



Technical Task Force

Meeting Minutes

April 4, 2006

2:30 – 4 pm

Lake DOT

600 W. Winchester Rd.

Libertyville, IL 60048

1.0 Roll Call

- √ Buehler, Marty, Chair (Lake DOT)
- √ Ellis, Mike (Village of Grayslake)
- √ Harmet, Peter (IDOT)
- √ Peterson, Bambridge (Village of Round Lake)
- √ Quick, Dan (Village of Wauconda)
- E Richartz, Cindy (Abbott Laboratories)
- E Ziegler, David (Village of Gurnee)

Public: Cheryl Doros, SWCD; Susan Zingle, LCCA

Staff: David Young, LCP; Russell Medley, LCP

2.0 Public Comment

No public comment

3.0 3-1-06 Meeting Minutes Approval

Motion: To approve the 3-1-06 meeting minutes

Motion By: Dan Quick

Seconded By: Peter Harmet

Discussion: None

Motion Passed: Unanimous

4.0 Short Term Tasks

4.1 Chair's Comments

- Need to be patient for the work from the other Task Forces
 - For Viable alternatives and competing plans
 - For Potential for business development
 - For water/sewer lines for development

4.2 Status of Assembling Previous Information for the Future Consultant

Pete Harmet-Peter was tasked with assembling information resources including the LCTIP (Lake County Transportation Improvement Project) reports and the Strategic Regional Arterial (SRA) report which recommended that 120 be turned into a 6 lane highway. Peter did point out that the environmental impacts of using the existing Route 120 roadway as the basis for SRA's recommend expansion were more negative.

Susan Zingle pointed out that several environmental organizations had analyzed LCTIP's information and found different conclusions. No formal response had been provided to the organizations who noted the differences. Since no formal response was prepared, Susan asked whether this invalidated the process and the information contained in the LCTIP reports. Peter responded that the information is a matter of public record and could be used as research background. Chairman Buehler noted that the new 2030 CATS (Chicago Area Transportation Study) demographic information would be used as the basis for any study undertaken by the Rte. 120 Corridor Planning Council.

4.3 Introduce LCDOT Project Management Team – Chairman Buehler introduced members of the LCDOT staff that would be working on the Route 120 CPC project study.

- Mike Zemaitis for RFP and Project Plan
- Chuck Gleason for Project Management of the Feasibility Study Consultant
- Bruce Christensen for Liaison to Land Use Task Force

4.4 Work to Date on Project Plan - Mike Zemaitis - LCDOT staff have taken the "Project Schedule" prepared by David Young, Lake County Partners, and put in LCDOT's project management software program. Mike demonstrated how LCDOT staff would track and manage the feasibility study in the interim until the consultant is on board.

4.5 Possible Invited Presenters for Future Meetings

McHenry County- LCDOT staff met with Joe Korpalski, McHenry County DOT's Chief Engineer to discuss how McHenry County has handled the two feasibility studies that they have completed. Mr. Korpalski noted the following:

- To be successful, strong leadership on the committee from elected officials is essential,
- Need a consultant who can translate technical transportation jargon into simple English that a broader audience can understand,
- Need to stay on message,
- IDOT should have a strong presence on the study committee, and,
- Need continuous interaction and communication with effected communities. Local communities need the information gathered by the study committee so that they can utilize the information for their local municipal plans.

ARTBA/Financing Options Expert – Chairman Buehler noted that they would be contacting experts at the ARTBA (American Road and Transportation Builders Association) for information about financing alternatives for the construction of the 120 Bypass. He also noted that he would possibly be attending the Public Private Partnership Summit scheduled for April 19-21 in Chicago to learn more about how public private partnerships (ppp) can be utilized to finance transportation improvements.

