

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

At their August 13, 2008 meeting, the Programming Coordinating Committee heard reports from the working committee representatives on their respective committee's comments and input on the proposed process for addressing Developments of Regional Importance (DRI). As a result, the Programming Coordinating Committee decided to meet again in September and requested that staff summarize the working committees' comments and propose recommendations of changes to the draft document. This document reflects that request.

The table below is a compilation of comments submitted to the Programming Coordinating Committee on August 13, 2008 from the working committees. The table tallies the comments as they were raised by each of the working committees and sorts them by frequency of occurrence. The rows are repeated throughout the remainder of the document with alternate process text and a staff recommendation for consideration and discussion. Additionally, when changes were made within the document, with the exclusion of the FAQ section, they are noted by **highlighted text**.

Working Committee Comment Grid

ECD – Economic & Community Development

ENR – Environment & Natural Resources

H – Housing

HS – Human Services

LU – Land Use

T- Transportation

CAC – Citizens' Advisory Committee

	<i>ECD</i>	<i>ENR</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>HS</i>	<i>LU</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>CAC</i>	Total
What is a DRI?	1	1	1	1	1	1		6
The current process is subjective.	1	1	1	1	1	1		6
The language describing tier determination is confusing.	1	1	1		1	1	1	6
What are the objective criteria, procedures and rules for the process?	1	1	1	1	1	1		6
Does CMAP have adequate staffing?	1	1	1		1		1	5
What is the timeframe or timeline of the review process?	1				1		1	3
What are the thresholds or triggers?	1	1			1			3
What is the role of citizens in the process?		1			1		1	3
Potential abuse	1		1		1			3
What are the financial incentives?	1		1					2
Define regional- issues of area and scope or geography.			1		1			2
What is the consequence or benefit of a bad or good review by the board?					1	1		2

	<i>ECD</i>	<i>ENR</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>HS</i>	<i>LU</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>CAC</i>	Total
What happens after a DRI review?	1	1						2
Use another classification nomenclature other than 'tier', perhaps use stage.							1	1
Criteria for defining Natural Resources Impact should be linked to the <i>GO TO 2040</i> Indicators.		1						1
Create a visual depiction of the DRI process.	1							1
Create a 'FAQs' for public stakeholders outreach.					1			1
Provide some examples of possible DRIs.					1			1
CMAP and area regulators should formalize a relationship in order to be on an automatic alert of possible DRIs.		1						1
Clearly describe staff activities at each tier or stage.							1	1
What are the requirements of the project sponsor and CMAP staff in preparing the FRIA?							1	1
Clearly define the participation role of CMAP Committees in regards to evaluation activities.							1	1
What are the actions of the CMAP Board after a FRIA?							1	1
What is the appeal process for the review findings?	1							1
Will affected communities be alerted that a project is being considered for a DRI?					1			1
There should be a 24 month trial period and allow for official revisit of process.	1							1
Forest Preserve & Conservation Districts should be able to refer a DRI.		1						1

Proposed CMAP Process for addressing Developments of Regional Importance

Assessing the impacts and providing planning guidance on Developments of Regional Importance (DRIs) is a new element to the work program of the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP). The preceding regional planning agencies had occasional involvement in regionally significant land use or economic development proposals in addition to including major capital transportation improvements in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). CMAP's DRI process provides a new opportunity for regional partners to comprehensively assess the regional implications of large-scale development proposals, reconcile regional priorities associated with these proposals and coordinate independent actions in support of regional goals.

A systematic process for examining DRIs is useful to those seeking to improve intergovernmental coordination; often seen as key to successful regional planning. Conversely, an entirely "automatic" process risks irrelevance by generating too much information outside the legitimate regional interests at stake. With these considerations, CMAP and its partners and stakeholders are developing a meaningful review process for examining DRIs.

This document is intended to establish the decision framework and mechanisms for CMAP’s identification, review and disposition of DRIs. The DRI review process is not automatic and its effectiveness depends, to a large degree, on active public participation in CMAP’s overall planning process as well as CMAP’s active involvement in related federal, state and local planning programs.

