



## **Route 120 CPC Public Open House Comments: May 31, 2006 – June 15, 2006**

1. I am a resident of Alleghany Road in Grayslake, and have been so for 46 years. I would like more information regarding the 120 Bypass and what I can do to help make it happen sooner rather than much later. Thank you.
2. I think that the wetlands and heron rookery at 120 and Almond should remain undisturbed and avoided at all costs. Once these natural areas have been demolished, they can never be returned to us. Future generations will not thank us for paving and developing everything. To destroy these areas to benefit only ourselves is selfish and short-sighted. Thanks for your time.
3. Regarding the 120 extension. The wave of the future is roundabouts. There may be a way to expand 120 where it is now & install roundabouts at major intersections. You could save money & not disturb the Marsh. I'm NOT for relocating 120 unless all other avenues have been explored.
4. Your current plan would eliminate a heron rookery - I am opposed to the elimination of habitat without mitigation. I frequently visit Lake County for bird watching and enjoy the county very much. I hope you keep environmental considerations in mind.
5. It is vitally important to preserve the Almond Marsh and its heron rookery. Many birds use the marsh in migration and many others nest there. The nearby woodland and prairie areas are important to birds. The Marsh and its environs are also an attraction which brings many persons to the area. These persons spend money at local businesses. They also pay taxes and vote. Lake County has a good reputation for conservation and environmental progress. Allowing the destruction of Almond Marsh would be a great loss. As a member of the Lake-Cook Chapter of the Illinois Audubon Society, I have enjoyed many visits to the Marsh. Please save it for the sake of the birds who need it and for future generations of people who will enjoy it.
6. Please consider extending Lake Street in Grayslake to the bypass to give better access to the Metra station. Your studies should indicate where the Metra stations are so that efficient traffic flow to and from them can be considered.
7. The environmental damage from such a road cannot be supported, and I ask the Council to look at alternatives, including an arterial road that could easily be curved around the more sensitive areas, preserving them. An arterial also would

- permit connections with all the local roads in the area, would be less visually intrusive, and would be less expensive.
8. I have been alerted to the proposal to build a road through the heron rookery at Almond Marsh. I can't believe such a wonderful place would be ruined so. I know of no other place where you can walk right up to the edge of the water and observe Great Blue Herons and Cormorants building nests and raising young and essentially paying no attention to the observers. To destroy such a situation would be an evil obscenity, displaying the worst of human conduct in its relations to other non-human inhabitants of the planet.
  9. To Whom This May Concern: I hope you'll consider preserving Almond Marsh. I consider a beautiful asset of your community. It draws me into the area to birdwatch and spend free time. The wildlife depends on the Marsh and would be damaged by any changes.
  10. The heron rookery at Route 120 and Almond Rd (Almond Marsh in Grayslake) is of unique interest to anyone interested in wildlife and should be protected if at all possible from damage due to road development.
  11. Under the proposed plan, please state exactly what will become of the heron rookery at Almond Marsh, Grayslake. Who will be the winner - asphalt or herons?
  12. Please DO NOT route the planned Rt 120 project through the Almond Marsh Forest Preserve and destroy the Heron Rookery. This an important part of Lake County's ecology and must be preserved. These majestic birds have few suitable nesting sites and Almond Marsh must be preserved.
  13. Hello, I understand that one of the proposed routes would require destroying the Almond Marsh great blue heron rookery. I have recently started taking my kids and their friends to see the rookery. It is an amazing thing to show young kids so many huge, beautiful birds. I urge you to find alternatives.
  14. I'm simply writing to register my support for the Belvidere Boulevard proposal. I realize that it's still quite early in the planning process, but the proposal for Belvidere Boulevard that I heard earlier this year was, I thought, an excellent solution to the current road problems in this part of Lake County. I just wanted to voice my support for Belvidere Boulevard, and I thank you for the opportunity to do so.
  15. I am concerned about the potential damage to wetlands, as well as the destruction of a heron rookery at Almond Marsh that would result from the planned work. Please make sure that any work done to improve route 120 has minimal environmental impact, especially with regard to the wetlands and heron rookery mentioned above.
  16. My residence on Almond Road had been given a residential impact number by the state when they were planning the Rt. 120 By-pass / Route 53 extension improvement. It looked like part of my property would be taken to provide an off ramp to Almond Road and the current intersection of Almond and Rt. 120 would be closed. Can you tell me if this plan is still being considered or provide any additional information on this subject? Is there a committee or individual I can voice my objection to?

17. I am opposed to the removal of the heron rookery at Almond Marsh and the wetlands.
18. I am strongly urging you not to destroy the heron rookery at Almond Marsh and to reconsider the building of a housing development that will destroy a wetland. Our natural ecology is being destroyed bit by bit and we cannot afford yet another breach.
19. I am opposed to the removal of the Heron Rookery at Almond Marsh and the removal of wetlands.
20. I strongly oppose the road. We never seem to look at the impact things have on our environment and the things that live in it, including us. With the heron rookery being there and you wanting to take it down do they think about the impact on these animals. Is there any tourism dollars that come in because of the local wildlife? Move the road elsewhere!
21. I am very concerned about the potential destruction of the Heron rookery at this site and would oppose the development of this site if it would mean the destruction of the rookery. Not only is the site clearly important habitat for the herons, but it is a wonderful opportunity for the community to see some beautiful wildlife in their natural habitat.
22. I oppose the destruction of the heron rookery at Almond Marsh due to future planning. This is an amazing area that should not be destroyed in the name of progress. Hasn't wildlife and the environment suffered enough?
23. There is so little nature left in the area, we as a community should do everything possible to save beautiful places like Almond Marsh. Our children should remember this generation as the one that finally said, nature should come first before money. There must be a better way of doing things that doesn't require the destruction of nature.
24. I am totally opposed to the destruction of the heron rookery at Almond Marsh. Aldo Leopold said something to the effect that every child had the right to see a pasque flower in the wild. I believe that we all have the right to watch herons fly overhead, but even more importantly the herons have a right to raise their young and not have their homes destroyed. Do onto others as you would have done onto you, even if the others are not humans! Thanks.
25. Fix 120 Now, or stop the building of additional homes between Grayslake and Volo. The additional homes planned for the western edge of the county are going to bring 120 traffic to a stand still! As it is right now we have 100's of cars turning off 120 and driving thru the West Trail Subdivision to get around the bottleneck every week day morning. It can take up to 30 minutes to travel that 1 mile stretch from West Trail to the RR tracks. Thats wasted gas, and it creates pollution not to mention road rage. Continuing to grant permission for additional commercial and residential growth along this highway is just wrong. This road needs to be fixed NOW.
26. I live in Round Lake and Wilson and 120 and I am completely for building a 120 bypass/expressway. Traffic here is HORRID. What can I do to help move this project along quickly?
27. WHY DON'T YOU BEGIN WITH THE MESS YOU HAVE CREATED THE PAST FEW WEEKS ON 120/45. THERE HAVE BEEN WOODEN

HORSES/SAND BAGS ON 120 AND THERE HAS NOT BEEN ONE WORKER THERE DOING ANYTHING AND YET THE ROAD IS DOWN TO ONE LANE. THEN ONE DAY ALL THE HORSES/SAND BAGS ARE IN THE GRASS ALONG THE SIDE OF THE ROAD. A DAY OR TWO AGO THE HORSES/SAND BAGS ARE BACK. EVEN IN THE ARTICLE IN THE PAPER ONE PERSON ON THE COMMITTEE ADMITS TO NOT DRIVING ON 120, WELLLLLLL, MAYBE HE OUGHT TO TRY IT ESPECIALLY DURING RUSH HOUR. MY OFFICE IS ON 176/45 AND THAT IS THE WAY TO IT FROM MY HOME IN WILDWOOD. THIS WHOLE THING IS A JOKE. I WOULD RATHER SEE THE MAN SELLING ROSES AND ELVIS PICTURES BACK ON THE CORNER OF 120/45. I WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR COMMENTS.

28. Hello, my name is XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, and I am a student at Prairie Crossing Environmental Charter School. I am concerned about your lack of attention to the fact that if you expand route 120 into a four lane bypass may cause very sensitive species to cease to exist in the Almond Marsh area. By expanding into the Heron Rookery, you will be bulldozing the habitat of endangered Common Moorhens, endangered Yellow Headed Blackbirds, threatened Black Crowned Night Herons, and very possibly disturbing the migration route of U.S.A's threatened Bald Eagle. Remember when a Bald Eagle landed in Prairie Crossing? That species uses Almond Marsh as a migration stop to eat and rest at before it continues south for the winter. The rest of the species listed above also use the Rookery as an urgently needed stop on migration and for breeding as well. Other species, such as Great Blue Herons, Double Crested Cormorants, Broad Winged Hawks, Red Tailed Hawks, Sandhill Cranes, and even on occasion the endangered Northern Harrier use this area to breed and pass through on migration. All are protected by law. The marsh itself filters air and separates oxygen from dangerous chemicals and gases that are released into the air. We get clean oxygen to breathe from this. However, there's a catch. This filter is only effective if it is left undisturbed. If it is dug up or bulldozed, all of those toxins are released back into the atmosphere and makes it that much harder for us to absorb oxygen through our lungs. Those marshes also store water during rainy times and release it slowly back into the environment during drought. It also serves as a buffer against floods. This benefits the surrounding area greatly and helps to explain why the forests near there are much more healthier than some in more urbanized areas. This marsh has far more life in it than some ridiculous bypass and has much greater long term benefits unlike the short term ones of the bypass. We will continue to benefit from it many centuries from now, if it is left in peace. The bypass however, will be grown out of in twenty years or less with the massively growing population. Likewise, if you bulldoze areas in Prairie Crossing, there will be excessive complaints from the residents about having it "right in their backyard". I am sure many have already trickled in already. You will face great opposition if you try to bulldoze Prairie Crossing as well as the Heron Rookery. As in the Heron Rookery, there are many sensitive species there such as the Eastern Bluebird, American Goldfinch, Northern Harriers, Red Winged Blackbirds, and other species that rely on the prairie. there are many species of endangered plants and insects that need the

