



CPC Governance Board

Meeting Agenda

September 13, 2006

6:30 – 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
- Sandy Cole, 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
- Mayor Kristina Kovarik, Gurnee
- Mayor Jeffrey Harger, Libertyville

LCP Staff:

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

Steering Council:

- 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
- Peter Harmet, IDOT Section Chief, Project & Environmental Studies
- Sherry Hartnett, Public Information Task Force Chair

**III. APPROVAL OF MARCH 8, 2006 CPC GOVERNANCE BOARD MINUTES –
Request motion to approve minutes.**

**MOTION: To approve March 8, 2006 CPC Governance Board
Minutes**

MOTION BY:

SECOND BY:

DISCUSSION:

ACTION:

IV. ADD-TO AGENDA – Bill Gentes

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS (on items not on the agenda)

VI. CHAIRMAN’S REMARKS – Bill Gentes

6.1 Status of Illinois Tomorrow Grant

6.2 Congresswoman Bean’s \$2.0 million earmark

VII. STEERING COUNCIL/TASK FORCE REPORTS

7.1.1 Steering Council – Marty Buehler

- **Results of 5/4 Joint Task Force Meeting – Marty Buehler**
 1. Overall observations, comments
 2. GIS – its value in conducting this feasibility study
 3. How will this information be used by the consultant
- **Results of 5/31/06 POH**
- **Results of 6/20/06 p / p / p presentation**
- **Standard definition of barrier / constraint / opportunity**

7.1.2 Task Forces

- **Technical Task Force Report – Chair Marty Buehler**
 1. Opportunities, Constraints, Resources – existing conditions
 2. GIS Map
 3. Comments
 4. Feasibility Study RFQ - P/Schedule
- **Land Use, Economic Development, Municipal Impact Task Force – Chair Dennis Sandquist**
 1. Opportunities, Constraints, Potential Barriers – existing conditions
 2. GIS Maps – existing conditions
 3. GIS maps / Inventory of historical resources, landlocked parcels and future land use
 4. Comments
- **Environmental/Stormwater Impacts Task Force – Chair Mike Warner**
 1. Opportunities, Constraints, Potential Barriers – Existing Conditions

- 2. GIS Map – existing conditions
- 3. Comments
- **Public Information Task Force – Sherry Hartnett**
 - 1. CPC Web Site
 - CPC Power Point
 - 5/31 POH – Public Comments, FAQ's
 - Press Release on Congresswoman Bean's Earmark
 - 2. Draft Route 120 CPC Progress Report – Report to 9/20/06 Transportation Summit, media, Study Area Residents via Corridor Communities' web sites
- 7.2.0 Steering Council's Report to the Governance Board on their request to revisit the Steering Council's Guiding Principles/Purpose, the Environmental/Stormwater Task Force's Purpose and the Land Use Task Force's Purpose, based on public comments at the 3/8/06 Governance Board Meeting**
- 7.2.1 STEERING COUNCIL GUIDING PRINCIPLES/PURPOSE – MARTY BUEHLER (see attached)**
- 7.2.2 LAND USE/ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE – DENNIS SANDQUIST (see attached)**
- 7.2.3 ENVIRONMENTAL/STORMWATER TASK FORCE – MIKE WARNER (see attached)**

VIII.PUBLIC COMMENTS (on agenda items)

IX. NEXT MEETING DATE – 10/11/06

XI. ADJOURN

MOTION: To Adjourn

MOTION BY:

SECONDED BY:

DISCUSSION:

ACTION:

7.2.1 STEERING COUNCIL GUIDING PRINCIPLES / PURPOSE – MARTY BUEHLER

- Language Adopted By Steering Council on 2/2/06

Steering Council's Guiding Purpose and Principles

Guiding Purpose: Complete a feasibility study that paves the way for a federally eligible Phase 1 Study; build consensus for the recommended alternative and road characteristics; secure an agreement on land use in the corridor.