As such, the material in this document will serve as the source of presentation material on the DRI review process to CMAP committees and stakeholder groups prior to submitting the review process proposal to the CMAP Board for approval.

The timeline for involvement and approval follows **and is amended to reflect the Programming Committee’s additional September meeting**:

- June-July 2008 – Presentation of this proposal to CMAP Working Groups.
- August- **September** 2008 –Each Working Group’s representative on the Programming Coordinating Committee presents comments to the full Committee. Staff will assimilate Programming Coordinating Committee response into this proposal for release to public.
- September-**November** 2008 – Public Outreach including presentations of this proposal to public and private stakeholders. CMAP staff will prepare a formal “report-back” to participants and submit this to the Programming Coordinating Committee.
- **December 2008 or January 2009** – Report on Public Outreach to Programming Coordinating Committee. **We are requesting some flexibility in the schedule since it is difficult to predict the level of stakeholder feedback we will receive.** Staff assimilation of Programming Coordinating Committee response into this proposal for release to CMAP Board.
- **January or February 2009 – Presented for approval to the CMAP Board.**

	<i>ECD</i>	<i>ENR</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>HS</i>	<i>LU</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>CAC</i>	Total
What is the timeframe or timeline of the review process?	1				1		1	3
There should be a 24 month trial period and allow for official revisit of process	1							1

Original: November 2008 – This proposal is presented to CMAP Board.

Alternate: January or February 2009 – This proposal is presented to the CMAP Board for approval for a period of two years. After two years, the Board may renew the existing process or adopt a new process. During the initial two year approval, no DRI review may exceed 75 days (i.e. two subsequent regular board meetings) in duration from the date of its initial Board consideration.

Staff suggests: Accept the alternate. It will give a framework by which to evaluate the success of this effort.

Background

The value of assessing and evaluating major land use and transportation proposals at the regional level is well recognized. Large-scale development proposals have the possibility of introducing widespread primary and secondary impacts to the daily activities of significant numbers of people or the natural environment. Examining these impacts at the regional level offers the potential to help improve a proposal through coordinated actions among affected jurisdictions.

The Illinois Legislature specifically enabled¹ CMAP in this area:

Sec. 47. Developments of Regional Importance. The Board shall consider the regional and intergovernmental impacts of proposed major developments, infrastructure investments and major policies and actions by public and private entities on natural resources, neighboring communities, and residents. The Board shall:

(a) Define the Scope of Developments of Regional Importance (DRI) and create an efficient process for reviewing them.

(b) Require any DRI project sponsor, which can be either a public or private entity, to submit information about the proposed DRI to CMAP and neighboring communities, counties, and regional planning and transportation agencies for review.

(c) Review and comment on a proposed DRI regarding consistency with regional plans and intergovernmental and regional impacts.

The CMAP Board, in its first year of operation, established a Strategic Report for the agency that included six areas of planning inquiry:

- Land Use
- Transportation
- Economic and Community Development
- Environment and Natural Resources
- Housing
- Human Services

These topics establish the parameters within which CMAP will conduct its DRI evaluations.

The DRI Process

DRI Identification

DRI Review

¹ Illinois General Assembly, Public Act 095-0677.

How a DRI is identified and referred to the CMAP Board

The CMAP region is very large and diverse. Household and job densities range from nearly zero in rural areas to several thousand per acre in downtown Chicago. The CMAP region itself covers over 4,000 square miles. Because the impact of any new development will vary depending on prevailing densities and existing land uses, there is no universally accepted set of physical characteristics of a proposed development that signifies a DRI.

	<i>ECD</i>	<i>ENR</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>HS</i>	<i>LU</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>CAC</i>	<i>Total</i>
What is a DRI?	1	1	1	1	1	1		6
What are the financial incentives?	1		1					2

Original: (Source: Similar to Georgia DRI definition): It is CMAP’s intent to review development proposals that have the possibility of introducing widespread impacts to the daily activities of significant numbers of people or to the natural environment. Of particular concern are characteristics of proposals that may have impacts beyond the jurisdiction of the permitting agency (e.g. municipal zoning, county stormwater, state transportation departments). At the same time, it is not CMAP’s intent to usurp the due authority of permitting agencies or unnecessarily delay a proposed development with a review of questionable relevance or value.