- prairie conditions or those of the Heron Rookery. Again, all of these bird species are protected by law, and many of the plant species. All of these species are already suffering enough from pesticides and herbicides that are washed in to their environment. Please do not make it worse. Please try to listen to me and maybe a compromise can be reached.
29. This is a good idea and what has taken so long to make it come to the planning stage. We need this!!!
  30. I would like to express my objection of any plan to construct Rt 120 as an expressway that would destroy unique and vital natural habitats in Lake County, particularly the heron rookery in Almond Marsh, an area that my daughter and countless other children and adults visit to see the wonders of nature--this should be a protected area. ...I am also very concerned about the air quality and negative impact of an expressway on the residential areas adjacent to it---I feel strongly that it should be configured as an arterial highway that could be more environmentally sensitive and also lessen the impact of a noisy and ugly roadway through our area---an arterial with roundabouts can be landscaped and also enhance traffic flow in a much less adverse impact to natural areas and neighborhoods.
  31. It was brought to the attention of the International Crane Foundation by a concerned citizen that the proposed route of Hwy 120 would be placed closer to the Almond Marsh, an area known for roosting and nesting Sandhill cranes. I have contacted the Lake County Coordinator of the ICF sponsored Annual Midwest Crane Count to determine exactly how many cranes may be in the area affected. Unfortunately, despite the fact the Almond Marsh is a designated count site, the count is dependent on volunteers and not counted every year - 2006 was one of those years. However, the count coordinator informed me that the cranes are using the marsh. ICF feels that the consideration of these birds (as well as the Great Blue Heron rookery which is very close to the proposed route) should be considered within the scope of any possible impacts from this new construction. Thank you for considering this marsh as a haven for cranes as well as the myriad other wetland species that inhabit this important area.
  32. After attending the display of the Route 120 plans in Hainesville recently, I would like to comment. there appeared to be too few grade separated intersections which just seems to indicate more lanes of traffic, which will be complemented with more traffic lights. The end result is a relatively short band aid to a long term issue - the continued residential development in northern Lake County along with the use of County roads by residents transiting from McHenry County and areas of southern Wisconsin. Each day I see many vehicles with Wisconsin plates travelling through the county during commute hours. Route 120 needs to be built to eventually accommodate traffic which will flow from enhanced north-south traffic roadways which will diverge east and west at Route 120. As I-294 continues to get more congested, an alternative north-south route will become essential and the connection with an east-west Route 120 will evolve. Since funding has not been totally committed for this project, I believe it should be a toll road which in states like Florida and California seems to be the fastest way to bring projects on line.

33. How long will the intersection at 120 and 45 have limited lanes? Nothing seems to be going on there? Why??
34. I strongly object to anything coming close to Almond Marsg and the Heron Rookery located there. Many residents are willing to pay higher taxes so that Lake County Forest Preserve can purchase more lands and put into permanent protection. Moved from Cook County and the traffic is worth putting up with in order to protect open space. Other comments regarding traffic on Route 120: Live in the Prairie Town Subdivision and cannot get out (left or right) on Route 120. Need a trip light so that residents can get turned. May need to eliminate right turns on red off Rte. 45 and Atkinson Rds. Need more coordination of traffic signals to improve traffic flow and allow easier access onto Route 120 from residential areas. Tie traffic signals to trains (freight and commuter). Open up Harris Rd. for through-traffic. Ease congestion on Route 120.
35. Please figure out a way to re-route neighborhood traffic through Wildwood down Mill Road to Route 120. Mill Road is now a busy through street that people use to cut through and around Rte 120. Keep our kids safe and do something about it.
36. would like to add my opinion to those expressed at the recent meeting held on the above subject. I am in favor of maintaining the ecological integrity of the area this Route 120 corridor impacts. While I realize that there are trade offs necessary for progress I think that the Planning Council must do everything possible to save migratory bird routes and sanctuaries in the area. The Rookery and Marsh areas should be kept in tacked and not violated by this buildig project. Thank you. PS: I use this route frequently and would rather see the statuts quo than the destruction of our natural settings. Please protect them.
37. Bravo! Long overdue.
38. Hello - I just wanted to send an email showing my full support for the IL-120 bypass project. As a commuter that travels ear and west daily on IL-120 and IL-60, I want you to know that you have a lot of support for this project. Please let me know if there is anything I can do to help.
39. I believe this will be good for Grayslake and the surrounding communities. I could not find a timeline for construction (should the prohect be approved). Are we looking at 5 years, 10 years, or longer to have this improvement in place?
40. Just get the darn thing done and not at government speed. It is pathetic that it takes me an hour and usually more to travel from Mchenry to Lake Bluff - a stinkin 23 miles. And people wonder why woman put on make-up and men shave on the way to work - easy to criticize...if we didn't we would be initiators of road rage on 120 as it is insanity that all the developments continue to get approved - including new schools and housing with no changes to the infrastructure - so what idiots were in charge of all that in and around Grayslake? FIRE THEM!
41. I am not able to attend the meeting but would like information on all that you have found regarding improving 120. My husband and I are interested in the bypass or widening Route 120 and believe that something needs to be done about the traffic on 120. We would like more information on what is planned. Thank you for your time in this matter.
42. I would like to get involved. I have lived in Grayslake for 9 years and 120 has become a complete nightmare!!!!!!!!!!

43. We need to have this bypass. I can remember when we took only 25 minutes to get where Lakehurst Mall was in Waukegan. Now to get the same location it is 45 minutes to an hour, depending on traffic. All main roads in Lake County should be 4 lane highways. Such as Washington St., Grand Ave. (Route 132) and Belvidere Rd (Route 120). The time of farms is long gone and the promise of this bypass has been long overdue. My 81 year old mother remembers the talk of this bypass 40 years ago. let's make this a reality.
44. Rt 120 has the space and need to expand. This expansion will also drive up business along the route. The intersection at 83 and 120 is the cause of most of the problem! What this intersection needs to help with traffic is the same as what was done to Milwaukee and Dempster (Niles; Cook County) about 20 years ago. Also the single lane by Rockenbach is sinking to the right east bound and to the west. Please please please do something. I.D.O.T. tollway \$ along with Federal \$ and \$ from businesses along 120. A slight increase in taxes would be worth it. Add a toll for 120 \$.20 per car it adds p quick. We need to do something NOW!
45. Lucky for me, I have the ability of taking Metra to work in Downtown Chicago. However, on thos eoccasions when I do have to drive, the first 12 miles of my 55 mile trip takes me 1/3 of the time. I clocked my trip last week. To get from my house at approximately Nippersink and Wooster Ln. took me 36 minutes! The rest of the trip took only 1 hour. You can do the math. We are in dire need of expanding Rte. 120 (and all our east-west roads) to a minimum of 4 lanes, with right and left turn lanes. Thank you.
46. A big yes to the rt. 120 improvement! We live in Hainesville and would love to see this happen. Good luck.
47. It doesnt appear that the other "Roundabout" proposal is being given ANY attention. Not that I support one over the other, but if that proposal can accept the projected traffic flows (and from what I have seen, it will) through 2030 it appears to be a cheaper, less obtrusive, more realizable project. Obviously, there are traffic issues that need to be dealt with, but creating an eyesore throughout the community may not be necessary.
48. Greetings, I have two questions regarding 120 planning: 1-What is the current construction at 120/45 looking to accomplish? 2-Will there be ramps set up to be able to access 120 westbound from I-94 southbound as well as accessing I-94 northbound from 120 eastbound? Please advise, and thanks for your time.
49. Thank you for setting up this website this is very convenient to check updates on this project. I have a couple questions. What frustrates me is the amount of studies that need to be done for this project. Isn't there a way to use past studies of Rte. 120 and of Lake County to come to the conclusion that really everyone already knows? Is this going to be a 6 lane highway that runs to McHenry County to anticipate the traffic amount for 2030. In addition wouldn't this highway give corporations such as Abbott an area to possibly invest instead of moving north to Wisconsin?
50. WHY DON'T YOU TAKE 120 AND MAKE IT A NORTH ROUTE TO WISC. YOU HAVE PLEANTY OF EAST WEST ROADS! ROUTE 45 STINKS, ROUTE 83 STINKS AND ROUTE 173 NEEDS TO BE 4 LANES MORE

THAN RPUTE 120! WE DO NOT NEED TO ADD ON TO ROUTE 120 TO MAKE IT EASIER FOR McHENRY COOUNTRY!

