History
Route 53 Extension Project Timeline

• Extension of Route 53 has been discussed since the 1960’s when the original right of way was envisioned.

• Between 1970 and 1990 two environmental studies on the north extension were initiated but then discontinued due to other road priorities.

• Between 1970 and 1990 IDOT begins acquiring property for the proposed extension. Currently about 65% of the ROW is owned by the State of Illinois.

• 1993 – Illinois General Assembly authorizes the Illinois Tollway to extend IL Rt. 53.
History
Route 53 Extension Project Timeline

• 1993 – 1997 IDOT & Illinois Tollway prepare Phase One Engineering/Environmental Studies


• 2001 – DEIS contemplates many alternatives, settled on two – Illinois 83/US Route 45/US Route 12 and Route 53 Extension

• In VHW, the DEIS gave us preferred alignments through sensitive areas in town, and the now famous FAP 342 R.O.W. signs were posted
History
Route 53 Extension Project Timeline

• 2001 – The DEIS was presented at public meetings but did not advance due to lack of consensus

• 2003 – The Illinois Toll Authority estimated the cost to extend Rt. 53 at $1.86 billion dollars

• 2006 – Lake County officials establish a Corridor Planning Council (CPC) to study the potential expansion of the Rt. 120 corridor

• The CPC develops the IL Rt. 120 Unified Vision Plan recognizing the possibility of a Rt. 53 extension
History
Route 53 Extension Project Timeline

• 2009 – A nonbinding voter referendum question is asked of voters – “Shall the State of Illinois construct the extension of Illinois Route 53 from Lake Cook Road northerly to the existing Illinois Route 120?”
  • Referendum passed

• 2010 – Lake County leaders lobby Tollway Authority to adopt Rt. 53 extension project

• 2010 – Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) identified Rt. 53 as a priority project in their GO TO 2040 Regional Plan
History
Route 53 Extension Project Timeline

- 2011 – Tollway, Lake County, and CMAP create the Blue Ribbon Advisory Council (BRAC) to assist in the planning and potential building of the Rt. 53 extension
- 2012 – BRAC issues Resolution and Summary Report; concludes consensus
- 2013 – CMAP establishes a Finance Committee and Land Use Committee made up of local leaders and other stakeholders – VHW is represented on both committees
History
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- 2013 – Tollway approves $4 million contract with TranSystems Corp to plan for extension project
- 2014 – VHW establishes Task Force of our elected officials, professional staff, and professional consultants to assist in the assessment of the Finance and Land Use Feasibility studies conducted by committees
- 2014 – CMAP finalizes GO TO 2040 plan, ranks Rt. 53 project as their highest priority project in its effect on regional congestion
History
Route 53 Extension Project Timeline

• 2015 – Finance Committee approves and recommends a funding package to the Tollway that includes local tax dollars in the amount of $115 - $153 million to assist in the funding of the project and recommends moving forward with next steps

• 2015 – Land Use Committee continues its work on Land Use issues; final report, Land Use plan, and recommendation to Tollway Authority due by end of 2015
Primary Issues Facing the VHW

- BRAC REPORT
- ALIGNMENT
- FINANCING
- LAND USE
- ENVIRONMENTAL
Blue Ribbon Advisory Council

VHW Concerns

• BRAC included transportation representatives, selected government officials, and business/environmental groups however did not include a representative from one single community in the actual Rt. 53 corridor path

Communities not included in BRAC:

• Village of Hawthorn Woods
• Village of Long Grove
• Village of Kildeer
• Village of Mundelein
• Village of Round Lake
VHW Concerns

• BRAC report is flawed, as it only considered the original 1960-era alignment and not the preferred alignment previously approved (2001) by dozens of regulatory agencies from previous Environmental Impact Studies.

• BRAC alignment contemplates a raised roadway (bridge) over sensitive areas in VHW, over Gilmer Road, which would divide and profoundly changing the character of our Village.
Blue Ribbon Advisory Council

VHW Concerns

- BRAC recommended a “Regional” development plan impacting only corridor communities
- BRAC report recommended local funding for a regional Tollway completely contradictory to other Tollway funding programs such as the Tri-State
1993 Alignment Map
2011 BRAC Map
Issues Facing the Village
Alignment

- Proposed vs. preferred
- Elevated roadway through Indian Creek Marsh
- Anticipated elevated roadway at:
  - Old McHenry Road
  - Gilmer Road
  - Indian Creek Road
  - Canadian National railroad tracks
- Impact to homes on adjacent Right of Way (ROW)
Issues Facing the Village
Financing

- Roadway construction estimated at $2.3 - $2.65 billion in 2020 dollars
- $0.04 per gallon gas tax in Lake County
- Multi-jurisdictional TIF district in corridor communities only
- Highest tolling rates in entire state/region
- Congestion pricing
Issues Facing the Village
Financing

• Most expensive road in the country, average of $200 million dollars per mile
• Most expensive Tolling in state, $0.20 cents per mile vs $0.06 cents on existing Tollway
• Tolls double during peak use hours
Issues Facing the Village
Financing

A Sustainable Transportation Fund for IL 53/120

The proposed IL 53/120 project has the potential to provide significant benefits to communities in the region. It aims to enhance the quality of life and employment opportunities for residents by increasing accessibility to critical services and employment centers. The increased accessibility is expected to stimulate local commerce and improve the area’s economic vibrancy.

