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CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. The meeting is called to order. We do have a quorum so we'll get underway here.

The first order of business, approval of the May 13 meeting minutes. Is there a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: So moved.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Is there a second?

MEMBER COMMISSIONER: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All those in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Motion carries. Next order of business, committee assignments.

MS. GUDERLEY: I think --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Do we all have our committee assignments? I think with the two new additions that were going to go on Zoning. Mr. Peters?

MS. GUDERLEY: Just in case the two members had any other, besides another on Zoning, but if there is anything else they wanted, whether they wanted it to be Rules or stuff.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Robin, you're on Rules, right? Okay. Mr. Dunkley, you're up next, Item
No. IV, Continuation of Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment.

Before we get in -- yes? Oh, I'm sorry, yes.

MS. GUDERLEY: I just wanted to, I think everyone has had a chance to meet Craig as they were coming in, but maybe not Robin. Craig Sklenar, we're very happy to have him aboard. He started the week after the last Plan Commission meeting.

Craig has wonderful credentials. He has a Bachelor's degree from Ball State University which is, in terms of the planners I've worked with, has one of the, I think one of the best curriculum in terms of both design and policy orientation. He has dual Masters in Urban Planning and Urban Design from Colorado, University of Colorado. He has worked the last several years working in urban in-fill projects, a lot of transit-oriented development, is very fluent in terms of design issues. I was very impressed during the interview process and I think that he will really come in handy with a lot of the things that are facing the Plan Commission in terms of downtown, talking about design, updating the plan, et cetera.

So, with great pleasure, I'd introduce Craig.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Craig, welcome.

MR. SKLENAR: I just want to say really quick
that if you guys have any questions or concerns, please email me. I will send out another email after tonight so you'll have my contact information again. So, I'm excited to work here.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Welcome aboard. On a related matter, everybody receives their packet through email means. Does anybody have a problem with that or any suggestions how it might be changed or modified in any way? So, we're content with the email dissemination of information?

MR. SKLENAR: If there is any special document or anything --

COMMISSIONER WOODS: Yes, I was going to say assuming that --

MR. SKLENAR: We will mail those out. But if there is not, we'll just send out an email packet.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Jim, what were you saying?

COMMISSIONER WOODS: I was going to say assuming you don't have some huge PUD type of submission where --

MR. SKLENAR: Yes. Yes, we're just trying to reduce our --

COMMISSIONER WOODS: Then you would have to print it. 600 pages.
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: And Craig, you do have copies there of, hard copies for any members of the public that should attend. And you will put those in the recycling bin if no one uses those, right?

MR. SKLENAR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Mr. Dunkley?

MR. DUNKLEY: Thank you. Good evening, Commissioners. I have given Dominick the night off because we have a fairly concise Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment agenda for tonight.

The one item which remained from our last Plan Commission meeting was the definition of automobile and truck rental establishments. There were some questions about what would be the cutoff between the two, we talked about two models of those establishments, the retail model and the airport model, and how it was important to be clear in delineating the two so that one could continue, the retail model could continue as a type of retail service establishment which is how it's been handled to date whereas the other which is the much more, the high impact model would not be ubiquitously allowed wherever retail services are permitted.

And we went back and did some research and found that a cutoff of 15 vehicles in surface parking --
I'm sorry, more than 15 vehicles in surface parking was a pretty good delineation between the smaller, I think the example that was used is the Enterprise on Green Bay Road, and the larger airport models. So, we'd propose that that be the delineation, that the definition be changed so that it would read automobile and track rental establishments provide the rental of vehicles that includes the onsite storage of 15 or more vehicles in surface lots. The establishment of vehicles with less than 15 vehicles would continue to be defined as retail service establishments. We wanted to spell that out in the definition.

COMMISSIONER SHURE: Excuse me, is that vehicle both truck and?

MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SHURE: And is there any concern about the sizes of trucks?

MR. DUNKLEY: Well, no, it was felt that since our parking spaces are standard, the required parking spaces are standard size, it would be using up the same amount of land. There was no discussion --

COMMISSIONER SHURE: So, it's 15 parking spaces?