51. I really don't see the need to go through a heron rookery, farmland... to go around the corner of 120 and 45 which will have a mega-mall. You are diverting the traffic away from the commerce. Makes no sense to me at all. These corners are backed up because they turn into two lane roads. Widen 120 and 45 and be done with it. I find this a Route 53 in disguise. Offensive.
52. I LIVE IN ARBOR VISTA AND MY KID'S GO TO PRAIRIE CROSSING CHARTER SCHOOL---PLEASE-IF YOU HAVE TO BUILD DO IT WITH CARE FOR US WHO LIVE HERE! I CAN ALREADY HEAR 120 FROM MY HOUSE TO THE POINT WE CAN'T EVEN CAMP OUT IN THE BACK YARD WITH THE KIDS!!!! PLEASE BUILD USING AN ARTERIAL DESIGN--DO NOT IMPACT ARBOR VISTA, THE CRANE ROOKERY(THEY ARE A VERY SENSITIVE SPECIES-VISIT THE CRANE FOUNDATION IN BARABOO- TO LEARN HOW THE SPECIES FUNCTIONS-- OR PRAIRIE CROSSING--YOU ARE AFFECTING AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREA---LEAVE IT ALONE!!!WE'VE LIVED HERE FOR 13 YEARS AND DO NOT WANT TO SEE IT RUINED...PLEASE BUILD AN ENVIRONMENTALLY MINIMIZING ARTERY...THANK YOU.
53. Would be nice to see some information on how Rt. 120 bypass planning will address the potential development of the Lake County Fairgrounds, as a proposal is again heating up. How will the potential traffic this would bring be accomodated in the Rt. 120 bypass? How will access be accommodated?
54. I don't know why common sense isn't prevailing here. Why in the world would we build a new road 500 feet from an existing road when we could simply widen the existing Route 120? Why don't we simply widen the existing road from 2 to 4 lanes? Our default position should be to improve our current roads before building new ones. Let's put politics aside and use some common sense here.
55. Being that I live on Alleghany Road (next to railroad tracks), what effects will this have on Alleghany Road? Will they have to widen the road? Also, is the stoplight ever going to be put in at 120 and Alleghany? Will they have to close down Alleghany for any reason during construction of the new 120 or when they put in the stoplight? Just questions I would like answered.
56. Please consider another viewpoint from a resident who agrees with the need to improve local roads and arteries but DOES NOT support the needless destruction of natural habitats to do so. I moved here BECAUSE of places like Almond Marsh. Cutting through that and other wetlands and environmentally proceless micro ecosystems will lay waste to the very aspects of Lake County we all hold dear. Find an alternate route! Widen existing roads if necessary. Do not touch the few remaining wetlands and woodlands!
57. Improving and widening the current ROW should be the first consideration. It's more free and clear of environmental impacts than the Rt. 53 ROW and is already degraded. There are few human impacts east and west of Grayslake on the existing ROW. Don't run a road through or close to the heron rookery at Almond Marsh, which is also a feeding place for Sand Hill Cranes. Don't damange the

ADID wetland at the Sports Club. Don't take away Ziegler's Orchard, the only remaining apple orchard has been in Lake County for 40 years. Don't put a 4-6 lane expressway near the residents of Madrona Village, Prairie Crossing, Arbor Vista with the resulting pollution and degradation of their property and lives. It's critical that Lake County be considered for what it is. LAKE COUNTY is very ecologically sensitive - flying over it one can see all the lakes, which are only the tip of the sensitive areas. Promoting and building a super highway in this environmentally sensitive county is a dinosaur-like answer - promoting sprawl, environmental damage including flooding and it doesn't promote any kind of energy conservation. This study should include not just the "corridor", but how improving the other roads, including Rt. 120 would affect traffic. Do not count on the studies from LCTIP. Do not isolate each alternative, as LCTIP did. The old EIS is old. It is expired and inadequate. Consider why an adequate EIS has never been accomplished. Could it be because environmental damage is too great to allow a new road of that magnitude? The existing EIS was a waste of money and now more money must be spent if the push to use the new ROW continues. There are volumes more to say; however, much has already been said and I suggest the comments from previous hearings, meetings and any other be utilized in this process. A lot of people have educated themselves on traffic relief and the time is overdue to listen to the public comments. Do not by pass common sense, fiscal responsibility and information from the former studies, such as the validity of the EIS (and the costs of conducting a faulty study in this process ). The most fiscally and environmentally solutions to traffic woes are: Improving the current Rt. 120 and possibly a very short bypass just around Grayslake proper might be doable. Once again, improve the existing ROWs such as: Alleghany, Rt. 60, Rt. 83, Gilmore, Peterson, Rt. 137 between Grayslake and Libertyville. Add right and left turn lanes. Synchronize lights. If this is really a 7.5 mile bypass, why is the study area from Waukegan to McHenry? This process must be honest and result in the most fiscally, environmentally, and humanly responsible solutions. Unfortunately, the first summit inconsistently phrased the 120 bypass option three ways. Is it 7.5 miles (working papers) or from Waukegan to McHenry (moderator) or of indeterminate length as was stated in the actual vote. This is one example of not being transparent to the public. There are volumes more to say; however, much has already been said and I suggest the comments from previous hearings, meetings and any other be utilized in this process. A lot of people have educated themselves on traffic relief and the time is overdue to listen to the public comments. Do not by pass common sense, fiscal responsibility and information from the former studies, such as the validity of the EIS (and the costs of conducting a faulty study) in this process.

58. I am appalled at the concept of constructing a superhighway parallel to Ill. Rt. 120, especially on its proposed route. It will: obliterate the heron rookery at Almond Marsh, foster development of single-use residential subdivisions adjacent to the road, draw customers and clients away from business establishments adjacent to the current Ill. Rt. 120, transgress and destroy wetlands, woo suburbanites to continue to drive alone when to reduce petroleum consumption, many should find other ways to go to and from work, gobble up land at

interchanges and clog roads leading to and from the interchanges, and require a big chunk of highway funds available to Lake County, leaving other parts of the county begging for years. I heard the Federal Highway Fund will be empty by 2009. If so, costs of road maintenance and improvements must be borne by state and local taxpayers. To relieve traffic congestion in Lake County, we need a 10-year plan to allow multiuse zoning, develop public transportation and encourage its use, improve intersections to speed the flow of traffic, improve roads and bridges, develop programs to boost the residential and commercial density in our downtowns, and develop incentives to encourage persons who use Lake County roads to go wherever they want any way but alone in a car. Lake County business interests and civic boosters need to rethink any plan that would force local school districts and municipalities to hike taxes to pay for new and expanded services. Paradoxically, they need to consider the potential impact of superroads on local flooding and, with soaring subdivisions, shortages of drinking water. They also should think twice before destroying the environment by building a superroad they think will somehow ease traffic congestion. To do so it must completely skirt municipalities. Lake County Partners would do well to study how other areas of our nation are dealing with urban sprawl before calling for a new superroad in the so-called 120 corridor. The Partners have the resources, the knowledge base and the leadership to find practical solutions to a very serious problem.

59. I'll just be direct about my concerns. There has to be an alternative to the destruction of the heron rookery at Almond Marsh. I understand that we need better traffic conditions in our area. I in fact must endure these conditions; however, there are alternatives to the current plan that will not harm this natural AND local treasure. I, therefore, officially register my opposition to any proposal that requires the destruction of this habitat. I appreciate the time and hard work you are doing for our community. I sincerely believe you do not consider the habitat destruction a desirable option, but will need support to consider alternatives so consider me a part of that support.
60. Hi, I am all for changing the roads around here to avoid traffic hassles but there is one point to this proposal that I am opposing. There is a heron rookery at 120 and Mill Road that would be destroyed with the new route. We live in tandem with nature and we must keep it that way. We have to be able to share our earth. The fact that so many herons have nests so close to us is utterly amazing. I feel honored by nature to be able to witness the adult heron's and their babies. We would be only hurting what is around us if we were to destroy that. There must be some way to avoid destruction of the heron rookery and that route must be taken. We cannot ignore the nature that is here.
61. What will happen to the wetland and Heron rookery by 120 and Mill if the change to 120 is made? Will they be relocated? How is that issue being addressed?
62. How long are they going to drag out the patching on the 120 & 45 intersection? 5 weeks seems to be plenty of time. Is the state doing this on purpose? How about finishing a road for a change. Rte 45 for example. Get one bottleneck done, then move to another.
63. Hello. I have reviewed the website and found many useful maps and much useful information. I have not found detailed information on the type of road being