Alternate: We would determine criteria and thresholds for defining a DRI. An example is outlined below in the criteria examples from New Hampshire. Please also note that thresholds and criteria were proposed and rejected earlier in this process and outlined in the draft document presented at the [February 13, 2008 Programming Coordinating Committee](#).

Staff Suggests: Retain the original. Even though the Alternate can be perceived as more straightforward in almost all case studies, buried within very specific criteria are statements permitting the governing board ultimate discretion. This discretion is what the original text offers in a more transparent way. The same rationale is outlined below in addressing objective criteria and thresholds.

As such, CMAP will rely on existing mechanisms of statutory authority and due process associated with typical permitting processes to identify a DRI for review. Doing so will automatically employ conventional methods of public notification and disclosure. This provides an efficient mechanism for encouraging citizen involvement and ensuring agency transparency. This will also maximize CMAP’s ability to process and document the DRI review through its representative board and committee structure.

	<i>ECD</i>	<i>ENR</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>HS</i>	<i>LU</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>CAC</i>	<i>Total</i>
The current process is subjective	1	1	1	1	1	1		6
What are the objective criteria, procedures and rules for the process?	1	1	1	1	1	1		6
What are the thresholds or triggers?	1	1			1			3
Define regional- issues of area and scope or geography			1		1			2

Original: Under the approach outlined above, DRIs will be referred to CMAP in three ways:

- A. CMAP staff identifies specific Federal or State actions with regional planning implications.
- B. A county, municipality, or CMAP coordinating Committee formally requests a DRI review.
- C. The CMAP Board independently initiates a DRI review.

Alternate: Source: Examples adapted from New Hampshire

- 60 or more dwelling units would be constructed.
- 30,000 SF of commercial gross floor area would be constructed.
- 70,000 SF of office or medical gross floor area would be constructed.
- 120,000 SF of industrial gross floor area would be constructed.
- 8 or more lots or dwelling units would be constructed within 1,000 feet of a municipal boundary.
- 4 or more lots or dwelling units would be constructed, which abut or involve rivers or perennial (year-round) streams which, within 1/2 river miles downstream, flow across a municipal boundary.
- 4 or more lots or dwelling units would be constructed, which abut or involve lakes or great ponds, the high water mark of which lies within 1,000 feet of a municipal boundary.
- Proposed subdivisions of 100 acres or more, which result in 4 or more lots or a new street or roads.
- Any construction of improvements for any purpose above the elevation of 2500 feet.
- The construction of improvements for any commercial or industrial purpose (including not-for-profit developments but excepting farming, logging, or forestry) on more than 10 acres of land; or on more than one acre of land if the municipality does not have both permanent zoning and subdivision bylaws.
- The construction of 10 or more housing units within a radius of 5 miles, or the construction or maintenance of mobile homes or trailer parks with 10 or more units. (In “designated downtowns” the 10 unit threshold may be higher for some projects.)
- The subdivision of land into 10 or more lots of any size within a 5 mile radius or within the jurisdictional limits of a town within a continuous period of 5 years.
- Within a town that does not have both permanent zoning and subdivision regulations, the subdivision of land into 6 or more lots of any size within a continuous period of five years.
- The construction of improvements for a governmental purpose if the project involves more than 10 acres or is part of a larger project that will involve more than 10 acres of land.
- Any construction of improvements for a commercial, industrial or governmental purpose which will be a substantial change or addition to or expansion of an existing pre-1970 development of the type which would require a permit if built today.
- The construction of a support structure 20 feet or more in height which is primarily for communication or broadcast purposes.
- The exploration for fissionable source materials beyond the reconnaissance phase or the extraction or processing of fissionable source material.
- The drilling of an oil or gas well.
- The sale, by public auction, of any interest in a tract or tracts of land, owned or controlled by a person, which have been partitioned or divided for the purpose of resale into five or more lots within a radius of five miles and within any period of ten years.
- Transportation facilities for passage to or from a County.