MR. DUNKLEY: Actually 15 or more vehicles.
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: -- over on Dempster, right? They have some pretty large trucks. I would assume that some of those orange trucks take up more than one parking space.

MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, they likely would take up a larger area to park.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: They could have 15 of their largest trucks.

MR. DUNKLEY: That is possible.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Do we know how many vehicles that, I'm assuming U-Haul does fall under this, correct?

MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, it does.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Do we know how many vehicles they have on that lot there?

MR. DUNKLEY: We may have that number in research. I'll have to check with our researcher.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It just seems like they've got quite a few vehicles there and I just want to make sure we're not doing anything that would --

MR. DUNKLEY: An alternative would be to specify the square footage of surface parking that was used. It would be a little more difficult to calculate but it would be doable.
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I have a question. If we do make it 15 and then --

MR. DUNKLEY: Correct.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Two questions for definition. An unattached trailer, as in a U-Haul, is that a vehicle?

MR. DUNKLEY: We would consider that a vehicle. It would take up the same amount of space.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: We're talking only about outdoor space so if they park five more inside a garage type environment, would that count?

MR. DUNKLEY: They would be dealt with as retail service establishment.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Okay.

MR. DUNKLEY: We found that that really is a very clear difference. If the cars are being stored in structured parking and covered parking, there is much less impact on the surrounding environment.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Okay, thank you.

MR. DUNKLEY: In defining a new use, of course we have to define where that use is permitted and where it's allowed as a special use. And in looking at the existing uses, we felt this was closest to outdoor
storage, has similar impacts. And so, we, you know, our
draft here modeled the usage profile for the airport
model the same as for outdoor storage. So, what that
means is that the airport model, car and truck rental,
would be a permitted use only in the I3 District and
would be eligible as a special use in I1, I2 and the RP
District. It should be relatively short --
I think the only concern is the RP District.
It's not that large of a concern since it is a special
use and would get adequate public scrutiny. However,
that is the northern part of downtown that may
categorically not be appropriate for large land use
surface parking rental agencies. And I'd welcome your
input on that.

COMMISSIONER WOODS: I think personally
there's a couple of issues here. One issue is I don't
think it should be in an RP District. Second is I think
there is a difference between trucks and cars. 15 24-
foot trucks has got a significantly greater impact than
15 automobiles/cars. And so, I --

MR. DUNKLEY: We could use certainly a dual
scale. 15 passenger vehicles --

COMMISSIONER WOODS: And or something --

MR. DUNKLEY: 10 would, I think would be an
appropriate number of trucks. We just have to make sure that we have an adequate definition of passenger vehicles versus trucks.

COMMISSIONER WOODS: -- truck in this case.

MR. DUNKLEY: I hope mine isn't because I wouldn't be allowed on Lake Shore Drive. But that would require just a little bit more research and I'm sure the definitions exist, not in the Zoning Ordinance but in other parts of the City Code.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: It's also a question of the length of those big trucks. It's not just width. If you've ever rented one, some of those are enormous.

MR. DUNKLEY: Certainly.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Or two-cars long.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: How did you decide where to allow them as special uses?

MR. DUNKLEY: We mirrored the outdoor storage use which is a similar, a use that requires large amounts of essentially surface land that's inordinately large. And so that was our starting point.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: And if I, as I think about the Dempster site, you know, it might not be appropriate for some kinds of outdoor storage, but the U-Haul is fine there.
MR. DUNKLEY: Correct.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: I guess it seems there might be other areas where we'd want to look at it as a special use.

MR. DUNKLEY: The other set would, I think the next tier would be the Transitional Manufacturing Districts although those are rapidly becoming more mixed use. And certainly, you know, after that the higher intensity uses below that would be the Commercial Districts.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: I'm thinking that with the special use designation, there's still control of impact.

MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. I don't think there would be an issue with extending as a special use this use to all but the, to the C Districts other than C1-A.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You're talking, you know, especially as you're talking about the airport, the large --

MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. I think that would be very reasonable especially because there would be the opportunity for scrutiny.

I'd recommend against the B Districts, certainly the Residential Districts as well. And I'd,
unless there is a request to include this use in the University and Transitional Districts, I would stay away from them. And the Office Districts tend to be fairly small and self-contained. I wouldn't think that it would be appropriate there either.

Okay. That is the end of the --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, is there a consensus that we want to somehow modify to include sizes of vehicles and so on?

MR. DUNKLEY: That would be fine. You know, we tried to find a good workable line between being absolutely, well, be able to administer the ordinance in a reasonable way and also keep ourselves from the risk of, you know, 15 huge 18-wheeler trucks for rental. So, somewhere in there is a good, is a fine compromise and I'm willing --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: We don't have any places that rent semis in Evanston today, do we?

MR. DUNKLEY: We have not found any.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Do we want to exclude --

COURT REPORTER: Would you mind turning your microphone on?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: No. I had asked if we
had any places that rent semis today in Evanston, and
then the answer was no. And I said, well, is that
something we want to exclude.

    MR. DUNKLEY: I wouldn't think we would want
to categorically exclude it. Keep in mind, the
differences between the retail services model, the urban
model, and the airport model, I think if it were an
appropriate use in an industrial district, renting semis
would be a great economically contributing use for
certain very specific areas within the city limits.

    ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think if
you have a concern about that, you just want to move it
into, by some definition, into the airport variety just
so that can be scrutinized.

    MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

    ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Based on
where you put it.

    COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Agree.

    ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But it's a
good business and I wouldn't throw a good business out
if the opportunity comes our way. We can tax rentals
then.

    COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Then in each one of the
zones, we'd want to have, as currently outlined, you'd
COMMISSIONER PETERS: Let me ask a question.

Is there any I3 other than the area by the canal where
the junkyard and auto crushing is?

MR. DUNKLEY: I believe that's it.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: So, if that's the only
area that's over by the junkyard behind the, sort of
south of the Wal-Mart, maybe the concern about larger
trucks is not --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Is not an issue.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: Not an issue.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Now, yes.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: And in the other places,
it would be a special use and restrictions could be
adopted on a case by case basis.

MR. DUNKLEY: I don't see us growing I3 areas.

We're trying to conserve the ones, the industrial areas
that we have.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: So, maybe we don't need
the special consideration of truck sizes.

MR. DUNKLEY: I think there's a fairly low
risk of that occurring, and it's well contained with
what we're proposing. But I certainly would welcome a
motion that also includes the C Districts as special
uses except for C1-A.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: So moved.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: So, you're recommending these changes in I1, 2 and 3 and the Research Park and C1? Is that what you're proposing?

MR. DUNKLEY: No, what I just said was we'd welcome an expansion of the use as a special use in C1, C2, not C1-A. However, there were other alterations that were recommended, for instance, removing the RP District as an allowed use, removing this as an allowed use in the RP District. Also, the change to allow either 15 passenger vehicles or 10 trucks as the dividing line between the urban model and the airport model, I thought that was reasonable as well.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Then for my benefit, would you articulate please the full contours of what your proposal is?

MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: And then we will have a motion on that particular articulation. If you would do that for my benefit?

MR. DUNKLEY: The change to the definition would be the rental of vehicles that includes the onsite
storage of 15 or more passenger cars in surface lots or
10 or more trucks in surface lots. Establishments of
vehicles with less than 15 passenger vehicles or 10
trucks are defined as retail service establishments.
That same bifurcation would be carried over into the
retail service establishment definition so we would
cross reference back the uses as defined.

I1 would be a special use for the automobile
and truck rental establishment with the amended
definition. I2 would also be a special use. I3 would
be a permitted use. RP would not be an allowed use at
all, would neither be a permitted nor a special use. C1
would be a special use and C2 would be a special use.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: So, we're scratching the
Research Park?

MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay, fine. So, is there
now a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER PETERS: Let me ask. What was
the third part of your definition? Because I heard 15
or more passenger cars, 10 or more trucks, and there was
a third.

MR. DUNKLEY: No, that was it. And there is
of course the other condition of surface lot versus
structured parking.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Is there somewhere a definition of automobile or passenger car? And the reason I'm getting into that is you're going to get the question of SUV's, vans, and those two are probably fairly used that you can throw into an automobile. But it's going to be the small pickup, and I know there are definitions of, you know, the half-ton, quarter-ton or whatever that can probably allow you to move into one or the other category. But now that you're dividing them out, you know, as those vehicles that, you know, for example, the State of Illinois classifies an SUV as a truck.

MR. DUNKLEY: I see we're --

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But I don't think we want to here.

MR. DUNKLEY: We're on the verge of a slippery slope.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes.

MR. DUNKLEY: May I suggest an alternative? And what we're really concerned about is surface land use, surface land parking. Would it be acceptable to have the difference in definition correspond to, I'm sorry, 15 or more passenger vehicles or a surface
storage area that occupied the same surface area?

That's easily calculable. We know exactly how many --

COMMISSIONER WOODS: -- 6,000 square feet.

MR. DUNKLEY: How much space you'd need.

COMMISSIONER WOODS: 15 spaces times 400 square-foot of space would be a typical parking lot in terms of ballpark.

MR. DUNKLEY: That would be a workable definition that would cover both options. And this way you could have some cars and some trucks.

COMMISSIONER WOODS: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: So, you want to define it in terms of square footage?

MR. DUNKLEY: I think that would be, I think that would get to the core of the matter, yes, and would allow flexibility.

COMMISSIONER WOODS: And then we wouldn't have to slide down the slippery slope of cars, trucks --

MR. DUNKLEY: SUV's --

COMMISSIONER WOODS: SUV's, pickup trucks, whatever.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: So, we're going to have three or four semis maybe.

MR. DUNKLEY: I'm not sure if they'd fit in
6,000 square feet.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: I'm not so concerned about this distinction if it's only allowed in the I3 zone because that's by the junkyard. And the canal land there is, I can't think of an adverse impact in that --

MR. DUNKLEY: Well, this actually is, this affects the difference between retail services establishment which is all of the commercial districts and the airport model. So, I do think this is an important distinction.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: The 6,000 square feet just relates to the space whether it be a closed park.

MR. DUNKLEY: Correct.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Not to the driveway or anything else.

MR. DUNKLEY: No, no, it's all, fully loaded, it's the entire space.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: The entire space or is it the space that the vehicles occupy?

COMMISSIONER WOODS: It includes drive aisles and everything else.

MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, it would include drive aisles which is --

COMMISSIONER WOODS: Basically, a car parking
space is 200 square feet. So, 400 square feet, if one
is roughly doing land development, is an approximation
for what drive aisles and parking spaces would take up
for automobiles. And so, by limiting it to 15 times 400
or 6,000 square feet, you kind of precluded the fact
that you could park 15 semis there.

MR. DUNKLEY: And I'm comfortable with that.

We do those calculations day in and day out.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Would you then please again
for my benefit recite the retail services establishment
that reflects the change to surface parking lots?

MR. DUNKLEY: Certainly. Actually I think I
should probably go back to the initial definition as
well. It would be the rental of vehicles that includes
the onsite storage of in-surface lots that comprise
6,000 or more square feet of surface area include
parking and access. And that's it.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Do you want the surface lot
to be that size because then you are including the
surface lots with two spaces for rental cars? Or do you
want the area of rental cars to be that size?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I think it should be
the area of rental cars.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: I think so, too.
MR. DUNKLEY: I'm not sure I understand the distinction.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: If you think about the surface lot adjacent to Whole Foods, it's more than 6,000 square feet.

MR. DUNKLEY: Correct.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: There are two spaces for I-Go or one space for I-Go rental. If you defined it in terms of lot size, you've made that an airport.

