

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
Jeffrey Berman, Buffalo Grove
Heather Rowe, Libertyville
Stephen Henley, Volo
Mike May, Volo
Brad Leibov, LPF
Aaron Lawlor, Lake County
Dawn Abernathy, Mundelein
Jason Navota, CMAP
Daniel Grove, Lakota

Introduction – *Pat Carey*

Presentation – *Jason Navota*

Discussion

- Comment that the details of the IGA are important. Many municipalities may be hesitant to giving up authority on development decisions. Additional open space protection could be seen as an extra hoop to jump through and loss of control
- Suggestion that the proposed IGA is trying to provide structure, so not giving up too much
- Concern that the road creates unequal benefit and that impacts each municipality's opinion
- Comment that agreeing to an IGA now ties the hands of future boards
- Comment that municipalities would be getting a benefit from the road
- Request for members at the table to let the Working Group know what each municipality thinks they would be giving up by agreeing to the IGA
- Comment that proposed plan is like a municipality's comprehensive plan, that it gives good guidance for future planning decisions
- Comment that non-binding comp plan type guidance is okay
- Concern mentioned that the land use plan may conflict with comp plans and the Working Group needs to understand if it does
- Request for a hierarchy of what is being agreed to
- Comment that any proposed natural resource protections by the other Working Group would be a land use requirement and therefore it is important to understand the other group's discussion
- Brad Leibov and Aaron Lawlor provided a brief recap of the Open Space and Natural Resources Working Group discussion
 - Indicated that the focus is on unprotected and unregulated resources and the direction to the consultants is to identify how many and where?
- Comment that any new natural protections are giving up authority and because of the uncertainty of the future, it would be difficult to agree to this as it may tie the hands of future boards

- Comment that this work should be seen as a regional benefit and encouraged that the groups work build on previous efforts
- Jason Navota asked if a startup Memo of Understanding (MOU) is acceptable as a means of agreeing to work together?
 - One WG member indicated it is unacceptable if the details of balanced land use & OSNR strategy details are not provided.
 - Another WG member suggested that what is being asked is if a startup MOU is acceptable, assuming that after document is released, people review and agree on details of plan
 - Another WG member indicated the group is being asked if they want to be part of the process
- Suggestion that future IGA & plan would have to have review process to figure out all details
- Question on how would Corridor Planning Council (CPC) and their activities be funded?
- Discussion of the CPC
 - Who would the members be?
 - Comment that citizens at-large should not be included, that the municipalities should be representing them
 - Question on if transit agencies – Metra, Pace and RTA – would be members?
 - One WG member suggested that they did not need to be members, or that the RTA could represent all three
 - Question on how big would the CPC be?
 - Discussion that it may be up to 30 members
 - Suggestion that it include County, Municipality, environmental groups and economic development groups
 - Suggestion that not all environmental groups would have standing in the CPC
 - Suggestion that the issues do not affect the environmental groups as directly as municipalities
 - Comment that it is important for the environmental groups to have a chance to participate
 - Suggestion that there is agreement that the environmental groups should be asked to participate in the CPC
 - Suggestion that only Lake County Partners should be part of the CPC and no other economic development groups are needed
- Suggestion to show different scenarios of how the IGA would impact municipalities to help provide clarity
- Comment that the participating municipalities all are at the table to work together and that members would not be participating if they were not willing to make some compromises

Next meeting date:

- June 30th, 1:00 pm

Public Comment

- Barbara Klipp – Requested that citizens at-large are included in the CPC. Also requested that establishing the IGA be a process that includes meaningful public input.
- Jeff Maras from Grayslake - Indicated concerns for impact of road on the character of the adjacent land as well as on taxes.

Note: This summary represent Lakota’s understanding and interpretation of the issues discussed at that meeting regarding the project. If there are any edits or discrepancies in how the meeting discussion is presented, please provide them to The Lakota Group for inclusion in the final meeting summary.