- Demolition or major changes to some national- or state-recognized historic structures.
- Bridge, ramp, or road construction providing access to several types of water bodies and wetlands.
- Change of use or demolition of an existing commercial building greater than 40,000 square feet or industrial building greater than 50,000 square feet
- Construction of any wireless communication tower exceeding 35 feet in height.
- Site alterations or site disturbance greater than two acres without a valid local permit.
- Mixed use residential and non-residential developments with a floor area greater than 20,000 square feet or greater than 10,000 sq. ft. of commercial space.

Or:

- Proposals before the Planning Board which may reasonably be expected to contribute substantially to air or water pollution, school enrollment, solid waste disposal, demand for water supply or wastewater treatment, street deterioration, traffic safety, or otherwise substantially affect another municipality.
- Proposals before the Planning Board which, in the sole discretion of the Planning Board, are reasonably likely to have a substantial effect on another municipality.

Staff suggests: Retain original. In almost all case studies, buried within very specific criteria are statements permitting the governing board ultimate discretion. This discretion is what the original text offers in a more transparent way.

CMAP staff identifies specific Federal or State actions with regional planning implications.

	<i>ECD</i>	<i>ENR</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>HS</i>	<i>LU</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>CAC</i>	<i>Total</i>
CMAP and area regulators should formalize a relationship in order to be on an automatic alert of possible DRIs		1						1

Original: CMAP often learns about regionally important proposals in the course of monitoring Federal and State government activity. Examples include monitoring the federal register, state departmental bulletins as well as bills introduced into U.S. Congress or the Illinois General Assembly. In many cases, federal or state agencies request CMAP participation in their own internal planning efforts. While CMAP staff knowledge of these developments is common, they are not currently instructed to specifically “flag” a proposal for possible internal evaluation. CMAP staff involved or informed of these activities will be instructed to refer details to designated DRI project staff when the proposal specifically identifies a development requiring federal or state action to proceed. DRI project staff will then prepare documentation to submit the proposal to the DRI Review Process.

Alternate: CMAP and area regulators will enter into MOU/A in order to be on an automatic alert of possible DRIs.

Staff suggests: Retain original. Area regulators can be encouraged to contact staff with potential DRI’s without entering into formal agreements.

	<i>ECD</i>	<i>ENR</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>HS</i>	<i>LU</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>CAC</i>	Total
Forest Preserve & Conservation Districts should be able to refer a DRI.		1						1

Original: A county, municipality, or CMAP coordinating committee formally requests a DRI review

Alternate: Any governmental entity or CMAP coordinating committee formally requests a DRI review.

Staff suggests: Retain original. Special purpose governments may not have electoral accountability. Special purpose governments should champion DRI concerns through their county, municipality or CMAP committee structure.

CMAP often learns about large-scale developments proposals from its partners and participants in the regional planning process. In the ongoing dialogue over regional planning and development, participants and staff interact and learn details about many publicly and privately sponsored development proposals. While any participant might have significant personal concern about a development proposal, CMAP seeks to capitalize on this ongoing regional dialogue and its existing committee structure as the means of initiating the DRI review process.

All individuals in the region are governed by a County or municipality and any individual is free to communicate with governmental leaders outside their own jurisdiction. All counties and municipalities are represented by one or more members on the CMAP board. In addition, the CMAP Board responds to two standing committees that are further responsive to several working committees organized around a variety of specific planning functions. This arrangement permits any individual an avenue by which to organize and marshal a formal request for a DRI review.

This method engages a formal public dialogue on a proposed development and promotes resolution of local or subregional concerns in the course of raising the concern to the CMAP Board level. It is anticipated that many concerns will be resolved as the DRI request is vetted through successive discussions thereby keeping the number of DRI review requests coming before the CMAP Board at a manageable number.

