



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

Environment and Natural Resources Committee

DRAFT Minutes

June 4th, 2008—9:30 a.m.

Members Present:

Joe Schuessler (*alternate*) – Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago, Patty Werner (*alternate*) - Lake County SMC, Jack Darin – Sierra Club, Karla Kramer – U.S. Fish & Wildlife, Kama Dobbs – DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference, Wally Van Buren – Illinois Association of Wastewater Agencies, Pete Harnet - IDOT, Martha Dooley – Village of Schaumburg, Lenore Beyer-Clow – Openlands, Andy Kimmel (*alternate*) – Illinois Association of Conservation and Forest Preserve Districts, Mike Rogers – IEPA Bureau of Air, Charles Wheelan, The Harris School, Public Policy, Martin Jaffee-University of Illinois at Chicago, Patrick Ryan-Village of Berwyn, Ken Anderson – Kane County, Ingrid Ruttendjie – Fox Waterway Agency, Kevin Givens – Cook Co. Dept. of Environmental Control

Staff Present:

Kerry Leigh, Joy Schaad, Andrew Williams-Clark, Bob Dean, Don Kopec, Randy Blankenhorn, Dawn Thompson

Others Present:

Chris Slattery - Delta Institute , Anja Claus - Center for Humans and Nature, Edward Kalimer – RJN Group, Angela Larsen – UIC-CAC,

1.0 Call to Order

Jack called the meeting to order at 9:32 am.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

Agenda items 8.0 and 6.0 were switched to accommodate committee members.

3.0 Approval of Minutes from May 7th, 2008

Patty Werner moved to approve and Andy Kimmel seconded. Motion carried.

4.0 Coordinating Committees Update – Chair Jack Darin

The programming coordinating committee requested more work at a staff level on the DRI process, specifically on the criteria although the analysis part was more complete. The committee felt it wanted more specific information for review and discussion prior to disseminating it to the working committees for comment. Jack isn't sure if there is a new timetable, but it includes multi-stakeholder review prior to adoption by the board. The draft for comment may come to this committee in July. Programming coordinating committee meets on the 11th of June.

Patty W. asked about committee structure, particularly for the new members, and Jack explained that in practice the working committees don't have time at the coordinating committees to discuss their work other than what is brought to the coordinating committee by the working committees. The coordinating committees are the appropriate place for conveying where issues need to be addressed by more than one committee. The discussion centered on how the working committees identify where issues overlap and where it is important to have cross pollination of ideas as that has not come through clearly to this committee. Bob said that staff will discuss possibilities. Ingrid added that this committee should be making recommendations to the coordinating committee level on issues we feel should be addressed more comprehensively. Jack said he would bring this issue up for discussion at the programming coordinating committee.

5.0 GO TO 2040 Indicators Development – CMAP staff

5.1 Indicators Development – Andrew Williams Clark

New update from the consultants project manager. Kerry will post metadata from Andrew on the web site. So far this reflects the consultants' educated opinion on the validity and location of data. Doing data warehousing, every data point proposed will be warehoused so continue to communicate directly with Andrew directly any data you can share or point us to. The list is difficult to read as it is a huge list of things. We are working to funnel it in to a smaller list, and now staff are making progress toward the vision and finding a simpler way to categorize them. Some are cross-cutting indicator themes, such as equity, sustainability and innovation. Andrew said that these will have regular updates (ideally annually or more frequently). Sustainability maybe more problematic as is innovation, and the question is how do we measure those? Andrew explained that this is a first cut at re-categorizing the indicators and there is a need to cut it down to 150 metrics. They will be available for download to anyone. Staff will continue to involve the committee and the final list of tracking will be submitted to the board in September. In the next couple of months there will be continued committee input as well as going out to the region and getting feed back from stakeholders through workshops. The community and technical assistant unit is in the process of creating the outreach plan.

Transitioning this from a spreadsheet to a database will give better access and we will have a metadata engine so that anyone can fill in the spaces online. Any data

entered will be automatically entered into the database in a more concise way, this will make it easier to generate reports internally, and also for committee members to use. Finally, at the end of June, Bob and Andrew will be making a presentation at the Community Indicators conference in DC.

Patty asked about the community outreach, and could we do some polling on what people actually knowAA? Will those questions be asked? Andrew said that these are focus groups and are not scientifically chosen, so this may be a good way to test ideas and language. Kerry will send the spreadsheet out to the committee so they can add contacts directly onto the spreadsheet and send it back to Andrew (awilliamsclark@cmap.illinois.gov).

