



Route 120 CPC Governance Board
Meeting Minutes
March 8, 2006
6:30-7:33 p.m
Round Lake Police/Public Works Facility
741/751 W. Townline Road, Round Lake, IL

Call to order: Mayor Bill Gentes, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

I. Pledge of Allegiance

Moment of Silence for the late Round Lake Park Mayor Ila Bauer.

II. Roll Call

County Board Members:

- Chairman Suzi Schmidt
- Larry Leafblad
- Sandy Cole
- Bonnie Thomson Carter
- Diana O'Kelly

Municipalities:

- Grayslake Mayor Tim Perry
- Volo Mayor Burnell Russell
- Round Lake Park Acting Mayor Jean McCue
- Hainesville Mayor Ted Mueller
- Waukegan Mayor Richard Hyde
- Round Lake Mayor Gentes
- Wauconda Mayor Salvatore Saccomanno
- Mundelein Trustee Ed Sullivan
- Gurnee Mayor Kristina Kovarik
- Libertyville Mayor Jeffrey Harger

Staff:

- Dave Young, President of Lake County Partners

III. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 11, 2006 CPC GOVERNANCE BOARD MINUTES –

Request motion to approve minutes.

MOTION: To approve January 11, 2006 CPC Governance Board Minutes

MOTION BY: Bonnie Thomson-Carter

SECOND BY: Tim Perry

DISCUSSION: none

ACTION: passed

IV. ADD-TO AGENDA – Bill Gentes – nothing was added.

ROUTE 120 BYPASS CORRIDOR PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF 3/8/06

V. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS – Bill Gentes

- **Request a Motion to establish guidelines governing public comment:**
Proposed: There will be public comment at the start and end of the meeting and during the discussion on action items. In all cases, each individual's comments are limited to 3 minutes. The chair can limit the overall length of public comment on an action item, curtail comment by an individual if it is redundant and limit it to comment vs. Q&A.
MOTION: To establish public comment guidelines as submitted
MOTION BY: Jean McCue
SECOND BY: Larry Leafblad
DISCUSSION: none
ACTION: passed

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

George Ranney asked about the public comment section of the meeting minutes of January 11, 2006 where he was quoted regarding the level of service to be established – he hoped that his recommendation be accepted and reflected – he does not see that it is being worked in.

Dave Young explained that his recommendation was accepted and would be incorporated in the draft bylaws. The bylaws are still going through the legal review by cities, municipalities, and the County. The bylaws will then be brought before the CPC for final approval.

Sandy Cole indicated that the bylaws are not on the agenda for this meeting, but as was reflected in the January meeting minutes, the bylaws are to be on the agenda for a future meeting.

Bill Holleman asked if the alternative plan that was in the newspaper today is to be discussed tonight. (Belvedere Boulevard - the roundabout plan)

The Chairman replied that it would be discussed since it is on the agenda and reassured the public that the long range intention is to entertain all alternatives. The process would be that a presentation will be made to the Task Forces, the chairs of the task force will present the results of that presentation to the Steering Committee who will then present to the Governance Board.

Sandy Cole pointed out that the topic is indeed on the agenda as item 9.3.

Marty Buehler confirmed that roundabouts per se were part of his presentation.

Susan Zingle commented that she wanted to be assured that this whole effort is not to have the Route 53 project come alive again – those efforts have failed twice in the past. It failed because it was a bad idea. It was environmentally damaging and also divided communities. The monies and efforts for this project ought not to be wasted. She encouraged the CPC to go forward with a fresh mind with everyone's support that is present and to pursue alternatives.

ROUTE 120 BYPASS CORRIDOR PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF 3/8/06

Mr. Mike Sands, Executive Director of the Liberty Prairie Foundation, stated that he has forwarded the Belvedere Boulevard's technical report to the Technical Task Force. Christopher Burke Engineering, the engineering firm that completed the study, has indicated they are available to make a presentation to the CPC.

Cheryl Doros, Chairman of the Lake County Soil and Water Conservation District, said that her district conducts comprehensive natural resource inventories providing a complete picture of natural resources on and near a property. She voiced her district's disappointment that they were not included in the CPC's distribution of the application of interest form. By the time they sent it in, the position was filled. If the Environmental/Stormwater Issues Task Force assessments provide detailed information and recommendations in layman's language, their participation can provide the most understandable resource.

