

VILLAGE OF GURNEE

PLAN COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING

held

OCTOBER 14, 1998

7:00 PM

GURNEE MUNICIPAL BUILDING

325 North O'Plaine Road

Gurnee, Illinois

2

1 PLAN COMMISSION:

2

3 DONALD RUDNY, Chairman

4 JIM SULA
5 BILL SMITH
6 LYLE FOSTER
7 BRYAN WINTER
8 KRISTINA KOVARIK
9 CARL CEPON

10

11 ALSO PRESENT:

12

13 JON WILDENBERG

14 TRACY VELKOVER

15 BARBARA SWANSON

16 AL MAIDEN

17

18

19

20

21

22 Reported by: SANDRA K. SMITH, CSR, RPR

23 CSR License No. 084-003104

24

3

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The Village of Gurnee

2 Plan Commission meeting will now come to order.

3 Can we have roll call, please.

4 MS. VELKOVER: Winter.

5 MR. WINTER: Here.
6 MS. VELKOVER: Foster, absent. Smith.
7 MR. SMITH: Here.

8 MS. VELKOVER: Sula.

9 MR. SULA: Here.

10 MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.

11 MS. KOVARIK: Here.

12 MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.

13 MR. CEPON: Here.

14 MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Here. Will you all
16 please join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

17 (Pledge of Allegiance.)

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. First we have
19 the approval of the September 16th, 1998 Plan
20 Commission minutes.

21 Now I understand that we all got
22 our packets at a different time. I know I just got
23 mine today so I did not have a chance to review the
24 minutes because they are pretty lengthy. And I

4

1 think, Jim, you didn't even get your packet, right?

2 MR. SULA: That's correct.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I would suggest we just
4 table this until --

5 MS. VELKOVER: Talk into your microphone
6 because I think you're having trouble with that

7 microphone.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You know what, I'm just
9 going to use Barb's.

10 Okay. Is that better?

11 THE AUDIENCE: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So I think we'll table
13 the minutes until the next meeting so that everyone
14 has a chance to review them. Is that acceptable to
15 everyone?

16 And we have a matter before us that
17 we stuck in here. This meeting was intended to be
18 solely for the Six Flags entertainment village
19 petition but we have one matter which we think
20 shouldn't take much time and since we have some
21 limited meetings in the future we thought we might
22 sneak this one in.

23 So this is the review of the
24 Immanuel Baptist Church lighting plan.

5

1 The Immanuel Baptist Church is
2 constructing Phase I of their facility at the
3 northwest corner of Dilley's Road and Stearns
4 School Road. The church is seeking review and
5 approval of their Phase I lighting plan per the
6 requirements of our annexation agreement.

7 Tracy, can you fill us in more on

8 that?

9 MS. VELKOVER: The Immanuel Baptist
10 Church came in months ago with their plans for
11 Phase I of the project including their lighting
12 plan.

13 At the time they came in it was
14 prior to the adoption of our new lighting
15 Ordinance. And in fact when they annexed to the
16 Village we had concerns that we may not be
17 operating under our current lighting or our new
18 Lighting Ordinance so in the annexation agreement
19 we set it up so that they had to come back before
20 the Plan Commission and Village Board for review
21 and approval.

22 You do have a copy of their
23 lighting plan for Phase I. Just as a comparison
24 with how they conform to our new Lighting Ordinance

6

1 even though they're not subject to that, they do
2 conform to it in every way except one.

3 One -- the one item where they do
4 not conform is that our Ordinance requires a
5 maximum cutoff luminare of 75 degrees. They have
6 an 85 degree luminare cutoff level.

7 Part of the reason that we put this
8 in our Ordinance was to control the light levels at
9 the property lines and also to control the light

10 levels internal to the property.

11 Our new Lighting Ordinance does
12 have a maximum foot candle level that's allowed at
13 the property lines and a maximum foot candle level
14 that's also allowed internal to the site.

15 They have given us photometric
16 plans for this property. They conform in every
17 regard to the maximum foot candle level both at the
18 property lines and internal to the site.

19 In fact, you do -- I think you have
20 a copy of their photometric plan and they're
21 substantially under the maximum that's allowed or
22 that would be allowed per the new Ordinance.

23 I believe that a representative of
24 the church is in attendance if you have any

7

1 questions for them.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do we have any
3 questions, Commissioners? If not -- Mr. Sula.

