1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Peters called the meeting to order at 7:35 A.M. The meeting notes of April 3, 2013 were approved, as written.

2. **DISCUSSION**

- Reviewed a table displaying the population and employment densities within ¼-mile of Evanston’s CTA and Metra stations. The data was collected from the Center for Neighborhood Technology’s TOD Database.
- Chair Peters reviewed his memo to the committee that suggested an approach to the comp plan update that was organized around issues and challenges facing Evanston as opposed to the 2000 Plan’s structure of functional components like Housing, Transportation, Land Use, etc. The desired future building environment would respond to the plan’s policy and action recommendations.
- Member Shure noted that a prior committee discussion had suggested a similar approach that identified major problem areas for each chapter. He endorsed an issue/action approach as a structure for the revised plan. Member Galloway agreed that issues made a better organizational structure. Member Putta noted that the current plan’s organization is wordy, repetitive and dilutes the strategies and actions aimed at issues that straddle several functional silos. A plan organized around strategic actions could be more succinct.
- At a prior meeting, the discussion had also suggested organizing around guiding principles or themes, some of which the committee has been exploring definitions: TOD, livability, sustainability, density, and mixed-use. The committee emphasized the need for a usable plan.
- There was also interest in the concept of testing alternatives and identifying trade-offs. This type of discussion had been accommodated by CMAP’s local planning meetings leading up the Plan 2030, with the use of voting pads by their audiences. There would be a need to develop alternative local scenarios, along the lines of the ones developed by CMAP for the region.
- Chair Peters suggested that committee members review the plan for Marin County, CA for its approach.
- The goal is to create a plan that can be implemented – containing a ranked list of all recommended actions. In its discussion of the actions, the plan will distinguish between those which are feasible in the short term, those which require a longer planning horizon and those which may be unattainable but function as a goals.
The Chair recognized a member of the public, Jessica Feldman, for comment. She urged the committee to elevate the profile of the project and their work. Chair Peters’ memo suggested an initial list of issue areas for consideration in the Comp Plan, including:

- Changes in city’s demographics;
- Increased cost of oil and its impact on local land use and real estate market;
- Need for economic development within a fully developed, land-locked city;
- Opportunity to build on to existing transit and create transit oriented developments (TOD) and pedestrian friendly neighborhoods appealing to both baby-boomers and millennials;
- Opportunity to build on and integrate various, existing neighborhood plans;
- Need to plan for economic development and TOD infill in west Evanston, as well as near existing CTA and Metra stations;
- Need to identify and plan for areas of opportunity where economic development and diverse housing opportunities might be provided;
- Protect the diversity of housing for various income levels, household type and characteristics, as well as unit types/tenure.

The Chair asked if anyone had suggested additions, those included:

- Lake Michigan shoreline – role as iconic natural feature of Evanston, its roles as both an economic and recreational asset, and its relationship with adjacent neighborhoods;
- Open space – issues include the existing deficit for both active/passive recreational use and its role as a critical design element to balance increased density;
- Circulator to serve west Evanston and other potential TOD locations;
- Northwestern University plans – what is the relationship between NU master planning and city’s own land use plan;
- Future role and use of MWRD canal;
- Quality of Life/Livability – encompasses some of the other topics mentioned: open space, transportation, walkability, etc

Chair asked for suggestions regarding the process for moving forward with the comprehensive plan revision.

- Needed some organizational structure or “skeleton” for plan to share with public
- Need public input process that:
  1) Identifies and engages stakeholders (elected officials, Plan Commission, NU, business districts, others);
  2) Key public meetings in the neighborhoods (Robert Crown, Fleetwood-Jourdain, etc);
  3) Non-traditional public input techniques, e.g. COE web-based information, surveys and CMAP voting pads for scenarios.

3. NEXT STEPS
NEXT MEETING – Wednesday, May 22, 7:30 a.m., Room 2403

Discussion items: Additional details about a planning process, debrief on meeting with WestEnd for discussion of local manufacturing.

4. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at 9:00 A.M.