

# Lake County Illinois

*Lake County Courthouse and Administrative Complex  
18 N. County Street  
Waukegan, IL 60085-4351*



## **Meeting Minutes - Final**

**Wednesday, January 14, 2009**

**10:30 AM**

**Assembly Room, 10th Floor**

**Public Works and Transportation Committee**

1. Call to Order

*Others present:*

*Ted Booden, Grayslake  
Joe Schwan, Ivanhoe  
Mike Sands, Grayslake  
Lorraine Ray, Wauconda  
Steve Carlson, County Board Member  
Linda Pedersen, County Board Member  
Steve Mountsier, County Board Member  
Scott Anderson, Village of Mettawa  
David Bockner, County Administrator  
David Brown, Village of Vernon Hills  
David Lethspeich, Village of Long Grove  
Vicky & George Ranney, Grayslake  
Susan Zingle, Wadsworth  
Evan Craig, Vernon Hills  
John Roskowski, Pioneer Press  
Bill Holleman, Lake Villa  
Rob Sherman, Buffalo Grove  
Sandi Morris, Grayslake  
Klaus Cuisiol, Grayslake  
Dick Hosteny, Grayslake  
Jim Bland, Third Lake  
Wallace Winter, Grayslake  
Steve Barg, Wildwood  
Carol Niec, Grayslake  
Mary Cunningham, County Board Member  
Veronda Spiller, Robert Morris College  
Jill Lawless, Grayslake  
Douglas Williams, Grayslake  
Jeff Braiman, Buffalo Grove  
Constance Hanninen, Grayslake  
Suzi Schmidt, County Board Chair  
Barry Burton, County Administrator  
Peter Kolb, Public Works  
Marty Buehler, Transportation  
Kevin Kerrigan, Transportation  
Amy McEwan, County Administrator  
Linda Wisch, County Board Office*

**Chair O'Kelly called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.**

**Present** 7 - Chair O'Kelly, Vice Chair Stolman, Member Carter, Member Maine, Member Talbett, Member Bush and Member Wilke

2. Pledge of Allegiance

*The Chair led the pledge.*

3. **Approval of Minutes**

4. **Public Comment**

*None.*

5. **Added to Agenda**

*None*

6. **Old Business**

*None.*

6.1 **08-0924**

Resolution Authorizing the Director of Public Works to execute a Plat of Easement Vacation in the Melody Lake Subdivision in the Village of Mettawa.

*Member Maine stated that in the interests of this being in court, she would like to defer this item. Member Carter asked who is in court. Member Maine reported that the citizens and the Village were in court.*

*Ted Johnson - representing Costco wholesale and the Village noted that there is in fact a case in court tomorrow; however, it has nothing to do with this easement vacation request. Member Maine noted that one of the issues to be decided in court is how the Village originally acquired the property. Member Maine stated that she respectfully disagreed with Mr. Johnson on the relevance of the court case with respect to this easement vacation. In addition she had seen the proposed engineering plans for the Costco development and noted that she had expected more of an effort with respect to how the site stormwater issues were being handled.*

*Evan Craig - Vernon Hills - Village indicated that they were going to make this into a park and now it is going to be a Costco.*

**This matter was Postponed indefinitely.**

**Aye:** 7 - Chair O'Kelly, Vice Chair Stolman, Member Carter, Member Maine, Member Talbett, Member Bush and Member Wilke

7. **New Business**

**TRANSPORTATION**

7.1 **09-1139**

Resolution providing for and authorizing the submission to referendum of an advisory question of public policy concerning the possible State of Illinois construction of the extension of Illinois Route 53 and operation of Illinois Route 53 as a tollway through Lake County to the voters of the County of Lake, Illinois, at the consolidated election to be held on April 7, 2009.

*Read into the record by Chair O'Kelly. Chair O'Kelly noted that this item was sent via email to the Committee Members. Chair O'Kelly opened up the meeting to public comment. Member Carter requested that Chair O'Kelly read the actual proposed*

question.