Wayne Steigerwald, a resident of Round Lake, commented that he is very glad to see the CPC will take stormwater and environmental concerns into consideration, he does not like the idea of a major highway going through Madrona Village.

VII. STEERING COUNCIL/TASK FORCE REPORTS

7.1 Steering Council – Marty Buehler

- **Request a motion to nominate and elect Mike Warner, Chair of the Environmental/Stormwater Task Force**

MOTION: To nominate and elect Mike Warner, Chair of the Environmental/Stormwater Task Force

MOTION BY: Bonnie Thomson Carter

SECOND BY: Larry Leafblad

DISCUSSION: none

ACTION: passed

- **Steering Council's Guiding Purpose and Principles**
Guiding Purpose: complete a feasibility study that paves the way for a federally eligible Phase 1 Study; build consensus for the recommended alternative and road characteristics; secure an agreement on land use in the corridor.

Marty Buehler said that he would expound on the Guiding Principles and the Tasks of every Task Force. He then named the Chairs:

Land Use, Economic Development & Governmental Impacts Task Force
- **Dennis Sandquist**, Deputy Director of the Lake County Planning and Development

Technical Issues Task Force - **Marty Buehler**, Head of the Lake County Transportation

Environmental/Stormwater Issues Task Force - **Mike Warner**, Chief Engineer Stormwater Management Commission

Public Information Task Force - **Debbie Fliehman**, President and Owner of Creative Technical Resources

ROUTE 120 BYPASS CORRIDOR PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF 3/8/06

The Steering Council

- Comprised of the 4 Task Force Chairs and an IDOT Representative
- Provides overall feasibility study direction to the Governance Board
- Presentations will be made to the committees; the committees' chairs will present the committee's findings to the Steering Council, who will then sift through the information/ideas and present their recommendations to the Governance Board
- A consultant should be on board within 45-60 days from the state grant's contract being finalized by the parties. This consultant's cost will be driven by the grant's scope of work and deliverables. There may be no additions to this contract, so the role of the Steering Council is to ensure this work is produced on time and within the budget.
- The Feasibility Study will pave the way for a federally eligible Phase 1 Study which will note the consensus for the recommended alternative, character of the road and an agreement on land use to protect the Corridor.

Guiding Principles:

1. Undertake and complete an 18-month Feasibility Study within budget.
2. Defined Study Area:
 - **Termini:** East - Greenbay Road (Waukegan); West - McHenry County Line (Lakemoor);
 - **Limits of Analysis:** ½ mile north/south of existing route 120 centerline - west of Wilson Road to the McHenry County line and East of Almond Road to Greenbay Road in Waukegan; ½ mile north of existing route 120 centerline and ¾ mile south of Proposed LCTIP Route 120 Centerline - Almond Road to Wilson Road.
3. Traffic Improvement should handle projected 2030 demands, *with or without Route 53* – based on traffic modeling of projected 2030 population and employment.
4. Define Land Use & Environmental/Stormwater Study area -above defined study area.
5. Evaluate the alternatives – improvements to the existing roadway and variations of a new alignment.
6. Determine the character of a road that meets capacity requirements (Level of Service "D" for arterials, LOS C for expressways):
 - Will it be a Controlled-Access Expressway or a Limited-Access Boulevard?
 - Will it be at grade with traditional intersections, roundabouts or continuous flow intersections or grade separated interchanges?
 - Will it have railroad grade separations?
 - Will it handle traffic flows at 45 mph, 55 mph or 70 mph?
 - Will there be access points between major intersections?
7. Develop an estimated cost to build and evaluate financing options.
8. Frame Feasibility Study's policy issues and present them to the Governance Board.
9. Recommend to the Governance Board the strategy they could pursue to get the recommended improvement funded.

ROUTE 120 BYPASS CORRIDOR PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF 3/8/06

10. Recommend to the Governance Board a strategy they could pursue to protect the land use in the study area; which will in part be determined by the recommended transportation alternative.
11. Bottomline: Determine what is technically feasible and publicly supported.
12. Look at big picture items, broad concepts, save the drill downs for the Phase 1.

