

ILLINOIS ROUTE 53/120 CORRIDOR LAND USE STRATEGY

Summary of comments and proposed responses DRAFT for Land Use Committee Review

October 29, 2015 - *Revised November 4th, 2015*

The 53/120 Corridor Land Use Strategy was presented for public review from Friday September 25th to Friday October 23rd. During this time, the draft document was available on the project website and public could comment via mail, email or through the project website. Additionally, two public open houses were conducted:

- October 14th at the Libertyville Civic Center in Libertyville
- October 15th at the Kemper Lakes Golf Club in Kildeer

At these open houses, a series of 18 boards summarized the content of the document. Additionally, paper copies of the draft document were available for review. Participants were encouraged to provide comments.

The following input was received:

- 66 Comment forms or card submitted at the open houses
- 250 257 Comments submitted via email or the website
- Additional comments submitted by local agencies or municipalities

Submissions were received from 318 individual sources, but in some instances were split into multiple comments for tracking and responding to if there were separate thoughts or ideas within the same submission. These comments were classified as follows:

- ~~233~~ 240 comments are specific to the facility itself, either supportive, in opposition, or about the alignment of the facility, and not the Land Use Strategy document. These comments will be shared with the project partners who are working on the facility.
- 16 comments provided were in opposition to the Corridor Land Use process. The following are some examples:
 - *The Blue Ribbon Advisory Council did not unanimously approve the project and contained hand-picked organizations that were expected to be least challenging. Most panelists represented Cook County's interest.*
 - *Every couple years a politician decides to hire a relative in the engineering business to run a survey and impact study then the tree huggers come out and make noise and every one forgets about it till next year when we rehire the relatives and do it all over again*
 - *Land use planning should be limited to road bed areas. Areas outside should be left to the various villages town county to meet their need. No funds should be spent except for road planning.*
 - *What a leviathan document you have wrought! So impressive a tone – and yet so few of our citizens will read and understand the huge expenditures of more have been spent to study this wasteful, imprudent, outdated idea.*

As these comments do not pertain to the contents of the Land Use Strategy document, there are no recommendations for changes.

- 21 comments were supportive of either the Corridor Land Use process or draft strategy document. The following are some examples:
 - *This opportunity to preserve the ecology while addressing a major problem should not be wasted. The plans laid out today are well thought out and will accomplish this goal. Better this cost is born by the tollway than the state.*
 - *I like a lot of things about the plan, except for the road. I like information about community typologies and valuing open space.*
 - *I thought this information was very useful. I would like to see future developments follow these best practices.*
 - *Well thought out. I like the value given to agriculture and underdeveloped land. Good ideas. A much better and holistic approach is being made compared to previous roadways.*

Again, as these comments do not pertain directly to the content of the document, there are no recommendations for changes to the report.

- 15 comments were provided that did not directly comment on the content of the strategy document, but instead commented on the process, or the values behind the process. The following are some examples:
 - *As open space and natural areas are defined, who and how will the areas be created? Funding by tax is not a good thing.*
 - *Who and how will school planning be done as residential areas are defined and school needs are potentially created, how will this get funded?*
 - *It is crucial to preserve and protect our existing wetlands to keep the quality of living in this area.*
 - *I'm concerned that this roadway is being pushed not for potential economic development by the surrounding towns less affected by Rte 53 rather than the supposed purpose of reducing traffic congestion.*

Again, as these comments do not pertain directly to the content of the document, there are no recommendations for changes to the report.

- The remaining comments were about the Corridor Land Use Strategy. These have been addressed either individually or grouped by similar comment or theme. The responses indicate a recommendation as to whether the draft document should be modified to address the comment:

1. Comment: Each section of the report should have an introduction/summary.

Response: Each of the three major sections of the report (Corridor-Wide Framework, Planning Zone Framework and Typologies & Best Practices) have an introduction page (pages 14, 57 and 91)

2. Comment: The CMAP report is over 100 pages of details without any meaningful executive summary in order to help understand it.

Response: An executive summary is being prepared to accompany the final document.

3. Illinois law gives its municipalities the power to negotiate inter-governmental agreements (IGAs) to avoid costly and wasteful competition for development without the 53/120 tollways, and CMAP should be providing a parallel strategy for this that presents the appropriate retail, office and industrial planning for the likely scenario in which 53/120 is not built.

Response: The scope of the study came from the BRAC recommendation, which was to conduct a Corridor land use planning process that assumed the facility is built.

4. Citizen participation has actually been weakened by the Land Use Committee and the larger BRAC planning process. We'd like to raise our concerns in a more formal way, not just five minute limits at the end of meetings or a little postcard in an open house, or in these comments after the plan is written. We want a genuine public hearing where all participants hear all questions and answers.

Response: Noted

5. The land use plan is not meaningful until the IGA (Inter-governmental agreements) are written and signed. These should not be considered as separate issues. If the IGA is not binding as they are suggesting, there is no guarantee that open space will be protected. If history is any indication, given the choice between a tax-revenue-producing project and the protection of open space, a municipality nearly always chooses tax revenue.

Response: Noted

6. Comment: I really don't like the idea of dense housing – more than seven units per acre. We need to keep the “community atmosphere” – more open space, less people. This will increase the traffic in Lake County, and I can't support that!

Response: Noted

7. Comment: Land use on either side of the roadway needs to be consistent and uniform with the surrounding communities. Land development establishing shopping malls in residential neighborhoods in my view is an example of what not to do. Residents of Hawthorn Woods and the surrounding communities moved there to be removed from commercial traffic and noise. The insertion of commercial properties into residential communities will benefit some but will not benefit the residential homeowners. My comments on land use abutting the roadway is that the planned uses should be consistent with the surrounding communities. Residents moved to the affected communities to escape commercial noise and traffic.

Response: Noted

8. One of the most significant technical lapses is the failure to project induced growth outside of the immediate corridor. Technical analysis of land use changes are restricted to the corridor, but it is clear that the corridor will have substantial impacts throughout Lake County. This Land Use Plan is misleading for residents outside the study area.

Response: Noted

9. Comments addressing the amount of open space in the plan and how it is addressed:

- Plan seems to sacrifice open spaces while claiming to support them.
- It seems that you've identified some wetlands and then created detailed plans to build over them.
- Corridor-Wide Framework Comments: More open space should be reserved/preserved than what is currently proposed.
- CMAP says that losing 50% of the corridor's open space to development is a “balanced” approach, but it will result in a commensurate loss of species and water quality that rely on open space. Loss of 50% of open space is not “balanced,” it's destructive of our native ecosystems. CMAP claims that this strategy will increase open space, when in reality this strategy sacrifices open space presently used for farming or protected as the 53/120 corridor, and indirectly impacts thousands of acres of protected open space. This is a bad deal for Lake County residents who value the rural character of Lake County. We don't want every square inch of Lake County paved over as in the CMAP development plan! We love the rural character and our open spaces in Lake County! This Land Use Plan sacrifices thousands of acres of open space and its promise to mitigate and protect open space is speculative.

Response: The strategy document identifies opportunities and strategies for preserving and enhancing natural resources and open space. It will be up to municipalities, property owners, developers, and other stakeholders to decide if and how to preserve these areas.

10. Comments were provided regarding air pollution:

- What about air pollution?
- Lake County already has an air pollution problem. We have received an “F” from the American Lung Association for our air quality for several years now. The data is clear that large highways increase air pollution and there is NO plan to mitigate for that impact or the negative impacts it will have on local resident’s health. 63,000 vehicles /day projected for project will INCREASE congestion and air pollution as well as associated induced exacerbation of respiratory and cardiac illnesses. CMAP should not be recommending a Land Use Plan that worsens Lake County’s chronic air pollution impacts on its residents.

Response: Air pollution was not part of the scope of this project.

