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IL Rt. 53/120 - It’s a long story...

Discussed for nearly 50 years

Numerous attempts to move project forward, including NIPC in the 90’s

2010: 53/120 listed as GO TO 2040 Major Capital Project with high potential to reduce regional congestion

2012: Blue Ribbon Advisory Council Report recommends conditional advancement of facility:

1. Create a transportation system that preserves the environment, communities, and connectivity
2. Design a context-sensitive roadway
3. Respect and preserve the land
4. Create an innovative road funding plan
5. Create a market-based land use, transportation, and open space plan (also recommended in GO TO 2040)
Process Overview

Relationship of CMAP Land Use Plan & Tollway Feasibility Analysis

- **Core Team**
  - Tollway
  - CMAP
  - Lake County
  - BRAC Chairs

- **Land Use Plan**
  - CMAP led Land Use Committee

- **Feasibility Analysis**
  - Tollway led Finance Committee

*Information/Insight*
Land Use Committee
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Process Overview

Outreach & Education
- Ongoing
- www.lakecorridorplan.org

March – October 2014
- Existing Conditions Assessment

October 2014 – March 2015
- Detailed Land Use, Market, Transportation, and Environmental Analysis

May – June 2015
- Draft and Final Corridor Plan

June 2015 – December 2015
- Plan Endorsement and Follow-up
Corridor Land Use Plan Objectives

1. Utilize a *market-driven approach* to assess the feasibility of future land use change
2. *Balance* economic development, open space, and community character goals
3. Formulate a *multi-jurisdictional economic development strategy*
4. Encourage *mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly and/or transit-supportive land uses*
5. Design land use and transportation systems to facilitate *walking and biking, transit, increase local connectivity*
6. Develop an *integrated open space system*
15,682 Acres are available to address open space and development goals.
Existing Local Land Use Plans

- Full build-out depicted in municipal Future Land Use Plans unlikely within the next 30 years
- Growth according to plans would cause significant loss of natural areas and agricultural land
- Plans avoid underutilized or infill sites that could accommodate part of the development demand
- Current zoning in the Corridor does not generally support transit
Market Projection vs. Muni Plans

**NON-RESIDENTIAL** (Millions of SF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Market Demand for 2040 (High)</th>
<th>Future Land Use Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Commercial</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESIDENTIAL** (Units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Market Demand for 2040 (High)</th>
<th>Future Land Use Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached &amp; Detached</td>
<td>18,563</td>
<td>9,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>7,238</td>
<td>2,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hot Spot / Cool Spot Analysis

Cool Spots: important and valuable natural resource areas
- Identified through GIS analysis based on 27 weighted factors

Hot Spots: areas likely to undergo significant land use change as a result of the new road facility
- Identified based on GIS analysis of 18 market, entitlement, and policy factors that drive location of different land uses
## Cool Spots Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Sensitive Lands identified by BRAC</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADID wetlands</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened &amp; Endangered Species Locations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Natural Area Inventory Sites</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Nature Preserves</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corps Wetland Mitigation Sites</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biologically Significant Streams</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites with wetland bank potential</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Forest Preserves</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated/Protected Open Space</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Includes the following lands: The Conservation Fund, Conserve Lake County, Deed Restricted Land, Illinois Department of Natural Resources, Libertyville Township Open Space, Prairie Crossing HOA, The Nature Conservancy, Openlands, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Local Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Wetland Inventory</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20 acres and larger)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Floodway (FEMA and SMC)                   | 3 |
| SMC Floodplain Buyout Properties          | 3 |
| Streams                                   | 3 |
| 303-D Streams                             | 3 |
| Lake County Wetland Inventory (5-20 acres)| 3 |
| Lake County Wetland Inventory (0-5 acres) | 2 |
| USGS Flood of Record                      | 2 |
| SMC Flood Hazard Inventory                | 2 |
| Green Infrastructure Vision - Connectivity Areas | 2 |
| Forest/Woodland                           | 2 |
| Prairie/Savanna                           | 2 |
| Lake County Farm Land                     | 2 |
| Hydric Soils                              | 1 |
| Erodible Soils                            | 1 |
| WDO Buffer Areas                          | 1 |
| Very Highly Permeable Soils               | 1 |
Cool Spots