Mr. Buehler indicated that this is a Feasibility Study, a pre-phase one. The job of the Steering Council is to make sure that the task forces stay on track because of the tendency to get bogged down in details.

7.2 Technical Task Force

Purpose:

Determine the technical aspects of the transportation alternatives, such as the character of the facility and projected usage. Cost out the alternatives.

Chair: Marty Buehler

7.3 Land Use, Economic Development, Municipal Impact Task Force–**Purpose:**

Based on the transportation alternatives, determine the appropriate compatible land uses. Recommend a “corridor preservation plan” and integrated land uses for the chosen transportation alternative. Recommend the implementation strategy the Governance Board should pursue to effect the land use recommendations for the corridor.

Chair: Dennis Sandquist

1. The Task Force has 8 members.
2. One of their tasks is to create a detailed land use inventory of existing development in the defined study area. Developments that are in the approval processes will also be inventoried. The development report will be used to identify the corridor’s barriers, opportunities and constraints.
3. Another task is to aggregate the Municipal and County comprehensive land use plans to develop a composite future land use scenario for the Corridor. All the communities in the defined study area will be contacted to ensure that the Task Force has their most current planning documents.

His Task Force has created a 120 Bypass contact list and it is included in the Governance Board’s copy of his report. He asked the members of the Governance Board to provide feedback on this list – whether to add a contact or change a contact. The task force will prepare an integrated Land Use Plan for the Corridor’s proposed transportation alternatives.

7.4 Environmental/Stormwater Impacts Task Force –

Purpose:

To ensure that environmental information on the wetlands, floodplains and other environmental assets in the corridor are appropriately considered in the determinations of the transportation and land use recommendations.

Chair: Mike Warner

ROUTE 120 BYPASS CORRIDOR PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF 3/8/06

Mr. Warner indicated that all of the members were present for the first meeting of his Task Force. They commenced with a listing of the GIS layers that were available to the regional planning process and applied them to a map similar to the map on display here. Each layer was evaluated and it was determined several layers needed to be added. Further details are disclosed in the meeting minutes such as: threatened endangered species locations, Illinois nature inventory sites, and also the IEPA stream designations (IPA studies all streams and rates them as "A" being the best and "D" being worst). Those streams that are within the layers will be added to the product that will be distributed to his Task Force. At the March 29th meeting they will review the results of all of the analysis and he will then provide that analysis to subsequent CPC Board.

7.5 Public Information Task Force

Purpose:

To insure the public has access to the facts about the CPC, its activities, its progress and has input to the feasibility study. In addition, this group will collect input from the corridor's mayors, county board members, businesses, property owners, residents and members of the general public on the alignment of the improvement, character of the road and land use.

Chair: Debbie Fliehman

Ms. Fliehman named the members of her Task Force: Al Giertych - Lake Co. Dept. of Transportation, John Lyday- Lake Co. Head of Communication, David Motley - Head of Public Relations and Communication for the City of Waukegan, Susan Zingle - public member and Susan Vancil, Public Information Coordinator, Lake County Stormwater Management Commission. She indicated that her Task Force's purpose and minutes are available tonight (table at entrance).

Public Information Task force tasks:

- Divided out the responsibilities and several meetings will be held: one will be with all the Task Force Chairs to ensure that the information that is shared among themselves and everything that is made public is accurate, current, and consistent.
- Will organize meetings grouped geographically along the Corridor.
- Will meet with all of the mayors to find out what type of communication vehicles they have to ensure that each community is informed on a timely basis.
- Will be collecting information to ensuring that it is ongoing and updated.
- Will be requesting the CPC to inform her Task Force with updated information at all times especially if any member is making a public appearance.
- A set of press releases will be developed.
- A website will be developed to contain as much information as possible such as maps, agendas, minutes and press releases.

Ms. Cole asked that if in the interim, the minutes and agendas are to be provided through the Lake County Partners website.

Mr. Young indicated that LCP would continue to post agendas and minutes on their website. He also said that funds are being raised currently to support the 120 CPC website which would house all information for the 120 CPC.

ROUTE 120 BYPASS CORRIDOR PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF 3/8/06

MOTION: To approve Steering Council's Guiding Purpose and Principles and Task Forces Purposes as submitted and/or amended

MOTION BY: Mayor Mueller

SECOND BY: Mayor Perry

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Evan Craig asked about Guiding Purpose #3, "with Route 53." The Chair and Mr. Buehler indicated that the State required the CPC to look at what facilities are in the Regional Plan.

