



CPC Governance Board

MINUTES

October 8, 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:

Suzi Schmidt, County Board Chairman

Larry Leafblad, District #6

Terese Douglas, District #11

Bonnie Thomson Carter, District #5

Diana O'Kelly, District #10

Municipalities:

Mayor Tim Perry, Grayslake

Mayor Burnell Russell, Volo

Mayor Jean McCue, Round Lake Park

Mayor Ted Mueller, Hainesville

Mayor Richard Hyde, Waukegan

Mayor Bill Gentes, Round Lake

Mayor Salvatore Saccomanno, Wauconda

Trustee Ed Sullivan, Mundelein

Trustee David Ohanian, Gurnee

Mayor Jeffrey Harger, Libertyville

Mayor Virginia Povidas/Trustee Robert Koehl, Lakemoor

LCP Staff:

Dave Young, President

Russell Medley, Marketing & Research Director

LCDOT Project Manager:

Chuck Gleason

Task Force Chairs:

Marty Buehler, Technical Task Force Chair

Mike Warner, Environmental/Stormwater Task Force Chair

Dennis Sandquist, Land Use/Economic Development and
Municipal Impacts Task Force Chair

David Motley, Public Information Task Force Chair

IDOT Representative:

Peter Harmet, Bureau Chief – Programming

Consultants:

Chuck Stenzel, TranSystems

- Jeff Hall, TranSystems
- Matt Smith, TranSystems
- John LaMotte, Lakota Group
- Zac McConnell, Lakota Group

III. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2008 CPC GOVERNANCE BOARD MINUTES

MOTION: To approve September 17, 2008 CPC Governance Board Minutes

MOTION BY: McCue

SECOND BY: Perry

DISCUSSION: none

ACTION: passed

IV. ADD-TO AGENDA – BILL GENTES

The Consultant distributed a Summary of the Decision Matrix and pointed out to the CPC Governance Board 2 “add-to agenda” items for name changes along with revised color graphs of the same of the slide show that was to be presented.

Member Douglass recommended that the Board eliminate all other alternatives and to proceed with both four lane options for the feasibility study. This was deemed as not compatible to the process nor the open meetings act.

Member Perry requested adding to the agenda the receipt of the of the resolution of the Village of Grayslake’s duly naming a designated alternate to the Governance Board.

MOTION: To approve the requested changes by unanimous vote.

ACTION: passed.

- 4.1 Motion to accept the new Agenda Item 10.1 - Name change of Decision Matrix Item 1b from “Compatibility with Financing Strategies” to “Compatibility with User Fee Collection” as recommended by the Technical Task force.

MOTION BY: Saccommano

SECOND BY: Schmidt

DISCUSSION: More detail was requested by some members of the CPC as to the need for the name change. Mr. Hall provided a brief explanation and assured the Board that the presentation would elaborate.

ROLL CALL: all ayes, none opposed

ACTION: passed

- 4.2 Motion to accept the new Agenda Item 10.2 - Name change of

Decision Matrix Item 8a from “Opportunity for Natural Areas” to “Opportunity for Open Space” as recommended by the Environmental Task Force and Technical Task Force

MOTION BY: O’Kelly

SECOND BY: Douglass

DISCUSSION: Member Douglass questioned the basis for the name change. Mr. Hall responded stating that the State utilizes the designation of “natural areas” for regulated areas and the name change will allow for more planning flexibility.

ROLL CALL: all yes, none opposed

ACTION: passed

4.3 Motion to approve the appointment of Grayslake Trustee Shawn Vogel as an alternate voting member of the CPC Governance Board.

MOTION BY: Douglass

SECOND BY: O’Kelly

DISCUSSION: none

ACTION: passed

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Eve B. Lee requested that the CPC reconsider the amount of feet required for right-of-way on the proposed alternatives.

VI. CHAIRMAN’S REMARKS – BILL GENTES

6.1 Request a motion to accept By-Laws changes

MOTION: To accept By-Laws changes

MOTION BY: McCue

SECOND BY: Perry

DISCUSSION: Member Douglass informed the Chairman that she would be voting no. Member Carter stated that she had concerns about the Committees findings, reports, and decisions but was assured by Mr. Buehler that those reports would still be disclosed to the Board.

ACTION: passed.

VII. FISCAL AGENT’S REPORT – CHUCK GLEASON

Mr. Gleason reported that the Financial Report that was in the meeting packet depicts a difference in the “Project-To-Date” payout and a change in the “Incomes-To-Date” with the inclusion of Lakemoor’s contribution.

VIII. IL ROUTE 120 FEASIBILITY STUDY’S PROJECT TEAM REPORT – CHUCK GLEASON

8.1 Public Involvement Task Force Activities

Mr. David Motley, the new Chairman, was introduced. He reported that at the last meeting – the game plan for the November 12 Open House was discussed. Members of the public and anyone with interest in submitting comments after the open house can submit comments directly on the www.120now.com website.

