



Unified Work Program Committee Meeting Notes – September 7, 2006

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 AM at the CMAP Offices, DuPage County Conference Room, 233 South 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	David Simmons, Jim Richmond*
Counties	Thomas Rickert
Federal Highway Administration	Chris DiPalma
Metra	Tom Weaver*
McHenry Department of Transportation	Jason Osborn
Pace	Lorraine Snorden, Tom Radak*
Regional Transportation Authority	Mark Pitstick, Patty Mangano*
CMAP	Gordon Smith

Unified Work Program Committee Members Not Present

Illinois Department of Transportation	Les Nunes, <i>Chair</i>
Chicago Department of Transportation	LuAnn Hamilton*
Council of Mayors	Dan Podgorski, Arlene Mulder*
Federal Transit Administration	Vanessa Adams
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency	Mike Rogers
Metra	Jack Groner
CMAP	Linda Bolte*

*Alternate Member

Interested Parties

DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference	Tam Kutzmark
Illinois Department of Transportation DPIT	Amy Welk
Northwest Municipal Conference	Mike Walczak
Will County Government League	Hugh O'Hara

CMAP Staff

Patricia Berry	Suzanne Lanzafame	Hubert Morgan
----------------	-------------------	---------------

MEETING SUMMARY

A. Approval of Minutes

The meeting minutes from the August 15, 2006 meeting were unanimously approved on a motion by Mr. Pitstick seconded by Mr. Seglin.

B. Discussion of RTP and Framework Plan Goals

Mr. Smith explained the two documents are goals for the region and he believes that the UWP should support those goals. Mr. Smith brought Mr. Morgan in to address the Framework 2040 Plan. An Initial Concept for FY 2008 UWP Goals was distributed at the meeting. Mr. Seglin commented that they covered everything. Mr. Pitstick asked if this was an assembling. Mr. Smith answered that it is two distinct summaries of documents. Ms. Berry said that the first page is on the Framework and the second page is on the RTP.

Mr. Morgan explained that two universities are working on land-use modeling projects. Four goals have been identified for this fiscal year; they are redevelopment, access to housing, access to water supply and access to education. There will be another set of goals for the next fiscal year. Mr. Pitstick feels that the relationship to transportation is not very direct; he is looking more for how this relates to transportation planning. Mr. Morgan pointed out the five Common Ground core themes on page two of the Initial Concepts and pointed out they looked at centers, corridors and green areas and they relate to transportation as they develop land-use patterns. If RTA, Pace, Metra or CTA is looking to servicing areas, those areas should be modeled and outcomes need to be viewed.

Ms. Snorden stated that she was confused because she had felt that Mr. Blankenhorn at the last meeting stated the committee should discuss the regional issues and the Core will develop from that. Mr. Pitstick responded that she is not misunderstood, that there were different takes on it. It is primarily what planning staff needs to do in order to help the UWP Committee meet those steps and goals.

Mr. Seglin stated that it is really more the land-use pattern that drives transportation and infrastructure improvements. Mr. Morgan added that transportation connections would not be built connections in areas where land-use is not present. Mr. Seglin responded that it would not work if the research was done and there could be no transportation infrastructure in the areas.

Mr. Rickert commented on whether land-use is a goal that the UWP needed to look at. Mr. Smith stated that there is interactivity between housing and transportation and the CMAP report to Governor and General Assembly shows how these need to be addressed. The RTP identifies projects, while the 2040 plan establishes land-use and quality of life issues. Both documents are goal and issue statements for the region and the UWP Committee needs to take a stand on seeing products.

Mr. Pitstick stated that CMAP's work plan outlines work that needs to be done to complete the RTP and the 2040. The UWP's charge is allocation. He asks what work does the MPO have to do for good transportation planning in the region. The first part is to decide on what work needs to be done and work on transportation needs for the next year. Mr. Morgan said that the charge has not been met. We need more for the UWP to move forward.

Mr. Smith said Mr. Pitstick is looking for staff to provide MPO activities and MPO Work Program. Mr. Pitstick added that it is more than that and what activities are needed is to accomplish the purpose. Mr. Weaver stated the importance of what staff is doing during the course of the year to further their goals. The process allows flexibility for the UWP

committee to be responsive during the year. It is a flexible system and needs have changed. Ms. Welk asked how projects are chosen and once the projects are chosen and Mr. Weaver responded that it is done on a higher level. Ms. Welk also asked if the list is also developed by a higher level and Mr. Smith responded that the Core was developed by the UWP Committee. Mr. Rickert added that prioritizing can be given to planning and programming projects that have connection to land-use. Mr. Seglin suggested project planning. Mr. Smith added that projects associated with the Core are certain things that have to be done by the MPO.

Mr. Morgan asked if the CMAP report is on the Governor's desk and Mr. Smith responded that it is.