The request would take the form of a resolution passed by a municipal or county government or as a formal request passed up through the CMAP coordinating committee structure in its official report to the CMAP Board.

DRI project staff will receive approved resolutions or coordinating committee recommendations and prepare documentation to submit the proposal to the DRI Review Process.

The CMAP Board independently initiates a DRI review.

	<i>ECD</i>	<i>ENR</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>HS</i>	<i>LU</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>CAC</i>	Total
What is the role of citizens in the process?		1			1		1	3
Potential abuse	1		1		1			3

Original: CMAP Board members retain the privilege of introducing proposed developments of concern to the DRI review process in the course of conducting regular Board business.

Alternate: The CMAP Board will, upon valid citizen petition, vote to introduce proposed developments of concern to the DRI review process in the course of conducting regular Board business.

Staff suggests: Retain original. While citizen petitions may be submitted to influence Board action, accepting petitions in order to force a Board vote requiring 4/5 majority to pass will create an incentive to bypass a public discussion of the merits of the DRI review in favor of a political showdown.

The CMAP Board’s DRI Review Process

Three successive decision tiers are proposed by which the CMAP Board can efficiently evaluate and advise on a potential DRI. This screening process occurs when the CMAP Board considers the question of a proposed development’s regional importance and whether regional planning involvement is appropriate.

	<i>ECD</i>	<i>ENR</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>HS</i>	<i>LU</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>CAC</i>	<i>Total</i>
The language describing tier determination is confusing	1	1	1		1	1	1	6
CMAP should weigh in on Tier 1 DRIs because regulatory processes may not address regional concerns		1					1	2
Use another classification nomenclature other than ‘tier’, perhaps use stage							1	1

Original: ***Tier 1: Existing Review Process***

Is the proposed development subject to a planning process that permits formal multi-jurisdictional coordination public involvement?

Alternate: Review Level 1: Is the proposed development subject to a formal multi-jurisdictional planning process that addresses the concerns of the petitioner?

Staff suggests: Retain original. The original intent is intended to ensure that, whatever planning process is employed, coordination and public involvement are present. The text below should be clarified that if the scope of the alternate regional planning process doesn’t address the concerns of the petitioner, then the DRI should proceed to Tier 2.

CMAP seeks to ensure that planning for large-scale regional developments include an opportunity for the formal involvement by all affected jurisdictions. Most federal and state planning processes have explicitly stated mechanisms for involvement by the public and other government agencies.

If Yes: Then this is a Tier 1 DRI. No further internal evaluation needs to be conducted. CMAP may ask for formal inclusion as a partner in the relevant planning process. CMAP may also

recommend formal planning collaboration between jurisdictions likely to be affected by the proposed development.

Examples: This may include proposals currently handled through the regional FPA and RTP process. It also includes any proposal that is subjected to the federal NEPA process. This may exclude any of the above planning processes if the Board’s concern lies outside of the typical scope of these planning processes. Recommendations may also include the formation of a sub-regional or corridor planning council to resolve planning concerns at the appropriate scale.

If No: Then proceed to Tier 2 DRI disposition.

Tier 2: Qualitative Assessment

Does the proposed development include certain context-dependent development characteristics?²

CMAF seeks to influence proposals with characteristics that, by their nature, engender discussions of regional land use patterns and transportation system performance. An initial qualitative consideration by the CMAF Board (or designated Coordinating Committee) of development characteristics will establish consensus on whether the proposal is likely to:

	<i>ECD</i>	<i>ENR</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>HS</i>	<i>LU</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>CAC</i>	Total
Criteria for defining Natural Resources Impact should be linked to the <i>GO TO 2040</i> Indicators		1						1

Original:

- a. Significantly affect important features of the natural environment.
- b. Significantly change prevailing development density. Examples include large new developments that might place unexpected burdens on water, sewer, storm water and local road systems.
- c. Significantly affect operations on a regional transportation facility. Examples include major commercial, industrial or warehousing developments sited for convenient access to expressways and tollways.
- d. Significantly change existing land use patterns. Examples include substantial conversion between agricultural, residential, commercial and/or industrial uses.
- e. Affect the function or performance of a planned or existing public investment.

