



CHICAGO AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY

## UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

### MINUTES

December 21, 2004

The meeting was held at 10:00 AM at the Chicago Area Transportation Study, Cunningham-Williams Conference Room, 300 West Adams Street, Chicago, Illinois. Those present at the meeting were:

#### **Unified Work Program Members**

<b>Gordon Smith, <i>Chair</i></b>	<b>Illinois Department of Transportation</b>
<b>Ralph Coglianesi</b>	<b>NIPC</b>
<b>Jack Groner</b>	<b>Metra</b>
<b>Mark Pitstick</b>	<b>Regional Transportation Authority</b>
<b>David Seglin</b>	<b>Chicago Department of Transportation</b>
<b>David Simmons</b>	<b>Chicago Transit Authority</b>
<b>Lorraine Snorden</b>	<b>Pace</b>
<b>Mark Thomas</b>	<b>CATS</b>
<b>Kevin Ward</b> (teleconferenced)	<b>FHWA</b>

#### **Transportation Operators, Planning Officials and Municipal Staff**

Chuck Abraham	IDOT DPT
Linda Bolte	NIPC ( <i>Alternate Member</i> )
Mike Erickson	Metra ( <i>Alternate Member</i> )
Ernestine Flient	CTA ( <i>Alternate Member</i> )
Patty Mangano	RTA ( <i>Alternate Member</i> )
Beth McCluskey	NC Council
David Spacek	IDOT DPT
Jason Tai	IDOT DPT
David Tomzik	Pace ( <i>Alternate Member</i> )

#### **CATS Staff**

Patricia Berry	Craig Heither	Thomas Palzer
Claire Bozic	Ryan Herren	Gerald Rawling
Janet Bright	Bill Kiley	Tom Vick

## **MEETING SUMMARY**

### **A. Open Discussion on UWP Process**

Chairman Smith called for the meeting to discuss the UWP development process. He opened the floor to discussion, specifically seeking recommendations on project selection criteria and on how to approach the process from a regional planning perspective. Mr. Pitstick shared his concern that goals and objectives are lost in the process if it uses historical agency funding levels as a basis. He would prefer a process that starts with a clean slate and builds the program based on priorities. Mr. Tomzik noted that the programs he has examined from other regions include goals and objectives in the UWP. He would like some discussion of how projects are related to one another and what regional benefits they provide included in the UWP.

Mr. Groner stated he did not want there to be an impression that funds have been spent on projects that were not worthy or beneficial. Mr. Smith agreed that the purpose of the discussion was not to criticize projects, but was to develop the best possible process for distributing the limited pool of funding. Mr. Coglianese commented that there are always too many good projects to fund and that the process would require compromise among the members.

Mr. Herren noted that the UWP document includes a summary of the amounts allocated under seven major categories, and that it represents a prioritization of funds. Mr. Coglianese stated they are just subject areas and are not related to specific goals. Mr. Pitstick agreed that they are broad categories and suggested that a few goals be developed that the UWP Committee could focus on. He proposed that they should be guided by policymaker discussions and that they could be clarified for the UWP Committee by the Policy or Work Program Committees. Mr. Smith stated that any change in direction of the UWP Committee should come from the Policy Committee.

Mr. Seglin stated that during the development of prior programs, a list of work necessary to meet federal requirements was compared to other planning initiatives. He felt that 90% of the funds were spent to meet the region's requirements and that is where the initial emphasis should be. Mr. Groner agreed that the requirements needed to be met before other planning initiatives. Mr. Coglianese felt the UWP Committee would be limiting itself if it only used that perspective, but acknowledged that mandates would probably take all of the funding. Mr. Groner and Ms. Bolte both stated that the UWP is the only place where funding is available for certain activities.

Mr. Smith emphasized the need for the group to develop goals for the UWP. Mr. Tai stated that the intent behind federal legislation was for MPOs to develop and promote integrated intermodal systems and suggested that should be the target for setting priorities. Ms. Bolte suggested synthesizing the key statements from *Common Ground* and the RTP, as well as goal-oriented material Ms. Metzger had submitted previously, to create a starting point for UWP goals. Mr. Smith also proposed including federal guidance. Mr. Groner suggested CATS staff compile the RTP and Common Ground goals and make a first stab at coming up with a set of goals consistent with federal requirements and processes. Mr. Thomas stated staff will compile the information and distribute it to members prior to the next meeting.

**B. Meeting Schedule**

A meeting on Thursday, January 6, 2005 at 10:00 AM was added to the UWP schedule to discuss the goals and objectives. It would be possible to forward the recommendations for approval by the Policy committee on January 13, 2005. Mr. Herren noted that the UWP Committee meeting scheduled for Friday, March 25<sup>th</sup> may need to be rescheduled due to it being Good Friday.

**C. Representatives and Alternates**

Mr. Thomas requested that updates to the list of UWP Committee representatives and alternates provided at the meeting be forwarded to him.

***NEXT MEETING***

Thursday, January 6, 2005 at 10:00 AM.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Mark S. Thomas  
Secretary