



## Joint Land Use Committee and Economic Development Committee Meeting

### Minutes

Wednesday, December 2, 2015

9:30 a.m.

Cook County Conference Room  
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800  
Chicago, Illinois

**Members Present (LUC):** Ed Paesel (Chair), Judy Beck, Kristi DeLaurentiis, Lisa DiChiera, Paul Lauricella, Steve Lazzara (for Curt Paddock), Robert McKenna, Arnold Randall, Paul Rickelman, Heather Smith, Todd Vanadilok, Nathaniel Werner, Nancy Williamson, James Wilson (for Susan Campbell), Adrienne Wuellner, Ruth Wuorenma.

**Members Absent (LUC):** Michael Kowski, Mark Muenzer, Curt Paddock, Dennis Sandquist, Heather Tabbert, Mark VanKerkhoff (Vice-Chair), Eric Waggoner.

**Members Present (EDC):** Patrick Carey (Co-Chair), Lindsay Broughel, Peter Creticos, Katie Fitzpatrick, Joanna Greene, Emily Harris, Jason Keller, Gretchen Kosarko, Judith Kossy, Kelly O'Brien, Kurtis Poszgay, Ed Sitar.

**Members Absent (EDC):** Reggie Greenwood, John Grueling, Rand Haas, Bret Johnson, Kevin Kramer, Jeff Margolis, Lance Pressl, Nick Provenzano, Ayom Siengo, Gary Skoog, Christine Sobek (Chair), Carrie Thomas, Jerry Weber.

**Staff Present:** Stephen Ostrander (LUC committee liaison), Simone Weil (EDC committee liaison), Alex Beata, Lindsay Hollander, Kristin Ihnchak, Jason Navota, Elizabeth Oo, Elizabeth Schuh.

**Others Present:** Elaine Bottomley (WCGL), Karen Ann Miller (Kane County), Mike Walczak (NWMC).

### 1.0 Call to Order

Patrick Carey called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

### 2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

Alex Beata provided a brief legislative update.

### 3.0 Approval of the Meeting Notes (LUC) – October 21, 2015

A motion to approve the minutes of October 21, 2015, was made by Arnold Randall and seconded by Judy Beck. All in favor, the motion carried.

### 4.0 Next Regional Plan: Reinvestment and Infill Strategy Paper – Elizabeth Schuh, CMAP GO TO 2040 broadly sought “to direct investment toward strengthening existing

communities and find opportunities to encourage new development and redevelopment in livable communities that are denser and designed for mixed uses.” This project is exploring refinements to that recommendation. Liz Schuh provided an overview of findings thus far, including definition of area types that are important for reinvestment and identification of broad barriers to and strategies to promote reinvestment in the region’s communities.

One LUC member commented on the importance of taxes as a barrier to reinvestment, especially in places such as the south suburbs.

An EDC member asked whether the strategy paper would include consideration of the impact of property tax classification. Liz replied that this as an area in which CMAP doesn’t expect to see much change.

A LUC member noted that it seems that problems with underlying infrastructure might be preventing reinvestment.

Another LUC member underscored the need for incentives, as well as a focus on the repurposing of existing structures.

A LUC member noted the importance of large areas which serve as part of “social infrastructure,” such as hospitals (as they can’t easily re-locate).

An EDC member asked about whether the paper would consider the role of race and related issues such as red-lining. Liz responded that the next plan’s focus on disinvested areas would address those concerns. Ed Paesel commented that there was a relevant study that looked at four communities in the SSMMA area that were similar in terms of factors such as resident income, spending, etc. but were different in terms of racial makeup, and which experienced very different treatment by businesses choosing where to locate.

In addition to looking forward, a LUC member encouraged CMAP to also focus on looking closely at recent redevelopment and existing development that wasn’t developed well.

#### **5.0 Next Regional Plan: Place-Based Approach Alternatives – Kristin Ihnchak, CMAP**

One goal of the next plan’s development is to provide actionable guidance for implementers via more detailed policy recommendations and greater geographic specificity for some policy areas. “Place-based approaches” are used by many peer MPOs to provide locally appropriate recommendations within the context of their regional plans. Kristin Ihnchak provided an overview of the two place-based approach alternatives – typologies and layers – and discussed their potential utility for the next plan.

An EDC member commented that if CMAP chooses a place-based approach, she thought that it was important to study and assess the interrelationships between all of the layers.

A LUC member encouraged CMAP to think of centers of MSA’s as a potential data point in

the analysis.

Another LUC member commented that layers made sense to her, but noted that she felt that “in many ways, we’re already there,” since this sort of analysis has been done before to some degree. She added that since CMAP was already looking at Minneapolis, the team should look at the greater regional authority/powers and compare and contrast.

A LUC member liked the layers approach but thought that representation could pose some challenges and problems at the regional scale. He gave the example of Will County’s significant industrial sector being represented as regionally less-significant (than it is).

Another LUC member noted that with advances in GIS, it would be ideal if CMAP could map all of the information and provide this to communities (who often aren’t thinking of such issues). Kristin responded that CMAP is considering developing a tool that might do something of this nature. An EDC member added that he thought that creating and providing such tools and products was actually more important than reports.

Another EDC member commented that she liked the layers approach, but thought that CMAP would still need to think about how this information is packaged in a way that municipalities find practical to use. Other EDC members added that they agreed that this was key—and, with this in mind, the typology approach might ultimately be more useful for municipalities. A LUC member suggested that CMAP could develop a typology approach that didn’t use municipal boundaries (i.e. showing areas of similarity identified through a layers approach).

An EDC member said that despite some reservations about sensitivities (of some communities) showing similarities between communities that are alike—save for one or two differences—would be interesting and useful.

A LUC member liked the layers approach, especially given the importance of issues such as drinking water and stormwater.

#### **6.0 Next Regional Plan: Tax Policy and Land Use Strategy Paper – Lindsay Hollander, CMAP**

Residential, office, retail, and industrial development each have benefits for the region and its communities. However, current statutory framework in Illinois emphasizes disbursements of state tax revenue to municipalities with greater retail sales. It is important to ensure that all communities have the ability to generate revenue that supports the land uses that those communities have identified as important to support their economic, quality of life, and other goals. Staff are developing a strategy paper that includes research on how tax structures affect land use and development and outlines case studies from other states on the interaction between tax policies and land use outcomes. Based on this background analysis, policy recommendations or strategies in this area may be developed in FY2017. Lindsay Hollander provided an overview.

An EDC member observed the importance of different tax assessments in the region and, most important, differences in how some people and entities of greater means “seem to be able to affect assessments” (through appeals). A LUC member seconded this, saying that often some with greater means gain the most benefits (from the way the system works), leaving others (often with less means) to pay more.

**7.0 Next Regional Plan: Update on Select Snapshots and Strategy Papers – Elizabeth Schuh, CMAP**

The memo included in the committee packet provided a brief update on select snapshot reports and strategy papers that are related to the work of the Economic Development and Land Use Committees. Liz Schuh answered committee member questions.

A LUC member asked if it would be possible for CMAP to create a “report card” on GO TO 2040 (i.e. what worked and what didn’t). Liz responded that this was what CMAP had already been doing to determine the best approach for the next plan.

**8.0 Other Business**

The Chairs of both committees (and several members from each committee) indicated that they found the joint meeting to be useful and something to be repeated in the future.

**9.0 Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**10.0 Next Meeting**

The Land Use Committee was scheduled to next meet on January 20, 2016.

**11.0 Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Committee Liaison  
January 15, 2016