Alternate: Significantly affect the current or projected value of an officially adopted CMAF regional indicator.

² Tier 2 is similar to the NEPA scoping process.

Staff suggests: Retain original. The CMAP regional indicators may be consulted by the petitioner as evidence, but should not be required.

If No: Then this is a Tier 2 DRI. No further internal evaluation is needed. The CMAP Board may choose to take an official position on the proposed development based on this qualitative assessment. This may take the form of a board resolution on the subject or some other appropriate public comment mechanism.

If Yes: Then proceed to Tier 3 DRI disposition.

Tier 3: Measurable Regional Impacts

Will the proposed development have measurable regional impacts?³

CMAP seeks to ensure that sufficient technical information exists to conduct a robust analysis and objective evaluation of the transportation and land use effects of a proposed development believed to have measurable regional impacts.

	<i>ECD</i>	<i>ENR</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>HS</i>	<i>LU</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>CAC</i>	<i>Total</i>
Clearly define the participation role of CMAP Committees in regards to evaluation activities.							1	1

Original: To facilitate this determination, an Outline Regional Impact Assessment (ORIA) will be drafted by CMAP staff. The ORIA will establish an organized approach to gathering, interpreting and processing quantitative information.

Alternate: To facilitate this determination, an Outline Regional Impact Assessment (ORIA) will be drafted by CMAP staff, reviewed by Board-designated working committees, and accepted by the Board-designated coordinating committee. The ORIA will establish an organized approach to gathering, interpreting and processing quantitative information.

Staff suggests: Retain original. Evaluation, at this stage is largely a technical exercise that has been sanctioned by the Board. Staff accountability at this point, is to respond to the Board’s concerns.

Each ORIA will be organized as follows:

1. A project “literature-review” documenting the proposal’s history and background, a bibliography of relevant documents and previous public decisions.
2. An assessment of the likely comprehensive planning implications that emerged from Tier 2 consideration. This assessment should clarify those anticipated outcomes that can be subjected to further quantitative measurement if needed.
3. The results of an initial search for data resources that can be systematically analyzed in order to conduct the proposed impact measurements. This step will also reveal any new data collection needed to adequately assess the proposal’s impact.

³ Tier 3 is similar to the NEPA environmental assessment (EA) process.

If Yes: recommend that the project sponsor **conduct a Full Regional Impact Analysis (FRIA)** with the intention of substantiating the hypothesized regional impacts appearing in the ORIA. The recommendation should include an estimate of appropriate time and resources needed to complete an analysis that would satisfy CMAP’s desire to understand the proposals regional impact.

	<i>ECD</i>	<i>ENR</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>HS</i>	<i>LU</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>CAC</i>	<i>Total</i>
What is the consequence or benefit of a bad or good review by the board?					1	1		2
What are the actions of the CMAP Board after a FRIA?							1	1
What is the appeal process for the review findings?	1							1

Original: 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.

Alternate: 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. The Board may also elect to review any revisions or changes to the proposal occurring as a result of their recommendation and take actions permissible under its enabling legislation. Any written appeal or dissent will be included with the public record of the discussion before the board.

Staff suggests: Accept alternate. There is a little more closure here.

If No: Conclude that the proposed development has **no significant regional impact**.

