

**Unified Work Program Committee  
Draft Meeting Minutes – October 24, 2006**

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

**Unified Work Program Committee Members:**

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

**Unified Work Program Committee Members Not Present:**

Chicago Department of Transportation	LuAnn Hamilton*
Council of Mayors	Arlene Mulder*
Counties	Tom Rickert
Federal Transit Administration	Vanessa Adams
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency	Mike Rogers
Metra	Jack Groner
CMAP	Linda Bolte*

\* Alternate Member

**Interested Parties:**

Council of Mayors	Vicky Smith
DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference	Tam Kutzmark
IDOT Division of Public Transit	Amy Felk
Northwest Municipal Conference	Chalen Hunter
South Suburban Mayors and Managers	Joe Heinrich

**CMAP Staff:**

John Allen  
Don Kopec  
Joy Schaad

## **Meeting Summary**

### **I. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 10 a.m. by Committee Chairman Les Nunes.

### **II. Agenda Changes and Announcements**

None.

### **III. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes from the September 19, 2006 meeting were unanimously approved on a motion by Dave Seglin and second by Tom Radak. Mr. Weaver noted that he was absent from the last meeting and therefore couldn't have made a motion to adjourn. The minutes were amended to reflect that Tom Radak made that motion.

### **IV. Regional Focus Areas**

Mr. Smith said CMAP staff had been asked to assemble a list of UWP member agency problem statements/questions (attached) and to identify gaps the MPO could fill. He said three Planning Liaisons and four or five UWP agencies had submitted comments. He said that members were also asked to identify focus areas for CMAP and that those items had been underlined on the revised document dated October 23 (attached). The October 23 document includes all activities defined by members in the problems/questions statement, Smith said, adding that CMAP wants member agencies to look over the list to see if there's anything that needs to be added.

Mr. Pitstick asked where the focus areas had originated, noting that CMAP Director Randy Blankenhorn had stated at the last meeting that they were from the CMAP strategic report submitted to the legislature. However, Mr. Pitstick said, the focus areas don't match up to any similar list in the report.

Mr. Smith said the strategic report defines seven focus areas: research and analysis; land use; transportation; economic and community development; environment and natural resources; housing; and human services. The only addition to those areas in the UWP focus areas document is congestion relief, he said. He also said the UWP focus areas document is not laid out to follow the outline of the CMAP report.

Mr. Weaver said the regional focus areas were not created to define the UWP process. He then asked if regional focus areas were used as the basis for the UWP if that would mean projects such as corridor studies would be left out.

Mr. Smith responded that the focus areas are general and don't lay out specific activities to be funded, adding that it's the UWP Committee's responsibility to make those decisions. He said the committee needs to decide if it's going to lay out specific projects or just general focus areas.

Mr. Nunes said projects need to be connected to the focus areas and that everything should be identified from the start.

Mr. Smith said if the Policy Committee thinks a project is important it should be included.

Mr. Seglin said the Congestion Relief and Comprehensive Regional Plan focus areas are very broad, to which Mr. Smith responded that the agencies had asked CMAP to identify issues within the focus areas and CMAP had done so.

Mr. Nunes suggested committee members digest the focus areas documents and be ready to adopt them next meeting as guidelines for spending UWP discretionary funds.

Mr. Seglin asked how the focus areas and problem statements were related, with Mr. Nunes responding that the focus areas were derived from the problem statements. Mr. Smith concurred with that assessment.

Mr. Pitstick said the problem statements listed transit planning, but that is not on the focus areas list. He said the agencies wanted CMAP staff to define items missing in the planning process.

Mr. Smith said the focus areas are a list of project areas CMAP staff had identified as important, but it's not project specific. "We believe the items identified on the focus areas list include the problem statements, but if we're wrong that's what we're asking you to tell us," he said.

Mr. Seglin asked why the TIP (Transportation Improvement Program) wasn't included on the list.

Mr. Smith said items the MPO is federally required to produce were not included. Mr. Nunes said these five are the TIP, the Regional Transportation Plan, the Unified Work Program, public involvement and congestion management. Mr. Seglin asked if those five form the core of the UWP, to which Mr. Nunes replied affirmatively.

Mr. Seglin said the committee has been talking about core elements as MPO staff activities, but that excludes the City of Chicago's TIP.

Mr. Weaver said the MPO staff can't do everything the MPO is required to do and that the agencies provide assistance.

Mr. Podgorski said the regional focus areas list should be used as a basis to submit projects, but that the agencies need a similar list to define core elements. Mr. Nunes asked if such a list could be developed.

Mr. Smith said it could, but it probably would not solve anything. He said the committee had historically wrestled with how agencies participate in completing the five core elements, adding that CMAP could develop a document it believes is fair and equitable, but it would probably still lead to arguments.

Mr. Podgorski asked where the impetus for the UWP to define core versus discretionary elements had originated, adding that if the impetus was from another committee then that committee should tell the UWP Committee what it expects.

Mr. Smith said the Work Program Committee had provided the impetus last year and the UWP Committee had been discussing it ever since. He said Scenario 2, laid out last year, attempted to define core elements by the number of person hours each requires and the number of hours each agency contributes.

Mr. Pitstick said the committee attempted last year to define the federally-required core work that should be done by the MPO staff, adding that funding for that work would be taken off the table and the remainder set aside for discretionary projects.

Mr. Kopec said Mr. Pitstick seemed to be advocating looking at the focus areas to fund projects. He said the focus areas are what CMAP wants to address and that most of what CMAP does is covered under one area or another.

Mr. Pitstick responded that the focus areas list looks like a focus for CMAP and not for everyone else. He asked if all projects would have to fit under the categories delineated in bold face. Mr. Kopec replied that they would.

Mr. Pitstick said the five core elements should be the MPO staff's responsibility. He said the discretionary spending list should be the focus areas list, including an additional item that says the other agencies also do some core planning.

Mr. Podgorski agreed, saying work that other agencies perform to assist in core elements needs to be defined. He added that paring the core too much would exclude the work the agencies do. For example, he asked if excluding the Planning Liaison program from the core would mean it is excluded altogether.

Mr. Nunes said the PL program isn't at the same level as the core programs, but it's higher than the discretionary programs would be. Mr. Smith said funding the Council of Mayors isn't federally required, but it has a higher standing than the competitive selection projects.

Mr. Podgorski said the process should have three steps: core, “core lite” and discretionary spending.

Mr. Weaver asked if the first two steps could be handled at the same time. Mr. Kopeck said if the focus areas are defined to include core activities there could be a two-step process, with the committee deciding whether projects are core or discretionary.

Mr. Podgorski then made a motion, seconded by Mr. Weaver, that a three-step process be used. It would have a lean core defined by CMAP and the focus areas would be under the competitive selection process. The motion passed unanimously, except for Mr. Smith, who voted “present.”

**V. RTP and Framework Plan Goals**

Mr. Pitstick said this item asks what the MPO will do to bring the RTP and framework plan together. He said the committee is trying to define a unified Work Program for the region and the agencies need to know what resources they need to allocate to the MPO.

Because of time constraints, this item was tabled until the next meeting.

**VI. Other Business**

None.

**VII. Public Comment**

None.

**VIII. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for 10 a.m. on Tuesday, November 14.