- discussed to put in for a bypass. But I have heard 2 options so far from various other sources: 1-limited access freeway similar to Route 53 with intermittent on and off-ramps. 2-"boulevard" style road with traffic circles. I am strongly opposed to a Route-53 style freeway running through this county with limited access for communities, but increased speeds and congestion, and increased environmental impact and negative aesthetic impact.
64. I have heard of the proposal for the boulevard and it is significantly more appealing, aesthetically, environmentally, and financially as well as a good way to manage traffic. It seems forward thinking and something which can differentiate Lake-county from the rest of Chicagoland by showing we can come up with innovative ways to solve our traffic problems rather than using 50 year-old methods of road design. Real creativity in the way Lake County solves problems can be displayed with a project like this. Thanks for the opportunity to provide input. I look forward to more information regarding the planning. The Almond Marsh Heron Rookery and all the wetlands of the Route 53 corridor are valuable and irreplaceable. Please seek a new alignment of the infrastructure that does not compromise the health of this area's groundwater and does not impinge upon environmentally sensitive areas. Alternative modes (such as intersection upgrades) are available if you would just take the time to consider them.
65. We moved to Lake County from Chicago, and have no desire to live close to another expressway. The Almond Marsh is such a treasure, it would be terrible to see it destroyed!!!! If you've ever taken the time to look at the birds nesting there, you'll notice they nest as far from 120 as possible. We need public officials who protect the reasons why many people moved to Lake County -- the natural spaces that make this a unique area. If we wanted to live in Schaumburg, we'd have moved there! I urge you to explore ALL the options available to make a smart decision that doesn't destroy the look and feel of this part of Lake County.
66. That issue of improving transportation along route 120 is of significant concern to me. Although I agree and would appreciate traffic and road improvements in Lake County, I am strongly believe they must and can, with careful planning, be kept in balance with preservation of the local environmental treasures that cannot be replicated or replaced. Existing suggestions for 120 improvements would run through several very environmentally sensitive areas, including the heron rookery at Almond Marsh just south of existing 120 at Almond Road, destroying the rookery and changing the nature of the rest of the forest preserve. Current proposals would also traverse the ADID wetland at the Northbrook Sports Club. The proposed road would also run through Ziegler's Orchard, the last orchard in Lake County, a valued property to families in the area. In addition, the proposal skirts numerous subdivisions, including Arbor Vista, Madrona Village, Prairie Crossing and others, subjecting the residents to noise, dirt and winter salt. Proponents of the bypass seem to want the road designed as an expressway. Although the maps indicate where local roads and the expressway cross, those roads will be bridged over the expressway, limiting local access, and increasing construction expense. On the far eastern side, frontage roads will be needed to give local residents access. Building the bypass as an arterial (rather than as an expressway) would allow the road to curve around Almond Marsh and save the

- wetlands. It can be designed with a landscaped median rather than a cement barrier, providing connection with local roads, improving community access, in addition to containing costs and decreasing construction time. Please take these considerations and concerns seriously and try to achieve a solution that balances the beauty of this area and the future quality of life here with the need to improve travel times and traffic congestion.
67. I live in Lake Bluff and want to let you know that I feel strongly that the Rte 120 bypass needs to avoid Almond Marsh. Enough is enough with sprawl continually encroaching on our wetlands as well as negatively effecting our groundwater supply, which, I am sure you know, is vital and irreplaceable.
68. I am a Grayslake resident who lives near the Rte 120 and Rte 45 intersection. I am deeply concerned about how the plans to improve 120 go forward from a number of aspects. Environmental impact -- plans presented in the past called for the destruction of parts of Almond Marsh, especially the heron and crane rookery that is one of the few remaining such nesting areas left in the surrounding countryside. I heartily oppose this and want to urge the Council to actively seek ways to avoid damaging Almond Marsh or any other wild places in the path of 120 proposals. Noise -- some plans call for a raised roadbed and overpasses for the railroad crossings. These would subject surrounding residential areas to the maximum amount of noise from the roadway. Intersections -- lighted intersections are responsible for much of the delay issues and accidents that occur. Adding such intersections can only add to this negative affect. Access -- the tollway/expressway solution would create a Route 66-type situation for local communities, limiting access to local businesses and discouraging responsible, sustainable development. Overall impact -- a 53-type expressway will maximize the overall impact by necessitating on and off ramps and the highest number of travel lanes. I have seen and heard a proposal for a boulevard-style improvement that will minimize destruction and damage to the environment; keep the new road at grade level and use underpasses for the railroad crossings, which would minimize noise; use round-a-bout intersections wherever possible to optimize traffic flow and safety, provide maximum, safe access to local businesses and minimize the overall impact in terms of breadth of construction. I am fully in favor of the boulevard solution to improving 120 and urge the Council to give it all due consideration as plans go forward. Thank you.
69. As someone who has watched the rampant development of Lake County over the last 25 years, I am appalled to hear of yet another project to destroy one of the few remaining natural areas in the region. Almond Marsh on Route 120 represents a significant heron nesting area and wetland that contains endangered species. Expanding Route 120 in a way that damages this natural area is unacceptable. A major traffic corridor and construction zone in the area of this marsh would cause irreparable damage to the wildlife that depends on this remnant of natural space. This is an example of how Lake County developers have been allowed to build with no consideration for the appropriate infrastructure of roads, services and schools needed to support an overburdened area whose quality of community diminishes with every natural area that is destroyed to be replaced by a fast-food restaurant or highway that simply bring more traffic and congestion to the region.

70. I am a Grayslake resident who has been trying to find out if and when a left turn lane will be constructed on Hwy 120, for westbound traffic, at Garfield Blvd. (just west of the intersection of Hwy 83. Is tonight's Hainesville open house an appropriate forum for trying to get some information or talking to someone from IDOT who would know what I'm talking about? A developer promised the Village of Grayslake that he would build this turn lane back in 1999 or 2000 as part of an agreement when he built the Hidden Ponds subdivision. I've checked back with the village several times over the past two years, and officials there say the state is holding up the project and won't grant the permit because of other larger plans for the 120/83 intersection. Meanwhile, the situation is increasingly dangerous and I can't understand why nothing is being done. If you are not able to reply to this message before tonight's meeting, I will try to leave work earlier enough to get there. I just wasn't sure if I'd be wasting my time, if all the discussion will be centered on the 120 bypass plan.
71. In regards to the Rt. 120 bypass, I have three thoughts: 1) I have used Rt. 120 MWF between 8:45am-9:45am, MWF 11:15am-11:45am, and M-F at 5:00pm for two and a half years, and I have never encountered substantial traffic on this route. 2) With the persistent interest in developing a mall at the corner of 120 and 45, is the bypass route that is currently proposed actually useful? 3) I fear that the destruction of Almond Marsh would set a precedent of wildlife destruction for Lake County, especially with the highway 53 extension and possible mall lurking in the not-so-distant future. So many of Lake County's residents live here to enjoy what is left of accessible, outdoor living. I personally visit the Almond Marsh regularly. I take my children to the Marsh. I take visitors to the Marsh. And I enjoy watching the herons hunt in my backyard. The Marsh is not only a local treasure, but symbolic of the flavor of this county. Everything changes the moment that paving the Marsh takes precedent over its inhabitants. And this literally paves the way for highway 53 and the mall. To those of you with decision making power, I beg of you to "think outside the box" and make Lake County unique.
72. I am concerned that any road construction related to the current discussion of widening Route 120 be planned with the most careful considerations of the Almond Marsh Heron Rookery as well as other wetlands in the area that would be adversely impacted by any man-made disturbance. As the song goes "you don't know what you've got 'til it's gone"...and that applies to many areas of our earth already. Haven't we learned? Time for you local government folks to start thinking outside the box. Traffic congestion is rampant in fact all over the world in developed countries AND in developing countries. The solution to this problem is NOT to build more roads and in fact should not always be to widen existing roads. There are many alternatives. You all know what they are. Improving and expanding public transportation being first among those alternatives that need much more support from you and state and federal government. I support the least possible expansion of Route 120 using a system of roundabouts that I learned about through a presentation by Mike Sands at Prairie Crossing. We all need to be much more thoughtful and responsible in our planning changes to the natural

- environment we have left. Lake County has done a better job than most in that regard. Keep it up. In fact do even better. Leave Almond Marsh to the herons.
73. We object to the destruction of the heron rookery at Almond Marsh to the imposition on the subdivisions adjacent to the road, to the loss of ADID wetlands and local landmarks with the proposed Route 120 bypass. We find the environmental damage from such a road to be unsupportable, and encourage the council to look at alternatives, including an arterial road that could easily curved around the more sensitive areas, preserving them. As arterial road also would permit connections with all the local roads in the areas, would be less visually intrusive, and would be less expensive. Let's be leaders in creating a corridor for community and commuter instead of the business as usual transportation.
  74. didn't see any way to email these via website, so am mailing my comments via U.S> post. I have several concerns about this project. Firstly, using the "LCTIP" reeks of attempts to circumvent federal evaluation processes, and is also an inaccurate picture of current situations. The plan itself as publicly detailed is incomplete. Are there barriers? Is it an expressway? How is it to be accessed locally? Are there access roads not illustrated on current plan maps? Will my children still be able to bike to Grayslake Central High School from Prairie Crossing? Will I still be able to ride my bike from there to run errands in Grayslake? How about the environmentally sensitive areas like Almond Marsh? Our last remaining apple orchard will be destroyed. If the Chicagoland area is currently designated as "non attainment" for particular matter, how does this plan help? What are the costs of this project, including opportunity costs and how is it to be funded - SPECIFICALLY? What alternative proposals exist and how do they compare with this plan? HOW does THIS plan solve out current traffic problems? How well does this plan complement other plans in the pipeline (or proposed) for Lake County?
  75. Your planned route for the 120 bypass around Grayslake could not be more ill-advised. As a volunteer for the Lake County Forest Preserve District I have personally guided hundreds of people through the unique and vital Heron Rookery known as Almond Marsh and I know that it gets thousands of visitors yearly. The significant decline we are experiencing in migratory bird populations is primarily due to habitat loss and your are proposing more of the same. You could do a far better job of route planning that would avoid the Ziegler Orchard, proximity to Prairie Crossing and other wetlands, but especially ALMOND MARSH. Please, please do not destroy it.
  76. Anybody who thinks this is a bad idea needs to drive on 120 between 7:30 in the morning and then again at four o'clock in the afternoon around Hainesville and 120. And they'll see that it's backed up coming west practically from 83 and from going east from as far as the eye can see. And they just need to see what we're dealing with every day to see that this would be a good thing.
  77. I am requesting that the alignment for 120 from Route 45 east be looked at. It could be shifted further north to avoid the wetland altogether. It could terminate near Mill Road. It would save IDOT a lot of money, and it would save the people that live where -- in Arbor Vista a lot of aggravation if you could shift this further north. There's only three homes, and they are all for sale at this time. You would