11. Comments were provided regarding impervious surface amounts:

- I am concerned about what this proposed land use would do to the environment in Lake County. I am not comfortable with the information that has been provided in this report. What about the environmental effects of the addition of impervious surfaces in the corridor communities as well as the Lake County as a whole.
- We believe that impervious cover (IC) in the Corridor is already well above the 10% that represents a threshold for stream degradation. Induced growth, both in the Corridor and outside of it, is almost certain to increase IC to the detriment of regional fisheries. Why is this not discussed and preempted by this Land Use Plan?
- The CMAP Document fails to address the serious ramifications to the impervious cover of the natural surroundings affected by the proposal. This issue has serious and wide-ranging effects on natural wetlands, water retention, salt runoff, flooding issues, and safety for residential and commercial occupants. Again, this is a readily available and accessible topic that is inexcusably ignored in the CMAP Document.

Response: The amount and locations of impervious surfaces in the Corridor was reviewed and analyzed during a previous phase of work and used to inform the strategies and recommendations presented in the Land Use Strategy document. The potential for natural resources in the Corridor to be impacted by run-off from additional impervious surfaces is mentioned on pages 19 through 27. Additionally, the best practice OS-3 Utilize Green Stormwater Infrastructure on page 123 discusses minimizing impervious coverage.

12. Comments on impacts to surface water, especially from salt:

- It is striking that the CMAP Document omits readily available data on the damaging effects of salt water increases on the Des Plaines River System without ever exploring how the recommended proposals would greatly exacerbate those effects. Despite the fact that the Des Plaines River System is one of the most studied river systems in the U.S. and the results of those studies are available (at no additional cost to taxpayers), it is inexcusable that they have not been incorporated into the CMAP Document and discussed with all stakeholders present.
- The plan relies heavily on the use of bio-swales to treat storm-water runoff and salt from the tollway surface. While bio-swales are desirable they are NOT likely to have performance characteristics that can deal with salt loading. Salt loading in lakes protected by bio-swales in Lake County presently exceed guidelines for fully supporting their aquatic life. CMAP should not be misleading the public with a Land Use Plan that ignores the damage that salt does to wetlands, streams and lakes. Nor should it overlook the damage done to groundwater by disposing of briny road runoff through infiltration.
- This Land Use Plan does not recognize the sub-watersheds in the study area. According to the USEPA’s report, Eight Tools of Watershed Protection in Developing Areas, watersheds are the key to land use planning. This Land Use Plan therefore cannot be expected to protect the waters of central Lake County.

Response: The condition of surface water in the Corridor, including impaired lakes, ponds, streams and rivers, was reviewed and analyzed during a previous phase of work and used to inform the strategies and recommendations presented in the Land Use Strategy document.

13. Comment: Why is ADID wetland site in southern Lake County ignored?
Response: ADID wetland data was provided by Lake County. ADID wetlands within the Corridor boundary are shown.
14. Comment: The Route 53 routing violates GP-1 and GP-3 in Long Grove, Heron Creek and areas north of there. "it goes through/over green spaces, woodlands, and watersheds).
Response: This process used the BRAC alignment for Route 53. The final alignment would be developed as part of future study.
15. The CMAP Document noticeably fails to address the deep concerns that affected residents and stakeholders have about the environmental and health impacts on their communities. There have been serious concerns raised by previous Environmental Impact Studies performed on the Route 53 expansion but these are not addressed in an appropriately serious fashion by the CMAP Document. Vague assurances about unspecified measures that will be implemented to mitigate what previous environmental studies have factually indicated are long-term and damaging effects are no substitute for a transparent and rigorous process that incorporates and includes all of the facts and stakeholders.
Response: This type of detailed analysis is outside the scope of the work for this project, but would be part of a future Environmental Impact Study, should the process continue.
16. Value gap – Open space protection is the best antidote to future road congestion, and is available at a fraction of the cost of the tax and toll increases for the extension of 53. This Land Use Plan should consider the option for IDOT to reduce congestion by transferring all or part of the land it owns in the corridor to the IDNR or the LCFPD in addition to the 750 acres it targets for open space.
Response: Noted
17. What if the development doesn't happen as predicted? Who gets left holding the bag for the environmental stewardship fund, or for any shortfall on the gas taxes or new tolls? This plan should not be saying that land will be protected based on development speculation while condoning the certain loss of high quality lands and wetlands.
Response: Noted
18. The Tollway environmental groups who signed on to the BRAC recommendations should assure promised funding for ecological restoration and a perpetual funding source for management within the corridor. So far this has not occurred, rendering this Land Use Plan misleading.
Response: Noted
19. Notably, none of the County's watershed plans integrate with the Rt. 53 Corridor project. Mill Creek for example, the most recent watershed plan, includes a call-out box which acknowledges the existence of the Corridor Plan but does not integrate it into the watershed plan itself. Thus, none of the loading estimates which were made for the Mill Creek watershed include the existence of the roadway. This Land Use Plan is invalid without the stewardship commitments of the sub-watershed citizens expressed in their watershed plans.
Response: Noted
20. We see the advantage of strengthening the benefits of being part of the corridor planning group but we prefer that the Lake County Forest Preserve District be the vehicle for making decisions on implementing the natural resource preservation plans and making decisions on use of the funding for this purpose. They have an outstanding record in this.
Response: Noted

21. Several comments relate to the lack of information or planning for utilities.

- No mention of severe water shortage in much of proposed development area, especially west of 120. How will that be addressed?
- Build it with the future in mind! Incorporate major utilities within the corridor NOT in the cities it is now! Utilities: Gas/Electric/LP/Oil – in the planning, incorporate in idea of The OLD utilities are going to fail – at that time, relocate into the new 53/120 corridor.
- The plan threatens our access to clean drinking water! Lake County already has a problem providing clean drinking water to the western parts of the county because of overdevelopment. There is currently NO plan in place as to how we are going to provide clean drinking water for all of this induced development. Healthy underground drinking water supplies would no longer be recharged by functional wetlands. A Land Use Plan that projects tens of thousands of new residents without determining drinking water sources is misleading.
- There are dramatic sewage treatment plant implications for the increase in population implied by the Corridor Plan. Phosphorus continues to be a significant problem for urban areas even with P bans in place. Lake County Public Works recently approved bonding for a 30 million dollar unit process for P control. Limits on ambient concentrations of P are likely to be more stringent in the future. Who is going to pay for the additional functionality, and additional plants to handle the increased volume?

Response: The scope of this project did not include utilities.

22. Several comments indicate that the strategy does not appropriately plan for future congestion:

- Fallacy of reducing congestion is repeated. Why do you believe that this project will succeed when all similar projects have in fact worsened congestion?
- How is this supposed to reduce congestion when, along with the road, 22000 homes are expected to be built along the corridor? Won't that just enable more congestion?
- My other concern with this roadway is that CMAP should provide a strategy for reducing congestion, rather than my perception of fostering potential and I emphasize potential commercial development. I haven't yet seen the congestion reduction plan. Clearly, this region has traffic congestion issues but is Route 53 the answer or even the main purpose of this roadway? Also have other options been explored and evaluated or is this the only plan?
- Less congestion as a result of less/lower density development.
- There's no plan for increases brought by development and it's already atrocious.
- Congestion will be exacerbated by additional construction served by unimproved arterial roads.

Response: Page 45 addresses congestion and the need to plan for other transportation systems and appropriate land use planning and development to manage future needs and congestion.

23. Several comments ask for additional detail or attention given to public transportation

- The plan seems remiss in public transportation, e.g. no plan for future light rail alongside 53. No provision for express bus lane. Minimal connection to accommodate road liners. Park & ride.
- IL has already hit peak mileage, people are driving less and millennials are driving even less than their parents. This is not a forward thinking plan. This Land Use Plan was an anachronism the day it was released.
- Comment: And finally, to reduce congestion, save the ecosystem, and reduce pollution why is mass transit systems not being investigated more?
- Need for focus on public transportation
- Plan lacks significant public transportation options.

- This plan will INDUCE urban sprawl, INCREASE traffic congestion and air pollution and will deplete our ability to afford infrastructure to make Lake County competitive in a 21st century economy. We demand instead a plan that offers alternatives to cars and incentivizes cars off of the roads with transit oriented development, increased public transit, bus rapid transit and other more modern and competitive transportation options.

Response: Corridor-wide recommendations for public transit are provided on page 46 and 47. Additional recommendations for how municipalities and developers can plan for future public transit are provided within the typologies and best practices.

