



Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400
www.cmap.illinois.gov

**Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)
Environment and Natural Resources Committee
Minutes
Wednesday, September 3, 2014**

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

Committee Members

Present: Ed Collins – MCCD, Jack Darin – Illinois Sierra Club, Martha Dooley – Village of Schaumburg, Jon Grosshans – U.S. EPA, Martin Jaffe - UIC, Anne McKibben – Elevate Energy, Stacy Meyers – Openlands, Joe Schuessler – MWRD, Deb Stone – Cook County Department of Environmental Control, Mike Sullivan – Kane / Kendall Council of Mayors, Sean Wiedel – Chicago Department of Transportation, Patricia Werner – Lake County Stormwater Management Commission

Absent: Pete Harmet – IDOT, Wallace Van Buren – IAWA, Nancy Williamson – IDNR

Staff Present: Andrew Williams-Clark, Bob Dean, Jason Navota, Tim Loftus, Jessica Gershman, Nora Beck

Others Present: Mike Klemens – WCGL, Beata Welsh – RTA, Marcella Bondie -- ElevateEnergy

1.0 Call to Order and Introductions

Committee co-chair, Sean Wiedel, called the meeting to order at approximately 9:35 a.m.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

Deb Stone announced the completion of the Cook County 2014 Sustainability Report and passed around copies to committee members

3.0 Approval of Minutes – July 2, 2014

Ed Collins asked for an amendment to the minutes, making a grammatical update to the second bullet in section 5.0. A motion to approve the minutes of the July 2 meeting as amended was made by Martin Jaffe, seconded by Stacey Meyers, and with all in favor, carried.

4.0 Municipal Survey Results – Drew Williams-Clark, CMAP Staff

CMAP has completed the 2014 Municipal Plans, Programs, and Operations survey. The purpose of the biennial survey is to help track the progress of GO TO 2040 implementation and shape our work to support municipal efforts through the CMAP

Local Technical Assistance program, policy analysis, and the development of other resources. Referring to a [memo](#) and using a PowerPoint [presentation](#), Williams-Clark highlighted the key findings of the survey, which highlighted how the types of projects currently undertaken by CMAP staff through the LTA program continue to be in high demand and that significant demand exists for plan implementation assistance. He also discussed the repositioning of the model toolkits and ordinances as more internal white papers to guide CMAP staff. Committee members asked a number of questions:

- Dooley asked about the breakdown of LTA projects between new ones and implementation efforts from previous LTA planning work. Bob Dean explained that we currently have a 2/3 to 1/3 split at the moment; that he anticipates the portion of projects focused on implementation to grow; but doesn't think it will exceed 50% of the projects.
- Collins recommended that strategic planning and CIP projects be joined together. Schuessler seconded this with the need for the financial plan to be integrated into the process. Bob Dean agreed; stating that he sees this same need and that our first CIP in Berwyn includes coordination with their Director of Finance.

5.0 LTA Program Evaluation, Part 3: Internal Evaluation – Bob Dean, CMAP Staff

Dean presented the third part of the LTA Program Evaluation, which focused on the internal evaluation of projects. Referencing a [memo](#), Dean stepped through the evaluation process and the main conclusions being drawn from the analysis. Committee members asked clarifying questions and provided feedback:

- How is implementation being evaluated? What plans are inspiring action? Dean responded that evaluation continues; it is harder to compare between projects.
- Discussion of municipal staff turnover and the importance of starting projects more quickly after the application process. Staff turnover will also affected the implementation of plans; but hopefully at that point more connections have been made with residents, municipal leadership.
- Which projects were included in the analysis? The 60 or so that have been completed largely by CMAP staff. Consultant-led projects are being reviewed separately.
- What are the main differences between a good and a bad project? Without identifying projects by name, Dean described the characteristics of a poor project as one that experienced staff turnover, delayed project timeline, and little commitment from the community. The good projects are ones that were completed ahead of scheduled, involved partners, and are already working on implementation. Dean explained that he has needed to end a couple projects because of problems with the scope and/or level of community support.
- Are there ways to communicate your assessment of what projects need to future applicants? Dean responded that while we'd like to recommend changes to their application, it's difficult because it could be misinterpreted as a promise that we'll select them during the next call if those issues are addressed. However, we have accepted portions of projects that are workable.
- Support for the planning priorities report. Wondered if the report could include an assessment of their comprehensive plan and ordinance with some more detail on what needs to happen. This could potentially help frame the scope of the follow up project to include GO TO 2040 objectives. Dean responded that it's a balance where we don't want to do work that will then need to be redone when an ordinance revision project is undertaken.