- avoid the very large wetland there. It would be a lot easier for you to engineer and build. Thank you.
78. I think the traffic on 120 is atrocious. Even on Washington you come -- if you try to get through either one of these roads between three and six o'clock, you can at least spend sometimes 45 minutes or an hour. Getting off of Alleghany it's atrocious. It takes sometimes 45, half an hour to make the turn there. The sooner they get this 120 bypass, I think it will be the best thing for the area. It will also alleviate a lot of the truck traffic during the day and make regular 120, Belvidere Road, move faster too. It's a good thing.
  79. My comment is that the small retail businesses that complain about losing business because of a proposed bypass I think are crying wolf. Because when they decided to choose a site along 120, for example, in Hainesville, they were thinking -- in my mind, they were thinking of serving the local residents and not counting on people that were coming from McHenry to be at their Walgreens or their Subway or whatever. So I don't think that there should be a lot of complaints because most of the retail stuff along the current 120 is really for local business. And I have two comments. One is the resolution passed by the Lake County Board specified a four-lane arterial route, not a limited access highway, No. 1. And No. 2, avoid the heron rookery. You do those two things, you have my full support.
  80. This bypass is grossly over needed for Northern Illinois. Anything that can be done to alleviate traffic from the several downtown communities is highly desirable so commuting traffic can get from Point A to Point B.
  81. I'm having a problem with the area where the -- what do I want to say -- where it cuts off into -- the area by Almond Road and 120. That's where I'm having a problem at. My concern is the impact of Almond Road and the birds, and that's it.
  82. I'm a 23-year resident. I'm here on behalf of myself and my neighbors. We're concerned about the wetlands. We don't want the road to go through any wetlands, and there is in particular two special wetlands that are shown for being gone through. And we'd like to see it not go through that. We're also concerned -- we don't want to see an expressway with a raised road. We'd rather see something with like a flat grade or a lower grade. We don't want to see anything with frontage roads because of the expense to the communities that would be involved in that. And mostly we don't want to see something that's like a fat -- like a really rushing smelly road like Route 53. We'd like to see an alternative to that. So it would appear that I'm for an arterial bypass mostly because of less -- generating of pollution, and that would include oil and noise and dirt and salt, no spraying on the houses and the trees and the yards and as well as the heron rookery being possibly devastated by an expressway. That's it.
  83. I would like to see them make the road -- if they have to do it at all -- as an arterial so they can curve it to miss Almond Marsh and the heron rookery, so they can miss the ADID wetlands in the center, and Miss Zigler's Orchard over on the far side. I would like to see it connect with the local roads so communities don't get divided by having this big expressway running through the middle, and I absolutely do not want it as a toll road.

84. My question is why doesn't whoever is responsible for creating this proposal take the initiative to make changes to avoid the greatest environmental concerns.
85. I just wanted to say that I'm in favor of the bypass. I'm a little concerned about the wetlands, but something needs to be done. And I'm glad that there is finally some big movement happening.
86. I live in the Philmar Subdivision which is just west of the intersection of 83 -- Route 83 and Route 120, and I'm in favor of a bypass. But I want -- you know, I'd like them to be very careful about the environmental impact, especially with the heron rookery that's farther east of us. I just love that. It's bird city. But my -- a smaller, but just as relevant concern for me, is we were told about six years ago that there would be a left turn lane built off of 120 when you're heading westbound just west of the 83 intersection into our subdivision, that there be a left turn lane onto Garfield Boulevard. And a developer who built a new subdivision back there called Hidden Ponds was supposed to build this -- pay for this left turn lane. Well, it never happened, and I've been told by the village that it's because IDOT has held up the permit. But I'm still waiting to hear on the status of that, because right now I think it's a very dangerous area. People speed through. They want to get through that intersection of 83 and 120 when they're heading westbound on 120. They're not prepared to stop when people immediately want to turn left into our subdivision. People have been rear-ended there, and I once had a semi truck go around me very quickly. I was new, and I didn't realize what a bad situation that was. Now I drive farther up and turn left. But he went around me on the shoulder of the road, which is a soft shoulder, and there was a water hydrant there. And I don't know how he avoided hitting me or the water hydrant, but he did it. But it scared the poop out of me. It was really -- it was really my awakening to how dangerous that was. And the more people I talked to, the more I realized everybody I knew had had a problem. And some people I know have been rear-ended there trying to turn left. So I know that's in the grand scheme of things not the priority probably right now, but if they're not going to build a bypass or they're not going to do anything to alleviate construction in the very near future -- I mean to alleviate traffic -- I'm sorry -- then I wish that they would at least address concerns like that. I would think that could be easily done, and that's it.
87. I want to say is that the corridor for the possible 120 bypass should be -- well, should not be assumed to be the previous north segment of the Route 53. And I'm disappointed to see that that's the only thing that's being presented here. Instead there ought to be a general proposal for a general location and leave it up to the future work of the committee to decide what's possible. Unfortunately, because IDOT already purchased a lot of land, what's being presented tonight probably will be the only thing that the committee can afford to consider; and that will sacrifice the heron rookery, Almond Marsh, Lake County Forest Preserve and go through an ADID wetland near Campbell Airport and potentially compromise the drinking water of both present and future communities in the area. The reason I bring up 53 is because the Director of Lake County Department of Transportation is insisting that the 120 bypass plan include traffic demands generated with or without the north/south 53 tollway extension, and clearly including that addition

- of a traffic burden you want to make this plan grandiose or unaffordable and incompatible with the environment that we are so privileged to enjoy. Thank you.
88. For 20 years I've lived in either, you know, northeast Cook County/ Wheeling area or Lake County doing business in Lake County for over 20 years. And all I have observed is an increase in traffic with no viable plan to deal with the overload. 120 is a disaster. We need relief.
  89. I'm the Mayor of Hainesville. And I'm delighted to be the host for this function, and I'm also very optimistic that the project is going to go ahead. And I'm always proud to show the building. It's new. We've only been in it a little over a year, and I'm delighted to have people use it.
  90. I just came here representing myself. I'm in the Arbor Vista Subdivision, and we just recently moved here from Chicago and just wanted to see -- find out if -- I guess try to understand the impact to our investment we've just made in our home and whether or not it was -- if we need to be concerned about impact on the bypass on home values and property values in the area.
  91. My comment is certainly having access to this bypass and access to some of the perpendicular roads, i.e., Cedar Lake Road and Fairfield Road, because primarily Cedar Lake Road, that's such a key access. And that's it.
  92. am very concerned about the proposed 120 project and its threat to the heron colony in the area. I believe the proposed road can be planned and not impact this important important area. I am also concerned about the impact of this proposed road on the private business apple orchard in the area.
  93. I wish to express my concern over the projects nearness to the Heron Rookery in Almond Marsh. I hope that every effort will be made to preserve this valuable piece of Chicagoland natural history.
  94. Though I do not live in Lake County, I have been actively applauding the efforts of the Lake County Board to buy, and therefore save from development, land over the last few years. In the face of rampant growth in Lake County it has been heartening to see new Forest Preserve land! But now the widening/rerouting of Rt. 120 threatens a wetland - an endangered habitat type in Illinois - and a heron rookery. I urge the County Board to consider other options for Rt. 120, such as widening the already existing roadbed, creating roundabouts at key intersections, and creating barricades to protect the wetland areas and housing areas. Thank you for your attention to this email.
  95. I'm all for it. It would provide much needed traffic relief.
  96. I totally support the Route 120 corridor. We have needed it for a long time.
  97. The proposed Route 120 alignment is not an appropriate use of public funds. It should be an arterial road only, with not destruction of the heron rookery or forest preserves. The most important aspect of any new road is to bridge the railroad tracks; don't waste money on a consultant for that aspect. Route 53 by a backdoor Route 120 roadway is not necessary or appropriate. This plan is too expensive and serves only certain special interests. We need only a road (or transportation system) to link the four lane partitions of Route 120 with the same type of road that we have now as 120.
  98. I don't want the proposed route 120 realignment to go through any forest preserves or the Heron Rookery. The people of Lake County have noted and paid

