



Technical Task Force
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, May 5, 2009
1:00 – 3:00 pm
Lake County DOT
600 W. Winchester Rd.
Libertyville, IL 60048

1.0 Roll Call

Technical Task Force:

- Buehler, Marty, Chair (Lake County DOT)
- Heinz, Bill (Village of Grayslake)
- Harmet, Peter (IDOT)
- Huber, Marc (Village of Round Lake)
- Quick, Dan (Village of Wauconda)
- Richartz, Cindy (Abbott Laboratories)
- Ziegler, David (Village of Gurnee)

Related Task Forces:

- Mike Warner (Environmental Task Force Chair)
- Kirk Smith (Land Use Task Force Chair)
- David Motley (Public Information Task Force)

Staff:

- Patty Gayes (Lake County Partners)
- Chuck Gleason (LCDOT)
- Paula Trigg (LCDOT)
- Al Giertych (LCDOT)

Consultants:

- Jeff Hall, (TranSystems)
- Matt Smith (TranSystems)

2.0 Public Comment

There was no public comment at this time.

3.0 February 25, 2009 Meeting Minutes Approval

- Motion:** To approve 2/25/09 Minutes
Motion By: Marc Huber
Seconded By: Dan Quick
Discussion: None
Motion Passed: Unanimous

4.0 Chairman's Remarks

Chair Marty Buehler asked Jeff Hall of TranSystems to summarize public comments received during and after the April 15th Open House regarding placement of the proposed Route 120 Bypass. Jeff said that comments were received from the public, both during the meeting on comment forms and through a court reporter, and after the meeting through the project website, email or regular mail to the LCDOT. Jeff also noted that comments were received from residents in all of the communities in the CPC except for Mundelein, Volo and Wauconda.

Jeff handed out his summary document and a booklet of all comments. He said that of the five decision matrix categories – cost, right of way, environmental, connectivity, and existing / proposed land use – public comment focused on environmental as the most important criteria in a road placement decision. The cost criteria was 2nd most important, land use was 3rd most important, and 4th was right-of-way.

Marty Buehler reminded the TTF members that the task force could make recommendations on the alternates to the Governance Board, or it could choose not to do so. He added that since the purpose of the TTF is to give input to the Governance Board, it would be prudent to make recommendations where it is possible to come to a consensus.

A. Eastern Terminus Alternatives

Since Bill Heinz needed to leave early, Jeff began with the Eastern Terminus alternatives. He said that the comments showed a slight preference for the north alternates (Alternate 3E or 6E) over the south alternates (2E or 5E). For those preferring the north alternates, the comments show a preference for Alternate 3E over 6E. For those preferring the south alternates, the comments show a slight preference for Alternate 2E over 5E. Jeff noted that at its May 4, 2009 meeting, the CPC Environmental Task Force requested that the Public Meeting Comment Summary be amended to clarify that comments preferring one alternative over another within north or south groups be specifically summarized as being preferences within those groups (as shown above).

Jeff said that the additional traffic added to U. S. Route 45 for Alternate 3E was not noted as a concern to those preferring Alternate 3E. The increased right-of-way needs, greater property impacts, and less compatibility with land use were not noted as a concern to those preferring the north alternates (3E or 6E). For those preferring the south alternates 2E or 5E, the comments noted decreased right-of-way needs, less property impacts, and access issues. These comments noted that these issues are a bigger concern than the environmental impacts.

Jeff also noted that of the comments received from property owners in the Eastern Terminus area, those property owners north of Route 120 only prefer the south alternates, whereas the property owners south of Route 120 only prefer the north alternates.

Bill Heinz noted that the Grayslake Village Board would be considering making a recommendation regarding the alternatives, but the board had not yet met on this issue. Bill said he would not be able to vote today if the TTF made a recommendation to the CPC Governance Board on the Eastern Terminus alternatives. However, he did make a suggestion that the TTF consider eliminating Alternates 2E and 3E. This would eliminate both of the most widely differentiating alternatives. Additionally, 2E would have the highest environmental impact and also would run very close to the Arbor Vista residential development. Alternate 3E would have the greatest impact on Route 45 traffic and cuts directly into proposed commercial development area.

Mike Warner, Environmental Task Force Chair, noted that the Environmental Task Force agreed that the Decision Matrix ranking of characteristics for the alternates was correct, but it did not make recommendations to choose or remove any of the alternates.

Marty asked for a straw poll of the TTF regarding a recommendation to limit the Governance Board's Eastern Terminus locally preferred placement decision to Alternates 5E or 6E, removing Alternates 2E and 3E. The TTF members all agreed with this recommendation.

Pete Harmet (IDOT) noted that any recommendations by the TTF and by the Board of Governors will not necessarily change the alternates considered and recommended in the Phase One Environmental Study. He reminded the TTF members that all alternatives to the bypass character and placement would be back on the table when the Phase One begins.