24. Several comments address the desire for more capacity in local roads, especially east/west roads, to alleviate congestion:

- Need for more East/West roads/widening versus North/South
- Why aren't local roads part of the plan to relieve congestion? Have those local roads been evaluated as part of the plan?
- This Land Use Plan should reflect the conclusion from the June, 2012 Blue Ribbon Advisory Council report, "There is perhaps no location that presents a greater challenge for the construction of an environmentally sensitive roadway than the proposed corridor for Route 53/120" by identifying and discussing existing Lake County road corridors that would pose a lesser challenge

Response: Lake County has a 2040 Transportation Plan that addresses improvements to local roads. For the purposes of the Strategy report, it is assumed that all the recommendations in that Transportation Plan will be implemented within the 2040 timeframe.

25. Comment: Bike trail/access for the older subdivisions is not provided for (e.g. Casey Road Trail along Casey (North end))

Response: The bikeway plan shown on page 49 reflects the major regional bikeways in the Corridor and not smaller local connections. These are encouraged and discussed in the typologies and in GP-5: Create Complete Networks, on page 119.

26. Comment: It is stated that "Lake County has seen traffic congestion become acute." Please direct me to the studies supporting this statement.

Response: An assessment of IDOT Average Annual Daily Trip volume data between 1996 to 2013 for local roads within the Corridor demonstrates a significant increase in trips over the time period studied, in some cases greater than 100%.

27. Comment: The overall strategy does not appear to recognize the true transportation needs of the area. Instead it sets a pathway for future high-density development and in particular, long-haul truck traffic and depot-ing.

Response: The document provides a market forecast and strategies on how the forecasted development can be managed in combination with preservation of open space and quality of life so that communities and other stakeholders in the Corridor can plan appropriately to meet their goals.

28. Comment: The more bike plans, the better. North Almond Rd. has a Illinois bike path, but RT. 120 cuts the path off from South Almond Rd., which is right by the Lake County Forest Preserve - Almond Marsh. It would be great to have an underpass or a overpass connected the two Almond Roads. The more bicycle friendly roads and bike trails the better.

Response: Noted.

29. Several comments address the amount and type of development shown in the strategy document.
- Why are only “maximum” consumer demand requirements highlighted. We are still recovering from the dual impacts of over building of retail followed by a severe recession. This appears to be a self-serving justification without merit.
 - The development plan talks much about new housing communities, etc. However, more and higher-density housing is not desired. Typically associated with such growth is more traffic issues (the East-West traffic is not addressed in this plan) and increased taxes due to new schools that will be required to support incremental population growth.

Response: The Land Use Strategy is intended to show market potential for different development types in the Corridor in order to plan appropriately for this growth. This is not intended as a directive or a prediction, but as an estimate of the volume of development that may occur, so that communities and other stakeholders in the Corridor can plan appropriately.

30. Several comments indicate that commercial and retail development is changing and the strategy document needs to take that into account:
- Due to changing ways that people shop (i.e. online) there is less need for retail spaces than in the past so that type of land use should not be encouraged.
 - As we continue into the digital age our society is in less need of the office and retail space that we already have. Why on Earth would we build 22Mil SqFt of new office and retail space that is not needed. This will further destroy the environment and increase impervious land that this already over a safe limit.
 - Younger people are staying in or close to Chicago – projections on residential and commercial/land development are flawed!
 - The plan does not recognize the trend and need for more workers to be home based more or much of the time. By the time it is finished, Rte 53, if extended, will be obsolete and a drain on the economy and ecology.

Response: The market study considered possible current and future trends such as online shopping, cyber-commuting, and living preferences of young professionals into account in the preparation of the market forecasts.

31. Several comments addressed potential impacts on schools.
- Fremont School District 79 will be heavily impacted by this project. While I certainly appreciate the mountain of work and coordination required to pull this project together, I am awestruck by this complete lack of impact analysis of both population increases and taxation implications for impacted school districts. What will the impact of development enticing tax incentives along both sides of the proposed corridor be for Fremont 79 and other districts? What is CMAP’s vision of population growth/student growth for communities along the corridor?
 - Who and how will school planning be done as residential areas are defined and school needs are potentially created, how will this get funded?

Response: School district planning was outside the scope of this effort.

32. Comments about the desire for more discussion on impacts or probable effects:
- I realize that you had to break down the project into bits to make it possible to digest. You want to present all of your findings in the best possible way, but you omit any negatives. These are biased results.
 - Comment: Someplace in the report should list the probable effects/changes, Now things are buried in the “fine print” (details and maps).

Response: The document addresses potential negative impacts on open space and natural resources, transportation and land use at several points in the document, including in the introduction and in the Corridor-Wide Framework.

33. Comment: Who decided a major purpose is to MAXIMIZE economic development in the area. This directly contradicts the purportedly important quality of life and traffic congestion goals.
- Response: The Land Use Strategy is intended to identify an approach to achieve multiple goals, one of which is economic development. Some stakeholders during the process indicated a desire to maximize tax-generating development, which helps to support municipal needs. On page 55 the document discusses the trade-offs that result from this and other goals for the Corridor.
34. Comment: Hard to believe there is no population density or private property density on the zone – please consider people, NOT just woodlands, prairies, etc.
- Response: Unclear what this comment refers to, but population density was discussed and mapped as part of the analysis during an earlier phases of this project.
35. Comment: Population has not increased versus projections as it presented.
- Response: The strategy document uses CMAP population projections for 2040, which are lower than independent third party projections.
36. The purported need is contrary to the trends. There are currently overbuilt, abandoned buildings, empty retail and office space throughout Lake County.
- Response: The market analysis takes into account current vacancy amounts.
37. The development plans of the 120 Bypass and the 53 BRAC are the primary motivation for the 53 extension proposal, not incidental considerations, so any pretense that this land use plan seeks to moderate them are disingenuous. CMAP should either provide a strategy for reducing congestion, or be clear that its goal is to create “critical mass to become regional centers of commercial use” in Lake County’s open space, as it states in the Introduction to this strategy.
- Response: Noted.
38. Comment: Consistency about how the roadway project is referenced – IL53/120, Rte 53/120, IL-53/120, Route 53/120, the 53/120 facility
- Response: Noted. References to the facility will be made consistent.
39. Page 7. At the 9-24-15 LU Committee Meeting, I offered comments related to the text in the 3rd and 4th paragraphs on page 7 concerning criticism of the “– lack of adequate planning for residential development–” and “-- the result of this imbalanced and unrealistic planning approach can result in a rise in traffic, disruptions to the environmental systems, and lower quality of life for Lake County residents, businesses, and others.” As I noted at the 9-24-15 LU Committee Meeting I saw an article by a CMAP Board Member that was in the Daily Herald Newspaper on 9-15-15 that had the following comment: “But this simplistic frame misses a critical reality: we cannot implement any truly meaningful long term fix to government until we bring the archaic hodgepodge of taxes, fees and penalties that fund local government and schools into the 21st century.” It is my opinion that the comment in this article directly relates to the text on page 7 of the Draft Document and without these types of changes the local municipalities must consider the impact on the local school districts that contribute substantially to the “quality of life for Lake County residents, businesses, and others.” I hope the text on page 7 can be significantly improved to appropriately reflect the “critical reality” that local units of government are forced to deal with the Illinois system of funding for all local units of government.
- Response: The final sentence of the third paragraph will be revised to read “While it is recognized that there are a range of issues related to funding of local units of government that influence long-range planning decisions, the current approach to planning can result in a rise in traffic, disruptions to environmental systems, and lower quality of life for Lake County residents, businesses, and others.