- to protect those lands from development and they must remain protected. Make a bypass on 45 if you must. And don't make it a toll road, because no one will use it if you do.
99. Route 120 bypass is crucial to the county and its businesses. Push hard for funding. Full speed ahead. Also provide for interchanges/access with 83 and potential Route 53.
  100. More roads just brings more traffic. Improve existing roads (Route 120 - 4 lanes). Offer alternatives: expand bus service, light rail, more bike trails
  101. The Route 120 By-Pass is needed to relieve congestion and improve the quality of life for the residents of Lake County. Travel times in the morning and afternoon are horrendous. I fully support the planning efforts and future efforts and future construction of the corridor.
  102. We should exhaust all possibilities for improving existing roads and streets. Almond Marsh and other wetlands and natural areas in the corridor should be protected. A 120 Highway that divides communities, creates storm water surges, and destroys invaluable ecological habitats is absolutely unacceptable.
  103. Maps look great! Progress cannot come soon enough. Get this study done so we can move on to the next study.
  104. Why not simply increase the lanes on the current 120 road? I definitely oppose yet another road, especially if it goes through the Almond Marsh.
  105. Improvement on Route 120 should NOT include destroying, or in any way negatively effecting, the Great Blue Heron rookery at Almond Marsh. I would rather sit in traffic if loosing the rookery were part of the cost of improvements.
  106. I urge you to consider Almond Marsh as off limits when planning improvements to the Rt 120 corridor. Almond Marsh is a unique, well-known natural area that (along with other nearby natural attractions) brings many visitors to Lake County, and therefore, should be viewed as an economical asset it it's own right. Destruction of such an area, even for the sake of improving transportation, will do more economical harm than good over the long term.
  107. The proposed route 120 expansion corridor is threatening one of Lake County's environmental treasures, the heron rookery at Almond Marsh. It is of great concern to me that we are willing to sacrifice such a unique and beautiful location. Please allow space for the herons and ensure their protection.
  108. I am very concerned with the preservation of the great blue heron rookery at Almond Marsh. I stongly oppose any plan for Route 120 that does not preserve the heron rookery at Almond marsh. The rookery is an important environmental feature and must be protected.
  109. Sierra Club strongly opposes any road or road building activity which will damage or endanger sensitive natural areas. The proposed 120 Bypass currently envisioned would bulldoze portions of Lake County Forest Preserve Almond Marsh, a natural area held in trust for the people of Lake County. Besides Almond Marsh, this road would destroy an important wetlands complex near Campbell Airfield and eliminate a cultural landmark, Ziegler's Orchard. No amount of traffic justifies the wanton destruction of the natural areas that give Lake County its character. Either this 120 Bypass project should be cancelled, or it should be rerouted to areas that are already developed.

110. This project is of utmost importance and tremendous commercial and residential value to Lake County. The lack of a East-West highway in the Northern Lake County impedes faster economic progress and presents an obstacle for future development.
111. Sirs/Madams: I support building townhomes and retail outlets on the current Lake Cty Fairgrounds site, and I support the needed expansion of Rte. 120. However, I do not support destroying the Almond Marsh and its unique Heron rookery. The rookery was one of the first things we noticed when scouting out this area when we were considering moving to Grayslake. It's a unique feature of the landscape. As we plan the expansion necessary to support development, we should perserve the unique (and much loved) features of Lake County that make it special. Paving over the rookery and turning it into just another by-way would be a step closer to turning Lake Cty into just another generic 'burb like Schaumburg. Please keep the Almond Marsh and the heron rookery intact.
112. I am very concerned that the proposed 120 bypass will do great damage to the semi-rural flavor of this area - the main reason we moved here in 2004. A high-speed roadway will dramaticall increase the noise levels; a huge overpass at the RR crossing will destroy the look of the area; the Almond Marsh will be destroyed; and traffic conjection in the Grayslake area will increase, not decrease. I urge the planning council to consider alternatives to the concentration of new pavement to this one area of the County. Traffic conjection will only be diminished if a number of east-west roadways are improved on smaller scales than this huge project. "If you build it, they will come."
113. I understand that 120 is a traffic nightmare, but it seems crazy that a county that has worked so hard to preserve land and natural resources would destroy the local landmarks such as the Almond Marsh Heron Rookery, Zieglers Orchard, and more, all the in name of an ugly, noisy highway. I plead with you all to continue to protect what makes this area so beautiful and special and please consider alternative plans that keep the landmarks intact. Thank you!
114. raffic is indeed a mess here in Lake County, and it doesn't come as any surprise to me that many within the gas-guzzling, auto-dependent public at large view the stagnant, car-clogged conditions along Route 120 and our other highways as one of the major problems of our times. For those who polish their butts along these roadways for anywhere from minutes to hours every day in the seats of their SUVs, minivans, Japanese sport sedans, or whatever on their way to wherever, harboring this viewpoint can come naturally enough. But c'mon Lake County--step outside your cars, houses and own little lives and see what's really important now and for all future generations: Our land, lakes, rivers, wildlife, and the air we all breathe. How much will these vital resources suffer just so we can construct the proposed bypass? By building yet another road will we not just be inviting more cars to come pump more nitrogen oxides and carbon monoxide into our already dirty, global warming air? Will we not be opening the door to even more development and a need for still more roads? What about the noise, and light pollution? Will we lose the blue heron rookery in Almond Marsh? Paving the planet doesn't solve anything. They've already tried this in places like Los Angeles County. Go see the results if you haven't already, because that's where

we're heading, and it's not pretty. You might not be able to experience them from inside your car, but believe it or not there are still many places in Lake County where the real winds blow, and some of the finest ones are along the proposed route of the 120 bypass. It's my sincere hope that you, the members of the Route 120 Corridor Planning Council, will give this mindful consideration as you go forward. When it comes to our natural resources, we've clearly lost enough already. Let's save what we have left, because once it's gone, we can never get it back.

115. I would like to express my concern over the proposed route 120 bypass which will, as currently planned, cut almost directly through my backyard, and will endanger wildlife and nature preserves such as the heron rookery at Almond Marsh. My family moved to this area largely due to the reputation of Lake County for preserving open spaces and natural habitats. I am sorely disappointed to find that this is not the case. I implore you to consider alternatives to the current proposal that would not have as drastic an environmental impact. Development of this nature may alleviate traffic issues, but at what cost? I, personally, would consider moving out of this area altogether, rather than live with a high-traffic motorway steamrolled through my neighborhood.
116. I agree that something needs to be done. However, this is not the only area of Lake County that needs attention, it is not even the worst area. Building a 4 lane expressway is unnecessary and a misuse of limited funds. I would suggest that either widening the current road to 4 lanes OR building a 4 lane arterial road would be the prudent course. Building anything more would drain on limited resources for the rest of Lake County and possibly the greater Chicago area. This concentration on a limited project would exacerbate the problems in the rest of the county. I also am concerned about building so close to the Rookery. That is a unique place in Lake County and must be protected.
117. I moved to Grayslake 3 years ago after living in Chicago and elsewhere internationally because of the great attachment to nature. Everyone who visits from the city, Gurnee, DeKalb, Aurora, Milwaukee, Indiana, or elsewhere nationally or internationally are ALWAYS impressed by the heron rookery near 120. Any plans to disrupt this sanctuary (for all of us) would be a travesty. Please consider the alternative arterial route options, which along with improved mass transit and intersections would suffice. Please don't take away what will NEVER be able to be done again. We can ALWAYS pave over something. Please don't take them away from my family. We don't complain about our taxes in this household because of these natural wonders. Tell me one other place I can live near all something even akin to this.
118. On behalf of the Liberty Prairie Conservancy, I want to submit our comments regarding the 120 Bypass option now being considered. In short, we oppose the current Route 120 Bypass alignment. Instead, we urge Lake County to consider alternative routes and designs that would address traffic issues but would minimize negative impacts on Lake County's natural resources that are of great value to people and wildlife. We do want to make clear that we understand that traffic congestion is a real concern. We would support a Route 120 bypass as long as it dealt sensitively with the natural areas of central Lake County and all aspects

of Lake County's environment in general. The alignment currently shown on maps would have severe and detrimental impacts on several key natural resources of Lake County - Almond Marsh Forest Preserve and the ADID wetland at the Northbrook Sports Club. For example, the alignment shown at the recent open house in Hainesville would slice through a portion of the Almond Marsh Forest Preserve and come very close to the Forest Preserve's rookery where more than 50 nests are currently occupied. This route would be very likely to disturb the birds and might well harm the marsh in which the rookery is located and which a wide variety of birds use for feeding. It's also important to note that the Almond Marsh Forest Preserve is part of the larger Liberty Prairie Reserve, a 5,800-acre area south of Route 120 where more than 3,200 acres of land have already been preserved. Harm to the Forest Preserve would simultaneously harm this larger area. We speak for Lake County's open land because open land is valuable not only to wildlife but to people as well. In addition to beauty and recreation opportunities, open lands help keep our county's air and water clean. Open lands also allow rainwater to filter down and recharge our shallow aquifers, which are becoming ever more vital for our county's water supply. And healthy open land keeps Lake County an attractive place where people want to live and businesses of all sizes want to do business. Again, fixing our traffic problems needs to be done, but it should be done in ways that do not exacerbate other problems and don't cause more damage to the natural infrastructure of our county than is absolutely necessary. We urge everyone involved to look for better alternatives for the Route 120 Bypass and to carry out full and complete environmental impact statements in the course of planning. (The Liberty Prairie Conservancy is a non-profit land conservation organization based in Grayslake. We work to preserve key natural areas and working farmland in order to keep Lake County a great place to live. We also lead the management of local natural areas and offer educational programs and activities to the public. More than 400 households are members of the Conservancy.) Note: The Liberty Prairie Foundation also submitted the Belvidere Boulevard Technical Concept Report, January 2006 for inclusion in public comments.

