

ILLINOIS ROUTE 53/120 CORRIDOR LAND USE PLAN

Land Use Committee Meeting #1 - Meeting Minutes

March 18, 2014

3:00 – 4:30 p.m.

University Center of Lake County, 1200 University Center Drive, Grayslake, Illinois

Committee Members Present: Lake County Board Chairman Aaron Lawlor, Committee Co-Chair, Lake County; George Ranney, Committee Co-Chair, BRAC; Michael Ellis, Village Manager, Village of Grayslake; Trustee Stephen Park, Village of Gurnee; Mayor Linda Soto, Village of Hainesville; Mayor Joseph Mancino, Village of Hawthorn Woods; Mike Talbett, Chief Village Officer, Village of Kildeer; President Tom Poynton, Village of Lake Zurich; President Angie Underwood, Village of Long Grove; Mayor Steve Lentz, Village of Mundelein; Russ Kraly, Village Manager, Village of Round Lake; David Brown, Village Engineer, Village of Vernon Hills; President Burnell Russell, Village of Volo; Pat Carey, Member, Lake County Board; Brad Leibov, President and CEO, Liberty Prairie Foundation; Michael Stevens, President and CEO, Lake County Partners; Mike Sands, Senior Associate, Liberty Prairie Foundation; Lenore Beyer-Clow, Policy Director, Openlands.

1. Welcome and introductions – *Committee Co-Chairs*

- Committee Co-Chair Aaron Lawlor welcomed participants and conveyed:
 - Land use planning is a key part of the 53/120 project
 - Project is based on the recommendations of the BRAC report
- Committee Co-Chair George Ranney provided opening remarks
 - BRAC was an intensive effort that developed consensus for moving forward
 - Thanked participants for agreeing to serve on this committee, adding that it is terribly important to do this work in the context of what has occurred before it (i.e. the BRAC process and all other work related to this facility)
- Kristi DeLaurentiis (Metro Strategies) took roll call – see *attendance list above*

2. Rationale and justification for process – *Jason Navota, CMAP*

- Explained Land Use Committee process is a few months behind the Finance Committee process
- Identified the shared goals of preserving community and environmental assets
- Established:
 - Initiative is just getting started with this process today, “setting the table”
 - CMAP was created to coordinate transportation and land use planning, which is what this project is about
 - We have an opportunity to plan to protect the people and assets of Lake County before the facility is built

- Walked through future land use analysis based on aggregate comprehensive plans of corridor municipalities
 - Significant increase in commercial land use categories, particularly retail, are planned by communities
 - One committee member asked whether we have this data in acres so we can see the carrying capacity. Navota responded that CMAP can provide the data, i.e. acres behind the land use analysis. Another member asked whether this land use table assumes no cannibalization or shifts between communities. Navota responded that this is correct; this future land use is presented in absence of market dynamics. However, market analysis will be part of the current effort.

3. **Process, Deliverables, and Guiding Principles** – *Scott Freres, Lakota Group (project lead for consultant team)*

- Introduced the consulting team, explaining that the expertise for the team was determined by the outcomes of the BRAC
 - S.B. Friedman (market and economic component)
 - WRD (environmental analysis, both at the broad and on-the-ground scale)
 - Sam Schwartz and Patrick Engineering (local and multi-modal transportation)
 - Metro Strategies (outreach)
 - Interface (planning, communications, and outreach)
 - Duncan Associates (land development regulation and codes)
- Summarized the timetable for the Land Use Plan
 - Outreach and Education will occur throughout the planning process
 - Phase 1 (five months): Existing Conditions Assessment
 - Phase 2 (six months): Detailed Analysis
 - Phase 3 (five months): Draft the corridor plan
 - Plan Endorsement and Follow up (six months): final plan will be reviewed by the BRAC for approval
- Reviewed Guiding Principles, objectives, and recommendations from the BRAC report

4. **Roles, Responsibilities, and Procedures** – *Jason Navota, CMAP*

- Roles and responsibilities were summarized
 - Co-chairs represent the Land Use Committee
 - BRAC will be kept up to date on the LUC process
 - CMAP will help make sure that there is coordination between the Tollway's process and the Land Use process
 - All committee members have a right to a vote
 - Assuming consensus on outcomes, each community/organization will be asked to endorse the final plan, and then issue a recommendation to the Tollway
 - In the future, committee members will receive meeting materials in advance to allow review; materials will also be posted online following the meeting