Mr. Pete Harmet of IDOT explained that the IL 53 Extension proposal is in the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan as well as the County plan. Therefore, a question that needs to be answered as part of this study is how the alternatives handle traffic with and without the full 2030 network in place. Mr. Harmet further indicated that he had no idea what the results of that analysis would be, and that ultimately, the recommendation from this study would be an alternative that is both technically and politically feasible.

Mr. Jim Plant, with the Sierra Club, asked if a water biologist was on board with the Environmental/Stormwater Impacts Task Force.

Mr. George Ranney asked if he could suggest volunteers for the committees.

Mr. Buehler stated that he recognized the fact that people wanted to continue to suggest volunteers, however, the Task Forces have been selected, a product needs to be completed and since these are all open meetings, the public is welcome. Mr. Buehler requested to the Governance Board to keep the structure as it is as that was the understanding when the chairs volunteered to undertake this work

Mrs. Thomson Carter asked Mr. Warner if the Lake Co. Health Dept. volunteered. Mr. Warner replied that he was unsure, but that Jeff Mengler with the U.S. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife Service should be able to address the concerns on aquatics.

Mrs. Thomson Carter pointed out that just because an issue cannot be addressed by a Task Force, an outside source can be brought in to assist as necessary.

Mr. Ranney made a suggestion on how to handle Mr. Evan Craig's concern on the reference of Route 53 and the land use language, he suggested the language be removed, if not removed, a lot of people will feel betrayed.

He further suggested that the text "based on transportation alternatives" be removed from the Land Use/Economic Development Task Force's Statement of Purpose - land use planning should be integrated with the evaluation of the transportation alternatives to determine the best economical development that has the proper access.

ROUTE 120 BYPASS CORRIDOR PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF 3/8/06

Ms. Cole indicated that with agendas being made public, other organizations can send their representative to the various meetings.

Mr. Young replied that all of the meetings are public and are posted publicly. He further stated that once the individuals sign in at the meetings – their email address will be added for distribution lists for minutes and agendas.

Mr. Leafblad suggested that he would make a motion to revise the verbiage regarding Route 53 because he believed that by removing those words, the meaning would still be the same.

The Board discussed it briefly and concluded that IDOT will still study what it needs to whether the words Route 53 are included in the verbiage or not.

Mr. Bill Holleman, a member of the Environmental/ Stormwater Impacts Task Force commented that the ESI purpose limits the environmental information to the Corridor. He recommended that the environmental impacts outside the Corridor be analyzed. The effects on air is of concern. He suggested amending the text to state from “other assets in the Corridor” and replace with “other assets affected by the roadway.”

Mr. Buehler addressed the suggestion indicating that this was discussed by the ESI Task Force and they made their recommendation to the Steering Council the way it stands.

Mr. Warner added that the Corridor study area covers a large area on either side of the proposed alternatives and the ESI Task Force believed the area to be sufficient. He did not want to recommend changes to what already has been approved by the Steering Council.

Mrs. Thomson Carter recommended that the Steering Council sift through the many ideas presented tonight and recommend to the Governance Board which of the proposed language changes should be adopted.

Mrs. Cole made a motion to table the approval of the Steering Council’s recommended Guiding Purpose and Principles and the Task Forces’ recommended Purposes until the Task Forces revisited them based on tonight’s comments. No one seconded. Motion failed.

Tim Latta, commented on the fact that he did not find information on the Lake County Partners website and asked about the timing of the 120 website.

Ms. Fliehman, Chair of the Public Information Task Force, answered that once the website is up, all of the agendas, minutes and meeting schedules will be posted there. She indicated they just conducted their first meeting on March 2, 2006. Another constraint is that funding is still being secured.

It was clarified that with the approval of this motion, amendments may be recommended by the Steering Council to the Governance Board for approval at their next meeting.