40. Page 7- The conclusion that municipalities in the corridor should maximize economic development potential is not the vision for Hawthorn Woods or all municipalities. One of our goals is to maximize the rural by design lifestyle as clearly identified on the Village's website. Please remove this statement.
- Response: Revise the statement to read "A thriving Corridor that allows municipalities to achieve realistic, market supportable amounts of development to the extent it aligns with each community's goals; and which can be accomplished within well-planned and designed developments that are successfully integrated into the natural and cultural context of the area."
41. Figure 1: Reflect Grayslake boundaries south of Peterson Road and west of Midlothian Road.
- Response: The figure on page 9 will be updated to reflect the current municipal boundaries.
42. Comment: Page 10: to be consistent the sub-header "Draft & Final Corridor Plan Strategy"
- Response: Noted. This will be addressed.
43. Page 10 – Strategy endorsement and follow-up, talks about each community endorsing the plan, but doesn't layout out the detail of how each community will go about endorsing the plan. Does this mean each community will have to adopt this plan?
- Response: It is a goal to have the communities that participated in the process endorse the document, however, it is up to each municipality to choose if and how they endorse or adopt the document.
44. Somewhere in the Strategy there should be a reference to the fact that some properties in the corridor for which there are suggestions in the Strategy may be previously entitled by zoning and/or annexation decisions which may impact the ability to implement the concepts included in the Strategy.
- Response: A comment to that affect will be added to page 12 – "About This Document"
45. Page 13 - The Plan states communities should consider adopting the Plan as an addendum to their comprehensive plan or as a separate planning guide by the end of 2016. The Plan also states communities should develop and enter in an IGA or similar corridor agreement. When will the IGA be available for review and comment? Why is the IGA not being reviewed concurrently with the Plan as both documents complement and reinforce each other? Please remove this request.
- Response: The strategy document identifies this as an encouraged, not required, next step. An IGA was not an envisioned product of this process when the project was initiated in 2014, and therefore is outside of the scope. The suggestion is that the Strategy and IGA be considered together by each individual community in 2016. No change.
46. Page 13- Villages may choose not to adopt the Plan as an addendum to the Village's Comprehensive Plan. To do so could obligate the Village to endorse the Plan's vision and agree to implement it in its strategic growth plan.
- Response: Noted. Communities are asked to consider adopting the Land Use Strategy, but not required to.
47. Page 13 - the Village of Mundelein is opposed to any formal adoption of the Land Use Strategy or as an Addendum to the Mundelein Comprehensive Plan. We would support a separate Planning Guide.
- Response: Noted
48. Page 13 - The Village of Mundelein cannot conceptually agree to an IGA without reviewing the specifics of the document. We have expressed our resistance to the creation of any group that would add an additional layer of bureaucracy in regards to development.
- Response: Noted

49. Page 13/ 1. Adopt the Corridor Strategy: After the first paragraph add a paragraph like “The document provides guidance on the basis of the time frame in which it was written. It is recognized that there may be changes to the road alignment and design or further traffic or other studies that could impact the concepts contained in the Strategy. In adopting the Strategy for use in planning municipalities reserve the right to change their positions on the concepts included in the Strategy based on changes to the road design or alignment or new information as it becomes available.”

Response: A new paragraph will be added to page 13 under Adopt the Corridor Strategy that will read: *“The document provides guidance based within the time frame in which it was written. It is recognized that there may be changes to the facility’s alignment and design or the preparation of other studies that could impact the concepts contained in the Strategy. In adopting the Strategy for use in planning, municipalities reserve the right to change their positions on elements of the Strategy based on changes to the facility design or alignment or to new information as it becomes available.”*

50. Page 13/Second Paragraph/Second Line: Delete “Commit to using” and substitute “consider”

Response: This substitution will be made.

51. Page 13/Second Paragraph/Third Line: Delete “to make more thoughtful and informed planning, investment, and development decisions.” And substitute “as they make their municipal land use decisions.”

Response: This substitution will be made.

52. Page 13/Fourth Paragraph/Fourth Line: Add “additional” after “through”

Response: This change will be made

53. Page 13/Line 5: Delete sentence starting with the word “They” and substitute for this sentence “They are intended to support the communities in their work toward achieving their preservation and development goals in the corridor.”

Response: The text will be revised to read *“To that end, the strategy document must be useful to Corridor communities as they work toward achieving their preservation and development goals in the Corridor.”*

54. Pages 16 - 54 - The Plan provides multiple maps identifying Core and Opportunity Landscapes. Will a comprehensive table summarizing all of this data be generated?

Response: The majority of the maps shown are developed from Lake County GIS data, which is publically available. At this point a comprehensive table will not be generated as it would be too large and unwieldy to be useful.

55. Page 16/Figure 2: Northeast Corner of Rte. 120/83; Wetland area is overstated to the east and north. Should be half the size of what is shown as a core area and be close to the actual 83/120 intersection. Area to the north of undesignated strip is developed and so this designation should be eliminated.

Response: The mapping is based upon Lake County GIS wetland data and is intended in this context for a regional planning approach and not site specific issues.

56. Page 16/Figure 2: Northwest Lake Street/Washington Street: Area is overstated to the south. Opportunity landscape should be reduced to the areas north. Land is entitled for single family homes
- Response: The opportunity landscape designation is referencing opportunities for preservation as open space or as a working landscape. As this site is entitled for single-family homes, the opportunity landscape designation will be removed and changes to the large open spaces map (page 36) and working landscapes map (page 40), will also be made.
57. Page 16/Figure 2: Area designated opportunity landscape area near the northeast corner of Peterson Road and from Alleghany Road on the west to Rte. 53 on the east is overstated. The area is entitled for manufacturing and office development with an approved development plan. The opportunity landscape are should be eliminated from this area.
- Response: The opportunity landscape for this area is referencing opportunity for wetland mitigation. While it is possible to integrate wetland mitigation into a manufacturing and office development, the map will be revised to remove the designation in this area.
58. Page 18/Figure 3: It should be noted that major park areas only are shown. There are preserved park sites not shown on this figure.
- Response: The label will be changed to indicate they are major park areas shown.
59. Comment: Corridor Wide Framework map legends were very difficult to read
- Response: Noted. These will be enlarged and made clearer to the extent possible.
60. Figures 2-15: The LC Forest Preserve headquarters office building which is located within a paved office park, is incorrectly identified with a green label for “parks, preserves, and public lands”.
- Response: Modify figures 2 through 15 to remove green color from the site of the LC Forest Preserve District headquarters.
61. We suggest stronger language in the Strategy stating the importance of the conservation strategy as the foundation for a balanced approach to development in the corridor. Also it should be stated that in seeking the balance in each zone, the municipalities should be cognizant of the previously preserved acreage.
- Response: The last sentence in the third paragraph on page 17 will be revised to read *“These landscapes form the basis of an ecological system that supports and contributes to daily services for residents and visitors alike and serves as the foundation for a balanced approach to development in the Corridor.”* Additionally, a new last sentence will be added to the first paragraph on page 59 that will read *“As municipalities work together to seek a balanced approach in each zone, they should be cognizant of the current land use amounts and ratios, including the current amount of protected open space within their zone.”*
62. On Figure 3: Protected Landscapes (page 18) and Figure 5: Wetlands (page 22), the Wetland Mitigation Banks that are in my Village of Hainesville and north of Campbell Airport are shown in their correct location, and on Figure 20: Future Land Use Changes (Page 53), the location of the anticipated land use changes in my Village are correctly shown as being to the east of the Wetland Mitigation Banks. However, on Figure 21: Corridor Hot Spots (page 54) and on Figure 33: Zone 2 Detailed Planning Areas A through H (page 72), the location of the Hot Spot and the Location of Area 2.B is not shown correctly as being east of the Wetland Mitigation Banks, but rather it is shown incorrectly as being in the Wetland Mitigation Banks. The text for Detailed Planning Area 2.B on page 73 regarding the “Preferred Typologies” regarding the preferred land uses is correct for the area “east” of the Wetland Mitigation

Banks, but the text under “Special Features” primarily relates to the area within the Wetland Mitigation Banks and not the area to the east. I request that either a new Detailed Planning Area be designated to the east of the Wetland Mitigation Banks to be consistent with the text for the “Preferred Typologies” (regarding the preferred land uses) or the current Detailed Planning Area 2.B be expanded to the east, or maybe as an Area 2.B West & Area 2.B East. I want to make sure that the information in this Corridor Land Use Strategy Document does not misrepresent the locations of our Villages intended future land uses.

Response: Area 2.B will be relocated to the east so it will not conflict with the wetland mitigation banks. Additionally the comments under “Special Features” that pertain to the mitigation banks will be removed.

63. Page 18, Figure 3 - The Village’s Public Works facility and the two adjacent residential parcels to the south (north of Old McHenry just east of railroad tracks) should be identified as ‘protected land’ as on subsequent maps.