MR. DUNKLEY: No, no, it would be the size that is --

COMMISSIONER PETERS: -- for the use.

MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: I just, that's what I wanted added.

MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, absolutely. We wouldn't --

COMMISSIONER WOODS: For the use, yes.

MR. DUNKLEY: We would want to encourage shared use of that space if possible. So, it would be only the space that is dedicated to that particular use, accessory parking, it's actually fleet parking for that use.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Are we all in agreement then as to the change in definition here?
There is a motion and there is a second. All those in favor?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Hang on, I'm sorry, I'm going to go back on this here. I want to ask another question. So, help me visualize because I, you know, I'm an average guy and not an architect who deals with this stuff. Let's frame it around U-Haul. That's a pretty big space on that corner, right?

COMMISSIONER PETERS: I don't know.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER PETERS: I don't know what --

COMMISSIONER WOODS: It's bigger than that. I think it's 77 by 77.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It's a large space.

COMMISSIONER WOODS: 6,000.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So, if that place wasn't there now, it would have to be a special use for them to open that facility, correct?

MR. DUNKLEY: That's right.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: And they have things on that facility like to fill gas that's on the lot itself. Does that, would that get counted in that 6,000 square feet?

MR. DUNKLEY: No. No, any accessory
maintenance space would be proportional to the number of vehicles which are serviced, so which should be proportional to the amount of space that they needed to store them. So, it would all essentially come out in the wash. But we do have to be clear about what it is we're measuring, and that is the parking space.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It's just for the rental?

MR. DUNKLEY: For storage of the rental vehicles, yes.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Not for customers or anything else?

MR. DUNKLEY: Correct.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Or other incidental, okay.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Any other questions?

There's been a motion, there's a second. All those in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Motion carries. Thank you, Mr. Dunkley.

MR. DUNKLEY: Thank you. A brief update on
the legislative schedule. We have, because we took a  
few Council weeks off I suppose or Council sessions off  
to get our new aldermen up to get familiar with our  
procedures, we are now experiencing a fairly high number  
of cases on our Planning & Development agenda. We have  
eight ordinances which have been recommended for  
approval by this Commission. Those have all been  
written, they've all been drafted. They will be  
actually before the Planning & Development Committee on  
July 13th. We were trying to get them on the June 22nd  
agenda but it is just too full.  

So, they are coming and it may turn out that  
some of them that are lagging will have a chance to  
catch up with the rest. So, that will be an  
interesting --  

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: We must also have a finding  
of fact here.  

MR. DUNKLEY: That is true. Regarding text  
amendment.  

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: So, the standards set forth  
in 6-3-4-5, Standard For Amendment, there are four  
standards but only one is really applicable here, and  
that is, whether the proposed amendment is consistent  
with the goals, objectives and policies of the
Comprehensive General Plan. I move that the standard in this case has been met. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER WOODS: Second.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Those in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Those again?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Motion carries.

Craig, are you up on Number V, Comprehensive Plan for Update Discussion?

MR. SKLENAR: Yes. That was actually a good segue to the Comprehensive Plan. Stu and I had a conversation last week about what's coming up in the year, just starting up in the City. We were trying to figure out what our schedule is going to look like. And I know the next few months are going to be dealing with a lot of the Downtown Zoning and resolving a lot of that. But I wanted to start thinking about how to scope out the Comprehensive Plan Update.

I do want to take the position that I think this should be more than just an update, that it should be a new plan because the current plan was an update of the '86 plan. And so, we seem to be coming up due for a brand new plan here. And I think it's the time to
really start thinking blue skies here and how we can
really reinvent the Comprehensive Plan for the City of
Evanston.

So, I wanted to bring that up for discussion
today, if you guys have any ideas or suggestions on
that. The next few months I think could be beneficial
for us to really start thinking about that. Comments?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Comments? You know, I
perused this and I have perused it the last couple of
weeks. And there's a lot of very good things that are
contained in that report, things that applied to 10
years ago, 20 years ago, that apply today. And I'm not
sure that we have to reinvent the wheel here and scrap
this thing and start from ground zero.