119. Please do not build a new road. There is a perfectly good existing right-of-way road in Route 120 that can merely be expanded. In addition to costing less, we do not need to disrupt the environment in the area and can be conscious of our neighbours in the area... both people and the animals and trees! PLEASE!
120. I am very concerned about the whole environmental impact and overall effectiveness of the proposed 120 By-pass. In the current plan, many environmental treasures would be literally destroyed, such as Almond Marsh. Which is home for many different species of wildlife, creating a habitat that offers many educational opportunities and helps to maintain the character of Lake County. The proposed by-pass doesn't seem to truly approach the traffic problems of the area, simply it seems to be an opportunity to build a mini-expressway, while all of the other roads in the area suffer terribly, such as IL-45, IL-137, IL-83, which all remain highly travelled 2 lane roads. The expectation that improving one east-west road will improve the dreadful traffic problems of the area seems a little hazy. I appreciate the hard work and effort that obviously gone

into this project, but drive the roads in the areas around 5 to 7pm and see that massive problems are seen on all roadways, not just Belvidere IL-120. The population has grown and continues to grow rapidly in Lake and McHenry Counties, but the roads haven't even come close to keeping up. Traffic is only going to get worse, as more people are commuting in all directions on our roadways. Where does the long standing proposed 53 extension play into this if the 120 By-pass is created. I hope that our area doesn't turn into just another suburb with mini-malls and chain stores everywhere. If we wanted Schaumburg we would have moved there. There are other options for region wide progressive road improvements which may also be available. Don't be too quick to dismiss other traffic techniques, that may seem foreign to our region, but are very simple, easy, cost-effective alternatives to more highways. For instance, I know that there were studies about the effectiveness of true traffic circles, not the suicide circle as seen on Golf Road in Mount Prospect. These have been shown to be able to handle significant volumes of traffic without the creation of enormous by-passes that may not even resolve much if any of the traffic problems existing today. A study was even funded to show this for the 120 bypass, why is this not being considered? Solutions to our regions traffic overload are possible, but don't think that by creating a new high-cost mini-highway, all or any of our traffic problems will simply go away. Don't forget that there are many arteries to feed into the area and conditions are getting more congested and at times more treacherous, such as IL45 at Casey Road. Lake County is a gem, that many of us chose to move to for many factors, but having a highway running through it, losing pristine wetlands in the hope that East West traffic through the area will move freely. Let's focus on all the areas roads, not just "super-size" one. Thanks again for all the hard work this group has done and I hope that more scenarios to address our area-wide traffic problems will be considered before moving forward with this one.

121. An arterial road could curve around the treasures that are Almond Marsh and other environmentally sensitive areas and preserving them for future generations. The arterial plan with "roundabouts" would also serve the needs for now and many years to come. Additionally it would cost a heck of a lot less than a freeway-type highway and provide greater access to local personal and business needs. The larger scheme would also cut off neighborhoods from communities. The arterial plan would go from concept to production a lot faster. We need a good fix...not another big bucks boondoggle.
122. I am against the current plan for the Route 120 Corridor. It does not make sense to me, will be unsightly and is far too expensive. I am in favor of a 4-lane boulevard, utilizing roundabouts to make intersections more efficient. This will help local businesses retain local traffic and be an attractive asset to the community and a model concept to the nation.
123. The proposal to put a 120 bypass right through the Almond Marsh bird rookery is destructive and short-sighted. This is a precious resource in a county fast being overrun by developers. Remember, it's LAKE County, not Paved County. Let's not turn this area into another Schaumburg. There are alternatives to improve traffic.

124. We are very concerned about the planned 120 bypass. As presently envisioned, the super-sized road will run through the heron rookery at Almond Marsh (visible from 120 on the south side of the road), through ADID wetlands near Campbell Airfield, and through local landmarks like Ziegler's Orchard. An arterial road could curve around these treasures, preserving them. And improved mass transit and intersections, both already in progress, might be sufficient measures alone if given time and support. We are totally against the destruction of the heron rookery at Almond Marsh. This is an important environmental treasure in Lake County! This project needs to be planned carefully to fill all the needs of the residents of Lake County!
125. Please recognize the importance of the heron rookery and other natural areas as planning for the 120 bypass continues. Please seek and carefully consider creative solutions to the traffic problem rather than an "easy" standard solution that will compromise some of what makes Lake County unique and special.
126. I have attended several task force meetings and the current process seems to be directed at creating the appearance of a consensus for a 6 lane limited access highway rather than an open debate regarding the project elements and tradeoffs. This will only lead to the same sort of deadlock we have endured for decades because the route 53 proponents refused to explore rational alternatives. It seems to me that there can be consensus on an arterial that will serve the area residents and the region's requirements. The cost of this plan is far lower than the limited access version so it is more likely to be funded during our lifetimes. The arterial plan includes traffic circles that will aid flow while improving safety. It is also able to skirt the most environmentally sensitive areas. Please, don't try to force a plan that will only fail. Let's work together to find a rational solution. I appreciate your hard work, please don't let it be a waste of valuable time and resources.
127. I am in support of the proposed design and construction of IL Route 120. Please build it.
128. Re: Route 120 Corridor - As a long time resident of Third Lake (20 years) I am certainly familiar with the traffic problems in the county. However, I would like to register my strong opposition to routing the Route 120 ByPass through heron rookery at Almond Marsh and through ADID wetlands near Campbell Airfield. Both of these sensitive areas serve a vital public interest in terms of both wildlife preservation and water filtration. I strongly urge the Planning Council to consider less destructive alternatives.
129. My husband and I are adamantly against the 120 bypass. It appears to be no more than a thinly veiled first phase of the Rt. 53 extension plan. We do not need more roads. We do not need to disrupt more environmentally sensitive areas. We need to repair and expand the existing roadways in a sensible and practical manner. I believe that the Lake County Conservation Alliance represents the best interests of the residents of the involved areas and I support their recommendations.
130. I am strongly opposed to the construction of the proposed 120 bypass. As presently envisioned, the roadway will run through or near and destroy numerous environmentally and culturally valuable sites such as the heron rookery at Almond Marsh, the ADID wetlands near Campbell Airfield and Ziegler's

- Orchard. The ecosystem of these areas will be destroyed or seriously damaged, and the peace and serenity essential to the survival of wildlife (and the psychic restoration of human beings) will be gone forever. There are ways to improve traffic conditions in this area that would not cause this enormous environmental destructiveness. Arterial roads could be constructed to avoid important natural habitat. Traffic circles as they are conceived of by modern planners could move traffic efficiently. Careful planning could alleviate congestion without causing such massive destruction. It is too late in history to destroy our scarce remaining natural habitat so cavalierly. It is too late to believe that building high speed roads will solve our traffic problems when experience teaches that such roads have the opposite effect: they encourage people to drive who otherwise might choose a public transportation option. Let us improve our arterial roads. We will alleviate our traffic congestion to a reasonable extent, and we will leave a smaller footprint on our earth and a better world for our children.
131. Route 120 Council: In the consideration of planning this new highway, do not damage the Almond Marsh or its watershed in any way. Once you pave on or near it, it will be destroyed forever. I favor the use of roundabouts in the intersection planning and would like to see some effort made to bring public transportation into the process. You should be talking to PACE about a bus route down 120 using natural gas or fuel cell buses.
132. I hope you will consider an arterial road that skirts around the Heron Rookery at Almond Marsh and doesn't put a freeway next to people's homes, if a bypass is necessary. The sites for herons and egrets to nest in are dwindling. You would be surprised at how many birds, frogs and other 'critters' (even butterflies) find homes, food and nesting sites in the Marsh.
133. I would like to express my deep concern about the proposal for the route 120 freeway to pass through the heron rookery at Almond Marsh, through wetlands near Campbell Airfield, and through local landmarks such as Ziegler's Orchard. An arterial road could curve around these treasures, preserving them. Furthermore, improved mass transit and intersections, both already in progress, might eliminate the need for a new, expensive freeway if given time and support. Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.
134. I do not believe that this is a good use of public funds and land. I am greatly apposed to building a brand new road when we have existing roads that can be widened and upgraded. Jeopardizing or elimanating areas like Almond Marsh will not improve quality of life. This is what makes Lake County unique. Let's not throw it away.
135. Save the Heron Rookery at all cost. Make 120 an arterial road, that way east bound lanes passing Almond Marsh do not need to be changed substantially. For west bound lanes through Wildwood some properties must be purshased. (If some people do not like congested roads let them move somewhere else.)
136. Although I am normally all for "conserving" as much open space as possible, the traffic situation here (Rtes. 137,120,45) has reach crisis level. I cannot leave my house after 3 p.m. Damn the trees, build us some roads.
137. The proposed Rt. 120 corridor seems to be a highly questionable endeavor on Lake County's part. Not only does it seems that numerous families may be

