



CPC Governance Board

Minutes

June 11, 2008

7:00 – 9:00 pm

Round Lake Police/Public Works Building

SE Corner Townline & Bacon Road

Round Lake, IL

I. Pledge of Allegiance

II. Roll Call

County Board Members:

- _A_ Suzi Schmidt, County Board Chairman
- _X_ Larry Leafblad, District #6
- _X_ Terese Douglass, District #11
- _X_ Bonnie Thomson Carter, District #5
- _X_ Diana O'Kelly, District #10 (Vice Chairman)

Municipalities:

- _X_ Mayor Tim Perry, Grayslake
- _X_ Mayor Burnell Russell, Volo
- _X_ Mayor Jean McCue, Round Lake Park
- _X_ Mayor Ted Mueller, Hainesville
- _A_ Mayor Richard Hyde, Waukegan
- _A_ Mayor Bill Gentes, Round Lake (Chairman)
- _X_ Mayor Salvatore Saccomanno, Wauconda
- _X_ Trustee Ed Sullivan, Mundelein
- _X_ Trustee David Ohanian, Gurnee
- _A_ Mayor Jeffrey Harger, Libertyville

LCP Staff:

- _X_ Dave Young, President
- _X_ Russell Medley, Marketing & Research Director

LCDOT Project Manager:

- _X_ Chuck Gleason

Task Force Chairs:

- _X_ Marty Buehler, Technical Task Force Chair
- _X_ Mike Warner, Environmental/Stormwater Task Force Chair
- _X_ Dennis Sandquist, Land Use/Economic Development and Municipal Impacts Task Force Chair
- _A_ Sherry Hartnett, Public Information Task Force Chair

IDOT Representative:

Peter Harmet, Bureau Chief – Programming

Consultants:

Chuck Stenzel, TranSystems

Jeff Hall, TranSystems

Grace Dysico, TranSystems

Mike Wahlstedt, TranSystems

Matt Smith, TranSystems

John LaMotte, LaKota Group

Zack McConnell, LaKota Group

Paula Riordan, Roux

Regina Webster Associates`

**III. APPROVAL OF MAY 14, 2008 CPC GOVERNANCE BOARD MINUTES –
Request motion to approve minutes.**

MOTION: To approve May 14, 2008 CPC Governance Board Minutes

MOTION BY: Perry

SECOND BY: Mueller

DISCUSSION: none

ACTION: passed

IV. ADD-TO AGENDA

**MOTION: To add a motion to allow Trustee David Ohanian to act as the
Village of Gurnee’s alternate with full voting rights.**

MOTION BY: Thomson Carter

SECOND BY: McCue

DISCUSSION: none

ROLL CALL: all ayes, none opposed

ACTION: passed

**MOTION: To approve Trustee David Ohanian to act as the Village of
Gurnee’s alternate with full voting rights.**

MOTION BY: Thomson Carter

SECOND BY: Douglass

DISCUSSION: none

ROLL CALL: all ayes, none opposed

ACTION: passed

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Pat & Bill Kirchherr of 31980 N. Wilson, Grayslake, requested that the Bypass not be constructed to the west of Wilson as they have come to know that certain maps have the Bypass depicted going through their property. They also voiced their support of the east of Wilson terminus.

VI. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS – Vice Chair Diana O'Kelly

Ms. O'Kelly informed the CPC that Member Sullivan was out of the Country, but had provided a letter to both her and Member Leafblad. She read the letter out loud into the record:

“Subject: Scope of Study to the Route 120 Governance Board and Staff

In the past 18 months much good work has been done by our 4 task forces and our consultants in regards to evaluating various methods of improving road transportation through the east-west Route 120 Corridor. While the effort has been productive there have been significant concerns raised by individuals in regard to building a new route 120 and we have noted the substantial decrease in the likelihood of obtaining funding for the ambitious project which would be represented by a 120 Bypass from Route 60 to Almond Road. When the 120 CPC was formed, its goal was to evaluate every means of improving transportation along the Route 120 Corridor by that we meant to study a Bypass Route as well as improvements to the existing roads. At this time, my view is that we have done very little to investigate the merits of expanding and working within the present right-of-way. Although I know there are those who strongly disagree with my view, I believe working for improvements on existing roads is the way we are most likely to achieve significant improvement in a timely manner. Aside from the concern of mine in regard to funding a major project and getting citizen approval for it, I believe working in our present roadways is worth serious investigations for the following reasons:

