



CPC Governance Board

MEETING MINUTES

December 10, 2008

7:00 – 8:17 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
- Bonnie Thomson Carter, District #5
- Diana O'Kelly, District #10
- Melinda Bush, District #6
- Steve Carlson, District #7

Municipalities:

- Mayor Tim Perry, Grayslake
- Mayor Burnell Russell, Volo
- Mayor Jean McCue, Round Lake Park (*Arrived at 7:15 p.m*)
- 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
- 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 Acting Chair

IDOT Representative:

X Peter Harmet, Bureau Chief – Programming

Consultants:

X Chuck Stenzel, TranSystems

X Jeff Hall, TranSystems

Grace Dysico, TranSystems

X Mike Wahlstedt, TranSystems

X Matt Smith, TranSystems

Paula Riordan, Roux

X John LaMotte, Lakota Group

Regina Webster Associates

III. Approval of October 8, 2008 CPC Governance Board Minutes

Motion by: O'Kelly

Seconded by: Mueller

Roll Call:

Yes: Schmidt, Thomson Carter, Perry, Mueller, Gentes, Saccomanno,
Sullivan, Ohanian

No: none

Abstain: Bush, Carlson, Koehl

IV. Add-To-Agenda – Bill Gentes

Motion to add Item 6.3 to appoint David Husemueller to the 120 CPC Land Use Task Force.

Motion by: Schmidt

Seconded by: Saccomanno

Roll Call: All ayes, none opposed.

V. Public Comments – None.

6.1 Request a motion to accept the resignation of the Chair of the Land Use Task Force.

Mr. Dennis Sandquist said his farewell to the Board, thanking them for the opportunity to work on this project and encouraged the Board to keep up the good work.

Motion by: Thomson Carter

Seconded by: Saccomanno

Roll Call: All ayes, none opposed.

6.2 Request a motion to nominate a new Chairperson to fill the vacant Chair of the Land Use Task Force.

Motion to nominate Kirk Smith of Grayslake as the new Chairman of the Land Use Task Force.

Motion by: Saccomanno

Seconded by: Perry

Roll Call: All ayes, none opposed.

6.3 Request a motion to nominate a new member to fill the vacancy in the Land Use Task Force.

Motion to appoint David Husemueller.

Motion by: Ohanian

Seconded by: Schmidt

Roll Call: All ayes, none opposed.

VII. Fiscal Agent's Report – Chuck Gleason

Mr. Gleason reported that the Fiscal Report depicts the expenditures for the Consultant and incomes to date.

Member Sullivan questioned the difference in expenditures and incomes. Mr. Gleason explained that the invoices from the Consultant are paid by Lake County and Lake County sends an invoice for reimbursement to IDOT. IDOT takes some time to send the reimbursement, but the amounts balance out once payments are received.

VIII. IL Rt. 120 Feasibility Study's Project Team Report – Chuck Gleason

a. Public Involvement Task Force Activities

Mr. Motley reported that the outreach strategy that was used included emailing, a grass roots style (word-of-mouth), and the flashing road signage on Route 120. This strategy was proved to be more effective and less expensive versus traditional printed mailings and advertisements.

b. Environmental/Stormwater Task Force Activities

c. Land Use Task Force Activities

Both the Environmental/Stormwater Task Force and the Land Use Task Force have not had meetings for the last few months. The next regular meetings are scheduled for January.

d. Technical Task Force Activities

The meeting of December 2 was conducted in order to review the public comment and to assemble the information for this meeting.

IX. Discuss the summary of Public Comments received – Jeff Hall.

- Mr. Hall stated that the public comments were summarized and placed at every Board members seat and also on the www.120now.com website.
- The public meeting was conducted on November 12 at the Prairieview School in Hainesville.
- Over 300 people signed in, but it is estimated that 350 to 400 people were in attendance.
- A slide show was presented and a main room was set up with the exhibits and staff members were present.
- The roadway character alternatives were presented.
- Public comment was received by court reporter, written comment and emailed comments.

- The Liberty Prairie Foundation also provided a pre-printed letter stating a preference to Alt. 3A or 3B.
- Most comments received were from residents of Grayslake.
- The comments were sorted by municipalities.
- The comments focused and ranked in priority as follows on the Matrix Criteria:
 1. Traffic, road user and network as the most important criteria.
Comments on traffic, road user and network focused on the importance of the new roadway facility to move traffic the most efficiently with the shortest travel time with the least delay.
 2. Land use
Land Use comments stressed the importance of the compatibility with the existing and proposed land use and the possibility of future economic development.
 3. Environmental
Environmental comments requested a selection of a roadway character that has the least amount of environmental impact.
 4. Cost
Cost comments centered on selecting an alternative that could be realistically financed and built.
- Comments from folks that are within the Bypass, but who do not live near the roadway, preferred Alternate 5. Those who live next to the roadway preferred the 4 lane alternate.
- The overall preference was for Alternates 3A or 3B with a higher preference for 3B.

X. Review Road Character Decision Matrix – Jeff Hall.

- Alternate 3A and 3B would move the least amount of traffic, but would have the most access.
- Alt. 5 would move most of the traffic, but have the least access.
- The level of service for Alt. 3A was above all others.
- The roundabouts are going to be large.
- A 4 lane alternate would be above the amount needed for ROW with a combination of roundabouts and signalization.
- Member Sullivan questioned the possible user fee collection. Mr. Buehler and Mr. Hall responded giving a few scenarios of how the user fee could be collected.
- The Chairman reiterated that the financial aspect would be discussed at a future meeting.
- Mr. Hall concluded by stating that Alt. 3A would be the most difficult to place the user fees, and that a signalized Alt. 3B would work better. It is easier to signalize and expand with Alt. 3B.
- Member Mueller questioned how the policing or enforcement of the user fee would occur.
- Mr. Hall responded stating that photo enforcement would be one of the ways.
- Member Thomson Carter stated that a user fee would not be feasible for taking the Bypass from Round Lake to Round Lake Park. Her vision is to get the traffic off the local roads.
- Member Saccomanno asked what the potential is to be expected regarding the economic development with Alt. 5.

- Mr. Hall responded saying that it would be dependent upon the land use types and the market conditions. Property values will rise as development occurs. Studies have shown that people purchase cheaper homes even if commuting is an issue.
- Member Bush asked what the compatibility is for Alternate 5's land use is since on the Decision Matrix, it is shown as strong in comparison.
- Mr. LaMotte explained that in reviewing what the compatibility is for the existing land use and the proposed land use, the footprint would be bigger and would impact some of the existing land uses. The 2 four lane alternatives have local access.
- Member O'Kelly requested an explanation of why the level of service between the 2 Alternates differ on the travel time.
- Mr. Hall and Mr. Buehler responded saying that the model used was based on the 2030 travel demand model. It is a generalized model, not a specific study for each intersection. Both Alternates 3A and 3B had the same number of ADT. Mr. Hall reminded the Board that the numbers depicted for all alternates are relative to each other.

Chairman Gentes then addressed the Board, Consultants, Staff and members of the public with the following statement:

"At the Lake County Transportation Summit in September 2005, an improved Illinois Route 120 corridor was identified as a consensus priority. The Corridor Planning Council was formed and tasked to look to the future, to 2030 and beyond, and establish the vision of what this new Illinois Route 120 corridor would be. The goal is to develop a plan that is technically feasible and will be preferred by the local communities along the corridor. This feasibility study will tell IDOT what is the locally preferred alternative and set the table for continued studies.

The project's Purpose & Need was established and two alternatives, the No-Build Alternative (Alternative 1) and the Widening of Existing Illinois Route 120 (Alternative 2) fell short of meeting the purpose of the project and were eliminated. A decision matrix with 8 main categories and 26 total criteria was developed to help compare road character and road placement alternatives.

The four alternatives being considered represent what potential alternatives that would be both technically feasible and preferred by the local communities along the corridor. Each alternative has its advantages and disadvantages. All alternatives that meet the purpose and need of the project will be studied by IDOT again later.

All four alternates for road character include a bypass around existing Illinois Route 120 within the Villages of Grayslake, Hainesville, Round Lake, and Round Lake Park. Alternate 3A is a 4-Lane Roundabout Boulevard, Alternate 3B is a 4-Lane Signalized Boulevard, Alternate 4 is a 6-Lane Signalized Arterial, and Alternate 5 is a 6-Lane Expressway.

The next steps in the project are to study road placement, intersection types, and finally, the project's financing strategy. A summary document will be prepared documenting the findings of the feasibility study and will be transmitted to IDOT.

Before construction would begin, IDOT would complete a Phase I Study that would further analyze the results of the feasibility study. At the conclusion of the Phase I study, engineering plans and specifications would be prepared for construction, and property would begin to be acquired. Depending on the availability of funding and other scheduling items, construction could begin no sooner than 6 to 10 years."

XI. Request a motion regarding preferred road character alternative – Bill Gentes.

Motion to accept Alternate 5 as the preferred road character.

Motion by: Perry

Seconded by: Saccomanno

Discussion: Member Ohanian commented that as a commuter, he did not believe that roundabouts would handle the future traffic demand. He also questioned why a 4 lane expressway was not one of the alternates. Mr. Hall stated that as part of the proposed 53 extension, a 4 lane expressway was studied; however, only the alternates that were selected by the CPC were the ones studied. Member Bush stated that she would not vote for the expressway alternate.

Roll Call:

Yes: Ohanian, Mueller

No: Schmidt, Thomson Carter, O’Kelly, Bush, Carlson, Perry, McCue, Gentes, Saccomanno, Sullivan, Koehl

Motion to accept Alternate 4 as the preferred road character.

Motion by: Koehl

Seconded by: Saccomanno

Roll Call:

Yes: Koehl

No: Schmidt, Thomson Carter, O’Kelly, Bush, Carlson, Perry, McCue, Mueller, Gentes, Saccomanno, Sullivan, Ohanian

Motion to accept Alternate 3 as the preferred road character.

Motion by: Perry

Seconded by: Thomson Carter

Roll Call:

Yes: Schmidt, Thomson Carter, O’Kelly, Bush, Carlson, Perry, McCue, Mueller, Gentes, Saccomanno, Sullivan

No: Ohanian, Koehl

XII. Next Steps – Marty Buehler

Mr. Buehler congratulated the Board on achieving the consensus on the road character. He then gave a projection of the steps ahead.

- Intersection type - A more detailed study will be conducted focusing on the characteristics for Alternate 3.
- Road placement - The locally and politically preferred road placement needs to be determined.
- Financing Strategy - Several strategies will be presented.

XIII. Project Schedule – Jeff Hall

- February 11, 2009 CPC meeting - The road placement study results will be presented.
- March 2009 - A public open house will be conducted.
- April 2009 - A CPC meeting will be conducted to make the decision on the road placement.

Member O'Kelly requested that the owners of properties that may be impacted by the road placement be invited to the next open house. Mr. Hall assured her that an invitation would be sent.

XIV. Public Comments – none.

XV. Next Meeting Date – February 11, 2009

XVI. Adjourn

Motion by Perry, seconded by Schmidt, all in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

Prepared by Martha Koechig