



**Land Use, Economic Development and
Municipal Impact Task Force**

Minutes

May 5, 2008

8:30 – 10:30 am

Grayslake Village Hall – Community Room

2nd Floor

10 S. Seymour Avenue, Grayslake

1.0 Roll Call

- Sandquist, Dennis, Chair (County of Lake)
- Barrera, Victor (Village of Mundelein)
- Kraly, Russell (Village of Hainesville)
- Maiden, Al (Village of Round Lake)
- Reindl, John (Public Member)
- Rowe, Heather (Village of Libertyville)
- Smith, Kirk (Village of Grayslake)
- Ziegler, David (Village of Gurnee)

Staff

- Whitmer, William (LCP)
- Husemoller, David (LCDPBD)
- Gleason, Chuck (LCDOT – IL Route 120 CPC Project Manager)

Consultants

- Jeff Hall, TranSystems
- John LaMotte & Michelle Velazquez, The Lakota Group

Public

- Mike Sands, Liberty Prairie Foundation
- Paula Trigg, Lake County Division of Transportation
- David Shiner
- Bill Pogson
- Eve B. Lee
- Terese Douglass
- George Ranney
- Christine Hides
- Michael Andrews
- Jim Anderson, Lake County Forest Preserve District

Chairman Sandquist mentioned the appointment of new Land Use, Economic Development and Municipal Impact Task Force members

- Mike Purtell, City of Waukegan
- Jean McCue, Village of Round Lake Park
- Burnell Russell, Village of Volo

2.0 Meeting Minutes Approval

- Motion:** To approve the minutes of January 7, 2008
- Motion By:** Al Maiden
- Seconded By:** Russell Kraly
- Discussion:** None

Motion Passed: Unanimous

3.0 Staff Report- Jeff Hall, TranSystems, reiterated the goal of the Route 120 Corridor Planning Council was to create the unified vision of a locally preferred plan for the corridor. Mr. Hall reviewed the Corridor Planning Council Governance Board responsibilities, and indicated that in a successful corridor planning effort, land use drives the character of the road.

Mr. Hall discussed the Land Use Taskforce recent schedule, including the workshop held on March 12, 2008, where the consultants received input on potential land use scenarios that could contribute to the overall proposed land use vision for the Corridor. Mr. Hall indicated that subsequent to the Workshop they have continued to receive input, which will be discussed later in today's meeting.

Mr. Hall discussed the Governance Board schedule and indicated that their next meeting will be on May 14, 2008, where consultants would present a project status update, the Purpose and Need Statement for approval (from Tech. Task Force), the Alternative Analysis Decision Matrix Criteria for approval (from Tech, Task Force), the Travel Demand Model Results (from Tech Task Force) and the upcoming project schedule.

Mr. Hall discussed this Task Force's schedule, and indicated that at the Technical Task Force meeting, to be held on May 6, 2008 consultants would present the draft Purpose and Need Statement for approval, present Alternative Analysis Decision Matrix Criteria for approval, present the Travel Demand Model results, present Road Character Alternative Analysis process and present upcoming project schedule.

Mr. Hall discussed the Corridor Environmental Task Force schedule and efforts. At the Task Force meeting held on January 23, 2008 consultants presented the environmental overview, including the recognition of two environmental areas of concern near Squaw Creek and Almond Marsh. The Task Force also discussed Purpose and Need and Decision Matrix Criteria that was presented at Technical Task Force meeting on January 29, 2008.

Mr. Hall indicated that the Technical Task Force had held a Federal Highway Authority (FHWA) coordination meeting on February 6, 2008, as required for federal and IDOT standards adherence. The Task Force also met April 1, 2008 to discuss methodology and schedule.

The Public Information Task Force's recent schedule was then briefly reviewed.

Chairman Sandquist asked about trip generation and access information. Mr. Hall indicated that TranSystems had reviewed the CMAP traffic map and land use assumptions, and the land use data gathered by Lakota, and found that potential changes to the assumptions would increase traffic by only 1%.

Access points to potential land use zones/development sites will be established for the alternatives, other than the limited access option. The biggest involvement for the consultants and Corridor Planning Council is the coordination of land use with road character. Mr. Hall stated that the Governance Board will determine land use before everything else, and then work to determine road character.

4.0 The Lakota Group Presentation –

Mr. John LaMotte of The Lakota Group then reviewed maps of land use options with the Task Force. Mr. LaMotte indicated that Lake County Planning staff did the original inventory/study of land use in the corridor and then worked with Lakota in meeting with communities regarding their individual development plans. Lakota gathered land use data from all corridor

communities, and reviewed with communities the functionality of their comprehensive land use plans, from the perspective of future corridor development and possible future roadway alignments. Lakota has had more meetings with corridor communities since the March 12 Land Use Workshop, and has received more current information since then.

Lakota has established existing land uses in the corridor and has mapped information on development opportunity sites. Lakota has reviewed this information and has used it in the characterization of certain areas on the corridor maps as susceptible for change. Particular attention was given to accurate indication of planned land use (from community comprehensive plans) in sites designated as development opportunities. Developments that have been recently approved by the communities were also mapped in the corridor, with access points noted. Discussions with communities took place regarding this correlated, mapped data. This led to further discussions of intersection options in the corridor. Lakemoor and Volo locations were specifically noted in this regard.

The Lakota Group questioned the amount of retail planned along the corridor, including anchor retail destinations. These planned uses call for the rearrangement of arterials, access points and intersections, particularly in Volo, at Route 59 and Gilmer Road. Widening of existing Route 120 has also been addressed in mapped recommendations.