- 1. Land acquisition – the amount of land required to add lanes and improve intersections will be far less for existing roads than that needed for a new road.*
- 2. Incremental improvements – the planned improvements of existing roads can be accomplished incrementally over a number of years. It is not necessary to undergo the uncertain way for approvals and funding in order to expand existing roads a few miles or a few intersections at a time.*

120 CPC Minutes 6-11-08

3. *Uncertain congestion relief- although it is our goal to provide relief for traffic congestion, the development stimulated by a new road and a new traffic associated with that development may create more congestion.*
4. *Community Development – Enhanced business and economic growth is one goal every community envisions when plans are considered for road improvements; however building a new road while it may stimulate new growth entails the serious risk of damaging the economic vitality of those businesses which already exist along the present roads in the area.*
5. *Cost – Although there may not be a great difference in the eventual cost of building a new road compared to improving existing roads, it seems logical to think given the huge cost of planning, engineering and building a major new road that a new road would cost significantly more than improvements to existing roads.*

These are my thoughts in regards to why I believe we should not overlook improvements to existing roads as we study ways to improve east-west transportation to the essential areas of our county. In considering the suggestion, I ask you to look at the map upon which we have outlined the suggested north-south boundaries of a new Route 120. Now trace a marker over the existing Route 120 from Route 60 to Almond Road, then trace a marker down Route 60 from Volo to Peterson Road and east over Peterson Road to the Toll Road. Does it appear to you as it does to me that we could consider improvements to these existing roads now in an incremental fashion in order to equal the traffic relief that we may get some day, if ever, from a new Route 120 Bypass. Thank you for considering my thoughts, I look forward to significant progress as the work of the 120 CPC and its staff continues.”

Member Leafblad requested that the record read that he (Mr. Leafblad) is not opposing the Route 120 Bypass, although he is supportive of Mr. Sullivan's. Mr. Leafblad stated that he is concerned about the State's Capital budget for road improvement projects. He informed everyone that the County announced a \$240,000,000 road program and recommended that folks view Marty Buehler's presentation on the County's cable channel. He commended the CPCs efforts, and concluded by stating that although he is supportive of road improvements to existing roads, he remains hopeful of the Route 120 Bypass.

Member Douglass recommended that they continue to study all options, but not make a decision at this point.

Member Thomson Carter reported that in effort to reach out to those municipalities that have not been involved with the CPC efforts and are within the corridor, she and Chairman Gentes attempted to speak at a Lakemoor meeting

and although they were on 2 agendas now, they were asked both times not to come. The next attempt is the end of July.

**VII. IL ROUTE 120 FEASIBILITY STUDY'S PROJECT TEAM REPORT –
CHUCK GLEASON – CHUCK STENZEL**

Jeff Hall reported on each task force.

7.1 Public Involvement Task Force Report – Al Giertych, Chuck Stenzel

- The last meeting was in January. The work will increase as fall approaches in preparation for the next public meeting.
- Member Douglass asked that an update be given on the website changes.
- Mr. Hall responded that Lake County Partners are the ones who maintain the website.
- Mr. Young stated that they will coordinate with Chuck Gleason on updates.

7.2 Environmental/Stormwater Task Force Report – Al Giertych, Grace Dysico.

- The last meeting was in January and input was given on the Purpose and Needs Statement at that time from the other Task Forces.
- This Task Force is involved mostly in the placement of the roadway and the next anticipated meeting is in July.

7.3 Technical Task Force Report – Chuck Gleason, Jeff Hall

- The Purpose and Needs Statement and Decision Matrix was approved in May by this task force; however the Decision Matrix had one criteria item added as per the suggestion of the CPC Board at the last CPC meeting.

Presentation of Purpose & Need, Decision Matrix Criteria

(At this point - 7:07 p.m. County Board Chairman Schmidt arrived)

Jeff Hall presented:

Approach

- This exhibit depicts task force interaction and how the project is to work.
- The preferred road alternative will consist of the road character and road placement. The Land Use Vision will need to be compatible with both.

- A financing strategy must be found in order to fund the preferred alternative.
- Public involvement will be ongoing. The Land Use Vision will be presented as it would relate to the various road alternatives.
- Road character must be determined to define the road placement. Once the decision is made, road placement will be studied more in depth. However, initial work will commence focusing on alignments of both the eastern and western termini due to pending development considerations.

