



MEMORANDUM

To: Programming Coordinating Committee

Date: May 12, 2008

From: CMAP Staff

Re: Additional Comments on DRI materials

Below are additional comments regarding the revised DRAFT DRI Overview document.

Comments from Chris Staron, NWMC

Identifying a potential DRI: This remains a significant issue for establishing the DRI process. The draft recognizes the lack of consensus on this issue, but without this piece, it is difficult to understand how, how many, and when projects enter the screening process.

DRI Screening: In regards to Tier 2, the qualitative consideration raises some concerns. The process should also include quantitative considerations in order to legitimize judgments on if a proposed development significantly changes density, operations on a regional transportation facility, or land use patterns. The quantitative considerations will then help support the Tier 2 decision. In addition, "significant" changes or affects can be interpreted differently and should be defined.

How long will the DRI screening take? Acknowledging that this is a new element in the work program for CMAP, it would be helpful to have a rough estimate of how long each tier and the Full Regional Impact Analysis (FRIA) will take.

Comments from Tam Kutzmark, DMMC

Thanks for the opportunity to review the DRI subcommittee document. I have the following comments:

Page 3: Regarding the statement "Tier 1: Is the proposed development subject to a planning process that permits formal multi-jurisdictional coordination and public involvement?", I

Memo to DRI Subcommittee

April 29, 2008

Page 2

thought the key question here was intended to be something like "Is the proposed development consistent with local and regional plans and policies?"

Page 3: Logically, isn't a Tier 1 DRI (a proposed development subject to a planning process that permits formal multi-jurisdictional coordination and public involvement) the same as a Tier 2 DRI (a proposed development without certain context-dependent development characteristics)? If not, what's the difference? If yes, how does Tier 2 as a classification support the process?

Page 3: Under Tier 2, terms like "significantly affect," "significantly change," and "affect" are still quite subjective. It would be ideal to use qualitative and objective criteria for Tier 2.

Page 3: Some examples should be given under Tier 2 for "d. Affect the function or performance of a planned or existing public investment."

Page 4: Regarding the statement, "Once the completed FRIA is reviewed, the CMAP Board will consider the proposal's consistency with existing regional plans and if necessary, recommend appropriate additional or remedial planning steps" -- isn't this assessment intended to be completed in the Tier 1 evaluation?

Overall, I agree with many of the Subcommittee members that it would be good to begin the process of convening the larger Task Force. With regard to that objective:

- What is the status of the DRI Task Force?
- What stakeholders have been added to the list since the list was circulated in Fall 2007?
- How many seats will local government have on the Task Force? How will they be selected?

DMMC feels strongly that municipalities need to be brought up-to-speed on the work of the Subcommittee before the Task Force convenes for its first meeting -- either at a presentation to the Caucus meeting or some other appropriate forum.

###