U.S. 45 – IL 132 to IL 173 and Millburn Bypass
Community Advisory Group #3 Meeting Summary

The third meeting of the US Route 45 Millburn Bypass Community Advisory Group (CAG) was held at the State Bank of the Lakes in Lindenhurst from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. on April 27, 2010. What follows is a summary of the evening's proceedings.

The goal of this third CAG meeting was to (1) update the members on the project status and schedule, and (2) procure CAG comments on the nine developed alternatives. Again present to facilitate were members of the Lake County Division of Transportation (LCDOT), Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT), and consultant members of the project study team. All attendees are listed on the last page of this document.

The meeting agenda was as follows:

I. Welcome and Meeting Agenda Overview

II. Project Status Update

a. CAG #2 Meeting Results
b. LCDOT and IDOT Initial Bypass Alternatives Screening
c. NEPA/404 Merger Meeting with Resource Agencies
    i. Purpose and Need Concurrence
    ii. Initial Bypass Alternatives Screening Concurrence
d. Preliminary Bypass Alternatives Development and Evaluation
    i. CMAP Project Traffic Projections
    ii. Transportation Performance
    iii. GIS Database and IDOT Environmental Surveys
    iv. Social/Environmental Impacts based on Typical Section Right-of-Way Footprint
    v. Relative Comparison for Distinction
    vi. Bypass Alternatives Evaluation Matrix

III. Breakout Exercise – Review of Preliminary Bypass Alternatives

IV. Next Steps

a. Further LCDOT and IDOT Bypass Alternatives Screening
b. June NEPA/404 Merger Meeting with Resource Agencies
c. Summer Public Meeting

The following information was provided for inclusion within the project binders each CAG member possesses:

- CAG #3 Meeting Agenda
- Copy of the CAG #3 PowerPoint Presentation
- Summary of the second CAG Meeting held on November 3, 2009
- Project Status update
- Conceptual Developed Alternatives exhibits
- Evaluation Matrix
- Updated project Environmental Resources exhibit
- Existing/Proposed Land Use exhibit

A PowerPoint presentation guided the overall meeting. Chuck Gleason of LCDOT began by giving a welcome and facilitating reintroductions of everyone present. Mike Matkovic of Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd. (CBBEL) continued the presentation by providing an overview of the current project status and a review of the schedule and NEPA process, which show the project is on schedule. He conveyed the project milestones that have occurred since the last CAG meeting, and described the process by which the original range of alternatives including eighteen options was narrowed to the remaining nine. He noted that this process began with the feedback received at the last CAG meeting, and then based on input from the PSG the remaining nine were selected to be carried forward. The alternatives dropped were A3, A5, A6, B3, B5, B6, C3, C5, and C6. Based on the CAG feedback it was generally determined that east-west options 3 and 5 were less preferable. And since the east-west movements were facilitated by other more acceptable east-west linkages, these options were dropped. In the cases of A6, which did not provide an east-west linkage, B6, which extended Crawford Road, and C6, which extended Wadsworth Road, it was determined that the project's Purpose & Need was not met. Therefore, these options were also dropped.

The remaining nine alternatives were developed further in order to begin evaluation of them to facilitate a decision on selection of a preferred alternative. Mike noted that this evaluation was based broadly on the entire ROW corridor width's impact. Mr. Druce-Hoffman noted that the church at the corner of Grass Lake Road and US 45 actually also owns the lot behind them and it should be considered an impact. Mike Matkovic requested that the CAG members be aware of this and to consider this information during the breakout exercise. Mr. Boller noted the southern 'historic' district was left off. Mike Matkovic indicated that this area is not considered an historic district by the State of Illinois or as part of the National Register. However, a photo log of the entire area has been submitted to IDOT and IHPA for review to determine if any additional buildings in the area are eligible historic structures. A response from IDOT and IHPA on this has not yet been received.