*Douglas Williams - Hainesville - spoke against the referendum because he didn't think we have enough time for public discussions. This needs more extensive discussion.*

*Rob Sherman - spoke about several issues. There has been plenty of discussion on this for years. This was discussed in 1984. There is a community concern regarding Emergency vehicles and their ability to get through with trains crossing. Because of EJ&E, traffic is congested and cars are now on arterial streets. Traffic is now flooding through on the residential streets - this is not safe or fair to the residents. Request the referendum be put on the ballot. There is consensus that the need is there. There may not be unanimity, but there is consensus. We need this link; give us an opportunity to present this information.*

*Mike Sands - Grayslake - the reality is that the process needs to be something along the lines of the Route 120 corridor bypass. We need to know how much it would cost, how many jobs it would create, etc. Vote this down and start a corridor planning exercise.*

*David Lothspeich - representing the Village of Long Grove - does not support the extension of Route 53, at this point there are simply too many questions to put this on the ballot. My understanding is that the feds want projects that are shovel ready.*

*Dick Hosteny - Grayslake - Over the past year I attended a number of meetings of Route 120 corridor planning council - these involved workshops and public comments from the public. It took 3 years from start of Route 120 CPC until decision was made last month on the character of the road. There is no information for the public to make an informed decision on this referendum. I urge you not to pass this on to the County Board.*

*George Rainey - Unincorporated Lake County - Saw some of you in 1994 at a meeting about this subject. I have substantial concerns about this proposal. A six lane expressway is not the way to address these types of issues. Mr. Rainey read a paragraph from report on the Metropolis Plan. This is the kind of transportation plan for the future that we want. I urge that we move in that direction. He directed attention to the Burke Report on Route 120 and presented some statistics of this report. He was concerned that this is going to inject a major element of controversy and bring us back to the type of debate we don't want.*

*Jill Lawless - pass.*

*Lorraine Raye - Fremont Township - spoke against going to referendum because we need fore planning to determine cost, etc. Suggest that we use 120 bypass model. This would compromise the good work done on the 120 project.*

*Bill Holleman - spoke against going to referendum. Spoke of time put into the framework plan and noted that the amount of planning that went into that plan is extraordinary. Transportation planning by referendum with no cost, what are overall consequences.*

*Spoke about work that went into the Route 120 bypass.*

*Sandy Morris - Grayslake - here to urge the committee to keep Route 53 off the ballot - it is a very complicated issue. the public needs more information and education and informed input.*

*Evan Craig - Vernon Hills - what we are talking about is process. The process to get this here was not a good one. Residents don't have good information, and you want to know what they think. We need environmental impact statements, including air quality studies. There is no money for this road. The new President wants shovel ready projects and green infrastructure projects.*

*Joe Schwan - unincorporated Lake County (Lincolnshire). This is a chance to listen to the people. The State has been studying this for years. We had hearings on this with our legislators. Over 75% of the people, want this highway. Let the people vote on this.*

*Klaus Curisiol - Grayslake - I do urge you to not put this before the people.*

*Wallace Winter - Grayslake - spoke against the advisory referendum. CPC process was the most dramatic example of listening to the people.*

*Steve Barg - Wildwood - congratulate you for LC Summit on transportation and starting a process that has worked as evidenced by the Route 120 Corridor Council. Look at your success with these things and remember what happened when you didn't follow this kind of process.*

*Matthew Paulis - passed.*

*Constance Hanninen - we need to look to the future - not at what was discussed in the 80s and 90s. Better to work on arterial roads.*

*Ted Booden - Ivanhoe - spoke in favor of Route 53 and a process that allows the proper studying and development of ideas of how to do this in a way that is environmentally friendly. We need a decision and let's start attacking this problem. We need smart planning and other projects may need to be brought into this.*

*Carol Neic - Grayslake - spoke against putting this out to referendum.*

*Colin McRae - Grayslake - spoke in favor of the the referendum and noted that one thing missing is that things change and you have to change with them. Most things that people have said should be done, have been done at least twice. This issue is well over 40 years old. This is only a concept.*

*David Brown - Vernon Hills - The Mayor and Village Board of Vernon Hills are supportive of Route 53 and recommend that you move forward with the referendum.*

*Ellen Fuiry - passed.*

*Jeff Braiman - Trustee of Buffalo Grove - Village of Buffalo Grove spoke in favor of Route 53. You cannot be afraid of change. Let's take this to the people and let them decide.*

*David Young - LC Partners - supports Route 53 and has since 2000. This is key to economic development. We are all about building consensus and we were involved in the 2006 transportation summit. We are also supporters of the Corridor Planning Council. Mr. Young noted that 70% of the officials at that summit voted in favor of Route 53.*

*Steve Carlson, Lake County Board - feel elected officials are elected to make decisions, not send things to referendum. This is not shovel ready and will not qualify as a federal project. Follow example of Route 120 Corridor Council.*