Response: The parcels identified in Figures 4 through 15 as protected land, but not clearly defined in Figure 3 are Heritage Oaks Park, Hawthorn Woods Aquatic Center, and Hawthorn Community Park. Figure 3 will be modified to clearly define those parcels.

64. Page 20/Figure 4: The woodland designation should be removed near Rte. 120/83 northeast corner: The area is severely degraded and mostly scrub vegetation remains.

Response: The mapping is based upon regional GIS data and is intended in this context for a regional planning approach and not an indication of woodland quality. No change

65. Page 21 - Core Landscape: Woodlands, who determines if buffer size is feasible? Should consider keeping buffer requirements consistent with SMCs regulations.

Response: It would be up to each individual municipality to determine what buffer is appropriate for their specific community. A model ordinance may be developed that provides more guidance. No change.

66. Page 22/Figure 5: The BRAC Priority Sensitive Area south of Rte. 120, north of the 53 alignment and east of Rte. 137/83 should be eliminated as the wetland that was there is no longer present. It was mitigated for a road extension in the area.

Response: The BRAC Priority Sensitive Areas are shown for reference only. Removing or changing one would create confusion or imply decisions have been made to modify these areas as part of this process, which they have not.

67. Page 24/Figure 6: See comment on Figure 5 above

Response: See response to comment 66.

68. Page 24/Figure 6: The BRAC Priority Sensitive Area straddling Rte. 45 and south of Rte. 120 should be eliminated on both sides of Rte. 45 since the area is developed or currently under development.

Response: See response to comment 66.

69. Page 27-Core Landscape: Prairie and Grasslands: A model preservation ordinance could require protection of landscapes and mitigation requirements and include buffer requirements. The required completion of a flora inventory prior to any development or preservation action would definitely impact cost and set corridor communities apart from other development requirements in non-corridor communities. Please remove this requirement.

Response: This is not stated as a requirement in the Land Use Strategy, but as a recommendation which a municipality or agency can choose to undertake.

70. Page 29- The Plan states that while regulatory floodplains must meet the WDO, special consideration will be given to the construction of new bridges or culvert crossings and roadway approaches. Does this provision give the Illinois Tollway special considerations to not follow the WDO regulatory rules through the Indian Creek March? Please eliminate this section.

Response: Lake County SMC has provided language to clarify the intent of the WDO and has provided the following language to be used *“To ensure no adverse floodplain impacts occur for crossing locations, additional analysis is required for the construction of new bridges or culvert crossings and roadway approaches or the reconstruction or modification of existing bridges, culvert crossings, or roadway approaches.”*

71. Page 30/Figure 9: Much of the area north of Peterson Road and between Alleghany Road on the west and Rte. 53 to the east is entitled for manufacturing and office with an approved development plan. The wetland mitigation designation should be removed.

Response: See response to comment 57.

72. Page 31- The development of a stewardship plan, including who will perform stewardship duties, could add another layer of regulations on development within the corridor that would further place corridor communities at a disadvantage compared to non-corridor communities. Please list this as an optional guideline.

Response: The recommendation of a stewardship plan, in this context, is only for a newly created wetland mitigation area to ensure it is successful in the long term. It is stated in the Land Use Strategy as something that “should be considered” and therefore is already optional. No change.

73. Page 33: looks like a portion of the previous section squeezed its way under the header of the next section

Response: Noted. Page formatting will be fixed.

74. Page 33-Terrestrial restoration on land identified with threatened or endangered species, woodlands of high quality, oak groves, etc., would add another protective layer not found outside the corridor.

Response: The restoration sites identified are areas where restoration or stewardship activities would have good potential to significantly enhance the natural resources, but no requirement to restore nor protect these areas is recommended. Such activities would need to be conducted with the knowledge and consent of the property owner. No change.

75. Page 33 - Opportunity Landscape: Restoration, will the ERSF assist communities in making changes to their open space ordinances? This section does not provide any specific information on restoring and preserving, specifically regulating.

Response: The intent of the ERSF is primarily for physical projects. However, language was included to allow for the funding of “innovative investments” intended to remediate ecological health issues that may arise within the Corridor. While it will be up to future parties to decide on a case-by-case basis, it appears that the ERSF could be used to assist communities with their open space ordinances.

76. Page 35- The Plan encourages incentivizing wider buffer areas in the corridor than those required by WDO. What would be the incentives and where would this be encouraged?

Response: The creation of incentives would be up to an individual municipality and could be encouraged through density or other development bonuses. Priority locations could vary depending on the presence of natural resources or the amount of adjacent impervious surfaces and would also be at the discretion of the local municipality. No change.

77. Page 36/Figure 12: Much of the area north of Peterson Road and between Alleghany on the west and Rte. 53 to the east is entitled for manufacturing and office with an approved development plan. The open space designation should be removed.

Response: The figure will be modified to remove the open space designation from this area.

78. Page 40, Figure 14 -The Plan depicts a working landscape that is the same area depicted in Area 4.B on page 87. Area 4.B indicates preferred typologies of conservative design or rural living. However, working landscape identifies agricultural land. Please explain the discrepancy.

Response: The site in question has attributes that make it a potential candidate to remain as a working landscape if the property owner so chooses to. Additionally, if a local agricultural conservation organization was interested and able to work with the landowner to purchase the site, they could operate it as a working landscape. However, the Land Use Strategy attempts to recognize that there are other potential uses for this and other sites. This site also has the appropriate characteristics that could make it a successful wetland mitigation site and it was identified as a “hot spot” during the analysis process, so therefore, development typologies for the site were identified to provide additional options and guidance. To provide clarity about the role of the Detail Planning Areas, as they relate to Core or Opportunity Landscape, the following language will be added to pages 61, 69, 77, and 83 under the “Detail Planning Areas” sub-headers: *“Detailed Planning Areas may include natural resources that have been identified in the Corridor-Wide Framework section and be protected wherever possible. If the Detailed Planning Area is developed, suggested land use typologies are identified to provide guidance.”*

79. Page 40/Figure 14: Property on the south side of Rte.120 and east of Rte. 45 is developed or currently under development. The westernmost working landscapes designation should be removed.

Response: The figure will be modified to remove the working landscape designation from this area.

80. Page 40/Figure 14: The area at the northwest corner of Lake Street and Washington Street is entitled for single family residential. The working landscape designation should be removed for the area shown east of the RR tracks.

Response: See response to comment 56.

81. Page 41 - Opportunity Landscape: Working Landscapes, How is the land evaluated? Are lands that are currently being farmed to be preserved? What if there is developer interested? Who will make the determination of what lands need to be preserved? Will farmlands within the hot zones be automatically removed?

Response: The sites shown are intended to represent opportunities. The decision is up to the land owner if they want to sell or develop the site themselves. Agricultural conservation agencies and municipalities may choose to work with specific property owners to preserve specific sites.

82. Page 41- The Plan calls for local ordinances to preserve agricultural lands for future food production. Are municipalities being encouraged to restrict future development rights of private property owners across all of CMAP’s jurisdictional areas?

Response: Modifying municipal ordinances to preserve agricultural land is one option an individual municipality can choose to undertake if they want to support working landscapes. Other strategies are also presented. No change.

83. Page 45 - The Plan states 66,000 new County residents, while on Page 50, 65,000 new County residents is stated. Please correct.

Response: All instances will be modified to reflect the correct forecast of 65,000 residents.

84. Page 45/Second Paragraph/First Line: Delete the sentence after the word “growth” and substitute “that is well planned to balance conservation and economic development objectives as determined by the corridor municipalities will benefit individuals and businesses.” It is not a given that growth in and of itself will benefit people.

Response: The sentence will be modified as suggested to read *“Continued growth that is well planned to balance conservation and economic development objectives as determined by the Corridor municipalities will benefit individuals and businesses.”*

85. Page 45/Third paragraph/Third Line: After the word “planning” add “by the corridor municipalities and Lake County” and delete the work “needed” and substitute “preferred”

Response: This change will be made.

86. Page 46/Second paragraph/Second Line: after the word “corridor” add “if it can be determined that sufficient demand is present.”