Purpose and Need Statement

- Mr. Hall summarized what the purpose and need statement is.
- He also stated that the statement had not been revised since the May meeting.
- Member Thomson Carter voiced her support for the east of Wilson termini; she also said that if the termini is to be proposed to the west, the termini should go through the Village of Round Lake's proposed Advocate hospital site and not through the Forest Preserve property.
- Mr. Buehler stated that all termini alignment alternatives will be considered.

MOTION: To approve IL Route 120 Purpose & Need Statement

MOTION BY: Thomson Carter

SECOND BY: Perry

DISCUSSION: none

Roll Call: all ayes, none opposed

ACTION: passed.

Decision Matrix Criteria

- Mr. Hall presented the Decision Matrix Criteria.
- Dependent upon the type of roadway, the proper connectivity will ensure a proper transition.
- Member Ohanian asked about the possibility of a median for the Bypass scenario or a bus lane.
- Mr. Hall explained that it is mentioned under the "enhancement opportunities section, the "opportunity for transit accommodations."
- There are connections to Metra lines within the corridor, but consideration will be given for other options for transit within the corridor.

MOTION: To approve the Decision Matrix Criteria

MOTION BY: Douglass

SECOND BY: McCue

DISCUSSION: none

Roll Call: all ayes, none opposed

ACTION: passed.

**7.4 Land Use/Economic Development/Municipal Impact Task Force
Report – Dennis Sandquist; John LaMotte
Presentation of Land Use Vision for the Corridor and Request Motion
to Approve it:**

Zac McConnell presented:

Land Use Vision

- The various exhibits were presented showing the existing and future land use and how those uses would be impacted with the various possible development strategies.
- The corridor was separated into sections in the exhibits depicting existing and committed land uses.
- It was requested that 2 properties (one being the Kirchher property) be called out and depicted on the exhibits as other residential developments have been shown, labeled and in a shade of color.
- Member Thomson Carter questioned the possibility of land changes that would change the work of the CPC.
- Mr. Buehler responded to that stating that the land use scenarios that will be presented are based on information that has been obtained from municipalities on what is available now.
- Discussion occurred on the depiction of the potential alignments through protected open space and private property.
- Staff members and the Consultants explained the reasoning as to why the Potential realignments were depicted.
- The consensus of the CPC Board was to remove the alternative lines from the land use exhibits.

MOTION: To remove the potential realignments from the Land Use Vision exhibits with the exception of the base line alternative.

MOTION BY: Thomson Carter

SECOND BY: Schmidt

DISCUSSION: none

ROLL CALL: all ayes, none opposed

ACTION: approved.

Further discussion occurred on the depiction of the realignments and the concurrence was that since various realignments will be evaluated

throughout this process, all realignments should be removed until decisions are made on the select ones to be considered.

MOTION: To remove all placements on all other maps for the Corridor with the exception of the original base line proposed realignment.

MOTION BY: Perry

SECOND BY: Schmidt

DISCUSSION: none

ROLL CALL: all ayes, none opposed.

ACTION: approved.

Land Use Vision conclusion

- Some concluding discussion topics included:
 - The potential for land uses increases with the arterial/boulevard concept and an expressway bypass.
 - Road connectivity.
 - Impact on surrounding land uses.
 - A request was made to place the terms “draft, concept, or not endorsed” on all exhibits in large font in addition to the footnote that is on every exhibit since these are all public documents.

MOTION: To approve the Land Use Vision for the Corridor as amended (with the removal of all alignments depicted on the exhibits, with the exception of the base line).

MOTION BY: Perry

SECOND BY: Thomson Carter

DISCUSSION: none

ROLL CALL: 10 ayes, 1 nay

ACTION: approved

VIII. REPORT – CPC’s FISCAL AGENT, CHUCK GLEASON

8.1 Status of 2007 Membership Renewal

No change from the last report.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENTS (on agenda items)

- Dick Hosteny of Grayslake, asked about the maps depicting the 2030 traffic volumes no build scenario from the last CPC meeting, - where does the traffic come from?
- Jeff Hall discussed with Mr. Hostany how those 2030 exhibits depict the traffic demands and explained that the difference between the no build scenario and the expressway scenario is a 5% traffic difference. Traffic reduction will be shown in more detail as the concepts are studied more in depth.

- Member Douglas asked about the traffic peak times percentage on the east-west traffic. Mr. Hall said that the alternatives will be compared and the significance will be depicted in the travel model.

X. NEXT MEETING DATE – AUGUST 13, 2008

XI. ADJOURN

MOTION: To Adjourn at 8:34 p.m.

MOTION BY: Mueller

ROLL CALL: all ayes, none opposed

Prepared by Martha Koechig