- displaced by by the construction of a corridor, but wildlife may also be seriously affected. The heron rookery in Almond Marsh would be a considerable loss to Lake County's delicate ecosystem, not only tipping the balance for the wildlife in that area, but soil and water quality, as well. Erosion and flooding could become a large concern if this project is taken up. On the whole, I am greatly opposed to the Rt. 120 corridor plan, as the losses may be greater than the gains.
138. I would like to comment on the proposed Route 120 expansion, since I have just heard that this route would require the destruction of the heron rookery at Almond Marsh. I have been a Cook County birder for quite some time, but only recently discovered this part of Lake County. I've now been there twice myself, and have recommended this area on local birding internet sites. Almond Marsh is an amazing place, and there's far too little wilderness such as this left in our area. Lake County should be celebrating the presence of such a resource in their area, not planning for its destruction. If the environmental and aesthetic incentives to preserve wildlife habitat are not sufficient (though they should be), the economic impact of attractions such as Almond Marsh that bring visitors to the area should be considered. From my experiences alone, consider that we purchased food and gas at local businesses during both visits.
139. Just a quick comment. I agree that improvements need to be made to traffic flow through 120. But I'd really like to see portions of 120 widened instead of the expense and environmental impacts of a new road. Please at least consider widening portions (perhaps the eastern most portion) and not disturb the herons or open space of the forest preserve. Not sure if this is feasible but if you must consider a bypass what about starting the bypass near 83 (not sure what the black and white dotted line on the maps is indicating that this is a consideration). That way you can also avoid doing so much reconfiguration at the 45/120 intersection. Nobody wants to look at overpasses out their front window. Also please consider the fact that in a bypass scenario many people would go around Grayslake businesses instead of driving through and stopping to visit. In my opinion that is NOT what our business need. Consider consulting other small towns with a bypass and what it has done to the businesses that were "bypassed".
140. Any new Route 120 roadway alignment should not be an expressway, it should not be a raised road, it should be construction at-grade, and it should not go through 2 wetlands areas in the study area.
141. We would like to submit our comments on the Route 120 expansion for consideration. We acknowledge that there are traffic congestion issues in all of Lake county. However, as residents of the area that abutts 120, we are concerned by several things. One of the reasons that we chose to live in this area was because of the available open spaces and preserves. We love to walk and play in Independence Grove, Almond Marsh, and all of the other areas in the County. We want to voice our opinion that as the planning process moves forward, the council should make every effort to find a compromise between traffic relief and protection of our open and ecologically sensitive areas. To that end, we would prefer that options that involve utilizing the existing Route 120 be favored.
142. Widening the existing road would have less impact environmentally, would be less expensive, and would be more friendly to the neighboring

communities. Additionally, if a new mall is built on the Lake County Fairgrounds, widening the existing 120 would provide traffic access to the mall. It makes no financial sense to build a bypass that bypasses commercial development. We appreciate your consideration and hope that you will act in response to the local constituents who will be affected as well as in defense of our open spaces.

143. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. See no mention of plans, along with the 120 Now project, to remediate the already serious backups Eastbound mornings, West of tollway, due to folks backed up getting on the southbound tollway. When that happens, folks going straight at the Tollway, crawl (maybe a traffic cop with a flag telling them to keep it moving, FULL TIME!) past the folks getting on the tollway from the point where the right lane traffic is stopped. Every once in a while I've seen a creep put his turn signal on, in the left lane, holding up folks who want to go straight, while waiting to get in the front of the line to take the tollway, right at the Tollway. My belief is most of those are cheating creeps who know of the backup, just think they're too good to wait in it. Such deserve to be NOT let in by the folks in line who've been there for a quarter mile, except, he's holding me up getting to Green Bay Road! It would seem that, that eastbound backup, which I have seen under Milwaukee avenue, would be a LOT worse after the proposed 120 project. In fact, I bet folks wanting to exit 120 to Milwaukee Avenue will be waiting way back, their lot will be worse than it is now, also. For those of us wanting to proceed on 120 east past the tollway (the stated east boundary of the project is Green Bay Road), what is your proposal that we do? When Last I saw that back-up for the Tollway, I was heading to points South and East of the intersection of 120 and Green Bay Road. It would seem if 120 is still only two lanes East of start of current four lane section, that the 120 now project will turn out to be just a big funnel to the worst backups in Lake County history. In other words, the backups will be worse for folks living near the Eastern junction of the 120 now and the current 120, by funneling lots of folks from farther West into an existing backup, which will be much worse AGAIN, when things are down from current two lanes to one, to then fix that issue after-the-fact. Seems like Eastbound 120, West of the Tollway, should be widened to three lanes, with a fourth lane from the Des Plaines River East to Tollway.

144. From Des Plaines River East, the two right lanes be for Tollway entrance only, with frequent enforcement for them NOT to stop to block River Road traffic both directions. As much as I hate them, maybe an eventual traffic signal at River Road and 120. Such a widening of 120 from Tollway West on Eastbound side, should begin same time 120 Now begins, to be finished together, or there may be some Tar & Featherin' by folks whose commute got longer instead of shorter, with a lot of buildup and promises. It would likely squelch future citizen agreement to such projects, which will enhance traffic flow, and quality of life if done thoroughly, if the new extension turns out to be a parking lot causing the folks on it to be in traffic LONGER than before! Would appreciate hearing the committee's response to this, I won't be at the meeting, thank you.

145. It never ceases to amaze me what people will cheerfully destroy in the name of "Progress." By the actions outlined in your proposal, you are intending to

destroy much of what I moved to Lake Country to bring into my life. This is not progress, this is perfidy at its purest; a lovely, evocative word meaning "a treacherous breach of trust". I was lured to Lake Country by the promise of "small town values" and "country living." Waiting until after people have invested their lives and life savings to build home and community is not the time to announce that you intend to drop an elevated highway 300 yards from their front door. If there was ever a window of opportunity for this scheme, it has long since closed. So--you want my opinion? I am vehemently opposed to this action. Do not do this. Please do NOT destroy the heron rookery in Almond Marsh. There are millions of miles of roads, but proportionately few Great Blue Herons. I vastly prefer to sustain existing heron habitats than to gain five minutes in travel time. Please do NOT create a new roadway veering South through the rookery and ploughing through what is now open land and wetland bordering the Prairie Crossing subdivision and Lake Forest hospital. To do so would be an intolerable invasion of my neighborhood and home. If you take this action, I will be forced to move and take my (considerable) disposable income and tax contribution out of Lake County and into Wisconsin. I will make it a point to purchase nothing--not a stick of gum nor an ice cube--in this county. (And since the thought of moving my home rates only slightly higher on my list of unpleasant events than enduring a triple root canal, I hope you appreciate the strength of my feelings.) Please DO consider simply widening Route 120 to four lanes to Route 83, then creating an underpass under 83, veering South through the unpopulated land west of 83. If new roadways must be created, think "under", not "over". Raising roads increases noise and light pollution, and frankly, a stream of cars flowing past my window is offensive to the eye, ear and nostril. Again, I moved out of Cook county to get away from this sort of chaos. If you must bring cars through this area, bury them. Please DO consider the "trickle" traffic flow concept, as opposed to the idea of "surge" traffic flow. Consider widening several smaller East-West roads to carry traffic through the county rather than slabbing out a single behemoth highway. No, you won't be able to use that plan to open the door for a Route 53 extension, but since that's another vile, lifestyle- and habitat-degrading idea, I would shed no tears over seeing the 53 extension concept in a deep and permanent grave. We have been repeatedly presented with the notion that our roads and schools are inadequate for our burgeoning population--that this is "the problem" for which we "must" give up our lifestyle. I'd like to suggest that it's just as valid to posit that construction of high-density housing is creating the inadequacy, and that an equally viable solution would be to severely restrict construction of high-density housing. I have no particular desire to entice multitudes of people to Lake Country. I have no desire to see a huge increase in population density. Constructing 50 townhomes (read: 100+ cars) on a double wide lot may make a select few investors a considerable amount of money, but perhaps, in terms of road use and schools, it isn't the brightest idea for the majority of the population. Growth run amok is not "progress"--it's cancer. Preventing this "disease" is much easier and less expensive than attempting to accommodate it, much less encourage it. There are times when ingenuity and radical thought are more desirable than the obvious, simplistic answer. If we are to preserve the lifestyle we Lake Countians

- have come to cherish AND create more efficient means of transportation--and please note that I said "more efficient", not just "more"--the time for ingenuity is now. Please, please, please--entertain more subtle responses to this endeavor than the one you are currently proposing!
146. I am pleased to see any form of action being taken to improve conditions along Rt. 120. Years before we ever moved to Grayslake, we heard of plans to reroute the road, but nothing was ever done. We live in the West Trail subdivision, and it is impossible to turn left from West Trail onto 120. I will drive out of my way to avoid making that turn. I'm also very concerned about emergency vehicles driving that route. When traffic gets snarled, it forces ambulances and fire trucks to crawl along at a snail pace. I worry about the victims getting help soon enough--will a heart attack patient get to the hospital in time? I don't want to see years and years worth of hearings and impact studies that result in nothing being done. A new 120 needs to be built, and it needs to begin as soon as possible. It's no longer an issue of convenience, but a matter of safety and a better quality of life.
147. Why is it necessary to build a bypass 120? As a resident of Wildwood, I would much rather see the existing Rt 120 widened. There is no need to build a bypass.
148. I understand the need for an improved traffic corridor in central Lake County. However, the rapid pace of development in flood plains also underscores the need to protect the relatively few wetlands that remain in the area. Areas like Almond Marsh and the wetlands complex by the Northbrook Gun Club are very important, not only for the environment, but for human needs. It is important to find a corridor that can move traffic without increasing the flood risk that we all face and without further destroying what few high-quality ecological areas still remain in central Lake County.
149. I would like to request that when you consider the 120 Bypass that you NOT use the Route 53 concept that will go directly through the Almond Marsh Forest Preserve and other key natural resources. Please consider the ecological impact this route would have to the quality of life the this already overcrowded area. I realize we need this extension and am all for it. I would just strongly object to the route chosen and beg you to consider another route - one that would solve the problems of traffic congestion in a less obtrusive way. Thank you.