*Pat Carey, Lake County Board - Oppose putting referendum question on the ballot because I think it will affect Route 120 project. Consensus on the Route 53 project has never been demonstrated. Consensus has been achieved on the Route 120 project.*

*Steve Mountsier, Lake County Board spoke in support of Route 53 because his residents are in support. This is to send the right message to the people in Springfield.*

*Chair O'Kelly advised that if this passes the committee it will be sent on to the full board.*

*Member Carter asked how this would affect the Route 120 process and asked for Director of Transportation Marty Buehler's input. Mr. Buehler commented from staff's point of view and a transportation professional's viewpoint. The current 120 feasibility study is 53 neutral. The 120 feasibility study has a limited purpose - to determine preferred alignment and character to be used as a local planning tool. It was meant to help local agencies to do their job. The 120 feasibility study when completed is not binding at all on a Phase I study. Phase I study does not recognize the results of a feasibility study. Mr. Buehler advised what has been decided so far. There is no agency or funding source for Phase I. This is a local group effort to preserve the options for the future. Discussion followed. Member Carter asked what does it do to the 120 process if it passes - are the two together or are they separate. Mr. Buehler - can 53 be built and connected to existing 120 - yes it can, but doesn't mean that it would be. Member Carter - would this stop the 120 process if approved. Mr. Buehler - this is not a county project - it is a state project. Mr. Buehler agreed with Member Mountsier in that it sends a message. Member Carter - 120 was consensus and CPC was formed to deal with the issues. If there was support for 53, would you envision the same process - CPC - could the State use the same format. Mr. Buehler noted that this would be a Tollway Authority project and they would have their own process. "He would not recommend a 120 CPC Feasibility Study process."*

*Member Stolman gave an overview of past meetings which were held for three years on Route 53. It got dropped. This is not in conflict with 120. There are some of us who are*

*hearing from our constituents and the people want to have a say in this. The tollway authority would be the funding source. If 120 fails, it will be because IDOT won't do it. We have a dysfunctional state government. This is out for public opinion. This only tells you that we want the tollway authority to have some kind on sponsorship. It will show the tollway people that we have political will. The bottom line is to get something moving. We are trying to do something that shows that we do have concerns. We are offering an alternative and this is not in competition with Route 120; it is thought of as a tollway project only. This to allow the public to have a voice.*

*Member Bush stated that it is a very difficult issue for her and she wanted to do the right thing. She read a prepared a statement. She wanted to solve traffic problems in Lake County and believed 53 needs to be built. She previously did not support Route 53, however things do change and we are now in an urbanized county. She stated that she cares about the environment. We need to solve the traffic problems and we need to extend Route 53. I don't know how we will do it. Member Bush spoke about input she had received from her constituents, state representatives, Lake County Partners, union workers, etc. because I want to do the right thing for all people in Lake County. I don't believe this should be done by referendum. I have come to the conclusion that we are acting too fast. I want to move the 120 project forward. My question is how do we move it forward. Chair O'Kelly reported that the IL tollway authority wanted more than elected officials consensus. This issue has been around forever. It truly is just a gauge of the public. I can't be opposed to asking the public what they think.*

*Chair Schmidt - for the last 12 years transportation and economic development have been my goals for this county. Over the years I have been working to bring jobs to this county - we need jobs for the people of this county. In order to bring jobs, we need roads. This is nothing more - we have a resolution supporting this and support of 70% of the elected officials. One of the reasons why it says tollway is because the State is dysfunctional. If we don't give the legislators a funding mechanism, they won't do anything. I am not a proponent of huge massive roads, but Lake County grew anyway. We need the public to give us a consensus pro or con because resolutions and everything we have done has not budged this. This is a non binding referendum. Whatever way it goes, we will live with it. I feel we owe this to the residents of our county. If we don't help, no one will do it. This can go on the ballot and it will not cost the taxpayers a penny.*

*Member Talbett - appreciate input provided. Lake County's commitment to try to improve transportation is pretty long standing. We had a surplus and we poured it into transportation. The summit process was a county initiative; the 1/4 percent sales tax increase referendum was a county referendum, the 120 corridor council was a county initiative. We are doing everything we can to get things done. This what we need to do next to get things done. State legislators have said we need to tell them what we want. What is the criteria for putting something on referendum - I thought that is what we were going to discuss. Context of the question is appropriate. Feel we need an answer to a very important question. The information is necessary at this time.*

