



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.cmap.illinois.gov

Land Use Committee **DRAFT** Meeting Notes

Wednesday, July 16th, 2008

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

Members Present:

Mark Avery, Robert Cole, Ken Mirabella (for Jerry Conrad), Roger Dahlstrom, David Dubois, David Galowich, Jim LaBelle, Ed Paesel, James Peters, Karen Stonehouse, Dennis Sandquist, Karen Miller (for Kai Taurm), Norm West, Nancy Williamson

Members Absent:

Sam Assefa, Judy Beck, Ken Johnson, Robert Palmer, James Peters, Tim Savage, Heather Smith, Heather Tabbert

Staff Present:

Ty Warner (staff liaison to the committee), Stephen Ostrander, Erin Aleman, Andrew Williams-Clark, Bob Dean, Kermit Wies, Tedd Carrison, Roseanne O'Laughlin, Kevin Lueke, Lee Dueben, Tara Fifer

Others Present:

Tam Kutzmark, DuPage Mayors & Managers Conference; Mike Walczak, Northwest Municipal Conference; Ryan Richter, Metra; Anja Claus, Center for Humans & Nature; Curt Wiley, Urban Land Institute

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 am

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes.

3.0 Approval of Minutes – June 18th, 2008

By e-mail, Judy Beck had requested an amendment to last month's minutes regarding comments on the Latino report. A motion to approve the minutes of the May 21st meeting, as amended, was made by Dennis Sandquist and seconded by Nancy Williamson. All in favor, the motion carried.

4.0 Legislative Update

There were no legislative updates.

5.0 Go To 2040 Plan:

5.1 Scenario Construction

Bob Dean recapped the last meeting's scenario construction, with preference given toward the thematic scenario construction. Committee scenarios will be going out between now and September, and the next few weeks Dean will be setting up a conference call to discuss what land use components should be used in scenario construction.

5.2 Regional Indicators Development

Andrew Williams-Clark indicated that the Indicator Workshops are beginning on July 22nd in Tinley Park. At these workshops CMAP is looking for input from generalists as to whether the indicator set is complete, and which of these are most helpful in doing their jobs better.

Drew Williams-Clark said he would like the committee to focus today on Reinvestment indicators, and noted that these indicators need to be broadly accepted and need to be trackable across the region. He explained the notations on the handout. A "1" connotes that the data tracks finer detail than county data and it is available for at least all seven counties. Additionally, all the 600-plus indicators will be housed in the data warehouse.

Nancy Williams suggested that reinvestment in parklands and trails should be an indicator.

The committee discussed the importance of water as an indicator. Specifically, Denis Sandquist noted that where water infrastructure is noted for FPA boundaries, this is "wastewater," not "water supply" as it is noted now. We should change the heading title to reflect this. The committee discussed what an indicator would be for water. Williams-Clark answered that the supply and demand gap would be the indicator based on the work of the Regional Water Supply Planning Group.

David Galowich noted that wastewater roughly replicates public infrastructure. Dennis Sandquist said that Lake County gets data from the State of Illinois on the number of service connections which shows the percent of people on public water supply. Ed Paesel noted that we could look at water usage and conservation (gallons per person used). Galowich cautioned that combined stormwater/sanitary doesn't tell you much about per-person usage.

Jim LaBelle asked what CMAP is measuring as far as agriculture and land use is concerned. Williams-Clark said the general consensus is that agricultural land should be maintained, so the indicator would measure acres within the region.

Karen Stonehouse noted that the names of the categories aren't all that useful.

As a point of clarification, Roger Cole asked what the sustainability of the number of tax sales would be. Williams-Clark explained that data is delinquency sales which often affect the sustainability in funding land use regulation.

The committee wanted to know what our infill methodology was. The methodology is outlined in the Infill Snapshot that was recently released – it is available on the CMAP website.

6.0 Developments of Regional Importance (DRI):

Mark Avery relayed that the programming committee would like to hear reports from other committees in August. In October the programming committee will review all of the comments from the stakeholder outreach. The central question is whether the DRI draft brings added value to the process.

Dave Galowich said that no one would argue against good planning, which would be like arguing against preventative medicine, but a good definition of what a DRI is lacking. The current definition is not clear enough, and could apply to any Walgreens on the corner, which is not the intent. He pointed to metropolitan Atlanta and the state of Florida's process, which has been going on for 20 years and still doesn't have it right. Each community in Florida has a different set of triggers. The current definition is too "soft and fuzzy", whereas something more concrete is needed while recognizing Cook County is different from Kendall County.

