



Unified Work Program Committee Meeting Notes – November 14, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 AM at the CMAP Offices, Cook County Conference Room, 233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 800, Chicago, Illinois. Those present at the meeting were:

Unified Work Program Committee Members

Illinois Department of Transportation	Les Nunes, <i>Chair</i>
Chicago Department of Transportation	Dave Seglin
Chicago Transit Authority	Jim Richmond*
Council of Mayors	Dan Podgorski
Counties	Paula Trigg*
Federal Highway Administration	Chris DiPalma
Metra	Jack Groner, Tom Weaver*
Pace	Lorraine Snorden, Tom Radak*
Regional Transportation Authority	Mark Pitstick, Patty Mangano*
CMAP	Gordon Smith

Unified Work Program Committee Members Not Present

CMAP	Linda Bolte*
Chicago Department of Transportation	LuAnn Hamilton*
Chicago Transit Authority	David Simmons
Council of Mayors	Arlene Mulder*
Counties	Thomas Rickert
Federal Transit Administration	Vanessa Adams
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency	Mike Rogers
McHenry Department of Transportation	Jason Osborn

*Alternate Member

Interested Parties

Chicago Metropolis 2020	Maria Urban
DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference	Tam Kutzmark
Illinois Department of Transportation DPIT	Amy Welk
Illinois Department of Transportation	Tom Kelso
Kane/Kendall Council of Mayors	Erin Wielrett
North Central Council of Mayors	Beth McCluskey
Will County Government League	Hugh O'Hara

CMAP Staff

Randy Blankenhorn
Suzanne Lanzafame
Ron Thomas
Joy Schaad
Ty Warner

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 am by Committee Chairman Les Nunes.

II. Agenda Changes and Announcement

Mr. Smith stated that the UWP Schedule Revision is an additional item to the agenda and the '08 UWP Program Development Process. He also added that CMAP staff was to address confusion over how to integrate land use and transportation planning. Mr. Nunes wanted to address yesterday's discussion at Policy Committee on the Core.

III. Approval of Minutes

The meeting minutes from the October 24, 2006 meeting were unanimously approved on a motion by Mr. Seglin seconded by Mr. Groner.

IV. Discussion Core

Mr. Groner stated that the Policy Committee did not object to the direction of the core, they just want the supplemental core to be defined better. Mr. Blankenhorn added that the committee was confused. Mr. Groner said that at the next meeting everything should be clearly laid out, including how it will be approved and what order. As long as the WPC moves forward to give them a break down of the core. Mr. Blankenhorn suggested adding a tracking system.

Mr. Smith stated that a three-phase approach was agreed upon. Three questions have to be addressed, they are;

- In what order does the UWP Committee approve this process?
- How does the UWP come to agreement on focus areas?
- What about missing areas, did all groups have an opportunity?

Mr. Seglin asked why freight data was included as opposed to freight. Mr. Blankenhorn responded that currently there will be an 80% increase in freight and it is important for CMAP to see the accuracy of this information. Better information for better planning, this is not exclusive to freight data, but a priority. Mr. Groner wanted to check if this meant all types of freight. Mr. Blankenhorn responded that it is all modes of freight.

Mr. Blankenhorn stated that the Core and Supplemental Core is done with staff assistance. Staff supports the five primary outputs of the Core Program process. He also stated that the core definition needs to be narrowed, or there will be confusion like the previous year.

Mr. Nunes referred to the Program Development Process handout and Mr. Smith asked the members if they approved of the language of the document. Mr. Blankenhorn responded that the categories should be narrowed. Mr. Groner added that Work Program Committee and Policy Committee will question the definition. Mr. Pitstick also suggested narrowing the scope. Mr. Blankenhorn questioned what the supportive core is, whether it is studies or staff work. Mr. Pitstick suggested adding,

“Shall consist of staff support,” to the definition of Core Program. Mr. Blankenhorn suggested “Shall consist of the staff work of CMAP as the MPO.” Ms. Welk asked for clarification on studies and Mr. Blankenhorn answered that studies are included in the Discretionary Program.

Mayor Podgorski suggested using the word “produce” in the definition. The definition is “Shall consist of staff work of CMAP to produce the five federally required products of the MPO.”

Mr. Smith asked if the UWP was looking for Policy Committee endorsement and Mr. Blankenhorn responded that it will go to the Work Program Committee, who will then report it to the Policy Committee.

