

Attendees:

Pat Carey, former Lake County Board (Chair)
George Ranney, BRAC (Co-Chair)
Mike Ellis, Grayslake
Steve Park, Gurnee
Joe Mancino, Hawthorn Woods
Al Maiden, Round Lake Park
Mike Stevens, Lake County Partners
Nicole Woods, Buffalo Grove
Noelle Kischer-Lepper, Waukegan
Brad Leibov, LPF
Aaron Lawlor, Lake County
Dawn Abernathy, Mundelein
Jason Navota, CMAP
Daniel Grove, Lakota

Introduction:

- George Ranney – Stressed the importance of an implementable plan and the hope that the approach will provide a structure.
- Pat Carey – Encouraged the Working Group to keep in mind the potential benefits to each community as well as the Corridor and the County from a successfully implemented plan. Stated that she understands from her time as a Mayor how comprehensive community and regional planning can create benefits.

Presentation – Jason Navota

Questions & General Discussion – The following comments and questions were raised by different members of the Working Group as part of the discussion:

- Question on the Corridor Planning Council (CPC). What would the requirements be to participate? Would the community need to buy in and adopt plan to sit on Council?
- Suggestion that planning for implementation will need to marry up with Stewardship fund.
- Question if CPC membership only includes agencies with land use authority? For example, school districts may want to participate.
 - One suggestion that it would just be municipalities
 - Question if economic & open space representatives would at table?
- Comment there are vastly different characters across Zones. Asked how the process will balance those differences? Will there be different impacts or relationship to "paying in"?
 - Suggestion that only the communities receiving a benefit are being asked to pay in.
 - Comment that there may need to be a balance of where revenue is generated and who gets the funds. Suggestion that it may not be balanced and it will be important to show how it is structured.
- Question on how open space would be captured? Who would be responsible for purchasing that land?
- Suggestion that it will be important to get agreement on which spaces are important and that municipalities can monitor those spaces and work with agencies and park districts to purchase if desire and funding are available.

- Question on if the plan shows a property to be green space but an interested developer comes in, what would happen?
 - Suggestion that there could be an impact fee or dis-incentive if a municipality or developer breaks from plan.
 - Suggestion for a three step approach:
 - Step 1 - Municipality could be proactive and work with owner and park district to use funds to acquire and protect the land.
 - Step 2 – The municipality could work with the developer to create a sensitive plan or identify funding sources to incentivize the developer to avoid impacts to the identified natural resource areas.
 - Step 3 – Would be reactive measures and disincentives.
- Question on how much open space is there and how much will it cost to acquire?
- Request for a hierarchy of open space.
- Comment that the cooperative planning structure is really just asking the participating municipalities to establish and monitor a vision, with the independent communities tasked to implement it. Suggestion that it is better to all work together and that it is not a radical charge from what municipalities are asked to do already
- Comment that the edges of the planning zones are important for having agreements in place.
- Concern for a potential conflict. There are four zones, so how would planning conflicts be resolved from zone to zone? Will an overall group be needed to monitor and mediate between zones
- Suggestion to the working group that it is better to focus on overall benefits for the Corridor instead of just trying to balance individual cost-benefit on each issue.
- Suggestion that there should just be one Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with carve outs for each planning zone or for specific issues such as open space.
 - One WG member agreed with the approach for one IGA to establish the vision and implementation could happen in the zones through sub-committees.
 - Another WG member agreed it can it all be done with one IGA
 - Another WG member commented that a single IGA & CPC could work, and agreed that call outs for smaller groups to address zones would be necessary and could come back to the bigger group to resolve issues
 - Another WG member suggested that there could be two levels of approving the overall IGA.
 - The first would be to sign on to the idea of the IGA, the objective of balanced land use, and agree to continue the discussions and move it forward.
 - The second would be signing on to establish sub-groups and implement the IGA.
- Suggestion that implementation & tactics could be a sub-group.
- Group was asked how to get participation from the municipalities.
 - Suggestion that self-interest will bring them to the table – that there has already been an investment of money and time. However, he acknowledged you can't force the municipalities to participate.
- Comment that there are certain key municipalities that need to be at the table.
- Comment that participating would mean less chances for disputes and better outcomes.
- Question asked if we pushing people or pulling them to participate? Suggestion that it needs more thought.
- Comment that each community will need to update their plans and technical assistance could be provided as an incentive to participate in the IGA.
- Suggestion that being able to work with Tollway on design could be another incentive as well as agreeing that help on comprehensive plans, both technical and monetary could be an incentive. Another option could be to underwrite part of the open space planning thru Stewardship fund.
- Comment that State and Federal funds are also needed and could be used to leverage opportunities.
- Comment that it is better to work on designing road together

- One WG member agreed that self-interest and funding will be important. Communities still might not come to the table for various reasons
- Suggestion that the potential for a streamlined approval process as an incentive.
 - One WG member commented that it would be huge economic development incentive
- Question asked if the CPC would serve as oversight of stewardship fund?
- Request for a flowchart of the groups (CPC, Stewardship Fund) and their proposed relationships.
- Suggestion that the consultant team not steer away from prescriptive language, be clear and make use of people at the table.
- Comment that the consultant team try to push the envelope and put together a list of things needed or recommended (maybe in two columns) for the IGA.
- The consultant was requested to show the Working Group the Open Space and Natural Resources map.
 - Jason Navota conducted a brief overview of the OSNR Working Group presentation.
 - Question asked how some of the recommended natural resource areas and buffers differ from SMC requirements? Also, how does it compare to Wisconsin requirements. Indicated that if it is in common with SMC, then Wisconsin requirements are not critical.

Potential next meeting date:

- June 10th-2 PM

Public Comment

- Barbara Klipp – Would like a rigorous public process, above Open Meetings requirements, for the IGA.
- Susan Zingle – Suggesting a moratorium on annexation until the plan is in place. Also suggested that the impacts will extend beyond corridor and asked if planning will go further - will the County Update its Comprehensive Framework Plan?
- Gloria Charland – Indicated that she does not believe the road, commercial development or industrial development are benefits.