



Land Use Working Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, February 17, 2016

9:00 a.m.

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

Members Present: Mark VanKerkhoff (Vice-Chair), Judy Beck, Thomas Chefalo (for Eric Waggoner), Kristi DeLaurentiis, Paul Lauricella, Steve Lazzara (for Curt Paddock), Mark Muenzer, Paul Rickelman, Heather Smith, Heather Tabbert, Jane Turley (for Michael Kowski), Todd Vanadilok, Nathaniel Werner, Adrienne Wuellner, Ruth Wuorenma.

Members Absent: Susan Campbell, Lisa DiChiera, Robert McKenna, Ed Paesel (Chair), Arnold Randall, Dennis Sandquist, Nancy Williamson.

Staff Present: Stephen Ostrander (committee liaison), John Carlisle, Brian Daly, Kristin Ihnchak, Kara Komp, Tom Kotarac, Elizabeth Oo, Joe Szabo, Louise Yeung, Evelyn Zwiebach.

Others Present: Elaine Bottomley (WCGL), Brian Hacker (Metra), Brian Pigeon (NWMC).

1.0 Call to Order

Mark VanKerkhoff called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes or announcements.

3.0 Approval of the Meeting Notes – January 20, 2016

A motion to approve the minutes of January 20, 2016, was made by Than Werner and seconded by Paul Rickelman. All in favor, the motion carried.

4.0 Next Regional Plan: Place-Based Approach – Pilot Layers – Brian Daly, CMAP

At the Committee's December meeting, staff described potential place-based [approaches](#) and recommended the use of "layers" (data layers and mapping, along with pertinent spatially-based recommendations) for key topics in the next long-range plan. To explore the layers concept more concretely, staff are moving forward with the development of two "pilot layers" – priority areas for reinvestment and high quality natural resource areas – to explore how the approach might work and estimate the level of effort that may be required to

incorporate the layers concept into the next plan. Brian reviewed the preliminary approach for developing each pilot layer and asked for feedback on reinvestment area types.

In responding to “natural area types,” one member wondered about watersheds, while another member suggested prairies.

A member brought up migration route (e.g. of migratory birds). This member also thought that natural resource layers should be thought of in combination with built environment layers, and suggested that this could help identify opportunities in areas such as eco-tourism.

Another member thought that it was important to include corridors between core natural areas. Mark VanKerkhoff mentioned that Kane County developed a green infrastructure map that essentially did this, and observed that not all natural areas included in the base layers were pristine wilderness.

Steve Lazzara mentioned that the Will County Forest Preserve distinguishes between passive and active recreation areas, and wondered whether both types would be included in CMAP’s layers. Brian answered that they would generally-speaking. Steve then asked whether protected farmland would be included, to which Brian responded that agricultural land would not be included in this analysis (but would be addressed in a different analysis).

A member mentioned that the EPA has an environmentally sensitive areas classification which could be helpful to CMAP’s analysis. She also said that she didn’t see federal data layers, and offered to supply a list.

Another member asked about whether shopping malls would be included in commercial layers. Brian responded that they would. A different member seconded the importance of shopping malls, especially for any reinvestment. A member asked whether residential areas would be included; Brian answered not within this analysis.

A member underscored the importance of “eds and meds” (educational and medical institutions), which serve as key anchors for communities, especially as they cannot move easily. She added that this is especially important to consider in poorer areas.

Another member thought it was worth looking at destinations for tourism, especially for short-term/weekend getaways (e.g. destinations in Chain of Lakes). A different member added that craft beer breweries fit into this category.

A member asked whether any other MPOs had used this kind of analysis. Brian answered that the Met Council in Minnesota’s Twin Cities did something

similar. This member added that perhaps a good idea would be to identify sub-level linkages between main typologies. He also asked whether CMAP was looking at federal enterprise zones, to which Brian answered that CMAP was mostly analyzing things at the local level, but he acknowledged that there was certainly some crossover.

Heather Tabbert suggested looking at mixed-use transit corridors (e.g. bus corridors), mentioning RTA-funded plans and studies for Harlem Avenue, Cicero Avenue, and North Avenue.

Adrienne Wuellner mentioned that Pace is in the process of developing the Pulse Network—24 prioritized corridors. She said that she would forward a list.