ROUTE 120 BYPASS CORRIDOR PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF 3/8/06

The motion was restated:

MOTION: To approve Steering Council's Guiding Purpose and Principles and Task Forces Purposes as submitted and/or amended

MOTION BY: Mayor Mueller

SECOND BY: Mayor Perry

ROLL CALL:

County Board Members:

Larry Leafblad

Sandy Cole

Bonnie Thomson Carter

Municipalities:

Grayslake Mayor Tim Perry

Round Lake Park Acting Mayor Jean McCue

Hainesville Mayor Ted Mueller

Round Lake Mayor Gentes

Wauconda Mayor Salvatore Saccomanno

Mundelein Trustee Ed Sullivan

ACTION: Carries

VIII. DISCUSS PROPOSED PROJECT SCHEDULE/MILESTONES

Mr. Young stated that a revised schedule incorporating the individual task forces, steering council and Governance Board meeting dates, tasks and deliverables will be presented at the next Governance Board Meeting in May.

IX. ROUTE 120 BYPASS/NEW APPROACHES

Mr. Harmet presented information regarding past study efforts by IDOT in the IL 120 corridor. Before beginning, however, Mr. Harmet offered some further clarification regarding the definition of a feasibility study, since there seemed to be much discussion about the appropriate level of study detail. Mr. Harmet indicated that a Feasibility Study is a study to see if something is worth being studied further. Therefore, a very broad level of study detail is appropriate.

Mr. Harmet then continued with a description of past study efforts in the IL 120 corridor, which included the 1995 SRA (Strategic Regional Arterial) study, and the 1998-2002 LCTIP (Lake County Transportation Improvement Project).

9.1 1995 SRA Study

- Strategic Regional Arterial (SRA) Studies are not detailed Phase I Studies. It is a concept level study, and can be used as a template for future roadway improvements, and a planning tool.
- The Route 120 SRA study, which was initiated in 1995, included project limits were Route 12 to Route 41
- The recommendations from the study included a 6 lanes roadway running east from Route 12 to I-94
- A four lane roadway was proposed from I-94 to Route 41

ROUTE 120 BYPASS CORRIDOR PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF 3/8/06

- Other features included:
 - Non-mountable medians
 - At grade intersections
 - Overpass at the railroads
 - A 300 foot wide right of way (ROW) from US 12 to I-94
 - A 150 foot wide right of way (ROW) from I-94 to US 41.

9.2 LCTIP

The Lake County Transportation Improvement Project was a study of transportation alternatives over a large area, and was intended to be conducted in two parts. Part One, or Tier One, was a broad study, following the format of an EIS (Environmental Impact Statement). The purpose of Tier One was to identify a preferred set of improvements. Part two, or Tier Two, would be a detailed analysis (also an EIS) of the preferred alternative. Mr. Harmet then further described some of the features of the Tier One process:

- Assembled a Geographic Information System (GIS) data base – over 80 layers from 19 different public sources (used to analyze environmental impacts)
- Used a Travel Demand Model to analyze the transportation performance of a wide array of roadway improvement options over a large study area
- Included an extensive public involvement program

Mr. Harmet then described base line improvements, which were a set of roadway and transit improvements that were common to each of the alternatives that were assumed to be in place by the year 2020. The LCTIP study resulted in two finalist alternatives, and a Draft EIS was circulated for public comment and Public Hearings were held in the fall of 2001. The two finalist alternatives were then described, with a focus on the improvements associated with each alternative in the IL 120 corridor:

The IL 53 Freeway/Tollway Finalist included a north extension of IL 53, from Lake Cook Road to the IL 120 corridor, and connected to a new/reconstructed east west roadway along the IL 120 corridor, from US 12 to Greenleaf Street.

- Proposed IL 120 Corridor improvements:
 - Widen existing IL 120 to four lanes, from Fish Lake Road Wilson Road
 - Construct new alignment from Wilson to west of Route 83 – 4 lane access controlled highway
 - From West of IL 83 to Greenleaf Street – 6 lane highway - access controlled with grade separations and interchanges (new alignment from west of IL 83 to Almond Road).

The IL 83/US 45 Finalist included four major improvement corridors (US 12, IL 83/US 45, IL 21 and I-94). Bypasses of downtown Mundelein and Libertyville were also included.