The Sustainable Transportation Fund (STF) would leverage this new investment by focusing on the creation of new, non-residential property tax revenues from the sale of environmental improvements in the corridor. The STF would raise funds to support environmental projects in the corridor, such as the creation of green spaces, pedestrian and bicycle pathways, and other green infrastructure.

How does the STF work?

How much of new tax revenue will continue to flow to underlying districts?

Underlying jurisdictions would retain all of the current and new non-residential property tax revenues from all existing development, all new environmentally friendly developments, and all new environmentally friendly developments in the corridor. The STF would retain all tax revenues from new non-residential development within the corridor.

Is this a new tax or fee?

The STF is not a new tax or fee. Tax revenues would increase to support these projects, which will reduce overall property tax revenues to local communities.

How much will the STF continue to flow to underlying districts?

The STF would retain tax revenues from new non-residential development within the corridor.

Will the STF continue forever?

The STF would remain in place until the obligation for it is met, after which it would be phased out.

Will the STF be able to create a local TIF, SBA, or similar district to promote local economic development?

Yes, the STF could be used to create such districts to promote local economic development.

What is the process for creating the STF?

The process for creating the STF would involve the following steps:

1. Approval of the STF concept by the Finance Committee.
2. Development of a clear boundary for the STF.
3. Approval of the STF concept by the Finance Committee.
4. Development of a clear boundary for the STF.
5. Approval of the STF concept by the Finance Committee.
6. Development of a clear boundary for the STF.
7. Approval of the STF concept by the Finance Committee.
8. Development of a clear boundary for the STF.

Source: Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning analysis.
Issues Facing the Village Financing

- Multi-jurisdictional TIF District to capture 25% of new non residential development
- Dollars lost from corridor Villages, School Districts, Fire Districts, Townships, Library Districts, and all other taxing entities
- Only communities in corridor will be in TIF, all other communities will be exempt
- $81-$108 million in TIF Dollars
Issues Facing the Village Land Use

• Start-up Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) by end of 2015 – a “pre-agreement” with obligations
• Corridor Land Use plan by end of 2016
  – Addendum to Village Comprehensive Plan
  – Prepared from consensus of outside stakeholders and special interest groups
  – Captures 750 acres of private land for open space; property owners with future plans may not be aware
• Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between corridor communities to enforce Land Use plan
Issues Facing the Village
Land Use

• Creation of Corridor Planning Council to oversee Land Use plan
  – Creates additional layer of approval and bureaucracy for development
  – Allows for bias from outside stakeholders on local projects
  – Would have chilling affect on local development visions
  – Politicizes development process
  – Loss of local municipal authority in decision making pursuant to current statutes
Issues Facing the Village
Environmental

- Noise
- Ambient light
- Salt spray
- Visual pollution
- Piers in marsh
- Future potential expansion from 4 lanes to 6 lanes
- ADID wetland impacts on flora & fauna habitat
  - Sandhill Crane
  - Great Blue Heron
  - Great Egret
Photo Simulations

- Gilmer Road looking west
- Gilmer Road looking east
- Lisa Lane looking east
- Edward Lane looking east
- Oneida Lane looking west
View: Looking east on Gilmer Road past Darlington Drive
View: Looking east on Gilmer Road past Darlington Drive
Note: Measurements are approximate
View: Looking west on Gilmer Road past Hawthorn Grove Drive
View: Looking west on Gilmer Road past Hawthorn Grove Drive
Note: Measurements are approximate
View: Looking east at the end of Lisa Lane
View: Looking east at the end of Lisa Lane
View: Looking east at the end of Edward Lane
Village Action to Date

- Members of Finance and Land Use Committee
- Participated in every meeting over 18 months
- Staff/Task Force presence at every meeting
- Wrote letter of objection to alignment to Toll Authority, CMAP, Lake County and Governor
- Met with Governor Rauner to discuss alignment and land use concerns
- Met with CMAP to discuss Village concerns
- Met with Lake County to discuss Village concerns
- Regular meetings with Task Force to discuss concerns
Village Action to Date

- Voted “NO” to Finance Committee funding package recommendation to Tollway
- Voted “NO” on Working Group recommendation to create CPC
- Engaged 5 communities in actual corridor to collaborate on common concerns
- Hosted meetings with 5 communities to discuss strategies on how to address concerns
- Sent two letters unified with the 5 corridor communities all signing to Tollway, CMAP, IDOT, Lake County and Governor
Village Action to Date

- Letter from the 5 corridor municipalities of Hawthorn Woods, Long Grove, Mundelein, Kildeer, and Round Lake requests:
  - Municipal representation on all committees
  - Start-up MOU review prior to any further votes
  - Land Use plan review prior to any further votes
  - Abandonment of Corridor Planning Council
  - Full Lake County municipal funding participation
  - 50% of gas tax distribution to Corridor municipalities only
  - No further votes until concerns addressed
What’s Next

- CMAP to present draft of Land Use plan to full Land Use Committee
- CMAP to present draft of MOU and IGA’s to full Land Use Committee and corridor municipalities
- Land Use Committee to deliberate and make recommendation to Tollway to proceed with next steps - $100 million Phase One Engineering and Environmental Impact Study.
What’s Next

- Citizen involvement
  - Contact
  - Toll Authority
  - Lake County representatives
  - CMAP
  - IDOT
  - Governor Rauner

- www.lakecorridorplan.org