5.0 Next Regional Plan: Infill and Transit-Oriented Development Snapshot: Initial Findings – Evelyn Zwiebach, CMAP

As part of next plan development, staff is preparing an Infill and TOD Snapshot, which will provide an overview of existing conditions and trends in infill and TOD in the region, focusing on development since 2000. Evy presented initial findings from the first phase of analysis, which included an evaluation of regional progress towards the development targets established by the Plan Update, and an examination of additional indicators of infill, including demographic and built environment indicators, such as population, households, density, and housing units.

Thomas Chefalo mentioned that for Lake County it was important to keep Great Lake Naval Station in mind—and leave out of the analysis.

Another member asked whether CMAP was looking at regulatory framework within the areas CMAP is analyzing. Evy responded that CMAP wasn't in this analysis, but added that would be included in the layers analysis and other future work.

A member asked how CMAP was evaluating transit-oriented development (TOD) in different (and differing) areas of the region. Evy explained that CMAP used a 1 mile buffer/walkshed around transit for this analysis, but is now looking at quarter and half-mile buffers/walksheds.

Another member suggested that CMAP might want to look at Metra fare zones.

A member noted that what can be supported in terms of TOD isn't equal throughout the region, due to differences in levels of service along different Metra lines and different stations.

Thomas Chefalo noted that there are some areas in Lake County where TOD is essentially not possible.

Another member suggested that some of the map representations might be misleading, and that perhaps it might be helpful to use more charts.

A member observed that the residential layer that Brian Daly had discussed during the previous agenda item might provide an interesting overlay.

6.0 Next Regional Plan: Climate Resilience Policy Framework – Louise Yeung, CMAP

From flooding to heat, climate change is already affecting the region's infrastructure, ecosystems, and communities. CMAP staff, in conjunction with a resource group, are currently exploring regional policies and strategies to build resilience to a changing climate. Louise presented the group's draft vision for climate resilience along with an outline for the strategy paper, as summarized in [this memo](#).

A member observed that in the engagement process it is essential to keep scale in mind (i.e. a large-scale systems approach is needed). She added that CMAP can learn from the City of Chicago and Cook County not getting any of the HUD-Rockefeller funding; Louise responded that HUD is having a debriefing with unsuccessful applicants, and added that she considered the opportunity referred to as a learning process for CMAP, and that the next plan process is an opportunity to build upon this experience.

This same member added that it should be known that the insurance industry is starting to essentially penalize municipalities that not preparing.

Another member suggested that CMAP might want to look at FEMA claims as a lead in its analysis. This member also asked whether development of this framework would lead to an advocacy/legislative effort by CMAP (e.g. CMAP might want to think in terms of the next capital bill). Louise responded that it may be a little early to say, but this was possible. This member added that feedback on this would help guide later conversations with partners, etc.

A member mentioned that he hoped that CMAP will not only look at the question of new development, but also undoing/mitigating the bad development decisions of the past.

Another member suggested that "we have the wrong language for how we deal with local officials" (e.g. identifying "vulnerabilities"), and advised that there was a need to learn was language resonates with these audiences. She added that the Clean Water Act has led to "a huge set of tools" that are underutilized.

7.0 Local Technical Assistance Program: Carol Stream Comprehensive Plan – John Carlisle, CMAP

Carol Stream, located in north central DuPage County, is within close proximity to I-355, I-88, and the O'Hare International and DuPage County Airports. The Village was originally developed as a planned community that would offer ample business and employment opportunities for its residents to live and work in the same area. Today, it has a diverse population, a variety of housing options, booming industrial parks, growing commercial and retail areas, and an award-winning park district. Building off these community assets, CMAP's Local Technical Assistance (LTA) program is helping the Village create a new comprehensive plan. John provided an overview of the draft plan's recommendations.

[Due to the meeting's very full agenda, the committee ran out of time for questions. Committee members were asked to pose any questions directly to John Carlisle immediately following the conclusion of the meeting.]

8.0 Other Business

There was no other business.

9.0 Public Comment

There was no public comment.

10.0 Next Meeting

The committee was scheduled to next meet on March 16, 2016.

11.0 Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:04 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Committee Liaison
March 10, 2016