4 MR. SULA: I do have one question.

5 It seems to me that the purpose of
6 the cutoff angle was to be sensitive to glare from
7 the approaching roadways and adjacent properties.

8 Given the specifics of this
9 property, is there a concern about glare?

10 MS. VELKOVER: We -- at first we looked

11 at having the 85 degree cutoff. A lot of fixtures
12 have a 90 degree cutoff so that as you're, you
13 know, the very top of the fixtures that would be
14 where the light source could come out from.

15 And we looked at an 85 degree angle
16 and decided later to change it to a 75 in order to
17 try to cut down again on glare but also to cut down
18 the ability of the lights to trespass onto adjacent
19 properties.

20 I think if you were to look at this
21 site it's going to develop in three phases. If you
22 saw the first phase at a 75 degree cutoff and then
23 you saw the future phases at an 85 degree cutoff I
24 don't think you would be able to discern the

8

1 difference from the roadway.

2 MR. SULA: Will there be filament glare
3 or not at what they've proposed here?

4 MS. VELKOVER: You're not going to have
5 light, you're not going to see light visible to the
6 eye. You're not going to see light above an 85
7 degree or an 85 degree cut -- 75 degree cutoff.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other questions?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'll entertain a motion
11 for a favorable recommendation.

12 MR. SMITH: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion by Mr. Smith.
14 MR. CEPON: Second.
15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Second by Mr. Cepon.
16 All those in favor of the motion signify by saying
17 aye in the roll call; those opposed nay. Roll
18 call, please.
19 MS. VELKOVER: Winter.
20 MR. WINTER: Aye.
21 MS. VELKOVER: Smith.
22 MR. SMITH: Aye.
23 MS. VELKOVER: Sula.
24 MR. SULA: Aye.

9

1 MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.
2 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.
3 MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.
4 MR. CEPON: Aye.
5 MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.
6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries
7 and it is so ordered. Thank you.
8 Okay. Next we have the continued
9 public hearing of the Six Flags Theme Parks, Inc.
10 and Prism Development Company, LLC.
11 The subject property consists of
12 approximately 134 acres located at the northwest
13 corner of I-94 and Washington Street. The

14 Petitioner Six Flags and Prism Development Company
15 are requesting the following:
16 A, to rezone the property from I-2
17 General Industrial to a Planned Unit Development
18 PUD with underlying zoning of I-2 General
19 Industrial District and C/S-1 Outdoor Recreation
20 District.

21 And B, such other approvals as may
22 be necessary or desirable under applicable Village
23 Ordinances and Codes, all as may be necessary to
24 permit development on the property of theme park

10

1 uses, an entertainment village consisting of
2 entertainment and compatible retail and related
3 uses, employee housing facilities that are
4 accessory to new or existing theme park uses in the
5 Village, general office and industrial uses and
6 other compatible uses.

7 Tracy, did you have anything to
8 add?

9 MS. VELKOVER: Just that this is a
10 continued public hearing.

11 They do have plans to go through
12 and answer questions that were previously
13 unanswered from the previous hearings and also to
14 go through and answer any traffic questions from
15 the previous meetings and to go through their

16 development standards.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Now, we did
18 receive a memo from Bud Reed to Jon Wildenberg
19 regarding the Bill Grieve traffic report.

20 I know Mr. Foster -- you just
21 showed up -- had requested some more detailed
22 reports on the traffic. There was also a more
23 detailed report provided by Bill Grieve who is
24 here.

11

1 So, Mr. Foster, did you get -- you
2 didn't get your packet yet so you didn't have the
3 chance to review that.

4 Do any other Commissioners have it?
5 It might be a good idea to kind of first cover the
6 traffic. I was wondering if there are any other
7 questions in regards to traffic and the reports
8 that were presented?

9 And again, I apologize.
10 Unfortunately, these -- a couple of the Trustees
11 haven't had a chance to review these yet. I guess
12 I'll start.

13 I guess I think probably the two
14 key areas that I thought were brought out in the
15 reports were the addressing the extension of the
16 Grand Tri-State Business Parkway and also the

17 possibility of putting in some traffic improvements
18 to make the 21/120 interchange more conducive to
19 take some of the traffic impact off of Hunt Club
20 Road.

