



Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 800
Chicago, IL 60606

312-454-0400 (voice)
312-454-0411 (fax)
www.cmap.illinois.gov

Planning Coordinating Meeting Minutes

November 18, 2009--8:00 a.m.

Offices of the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)
Cook County Conference Room
Suite 800, 233 S. Wacker Drive, Sears Tower, Chicago, Illinois

Members Present: Elliott Hartstein, Chair-CMAP Board, Frank Beal-CMAP Board, Roger Claar-CMAP Board, Sheri Cohen-CDPH, Luann Hamilton-CDOT, Al Larson-CMAP Board, Ed Paesel-South Suburban Mayors & Managers Association, Rae Rupp Srch-CMAP Board

Staff Present: Erin Aleman, Brett Baden, Lindsay Banks, Randy Blankenhorn, Bob Dean, Lee Deuben, Dolores Dowdle, Tom Garritano, Don Kopec, Jill Leary, Gordon Smith, Andrew Williams-Clark

Others Present: Len Cannata-WCMC, Mark Pistick-RTA, Mike Walczak-NWMC

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 8:05 a.m. by Elliott Hartstein.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes.

3.0 Approval of Meeting Minutes

The minutes of September 9, 2009 were approved on a motion by Rae Rupp Srch and a second by Roger Claar.

4.0 Preferred Regional Scenario Development

Bob Dean described the preferred Regional Scenario report, which was meant to communicate the policy directions that would be prioritized in *GO TO 2040*. He stated that working committees and stakeholder groups have been reviewing the document, and that they have not expressed any fundamental problems with its direction to date. Randy Blankenhorn added that he had been discussing the document with groups of local elected officials and other stakeholders, and that there is general support for its direction. He stated that the most common comment has been a request for additional policy details,

which were not included in the preferred Regional Scenario but would be included in the final plan. Ed Paesel added that Mr. Blankenhorn had recently spoken to SSMMA, and that issues of tax policy had particular resonance with this group.

Elliott Hartstein noted that for the plan to be relevant, it would need to address the challenges of redevelopment in communities that are already developed. Mr. Dean agreed that this was a priority and stated that CMAP's Land Use committee would spend time on this issue over the next several months. Mr. Blankenhorn noted that *GO TO 2040* was not starting from scratch on this issue and would include case studies of successful redevelopment efforts. Rae Rupp Srch stated that the recent downturn in the housing market might make redevelopment projects more likely. Mr. Paesel added that new regulations under consideration by MWRD may make redevelopment more difficult in Cook County, which would work against the goals of the plan.

Roger Claar stated that there was a gap in the area of public policy and governance. He stated that there are many overlapping government jurisdictions in the region, making governance and service delivery duplicative or inefficient in some areas. He suggested that service sharing between communities, or even consolidation of duplicative government units, should be discussed in the document, and that the term "unsiloing" be removed as it was unclear what this term meant. Other committee members agreed with adding a focus on overlapping governance and service coordination, and there was also agreement that "unsiloing" was not a good term to use. Mr. Blankenhorn stated that there had been interest in addressing better service coordination among other local government stakeholders that he had spoken to, and agreed that this concept should be added.

Mr. Claar also noted that the document appeared to support dense concentrations of affordable housing, which would be problematic in many communities. Mr. Dean explained that density and affordable housing were defined differently in different communities across the region. He stated that the plan would not focus on concentrating affordable housing in very dense areas, which could lead to concentrated areas of poverty with accompanying social problems. He stated that the plan would support densities that were determined by communities to be appropriate. Luann Hamilton added that mixing housing types and incomes within developments was generally preferred.

Mr. Dean also asked that the committee address three specific questions that were posed in the cover memo to the document. The first was whether the document should include specific references to other groups who would play a role in implementation, such as COGs or the RTA. The committee agreed that this should be included in the full plan but was not necessary in this report. The second question was whether density, mixed-use, and other terms should be defined. The committee agreed that they should be defined, although not quantified. The third question involved the breakdown of the policy section into local infrastructure, regional infrastructure, and the policy environment, and whether this division made sense. The committee stated that a distinction between infrastructure and non-infrastructure elements of the preferred Regional Scenario, and a further breakdown within the infrastructure section, was reasonable.

5.0 Board Discussion of GO TO 2040 Recommendations

Mr. Dean stated that staff would be presenting potential plan recommendations to the Board over the coming months, and provided the committee with a schedule. There were no comments on this item.

6.0 Plan Production and Promotion

Tom Garritano and Erin Aleman described an active Request for Proposals to select a consulting firm to assist with the production and promotion of GO TO 2040. They stated that this would be a large contract, and would focus on assisting CMAP with developing an implementation strategy for the plan. Ms. Hamilton encouraged video production to be included in the work, as this was an increasingly important communication means. Committee members also asked about what types of organizations had submitted proposals, and where they were based; staff stated that a wide mix of responses had been received.

7.0 Other Business

No other business was raised.

8.0 Public Comment

There was no public comment.

9.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting of the committee was scheduled for January 13, 2010.

10.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 a.m. on a motion by Rae Rupp Srch and a second by Roger Claar.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved as presented, by unanimous vote, January 13, 2010.