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Program Background

• This evaluation was conducted by Northern Illinois University of the Kane County Farmland Protection Ordinance Health Impact Assessment project.
• The purpose of the project was to “conduct a health impact assessment of a proposed amendment to a Kane County, Illinois farmland protection law.”
• The Kane County Development and Community Services Department and the Kane County Health Department co-managed the project.
Health Impact Assessment

- HIA is defined in various ways but essentially is a structured process using scientific data, professional expertise, and input from the communities most affected by a proposed policy, to identify and evaluate public health consequences of proposals and suggests actions that could be taken to minimize adverse health impacts and optimize beneficial ones.
Program Evaluation

• Program evaluation is a systematic method for collecting, analyzing, and using information to answer questions about projects, policies and programs, particularly about their effectiveness and efficiency.

• Stakeholders often want to know whether the programs they are funding, implementing, voting for, receiving or objecting to are producing the intended effect.
Evaluation Objectives and Results

1. What essential elements of the HIA process contributed to the success or failure of the project during various phases of implementation? What challenges and opportunities for improvement occurred?

- **Finding 1:** Previous collaboration between Kane County Development and Community Services and the Health Departments—particularly the Making Kane County Fit for Kids, Healthy Kids, Healthy Communities project—served as a critical point of reference among county staff involved in the HIA project.

- **Finding 2:** Effective engagement of communities most impacted by the decision through effective community engagement was a key strength of the project.

- **Finding 3:** It was challenging to maintain the interest among people in the groups affected by the proposed policy. While engaged in the process early on, some lost interest over the eighteen-month duration of the project. A shorter faster moving process might be more effective.
Evaluation Objectives and Results

2. Were important milestones and key activities met and fully carried out as specified in the funding proposal?

• **Finding 4:** The project team carried out all phases of the project as specified in the funding proposal.

• **Finding 5:** The project led to the development of a high quality HIA document consistent with best HIA practices.
3. Was the HIA conducted according to established standards? What analytic methods were used? Were the Analytic methods used appropriately?

- **Finding 6:** The HIA was conducted according to prevailing standards in the HIA field.

- **Finding 7:** The project team used a wide variety of analytic methods to conduct the HIA. They included a baseline assessment of existing national, state, and county data, an exhaustive search of published works, public meetings, interviews, questionnaires among others. The analytic methods were used appropriately.
4. In what ways did the project team identify and engage the communities most likely to be affected by the ordinance? Were the actions taken to engage the community appropriate to the task of completing the HIA?

- **Finding 8:** The outreach activities lead to a high level of engagement of the groups most affected by the ordinance. This was a key strength of the project. The project team identified and sought involvement of key groups, most notably the Kane County Farm Bureau and the Northern Illinois Food Bank, and a significant number of others, early in the process and effectively used relationships established to achieve the objectives of the project.

- **Finding 9:** The efforts undertaken to engage key community members, groups, and organizations was appropriate to the task of completing the HIA.
Evaluation Objectives and Results

5. How effective were the training and technical assistance and what ways, if any, could they be improved?

• **Finding 10**: The project team indicated that the HIA training they received in April 2012 was effective. The team benefitted particularly from the scoping exercise, the practice of which lead to comprehensive scoping evident in the final HIA.

• **Finding 11**: The project team indicated that the technical assistance they received throughout the process was adequate but the timing of assistance with specific tasks could be improved.
Evaluation Objectives and Results

6. What impact did the HIA have on decision-making and implementation of the proposed recommendations up to the time that the evaluation is conducted?

• **Finding 12:** There is strong evidence to suggest that the HIA had a direct impact on the enactment of Kane County ordinance 13-240, a sister ordinance to the County’s established farmland protection ordinance.
Evaluation Objectives and Results

7. What additional impact(s), if any, occurred beyond the HIA objectives?

- **Finding 13**: The HIA project improved the organizational capacity of the Kane County Development and Community Services and the Kane County Health Departments to evaluate health related policy in a systematic way.

- **Finding 14**: The partnerships with the groups and organizations engaged during the HIA project have the potential to endure beyond the life of the project and to be of continuing reciprocal value.
8. What impact or potential impact does the HIA process have on population health and the 2040 Master Plan’s policies of *Healthy People, Healthy Living, and Healthy Communities*?

- **Finding 15:** The project addresses the Kane County 2040 Master Plan’s objective of healthy living by considering land use policies that affect population health.

