

**Executive Committee
of the Regional Planning Board**

Wednesday April 12, 2006
9:00 -10:00 a.m.
DuPage County Conference Room
Offices of the Regional Planning Board
800 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois

Meeting Minutes

I. Call to Order

Mayor Gerald Bennett of Palos Hills and Chair of the Executive Committee, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. at the offices of the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission and the Chicago Area Transportation Study at 233 S. Wacker Drive. Others present included:

Committee Members:

Rita R. Athas, Vice Chair (Deputy Chief of Staff, Mayor's Office, City of Chicago – City of Chicago)
Michael Smith, (Mayor, Village of New Lenox-Will County)
Elliott Hartstein (President, Buffalo Grove-Lake County)
Al Larson (President, Schaumburg-Cook County)
Nigel F. Telman, (Partner, Sidley, Austin, Brown & Wood-City of Chicago)

RPB Members:

Frank H. Beal, (Executive Director, Chicago Metropolis 2020-City of Chicago)
Anthony Calderone, (Mayor, Forest Park-West Central Cook)
Zenovia Evans, (Mayor, Village of Riverdale-South Cook)
Marilyn Michelini, (President, Montgomery-Kane/Kendall Counties)
Raul Raymundo, (Executive Director, Resurrection Project-City of Chicago)
Rae Rupp Srch, (Former President, Villa Park-DuPage County)
Dan Shea, (McHenry County Board Member-McHenry County)
Stephen Schlickman, (Executive Director, Regional Transportation Authority, CATS)
Ed Paesel, (Executive Director, South Suburban Mayors and Managers Association, NIPC)

Others Present Include:

Vicky Smith, Southwest Conference of Mayors
Joe Heihrich, SSMMA
Dan Lynch, CCA

Joel Stauber, Lohan Anderson
Joyce Hollingsworth, Chaddick Institute
Sarah Sheehan, Chaddick Institute
Ron Thomas, NIPC
Don Kopec, CATS
Tom Garritano, NIPC
Aristide Bicios
Karyn Romano, Metro Strategies
Laura Wilkison, Metro Strategies
Jim LaBelle, Chicago Metropolis 2020
Nancy Firfer, Chicago Metropolis 2020
Randy Blankenhorn, IDOT
Pat Higgins, Central Region WCMC
Kit Hodge, MPC

II. McKinsey Update

(Waiting on presentation update from McKinsey)

Chairman Bennett stated that McKinsey spoke with all members of the Executive Committee and it appears that the status of the MPO is the critical factor in how we integrate. He wondered if there is a fully integrated board (pending agreement from all mayors) can the RPB create an adhoc committee authorized by this board to meet one a year for review of this plan (including current members of MPO)? McKinsey responded that is another way of explaining option B because it does not require redesignation of the MPO and therefore may be a more simple process.

Member Schlickman commented on ‘Option A’ and stated that he believes the recommendation to the legislature may open the process to difficulty because it involves telling the legislature the structure of the existing MPO must change. Member Schlickman is concerned the legislature may want to weigh in. Chairman Bennett responds that every region has the right to do as they wish with their MPO. Member Schlickman continued to state that, from a legislative point of view, it will look very complicated and ‘Option B’ looks cleaner. Member Paesel stated that his major concern is if the MPO isn’t redesignated everything that NIPC does will be seen as an after-thought. He noted those voices need to be at the table and able to vote.

Member Hartstein stated he does not agree. He believes that is the role of the board, who are representatives of the region in a fairly equal make-up. All of those are key parts of the integration, and that is the job of the board members and he doesn’t believe someone is needed at the table to represent a particulates group. Member Hartstein continued, stating he believes ‘Option A’ offers a more unified and integrated approach. Taking into consideration the legislative concerns, Member Hartstein didn’t think there is any question that ‘Option B’ is the easiest way to go. Although he believes it may be more

difficult, he feels that it is the role of the RPB to make the best recommendation and added if 'Option A' is chosen and it does not receive the support it requires the board can then look to 'Option B'.

Member Beal offered a comment regarding Member Schlickman's issues of legislative concerns. He stated that if the 15 members of this board come back to the legislature with a unanimous decision he believes their tendency would be to accept. Member Beal believes the legislative difficulties are being overestimated. Member Schlickman agreed with Member Beal pending the support of the current MPO but he is not sure that can be obtained.

Member Rupp Srch stated she believed the report itself generated a lot questions that couldn't be answered in this meeting, but those that bring up legal questions need to be assessed and determined if they are in fact issues. Member Rupp Srch is concerned that the report does not deal with comprehensive planning. Chairman Bennett stated he disagrees and there is a definite presence of comprehensive planning. Chairman Bennett continued by stating the RPB has been charged with integrating planning for the future of the region and people were aware the designation of the MPO would be a problem. He then thanked McKinsey for doing a great job in giving the board to consider. Clearly there is an opportunity, without expanding the board, to meet the minimum requirements and focus on the task of comprehensive planning. Member Telman stated the integration of land use and transportation is being discussed by the Transition Committee and that integration will be taking place there.

McKinsey reviewed three questions that arose regarding the process:

- Legislation (How difficult will the legislative process be?)
- Legal-'Option B' (the remand notion of the MPO and its legality)
- Systems-McKinsey believes this is where the true integration will take place and have thoughts of how the systems could work once structure has been determined.

Chairman Bennett stated he is hopeful that at the next committee the board will come forth with recommendations and encouraged input to be directed towards himself or McKinsey. Member Rupp Srch inquired if Chairman Bennett was hoping for final structure in May? Chairman Bennett replied yes. Vice-Chair Smith stated as May approaches maybe the board can narrow it down to a preference and work from there. He agrees with Member Schlickman that if clear representation and support is not presented there will be issues.

McKinsey summarized by stating the essential question is if the MPO is structured as an adhoc committee without staff reporting to it and essentially only remand power will that satisfy the requirements? Member Rupp Srch responded she has never heard the term "adhoc committee" used to describe

an MPO. Chairman Bennett responded it is the wrong term to use but the processes will be worked from the bottom up.

Vice-Chair Athas stated that this is a public document so in the spirit of openness if anyone wishes to speak to the board members they should feel free to do that. Chairman Bennett then opened the floor to public comment.

Joel Staubber states from the public's point of view easier is better. When the structure is simpler it is easier to be approachable and accessible.

Chairman Bennett thanked the committee and the public for their effort and adjourned the meeting at 10:00 am.