5. Desired Outcomes and General Discussion – Co-chairs

- Co-chair Lawlor opened up discussion and asked committee members about their participation
 - One committee member noted that, as Scott Freres said, there is a difference between planning at the high level and the on-the-ground level, so at some point down the line it could be critical to have site visits to the “hot spots” or resource areas. There was discussion that the more market data provided, the better.
 - Co-chair Ranney requested that the committee members look again at the table that shows the difference in the comprehensive plans across the corridor, identifying it because it presents an enormous challenge. Communities need to help consultants with accuracy of the future land use map of comprehensive plans, recommending requests for information be formulated for the consultant team, because that will help guide their analysis.
 - There was discussion about the idea of value capture, which is being explored in the Finance Committee.
 - Navota confirmed that the market analysis will generate information that will feed into the Tollway’s process.
 - It was noted that project hot spots seem to be critical and suggested the committee staff/consultants should walk committee members through how we will identify hot spots.
 - Navota: Right now hot spots are defined very simply as areas that may undergo significant land use change as a result of the facility. We also may want to designate “green” spots with high quality natural resources
 - When asked how they would like to stay engaged in this process, committee members suggested that they be fed information regularly, i.e. every other week, and that updates be sent in advance to allow them to formulate questions in advance. It was noted that draft documents will be shared on the project website. Co-chair Lawlor suggested that they can use the twice-monthly check-in call with the Tollway as a reminder to provide regular updates to the LUC members.
 - It was noted that an important role of committee members is getting their village boards and city councils engaged. Freres agreed and suggested that the consultant team was available to have dialogues with members’ elected bodies if meetings are needed. It was noted that the same thing would be good for the conservation community, and perhaps focus group(s).
 - Navota agreed, noting that the intention is to feed them “talking points” that they can use.
 - One committee member asked other LUC members what they were hearing from their communities about this project, and said in his own village residents are asking what the facility is going to look like, how big, etc. and all their questions are about the road facility itself.
 - Other committee members agreed, saying that residents want the road and have for years, and at this stage they are confused about this process and wonder why – given the BRAC process – it seems like we are starting over or still undertaking land use planning.
 - One committee member suggested that small text blurbs be provided that every municipality can put on its websites and newsletters so that the message is clear and uniform. A consistent message with the same information across the communities would be good. Residents are saying that they’ve needed this road and wonder why it can’t just get going with construction. Another agreed, saying they often hear, “will Route 53 be built in my lifetime?” Therefore what the public needs to hear about is the process and timeline. Another committee member said he hasn’t heard anything about this during his 10 months in office, but his village is outside the buffer zone.

6. Public Comment

- One member of the public who is a retired engineer noted that he has been following this project since 2000 and would like to be more involved. Is there room for private citizens to be involved in this process? He noted that he has started to get encouraged in this LUC process. Freres responded that there is no defined role in the technical planning process for members of the public, but plenty of opportunities for public engagement throughout the process.
- Another attendee asked where is there a metric for greenhouse gases? Co-chair Lawlor responded that many of the metrics and factors were determined and set in the BRAC report, and they took those issues into consideration. Navota added that the land use planning recommendations of the BRAC address GHG emissions, such as planning for public transit, open space, etc. Co-chair Ranney asked whether a discrete analysis of the impact of the road on greenhouse gases will be conducted, using build/no-build scenarios. Rocco Zuccherro (Tollway) responded that environmental impact analysis is mandatory as part of further engineering if the project continues.
- A comment was made that there will be positive spillover effects in Cook County and asked whether the committee has considered engaging Cook and McHenry communities in the process. Co-chair Lawlor responded that yes, they are part of the Finance process.
- A representative from Lake County Audubon Society asked whether the committee can post clearer materials and maps on the website. Navota replied that we will be posting accessible materials in the future. A committee member added that as long as the maps are high enough quality that a user can zoom in, these maps will work. Navota replied that it is the intention to create an interactive website that allows the public to view maps and provide comments and input.

7. Next meeting (May 8, 3:00 – 4:30 at the Lake County Permit Facility)