8.2 Environmental/Stormwater Task Force Activities

Mr. Warner stated that the designation of “Opportunities for Natural Areas” has a meaning in Illinois that requires certain protections; therefore, this Task Force recommended the name change to “Opportunities for Open Space.” This Task Force reviewed cost information and submitted that information to the Technical Task Force.

8.3 Land Use Task Force Activities

Mr. Sandquist stated that at the last meeting - the Economic Development Criteria feedback was reviewed and the results will be provided to the Board at a future date.

8.4 Technical Task Force Activities

Mr. Buehler reported that the information that is on the agenda for discussion will be proposed action items for the meeting to be held after the open house.

Discussion occurred on the upcoming election and how that would impact the County Board membership on the CPC Board as well as the voting of the proposed action items. The concurrence was to continue with the meeting schedule of the next CPC Board meeting of December 10.

IX. PATH TO DECISION CHARACTER OF ROAD – MARTY BUEHLER

Mr. Buehler presented the Powerpoint slide that has been referenced at each meeting to demonstrate the project's progress.

Presentation points:

- Work has progressed and the CPC Board will be making a decision on the road character.
- The Technical Task Force will not provide an opinion on the road character, but will assemble all data in order for the CPC to make that decision.
- The public input from the upcoming public open house meeting will assist the Governance Board in making the road character decision.

- In answer to a question it was indicated that a hybrid recommendation may be provided later.
- After the road character is decided, the data for analysis will be more defined e.g. intersection operational analysis.

X. PRESENT AND DISCUSS ROAD CHARACTER DECISION MATRIX – JEFF HALL

Mr. Hall told the Board that a take-home packet will be distributed before the meeting is over to each member and that this packet contains background information on the presentation.

Alternate 3A, the 4 lane roundabout boulevard; Alternate 3B, the 4 lane signalized boulevard; Alternate 4, the 6 lane signalized arterial; and Alternate 5, the 6 lane expressway are all compared throughout the Decision Matrix to Alternate 1, the No Build scenario. A color legend depicts the strengths – red & orange represents weak, yellow is at midway, and green is the strongest in comparison.

Decision Matrix Criteria Item 1 – Cost

- Construction costs, R.O.W. costs, Environmental mitigation costs, and Engineering (Ph 1-3) costs are depicted with the total cost per mile.
- The distance is from Route 12 to Route 41 for a total of 14 miles.
- Member Thomson Carter asked for more detail on the collection boxes. Mr. Hall stated that dependent upon the Road Character, as an example - collection boxes could be seen midway in Alternate 5, the Expressway, and a signalized arterial could contain collection boxes throughout the different sections so that users would pay for whatever part a commuter would use.
- Mr. Hall stressed that the user fee collection is not being recommended as the only funding option.
- Member Douglass stated that she would be sending out an email to folks and she wanted to be sure that she understood the user fee collection. She also indicated that she would be sending in her comments for the open house and will be directing others to submit their comments through the 120now website.
- Member O’Kelly asked how the open house presentation was to be made.
- Mr. Hall responded saying that they would have an audio-visual slide show along with presentation boards of the Road Character. Staff will be positioned at stations and available to answer questions and collect comments.
- Mr. Buehler added that this public forum is very crucial and that the comments that will be collected will assist the Board on making the decision on the Road Character.

2a Total Proposed Right-of-Way Acquisition Areas

- Alternatives 3A, 3B, and 4 scored well (yellow) and the required acreage is 279 for each. Alternate 5 scored weakly (red).

- 300' width is what will be required for the locally preferred plan which would include medians and shoulders.

2b Total Building Property Acquisitions

- All 4 alternates scored weakly. 26 properties are affected for Alternates 3A, 3B and 4. 31 properties are effected for Alternate 5.
- Discussion occurred on how acquisitions are to specifically effect properties.
- Property acquisitions are counted as one acquisition regardless of the number of buildings on the single lot.

Decision Matrix Criteria 3 – Environmental

- The numbers depicted on the pie charts signify acres. Alternates 3A, 3B, and 4 have 180 acres of lowest impact, 33 of moderate impact, 3 of high impact. All 4 Alternates scored strongly for acres not impacted; free & clear.
- Alternate 5 has 248 acres of lowest impact; 45 of moderate impact, 4 of high impact. The remainder is free & clear.
- Member Carter asked if wetlands are part of the acreages depicted. Mr. Hall said that the take-home booklet contains the background information on that graph.

Decision Matrix 4 – Traffic

- The percent of effectiveness of Demand Accommodation for 3A and 3B is 73%. Alternate 4 is 90% effective and Alternate 5 is 100% effective.
- Roundabouts work best at the west portion as there is less traffic.
- The following intersections would not meet this criteria effectively with a roundabout:
 - Route 12 & Route 120
 - Route 45 and the Bypass
 - Hunt Club & Route 120
 - O'Plaine and Route 120
- For Level of Service at Intersections, 3A provides only level of service "D" at 56% and Alts. 3B, 4 and 5 all meet the level of service at 100%.