- IL 120 Corridor Improvements
 - Widen existing IL 120 to four lanes, from Hainesville Road to Alleghany Road
 - Construct new alignment from Allegheny to Almond Road
 - Overpass at Railroad

ROUTE 120 BYPASS CORRIDOR PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF 3/8/06

9.3 Roundabouts

Mr. Buehler presented the roundabout concept:

By Year 2030, the County's population is expected to grow and additional 200,000 residents. The critical need is the ability to finance the Bypass.

What is being presented is only for presentation purposes, but the ideas will be worked on further by the consultant that is expected to join the CPC. Therefore no decisions will be made tonight.

- Financing
 - If users are to be charged, access control is needed
 - Interchanges and Intersections – new ways of collecting
 - I-Pass – no interchanges would not be needed
 - No interchanges – lower cost and lower level of service
- ROSI (Regular Old Signalized Intersections)
 - High volume intersections similar to Route 41
 - Entrance sign an issue
- Roundabouts (not a traffic circle)
 - Not rotaries – rotaries are bigger with speeds of 40 to 50 miles per hour
 - Roundabouts are popular in Europe
 - Smaller in size than rotaries; slower in speed and safer
 - Can be bigger
 - Lock up with high volume near capacity
 - Federal Highway Authority promotes them
 - Lake County needs to construct a roundabout so that it can be experienced
 - Currently, Lake County has 3 small single lane Roundabouts in Phase 1
 - Computer simulations were presented; FHWA provided the computer simulation for the roundabouts
 - Single lane
 - One lane going around the center island
 - Buses and trucks can drive through easily
 - Higher volumes would mean stacking on the approaches
 - 2 lanes
 - Freeway exits with ramp terminals – very successful in Colorado
 - Multi lanes
 - Questions from the Audience: Answers
 - Pedestrians cross at approaches using refuge islands – outside of the circle
 - How do you compare the capacity to a signalized intersection?
 - The study would use traffic modeling to determine:
 - How much demand is expected to be generated?
 - Specific modeling will be done of intersections with various scenarios.
 - Existing data depicts roundabouts as very successful

ROUTE 120 BYPASS CORRIDOR PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF 3/8/06

- Can a roundabout be designed for a certain amount of traffic and compared with the same level of traffic with a signalized intersection?
 - Hard to determine – depends on the amount of traffic
 - Depends on the amount of turns
- Emergency vehicles, trucks and school buses can get around due to the special truck aid which is mountable curb.

9.4 Continuous Flow Intersections (CFI)

Signalized intersection

- What causes delays at traffic signals?
- More traffic requires more phases
- A phase is a green movement
- More phases – more signals
- Overlapping the phase
 - Overlap is a green movement at the same time
 - Meant for high volumes
- Low cost replacement for interchanges
- Accommodates entrance signing
- Side street access control is needed

Some possible application could be at Arlington Heights Road/Lake Cook Rd and the intersections along Route 41

- FHWA provided the computer simulation for CFI
- T intersection
- Left turning traffic turns flows across the street
- Access control is needed for the right turn lane
- Moves traffic without an interchange
- Partial on one of the roadways
- Crosses the same as the T intersection
- Full CFI – all 4 lanes – operates as the partial, but on all lanes.

Mrs. Thomson Carter asked if CFI's would require more ROW.

Mr. Buehler responded that it would have to be studied.

Ms. Cole asked that in the case of a commercial use located at a CFI location – how the egress and ingress would work.

Mr. Buehler responded that it would have to be carefully planned to address. Some developments would have an access closer to the development and another access further away from the intersection and the development.

Signage

- I-Pass – an example of a sign would be “Belvedere Boulevard – I-Pass Users Only”
- An interchange is very easy to sign
- Signalized intersection would be indicated if it is an I-Pass only right turn.

Roundabout

- Signing will be on all lanes as well as an I-Pass only sign

**ROUTE 120 BYPASS CORRIDOR PLANNING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES OF 3/8/06**

CFI

- o Separate signing

Conclusion

Land use, traffic flow, and operating characteristics along with other factors such as impervious areas will all be considered when evaluating the alternatives.

X. Public Comments

None was made.

XI. ADJOURN

MOTION: To adjourn the meeting at 7:33 p.m.

MOTION BY: Mayor Perry

SECONDED BY: Larry Leafblad

DISCUSSION: None

Approved:

Mayor Bill Gentes, Chairman

Martha Koechig, Recording Secretary