



December 7, 2011

Mr. George Ranney
Co-Chairman
32400 Harris Road
Grayslake, IL 60030

Re: Village Route 53/120 Design

Dear Mr. Ranney:

The Village has followed the initial work of the IL Route 53/120 Blue Ribbon Advisory Council with great interest. Since more of the proposed Route 53/120 project would be in Grayslake than in any other community, Grayslake wants to ensure that any project is designed with the highest environmental standards and in a way that minimizes adverse impacts to Grayslake.

Please find enclosed "Grayslake IL 53/120 Design Parameters". This document is respectfully submitted to the Council as Grayslake's position on the design for those portions of the Route 53/120 project within Grayslake. The Village requests that these design parameters be included in any report submitted by the Council to the Illinois Tollway. The Village, and its consultants, stand ready to assist the Council toward this result.

The Village looks forward to continuing dialogue with the Council on the enclosed parameters. Please contact me or Village Manager Mike Ellis to initiate any needed discussions.

Thank you for your attention to this request and good luck with your efforts.

Sincerely,

Rhett Taylor
Mayor

Enc.

cc: Co-Chairman David Stolman
Board of Trustees
Mike Ellis

Mayor: Rhett Taylor
Trustees: Bruce R. Bassett ~ Jeff Werfel ~ Amy Edwards ~ Shawn M. Vogel ~ Ronald L. Jarvis ~ Kevin D. Waldenstrom
Village Clerk: Cynthia E. Lee

Grayslake IL 53/120 Design Parameters

I. Context

In 2011 the Illinois Tollway Authority established the Illinois Route 53/120 Blue Ribbon Advisory Council to assist in the planning and potential building of the IL-53/120 North Extension in Lake County. As the Council seeks to develop a regional consensus on whether the Tollway Authority should move forward, the Council will discuss the scope and configuration, design elements, and how to finance the project. Since Grayslake would host the largest portion of the IL-53/120 project, the Village has a strong desire to ensure that any potential project be designed and built to the highest design and environmental standards and in a way that, as much as practical, enhances the area's environment. In this context the Village has developed design parameters for that portion of the project within Grayslake. Additionally, the Village feels the Council may find these parameters useful throughout the corridor while looking at ways to make this project unique among road planning and construction projects. The Village seeks inclusion of these parameters in the Council's report to the Tollway Authority and stands ready to work with the Council to refine the stated parameters as needed as part of the Council's effort to meet its guiding principles.

II. Road Objectives

The Village urges the Council to consider certain operational objectives, beyond congestion relief, related to Grayslake. These include:

- A. Economic Development: Central Lake County will be a major economic development hub for the region. Over 1300 acres is available in Grayslake and along the Route 53 corridor for business development. The chosen road configuration should support economic development in this area.
- B. Mass Transit: The Grayslake area hosts four Metra stations providing service on two separate commuter lines. Consideration should be given to the inclusion of a mass transit capability that allows access to the large economic development area from IL-53/120 and between the existing commuter stations and business development. While the service may be further in the future when the expected market is present, an IL-53/120 project should allow for this eventual service.

III. Road Design Parameters

- A. Adherence to design features included in Central Lake Thruway/Unified Vision
- B. Road Elevation
 - 1. Lowest possible elevation throughout
 - 2. Underpass (Route 137/83/railroads)
 - 3. Below existing grade where possible
- C. Noise
 - 1. DBA 64 adjoining the corridor
 - a. Decorative sound walls as needed

D. Screening

1. Roadway not visible from outside the corridor
2. Screening accomplished by berming
 - a. Berming includes natural landscaping
 - b. Any sound walls fully screened
 - c. All roadway signage screened
 - d. Lighting poles/luminaries screened

E. Lighting

1. No spill light outside corridor
2. Minimize light in night sky
3. Poles/luminaries not visible outside corridor
4. Minimum required light within corridor
5. Luminaries directed down to roadway

F. Signage

1. Signs screened from outside corridor
2. Sign lighting direct on sign face only (no spill) from above sign downward
3. Grayslake identification signage (Village cost)
 - a. Winchester
 - b. Route 120
 - c. West of Alleghany Road
 - d. Grayslake sign designs used

G. Pedestrian Facilities/Recreation

1. Preserve north/south bike path connection routes
 - a. Harris Road
 - b. Route 45
 - c. Route 83
 - d. Lake Street
 - e. Alleghany Road
2. Use of underpasses/pedestrian bridges to preserve corridors
3. Access to wetland restoration area/overlook area

H. Limited Access Points

1. Peterson Road
2. Alleghany Road
3. Route 45
4. Atkinson Road (if possible with mainline underpass)

I. Accommodate Existing Roadways

1. Emergency road access at Harris Road
2. Atkinson Road/Route 83 alignment/roadway

J. Water/Sewer Facilities

1. Preserve north/south water/sewer extensions (no Village costs)

K. Landscaping

1. Use of Grayslake landscaping mix
2. Native landscaping on berms/detention basins

L. Wetlands

1. Minimize impact on wetlands
 - a. Particular attention east of Route 45
 - b. Central Range wetland restoration area

M. Use Best Management Practices (BMP's) in Final Design