MR. SKLENAR: Let me restate myself. I don't
think that we should completely throw it out the window
and ignore everything that's in here. But I think there
might be, I've been doing a lot of research on other
plans that have just been published around the nation
and I think there is a way to really engage the public
by using the Comprehensive Plan as a guiding document
for that and not just a plan that the Plan Commission or
those of us in City Hall really look to, but something
that we could actually get citizens participating in and
really thinking about their community.

We just finished the Downtown Plan. From what I understand, there was a lot of public involvement with that. Or maybe not.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Oh, just a little.

MR. SKLENAR: Yes. But I think it's a great time to take the Comprehensive Plan and look beyond the borders of downtown and let people talk about their neighborhoods and talk about how the entire City of Evanston can grow and change as a community as a whole.

So, looking at ways to use what's in here that's great and find ways to change the parts that need to be changed or we think could be changed.

MS. GUDERLEY: Have you been looking at other communities as PDF files? Or do you have a small library of other plans? I'd be really interested --

MR. SKLENAR: I've actually started drafting a little white paper for Plan Commission I was planning on sending out later in the week that will have links to other city websites that I thought were really great.

One of the things that I, coming from, I'm 27, I'm a younger person, I grew up with the internet. I think that engaging a web version of the Comp Plan would be a great way to get people involved. I know 12,000
students from Northwestern University live in the city but may not be able to come to a Plan Commission maybe because they're gone during the summer or they're at night class or they're doing something else. And it would be a great way for us to interact with the younger crowd and get the message the get ideas out there that we wouldn't be able to do in other ways.

So, there are a lot of PDF plans but also actual active plans that have interactive websites that I thought were very interesting and very engaging.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Is the Comp Plan online?

MR. SKLENAR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay.

MS. GUDERLEY: I don't know that the original --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, I mean the one that we've got here, the 2000 version.

MS. GUDERLEY: I'll just say this because Craig and I were looking at things together. I think it was scanned in. I think that when this was written, there was no electronic file. And if you look at a lot of these, you know, these maps, I'm old enough to remember Zipatone, you know, I mean like tape. I mean some of these maps are quite old. So, the format in
which this plan was developed, you know, is not easily translatable to a web environment. So, I think what's on there is the same plan. It's just I think it was scanned. A lot of the formatting is gone, you know. So, it is on there though.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: Are you using a standard program now for this type of, does the city use other than PDF's --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Do you have a --

COMMISSIONER PETERS: Do you have a program that you use for this type of document?

MR. SKLENAR: To give you a little background, I spent the last six years both in college and working professionally doing a lot of graphic design and working with Adobe products. I am trying to get Adobe Creative Suite into the Planning Department right now. I know the city has a couple of licenses. We're looking to acquire one for the Planning Department and I will be using those programs to create all future documents.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: Now, as I recall, there is a reader that's available at low cost for citizens to read things created in that program.

MR. SKLENAR: Yes. Yes, Adobe PDF Reader,
COMMISSIONER PETERS: It's not the PDF Reader, it's a reader for the more complex documents. And I think it's, as I recall it's free.

MR. SKLENAR: Okay.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: Because the public somehow has to, I mean, the cost of Adobe is astonishingly high.

MR. SKLENAR: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: And somehow the public has to be able to access that.

MR. SKLENAR: All PDF documents that we show right now online are viewable if the user will download the PDF reader which is free.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: But for the Adobe, you need a further reader.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: No.

MR. SKLENAR: No. No, no, no. The PDF reader --

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Only if you want to modify it.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: Not for the PDF documents, for the large graphic documents.

MR. SKLENAR: All large graphic documents will
be translated into a PDF because it's the most universal
way of presenting documents to a mass audience. And
it's the way to compress everything down into a short
file standard.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: -- content.