Response: This change will be made.

87. Page 46/Third Paragraph: Add at the end of the paragraph “The depicted routes attempt to show major potential routes only. Final alignments and/or additional routes could be added if studies show a need.”

Response: The following text will be added to the end of the third paragraph: *“The corridors and service areas identified attempt to show general areas of major potential, not specific or final alignments. Additional corridors and service areas could be added as future studies show potential.”*

88. Pages 46 and 47 Public Transit: I would like to note that I am not only the Mayor of the Village of Hainesville, but I have also recently been appointed a Member of the PACE Board.as the representative for Lake County. In my review of the map on page 47 (Figure 16: Recommended Transit Network) I cannot help but notice the significant gap in the recommended transit service network in our area. I suggest that there may need to be some consideration for some recommended future minor transit routes for possible inclusion on Figure 16 (or in the text since the study area boundary on the map is cut off just a little south of the existing Round Lake Beach Train Station and the existing commercial corridor along Rollins Road). One of these recommended future minor transit routes could possibly run east-west along the Washington Street corridor in our area to offer public transit connection opportunities to the existing North Grayslake train station on Washington Street with further opportunities for connections with the existing minor transit routes that service the College of Lake County (CLC). Another recommended future minor transit route could possibly run north-south along the Hainesville Road corridor from at the north end at the Round Lake Beach train station/Post Office area and the Rollins Road commercial area, to the south through the Village of Hainesville to the connecting opportunities for the future east-west Washington Street minor transit route, and continuing to the south to the existing minor transit Route at IL. Route 120 (and possible south of Route, 120 to the area shown for future land use change to the east of the Wetland Mitigation Banks- See Figure 20). I recognize that these possible future minor transit routes are not reflected in the Appendix under the “Transit Analysis” section, but it should be noted that the existing Round Lake Beach Train Station and the existing commercial corridor along Rollins Road are both just a little north of the study area boundary as shown on the maps on pages 163 through 169. I further recognize that since the maps on pages 163 through 169 only address the area inside the study area boundary that they would not be changed, but I hope my comments regarding Figure 16: Recommended Transit Network (or the related text) can be changed to reflect my comments.

Response: The transit map did not suggest future routes on Hainesville Rd, Washington St, and Rollins Rd, as the approach focused on areas anticipated for the most new development to help encourage that new development be constructed in a most transit-supportive manner. However, there is potential as pointed out to extend service in areas with existing and growing development. Additionally, providing fixed-route bus lines is challenging. With this information in mind, the strategy document will be revised to include recommendations to enhance, expand, and promote, the Round Lake Area Call-n-Ride service to provide more demand-responsive transit service in this part of Lake County. If ridership grows, it may also be possible in the future to create deviating route bus lines that more formally serve Hainesville Rd, Washington St, and Rollins Rd, as corridors while also still retaining the flexibility and convenience that on-demand services offer to users.

89. It concerns Figure 17 - Recommended Bikeway Network. I live in the Longmeadow Estates Subdivision on the west side of Mundelein. We are bordered by Route 83 on the west and Route 53 on the east. Long story short, our subdivision is cut off at the present time from the rest of Mundelein due to this unimproved Route 53 right of way. In any event, on Figure 17, it does not show any proposed facility (bike path/trail/walking path) to connect our subdivision to the east side of the 53 right of way using a means of non-motorized travel. Right now, in order to get to any part or destination in Mundelein or the surrounding area, I need to travel by car from my home. It is my hope that should this road be constructed, that our subdivision does not continue to be cut off (trail wise) from the rest of Mundelein. Should a bike path/trail/walking path be constructed, our residential subdivision will be just a short walk or bike from: 1) Mechanics Grove School; 2) Fremont Library; 3) Mundelein Park District; 4) Lake County's Prairie Crossing/Millennium Trail System; and, 5) A sidewalk network that would connect our area to the rest of Mundelein, including, its downtown.

Response: The Recommended Bikeway Network map in the report was based on creating a more connected network at the regional-scale given the existing street pattern in developed areas and also recognizing the potential for new right-of-way through undeveloped land. As a result, an east-west connection between Maple Ave and Winchester Rd was not specifically called out as it would require a level of detailed work that is outside the scope to weave-together the existing subdivision road networks at the neighborhood-scale. However, language that supports of such east-west connections is provided in the last paragraph on page 48 of the document.

90. Page 49, Figure 17 - Recommend Bikeway Network. Mundelein will be severely impacted by the construction of Route 53. It will essentially bifurcate the Mundelein community into two halves. Bikeway Network needs to be incorporated into the Plan to connect the western portion of Mundelein with the eastern portion of Mundelein across the Route 53 right-of-way. Otherwise residential access to our schools, Park District, and Library facilities will be unreachable by pedestrians. Please refer to attached documents.

Response: See response to comment 89.

91. Starting on page 49 on Figure 17: "Recommended Bikeway Network" there is a dashed green line (labeled on the map legend as being for "Off-street trail opportunities") that starts toward its south end around the intersection of Route 60 & Peterson Road & extends in a curvilinear pattern north to Route 120; but it is not until we get to the more detailed maps in the "Planning Zone Framework" Section that this bikeway (that is now labeled as a "Recommended Priority Bikeway") is now shown as running through the middle of one of our Villages existing Planned Unit Developments (known as Saddlebrook Farms) that is a private age restricted development for seniors. This "Recommended Priority Bikeway" is shown on several of the maps in this Section including, but maybe not limited to, Figures 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, & 34. We do not support having this "Off-street trail opportunity" or "Recommended Priority Bikeway" that is shown in this location running through the middle of one of our Villages existing privately owned age restricted Planned Unit Developments. We may support the concept of this potential bikeway if it can be re-located to the west so that it does not include any of the property in this existing privately owned age restricted Planned Unit Development, & provided that the adjacent Village to the west (the Village of Round Lake) does not object to this new location.

Response: All figures showing bikeways will be modified to relocate this recommended route.

92. Page 49/Figure 17/ A path running west from the Prairie Crossing RR station through the landfill (per the end use plan) and further west connecting to the shown Alleghany Road path and continuing further to west of Alleghany should be shown. Also this would eliminate the dashed green line from the station to across Rte. 53. The remaining dashed green line in this area is generally provided for in the Cornerstone approved project.

Response: The figure will be modified as suggested.

93. Page 50/First Paragraph/Last Sentence: We have been told that the market studies say that the road itself will not materially change the expected new residential unit count in the corridor. This sentence seems to imply otherwise and should be revised to say something like: "While the highway will not materially change the projected population in the corridor it will provide improved access and mobility to the projected residential population."

Response: The last sentence of this paragraph will be changed to read "*Additionally, the improved access and mobility provided by the facility and the projected increase in population will impact housing decisions at a micro level.*"

94. Page 50-The Plan states the corridor shall serve as a catalyst for economic development and attract corporate offices, modern business parks, and retail developments that were previously out of the development pattern for such uses. How will this be reconciled if this is not the Village's municipal vision and goal? Please remove this statement.

Response: The statement will be revised to read: "*The limited access highway can act as a catalyst for economic development and attract corporate office, modern business parks and retail development to areas within the Corridor that seek such development but were previously out of the development pattern for such uses.*"

95. Page 53, Figure 20- the Land Use depicted in the documents are inconsistent with our 2011 Comprehensive Plan. The draft document indicates industrial land use which is inconsistent with our Comprehensive Plan that indicates residential for areas south of Winchester Road.

Response: For the purposes of the analysis summarized in Figure 20, the future land use plans for the communities in the Corridor were aggregated. Certain sites, such as the one identified, are in unincorporated Lake County and identified in the future land use plans of more than one municipality. In these instances, the most intense land use was used for the map. In this case industrial is considered more intense than residential and was shown for this site in another community's future land use plan.

96. Page 53/Figure 20: The figure should reflect entitled properties in the corridor. Note particularly:
- The southwest corner of Peterson Road and Rte. 83 is entitled for mixed use and is not single family as shown on the figure. This missed use designation should include the area in white at the corner.
 - The southwest corner of Alleghany Road and Rte. 120 is entitled for single family residential.
 - The industrial area on the west side of Atkinson Road and north of Rte. 120 should include a larger area running from Center Street south to near Rte.120.
 - Areas along the north side of Peterson Road and east of Rte. 83 and fronting on the fairgrounds should be designated as Retail or Commercial.

