

Illinois Route 53/120 Project  
Stewardship Fund Working Group #2  
Roll Call August 27, 2014  
Meeting minutes issued by Lake County

PRESENT	NAME	REPRESENTING
Present via phone	Aaron Lawlor	Lake County
Present	Brad Leibov - Chairperson	Liberty Prairie Foundation
Present	George Ranney	Co-Chair, BRAC
Present	Mike Talbett	Village of Kildeer
Present	Angie Underwood	Village of Long Grove
Present	Dave Brown	Village of Vernon Hills

### General Business

#### *Call to Order and Roll Call*

Before adopting the previous meeting minutes, **Aimee Lee (ALee)**, of the Tollway, noted that at the last meeting she had incorrectly stated the project costs related to the mitigation of direct environmental impacts. The correct cost is estimated at \$242 million, which was presented at the second Finance Committee meeting. **Mike Matkovic (MM)**, of Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd., clarified that the \$242 million estimate captures both the regulatory requirements for mitigation as well as those recommended by the Blue Ribbon Advisory Council (BRAC). **MM** further noted that this cost is currently being refined through the input of environmental stakeholders and will be presented at the next Finance Committee meeting. **Action item: Dave Brown (DB)** moved to adopt the meeting minutes on a motion that the amended direct impact costs be included, and **Angie Underwood (AU)** seconded the motion and the group approved it.

**MM** provided the group with an explanation and handout defining potential direct and indirect environmental impacts. The list illustrated potential direct impacts that are caused by the project that occur within or directly adjacent to the project construction zone. There is typically a regulatory and permit requirement for mitigation of most direct impacts, as part of the project. These impacts are measurable and observable, while the indirect impacts are generally not readily measurable or foreseeable as resulting from the project. Potential indirect environmental impacts would be monitored long term and addressed through the proposed \$81 million Environmental Stewardship Fund (ESF). **Mike Talbett (MT)** asked how chloride impacts and water quality degradation would be categorized. **MM** said water quality impacts will be mitigated as direct and indirect impacts. Direct impacts cover construction or operations, and this will be further addressed in the next phase of project development. Indirectly, the ESF will provide for previously degraded wetlands and the roadway's secondary or cumulative impacts and long-term monitoring. **ALee** noted that the handout was developed at the request for better distinction to be made between direct and indirect impacts and asked if there was need for any further information needed. The group noted that the handout was helpful.

Based on the BRAC recommendation to use the ESF for acquiring 750 acres for land preservation and restoration to address indirect impacts, **MM** said the cost would be approximately \$65 million, based on

a Lake County average of \$2 per square foot, or \$87,000 per acre. **JA** said that it may be helpful to provide a range due to the high cost that may swallow the majority of the fund. **Jason Navota (JN)** said there is confusion on why increased stormwater runoff is a direct impact and stream erosion is an indirect impact. **MM** said the Tollway will have to meet requirements and comply with local ordinances to mitigate stormwater runoff and detention issues as a result of the project, but there may be increased stormwater runoff that may arise 10 years after the project is complete. This is categorized as an unforeseen, indirect impact. **MW** said the SMC is currently dealing with drainage and water runoff issues that have come as a result of other projects over time. There is no perfect system designed to cover these unintended consequences. **AU** asked who and how it will be determined that these consequences are a result of the road. **ALee** said that will be decided through the governance of the ESF. Chair **Brad Leibov (BL)** said it is up to the group to identify the strategic goals of the governance. He acknowledged that there is not enough technical data available to determine every detail of this governance and how the ESF will exactly improve the corridor's ecological health, but the list of direct and indirect impacts gives the group a better understanding of what the ESF is intended to cover. **MT** said there is more comfort that environmental concerns will be met knowing the Tollway's direct impacts will account for \$242 million in mitigation. **DB** said it is incumbent on the group to figure out what the baseline is now to determine what is attributable to the ESF before the indirect impacts occur later. **George Ranney (GR)** said they know there will be significant impacts but the question is figuring out how much and when. They cannot provide a number for what is unanticipated. **MT** said those unknown costs should be covered by the ESF. **MW** said the issue of stream erosion should not be considered an expensive indirect impact, but it should be tied to drainage impacts because these are most times inseparable issues.

**BL** provided the group with a prepared statement to clarify the intent and purpose of the ESF. **BL** said it was important the group build consensus to articulate and describe the ESF to the Finance Committee and Tollway Board. The group established that the corridor included two miles on either side of the roadway. **Aaron Lawlor (AL)** said if a tax increment financing (TIF) district is utilized to generate funds for the ESF, then the boundaries must be aligned and this becomes a discussion for the TIF-Value Capture Working Group, which was studying a corridor with only a one mile radius from the centerline with two miles at intersections. **JA** said reducing the boundary by a mile will limit the opportunities to mitigate. The value capture area can benefit from major infrastructure because it will grow commercial development to which people will travel to, **GR** said. **MT** said the limit on broadening the TIF is impacting the existing TIF districts that currently exist. **Lenore Beyer-Clow (LBC)**, of Openlands, said after land acquisition takes place, the ESF is a small pot of money and innovation will be required to leverage other investment resources to restore the ecological health of the area and have a broad scale impact on the region. The group agreed that a technical advisory committee will likely be needed to oversee how the fund is managed. **MT** said they still have to address how administrative regulations are imposed; how investments and paying for unintended consequences is decided; and how long the ESF will last. **JA** said establishing the baseline would shed light on the future management of the ESF. **JN** said the Land Use study will provide additional insight but it does not include a baseline for all natural resource conditions. All agreed that a baseline would need to be developed in a future effort. **Action item:** **BL** said governance and funding will be discussed at the next meeting.

**Action item:** After lengthy discussion, the group amended, approved and adopted the ESF guiding principles as follows:

The Environmental Restoration and Stewardship Fund will provide financial support for the protection and enhancement of the natural resources, including agricultural lands and water bodies, within two miles of the Illinois Route 53/120 roadway. The Fund will support efforts to improve the ecological health within the corridor through:

- Protection and restoration of at least 750 acres of land
- Long-term stewardship of the current and newly protected lands and other natural resources, including agricultural lands and water bodies
- Innovative investments intended to remediate ecological health issues that may arise within the corridor
- Monitoring and study to inform governance and funding priorities

The group agreed to establish recommendations for the funding and governance of the ESF at its next meeting to recommend to the Finance Committee. The next meeting was scheduled for Friday, September 5 at 11 a.m. The meeting officially adjourned at 3:45 p.m.