MR. SKLENAR: -- content and you can --

COMMISSIONER PETERS: Maybe there's, if you do
a white paper, I'm thinking about process, you know, how
do you get from A to B. If you do a white paper and we
look at the documents and think about what's missing
that we want and what's here that we don't want, maybe
we should have a meeting time with a less formal
discussion of your proposal, what all the members of the
Commission think is needed. Presumably you've gotten
comments over the years from other departments, and we
could just sort of look and then try to figure out how
to proceed.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I would appreciate comments
from Larry and Jim on this because I can see a committee
being formed and taking this on over the course of the
next 12 months or so because this is not a small
undertaking. And a white paper, I mean I don't know if
that's --

COMMISSIONER PETERS: It's a monstrous
undertaking.

CHAIRMAN ODPYCKE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: And I've done these for a number of cities and it's huge.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I think his white paper is more to just get us oriented into what we have --

COMMISSIONER PETERS: Yes, background.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: And background and what's being done in other cities. I don't --

MR. SKLENAR: And I have to say that the actual Comp Plan document of other cities around the United States is changing dramatically over the last 10 years. It's no longer this document that sits on the shelf, that it's actually, it's almost an economic development package or a sustainable package for the city to figure out what they need to do over the next 10 years or 20 years. So, I think what we see today, there might be content in this document that may morph into a different format and I want people to start thinking about that. Do we really, is this layout the best layout to do the Evanston Comprehensive Plan? Or is there a way that we can present this material in a more interactive, more concise way?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes.
MR. SKLENAR: That citizens can actually participate in and stand up for.

MS. GUDERLEY: And what we have now, too, you know, we've got chapters there on transportation, we now have a multi-modal plan for the city.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I was going to say there's --

MS. GUDERLEY: We now have five or six neighborhood plans. So, yes, we have different building blocks.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: And the internet is a, I manage general management and e-commerce web software, and with a lot of the web 2.0 capabilities to have, you know, discussion boards and have all sorts of ways to generate community feedback. I think your idea is something that we should -- yes, the mike is on. It's unusual because I've got a big mouth that you can't hear me. I think it makes a whole lot of sense to leverage technology to get involvement. And I think it's more than just Northwestern students by the way.

MR. SKLENAR: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: You know, my mother is in her 70's and she's using the internet. So, but I think it's a way that we can get a lot of residents
involved that can't come to the meetings and sit here every time.

MR. SKLENAR: Yes. And let me be clear, we will still have a physical document.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes, absolutely.

MR. SKLENAR: Everybody will still have a piece of paper in their hands at the end. And we'll still have public meetings and we'll still have maps on the walls and we'll still have people drawing on those maps. But I think it's a great way to really reinvent or reintroduce the idea of the Comprehensive Plan.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'm agreeing violently with you.

MR. SKLENAR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: What are we looking at, do you think, down the road here in terms of staff resources, staff time?

MS. GUDERLEY: Want me to --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes.

MS. GUDERLEY: Well, at least until the fall, it will be primarily Craig and he will, with the subcommittee or the standing or the ad hoc committee or however we want to set a working group. We'll probably work with an internal, we were talking a little bit,
there may need, since we now have multiple city plans that we'll want to bring into this. It makes sense to form some sort of internal staff team to work with him on that so we can do that. But we haven't gone too much further than that. As we scope out the project, then we'll kind of figure out what, you know, what's the staff support beyond --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Can staff manage this comfortably without killing themselves? Because I know you've got a pretty full plate and you always do.

MS. GUDERLEY: I think we're up to this. I think we'll have a better idea whether there needs to be any additional resources. You know, the thing that we're running into maybe with this and also with the consolidated plan, some of our demographics were, you know, we won't have new census data for a while, so perhaps we'll need some, we need to get into numbers. That might be something we need outside resources for, but I think staff can handle it.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- before it's done. You know, I think one of the things you want to consider is exactly the structure that you want this to take. And by that I mean, you know, the old document sort of started from scratch and said here is all the
wish list we want for the city. And as you've pointed out, we have gone through and developed a number of plans through the whole process that you're talking about for downtown, for Central Street, for four or five areas.

