



# Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 800, Sears Tower  
Chicago, IL 60606

312-454-0400 (voice)  
312-454-0411 (fax)  
www.chicagoareaplanning.org

## Planning Coordinating Meeting Minutes

September 9, 2009

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, Bill Browne-Illinois State Treasurer's Office (for Robin Kelly), Roger Claar, CMAP Board, Sheri Cohen-CDPH, Ingrid Danler-Fox Waterway Agency, Adam Gross-BPI, Luann Hamilton-CDOT, Al Larson-CMAP Board, Ed Paesel-South Suburban Mayors & Managers Association, Rae Rupp Srch-CMAP Board

**Others Present:** Bruce Christensen-Lake County, Paul Heltne, David Kralik-Metra, Hugh O'Hara-WCGL, Mark Pitstick-RTA, Peter Skosey-MPC, Thomas Snyder, Chris Staron-NWMC, Mike Sullivan-KKCOM

### 1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 8:10 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 the June 10, 2009 meeting were approved on a motion by Rae Rupp Srch and a second by Roger Claar.

### 4.0 Public Engagement Results

Erin Aleman described the results of the "Invent the Future" public engagement process, which occurred during summer 2009. She reviewed the draft public engagement report included with the meeting materials, and described the various ways in which the public had been involved, the level of participation, and the results that were received.

Roger Claar asked whether attendees at the public meetings had tended to be planning professionals or members of the general public. Ms. Aleman responded that it was mixed

and varied by workshop. Rae Rupp Srch added that the meeting she attended was primarily attended by members of the general public.

## 5.0 Preferred Scenario Development

Bob Dean described the development of the preferred scenario, which would form the basis for the recommendations of *GO TO 2040*. He highlighted the importance of prioritizing the plan's recommendations, rather than creating a "laundry list" of potential recommendations. He noted that the conclusions of the scenario analysis process had been discussed with committees and key stakeholders, and that these conclusions were included with the memo describing the preferred scenario.

Luann Hamilton asked how the prioritization of the plan's most important recommendations would occur, and whether each working committee would be responsible for developing one recommendation, for example. Mr. Dean stated that prioritizing would be a difficult step, but that the most effective recommendations would likely cross committee boundaries, with positive effects in multiple areas. Randy Blankenhorn emphasized the importance of prioritization for the plan to be relevant. Rae Rupp Srch agreed with the importance of not developing a "laundry list," which would dilute the plan's impact.

The committee discussed the tradeoffs between tackling the most important issues versus focusing on those that are most feasible to implement. Elliott Hartstein stated that the plan should not simply address "low hanging fruit," but also address difficult issues that would be challenging to resolve. He also noted that understanding the financial costs of the plan would be important. Ms. Rupp Srch added that the financial implications of the plan were important, but that the ideas in the plan should not be overly constrained by cost. Mr. Blankenhorn responded that these were important tradeoffs to be considered when developing the plan's recommendations.

Several committee members also commented on particular elements of the preferred scenario as described in the memo. Ed Paesel stated that the preferred scenario should address the negative impacts of concentrated poverty, as well as transportation access between affordable housing and job concentrations. Bill Browne added that encouraging economic development in disadvantaged areas should be a priority, and Adam Gross stated that this could effectively be supported through infrastructure investment. Al Larson stated that the recommendations should also have a geographic balance.

Mr. Larson further noted that job access in general was an important measure, and Mr. Hartstein added that links between affordable housing and transportation were important to consider. Mr. Gross stated that the housing elements relied too heavily on reducing regulatory barriers, which were only one means to improve affordable housing provision and job access. Ingrid Danler noted that environmental stakeholders felt strongly that water supply and quality should be addressed explicitly in the preferred scenario, and that water should be tied to any discussion of open space.

Ms. Hamilton asked how the Planning Coordinating Committee would be involved in setting priorities for top recommendations. Mr. Dean responded that staff would discuss priorities with the Board, the Planning Coordinating Committee, and the working committees during the fall. Mr. Larson recommended that the discussion of priorities also consider transportation policy discussions that were underway at the federal level.

Mr. Hartstein asked how the evaluation of major capital projects would relate to the development of the preferred scenario. Mr. Blankenhorn responded that the evaluation was meant to identify projects that best support the preferred scenario. Mr. Paesel added that many projects would be more beneficial if built together rather than separately.

Roger Claar expressed concern with assuming that the results of the summer public involvement were fully representative of the viewpoints of the region's residents. He advised that underrepresented groups should be sought out to receive their input as well. Mr. Hartstein added that outreach to municipal, county, and state governments should be done, and Mr. Blankenhorn agreed and stated that this work was underway. Mr. Hartstein also advised that the Citizens Advisory Committee be fully utilized to assist with public engagement.

#### **6.0 Endorsement Schedules**

Mr. Dean distributed a draft schedule for the adoption of the final plan and endorsement of intermediate products.

#### **7.0 Staff Updates**

There were no additional staff updates.

#### **8.0 Other Business**

No other business was raised.

#### **9.0 Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

#### **10.0 Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the committee was scheduled for November 18, 2009.

#### **11.0 Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



*Approved as presented, by unanimous vote, November 18, 2009*