21 Did I state that correctly, Mr.
22 Grieve?

23 MR. GRIEVE: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Before we start I guess

12

1 this is a public -- continued public hearing so we
2 need to have anyone who is going to be testifying
3 on behalf of the Petitioner and also anyone from
4 the public we'll open the floor to the public later
5 on who is going to -- if you're going to ask a
6 question or make a comment you need to stand and be
7 sworn in by our Village Attorney.

8 (Witnesses sworn.)

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Grieve, you might
10 want to touch on those two points and then maybe we
11 can get a response from the Petitioner on how he
12 feels about those.

13 MR. GRIEVE: From our standpoint -- I'm
14 Bill Grieve. I'm an engineer with Gewalt Hamilton.

15 I'm Bill Grieve, Senior Engineer
16 with Gewalt Hamilton. As I wrote in our report,
17 we've been involved in this project now for several
18 months primarily with the charge of reviewing the

19 traffic studies prepared by Metro Transportation
20 Group for the developer and actually challenging
21 them all along the way to make sure that we really
22 did take a look at what we believe would be the
23 maximum traffic impacts of this development.

24 As the Chairman pointed out, two of

13

1 the big things that we looked at as far as even
2 greater detail than the Metro studies or
3 enhancements to their study was trying to maximize
4 what we felt was the flexibility of the major, the
5 arterial road system to try to get as many people
6 from the development to use those routes whether it
7 be the Tri-State, whether it be Route 21, and
8 listening to a lot of the concerns as far as the
9 traffic on -- even though they're arterial routes
10 but more of the residentially flavored arterial
11 routes if you want to say the Hunt Club roads or
12 the Washingtons west of the site.

13 We came up with two important I
14 guess additions. The first being taking the
15 existing Route 120/21 interchange, there's a need
16 right now for traffic signals at the ramps.

17 We would suggest very strongly
18 putting temporary signals at this point at the
19 ramps. That begs to the follow-up question of

20 Route 21 is very busy right now, what do we want to
21 do adding more traffic. A couple things that have
22 to be considered.

23 First, most of the uses in this
24 development aren't going to be busiest when Route

14

1 21 is, whether it be the morning rush hour or the
2 evening rush hour. The summer times of the water
3 park, for example, open 90 to 100 days in the year.
4 People want to get there in the middle of the day
5 to spend most of their time during the middle of
6 the day at the water park.

7 The next thing that should be
8 considered is that the Illinois Department of
9 Transportation has already understood that Route 21
10 needs improvement.

11 In the next five years they've
12 already got it funded, it's in their plan to
13 upgrade Route 21 south of where -- south of
14 Washington and create basically a five lane
15 pavement section through the 120 interchange.

16 At that point they will be taking
17 the temporary signals down and putting up permanent
18 signals. That's very important because right now
19 based on our own traffic counts Route 21 is
20 carrying something between 19 and 25 thousand cars
21 per day. That easily exceeds the capacity of a two

22 lane road which is why there are a lot of people
23 who have difficulty getting on and off Route 21 in
24 that area.

15

1 When they go to five lanes you're
2 going to be not only doubling the through lane
3 capacity but you're also going to be creating a
4 much safer environment by adding the additional
5 turn lanes whether it be a left turn lane, a right
6 turn lane, that sort of thing. So we felt very
7 strongly that we wanted to take advantage of that
8 flexibility of the existing 120/21 interchange.

9 The next point that was brought out
10 which is in somewhat conflict to the Petitioner's
11 studies and some of the concerns laid out was the
12 extension of Tri-State Parkway south from its
13 terminus right at the northern portion of the site
14 down to Washington Street.

15 At the last meeting Petitioner said
16 that they would be willing to provide the
17 right-of-way needed for that road. The question
18 came up when is that absolutely needed. My
19 response then was that you always want to provide
20 for that flexibility should the point in time come
21 when it's absolutely necessary to extend that road.

22 In my report taking another look at

23 it I think we really want to try to push and Bud
24 Reed echoed those statements of trying to get

16

1 Tri-State Parkway down to Washington right now.
2 There was some concerns raised by
3 the existing businesses, a possibility of
4 exasperating the westbound to southbound from 132
5 down to Tri-State Parkway. Once again, I've got to
6 remind everybody that the vast majority of these
7 development uses are going to be seeing their
8 busiest times in the off peak hours.