- Project Study Area
- Proposed IL 53/120 Alignment
- Rail
- METRA Station
- Green Infrastructure Vision 2.2 Final Composite
- BRAC Priority Sensitive Lands
- Protected Land
- Liberty Prairie Reserve
- Forest Preserves
- Parks and Open Space
- Threatened and Endangered Species
Hot Spot / Cool Spot Analysis

- Project Study Area
- Proposed IL 53/120 Alignment
- Rail
- METRA Station

- Cool Spots
- Hot Spots

- Hot Spots and Cool Spots Overlaps and Conflicts

- Forest Preserve
- Parks and Open Space
Role in Scenarios

Test land use scenarios with two distinct Open Space Networks

OPEN SPACE NETWORK “A” → OPEN SPACE NETWORK “B”
Scenarios 1 & 2 Start with Open Space Network “A”

2,2865 total acres of undeveloped open space
Scenario 3 & 4 Start with Open Space Network “B”

6,983 acres of unprotected and undeveloped open space

37,426 total acres in Open Space Network B

- Network A +
- GIV connections +
- Ag land +
- Additional buffering
Mitigation Opportunities

Open Space Network “A” mitigation opportunities

Open Space Network “B” mitigation opportunities
Restoration Opportunities

Open Space Network
“A” restoration opportunities

+ 

Open Space Network
“B” restoration opportunities
Land Use Scenario Planning – Balance Land Use with other Goals

Balance & Trade-offs

*Can only hold two at a time*

- Maximize Open Space
- Maximize Tax Revenue
- Maintain Existing Residential Character
Corridor Land Use Scenarios

Scenarios illustrate trade-offs
Look for common ground

SCENARIO 1

SCENARIO 2

SCENARIO 3

SCENARIO 4
TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL DENSITY RESULTS IN LOWER LEVELS OF NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

OPEN SPACE NETWORK “A”

SCENARIO 1

OPEN SPACE NETWORK “B”

SCENARIO 3

INCREASED RESIDENTIAL DENSITY SUPPORTS MORE NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

SCENARIO 2

SCENARIO 4
**Scenario Comparison**

**Scenario 1**
- 1.65 du/ac
- 92% of S2 retail due to less residential
- 4285 ac OSNR

**Scenario 2**
- 1.82 du/ac
- 100% of retail potential
- 4285 ac OSNR

**Scenario 3**
- 1.82 du/ac
- 68% of S4 retail
- 6983 ac OSNR

**Scenario 4**
- 2.79 du/ac
- 100% of retail potential
- 6983 ac OSNR
Scenario Comparison

Metrics allow us to compare scenarios relative to baseline

- **Open Space/Natural Resources**
  - New preservation areas
  - Agricultural land preserved
  - Connectivity

- **Mobility**
  - Congestion
  - Acres of transit-supportive density
  - Pedestrian friendly development

- **Market**
  - Ability to accommodate anticipated demand
  - Employment
  - Property and sales tax revenues

- **Land Use**
  - Impact on infrastructure efficiency
  - Number of residential units

Ratings used to show comparison to Business-as-Usual Scenario:

- Performs Worse
- Performs Slightly Worse
- Performs About the Same
- Performs Slightly Better
- Performs Better
## Scenario Comparison (all compared to business-as-usual scenario)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Space/ Natural Resources</td>
<td>Open Space and Natural Resource Preservation</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres of Transit-Supportive Density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Accomodates Anticipated Demand</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property &amp; Sales Tax Revenue</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Infrastructure Efficiency</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Residential Units</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

1. Work with communities and stakeholders to refine scenarios
2. Explore conservation as foundation of plan implementation strategy
3. Consider Plan structure, organization, and level of detail
4. Investigate cooperative planning tools
Plan Structure and Detail

Plan Structure and Detail vs Cooperative Planning Tool

Low Plan Detail and Specificity
Strong Implementation Tool

High Plan Detail and Specificity
Weak Implementation Tool