Ryan Westrom of Patrick Engineering Inc. (Patrick) continued the description of the developed alternatives by noting that each exhibit for the remaining nine (A1, A2, A4, B1, B2, B4, C1, C2, and C4) depicts the proposed buildout condition for the alternative overlaid on the aerial for the area. At this point, Ryan transitioned to describe the process by which the developed alternatives will be evaluated. One of the tools that was developed to aid this process was an evaluation matrix, which lists criteria upon which each alternative can be developed and weighed against each other. These criteria measure the benefits, costs, and impacts of each alternative and allow a relative comparison.

Three major items in regard to the evaluation matrix were observed. First, the criteria used: These criteria were grouped into four main categories: Transportation Performance, Environmental Resources, Socioeconomic Impacts, and Cost. Secondly, the means of measurements used: Both scales and applicable quantifications were used. Items for which no quantifiable measure is applicable used a scale in order to measure relative positive impacts ranging from 1, meaning a high positive impact, to 5, meaning a high negative impact. Where quantifiable, the applicable unit of measurement was used, and the scale was not used. Third, the color coding indicating a relative comparison between alternatives: Whether the criterion used a scale or number, the alternatives were weighed against each other. The best in each category was colored dark green, indicating it was relatively strong in comparison. The worst in each category was colored red, indicating it was relatively weak in comparison. Those values measuring between the extremes were colored proportionally (light green, yellow, orange) in between those spectrum ends.

The evaluation matrix is to be used as a tool to guide decision making in regards to alternative selection. While it is a handy tool, it is not the final answer. It can, however, provide overarching information and give broad takeaways. For instance, in regards to the nine developed alternatives, a few observations were able to be made. B1 can quickly be seen as having the lowest construction cost, but with the greatest impact to historic buildings. East-west alignment 2 is easily seen to be the most expensive. One other observation made was that the criteria categories are not weighted. This is due to the fact that any individual may consider them of differing varying importance, and thus they are presented without summation or weights. Mr. Boller noted that the costs are not accurate because the land acquisition costs are not included and he feels that land acquisition costs would be much less with the east bypass alternatives which is largely farm land. Mike Matkovic indicated that land acquisition costs can vary considerably based on a number of factors and can only be accurately estimated through property appraisals. The Project Team felt that at this stage of the project development process, it was best to compare the alternatives based on the more tangible construction cost estimates and to use the acreage of land acquisition required as a criteria for comparative analysis of the alternatives. As the number of alternatives are further narrowed and developed in more detail, land acquisition costs will be considered to the extent practical. Mr. McKeever asked about the available funding for this project. Paula Trigg indicated that approximately $2 million in federal funding was secured for this project by Congresswoman Melissa Bean as part of the last federal highway bill (i.e. SAFETEA LU). In addition, the Lake County Division of Transportation (LCDOT) has identified $20 million for this project through its one-quarter percent sales tax for transportation and public safety program. Mr. McKeever also asked which alternative was most favorable to commercial development due to the need for the local schools to see increased tax income. Mike Matkovic explained that the land use planning is not within the purview of LCDOT or IDOT, and therefore various potential land use development scenarios were not explored with the alternatives. The responsibility for land use planning lies with local agencies and is contingent upon their individual likes and dislikes. However, an assessment of the compatibility of each alternative to the known composite land use plans for the study area was made and is reflected on the evaluation matrix.

One aspect of the evaluation was detailed further. As part of the software, Synchro and SimTraffic, that helps calculate the delay each transportation network would result in, visualizations of the traffic in each condition can be created. Short video clips showing the following four scenarios were shown:

- Existing conditions
- 2030 No-Build conditions
- 2030 Alternative B1 conditions
- 2030 Alternative A4 conditions

Alternatives B1 and A4 were the best and worst relatively of the proposed improvements in terms of transportation performance. These videos were able to convey an idea of what variance in traffic delay could result within the different future scenarios. Mr. Anderson asked what the transportation delay values on the matrix meant. Mike Matkovic explained that each alternative was evaluated based on transportation performance within the core study area in the aggregate for the evening peak hour of travel, which is generally the heaviest travel period of the day. This means that the total travel time (or delay) for all vehicles traveling within or through the core study area during the evening peak hour of travel was added up for each alternative for comparison of overall travel performance. This was deemed as the most effective means of comparatively evaluating the overall transportation performance of each alternative within the core study area since the various alternatives have different numbers of likely signalized or stop controlled intersections.