5.2 Scenario Construction – Bob Dean

Bob provided an update on the construction of Alternative Scenarios. Staff is still working internally but also looking for committee input on where we're going. Currently working on the general framework, and the next step is the choice of a preferred scenario that is logical and possible for the future. The scenario is a combination of actions, and then a series of alternative futures that we could have is entered. Indicators then help evaluate how well we achieve our goals within the preferred scenario. Baseline items need to be in all scenarios, and the scenario needs to be logical and internally consistent as well as in the realm of possibility with reasonable courses of action we can take as a region.

We will prioritize activities for action here, and there will be no scenarios of reduction in environmental or economic activity, as those are considered minimum standards eg. Maintenance of infrastructure, etc. basic standards that exist in each scenario. Cost is an issue: there are two approaches, and we need to make tradeoffs of higher costs explicit otherwise it creates an unfair situation. Scenarios are examples, not a full range of where we can go in the future. Scenario planning is a good tool for communicating to the public and needs to be reasonable, with 4 or 5 alternative scenarios to choose between. Dimensions of variables are very broad, such as land use and transportation, economic development, housing and human services in each scenario. There are 4 different ways to put together scenarios. They are:

- **Intensity of Implementation:** envision Utah – intensity is the difference between the scenarios;
- **Maximizing one Goal over Others:** 3 dimensions of sustainability. One reference scenario eg. Positive environmental activities or improve the economy or equity. This has problems, not realistic, environment or economy is a false choice as you can have both. Can be conflicting and not recommending this approach.
- **Focusing investment:** base amount of investment in our systems to keep our region running plus improvements for other things. Idea is to focus the

optional investment . Answers how can the public sector best use resources but can be hijacked by special interest groups, need a balance to create a strong region.

- **Thematic:** come up with basic concepts and plug activities into it. Eg. A preservation scenario of what we currently have that we value, an infill and re-investment scenario such as brownfields redevelopment and would have less preservation, new technology scenario in transportation alternative energy and finally the Burnham scenario what kind of major things would he be thinking and put into a scenario, a new future for the region instead of emphasizing what we already have. Less easy to predict how interest groups would line up behind these. Hard to explain, not simple and seems arbitrary.

An alternative is to organize scenarios by themes, but identify specific actions within the vision themes. What scenarios are just for environment or education for example, and are not arbitrary. This is a bottom up approach. Kerry will post the powerpoint presentation on the web. Examples include: transportation goals; land use and housing approach; focus investment on minor capital; and solving problems in major investments.

What are some different courses of action we can take and how can they be intelligently implemented? We would prefer an approach that is not divisive. Bob asked the committee what they think is the best way to be involved.

Pete suggested that under the thematic scenario, the complication is definitions and what do terms mean to different communities? In terms of capital intensive vs. preservation, we tend to look at past programs and if we haven't yet addressed pure capacity needs as there is not a collective will, where do you set the baseline? Bob replied that we need to continue with what we have and no baseline will be below what we've had historically. Discretionary money is a good question. Finance is not really addressed very well. Pete asked what's the maximum buildout scenario? Bob said we have to look at these in relative terms.

Andy Kimmel asked if all scenarios have the same assumption of the same investment baseline? Eg. Openspace? Bob replied that we're assuming current activities will continue. The question is what do we do on top of these....Andy suggested that the basic stuff is new money too and shouldn't it be taken across categories? Bob said that we haven't gone into the financial aspects yet, but the quality of what we have now will not be allowed to degrade, and then we need to figure out how we improve on that.

Lenore, agreed about avoiding conflict scenarios, but current infrastructure investment for example will cause a degradation, so keeping the floor is actually a current investment.

Patty expressed concern that if this is a visioning process, and if we build on what we're currently doing, do we limit our scope? If we don't think about these things as possibilities then we will limit ourselves in terms of innovation. Bob replied that we want to balance current assets and find innovative ways to build on new technology for example but Patty was concerned that our money will only go to what we have and we need to look at lifecycle costs.

Karla added that when this was brought up before staff didn't want to set up along geographic areas, but there are some things that may need to be tied down geographically. She also noted that stakeholder groups need to work together more than they are at the moment. In terms of how much things cost, there are some things that may be difficult to put an economic value on such as environmental resources and functions. Some sort of innovative funding mechanism where the economic development community says this is where we're willing to assist. It is a challenge. Bob added that there may be some unresolvable issues with stakeholders, for example with the economy and the environment and we need to think about it carefully.

Others also liked the thematic approach, and it was noted that as many subjects will overlap getting various stakeholders to the table is a concern. The economic benefit of natural resource functions will be important to quantify. One suggestion was of different scenarios run that could use solar energy, for example.

