

**Attendees:**

Brad Leibov, LPF (Chair)  
Aaron Lawlor, Lake County (Co-Chair)  
George Ranney, BRAC  
Lenore Beyer-Clow, Openlands  
Dave Brown Vernon Hills  
Linda Soto, Hainesville  
Daniel MacGillis, Round Lake  
Jim Anderson, LCFPD  
Mike Warner, LCSCMC  
Dawn Abernathy, Mundelein  
Al Maiden, Village of Round Lake Park  
Jason Navota, CMAP  
Daniel Grove, Lakota  
Jay Womack, WRD  
Ernesto Huaracha, WRD

---

Introduction – *Brad Leibov* – Indicated that there is a lot of information prepared and the group should take time to go through it and understand the terminology

Presentation – *Jason Navota*

**Discussion**

- Question on how many SMC Buyout Parcels are there in the Corridor and what is the acreage?
- Comment that municipal parks should not necessarily be considered “Open Space” as they may have significant impervious coverage.
- Request that the coloring of the exhibits continue to be refined to improve readability and ensure that information is being conveyed
- Discussion of Pre-settlement Forests
  - Recommendation to use “Woodlands” instead of “Forests”
  - Comment that woodlands are a high priority for several groups in the Corridor
  - Question if restoration potential of pre-settlement woodlands is high?
    - Comment that more analysis will be needed to better understand restoration potential
  - Request for a breakdown of protected and unprotected lands for this category
  - Question if the suggestion is that pre-settlement woodlands are not to be developed
    - Comment that they can be developed but other preservation and mitigation techniques are being evaluated
- Discussion of Woodlands not within pre-settlement boundaries
  - Question if the Tollway is conducting a qualitative assessment of woodlands? Aimee Lee of the Tollway answered that they are not.
  - Comment that some qualitative level should be established
    - Comment that oak tree mapping may provide qualitative structure, especially if locations of threatened and endangered species are included
  - Group asked for comments on mitigation

- Comment that mitigation would need to occur on suitable sites
    - Comment that mitigation ratios based on acreage do not take into account the quality of the trees
    - Several comments that many municipalities have their own tree preservation ordinances that address individual trees
    - Agreement that mitigation should be based on trees, not area
  - Discussion of difference between pre-settlement woodland and remaining woodlands and if they should be treated differently
    - Jay Womack of WRD indicated that the pre-settlement analysis indicates areas that have a higher possibility of supporting ecosystems which requires different thinking and mitigation, where the woodlands mitigation would focus on replacing trees
  - Recommendation that the woodlands outside of pre-settlement areas be managed by the local municipality.
  - Suggestion that presence of woodland soils be used to help determine if a woodland is a restoration opportunity
  - Suggestion that a model ordinance for tree preservation be prepared. The Tollway has a policy, CMAP has model ordinance examples and the Great Lakes Tree Ordinance were all mentioned as potential references.
- Discussion of Wetlands
  - Question for clarification that there are no new requirements beyond what is existing
- Discussion of Water & Stream Buffers
  - Suggestion that the buffers should be larger in developed areas too. Response that those areas are addressed in an Opportunity Area
  - Request to more clearly understand where the undeveloped areas are
  - Request for background on the benefits of a wider buffer?
  - Jason Navota asked municipal representatives to identify locations where there are issues with the map
  - Comment that streams affect many municipalities as they move from one area to another, so the WG should be encouraged to think carefully about it this proposed regulation
  - One WG member indicated support for the larger buffer
  - Comment that buffer averaging can be problematic as the narrower area becomes funnel for pollutants
    - Comment that impacts of concentrated flow are important
- Discussion of Prairies and Grasslands
  - Comment that there does not appear to be a lot in this category that is not already protected and the areas where mitigation would be applied are very parcel and municipality specific, which can make the discussion challenging
  - Suggestion to come back at next meeting with mitigation recommendation but reach out to specific impacted municipalities in the meantime
- Discussion of composite map of Core resources
  - Request to show color variation between protected and unprotected
  - Comment the analysis has continued to move forward well and that the maps continue to be refined and zero in an important lands.
- Discussion of Opportunity Areas
  - Large Preserves
    - Suggestion that the Squaw Creek Mitigation Bank be included as it could be a public use even though it is protected
    - Comment that the term “preserves” is carries certain connotations and should be changed to landscapes or open space

- Agreement that “preserves” implies coordinated land management
  - SMC Hazard Areas
    - Concern that presentation of the map could create confusion or worry for a property owner and impact property owner plans or affect value of land
    - WG generally agreed the map should not be shown in the future
  - Headwaters Protection
    - WRD commented that there are educational opportunities but no definitive map.
- Linda Soto provided a brief presentation on the restoration of pond edges with native plants and suggested that reworking of pond edges be included in the suggested guidelines section of the report
  - Brad Leibov requested the consultant team prepare a brief memo and chart. Suggested that it should be 2-3 pages with a focus on where are the unprotected and unregulated lands and how much land do they represent. Additionally the memo should comment on mitigation suggestions for the few categories that do not have them currently.
  - Request to get minutes out soon after meeting to allow for review for accountability.

Next meeting date:

- June 30<sup>th</sup>, 9:00 am

Public Comment

- Erika Frable, Village Engineer from Hawthorn Woods, asked if the means of enforcement have been figured out. Additionally, she commented that the 300’ stream buffer is excessive and that the SMC regulations are already conservative and more than requirements in other Counties.
- Barbara Klipp - Suggested that zoning guidelines should be identified for development around bike paths to protect safety and usability. Mentioned industrial uses and truck loading near existing paths that create safety issues. Also indicated concern that 45 mile an hour speed limit and goals for expanding local food production as “wishful thinking.” Also commented that no one is mitigating for air quality-ozone issues.
- Jim Bland - Complimented the process for exceptional land use planning. However, suggested that a projection of impervious surface is missing from analysis as well as modeling of impacts on water quality
- Lori Sharland – Indicated her support for not building the Tollway and that she is not the only one with this opinion

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.