And I think instead of just starting from scratch let's just go to a new wish list plan, you may want to consider a method of integrating what's already done into something that becomes a plan. Otherwise, what you're going to end up with is everybody who lost in the last round, back trying to win in the next round.

MR. SKLENAR: Absolutely. I think step one is to lay out all the plans and integrate them and then figure out where the holes are. And then step from there to --

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And tying it together.

MR. SKLENAR: Yes.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You know, the biggest thing that the plan today doesn't do because things have evolved over 20 years is figure out how we tie these plans which we spent a lot of time putting together for different neighborhoods into a whole city.

MR. SKLENAR: Yes.
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And I think that if we look at everything we've done, that's probably the new purpose, or the purpose of the new Comprehensive Plan rather than just to start from, you know, one more time let's run through the wish list.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: The other thing I noticed about the old plan is that it doesn't address many tradeoffs. So, you have separate sections and they are not, from a policy perspective they are not consistent. You can't maximize all 15 things that are addressed in separate chapters. And the biggest difference I see between the newer Comprehensive Plans and the old ones is they deal with the tradeoffs. And the old plans, the old style plans, and this is better than most of them, they don't deal with the tradeoffs.

So, in my experience litigating this kind of issue, almost everything agrees with the plan because the plan wants public transit and the plan wants car transit and the plan wants calm streets and the plan wants good transportation and rapid movement of large amounts of traffic. And it sounds to me like you're talking about a plan that begins to address the tradeoffs. And some of them have been addressed, you know, the Downtown Plan, I was not here with you guys.
for all of the hearings and all of the disputes, but it
was pretty clear to me you were addressing the
tradeoffs. And then the neighborhood plans do, too.
And if you did a new city plan, similar to some of the
newer styles, that would be involved.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The old plan
is a plan for all people. No matter which side you're
on, there is a way to justify it in that plan.

COMMISSIONER WOODS: Absolutely.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And believe
me, every lawyer who has presented before us has pointed
that out.

COMMISSIONER WOODS: -- the position for or
position against a PUD.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And they
both could reference the plan and say, see, we're right.
Yes. So, your point is well, well taken I think.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Growth and development
thing, one of those sticky wickets.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: To preserve the
character of places just now. Lots of economic
development.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Right. We want to increase
the tax base. Okay. So, tell us again, Craig, what the
next move is? You're going to present us with a white paper?

MR. SKLENAR: I will email you a white paper of kind of the plans that I think are elements that we could actually pull from and think about organizing our plan. And then I think the Commission should form a subcommittee.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Sure.

MR. SKLENAR: To start organizing our scoping for this.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. So, perhaps you'll have that white paper to us in, what, within 30 days or something?

MR. SKLENAR: Two.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Two days?

MR. SKLENAR: By the end of the week.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay, fine.

MR. SKLENAR: I've been drafting it already.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: And then we can talk about it at the next Plan Commission meeting and decide where we want to go.

MR. SKLENAR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay, great. Any questions from anybody on this subject? Committee Reports. Mr.
Staley, you have something on Rules?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Not really. Just before we started which you overheard, I think there's a memo, because I thought we pretty much reached agreement. I just don't know where that is, you know. And I think you're going to look in, Susan is going to look through the notes because we had about five or six things that we agreed on. And I want to get that and then bring it to the Plan Commission and see if you agree on it. But I don't think there's much more to do. We had three or four meetings on that.

And I thought there was something that we put together but maybe it isn't --

MS. GUDERLEY: Yes, I'll look again. But based on conversations, I was left to believe that there were just some fine points. But what I will do is take a look through Tracy's files, look for the final document. And if I don't, finding none, I will put together my best guess based on notes and minutes and everything else.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Any other Committee Reports? Any open comments before I entertain a motion to adjourn? Is there a motion to adjourn?
COMMISSIONER WOODS:  So moved.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE:  Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN:  Second.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE:  Those in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE:  Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE:  Motion carries. We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the hearing on the above-titled cause was concluded at 8:00 p.m.)