Guiding Principles:

1. Undertake and complete an 18-month Feasibility Study within budget.
2. Defined Study Area:
 - Termini:** East - Greenbay Road (Waukegan); West - McHenry County Line (Lakemoor);
 - Limits of Analysis:** ½ mile north/south of existing Route 120 centerline - west of Wilson Road to the McHenry County line and east of Almond Road to Greenbay Road in Waukegan; ½ mile north of existing Route 120 centerline and ¾ mile south of proposed LCTIP Route 120 centerline - Almond Road to Wilson Road.
2. Traffic Improvement should handle projected 2030 demands, **with or without Route 53** - based on traffic modeling of projected 2030 population and employment.
3. Define Land Use & Environmental/Stormwater Study area = above defined study area.
4. Evaluate the alternatives - improvements to the existing roadway and variations of a new alignment.
5. Determine the character of a road that meets capacity requirements (Level of Service "D" for arterials, LOS C for expressways):
 - Will it be a Controlled-Access Expressway or a Limited-Access Boulevard?
 - Will it be at grade with traditional intersections, roundabouts or continuous flow intersections or grade separated interchanges?
 - Will it have railroad grade separations?
 - Will it handle traffic flows at 45 mph, 55 mph or 70 mph?

Will there be access points between major intersections?

6. Develop an estimated cost to build and evaluate financing options.
7. Frame policy issues of the Feasibility Study to be presented to the Governance Board.
8. Recommend to the Governance Board a strategy they could pursue to get the recommended improvement funded.
9. Recommend to the Governance Board a strategy they could pursue to protect the land use in the study for the recommended transportation alternative.
10. Bottom line: Determine what is technically feasible and publicly supported.
11. Look at big picture items, broad concepts; save the drill downs for the Phase 1.

- **Issue**

1. **CPC Charge**

The 120 CPC has been formed to study the feasibility of undertaking a federally eligible engineering study for IL Route 120 (either in its current alignment or a realignment) and pursuing federal funds for its construction.

2. **Recopied Paragraph from CPC's Guiding Purpose:**

Traffic Improvement should handle projected 2030 demands, with or without Route 53 - based on traffic modeling of projected 2030 population and employment.

- **Recommended Language Change**

*The, **with or without Route 53** language is, in fact, **neutral language** and it sets the Feasibility Study up for the intended purpose of leading to a federally eligible Phase I study of IL Rte 120. However the wording can be revised to recognize the neutrality on the Rte 53 issue.*

Recommended wording is:

As the CPC Corridor Planning Council is neutral on implementation of the proposed IL Rte 53 Extension, the traffic improvement for IL Rte 120 should be analyzed for projected 2030 demands, with or without Route 53 - based on traffic modeling of projected 2030 population and employment.

- **Reasoning**
 1. **Regional Framework**

The Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning's (CMAP) 2030 Regional Transportation Plan has Route 53 in it and the State must address "consistency with the regional plan" as part of any future U. S. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis.

A question that needs to be answered as part of the Feasibility Study is how the alternatives handle traffic with and without the full regional 2030 network in place. This information will be one of the many factors in the State's decision-making process. In addition, this information will be an important part of any future Phase 1 Study (Environmental Impact Statement - EIS).

2. **County Framework**

- The County Board's adopted plan has both of the Lake County Transportation Improvement Project (LCTIP) based Finalists Alternatives in it (53 Freeway/Tollway and the IL 83/US 45 with US 12):
- The County Board position recognized that the "53 Decision" was a pending state decision and so the Board **was neutral on the question.**
- The "with or without Route 53" language is consistent with the County Board position because the County Board recognized that improvements to county highways and other highways would be required in either case but the priorities would/might be different. How does the Route 120 extension in the County Plan stack up to all these priorities?

3. **CPC Framework**

The broad scope of highway types and the integration of land use to be considered in the Feasibility Study, leading to the final consensus recommendation, are envisioned to provide information on what is both technically and politically feasible. The intent is to have a financing plan to accompany the recommendation. That federal funds will be a part of the financing plan is a logical assumption at this point in time.

The Steering Council's charge is to recommend alternatives that work with/without Route 53 and we have to disclose where any of our recommended alternatives are at variance with the Regional Plan. Thus, the decision of the CPC's Governance Board regarding East/West alternatives could impact CMAP's consideration of what to do with the Route 53 Corridor.

- Request a motion to adopt the recommended wording:

As the CPC Corridor Planning Council is neutral on implementation of the proposed IL Rte 53 Extension, the traffic improvement for IL Rte 120 should be analyzed for projected 2030 demands, with or without Route 53 - based on traffic modeling of projected 2030 population and employment

MOTION: To adopt recommended wording.