Roger Dahlstrom suggested these could be quantified according to each of CMAP's topical areas, and suggested the transect concept be considered as a reviewing framework, from urban center to agricultural open land. This geographic base could be used for contextual analysis.

Norm West looked to SAFETEA-LU modeling, and pointed to the CN acquisition where there has been lots of meetings, but CMAP has had no regional conversations to date. Eliminating those DRIs that are in the EIS process may be eliminating the big issues that we should be talking about.

Karen Stonehouse indicated that the best way to work through this is with a bunch of examples. Wies pointed out the examples at the end of the document, and that the committee could not come to a significant agreement on them regarding which were DRIs.

Ed Paesel believes the two important issues are (1) assuring that this won't add to the timeline for development review; and (2) the limited amount of staff available.

Galowich said that in actual practice, a local jurisdiction will delay for the sake of a review from CMAP.

West pointed out the EIS process is often called a "delay maker" but in actuality has very specific timeframes and deadlines.

Jim LaBelle noted that projects and developments don't happen in a couple months. local review should be long enough, and impacts should be considered when the application is assembled, and we should have our DRI timeline fit within the development timeline. The benefit is to get everyone to think about the impacts of a project. The challenge is not to be so rigid that stuff will fall right under numerical thresholds. Also, the concern with thresholds like Florida is that people game the system. A 3000 unit development in Chicago versus the same number in a smaller community has very different impacts.

Mark Avery noted that a geographic context might help the process.

Nancy Williamson pointed out that not all land is equal. Rather, this should be looking at the biological and natural value of the land where this is proposed. We should make a map that blocks out all of these sensitive areas to give a heads up to developers; we cannot look at land as simply "vacant." Another concern of the Environment & Natural Resources committee was that presently there is no way for the public to bring a DRI to CMAP.

Wies said a way would be developed to bring this through the Committee structure, and these requests will need to be "entertained" rather than simply meeting a checkbox requirement in order to process.

David Dubois said a predictable process is beneficial to the development community as well as staff. There is a need to define the process and structure at the local level.

Dennis Sandquist raised the comparative issue of FPA requests, and LaBelle said what is in the FPA review has been a matter of contention. The State has felt that is more a clean water issue. We need to assess whether these other issues will be covered.

Wies asked for more perspective on Florida's process, and Galowich responded that people know which boxes need checked, and the cost to the applicant is huge, needing consultant reports in a certain format, etc. Galowich said we pretty much have a handle on the transportation impacts, and most else gets protected pretty well. Florida began this way but morphed into much else.

Avery asked Galowich how he would respond to a checklist where if a developer does certain things in that checklist, he does not have to go through a DRI process. Galowich responded that this would be positive.

Ken Marabella said that CMAP review is purely advisory, and it would be wise to attend to others' timeframes. Everything will not fit into the box of the DRI definition, but it should not apply to the Walgreens on the corner, and so we have to have some sort of limited thresholds. We are not ready to take this on the road yet; everyone will have their own take on it.

West asked what CMAP would actually do that would make time and cost an issue.

Williamson asked what the "plus" added to this is; there is potential to develop something better by bringing parties together, perhaps even speeding things up.

Galowich said an agency that coordinates and moves things faster would be nice, but is not very likely.

LaBelle noted that the only way this can be meaningful is if it's timely. Also when this process is presented to the public, CMAP should have a FAQ sheet for how these things are being interpreted.

Avery asked Wies what would be helpful from this committee that had not been addressed, and Wies said that this draft is good for this committee because it is focused on land use. Other committees are taking it more broadly (say, to expand it beyond "development."). September stakeholder input is for CMAP's partners, such as COGs, MPC, Chicago Wilderness, etc, and is not really the timeframe for a "public hearing." A medium for public is being developed.

Committee members were encouraged to get their comments to Warner and Avery as soon as possible to compile in the Land Use Committees' recommendations to the programming coordinating committee.

7.0 Next scheduled meetings:

There was consensus by the committee not to have a meeting in August. The regular meeting schedule will resume on September 17th, 2008

8.0 Other Business

David Galowich distributed ULI's new report on infrastructure, and also introduced Curt Wiley, ULI Chicago's Executive Director, who briefly summarized the report.

9.0 Public Comment

There were no public comments.

10.0 Adjournment

Jim LaBelle moved to adjourn, seconded by Norm West.
The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ty Warner", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ty Warner AICP, Committee Liaison

Notes compiled with the assistance of Erin Aleman