~~Response: The map was part of an analysis that compared the existing land uses to those shown on municipal future land use maps. The map is included in the strategy document for reference only. Maps will be changed to reflect a different land use than what is shown on the future land use map only in the case of an entitled development.~~

Revised Response: This map was created early in the process to show areas where land use change may be anticipated based on municipal and County comprehensive plans, but isn't intended to show entitled properties at the parcel level. The map is high level and is not used to any significant degree to influence the Planning Zone maps or Detailed Planning Areas.

97. This may seem like a specific comment but it relates to the general presentation where all of the maps/figures do NOT show "Interchange Locations" with the exception of the one map/figure 21. That figure has the title of "Corridor Hot Spots" but it includes "blue dots" on the map/figure 8 & the "blue dots" are labeled in the map legend as being "interchange locations," considering that these "interchange locations" are not shown on the other maps/figures, it would appear "generally" that these "Interchange locations" should not be shown on this one map/figure.

Response: Potential interchange locations will be removed from that graphic.

98. Page 54. At several of the past Land Use Committee Meetings and at several of the past Finance Committee Meetings (where I was also a-member), there were comments made that the location of potential "interchanges" was a matter for "later" study and later discussions. I noticed that the "Interchange Locations" have been removed from all of the maps in the Draft Document with the exception of the one map on page 54 (Figure 21: Corridor Hot Spots). I hope that this was just an oversight and this Map/Figure will be made consistent with all of the other Maps/Figures in the Draft Document and the "Interchange Locations" will be removed from this Figure 21.

Response: As noted in the response to comment 97, the interchange locations will be removed from this figure.

99. Page 58 – Figure 22: Similar to the labeling on maps earlier in this document, please shift the label "Libertyville" to show the fact the Village is within the Project Study Area.

Response: Modify labeling on Figure 22 to show Libertyville is within the Corridor study boundary.

100. Pages 59, 68 and 82 - The Plan breaks down the Corridor into four zones. Although it states municipalities were not divided across multiple zones, Hawthorn Woods is in Zones 2 and 4. Please explain this contradiction. The Village of Hawthorn Woods should be treated equally and only be placed in one zone so as not to have to seek two separate planning groups' consensus. Please correct this error and place Hawthorn Woods in Zone 4.

Response: Hawthorn Woods will be removed from Zone 2.

101. The scale bar (and related measurements) for the more area wide maps (Figures 1 -17) and map (Figure 20 for the "Future Land Use Changes) appears to be consistent with one another, but the scale bar (and related measurements) for the maps for the Detailed Planning Area Zone 2: North Central Corridor (Figures 32, 33, and 34) does not translate to be consistent with the scale bar or the measurements related to the area wide maps.

Response: The scale bar for all enlarged Planning Zone figures will be corrected.

102. Page 68 - Hawthorn Woods is misspelled in Zone 2. Please correct the spelling throughout the document.

Response: The spelling of Hawthorn Woods will be corrected.

103. Page 68/First Paragraph/Line 6: After “While” add ” there is a large protected wetland restoration area and a large community park in Grayslake and west of the proposed roadway alignment other areas in”/ change “lacks” to “lack”
- Response: To preserve the intent of the paragraph, the text will be modified to read *“There are fewer protected open spaces west of the proposed roadway alignment, so planning for additional open space is encouraged to preserve community character and natural resources.”*
104. Page 69/Second paragraph: Add to the end “The approved Cornerstone project in Grayslake, located in the Peterson Road corridor, utilizes this mixed use concept by including office, manufacturing retail/commercial, open space, and single family and multi-family residential in a single plan.
- Response: This section is intended to highlight the market forecast for this planning zone. This sentence will be placed at the end of the fourth paragraph on page 68.
105. Page 70/Figure 32: The wetland mitigation area shown as item 3 is on land already entitled for office and manufacturing. This depiction should be deleted.
- Response: See response to comment 57.
106. As the end use plan for the landfill will be as an open space feature, please show the landfill as green/open space in figures 32, 33 and 34.
- Response: Exhibits 32, 33 and 34 will be modified accordingly.
107. Pages 70, 72, 74 – Please be sure to label the MD-N [Metra rail line] in all of the maps in the Zone 2 chapter.
- Response: Labels will be added to the maps as indicated.
108. Page 71/Open Space and Natural Resources section: Item C should be deleted (see comment number 24 above). The area north of the east/west interchange, with its existing wetland/soil conditions is very appropriate for mitigation activities.
- ~~Response: Item C and the corresponding graphic and text will be removed from pages 70 and 71.~~
- Revised Response: Area C depicts an opportunity to create a larger wetland mitigation area to supplement the mitigation just north of there. Since this is an “opportunity landscape” it is only suggested and does not preclude other activities in that location. However, as stated in the narrative, there is an opportunity here to consider doing more from the natural resource perspective, including accommodating suggested trail components (along the creek and through Cornerstone, as shown) as well as maintain an open space and natural resource connection opportunity from the southern end of the stream corridor to the northwest connecting to area “B”.
109. Page 72/Figure 33: Area 2C is already entitled for single family residential which is consistent with the surrounding land uses.
- Response: Area 2. C will be removed from the report.
110. Pages 72-73: Area 2.F/Preferred Typologies: Please confirm that professional offices (attorneys, medical, etc) are considered to be part of “neighborhood commercial” or “corridor commercial”, as these may be well suited for incorporation into a multi-use structure at this location.
- Response: Professional offices are appropriate for both “Neighborhood Commercial” and “Corridor Commercial”

111. Pages 72-73:Area 2.F/Special Features: Opportunity to provide employee shuttle services between Metra and nearby employers. Opportunity to offer increased transit services to serve reverse commuter needs.
- Response: The following item will be added to the “Special Features” portion of Area 2.F: *“Opportunity to capitalize on the Metra stations to improve last-mile connectivity (for the commute and reverse-commute) through increased transit, employee shuttles, and vanpools.”*
112. Pages 72-73:Area 2.F/Best Practices: We agree mixed-use is appropriate here, but given proximity to the landfill this would likely be of the non-residential nature, such as a mix of office above retail. Your definition of LU-3 in the back of this document does not seem to take into account the possibility of an office/retail mixed use without a residential component.
- Response: The first sentence for LU-3 on page 130 will be modified to read *“Mixed-use development refers to the practice of including residential and non-residential uses, or two different types of non-residential uses such as retail and office, in a single building or within a single development site or block.”*
113. Pages 72-73:Area 2.H/Preferred Typologies: In addition to listed typologies, please add Corporate Office Center and additional typologies that might permit professional/medical offices and hospitality uses (such as hotels that could provide supportive services for neighboring corporations and tourism/tournament facilities).
- Response: Corporate Office Center will be added to the list of preferred typologies for Area 2.H.
114. Pages 72-73:Area 2.G/Map Outline: On the Meyer Farm property, we suggest that the portion of area 2.G located in Grayslake be a separate map number with separate typologies, etc, as their zoning suggests Corridor Commercial, which is not permitted at all in the Libertyville portions of the outline.
- Response: Area 2.G will be split into two separate areas to accommodate this request.
115. Pages 72-73:Area 2.G/ Typologies: The Libertyville portions should have the typologies Corporate Office Center and industrial Park. Please remove Corridor Commercial.
- Response: Noted, see previous response.
116. Pages 72-73:Area 2.G/Best Practices: Add “Encourage high employment generating uses”.
- Response: Add a new comment under special features: *“Opportunity for high employment generating uses proximate to transit.”*
117. Comment: Village of Green Oaks was listed as Green Lake on page 76
- Response: Noted. This will be corrected.
118. Page 83 - Figures noted in Zone 4 appear to be labeled incorrectly. Please correct.
- Response: The title of Figure 41 on page 83 will be corrected to read *“Zone 4 Forecasted Market Ranges”*
119. 86, 88 – Please be sure to label the NCS [Metra rail line] in all of the maps in the Zone 4 chapter.
- Response: Labels will be added to the maps as indicated.