Mike Matkovic then continued the presentation by walking through what each breakout group would be providing input on. The breakout session at this meeting was for the purpose of providing feedback on the nine preliminary developed alternatives. As part of the workshop, the CAG was divided into three groups (1, 2, and 3). Each group filled in a chart outlining their preliminary input on the 9 alternates. The entire group then gathered back together and reported out their individual groups' thoughts. Mr. Kimmel spoke for group 1, Mr. Boller for group 2, and Mr. Venturi for group 3.

With reference to the attached notes pages from each breakout group, the following summarizes the groups' reports:

Mr. Kimmel (Group 1)

The group felt that the B alternatives were generally not preferred as a widening of US Route 45 on the existing alignment would have such serious impacts as to not be worth exploring further. Thus, they recommended dropping these three from further consideration.

Amongst the remaining alternatives, this group felt that within the A bypass alternatives, combinations A1 and A2 would address the transportation needs while preserving the historic district and were worth further consideration. A4 impacted three homes, and thus, they were less sure about it. The group felt that the A bypass location, as compared to B and C, was advantageous due to the fact that many residents were expecting this to be the proposed alignment, and that the west bypass best serves the County since it best matches area travel patterns.

The group felt that of the C bypass alternatives, combinations C2 and C4 would be preferred. Alternative C was considered more favorable when weighing impacts to residential properties. However, it was noted that the length of improvement for C would be longer than A resulting in a higher cost. The group was less sure of C1 due to the remaining offset east-west routes.

Mr. Boller (Group 2)

This group also felt that the B alternatives provided too great of an impact, and thus, should be dropped from consideration.

They also did not prefer east-west alignments 1 and 2. They felt leaving the east-west configuration the same as in 1 would not solve the transportation issue facing the intersections. And they felt 2 was too expensive.

That left the group's preference for either alternative A4 or C4. There was some difference as to which of these alternatives was preferred, however both were deemed worthy of carrying forward.

A few residents living in the neighborhoods west of the proposed A alignment were concerned about the proximity of the road to residences and if an adequate buffer could be provided. A suggestion was made to include an alternative that would cul de sac Old US 45 on the south rather than having it intersect the new US 45 alignment.

Overall, the C4 alternative seemed to be most favorable to the group from a land development standpoint and its ability to minimize overall impacts.

Mr. Venturi (Group 3)

This group felt that Alternative B4 would solve the east-west movement issue. They understood that the widening proposed was not desirable, but wanted to see the transportation performance modeled for the north-south route with three lanes versus five. The group was comfortable, however, with eliminating B1 and B2 as they felt the east-west movement would not be as well addressed in these scenarios. In regard to the viability of alternative B4, Mike Matkovic explained that this improvement with less capacity on US 45 would not meet the project Purpose and Need, which established the likelihood of additional travel lanes being needed by 2030. There was general concurrence that if US 45 needed to be five lanes, alternative B4 was also not desirable.

The group also did not prefer east-west alignment 2. They felt this option was too expensive, and was better addressed by alignment 4. Thus, they suggested dropping A2 and C2.

The group also felt like alternative A1 was worth maintaining. While the east-west movement matched existing conditions, they felt that since much of the traffic would now use the western realignment, and not traverse these intersections, this option was more appealing. They noted that the evaluation matrix showed that this option performed adequately from a transportation perspective and was also relatively less expensive.

That left alternatives A4 and C4, which the group also felt were worth proceeding forward with. They felt east-west alignment 4 addressed the east-west movement of traffic well. They were, however, split on whether A or C were preferred.