Mayor Podgorski moved to accept the definition with “produce” and Ms. Snorden seconded the motion.

Mayor Podgorski also moved to approve of the core program and Ms. Snorden seconded the motion.

V. Regional Focus Area

Mr. Seglin asked if these areas were funded or requests to be funded. Mr. Smith answered that last year IDOT looked at the level of activity and their staff made decisions to propose work and activity level to complete the work. If something seemed unreasonable, it was looked at and some adjustments were made. This process could be done again this year. Mr. Groner stated that looking at just the Core and the Supplemental Core, the only thing out of the Core is CMAP. Mr. Blankenhorn added that CMAP is in the Supplemental as well as the Core. Mr. Pitstick stated that this was not satisfactory to all the previous year. Mr. Blankenhorn added that narrowing the definition is the big difference this year. He also said agencies need to be direct about what they are constructing. Mr. Seglin wanted clarification on if the UWP wants two separate proposals or if the proposal is to be broken up into the phases.

Mr. Nunes asked about a timeline. Mr. Smith directed the members to the Proposed Schedule handout and pointed out the dates for Core 1 and Core 2. Ms. Smith stated Discretionary would be due at Core 2. The Core and Supplemental would be geared toward approval at the June Policy Committee meeting.

Mr. Seglin asked about it being divided into two proposals, Core/Supplemental and Discretionary. Mr. Blankenhorn said that it could all be put in one project and accepted at one time if the Core, Supplemental and Discretionary are marked on the proposal. Mr. Blankenhorn asked if this would still be done completely electronically and Mr. Smith responded that it will be solely electronic.

Mr. Groner feels that having two timeframes is more work for staff. He thinks approval could be separate, but submittals do not need to be separate. Mr. Weaver stated that submittal forms were similar in previous years and the committee handled it differently. The process was a voting-scheme. Mr. Pitstick said that there was no resource allocation to look at in prior years. Everything was simultaneous.

Mr. Pitstick said that Core projects are most likely already written up and Mr. Weaver stated that everything could still be handed in at once. Mr. Groner wanted to make

sure that the two submittal times were not an issue, and if everyone is approves of it, it will work.

Ms. McCluskey asked if lines could be added under the submittal form for the Core only CMAP submittal. Mr. Smith said that as long as it was clearly distinguished it would be acceptable. Mr. Pitstick said that core projects should be in sooner because they are known projects. Mr. Smith stated that this was correct and added that additional time could be given again this year, as was done last year. Mr. Nunes added that this process should not change. Mr. Groner stated that Discretionary often includes more thought process.

Some concern over the March and April times was expressed due to spring break. Mr. Smith stated that the March and April meetings will be to be determined. Mr. Pitstick moved to approve the schedule with the “to be determined” meetings in March and April. Mr. Smith seconded the motion.

The committee addressed the regional focus areas. Mr. Pitstick stated that he does not approve of it with the sub points, it is too limiting. Mr. Groner asked if he felt the head captions were fine and Mr. Pitstick stated that they are fine. Mr. Smith asked what was important and what was not. Mr. Groner stated that something simpler would be better and recommendations could always get added without the formalized process. Mr. Seglin said that the dot points were illustrative. Mr. Richmond said that dot points could always get added. Mr. Seglin said that the general focus areas can be approved or the supplemental core definitions. Mr. Pitstick said that topic areas should be confirmed as starting points. Mr. Smith asked if the members were comfortable with the items listed, adding that this has already been approved.

VI. CMAP Staff Presentations on land use and transportation linkage

Ron Thomas presented on the link between land use and transportation planning. He discussed corridors, centers and green areas, major components of the Regional Framework Plan. He also mentioned the Centers Toolkit, an interactive workshop that includes land use and transportation elements. Modeling activities, such as surveys also integrate the two. Mr. Thomas introduced Ty Warner, the team manager of the process. Mr. Warner stated that there will be workshops in the spring and the fall with the interactive toolkit that feeds into the corridors, centers and green areas. Mr. Groner asked what the end product was and Mr. Thomas responded that it is an integrated land-use and transportation plan.

VII. UWP Schedule Revision

The item was discussed in item V under the Regional Focus Areas.

VI. Other Business

VII. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 16 at 10 AM. On a motion by Mr. Weaver and seconded by Ms. Snorden, the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 am.