



# 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](http://www.chicagoareaplanning.org)

## Economic and Community Development Committee Minutes June 24– 9:00am DuPage County Conference Room

**Members Present:** Chris Aiston, George Billows, Tracey Bosman, Consuella Brown, Bill Browne, Grant Davis, Robert Gleeson, John Greuling, Robin Kelly, Judith Kossy, Cindy McSherry, Harry Pestine, Charles Perkins, Jane Thomas (for Gideon Blustein), David Young

**Members Absent:** Andre Ashmore, Joe Balasa, Lori Clark, Sean McCarthy, Angie Powell, Mike Scholefield

**Staff Present:** Andrew-Williams Clark, Bob Dean, William Kiley, Brian Rademacher, Paul Reise, Diana Torres, Bradley Wolf

### 1.0 Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:00am.

### 2.0 Welcome and Introductions

All attendees introduced themselves.

### 3.0 Approval of the Minutes

Motion to approve the minutes was made by Harry Pestine and seconded by Bill Browne.

### 4.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

No agenda changes were made. The Chair announced that Kim Uhlig has stepped down from the committee due to a conflict in her schedule. He commended her on her participation in the committee in the past year.

### 5.0 Staff Report

Staff gave a brief review of the success of the third panel discussion on Public/Private Partnerships held on June 3<sup>rd</sup> in Oak Brook and mentioned plans for the upcoming panel discussion on Transit Oriented Development. The committee considered these very valuable to regional economic development and was pleased with their success.

### 6.0 GO TO 2040 Update

#### 6.1 Scenario Construction

Bob Dean presented four potential scenario themes that were considered for the scenario construction process. They were – intensity of implementation; maximize one goal over others; focus of investments; and “thematic” scenarios. Each scenario was presented highlighting the pros and cons for their use, along with examples on how they work. A recommended approach was the “thematic” scenarios and committee members were encouraged to get involved.

Bob Gleeson commended staff on a job well done saying this was a good leap forward in the planning process. He asked how specific the geography will be and if interim time periods will be used other than looking at 2040. Bob Dean responded that some geography at the county and community level will be used to demonstrate how certain scenarios could look when applied. Judith Kossy recommended that the indicator project be incorporated with the scenario construction because different scenarios will impact the indicators in different ways. John Greuling asked if the scenario development process prioritizes ideas. Staff confirmed that priorities will be made but will not be based on one scenario; however, particular focus will be on several scenarios that relate to themes developed. The committee was comfortable with the “thematic” scenario process and look forward to providing input.

## **6.2 Regional Indicators Development**

Andrew Williams Clark presented a spreadsheet that showed how each of the indicators proposed by the committee at previous meetings fits into the GoTo 2040 vision themes. The committee was asked to review the spreadsheet.

He also reported that the consultant working on this initiative is in the final stage of listing potential data sources. The indicator proposed last month on legislation will be listed in a new copy of the spreadsheet available at the next committee meeting. Committee members were invited to provide input on other indicator themes like community development, education, and culture, and they were informed that the committee will be responsible for choosing fifteen indicators from the economic competitiveness tab.

John Greuling asked the committee to consider the values and strategies for the regional economy and identify the role CMAP and the working committee should have in framing the discussion. He noted that the region lacks an economic development strategy and that this is an opportunity to develop one as part of the comprehensive planning process. He suggested the committee devote some time at the next meeting to discuss how the committee can lead in shaping a strategy for the Go To 2040 regional plan.

Staff concluded the discussion on indicators by reminding the committee about the Indicator Workshops being held throughout the region and encouraged their participation. The committee appreciated the update on the indicators process. The committee commented on the small print of the indicator hand outs and requested that future copies be made readable and simplified where possible.

## **6.3 Snapshot: Planning Impacts of Latino Population**

Due to a shortened meeting time it was decided to postpone the snapshot presentation until the July committee meeting in order to allow time for the presentation on Developments of Regional Importance.

## **7.0 Developments of Regional Importance**

Kermit Wies provided a synopsis of the proposed process for addressing Developments of Regional Importance (DRI). The DRI draft is intended to establish the framework for identification, review and disposition of DRIs. It is CMAP's intent to review development proposals that have the possibility of introducing widespread impacts on significant numbers of people. DRI's can be referred to CMAP in three ways: CMAP staff identifies an action of regional significance; a county, municipality or the CMAP coordinating committee requests a review or the CMAP Board can independently initiate a DRI review. When the Board considers the question of a proposed DRI, three successive decision tiers are proposed to evaluate a development: Tier 1 asks if the proposed development is subject to a planning process that permits formal multi-jurisdictional coordination and public involvement. Tier 2 asks if the proposed development includes certain context-dependent development characteristics, and Tier 3 asks if the proposed development will have measurable regional impacts. Staff concluded with the process review timeline before proposal submission to the CMAP Board for approval.

The committee was asked for comments, questions, and any feedback. John Greuling asked if CMAP believed the counties would be comfortable with the process as it is written now. Staff said that was a difficult question to answer. Charles Perkins commented that the tiered system is very subjective and that there are no standards or thresholds by which a developer can know whether a project will qualify as a DRI. Due to the lack of time the committee chair recommended the discussion be tabled for the July meeting when the committee can devote considerable time to comments and questions about the DRI process.

## **8.0 Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

## **9.0 Adjournment**

The meeting ended at 10:30am

The next meeting of the Economic and Community Development working committee will be held on Tuesday July 22, 2008 at 9:00am in the CMAP offices.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Rademacher  
Staff Liaison

07-09 -08