



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 Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, March 19th, 2008

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

Members Present:

Judy Beck, Robert Cole, Jerry Conrad, Roger Dahlstrom, Michael Davidson, David Dubois, Jim Labelle, Ed Paesel (vice chair), John Paige (for Karen Stonehouse), Robert Palmer, James Peters, Dennis Sandquist, Tim Savage, Heather Tabbert, Kai Tarum, Nancy Williamson, Nathaniel Werner, Norm West

Members Absent:

Mark Avery (chair), Sam Assefa, Keith Eichorst, David Galowich, Heather Smith, Ken Johnson, Mark Ruby, Jackie Tredup

Staff Present:

Erin Aleman, Bob Dean, Lee Deuben, Don Kopec, Stephen Ostrander, Paul Reise, Joy Schaad, Ty Warner, Andrew Williams-Clark

Others Present:

Paul Heltne, Center for Humans and Nature; Mike Klemens, Will County Governmental League; Tam Kutzmark, DuPage Mayors & Managers; Mike Mike Walczak, Northwest Municipal Conference

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

Ed Paesel, vice chair of the committee, called the meeting to order at 9:04 am.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

Paesel announced that Mark Avery could not be present, and welcomed the new municipal representatives on the committee. There were no agenda changes.

3.0 Approval of Minutes – February 20, 2008

A motion to approve the minutes of the February 20th meeting, as presented, was made by David Dubois and seconded by Roger Dahlstrom. All in favor the motion carried.

4.0 Legislative Update

Judy Beck noted that grants for parks districts have not been funded. Many parks districts have bids out but can't move forward. There are millions of dollars worth of projects that may be cancelled or scaled back due to the Governor holding back the money to IDNR.

5.0 Go To 2040 Plan:

5.1 Scenario Construction

Bob Dean gave an overview of the Go To 2040 Plan's proposed use of scenario construction, referencing a memo that was sent out to all committee members in advance.

Roger Dahlstrom asked to what extent these examples take into consideration policies for redevelopment. Bob Dean stated it is a common occurrence to target appropriate areas for infill scenarios.

Judy Beck stated that there seemed to be a denial of environmental impacts and these impacts need to be built in or add an entire scenario on environmental concerns. We don't want to go from conservation to risk management. Dean said that they are looking at environmental impacts seriously; for instance, green house gas emissions will be integrated into each scenario. Judy Beck said that this is good for mitigation but we need to look at the adaptation side

Norm West said that a year was spent looking at basing a plan on watersheds and that he was very excited about the shift in changing thinking so dramatically, yet this seems to be coming from a totally different perspective. Dean said the scenarios will be more publicly digestible and that watershed planning would be in a couple of different scenarios, but a watershed approach like this would make modeling more robust. Staff is not able to convert the scenarios to watershed units but will be doing environmental analysis in the scenario construction, and would have to try changing the units more first.

Mike Davidson said the scenario analyses are constructed around topic areas, but he is interested in looking at the impact of climate change for a particular scenario..

John Paige asked if this is a Regional Transportation Plan with land use, or a coordinated plan for land use and transportation? Dean said it is the official RTP. Investments will be strategic and include new programs, major capital projects we will look at afterwards. Paige asked if it would address investments including sewer and water, and Dean said it would

but would mostly look at transit. Paige asked if it is looking at areas outside of our jurisdiction; Dean replied that CAMP can't make recommendations for other regions, so no.

Paul Heltne, Center for Humans and Nature, said that watersheds and air quality don't stop at political boundaries. Also, the impact of immigration could be significant; he suggests another scenario that accounts for this.

Nancy Williamson said we need to look at whether infrastructure can sustain or hold growth. Dean said there is a technical team working on making the Green Infrastructure Vision actionable; may be one scenario. Williamson said we need to consider what the basic earth services are that we need to maintain.

Jim LaBelle said we're looking at a number of development scenarios helping us understand what strategies get us to these goals. How far can you go to address that? Dean said Drew will talk about quantifiable measures, but this is not unlike what Metropolis 2020 had done previously – what are the specific policies or investments we can make, and pick out the best combinations of things we can do to create a region based on centers, corridors and green areas.

Dennis Sandquist said watersheds should be used not only as a unit of analysis but as the primary method of growth management. Dean said there are two ways of scenario planning: one focuses internally, built around things we can control, and the other is built around external things that could happen to you. Need to pick one or the other; don't work together very well. CMAP has chosen to focus on the internal process because it will help us to prioritize and make recommendations today. Sandquist said social equity and environment justice are kind of constant, so what are the themes around these? Dean said they would not construct a scenario that has a worse environmental, economic, or equity impact. Next meeting should have some samples to start to throw out.

Roger Dahlstrom said the modeling capability gives the ability to test scenarios. Themes should be constructed to be dynamic over time to be able to be responsive to what might happen externally and to be re-measured.

LaBelle says that discussions of future population raises an interesting point, as past plans had a single population projection. What happens in the region if population is different than projected? Scenario planning doesn't work so well when you've already got it figured out. We might want to test 5-10% over/under scenarios to see what the outcomes might be.

We shouldn't try to comply with all 283 municipal desires but integrate and share in an informed way.

Paesel said NIPC and now CMAP has done a much better job of not blindly accepting what communities think they will grow to. There should be negotiation – what is the evidence of why you think we're wrong? It is important to be able to test the market reality of all these plans. For example, we may have policies to redevelop brownfields, but the market reality may be that they are simply too expensive to actually clean up.

5.2 Regional Indicators Development

Andrew Williams-Clark gave an overview of the history of indicators and examples of other organizations that are using indicators extensively (ex. The Boston Indicators Project, Sustainable Seattle)

The committee discussed indicators on the themes of Reinvestment and Coordinated Planning & Government.