Appendix

Past examples of DRI

	<i>ECD</i>	<i>ENR</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>HS</i>	<i>LU</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>CAC</i>	<i>Total</i>
Provide some examples of possible DRIs					1			1

A separate document identifies developments submitted by subcommittee members and observers as historical examples of DRIs. These participants were asked to think of examples of past projects that would have benefited from a DRI review and explain why. These were discussed as a group and were instructive in developing the process outlined in this proposal. In the course of the discussion, there remained several of these projects for which there was no consensus on their regional importance. This appendix is available on request. The developments included:

- Aurora Outlet Mall
- Joliet Arsenal Redevelopment
- Sears HQ relocation to Hoffman Estates

- Glenview Naval Air Station conversion
- IKEA Schaumburg
- Yorktown Center
- Major FPA Boundary Changes
- Conversion of any railroad to a bicycle trail
- Toyota Park

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

	<i>ECD</i>	<i>ENR</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>HS</i>	<i>LU</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>CAC</i>	<i>Total</i>
Does CMAP have adequate staffing?	1	1	1		1		1	5
What is the timeframe or timeline of the review process?	1				1		1	3
What is the role of citizens in the process?		1			1		1	3
Create a 'FAQs' for public stakeholders outreach					1			1
Will affected communities be alerted that a project is being considered for a DRI?					1			1
What are the requirements of the project sponsor and CMAP staff in preparing the FRIA?							1	1
What happens after a DRI review?	1	1						2
Clearly describe staff activities at each tier or stage							1	1

What is a Development of Regional Importance (DRI)?

Large-scale development proposals that have the possibility of introducing widespread impacts to the daily activities of significant numbers of people and proposals that, by their nature, engender discussions of regional land use patterns and transportation system performance.

What is the timeframe for a DRI review?

CMAP board has not determined a timeframe for the DRI review, but the suggested timeframe includes an initial two-year trial period and a review process not to exceed 75 days.

What are the thresholds for a DRI?

There are no explicit thresholds; each potential DRI will be individually assessed.

Does CMAP charge a fee to review a DRI?

There are currently no plans to charge a fee for reviewing a potential DRI. However, a Tier 3 DRI may require a Full Regional Impact Analysis conducted by the project sponsor. The cost related to the analysis is borne by the project sponsor.

Are there any financial incentives to encourage compliance?

There is no current policy for financial incentives.

How is a DRI identified and referred to CMAP Board?

DRIs are referred to CMAP in three ways:

- A. CMAP staff identifies specific Federal or State actions with regional planning implications.
- B. A county, municipality, or CMAP coordinating Committee formally requests a DRI review.
- C. The CMAP Board independently initiates a DRI review.

Why is there a 3 Tiered Review Process?

Three successive decision tiers are proposed by which the CMAP Board can efficiently evaluate and advise on a potential DRI. This decision process occurs when the board considers the question of a proposed development's regional importance and whether regional planning involvement is appropriate.

What kinds of response might the CMAP Board give in their review?

CMAP Board may ask for formal inclusion as a partner in the planning process. They may recommend formal collaboration between jurisdictions likely affected. The Board may make a resolution on the subject or other public comment. The Board may suggest that additional planning steps be taken.

Why would anyone want to have their projects reviewed?

Sponsors would receive good publicity in the form of CMAP's 'Good Planning Seal of Approval.'

Does CMAP have the authority to stop a project?

No, CMAP's role is advisory.

What happens after a DRI review?

After the DRI review, the process is complete. CMAP may pursue further involvement in ongoing planning for the project based on its findings.

How should advocacy groups and citizens initiate a DRI?

All individuals are governed by a County or municipality and they are free to communicate with governmental leaders inside and outside their own jurisdictions. Also, all counties and municipalities are represented by members on the CMAP board. This allows any individual or advocacy group an avenue to organize a formal DRI review request.

Will affected communities be alerted that a project is being considered for a DRI?

Yes, through conventional methods of public notification and disclosure such as the media and internet.

What is the role of CMAP staff in the DRI process?

CMAP currently monitors regional development activity as part of its normal work plan. Existing staff will be trained in identifying potential DRI reviews. Existing staff will also be trained to manage DRI administration. Also, senior staff with subject matter expertise will be asked to prepare the outline for a Regional Impact Assessment if necessary.

Process Flow Diagram

	<i>ECD</i>	<i>ENR</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>HS</i>	<i>LU</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>CAC</i>	<i>Total</i>
Create a visual depiction of the DRI process	1							1

Please see the separate attachment that illustrates the process.

###