- Support for review of the LTA program overall. This is good information to collect and consider as staff make improvements to the program.

6.0 Water Loss Among Lake Michigan Permittees – Tim Loftus, CMAP Staff

CMAP is currently working with the Illinois Department of Natural Resources' Office of Water Resources through its Lake Michigan Water Allocation Program in an effort to improve understanding of the water loss control practices and challenges faced by community water suppliers whose source of water is Lake Michigan. In 2013, CMAP partnered with the [Center for Neighborhood Technology](#) to analyze water use data (2007-12) compiled by IDNR, and gather more information about water-loss control issues and practices through an online survey and site visits with Lake Michigan permittees. Using a PowerPoint [presentation](#), Loftus outlined the main findings of the study ([An Assessment of Water Loss Among Lake Michigan Permittees in Illinois](#)) as well as the recommendations made to IDNR to advance the Lake Michigan Water Allocation Program in the face of these challenges. Committee members asked clarifying questions and provided feedback:

- Clarification, the water lost does count against the Lake Michigan allocation, even though a portion of it may feed back into Lake Michigan.
- Context of the amount of water lost annually with the total amount used. Is the amount we use annually the same amount Illinois uses in 10 days?
- Discussion about the Great Lakes Compact. Illinois is exempt from the Compact except for the conservation portion. Discussion about high-capacity wells. IEPA has permits for construction that are non-expiring and requires monthly reporting on quality, not quantity.
- Won't water conservation decrease revenues and therefore exacerbate the funding gap for infrastructure upgrades? A well designed conservation program is based on a cost of service study so that the conservation strategies are revenue neutral.

7.0 GO TO 2040 Update – Andrew Williams-Clark, CMAP Staff

As required under MAP-21, staff has been in the process of updating The GO TO 2040 plan since the summer of 2013. Staff prepared a draft plan update consisting of a summary document and a series of appendices that describe each of the key elements of the project in technical detail. As discussed at previous meetings, none of the plan's recommendations have been revised. The Board approved the draft plan release for public comment on June 11. Outreach meetings were held throughout the region through the end of the public comment period on August 1. Referring to two memos – [Public Comment Period Summary](#) and [Revised Draft Review](#), Williams-Clark outlined the comments received and subsequent responses to that input, as well as the key next steps in the process.

Committee members asked a number of questions about the voting procedures. Given the detailed questions, Williams-Clark internally confirmed the answers and they were sent out to the full committee via a separate email on Friday, September 5. For ease of use, these questions and answers are presented here as well:

- What will be the action requested of the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee? The action requested will be adoption of the FFY 2014-19 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), conformity determination, and the

GO TO 2040 Regional Comprehensive Plan update by the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee.

- Will the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee vote separately or together at the October 8th meeting? They will vote separately.
- Who will vote first, the Board or the MPO Policy Committee? The CMAP Board will vote first.
- Does the MPO have the final say on the approval of the plan update? The [memorandum of understanding](#) that defines the relationship between the Board and MPO encourages them to attempt to reach agreement regarding approval of the plan update. However, the MPO does have final say in the adoption.

Darin noted that the ENR Committee's comments on the 53/120 project led to some changes with how the project is presented.

Williams-Clark wrapped up the meeting summarizing the next steps.

- On October 3, the Transportation Committee will be asked to recommend MPO Policy Committee approval of the final plan.
- On October 8, the Regional Coordinating Committee will vote to recommend CMAP Board approval of the final plan.
- Later that same day, October 8, adoption of the final plan update is anticipated at the October joint meeting of the Board and MPO Policy Committee.

Recognizing that the ENR Committee will meet on October 1, there is more time for the committee to discuss how they would like their representative on the Regional Coordinating Committee to place their vote. Committee members briefly discussed the July motion, where the committee recommended the removal of the Illiana Highway from the Major Capital Projects list, and what that means for their vote on the Regional Coordinating Committee.

8.0 Public Comment

No public comments.

9.0 Next Meeting

The ENR Committee is scheduled to meet next on Wednesday, October 1, 2014.

10.0 Adjournment

A motion to adjourn at 11:10 am, made by Stacy Meyers, seconded by Patty Werner and with all in favor, carried.