



Unified Work Program Committee Meeting Notes – January 16, 2007

The meeting was called to order at 10:04 a.m. at the CMAP Offices, Cook County Conference Room, 233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 800, Chicago, Illinois. Those present at the meeting were:

UWP Committee Members Present

Illinois Department of Transportation
Chicago Department of Transportation
Chicago Transit Authority
Council of Mayors
Counties
Metra
Pace
Regional Transportation Authority
CMAP
McHenry Department of Transportation

Carl Mikyska
Dave Seglin
David Simmons, Jim Richmond*
Dan Podgorski
Thomas Rickert
Thomas Weaver*
Lorraine Snorden
Mark Pitstick, Patty Mangano*
Gordon Smith
Jason Osborn

UWP Committee Members Not Present

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

Linda Bolte*
LuAnn Hamilton*
Arlene Mulder*
Paula Trigg*
Chris DiPalma
Vanessa Adams
Les Nunes, *Chair*
Mike Rogers
Jack Groner

Interested Parties

Chicago Metropolis 2020
DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference
DuPage County
Northwest Municipal Conference
Will County Council of Governments

Maria Urban
Tam Kutzmark
John Loper
Mike Walczak
Hugh O'Hara

CMAP Staff

Randy Blankenhorn
John Allen

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:04 a.m. by Mr. Rickert, sitting in as chairman for Les Nunes.

II. Agenda Changes and Announcements

None.

III. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the November 14, 2006 meeting were unanimously approved on a motion by Mr. Podgorski and seconded by Ms. Snorden.

IV. Review of Core and Supplemental Project Submittals

Core proposals were submitted by CMAP, CDOT, CTA, Pace, Metra and the Council of Mayors. These are [attached](#).

V. Next Steps

Several members stated they had not seen final proposals until the day of the meeting, with Mr. Seglin proposing that committee members review them and then communicate questions and/or concerns via e-mail. A summary of e-mails would then be given to the committee and the public at the next meeting. Members are to have all questions/concerns into Mr. Smith by January 19. He will then send those on to other members on January 23, with replies due back to Mr. Smith by January 26.

Mr. Pitstick asked in core proposals needed to be approved at the January 30 meeting in order to stick to the committee's schedule. Mr. Smith said no, but that the committee needed to keep in mind pending meetings of the Work Program and Policy committees and have its work completed before then.

Mr. Seglin noted that discretionary proposals are scheduled to be discussed on February 20, adding that core proposals need to be finalized before then.

Mr. Weaver asked Mr. Smith if CMAP planned to provide more details on its proposal. Mr. Smith said probably not, unless committee members request more specific information.

Mr. Weaver questioned CMAP's proposal, saying it was vague on specifics about which employees would be working on which projects and how much time they would be spending. Mr. Smith replied that since the agency is in merger mode it is difficult to say which employees would be working on which projects. He added that it could be done, but would be unnecessarily burdensome.

Mr. Seglin said it would be reasonable for CMAP to submit a total budget for its staff, broken down into person-months, and then broken down further to show how much time would be spent on transportation-related activities. Mr. Smith said he would take that request to Mr. Blankenhorn, adding that he didn't see any reason it couldn't be done.

Mr. Pitstick questioned whether the CMAP proposal contained all core items, saying requests for consultant services, strategic initiatives not related to the congestion management system and technical assistance should probably be listed as either supplemental core or discretionary projects.

Mr. Podgorski agreed with that position, saying the committee had worked diligently to define core projects and that consultant work, commodities and computer hardware acquisitions don't fit the definition.

Mr. Rickert ended the discussion, saying there is obviously a need for more dialog on the proposals and that he hoped it would be worked out in the e-mail process before the January 30 meeting.

VI. Other Business

There was no further business.

VII. Public Comment

Mr. Loper asked if CMAP could allocate a staff member to "shepherd" competitive selection grant winners through the process until funding is actually received. Mr. Smith said there will be someone assigned to provide technical assistance.

VIII. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 30, 2007, at 10a.m.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.