Bob asked the committee how they see their involvement in the process and Andy said that it could start with a staff recommendation for each committee to lay claim to an issue and then committees could work together where there is overlap. Patty said she liked the intensity way of looking at scenarios as she likes to visualize things and felt that conveying the choices with good visualization was a plus on the intensity scenario. Bob assured the committee that all the visualization techniques will be employed for the scenario methodology chosen and that state of the art visualization graphics is not limited to a particular type. Pete felt that more representative graphics that show a distinct difference is preferable.

Lenore suggested that perhaps a smaller task force from this committee could form to work more closely with staff. Bob agreed that that is a good idea as monthly meetings may not give the level of feedback that staff need. Bob suggested that committee members let him know who would be willing to serve on a scenario construction task force.

Karla suggested that laying out a process whereby individual communities could identify what is important to them is another option. Bob said that we could

identify communities that are already doing active planning and could potentially insert Scenario planning into their processes.

6.0 State Capital Program & Open Space - Lenore Beyer-Clow, Openlands

ACTION REQUESTED: Recommendation to the CMAP Board

Lenore noted that there are a number of different groups working towards a chunk of money for land acquisition in the state. Propose a program called i-space which would be a land acquisition program. There are a lot of matching funds for open space protection. These funds also support the C2000 program and the Hunting Heritage program. The Illinois Works Coalition to present a capital program and funding sources. They were initially told by state legislators that the program was definitely included in the budget but when the proposal was eventually put forward the budget was at zero, however with advocacy it is now at \$200 million.

Randy interjected that the CMAP Board is behind this 100%. Putting a statement of support could only help. Lenore moved for a committee resolution that the CMAP Board express significant support for Open Space acquisition in the state capital program. Patrick seconded the motion. Motion carried.

7.0 Community Outreach Programs & the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Update – Hubert Morgan, CMAP staff

ACTION REQUESTED: Information & Discussion

Hubert presented the website interface with the general public and partners as an example of innovative ways to use new tools to captivate the audience. It illustrates what the CAC does and challenges faced, for example answering the question of how do we cross pollinate? CAC wants to understand the other committee challenges. Angela Larson is from CAC and is here to listen and bring back information to the committee.

In terms of outreach, how we engage our partners and goals we set, and how we align our work of the CAC with the rest of the agency, and how we fulfill goals of the 2040 planning process is being discussed as well as how we then measure our success.

Community Conversations: have a conversation with the general public, issues and challenges around their community. Let people know how we can align their issues with our work. There is an avenue for discussion around these issues. An outreach challenge for example is 500 invitations are issued, 6 people show. We are striving to establish relationships for the longterm.

CMAP has micro- grants for community groups, and we have sent out an RFP. We have selected 10 organizations with some meetings done just in Spanish, and some for youth.

Hubert encouraged the committee to have these types of conversations in your region. They can be self directed, and hosted.

8.0 Transportation & Environmental Collaboration Initiative. Chris Slattery, Delta Institute

ACTION REQUESTED: Information & Discussion

Chris described the initiative as basically getting 2 stakeholder groups together to work on creating a common language with a focus on long-range transportation planning and project development. There is a workshop directly following next months meeting. Why are we trying to do it? Surface transportation projects have an impact on the environment. Stewardship ethic, streamlining the process, less adversarial, better projects is the real goal. Chris would like feedback on preliminary ideas that can be part of a workplan. Please review and respond to Chris in advance of the workshop.

Lenore said that this is an opportunity for environmental organizations to advocate for the CSS process and that there are not many environmental organizations that exclusively do transportation work. There is a capacity issue and participation is dependent on work loads of people and how organizations are structured.

9.0 Facility Planning Areas Update – Dawn Thompson, CMAP staff

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

2 applications have been received since the last meeting. The Village of Itasca worked with environmental groups to remove phosphorous etc and their application was a result of collaboration with environmental groups. 2 actions that took place. The Village of Pingree Grove 175 acres applied for. There is currently controversy with Village of Huntley, there is a public hearing on July 1st. Information is available on the web.

Next weeks wastewater committee meeting is on wednesday and there will be a speaker from IEPA on how the IEPA is involved in the FPA process and how water quality is maintained in the region.

10.0 Discussion Items/Follow Up for Future Meetings

- Collaboration of the Working Committees
- Detail behind indicators, contact Drew and will continue to be on the agenda.

11.0 Other Business

12.0 Public Comment

13.0 Adjournment

Ingrid moved to adjourn and Andy seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Next Meeting Date: Wednesday, July 2nd, 2008 at 9:30 am