



## Land Use Working Committee

### Minutes

Wednesday, October 19, 2016  
9:00 a.m.

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

**Members Present:** Ed Paesel (Chair), Mark VanKerkhoff (Vice-Chair), Drew Awsumb, Judy Beck, Thomas Chefalo (For Eric Waggoner), Kristi DeLaurentiis, Lisa DiChiera, Steve Lazzara (for Curt Paddock, on phone), Mark Muenzer, Heather Smith, Heather Tabbert, Todd Vanadilok, Nancy Williamson, Adrienne Wuellner, Ruth Wuorenma.

**Members Absent:** Susan Campbell, Michael Kowski, Paul Lauricella, Robert McKenna, Arnold Randall, Paul Rickelman, Dennis Sandquist, Nathaniel Werner.

**Staff Present:** Stephen Ostrander (committee liaison), Anthony Cefali, David Clark, Lindsay Hollander, Kristin Ihnchak, Kara Komp, Tony Manno, Elizabeth Schuh, Joe Szabo, Evy Zwiebach.

**Others Present:** Allison Buchwach (Metra).

#### 1.0 Call to Order

Ed Paesel called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

#### 2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes or announcements.

#### 3.0 Approval of the Meeting Notes – September 21, 2016

A motion to approve the minutes of September 21, 2016, was made by Heather Smith and seconded by Heather Tabbert. All in favor, the motion carried.

#### 4.0 ON TO 2050: Reinvestment and infill strategy areas – Tony Manno, CMAP

GO TO 2040 broadly recommended that communities direct reinvestment and growth to existing communities and, specifically, transit station areas. Building on CMAP and partner work since GO TO 2040, the Reinvestment and Infill strategy paper offers refinements to CMAP's existing recommendations for reinvestment. Tony presented the proposed new strategies to encourage reinvestment and target efforts and limited resources.

A committee member asked what was the process for establishing regional

consensus on the topic. Tony responded that the strategy paper is just the beginning, and there will be a huge outreach effort next year to reach consensus.

Another member asked if for the layers being used for analysis, they would see green areas and parks, including things like trails, etc. Tony answered that they would.

A member asked if there is a recognition that there are different kinds of TOD. Tony responded that CMAP agrees/understands that there are many different kinds, and this will be reflected in the analysis. This member then asked if Divvy bike share was included in the TOD analysis; Tony responded that he didn't think so, but would check.

Another member commented on CMAP's analysis of disinvested areas, noting the importance of focusing on the *potential* of these areas (Tony agreed). She also underscored the need for finding effective ways to apply pressure on lending institutions to provide predevelopment services of scale (despite their common resistance to doing so). Tony responded by saying that CMAP is admittedly somewhat new to this area, but acknowledged that she was making a good suggestion—one which CMAP could pursue.

A member observed that through "Homes for a Changing Region" projects, it has been found that it is especially important to come up with programs that assist current homeowners to improve their properties; this benefits them in the near-term and then the community if they later choose to sell their improved property.

Another member asked if CMAP had reached out to World Business Chicago, Choose, DuPage, and similar organizations, for this and related strategies (saying that, if not, CMAP should). Tony responded that many of these groups are members of CMAP's Economic Development Committee, but CMAP would be sure to seek their input on these strategies.

#### **5.0 ON TO 2050: Infill and TOD snapshot – Evy 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 updated findings, including analysis of regional infill supportiveness in 2000, and analysis of indicators of development (such as changes in employment, housing units, and population) throughout the region, and specifically in transit-served areas.

A member asked if "TOD" areas were limited to rail transit. Evy responded that

“access to transit” included bus service as well. This same member then noted that the Center for Neighborhood Technology had previously found that the region wasn’t doing so well.

Another member asked if CMAP had looked at the number of household units, to get a fuller sense of increase or loss (as opposed to just considering population increases or losses). Evy confirmed that they did.

A member observed that looking at the maps in the presentation raised questions of the difference between central business district of the City of Chicago vs. the South Side/southern suburbs.

Another member suggested a need for a more precise definition of “infill.” Evy responded that the definition being used is based on whether the area had existing infrastructure, and noted that nearly all of southern Cook County is considered infill-supportive by this measure. A different member criticized CMAP’s definition of “infill,” observing that it was insufficient and problematic, especially for Will County’s past patterns and future potential of development.

A member asked if open space was included—and not considered infill-supportive—in the analysis of infill. Evy confirmed that it was.

#### **6.0 ON TO 2050: Urban classifications – David Clark, CMAP**

As part of the 2050 forecast local area allocation process described last month, staff are in the process of developing an “urban classification” scheme based on existing household and employment densities. These classifications are a necessary input to the local area allocation tool under development by staff and consultants, and will inform density and redevelopment assumptions at a local level. David described and solicited feedback on the proposed classifications.

A member noted that she found the map confusing. She also asked if it included consideration of bus service; David confirmed it did. Another member underscored the importance of considering the *frequency* of bus service. David and Liz Schuh (in audience) confirmed that the analysis.

Two other members suggested using different colors in map than green (due to association of green for open space).

#### **7.0 ON TO 2050: Alternative futures – Liz Oo, CMAP**

Alternative Futures will help stakeholders prioritize land use, economic, and transportation policies for the region. Staff and external experts have discussed trends that have the potential to meaningfully shape the future of the Chicago

region. Based on feedback, CMAP staff has identified five possible futures for the region's residents in 2050. Staff will provide an overview of the development and characteristics of these potential futures.

A member asked whether they were considering that even jobs requiring higher education would likely decrease due to intelligent software. Liz responded that she and her team were looking at that issue.

Another member observed that some analysis points to the region becoming a mecca for people attracted to fresh water. This comment led a different member to underscore the need for policies to protect that vital fresh water supply.

## **8.0 Other Business**

## **9.0 Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

## **10.0 Next Meeting**

The committee was scheduled to next meet on November 16, 2016, in a joint meeting with CMAP's Economic Development Committee.

## **11.0 Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:03 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Committee Liaison  
November 8, 2016