- **Finding 16:** The HIA influenced the passage of County Ordinance 13-240 which balanced farmland protection policies to encourage locally-grown fruits, vegetables, whole grains with the objective of protecting land where traditional commodity crops are grown (the original intent of the farmland protection policies), potentially leading to changes in dietary consumption and population health improvements.
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Topics for Discussion

- Legislation
- Governing Departments
- Taxing
- Zoning
Overview

A four year pilot program that begins January 1, 2014.

Highly regulated medical cannabis pilot program that is specific to debilitating conditions

22 Cultivation Centers

60 Dispensing Centers

Regulated by 3 Illinois State Departments
Governmental Agencies with Oversight

- Illinois Department of Public Health
- Illinois Department of Agriculture
- Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulations
Establish and maintain a confidential registry of qualifying patients authorized to engage in the medical use of cannabis and their caregivers;

Distribute educational material about health risks associated with the abuse of cannabis and prescription medication

Adopt rules to administer the patient and caregiver registration program;

Adopt rules establishing food handling requirements for cannabis-infused products that are prepared for human consumption; and

Determines the debilitating conditions.
Debilitating Conditions

- Cancer
- Glaucoma
- HIV/AIDS
- Crohn’s
- Alzheimer’s
- Multiple Sclerosis
- Muscular Dystrophy
- Severe Fibromyalgia
- Spinal Cord Disease
Enforce the provisions of the Act by licensing and regulating the 22 Cultivation Centers
Cultivation Center

- One per State Police District (22 Districts in IL)
- Kane County located in District 2
- Other counties in District 2
- Must have a valid registration from the DOA to operate.
Enforce the provisions of this Act relating to the registration and oversight of dispensing organizations.
Dispensing Centers

- 60 Distribution Centers within the state of IL
- Geographically dispersed throughout the state
Current Status of the Cultivation Centers

- DOA has 120 days from the effective date (January 1) to write the rules and criteria that will apply to the cultivation facilities.
- It then is filed with the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR) for review and public comment.
- The JCAR review and approval process will then follow state law, including public
- Applications for cultivation centers may not be realistically accepted until the fall of 2014
The Illinois Department of Public Health must adopt administrative rules, set registration fees, and develop the process to receive and process registrations. Any date for issuing registry identification cards will take into account the time needed to complete these tasks.

A date has not been determined by IDPH.
Current Status of Dispensing Centers

DFPR has 120 days from January 1, 2014 to file administrative rules with the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR).

The First Notice period lasts a minimum of 45 days. Second Notice period lasts a maximum of 45 days with the possibility of a 45 day extension.

Once the administrative rules are adopted, DFPR will establish the application process for dispensing organizations.
Definitions

- **Adequate Supply:**
  - 2.5 Ounces of usable cannabis during a period of 14 days

- **Enclosed Locked Facility**
  - A room, greenhouse or building or other enclosed area equipped with locks or other security devices that permit access only by a cultivation center’s agents
Limitations and Penalties

- Undertaking tasks under the influence
- Cannot Possess Cannabis:
  - In a school bus
  - On the grounds of any preschool or primary & secondary schools
  - In any correctional facility
  - In a vehicle - Section 11-502.1 of IL Vehicle Code
  - In vehicles not open to public unless medically secured
  - In private residences that are used as licensed child care or other social service care
Limitations and Penalties cont.

- **Cannot use cannabis:**
  - In a school bus
  - Grounds of preschool or primary & secondary schools
  - Correctional facility
  - Any Motor Vehicle
  - Private residences used as licensed day care or other social service care
  - Public Places
  - Operating motor vehicles
Cannot use cannabis: (cont)

- If you do not have a debilitating condition and is not registered

- Transferring cannabis to any person contrary to the provision of the Act

- By active duty law enforcement officers, correctional and firefighters

- Those with a school bus permit or commercial driver’s license
Employment Liability

- Employers may adopt regulations relative to:
  - Consumption
  - Storage
  - Timekeeping Requirements
  - Drug Testing policies
Local Ordinances

- Local government may enact reasonable zoning ordinances or resolutions that are not in conflict with the Act.

- May not unreasonably prohibit the cultivation or dispensing of medical cannabis
Questions?
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The year to date revenue for October 2013 and 2012 is $743,601 and $593,910 respectively.

**Total Revenue**
Total Expense

The FY2013 year to date expense is tracking lower than prior year by $51,198.