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

August 13, 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 (City of Chicago – CMAP Board), Alan Bennett (Village of Elmwood Park - CMAP Board), Beth Dever (Metropolitan Mayors Caucus - Housing Committee), Jack Groner (Metra - Transportation Committee), John Grueling (Will County Center for Economic Development - Economic and Community Development Committee), Russell Hartigan (Lyons Township - CMAP Board), Karla Kramer - (US Fish and Wildlife Service - Environment and Natural Resources Committee), 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: Mark Avery (DuPage County – Land Use Committee), Marilyn Michelini (Montgomery - CMAP Board), Raul Raymundo (Resurrection Project - CMAP Board), Nigel Telman (Sidley-Austin, LLP - CMAP Board)

Others Present: Lenore Beyer-Clow (Openlands), Anja Claus (Centers for Human and Nature), Catherine Kannenberg (Metra), Tam Kutzmark (DMMC), Leanne Redden (Regional Transportation Authority), Harry Solomon (CMAP Citizens' Advisory Committee), Mike Sullivan (Kane/Kendall Council of Mayors), Paul Heltne (Centers for Human and Nature), Joel Stauber (CMAP Citizens' Advisory Committee), Chris Staron (NWMC), Mike Walczak (NWMC),

Staff Present: Randy Blankenhorn, Jesse Elam, Tara Fifer, Don Kopec, Jill Leary, Matt Maloney, Roseann O'Laughlin, Holly Ostdick, Ylda Pineyro, Brian Rademacher, Paul Reise, Kermit Wies

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 8:05 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 Russell Hartigan to approve the minutes of the June 11, 2008 Programming Coordinating Committee meeting as presented was seconded by John Greuling and with all in favor, carried.

4.0 Developments of Regional Importance (DRI)

Ms. Athas stated that the working committee members who sit on the Programming Coordinating Committee took the draft DRI document to their committees for comments and that they will offer their committees comments at this meeting.

Mr. Wies stated that there were two substantive changes to the document since the last meeting of the Programming Coordinating Committee.

- Page 6 bullet points B, C, D, and E were added to clarify the tier II process.
- Page 3 now includes a statement regarding consideration of the natural environment.

The committee first heard from the Economic and Community Development Committee.

- The DRI review process should only occur if there is value added.
- DRI process is too subjective.
- Questioned whether CMAP has the necessary staff resources (time) to conduct analysis.
- Could help local units of government conduct a local analysis on potential regional projects.
- Should be a type of incentive to participate in the process.
- Allow for an accelerated permitting process for projects that go through the process.
- Clearly map the DRI process.
- Impact of job creation and tax creation should be included as part of the initial qualitative consideration of a development as a DRI.
- Information require for the review must be made absolute and codified to provide some known limits for the sponsor.
- Time limit placed on CMAP's allowable period for providing a review and comment; also coordination with local review process.
- The process for referrals to the DRI process should be totally de-politicized.
- Should be an administrative appeal process of the review's findings.
    - Committee members commented that the DRI process is advisory therefore an administrative appeal process is not needed.

Ultimately the Economic and Community Development Committee passed a motion that recommends upon adoption of the DRI review process CMAP will allow for a 24 month trial/beta period to test the DRI process. All projects reviewed during this period would be used as test cases only – no public policy ramifications unless all parties agree. Upon completion of the trial/beta period, the DRI process will be revisited.

The Housing Committee representative stated their concerns as:

- There is no precise definition of what a DRI is.
- There is no precise definition of how to define regional.
- The process is subjective.
- There is no money allocated to fund this process.
- It will become a regulatory barrier.
- This barrier will create costly delays in the development process.
- It lacks teeth and will become meaningless unless it has funding or other financial incentives.
- Could become a tool for an angry neighbor using it to stop development.
- The process should be clarified, mapped, and a timeline provided.
- Lack of financial support by the state.

The Housing Committee did think that the process could add value:

- As a seal of approval when seeking funding.
- If the seal offered some sort of priority funding

The Transportation Committee representative stated:

- Overall support for the process
- Concerns include:
    - Tier 2 evaluation.
        - How it gets done?
        - CMAP staff time.
    - Transparency needed.
    - Implementation strategies if a project is "rejected".
    - Clarification of timeline.

The Environmental and Natural Resources Committee representative stated their concerns:

- Clarify definition.
- Citizens access to the DRI process.
- CMAP participation in existing regulatory processes.
- CMAP should formalize its relation through memoranda of understanding with other area regulators who may review DRIs to ensure that CMAP's input on projects within the region is automatically sought and considered.
- Criteria for defining natural resources impacts.
- Forest Preserves/Conservation Districts should be considered local governments.

The Human Services Committee representative stated their concerns are:

- Appears to be geared toward physical impacts.
- Need more emphasis on policy impacts.
    - Redevelopment of Chicago Housing Authority.
    - Change in Welfare Reform.
    - Large retail, low wage job impacts healthcare infrastructure of uninsured workforce.
    - Free Senior Rides qualify as a DRI?
    - How do the Olympics fit into this process?
- The Human Services Committee could review human services aspect of a DRI.

The Land Use Committee representative stated their concerns are:

- Further define what a DRI is.
- Further define and map the process.
- Further explore the context of a DRI.
- Ensure the timeline does not extend for so long it devalues the process.
    - The project scope may possibly change during the review process.
- Further define what triggers a DRI.
- The affect of outcomes of a DRI review needs to be further defined.
- To assist in defining the process there is a need for more examples.

The representative of the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) stated their concerns are:

- Use of the term "Tiers", it implies hierarchy.
- Process should be clearly described as staff activities or decision points.
- A fourth stage should be separately defined from Tier 3 and should describe the requirements on the project sponsor and CMAP staff in preparing that assessment and the possible actions of the Board consequent to the Full Regional Impact Analysis (FRIA).
- The process for participation by the CMAP committees, included the CAC should be defined.
- The multi-jurisdictional process may not have within its scope or jurisdiction the evaluation of all six areas of CMAP concern and if this is the case a supplemental analysis should be completed to address all six areas.
- Timeframes for different stage of the DRI process.

A question arose about whether the CAC is recommending that the general public be able to request a DRI review of development projects. The CAC representative said no, the process for requesting a DRI is comprehensive enough and there is not a need for the general public to be able to make a request for a DRI review.

Staff thanked the working committees for submitting comments and for looking at the process so thoroughly. The Programming Coordinating Committee determined that staff should prepare a matrix of comments since some were overlapping and agreed to meet again in September to address the comments. The matrix should include comments, which comments were reoccurring themes and how the document will address those comments.

The committee will view this at their September meeting and consider making a recommendation to release it to local municipalities and other stakeholders for review. The committee requested they receive the matrix at least one week before their September 10 meeting.

5.0 Other Business

No other business was raised.

6.0 Public Comment

There were no public comments.

7.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Planning Coordinating Committee was scheduled for September 10, 2008.

8.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 a.m. on a motion by Rae Rupp Srch, second by Roger Claar.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia A. Berry
Principal Planner, Staff Liaison

09-02-08

Approved as presented, by unanimous vote September 10, 2008.