG, CMAQ, and/or other federal fund sources included in the TIP that permit set-asides for planning work. This is one major difference from CMAP’s approach – DRCOG operates several [TIP set-aside programs](#) specifically for planning work. Historically, the MPO has tried to dedicate consolidated planning grant funds only for MPO operations and carried them over to future years. However, there is pressure to spend those dollars down, which have helped to start these set-aside programs.

UPWP set-aside programs include transportation and land use connections studies, [transportation corridor planning](#), and a [community-based transportation planning program](#) (which is focused on historically underserved communities). These are somewhat similar to CMAP’s LTA program. The MPO ensures that regional goals are incorporated into these plans, particularly for the transportation corridor plans, which are regional in nature. While local agencies and CBOs co-lead on project scoping, the MPO manages the projects.

Practices for CMAP’s consideration:

- Consider establishing set-aside programs from other federal fund sources (STP, CMAQ, etc.) programmed through the TIP for external plans/studies that help implement the LRTP.
- Prioritize funding for projects that support multiple peer agencies/municipalities

**BOSTON MPO**

**Agency Details**

Name	State/Region	Major City	Notes
Boston Region MPO	Massachusetts / 97 cities and towns	Boston	

**UPWP Funding Types**

FHWA PL Funds	Name in UPWP	FTA Section 5303 Funds	Name in UPWP	Other
x	FHWA 3C Planning (PL)	x	FHWA 3C Planning (Section 5303)	Some staff tasks are funded by MassDOT (including SPR), MBTA, and Massport

**Present:**

- **Boston MPO:** Srilekha Murthy (UPWP Manager)
- **CMAP:** Noah Harris, Alex Ensign, Kama Dobbs

**Findings**

Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS – Boston MPO staff) and Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) receive allocations for their work programs from a statewide formula through MassDOT called MARPA. The Boston MPO dedicated all of these UPWP funds to its own operations.

However, Boston MPO has a robust process of collecting and executing externally identified non-core project ideas, and the engagement with these ideas is significant. The MPO establishes a “universe of proposed studies” through engagement with the subregions. CTPS attends their meetings and advisory council meetings to solicit study ideas. They also run a public survey and an internal staff survey for more study ideas. 76 ideas were raised last year.

Funding available for these is dependent on money left after the development of core and technical assistance activities for the work program (only \$150K was available this past year, which was significantly less than previous years). The expectation is that CTPS will lead these studies. One of the main considerations for study selection is staff capacity. The final list of studies is established by a committee via an iterative ranking process, after the study ideas are presented to the committee (each study idea is shared via a 15-minute presentation).

Boston MPO has established rigorous data governance policies and data sharing processes for these studies. CMAP staff has reached out to the relevant Boston MPO staff for details and can provide those more detailed insights in a separate document if needed.

Practices for CMAP’s consideration:

- Collect ideas for UPWP-funded plans/studies from the public, and present the ideas to the committee for consideration
- Establish data governance policies and data-sharing requirements for UPWP-funded external plans/studies, to support CMAP’s role as a regional data hub and provider

**DELAWARE VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL**

**Agency Details**

Name	State/Region	Major City	Notes
Delaware Valley Regional Planning Council (DVRPC)	New Jersey and Pennsylvania / 9-county region	Philadelphia	Multi-state MPO

**UPWP Funding Types**

FHWA PL Funds	Name in UPWP	FTA Section 5303 Funds	Name in UPWP	Other
x	FHWA Metropolitan Planning Funds (Highway PL Program)	x	FTA Metropolitan Planning Funds (Transit PL Program)	Federal Aviation Administration Funding, Other: PA/NJ TIP funds, PennDOT Supplemental Funding (competitive, PennDOT SPR Funding (competitive), PennDOT State Funds (State Motor License), PA Department of Environmental Protection Funding, U.S. Economic Development Administration grant, DVRPC Local Initiatives, William Penn Foundation Grants

**Present:**

- **DVRPC:** Greg Krykewycz (Director of Transportation Planning), Patty Elkis (Deputy Executive Director)
- **CMAP:** Noah Harris, Alex Ensign

## Findings

DVRPC offers both competitive and non-competitive programs through its UPWP. There are three pass-through programs funded by TIP and PL funds through formula. The purpose of these programs is to support member governments to participate in the regional planning process (such as participation in various standing meetings, TIP meetings, LRTP meetings, etc. – these are called the Transit Support Program (TSP) and Supportive Regional Highway Program (SRHP)), as well as a GIS pass-through program that supports training, technical support, and more related to GIS work. The amounts provided to governments are established through a legacy formula.

Competitive programs through the UPWP support the long-range plan. Examples include the Transportation and Community Development Initiative (TCDI – similar to CMAP’s LTA program), the Travel Options program, and a regional trails program. Member governments are required to submit extensive progress reports. Generally, the MPO is more protective of PL funds, and as such, these competitive programs are funded through the TIP, using planning set-asides from other fund sources such as STBG or CMAQ, whereas noncompetitive formula programs are funded with PL funds.

The MPO established standards for eligible activities through the TSP and SRHP programs, in response to member agencies’ inquiries (although these standards and criteria are not available online). This has also made it easier for staff to review tasks and invoices, and to provide documentation for federal oversight.

The MPO requires that local governments adopt products prepared through the TCDI program, and they maintain a database of those products. The MPO used to assign one staff member to each external project, which helped provide staff opportunities in local planning, but this approach is no longer utilized due to capacity constraints. Now, 1-2 staff members oversee the whole program. Additionally, DVRPC established a pre-qualified group of consultants for TCDI, and when grants are distributed, municipalities can use those or have DVRPC post task orders directly to pre-qualified consultants. The purpose of this process is to help avoid any time extension requests on external projects.

For the Travel Options program, the MPO established a database for invoicing, where grantees (twice a year) are asked to address how project is progressing. This has made it easier for MPO staff to stay up to date on projects.

The MPO has always paid partners for participation in the regional planning process through their UPWP. They find that they do get strong participation from partners in all regional planning activities. This payment is framed as a “payback” for the local match that partners provide to the MPO. Every two years, the MPO provides to local governments a fact sheet that shows how much money the local has paid into the MPO alongside how much money they are receiving back through projects and grants.

Practices for CMAP’s consideration:

- Requirements that UWP-funded external projects are adopted by the municipality.
- Establish a group of pre-qualified consultants for UWP-funded external projects/studies and/or post task orders directly to that group, to support efficient projects.