After the workshop, a few further questions were raised. Ms. Revenaugh asked about different geometric alternatives for the Independence Boulevard intersection with alignment C. Mike Matkovic explained that the geometric alternative as shown is conceptual based on the objective to minimize property and building impacts to the extent possible. As the alternatives screening process moves forward and more detailed engineering plans are developed, various intersection designs such as Independence Boulevard at US 45 will be evaluated in greater detail relative to transportation performance and impacts. Mr. Smith asked whether historic buildings can be taken down. Mike Matkovic explained that it is possible and that historic buildings can and have been moved with other projects, however, avoidance is typically the first objective with relocation a last resort. It was added that the Millburn Historic District is unique in that the proximity and connection of the historic buildings is a primary contributing factor to the National Register Location designation. Although the project team has not yet received the Cultural Resource review from IDOT, it is anticipated that IDOT and IHPA will prefer an alternative that avoids these impacts if the transportation purpose and need can be met with another alternative. Mr. Boller asked whether noise barrier costs were included. Mike Matkovic explained that for the alternatives that would place a new roadway in close proximity to a sensitive noise receptor, such as a dense residential community, noise walls and the cost thereof were included in the construction cost for those alternatives.

The CAG meeting concluded with an overview of the upcoming project development activities and schedule. This summer, a Public Meeting providing information on the project's to-date status will be held. The next meeting of the US Route 45 Millburn Bypass CAG is anticipated just prior to the Public Meeting and will likely be relatively brief, with no breakout session planned. This meeting will bring the CAG up to speed on project developments, including further alternative screening decisions that have been made by the Project Team. But the next formal meeting, at which the focus of discussion will be on working towards a selected alternative, will be in the fall.

Group 1 | CAG #3 | 4-27-10

Group	Combination	Rank*	Key Benefits	Key Concerns	Other Comments
A	A1	✓	-Less Pavement -Sewers Community/Mobility Travel Patterns -Preserves Historic Dist. -West of Bypass Grass Lake can expand	Displacement (Res)	Good travel Part previously condemned
	A2	✓	-Preserves Hist. ~~Bldgs~~ -West of Bypass Grass Lake can expand	Impacts Historic Dist ↑ Cost Less Compatible Planned Land Use Aesthetically unpleasing More roads	Doesn't effect church property
	A4		- ~~Less Best~~ Good Transportation Performance	Impacts to Church/School Property Impacts Historic District / Less compatible w/ historic setting	
B	B1	✗	~~Above~~ No Forest Res Impacts	High # Historic Impacts Displacements (Res & Com) Pedestrian Traffic Hinderance	
	B2	✗			
	B4	✗			
C	C1		No Res Displacements	Adverse Impact to Commercial (Planned) Destruction of Farmland & Open Space No ROW reserved ↑ Cost Bisects Millburn & Old Mill Ctd Residential Displacement (C4) Church & School Impacts (C4) Impacts to Historic Dist / Less Compatible w/ historic setting (C4)	
	C2	✓			
	C4	✓	Comparatively Good Transportation Benefit		

✓ Ranking Guidelines: (X = Candidate for dropping from further consideration based on relatively weak transportation performance and/or relatively severe impacts. ; ✓ = Candidate to carry forward for further development based on relatively strong transportation performance and/or with relatively less severe impacts.