Mr. Pitstick stated that before the call for projects, a list is needed from the MPO on regional issues. Mr. Smith asked if the schedule had gone to the Work Program Committee and Ms. Berry answered that it might have, but it can be revised. Mr. Seglin suggested looking at projects for land-use and transportation and focus on integrating both as well as looking at current RTP projects. Mr. Pitstick replied that CATS staff has done that already and Ms. Snorden said that issues are still being identified.

Mr. Seglin asked what the next step is and Mr. Pitstick stated that it is to identify CMAP's core proposals. Mr. Smith asked if CMAP is to identify a UWP work program and Mr. Pitstick replied that it is a region's work program for transportation planning. Mr. Weaver said that CMAP staff is logically funded by means other than transportation funds. He asked if there were non-transportation projects that are funded under CMAP. Mr. Pitstick said that UWP funds will not cover all of CMAP's work. Mr. Smith said that this is made clear by CMAP. Mr. DiPalma said that Title 23 funds cannot be used on non-transportation issues, but there is some leniency with that. There is a general agreement and three step process where issues are addressed and which agencies are determined to best take on the issues. Ms. Berry said that there is no set of issues.

Mr. DiPalma said the first step is to obtain a set of issues. He sees the issues as the goals of the region and that accomplishes step one. He feels that jumping ahead to resolve the issues muddle discussion, it is best to clearly identify issues first. Mr. Rickert said that they should look at specifics and refine the issues. Mr. DiPalma feels there should be further definition to the issues. Mr. Seglin asked what level of specificity is needed, and how are land-use and transportation integrated.

Mr. Seglin said that they had originally talked about making problem statements to be addressed and layout a work plan. Mr. Pitstick said that it is not a work plan, but problem statements should be submitted. Mr. Morgan suggested keeping a regional significance to them. Mr. Seglin asked how this should be included and integrated. Mr. Weaver asked if anything is going to happen once CMAP is one organization.

Mr. Rickert said that Federal Requirements need to be met, as well as certain goals and the UWP needs to ask how they feel this is a regional approach. More "teeth" is needed in the planning process. Mr. Pitstick stated that the UWP Committee influences CMAP, but wants to know what staff will do differently to address these goals. Mr. Smith stated that CMAP will identify regional priorities and product statements. Ms. Snorden pointed out that page 2 of the Initial Concept for FY 2008 UWP Goals is the goals. Mr. Rickert feels that page 2 is too general and does not reach specifics of projects. Mr. Morgan asked if the committee will respond to what staff comes up with. Ms. Snorden responded that an emphasis from the committee will be brought and "the wheel should not be reinvented" in regards to goals and objectives of the two plans.

Mr. Weaver stated that the problem is a lack of resources and Mr. Smith agrees that capital funding is a regional issue. Mr. Seglin asks how sufficient funding is obtained. Mr. DiPalma referred to page two of the Initial Concept for FY 2008 UWP Goals as being the goals. Mr. Pitstick said that regular goals drives and selects projects. Mr. Rickert said that the goal of the UWP is to get projects moving and funding. Mr. DiPalma said that feasibility and analysis helps with choosing programs or projects, it is similar to context sensitive solutions, the Committee needs to find a way to discover regular priorities. Mr. Smith said that problem statements need to be written and discussed. Mr. Seglin asked how the UWP can meet Federal mandates. Ms. Berry said that it is what the UWP has been doing and Mr. Pitstick is looking at how to do it differently and look at other major projects.

Mr. Seglin suggested that the phrase “How do we...” be added before the Shared Path 2030 Goals and Objectives on page two of the Initial Concepts for FY 2008 UWP Goals and then become more specific with questions. Mr. DiPalma agreed and stated that it is what is missing from the committee’s standpoint.

Mr. DiPalma asked Mr. Morgan if the proposals could be tailored to the committee’s standpoint and Mr. Morgan agreed. It was decided that problem statements could be returned to members by September 15 and discussed at the September 19 meeting. The Committee members were asked to email Mr. Smith at gsmith@chicagoareaplanning.org with the problem statements by September 12. Mr. Smith suggested that facilitators will be at the next meeting.

C. Discussion of Core Project Proposal Form

The Committee reviewed the form used for the FY 2007 submittals to see if there were any changes to be made to the FY08 program form. Ms. Snorden said that there had been some outstanding issues involving TIP development; she feels that the issues should be resolved before the form is discussed. Mr. Smith suggested that the Competitive Selection Process form is a good example to look for and he will bring in copies to the next meeting. Mr. Pitstick felt that the form addressed planning priorities and not so much the core. Ms. Snorden still felt the issues need to be discussed. Mr. Smith decided that it would be added to the next meeting agenda.

D. Other Business

Ms. Berry stated that the UWP Committee is now handled by Gordon Smith.

E. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 19 at 10 AM. On a motion by Mr. Weaver and seconded by Ms. Snorden, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am.