Jeff compared Alternates 5E and 6E in terms of ranking of criteria. In terms of cost and right-of-way, 6E has more impact than 5E, mainly because six homes would be involved with 6E versus 2 homes with 5E. Additionally, after TranSystems began its study, a new church began construction at the southwest corner of Route 120 and Mill Road. This is not considered in the decision matrix. Alternate 6E would go directly through this property. Alternate 5E would impact the last row of parking and a detention pond, so it is more likely that this alternate route could be tweaked to avoid an impact with the church. Also, a cell tower would also be directly impacted by 6E (not 5E).

In terms of environmental impact, Alternate 5E has a greater impact than Alternate 6E. This is primarily because 5E impacts two more acres of "moderate ranked" land and two less acres of "lowest ranked" land than 6E.

In terms of both existing and proposed land use, 5E has a more favorable compatibility than 6E.

Marty asked the TTF for discussion regarding whether a recommendation should be made between 5E and 6E. Dan Quick said he would favor 6E rather than 5E, because of the forest preserve impact. Marty asked Mike Fenelon of the Forest Preserve District, who was in the audience at the TTF meeting, for the Forest Preserve's recommendation. He said that Alternate 3E would be best, but between 5E and 6E, 6E would be the preferred alternate. A formal letter of comment had also been submitted.

After discussion of the two alternates' impacts on the criteria, the TTF decided it would not make a recommendation to the Board of Governors between Alternate 5E and 6E.

(Bill Heinz left at this point due to a conflicting meeting).

B. Western Terminus Alternates

Jeff reviewed public comments on the three western terminus alternatives (2W, 4W, and 6W). He said comments showed a preference for the north alternate, 2W, over the south alternates, 4W and 6W. Of those showing a preference for the south alternates, the comments showed a preference for 6W over 4W. The comments showing preference for Alternate 2W identified lower cost and lower environmental impact as the major reasons. The additional traffic added to Cedar Lake Road with Alternate 2W and the lower compatibility rating were not noted as concerns in the comments.

Jeff said that a small number of comments came from property owners in the area. Those north of Route 120 said they preferred the south alternates (4W or 6W) Those property owners south of Route 120 said they preferred the north alternate (2W).

Mike said the Environmental Task Force again did not voice a recommendation on the Western Terminus alternates, but did agree that the criteria rankings were reflective of the impacts.

Marty said that because of the connectivity of Alternate 2W with the existing Route 120 road, and the added traffic burden this would cause to Cedar Lake Road, this was a fatal flaw with this Alternate in his viewpoint. This was also his viewpoint of the 3E Alternate which was removed.

Mike Fenelon said that the Forest Preserve recommended Alternate 2W because it has the least environmental impact of the three alternates.

Pete noted that although Alternate 4W would possibly have a longer approval process, because it involves public land, Alternate 2W may be eliminated in the Phase One Study, based on traffic routing impact on Cedar Lake Road.

Marc voiced his opinion that Alternate 2W would be the least preferable route, because of the traffic impact on Cedar Lake Road. He said that between 4W and 6W, the differences are very slight and would benefit from a more refined study of the two.

Marty asked for the TTF members' opinions about 1) recommending that Alternate 2W be eliminated from consideration, and about 2) recommending either Alternate 4W or 6W. The members all agreed informally to recommend to the Governance Board that only Alternates 4W or 6W be recommended and that Alternate 2W be eliminated.

C. Central Section Alternates

Jeff reviewed comments on the three central section alternates (1C, 2C, and 3C). The comments showed a preference for the north alternate (1C), impacting the mitigation bank, over the alternates avoiding the mitigation bank but impacting the sports club (2C or 3C). Among those preferring the two south alternates, the comments show a preference for Alternate 2C over 3C. Those preferring Alternate 1C said their choice was because of less overall environmental

impacts and more compatibility with existing land use. The impacts to the mitigation bank and the sports club were not significantly noted in the comments.

There were very few comments received from property owners within the central section, and no correlation between their place of residence and the favored alternates.

Jeff said the Northbrook Sports Club responded to him just after the public meeting. The Sports Club related that they were concerned about the eastern area of Alternates 2C and 3C, because they would substantially impact the club's shooting areas, where shotguns with 400-ft. range are used. They built the bank originally to buffer from the surrounding land use. Alternate 1C would not greatly impact the club. The Sports Club proposed that Alternate 1C be recommended and that it be slightly tweaked to minimize impacts.

A straw poll of the Technical Task Force showed a unanimous recommendation to move forward with plans for the central section using Alternate 1C.

5.0 Public Comment

There was no public comment.

6.0 Adjourn

Before adjourning, Jeff briefly reviewed the upcoming schedule. The Governance Board will meet on May 20 to select the road placements for the eastern and western termini and the central section. The unified vision plan would also be introduced. The TTF will meet on Tuesday, May 26.

Motion:	To adjourn
Motion By:	Marc Huber
Seconded By:	Dan Quick
Discussion:	None
Motion Passed:	Unanimous