Dennis Sandquist said that the number of Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) aren't necessarily a positive, but could be a sign that things aren't working.

Ed Paesel added that there are lots of agreements in our region that are not formalized and therefore less likely to be tracked.

Roger Dahlstrom added that boundary agreements are not always effective, depending on how they are done.

Robert Cole wanted to return to the fundamental question of integrating land use and transportation -- what do we want to implement? Should land use and transportation have its own indicator category?

Judy Beck said that trending/variability and responsiveness aren't mutually exclusive. How do we go back if something is going wrong – feedback loop is important. She referenced the SOLEC indicators, which has multiple sub-indicators which feed into them.

Dahlstrom added that how much of geography is subject to an IGA may reflect bad mistakes or bad uses in the past.

Ed Paesel asked if we are looking at local government-to-local government or cooperation with counties and state? It is important to look at who we compare ourselves to – look to other global cities.

Sandquist said Lake county maps IGAs and can show where they are. He also referenced the indicator of teachers per capita, and suggested what we really want to look at is level of educational attainment.

John Page said all the themes and indicators influence reinvestment in some way. Infill areas are not just about new building values but the vitality of areas is also important. Some other indicators might be:

- Resale of existing properties
- Can centers or corridors constitute a framework of analysis to measure achievement?
- Acres of prime agriculture land developed
- How much investment is going outside of previously developed areas?
- How much transit investment is in our centers and corridors?
- Lane miles, Transit track miles
- Currency of local land use plans? (an inventory)

Nancy Williamson suggested:

- Participation in regional watershed plans and studies
- Numbers of communities participating with County initiatives

Jim LaBelle suggested:

- The NIPC study of local plans for consistency – how consistent are they with one another?
- Intergovernmental lawsuits/conflicts/major disputes
- How much do local/county plants integrate land use, transportation, housing, etc?
- How much does each plan advance the regional goals?
- Time indicator – how long does it take to make decisions?
- Is there a clear decision-making process that is coordinated for certain issues
- How much reinvestment is there on vacant or previously used land
- Is reinvestment well-served in terms of transit/infrastructure
- Measurement of unused capacity of brownfields

Jerry Conrad asked if the committee would be involved in other topics; could there be different themes? Dean responded that these themes are from the visioning work, and yes, the committee can discuss indicators on other topics. Some of the committees are definitely germane to certain indicators.

Conrad asked about *investment* versus re-investment. Dean said this came from the visioning process and could identify other indicators that don't clearly fit into those vision themes.

Dahlstrom said staff can only gather so much data. He would like some feedback on how deeply we need to go. What level of drill down do we have?

Dahlstrom suggested:

- Comprehensiveness of comprehensive plans, related to context – do they have a transportation element? Community facilities? Etc.
- Capital improvement plans adopted in the community?
- NIPC assessment of currency of comprehensive plans

David Dubois suggested:

- How many objections filed under county jurisdictional review?

Norm West said that in regards to comprehensive plans, is it one-size-fits-all for all communities in the CMAP area, or is there room in there for each community's own identity? This should not mean we have to form "Generica." Dean answered that CMAP will have differing recommendations.

Mike Davidson suggested:

- Consistency between comprehensive plans and actual zoning codes (such as regarding mixes uses)
- Technical assistance efforts could measure in
- Getting at the essence of land use factors by measuring VMT reductions, and measuring jobs – housing balance

Nancy Williamson suggested:

- IEPA approved sub-watershed plans
- Reinvestment, turning vacant land into community amenities
- Bike path completion

Judy Beck said there are a lot of inputs but short and soft on outputs. She suggested:

- Reinvestment/age of infrastructure
- Ratio of green infrastructure to grey infrastructure
- Current coordinating groups for infrastructure

Williamson further suggested:

- Measure how closely communities followed their comp plans

Kai Tarum said that the amount of local governments is unique to Chicago. The state and region also factor in – can we measure waste and duplication?

Tam Kutzmark said having done her Masters Thesis on indicators, this has particular interest for her. She said she hopes that CMAP has a place to put things that we'd like to measure but don't know how to yet, things that may be more qualitative and less quantitative in nature.

- Joint purchasing agreements
- Trails agreements
- Legislative initiatives (cable franchising)
- Joint plans, transit plans

Paul Heltne suggested:

- Places to grow food
- Water infiltration
- How much water is there?

He also asked if we actually can say that we know what the population is at any given time.

Ed Paesel further suggested:

- Tax delinquent properties
- Revitalization programs (land banking)

6.0 Committee Charge

With Mark Avery's absence, this item was tabled until next meeting.

7.0 DRI Process Update

Don Kopec said the DRI sub-committee has been asked to submit projects that they believe are examples of DRIs to try to tease out what those elements are that makes something a DRI. At this point there are 4-5 pages of examples, both concrete and policies, and staff is making calls of members for clarification. There will be another sub-committee meeting early April and the sub-committee will report back to the Programming Committee at the May 14th meeting (there will be no Board meeting in April).

Paesel reiterated that staff could do only 5-6 of such reviews per year at best.

8.0 Other Business

Paul Reise announced CMAP's next 'Seal the Deal' roundtable event will be held on Monday, March 31 in Oak Brook, and will deal with development incentives. Postcards were distributed with registration information.

Warner announced the Planning Commissioner Training workshops are starting up, with the first held in the South Suburban Mayors and Managers Association area on April 5 and 19.

9.0 Public Comment

There were no public comments.

10.0 Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting of the Land Use Committee is April 16th, 2008.

11.0 Adjournment

Ed Paesel adjourned the meeting at 10:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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

Ty Warner AICP, Committee Liaison