*Member Maine - philosophically I think advisory referendums are a tool for citizens, not for government. What do we mean by consensus? What is consensus to the toll authority? I believe we are asking people to vote without information and without knowing the consequences of their actions. Feel public has very little information on this issue and I am not comfortable with that. Consequences for other areas of the community, I don't know that you want people to have a say. You can do a very accurate survey with these kinds of questions and the tollway authority could do that.*

*Member Talbett - the task before us is to get them to do something.*

*Member Carter - I represent the far western part of the county and in my district we can't move - either East or South. I think it's important that the people in the western part of the county have a voice today. We believe in good road improvements, I have concerns about environmental issues and the character of the road. I have talked to the mayors in the western part of the county and their residents are telling them that we need to get this on the ballot and I believe my residents want to opportunity to say my vote counts and I want to be heard. Some issues are important enough to go to the voters. The big issue for me is to make sure as this goes forward, it will not kill Route 120. I did not hear that today. Route 120 is with the State; if 53 comes forward it is a different funding mechanism, it is with the tollway authority. I feel confident that this is not going to hurt 120.*

*Member Wilke - I have not been asked to talk about 53, I have only been asked to vote for a referendum. Concern that people may be confused by this.*

*Discussion followed.*

*Chair Schmidt advised that we do have a package put together for the stimulus and this has nothing to do with that.*

*Member Carter - you will have people who will support Route 53 and some who won't because it is a tollway and they will have to pay.*

*Member Wilke - I don't think we are asking the question. My point is we don't have enough time to think this all the way through and get it on the ballot.*

*Member Carter - I disagree because we just put together a Forest Preserve countywide referendum, managed to get the information out to the voters and were successful.*

*Board Member Carey - I agree this is not a political issue. Talk about needing to give an answer to legislators as to our priorities and I remain unconvinced that if the question is put out there and it is approved and you start on this, that it will not affect 120.*

**A motion was made by Member Stolman, seconded by Member Carter, that this Resolution be Recommended for adoption to the Regular Agenda. Motion carried by roll call vote. Motion carried by the following vote:**



**Aye:** 5 - Chair O'Kelly, Vice Chair Stolman, Member Carter, Member Maine and Member Talbett

**Nay:** 2 - Member Bush and Member Wilke

7.2 [09-1147](#)

Joint resolution providing: 1) An appropriation of \$650,000 of Motor Fuel Tax funds for 2009 Patrol One for the supply of ice control material and designated as Section 09-00000-00-GM; and 2) Authorizing a line item transfer of \$650,000 from account 268-4300030-85020 to account 268-4300040-65030.

**A motion was made by Member Stolman, seconded by Member Carter, that this Resolution be Approved and referred on to Financial and Administrative Committee. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Chair O'Kelly, Vice Chair Stolman, Member Carter, Member Maine, Member Talbett, Member Bush and Member Wilke

**PUBLIC WORKS**

7.3 [09-1126](#)

Joint resolution authorizing execution of a Memorandum of Understanding regarding sanitary sewer connection fees with the North Shore Sanitary District for the fairgrounds properties.

**A motion was made by Member Carter, seconded by Member Talbett, that this Resolution be Approved and referred on to Financial and Administrative Committee. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Chair O'Kelly, Vice Chair Stolman, Member Carter, Member Maine, Member Talbett, Member Bush and Member Wilke

7.4 [09-1131](#)

Joint resolution authorizing execution of a Memorandum of Understanding regarding sanitary sewer connection fees with the Village of Grayslake for the fairgrounds properties.

**A motion was made by Member Carter, seconded by Member Talbett, that this Resolution be Approved and referred on to Financial and Administrative Committee. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Chair O'Kelly, Vice Chair Stolman, Member Carter, Member Maine, Member Talbett, Member Bush and Member Wilke

7.5 [08-0785](#)

Director's Report - Public Works

8. **Executive Session**

8.1 [09-1133](#)

Committee Action ratifying and reaffirming a time extension to the Village of Hawthorn Woods for Execution of a Bulk Water Agreement as proposed by Board Chair, Suzi Schmidt.

**A motion was made by Member Stolman, seconded by Member Talbett, that this Committee Action Item be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Chair O'Kelly, Vice Chair Stolman, Member Carter, Member Maine, Member Talbett, Member Bush and Member Wilke

**9. County Administrator's Report**

**10. Adjournment**

**This meeting was adjourned.**

*Respectfully submitted,*

---

*Chairman*

---

*Vice-Chairman*

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

*Public Works & Transportation Committee*