4.6 Opportunities and challenges report.

The Task Force discussed the **functional classifications of roads** (Arterial, Collector, Local) connecting to existing Route 120 corridor and the interchanges/intersection that would be impacted:

- Green Bay Rd. intersection– arterial
- Rte. 41/Rte. 43 interchange – arterial
- Greenleaf Rd interchange – collector

- O'Plaine Rd. intersection – arterial
- I-94 interchange – expressway
- River Road intersection – collector
- 21/Milwaukee Ave. interchange – arterial
- Almond Rd. intersection (north of 120-collector but connection has not yet been constructed; local; south of 120 –collector)
- Rte. 45 intersection – arterial
- Atkinson Rd. intersection –collector (eventually merges into Rte. 83-arterial)
- Lake St. intersection – collector
- Alleghany Rd. intersection – arterial
- Hainesville Rd. intersection – arterial
- Route 134 intersection – arterial
- Porter Rd. intersection – collector
- Old Curran Rd. intersection– collector
- Cedar Lake Rd. intersection – arterial
- Bacon Rd. arterial (plans call for Bacon Rd. to be cul-de-sacked and Cedar Lake Rd. to be extended. This would replace Bacon Rd.)
- Fairfield Rd. intersection – arterial
- Wilson Rd. intersection – arterial
- Fish Lake Rd. – collector

The Task Force went thru a similar list for the new alignment corridor.

Termini

The Task Force discussed possible Termination points for the study corridor. The east end terminus would most logically be I94 or Green Bay Rd. The Task Force noted that the segment of 120 from Green Bay Rd. to I94 in Waukegan is heavily developed and would require major investments.

The west end terminus would most likely be at Rte. 12 and 120. It was suggested that we consider extending the terminus point to Chapel Hill Rd. in McHenry County because the McHenry County DOT is studying a 120 Bypass around the Village of McHenry. In this way, study areas would meet up and provide more leverage for state funding.

Challenges:

Some of the extensions planned for the study area may be problematic. These include Almond Rd., Atkinson Rd., Hainesville Rd and Cedar Lake Rd. Bam Peterson noted that plans call for Bacon Rd. to be cul-de-sacked and Cedar Lake Rd, with extension would serve as through road for that area.

Other items of concern included the following:

- Harris Rd. emergency access to Prairie Crossing subdivision
- Upgrade of the Rte. 83 and Rte 137 intersection. There is an at-grade railroad crossing at that location.
- Village Station subdivision at Lake St. in Grayslake
- Alleghany Rd. There is an established sports club in the area.
- Fremont Drainage/Squaw Creek. Private airport in area.
- Cedar Lake Rd. extension/Bacon Rd. cul-de-sac
- Fairfield Rd.- most of the population growth in corridor will occur west of Fairfield Rd. Time to improve Route 120 is now.
- Volo is in the process of developing a comprehensive transportation plan. Make sure the study and the plan are coordinated.

- Two railroad crossings: Wisconsin Central and Metra North. Need to have grade separations since the Illinois Commerce Commission will not allow at grade crossings. This will escalate the costs of any roadway improvements.
- Controlled access versus at grade access. The study was going to focus on controlled access. Some villages along the Rte. 120 corridor have expressed interest in looking at the impact of at-grade access for existing properties.

The Task Force needs more parcel level information from the Land Use and Stormwater Task Forces to determine the existence and severity of identified challenges.

Motion: To approve grade separations at railroads in the study corridor with the choice of above or below grade depending on engineering study results

Motion By: Dan Quick

Seconded By: Mike Ellis

Discussion: None

Motion Passed: Unanimous

Segments:

Lake DOT staff suggested that the study be segment focused to get the process moving on existing 120 or on the new corridor and to break the study area into workable geographic chunks. This allows for costs of the consultant to be directed to those segments that need the most analysis.

- Green Bay Rd. to I94: some kind of improvement on this segment is needed; however, there are numerous access points that will have to be dealt with.
- I94 to Almond
- Almond Rd. to Route 45
- Route 45 to Route 83
- Route 83 to Alleghany Rd: this segment goes through downtown Grayslake
- Alleghany to Wilson Rd: rural in nature. Includes Grayslake, Hainesville, Round Lake, and Round Lake Park
- Wilson Rd. to western terminus

Traffic Usage- Average Daily Trips (ADT)

Most of Route 120 averages 10,000 to 20,000 daily trips per day. As you move farther east toward I94, the average daily trips per day increases. At Rte. 45 the ADT is 30,000. Between Rte. 45 and I94 the ADT is 35,000. At the Rte 120 and I94 interchange the ADT is 40,000.

Traffic Models at LCDOT

LCDOT Staff discussed the traffic models that are used by the LCDOT. The models are VISSIM for traffic & transit simulation and VISUM for travel demand modeling. Both models are put out by PTV America Inc. Lake DOT will require that consultants responding to the RFP use these modules.

4.7 Update on RFP process – proposed

LCDOT (Chuck Gleason) will serve as the sole liaison between the Consultant and the:

- LCDOT Management
- Steering Committee

- *Lake County Partners*

Managing the RFP development process:

The **Steering Committee** will decide what items need to be sent to be reviewed/commented upon at the:

- *Land Use Task Force*
- *Environmental Task Force*
- *Technical Task Force*
- *Public Relations Task Force*

The **Steering Committee** will frame policy issues that need to be sent to the Governance Board.

Based on the direction of the Steering Committee **Lake County Partners** will prepare:

- *Meeting agendas*
- *Meeting minutes*
- *Web site materials*

Prior to hiring a consultant, **LCDOT (Mike Zemaitis)** will be responsible for the following items related to the project plan:

- *Development of an initial plan*
- *Maintenance of the plan as tasks are revised, deleted, and added*

Using the project management software of their choice, the **Consultant** will be responsible for the following items related to the project plan for the Feasibility Study:

- *Incorporating the Feasibility Study tasks into the existing plan*
- *Maintenance of the plan as tasks are revised, deleted, and added*
- *Task force assignments (via Chuck Gleason)*

Managing the consultant selection process:

Time Lines

- *Mike Zemaitis is starting to layout the time frames backdating from the County Board Meeting Dates.*
- *Information being assembled by the Task Forces is being cataloged.*
- *Reports on Constraints and Opportunities created by the Task Forces will be incorporated*
- *Start of selection process is contingent upon receiving IDOT Planning Grant (expected in spring of 2006).*

Scope of Services

- *LCDOT staff will be meeting to begin the listing of services needed.*

Minimum Requirements

- *IDOT pre-qualified consultants.*
- *Consistency with LCDOT transportation demand models and transportation simulation models is going to be a requirement.*
- *Consistency with LC GIS databases/software will be a requirement*

Future Reviews

- *Information will be reviewed with the Task Force Chairs as regards listing of services needed.*

RFP

- *Work Plan will be limited to a maximum of the budget available*
- *Qualifications Based Selection (QBS) will used*
- *The consultants approach to the project will thus be a key factor.*

Approval Process

- *LCDOT usual Selection Committee will short list to 3*
- *Interviews with the Steering Council.*
- *Selection by the Steering Council.*
- *Need to have IDOT Agreement in approval stage.*
- *Recommendation to the County Board from Steering Council and/or Governance Board (time constraint)*
- *County Board awards consultant contract subject to IDOT approval.*

Concurrent IDOT Agreement Process

- *IDOT prepares agreement*
- *LCDOT presents to the County Board*
- *County Board approves IDOT agreement*
- *LCDOT submits agreement to IDOT*
- *IDOT executes the agreement*
- *IDOT authorizes the LCDOT to start consultant work by approving the consultant contract.*

Motion: To approve the consultant/RFP management and consultant selection process as laid out above.

Motion By: Bam Peterson

Seconded By: Peter Harmet

Discussion: None

Motion Passed: Unanimous

4.8 Project Timeline: Project timeline was presented by David Young, LCP. The project timeline extends to September 2006 and has been revised through May 2006. Lake DOT is using the project timeline for project management tracking.

4.9 Joint Task Force meeting on 5-4: A joint task force meeting is scheduled for May 4 at the University Center of Lake County, Grayslake, IL. This is an opportunity for all four task forces to get together to discuss what they've accomplished and what still needs to be done before we engage a consultant.

5.0 Adjourn: meeting adjourned at 4:10 pm