Mr. LaMotte indicated that By-Pass options have also been discussed at length, which will dictate more functional arterials. Existing and potential land uses have been charted along the By-Pass route. By-Pass connections (termini) have been taken from early engineering documents, which have some environmental and access concerns. The By-Pass alignment could change land uses particularly just east of Volo and around interchanges. Lakota recommends industrial land use just west of the Baxter operation, with the potential for office use near the Advocate Hospital site at Wilson Road. Round Lake is rethinking their comprehensive land use plan subsequent to corridor discussions with Lakota.

Villages of Round Lake and Hainesville are planning on the extension of Cedar Lake Road and connections to a By-Pass, either boulevard or limited access version will be explored by the team. Alleghany Road is a location for potential development. Uses along Hainesville Road may be constrained by By-Pass construction and the railroad. To facilitate a Hainesville Road connection to a Route 120 By-Pass, widening is necessary with coordinated access (collector streets) paralleling existing Route 120. Lakota suggested that Hainesville keep its existing oak savannah as open space, rather the Route 120 frontage development that is planned. Lakota also finds that office and industrial uses need to be consolidated into more efficient sites along the Corridor, especially along Alleghany Road. There is also a question that there may be too much office space planned for the that area.

Mr. LaMotte stated that TranSystems and Lakota are weighing land use and access points for the boulevard and express By-Pass alternatives, with TranSystems also reviewing road design curvature. The Expressway By-Pass alternative has access interchanges at Alleghany and Fairfield Roads, with other road access being tested by TranSystems.

Mr. LaMotte indicated that as things look currently, the most of the Grayslake-Gurnee part of the corridor will remain open space because of environmental concerns. Institutional use near the monastery on IL Route 21 has been suggested. Lakota has located conservation easements in this part of the corridor. Residential development planned here has been calculated at 3-units per acre. An Almond Road connection to existing Route 120 has been indicated in as desirable and will be looked at further during the roadway analysis. Institutional/Senior Housing land use has been figured for the site immediately north of the Prairie Crossing Development in Grayslake. Mr. LaMotte stated that it has not been determined whether overpass or underpass will be used in design of the By-Pass concept to cross Route 83, river and both rail lines in Grayslake. Depending on the potential alignments,

either commercial or industrial uses are seen for the west half of the site immediately north of Prairie Crossing.

In the easternmost section of the corridor map, the Pritzker (auction) site is the only development opportunity site of any scale, which has been planned as residential. Consolidation of access and curb cuts at east end of the corridor is the predominant recommendation, with some arterial access changes recommended to improve access to Route 120.

Route 120 CPC staff member Chuck Gleason asked for clarification from Mr. Jeff Hall about the upcoming next steps for the Corridor Planning Council. Mr. Hall referred to a chart of Governance Board responsibilities. Indicating that with each specific responsibility, the Governance Board would receive a timely recommendation from the respective Task Force.

On May 14 the Governance Board will meet to hear

- consultants present project status update
- Purpose and Need Statement recommendation for approval (from Tech. Task Force)
- Alternative Analysis Decision Matrix Criteria for approval (from Tech, Task Force)
- Travel Demand Model Results (from Tech Task Force), and the upcoming project schedule.

Mr. Hall indicated that an early June meeting of the Land Use Task Force would be scheduled prior to the June 11 Governance Board meeting so that the Task Force could discuss and recommend land use vision for the corridor to the Governance Board, incorporating corridor villages' ideas.

Detailed upcoming schedule is as follows:

May 14, 2008

- Purpose & Need
- Decision Matrix Criteria
- Traffic Model Results

Presented to Governance Board for comments.

June 11, 2008

- Land Use Maps presented to the Governance Board for comments.

August 2008

- Revised Purpose & Need
- Revised Decision Matrix Criteria
- Revised Traffic Model Results
- Revised Land Use Maps

Presented to Governance Board for approval for presentation in Public Meeting, September 2008.

September 2008

- Public Meeting/Response/Comment on Governance Board revisions

October 2008

- Purpose & Need
- Decision Matrix Criteria
- Traffic Model Results
- Land Use Maps

Presented to Governance Board for Final Approval.

Mr. Hall stated that the Purpose and Needs Statement approved by the Governance Board on May 14 will determine whether any corridor alternatives should be eliminated. As anticipated the Purpose and Need is to add capacity to Route 120. The Decision Matrix criteria will be used to evaluate the alternatives.

Mr. Hall indicated that an anticipated August 2008 presentation to the Governance Board would lead to scheduling of a Public Meeting Discussion in September 2008. At this meeting the Public will be asked to comment on revised Purpose and Needs Statement, The Decision Matrix, Traffic Model results and revised Land Use Maps. With public approval, the process would go back to the Governance Board in October 2008.

Mr. Hall indicated that once the character of the road is established more design work will take place.

5.0 Old Business – None.

6.0 New Business – None.

7.0 Public Comment -

Chairman Sandquist called for public comment, pertaining to the items discussed by the Task Force today.

Questions and comments were offered by the public in attendance on the issues of open space, project schedule, traffic model data, parcel boundary information and public access to land use mapping information.

Chairman Sandquist told the gathering that the next meeting of the Route 120 Corridor Planning Council Land Use Task Force would be 8:30 AM, June 2, 2008. Task Force member Kirk Smith indicated that the Grayslake Village Hall is available once again, for the Village to host the meeting.

8.0 Adjourn

Motion: To Adjourn

Motion By: Kirk Smith

Seconded By: Victor Barrera

Discussion: None

Motion Passed: Unanimous