120. Page 86 -Figure 44 coupled with Detailed Planning Areas on page 87, indicate that Area 4B and 4C are opportunities to mitigate wetlands on site. Area 4B is almost the entire area west of Route 53, south of RR tracks and north of Indian Creek Road. Area 4C is the property south of Indian Creek and just east of Conservatory of Indian Creek. The preferred typology of these two areas is Conservation Design or Rural Living. Please correct.

Response: These areas both have attributes that make them opportunities for wetland mitigation, as identified on pages 30 and 31, should the property owner wish to pursue this opportunity. The preferred typologies for area 4.C will be modified so that both 4.B and 4.C reflect the preferred typologies of Conservation Design or Rural Living.

121. Comment: The “typologies” definitions include residential and economic development areas but NOTHING for “green spaces” or “natural landscapes” (only for human effects on the land). Typologies exclude anything not man-made. No green typology, no parks and recreation (non-commercial).

Response: The Corridor-Wide Framework and Planning Zone Framework identify where open spaces and natural resources are located in the Corridor and where efforts should be made to preserve and enhance them. The role of the typologies is to identify good design and planning principles if a site is developed.

122. Page 114: The page number references are incorrect

Response: The page number references will be corrected.

123. Page 115 - The Plan summarizes that LID focuses on customizing site design to each site and exploring non-traditional site infrastructure approaches and sizes (lots, streets, curbs, gutters, sidewalks). It is our position that it is not cost-effective or manageable for a Public Works Department to consider non-traditional infrastructure approaches. Please adjust this summarization.

Response: The sub-header will be changed from “*Use Low Impact Development (LID)*” to “*Reduce Environmental Impacts of Development*”. In this context, LID is provided as one example. Additionally, the language in the first full paragraph in the second column will be changed to read “*Developers should be educated about the benefits of practices such as LID and encouraged to incorporate the principles into development plans as long as they align with local municipal ordinances, building codes and overall community goals.*”

124. Page 115 - The Plan summarizes that LID focuses on decentralizing stormwater management and addressing rain where it falls rather than somewhere downstream. It seems that the goal in Lake County, overall, is to centralize everything because it is more efficient and less costly, but stormwater management is now being proposed to be decentralized. Please explain the inconsistency as it will cost more, be less efficient and more difficult to maintain. Please adjust this summarization.

Response: While centralization can be effective in certain situations, the strategy of “addressing rainwater where it falls” can be a cost effective tool to mitigate flooding and water quality impacts due to new development. So both approaches can be valid. To provide clarity, the bullet point will remove the comment about decentralizing and be modified to read “*Address rain where it falls where possible, rather than somewhere downstream*”

125. Comment: Guiding Principles -GP=6 refers to “open local spaces.” No other mention of natural landscapes. A mowed corporate lawn is NOT “GREEN SPACE!”

Response: GP-6 focuses on undeveloped landscapes that should be recognized for their potential value beyond the open spaces and natural resources already discussed as important in the Corridor-Wide Framework. Additionally, on page 39, the document provides recommendations and strategies for management and stewardship activities on private properties for restoring and recreating natural environments.

126. Page 125 - Open Space Best Practices, OS-5, states ERSF funds will be finite and some strategies may include purchasing easements or development rights to protect lands instead of fee simple purchases or using the ERSF to provide matching funds for grants. Please remove the suggested strategies or significantly expand the list of potential strategies that could be considered as some corridor communities may not necessarily want to be limited to those already identified. Please remove or expand strategies.

Response: The first sentence of the second paragraph on page 125 will be revised to read *“Some strategies to leverage ERSF investments could include the purchasing or donation of conservation easements or development rights by public or private conservation organizations, or obtaining matching grants from State or Federal agencies for significant undertakings and larger multi-jurisdictional projects.”*

127. Comment: “Transportation” Best Practices -TR-1 Humanize the scale of streets. Tollways are not humanized.

Response: The strategy document is focused on the local roads in the Corridor and not on the design of the Tollway.

128. Page 126 - Transportation Best Practices, TR-1 seems to suggest that roads should be designed with emphasis on pedestrians and bikes, more than the amount of cars that the roads can accommodate; that is, reducing the number of lanes of traffic to make it safer for pedestrians and bikes. Please confirm this is the intent as it is difficult to understand the concept of moving more cars through the area more quickly while primarily focusing on how to integrate pedestrians and bikes in the manner suggested. Please highlight how adding additional employment centers along the tollway will reduce traffic and not increase local traffic, as not every employee or consumer will use the toll road.

Response: The best practice emphasizes that roadway design should take a holistic approach, and that design for people walking and riding bikes is a core part of road design rather than just limited to providing sidewalks and bike facilities after the fact or as retrofits. Relative to the impact on local traffic - on page 45, the report discusses the connection between transportation and land use. The report acknowledges that development (including additional employment centers along the tollway) will bring an increase in travel, and that increased capacity of new roads could also stimulate new development. With regard to how more travel impacts “traffic” (i.e. congested travel conditions for vehicles) the outcome depends on two key things: how much travel new roads attracts and how people in new developments get around. A more involved transportation study would be required to determine the net impact on traffic – something that was beyond the scope of this land use study. Instead, the focus of this study was to provide guidance on appropriate land use development patterns that can help manage the growth of single-occupancy vehicle trips (from development and road construction) to increase the likelihood that more travel doesn’t lead to more traffic. Transit supportive development is the key mechanism suggested to help ensure that automobile trips grow at a slower rate than the rate at which road space grows.

129. Appendix Market Analysis Section: Again I recognize that this was a separate study and I don’t know if there will be any revisions to this part of the Draft, Document, but I do want to note some inconsistencies in the “Retail Forecast, 2015-240 Section.” For example on the paragraph on the left hand side of page 153 there are references to Figures 76 and 77 and on page 155 there is a reference to Figure 79, but in between these Figure references, there does not appear to be a reference to a Figure 78: “Retail Leakage within Regional Retail Cluster Trade Areas.” On the right hand side of page 153 there is a reference to an Exhibit 23 and in the text related to that Exhibit 23 there are references to “retail leakage” so that it appears that instead of the reference to Exhibit 23, the correct reference should be to Figure 78. Also on this page 153, the title of “Potential New Corridor Regional Retail Clusters” is on the right hand side of the page above the paragraph that references “retail leakage” while the paragraph on the left hand side of this page references “new regional retail cluster development”: It would appear that it would be more consistent that the title of “Potential New Corridor Regional Retail Clusters” should be above the paragraph on the left hand side of the page and not above the paragraph on the right hand side of the page that references “retail leakage.”

Response: The reference on page 153 to “Exhibit 23” will be corrected to read “Figure 78.” The sub-header “Potential New Corridor Regional Retail Clusters” and the paragraph that follows will be moved to the top of page 154 to relate more clearly to the graphic and the next section.

130. Again, while I do not know if there will be any changes to this part of the Draft Document, I do want to note that there appears to be a general reference to retail leakage occurring in “the northwest and far southern portions of the Corridor”, but there is not a reference to indicate that (according to the information shown on Figure 77) that the highest area of Retail Leakage is found along the portion of the Route 120 Corridor where the Village of Hainesville (and adjacent Villages) is located. I find it unfortunate that on Figure 85: Projected Corridor Retail Development 2015-2040 (page 160) that the pink area around the larger red dot for the “Potential New Retail Cluster” stops just short of the area shown for “Future Land Use Change” (Figure 20 on page 53) for the anticipate land use changes in my area just to the east of the Wetland Mitigation Banks.

Response: Figure 85 will be modified to extend the pink area further to the northwest.

131. 163-9 – Please be sure to label the NCS [Metra rail line] in all of the maps in the Transit Analysis chapter.

Response: Labels will be added to the maps as indicated.

132. Lake County SMC provided a series of detailed edits to clarify that the recommendations are consistent and do not represent changes to the existing WDO. Modifications in-line with their recommendations will be made to pages 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 35, 63 and 123.

133. Pace provided suggested edits to clarify transit goals and make sure they are in alignment with their future plans. Modifications in-line with their recommendations will be made to pages 46 and the Transit Analysis Appendix.