MOTION BY:

SECOND BY:

DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENTS:

ACTION:

7.3.1 LAND USE / ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / MUNICIPAL IMPACTS TASK FORCE – DENNIS SANDQUIST

- **Language Adopted by the Steering Council 2/2/06**

Task Forces Near Term Agenda

Item 2. Land Use, Economic Development, Municipal Impact Task Force - Dennis Sandquist

Purpose:

Based on the transportation alternatives, determine the appropriate compatible land uses. Recommend a “corridor preservation plan” and integrated land uses **for the chosen transportation alternative**. Recommend the implementation strategy the Governance Board should pursue to effect the land use recommendations for the corridor.

Tasks:

- Select the Task Force Members
- Update the Lake County Framework data for the Corridor - identify development projects underway, recently approved development projects and updates to participating Community’s Comprehensive Plans that impact the corridor’s study area
- By end of March, identify project barriers, opportunities and constraints; report it to the Steering Council.
- Determine existing sources of land use GIS based data for the corridor’s study area.
- Create projected 2030 population/employment projections in the corridor’s study area based on recommended land uses and compare them with NIPC/CATS 2030 projections for the corridor.
- Determine what land use is available for development and integrate with the transportation alternatives.
- Interact, as directed with the prime consultant or land use sub-consultant (if any).
- Review the consultant’s milestone reports and forward to

- **Recommended Language Change**

The Land Use / Economic Development / Municipal Impact Task Force on 4/3/06 adopted the following revised language and recommended that the Steering Council adopt it:

“The Land Use Task Force’s purpose is to (1) determine whether the Village and County planned land uses and transportation improvements for the corridor are consistent with the planned roadway; (2) through an iterative process recommend a “corridor preservation plan” that integrates appropriate land uses with an appropriate transportation alternative and protects the ROW for the chosen transportation alternative and (3) recommend an implementation strategy the Governance Board should pursue to effect the land use recommendations for the corridor.”

- **Request a motion to adopt the recommended language.**

MOTION: To adopt Language approved at 4/3/06 Land Use/Economic Development and Municipal Impact Task Force Meeting

MOTION BY:

SECOND BY:

DISCUSSION / PUBLIC COMMENTS:

ACTION:

7.4.1 ENVIRONMENTAL/STORMWATER TASK FORCE – MIKE WARNER

- **Adopted Language on 2/2/06**

Task Forces' Near Term Agenda:

Item 3. Environmental/Stormwater Impacts Task Force - Mike Warner

Purpose:

To ensure that environmental information on the wetlands, floodplains and other environmental **assets in the corridor** are appropriately considered in the determinations of the transportation and land use recommendations.

Tasks:

- Select the Task Force Members.
- Using the LCTIP/SRA Studies/Lake County Framework Plan and Watershed Studies as a basis, evaluate GIS maps inventorying the Study Area's wetlands, floodplains, forest preserve land holdings, parklands and other environmental assets -- provide the data to the consultant.
- By the end of March, identify project barriers, opportunities and constraints and report it to the Steering Council.
- Interact, as directed with the project's prime consultant or the prime consultant's sub-consultants (if any).
- Assist the Technical Task Force in their management of the prime consultant's (or the prime consultant's sub-consultant) inventorying/validation and mapping of the study area's wetlands, floodplains and other environmental amenities.
- Review the consultant's milestone reports and forward it to the Steering Council.

- **Recommended Language Change**

Keep the current language and recommend that the improvement comply with the public road development requirements of the Lake County Watershed Development Ordinance.

- **Reasoning**

1. Task Force Charge

This is a **Feasibility Study** and the intent is to look at the footprint of the project in the corridor. The suggested broadening of the scope is beyond the Feasibility Study stage.

2. Framework

The Task Force itself has no means to accomplish the broadening of either the geographical or environmental impacts' scope of the study as suggested. The proposed budget for the consultant is not going to be sufficient for broadening the scope beyond a Feasibility Study. As part of its standard scope, a Phase I/EIS is required to address these items. Concerns about water quality and quantity should be addressed by recommending that the project comply with the public road development requirements of the Lake County Watershed Development Ordinance.

- **Request a motion to adopt the recommended language.**

MOTION: Keep the current language and recommend that the improvement comply with the public road development requirements of the Lake County Watershed Development Ordinance.

MOTION BY:

SECOND BY:

DISCUSSION / PUBLIC COMMENT:

ACTION: