



Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 800, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606

312-454-0400 (voice)
312-454-0411 (fax)
www.cmap.illinois.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: DRI Subcommittee

Date: April 29, 2008

From: CMAP Staff

Re: DRI materials

Below are the comments in the order that we have received them regarding the revised DRAFT DRI Overview document distributed earlier in the month. One member of the subcommittee requested another meeting prior to the May 14 Programming Coordinating Committee. Please review the comments below and let us know by the end of the day **Wednesday, April 30, 2008**, if based on the comments, you would like to have another meeting prior to the Coordinating Committee or if have any concerns with us releasing the revised document along with your comments to the PL's and other interested parties. This will also go to the members of the Programming Committee next week with their agenda materials.

If it is the consensus of the subcommittee to meet, we can work to schedule it, so again let us know if you have reconsidered based on the comments below. If we do not meet, our intention is to present the current draft along with your comments and the staff's response at the Programming Coordinating Committee.

Comments from Dave Bennett:

It looks good to me. I don't think another meeting is necessary, but I'm happy to do whatever the others wish.

Comments from Mark Avery:

I do not believe another meeting of the sub-committee is necessary. While we have not found agreement on every issue, I do believe that we have consensus on MOST of the salient issues. I see no harm, and conversely, actually some benefit by advancing these recommendations and findings to the Program Committee, where it can be further vetted. There is some wisdom and knowledge among those folks as well. Let us let them weigh in.

Memo to DRI Subcommittee

April 29, 2008

Page 2

I am very pleased that the sub-committee and staff realize the importance of examining this effort/initiative with the same set of "regional eyes" that has been and will continue to be utilized with the GO TO 2040 Plan. After all, that is the premiere guiding planning document for the region, so first and foremost we need to establish a framework and context that is consistent with major recommendations and analysis of capital in the Plan.

I support the decision tiers as stipulated in Tiers I and II. I think that the ORIA approach will work well for Tier III. The approach is pretty comprehensive and allows us to sift through information that can produce some measure of quantitative analysis.

I am not terribly bothered that we advance this w/o complete agreement on the criteria/thresholds. In actuality, we may have to agree to disagree. Let's allow the Committee and the Task Force to weigh in.

I will be happy to talk about the issues in greater length and detail or assist in the discussions on the 14th.

Comments from Leanne Redden:

I think this is what the committee discussed. Unless one of the Taskforce members has a serious issue then I think we can share with the programming committee for input.

Would/could CMAP still comment on something that is determined to be Tier 1? In other words, using the CN purchase for example: That is now developing an EIS – does that constitute a process by which we feel input/review would be sufficient? Would CMAP participate/comment?

Comments from Rita Athas:

The document reflects the discussion from our last meeting. Let's forward it to the Programming Committee for further discussion.

Comments from Jack Darin:

Tier 1:

I agree with the logic of not proceeding further with projects that have already been through a collaborative regional or subregional evaluation, but the key detail here, to me, is what is "involvement." Many processes may include involvement by other public entities and the public in terms of comment, but none in decisionmaking. If a single decisionmaker approves a project of regional significance over substantial objections of those involved, should they be automatically exempt from DRI?

Tier 2:

What about adding:

"Substantial loss or degradation of natural resources of regional significance."

Memo to DRI Subcommittee

April 29, 2008

Page 3

Tier 3:

Makes sense to me.

Comments from John Greuling:

The Preamble: Why was "there needs to be a thorough investigations of the impacts" of a DRI eliminated? It was the justification for the DRI process, in that it would "add value" by improving the decision making process for these projects; just because we're putting off making a decision now about the impact measurements and thresholds doesn't eliminate this as a principle reason to have a DRI process;

I am assuming "Strategic Vision" and "Strategic Report " are interchangeable;

Identifying a potential DRI: I disagree on leaving this up to the committee of the whole; I think our sub-group has an obligation to prepare some basic thresholds that make sense "in general" - this would at least give the Task Force a point of departure on this issue. In the end, won't this really be what drives both the selection of and the review components for each DRI? Therefore, I believe our subcommittee needs another meeting.

DRI Screening: While the Tier 1,2, and 3 screening process appears to make sense in general, I do not like the idea of using a qualitative or "gut instinct" valuation to put projects in tiers 2 or 3. Why can't there be specific rules or guidelines for this ranking of projects? Again, we can run from the fixed criteria, but we always will go back to it. Under Tier 2, I am not sure a qualitative screening will always be the way to establish "consensus" on the DRI elements.

Legal Issues: Doesn't this new "qualitative" process expose CMAP legally? The words arbitrary and capricious come to mind. Using context-dependent characteristics are fine, but we need to find those (measurable) threads that make a DRI a DRI.

###