



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

Programming Coordinating Meeting Minutes

September 10, 2008

Offices of the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)
DuPage County Conference Room
Suite 800, 233 S. Wacker Drive, Sears Tower, Chicago, Illinois

Members Present: Rita Athas (World Business Chicago – CMAP Board), Mark Avery (DuPage County – Land Use Committee), Alan Bennett (Village of Elmwood Park - CMAP Board), Tom Cuculich (DuPage County - Transportation Committee), Jack Darin - (Sierra Club- Environment and Natural Resources Committee), Beth Dever (Metropolitan Mayors Caucus - Housing Committee) John Grueling (Will County Center for Economic Development - Economic and Community Development Committee), Marilyn Michelini (Montgomery - CMAP Board), Raul Raymundo (Resurrection Project - CMAP Board), Steve Schlickman (RTA - MPO Policy Committee), Dan Shea (McHenry County Board - CMAP Board), Holly Smith (Kane/Kendall Council of Mayors - Human Service Committee)

Members Absent: Nigel Telman (Sidley-Austin, LLP - CMAP Board), Russell Hartigan (Lyons Township - CMAP Board)

Others Present: Catherine Kannenberg (Metra), Tam Kutzmark (DMMC), Leanne Redden (Regional Transportation Authority), Paul Heltne (Centers for Human and Nature), Chris Staron (NWMC), Mike Walczak (NWMC)

Staff Present: Patricia Berry, Randy Blankenhorn, Teri Dixon, Jesse Elam, Tara Fifer, Don Kopec, Jill Leary, Matt Maloney, Holly Ostdick, Ylda Pineyro, Gordon Smith, Dawn Thompson, Kermit Wies

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 a.m. by Rita Athas.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes.

3.0 Approval of Meeting Minutes

A motion made by Alan Bennett to approve the minutes of the August 13, 2008 Programming Coordinating Committee meeting as presented was seconded by Marilyn Michelini and with all in favor, carried.

4.0 Developments of Regional Importance (DRI)

Ms. Athas stated that she would like staff to go through the distributed document per comment and receive comments from the committee and eventual consensus on the comment and revisions to the document.

Mr. Wies displayed a diagram of the DRI process.

He stated that he expects the Board's adoption of the process in January or February after the outreach to stakeholders is complete. He stated that two years after adoption the Board will review the process. The committee agreed that the initial two year timeframe would allow the DRI process sufficient time to work through the potential problems that might occur and give all the stakeholders enough history and documentation to reevaluate the process.

Mr. Wies continued by discussing the comments from working committees, specifically to define a DRI. He stated that staff continues to recommend using the standard Georgia definition stating the intent of a DRI rather than giving specific indicators to define a DRI. However, staff did insert examples from New Hampshire into the document to show specific indicator examples. Mr. Grueling stated he is not comfortable having the specific indicators examples from New Hampshire in the document. He also stated that phrases should insinuate the project has widespread impacts. The definition should include "regional" impacts, the word regional should be added in order to have a geographic definition Mr. Bennett suggested showing the stakeholders the New Hampshire examples and having them determine if the New Hampshire examples should be included in the approved document. Mr. Avery commented that it is difficult to have specific examples – the sub-committee has been trying for 18 months. Mr. Shea stated he does not believe that options should be distributed to the stakeholders for definition. Mr. Schlickman suggested the committee explore the definition of regional. The committee was in consensus to add regional to the definition and remove the examples from New Hampshire. Mr. Darin added that possibly after two years specific indicators will be apparent.

Ms. Dever asked if the financial incentives comment had been addressed. Mr. Wies stated that it was discussed at a staff level however staff feels financial incentives are a great idea in concept but they are difficult to implement and therefore were not included in the document.

Mr. Wies continued explaining the comments from the working committees. One comment was to have CMAP as an agency enter into a formal agreement with regulatory

agencies. Staff felt that at this time formalized agreements were not necessary but over time this could be reevaluated. Mr. Darin stated that the intent of the comment was for CMAP to enter into the agreements to formalize the commenting process. The committee agrees to leave the document as presented.

Another comment was that the CMAP board can independently initiate a DRI review but that it may allow for political involvement and also to clarify the role of citizens. CMAP staff recommends leaving the role of citizens as it is stated in the presented document because of the role of citizens during the local process. The committee agreed.

A comment received by the committee is that the definition of Tier II is confusing. Ms. Athas clarified that all the sub-committee discussion regarding the Tier II (Qualitative Assessment) lasted 18 months. A year and a half of examining DRIs illustrates that a two year trial to evaluate the process is needed. Revisions to Tier I include stating that the review by a regulatory agency addresses the need of the petitioner. The committee agreed to leave the document as presented.

Another comment was questioning the involvement of the working committees. The committee agreed with the staff recommendation that the document include that the DRI will be reviewed by staff and reviewed and approved by working committees that are appointed by the CMAP board. If the petitioner and the CMAP board do not agree on the designation of an individual project, the project sponsor will be able to respond with a written appeal. The committee agreed to include this in the document.

Mr. Shea questioned what would occur if a scope change initiated by the local agency or project sponsor occurred during the DRI review. Mr. Wies stated that staff would present the full regional impact analysis to the board and include the scope changes to the best of their knowledge.

The committee agreed the Frequently Asked Questions section is extremely valuable and to remove the entire example section.

Ms. Athas complimented the staff on their production of the process flow chart and comment organization. She stated she would like staff to produce a cover memo including a brief history of the document and the clarification that the document has not been approved, but only released for comment.

A motion made by Marilyn Michelini to release the revised draft DRI document with cover memo as discussed was seconded by Mark Avery and with all in favor, carried.

Mr. Cuculich asked if an impartial comment regarding the actual ability to implement the DRI document should be included in the cover memo. Ms. Athas noted that the committee has been working on developing the document for the last eighteen months. A large amount of discussion has occurred and many of the same discussions are likely to

occur at the stakeholder level. She suggested that the stakeholders will be able to make that determination on their own.

Ms. Athas thanked the staff again. Mr. Bennett thanked Chairman Athas. The committee gave her a round of applause. She requested staff prepare the document for release and the cover memo and distribute it to the committee in the next week.

5.0 TIP Amendment, RTP Update, Conformity Analysis

Ms. Dixon reported that the Transportation Committee has released a TIP amendment, RTP Update, and conformity analysis for public comment ending on September 21, 2008. She stated that the amendments will be coming to the Programming Coordinating Committee, CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee in October. She reviewed the proposed amendments and noted that the large number of amendments to the TIP is due to the air quality analysis year being 2010 and projects moving before or after 2010.

6.0 Other Business

No other business was raised.

7.0 Public Comment

Ms. Tam Kutzmark of the DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference stated the conference believes it would be valuable to include the working committee's comments matrix to show how the process has evolved. She also stated the conference would prefer to see stakeholder's comments organized in the same format as the working committee's comments. Mr. Wies stated that the small amount of working committee comments was almost unmanageable and that external relations will determine how the public comments for stakeholders will be displayed. He stated he assumes it will be a separate document rather than incorporated into the DRI document.

8.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Programming Coordinating Committee was scheduled for October 8, 2008.

9.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 a.m. on a motion by Dan Shea, second by Alan Bennett.

Respectfully submitted,



Patricia A. Berry
Principal Planner, Staff Liaison

09-10-08

Approved with corrections by unanimous vote October 8, 2008.