Group 2

Group	Combination	Rank*	Key Benefits	Key Concerns	Other Comments
A	A1	X	Morning good (Trans) like dividing line between municipalities	Afternoon PM Poor (Trans), Noise, Forest Preserve Breaks Subdivision, Landfill ~~Forest Preserve~~	Buffer,
	A2	X		Too Expensive	Reasons for Overall impacts, + all other 2's
	A4	✓		New Church Plan impeded Noise Pollution for Residential Dundas Forest Preserve	Cul-de-sac Old 45 on south, This ? will kill Retail Buffer
				Mix of Trans. Facilities and Residential	
B	B1	X	Historic District Impacts		Semi out of Residential Areas Doesn't Solve Blind Curve
	B2	X		Too $$$	
	B4	X			
C	C1	X	Potentially ROW Costs Less	Does Not meet Purpose + Need (E-W Problem)	
	C2	X		Too $$$	
	C4	✓	Not cutting through Res., Farm, Land Use and Space for Growth Good for Traffic Min. Noise Pollution for Res. but do for Hist. Dist.	↑ Hist. Dist & Farmland Impact than A-1 or A-4 (Blocked between 2 Roads) Old Mill Creek Retail + Traffic Connectivity How will creeks and bridges work?	Include Bridge in Cost Old.
					(A4) Heritage Trails now about this (A4) Forest Trails

✓ Ranking Guidelines: (X = Candidate for dropping from further consideration based on relatively weak transportation performance and/or relatively severe impacts. ; ✓ = Candidate to carry forward for further development based on relatively strong transportation performance and/or with relatively less severe impacts.

Group 3

Group	Combination	Rank*	Key Benefits	Key Concerns	Other Comments
A	A1	~~X~~ ✓	Least Neg. Impacts	East/West Movement, Splits Subdivision, 2 Homes Displaced, Forest Preserve	
	A2	X		Costs / Impacts	
	A4	✓	Already ~~Reduced~~ Reloaded / Solves East-West	Splitting Forest Trail Displaces Homes (2)	
B	B1	X		East/West Movement	
	B2	X			
	B4	✓	Solves East-West Issue	Movement of Homes	Reduce to 2 Lanes
C	C1	X		East/West Movement	
	C2	X		Costs/Impacts	
	C4	✓	Only 1 Home Displaced / Min. Environmental Impacts / Cost Effective / Safety ~~Reduced~~		

✓ Ranking Guidelines: (X = Candidate for dropping from further consideration based on relatively weak transportation performance and/or relatively severe impacts. ; ✓ = Candidate to carry forward for further development based on relatively strong transportation performance and/or with relatively less severe impacts.

CAG #2 attendees were:

PSG Members	Organization
Chuck Gleason	LCDOT
Paula Trigg	LCDOT
Marie Glynn	IDOT
Srikanth Panguluri	IDOT
Mike Matkovic	CBBEL
Matt Huffman	CBBEL
Pete Knysz	CBBEL
Marty Worman	CBBEL
Ryan Westrom	Patrick
Eric Boelter	Patrick
Eric Cook	Patrick
Chris DeRosia	Patrick

CAG Members	Representing
Andrew Kimmel	Lake County Forest Preserves
Bob Holbach	Millburn Tree Farm
Craig Richardson	Heritage Trails Homeowners Association
Daniel Venturi	Lake Villa Township & Lindenhurst/Lake Villa Chamber of Commerce
Dawn Revenaugh	Millburn Glass Studios
Dominic Marturano	Village of Lindenhurst
Ellen Mauer	Millburn Community Consolidated School District 24
Gerald F. Swanson	Self
Glenn Westman	Lake County SMC
Jennifer Andrew	Historic Millburn Community Association
Kevin Klahs	Lindenhurst Police Department
Kevin McKeever	Providence Ridge subdivision
Larry Leffingwell	Tempel Farms
Linda Berger	Forest Trail subdivision
Michael Mark	Self
Milt Anderson	Self
Pete Szpak	Heritage Trails Homeowners Association
Philip Rovang	Lake County Planning, Building and Development
Scott Pfeiffer	Cross Creek Homeowners Association
Thomas Druce-Hoffman	Self
Tim Smith	Old Mill Creek
Jim Stout (representing Tom Lippert)	Lindenhurst Park District

CAG members not in attendance were:

Michael Scholler	Providence Woods Homeowners Association
Scott Martin	Old Mill Creek Historic Preservation Commission