Decision Matrix Criteria 5– Road User - 5a Travel Time

- Travel time is for the distance from Route 120 westbound to Route 12 in the pm peak hour. Alternate 1 scored the weakest at 50 minutes, Alternates 3A and 3B scored well at 35 minutes each. Alternate 4 scored a little better at 25 minutes and Alternate 5 scored the strongest at 14 minutes.

5b Address Existing Safety Problems

- Alternate 1 was the weakest in comparison to the other 4 Alternates as these 4 strongly address the existing safety problems.

Decision Matrix Criteria 6 – Network - 6a Traffic Reduction on Parallel Routes from No-build Scenario

- Alternate 1 scored the weakest, Alternates 3A and 3B both scored 2nd weakest at 3,200 ADT reduction. Alternate 4 scored strongly at 7,200 ADT reduction. Alternate 5 scored the strongest at 8,900 ADT reduction.

6b Traffic Change on Major North-South Routes from No-Build Scenario

- This includes 2030 priority plan improvements. Alternate 1 scored the weakest at 0 ADT change. Alternates 3A and 3B scored strongly at 3,600 ADT change each. Alternate 4 scored the strongest at 4,200 ADT change. Alternate 5 scored strong at 3,900 ADT change.

6c Performance of Connectivity with Existing Roadway at Bypass Termini

- Alternate 1 scored the weakest. The other 4 Alternates scored strong.

Decision Matrix Criteria 7 – Economic Development

- John LaMotte with the Lakota Group presented and fielded questions.

7a Compatibility with Existing Land Use

- Each Alternate has its own Land Use Vision.
- Alternate 1 scored the strongest. Alternate 3A and 3B scored 2nd strongest. Alternate 4 scored well. Alternate 5 scored the weakest.

7b Compatibility with Proposed Land Use

- Alternate 1 scored the 2nd weakest. Alternate 3A and 3B scored the strongest. Alternate 4 scored 2nd strongest. Alternate 5 scored the weakest.

7c Potential for Economic Development

- The study area is within the corridor limits only.
- Alternate 1 scored the weakest for tax impact at 32.1 million per year. Alternates 3A and 3B both scored well at 45.8 million per year. Alternate 4 scored strong at 55.7 million/year. Alternate 5 scored the strongest at 58.9 million/year.
- Mr. Sandquist clarified that the tax impacts as depicted would be disbursed to all taxing districts.
- Member Carter asked if there is a significant amount of commercial land uses to be converted to industrial uses. Mr. LaMotte said that there is not.
- Member Sullivan commented that the net worth of the tax impacts would be a considerable amount.

Decision Matrix Item 8 – Enhancement Opportunities - 8a Opportunity for Open Space

- Alternate 1 scored the weakest with 0%. Alternate 3A scored the strongest at 43%. Alternate 3B scored the 2nd strongest at 36%. Alternates 4 and 5 scored well at 21% each.

8b Opportunity for Transit Accommodations

- Alternate 1 scored the weakest while the other 4 Alternates scored strongly.

- Pace, Metra, and Ride Share lots are included in this opportunity scenario with the exclusion of Metra for Alternate 5.

8c Opportunity for Bike Network

- Alternate 1 scored the weakest. Alternates 3A and 5 scored weakly and the connectivity for bike and pedestrian crossings are not good. Alternates 3B and 4 scored the highest.

XI. DISCUSSION OF UPCOMING PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE – CHUCK GLEASON

The open house is scheduled for November 12 at the Prairieview School in Hainesville. Information stations will be set up by subject such as environmental at one area and traffic at another so that individuals can visit the station that best suits their interests.

XII. PROJECT SCHEDULE - JEFF HALL

Dependent upon whether any other meetings are to be held, the Board will be requested to make a decision on the Road Character by the December meeting.

XIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS (on agenda items)

Eve B. Lee stated that the Christopher Burke study depicts the total amount of feet required for ROW is less than 300' and suggested that Board consider Alternates 3A and 3B as they could fit in a ROW of less than the 300'.

George Ranney stated that some of the technical review criteria may not be disclosed to the public such as the ROW required for Grayslake will be a dramatic impact. Roundabouts are proven to be safer versus signalized arterials. He suggested to the Board that roundabouts need to be presented in a more appealing fashion as they would be a strong economical tool to achieve the right results. He also highly recommended Alternates 3A and 3B with hybrid features.

Member Schmidt voiced her support for roundabouts also and gave some strong examples of roundabouts within the nation.

Member Perry voiced his support for coming to consensus and getting an improvement built.

XIV. NEXT MEETING DATE – December 10, 2008

14.1 Present Public Meeting Results

14.2 Present Road Character Alternatives

14.3 Present Road Character Alternative Analysis Decision Matrix Results

14.4 Request Governance Board select Locally-Preferred Road Character Alternative

XV. ADJOURN – BILL GENTES

MOTION: To Adjourn

MOTION BY: Perry

SECONDED BY: McCue

DISCUSSION: none

ACTION: meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Prepared by Martha Koechig