9 Tri-State Parkway southbound is
10 extremely busy first thing in the morning up until
11 about 9:00 AM when everybody is getting to work.
12 It's also very busy from about 3:30 to maybe 5:30
13 in the evening when everybody is leaving from work.
14 It's very -- its use is very limited during the
15 rest of the hours of the day.

16 As far as adding more traffic to
17 132 down to Tri-State for this development it's got
18 to really be remembered that this property was
19 originally meant for more of the same type of
20 office and business development.

21 In fact, the -- when you take a
22 look at what could happen on that property Metro
23 looked at some of the traffic volumes associated,
24 you could be looking at several hundred more cars

1 being added to those peak times, those same peak
2 times whether it be the westbound to southbound
3 left turn at Route 132 and the Tri-State Parkway
4 as well as leaving at those same times during the
5 evening.

6 So whether this project goes
7 through or whether it goes to more office
8 industrial warehouse type development we really
9 think that Tri-State Parkway should go through
10 anyway because the flexibility again will enhance
11 mobility, it will actually take some of the trips
12 away perhaps from the east that now are forced up
13 onto 132 down to Tri-State and maybe bring them in
14 from the east on Washington.

15 We're not going to take them by
16 Hunt Club but be able to get into the east and go
17 up Tri-State Parkway. Those were the two probably
18 the key issues.

19 The third one then I suppose as an
20 offshoot is the discussion of the Washington Street
21 interchange. From an overall context I think
22 that's certainly a regional improvement that
23 everybody ought to work for, the sooner the better.
24 And I think that's one of the key points in Bud

1 Reed's memo.

2 Is that needed for this
3 development? No. The traffic management program
4 and the improvement program that's been developed
5 for this development we feel very comfortable that
6 it can handle the traffic. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you. Ms.
8 Kovarik.

9 MS. KOVARIK: When you say you feel
10 comfortable with it, you're comfortable with it
11 because of the light at 120 and Highway 21 and
12 Grand State Parkway going all the way through or if
13 they didn't do that are you still comfortable with
14 it?

15 MR. GRIEVE: I'm still comfortable if
16 they don't do that because they came up with a very
17 intricate routing plan to try to make sure some of
18 the major intersections like along Hunt Club and
19 Washington could work without those.

20 But I really believe strongly that
21 the impact will be that much more minimized I guess
22 if those two enhancements are put in the package.

23 MS. KOVARIK: I really liked your
24 traffic report. You restored my faith in traffic

1 studies. You did an excellent job explaining it in

2 laymen's terms and your recommendations were solid
3 and you explained your logic.

4 So I would be strongly leaning
5 towards any kind of recommendation would include
6 the Grand Tri-State Parkway going through which is
7 on the comprehensive land plan. I did look it up,
8 the comp plan does show that road going through and
9 the Illinois 120 and Highway 21 having a signalized
10 light.

11 So I think that would minimize some
12 of my concerns about the traffic because it does
13 show in the study, and I know not everyone got to
14 read it yet, that almost five to six hundred trips
15 would be taken off of Hunt Club and Washington with
16 those two improvements. That's a significant
17 number.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Maybe we should ask the
19 Petitioner what he thinks of that.

20 MS. KOVARIK: I'm sure he'll comment on
21 it.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Go ahead. Good
23 question.

24 MR. FRANCKE: I'm rarely at a loss for

20

1 words.

2 I would just like to reiterate what
3 we had said at the last meeting which is, as Mr.

4 Grieve indicated, we said we would make the
5 right-of-way available and we do believe this is a
6 Village issue to resolve.

7 We just want to reiterate that when
8 we began this process this is the direction that we
9 were initially going in for the reasons that
10 Commissioner Kovarik just indicated, it's shown on
11 the comprehensive plan and that's what our original
12 plans indicated.

13 The direction we initially received
14 from Village representatives was to go in a
15 direction that we have gone in to this point in
16 time. In other words, to do everything we can to
17 keep from encouraging the use of Grand Avenue
18 with -- the use of Grand Avenue for traffic that's
19 going to be coming and going -- coming to and going
20 from this development.

21 So our entire thrust of our -- the
22 entire thrust of our program was to keep traffic
23 off Grand Avenue. We believe that if you extend
24 the Parkway -- and again, that is okay, that's a

21

1 Village decision. So if the Village does that they
2 will be doing just the opposite which is going back
3 to encouraging the use of Grand Avenue.

4 And we do think that the weave

5 problem will be there which was brought to our
6 attention by the Village that there was this
7 concern about the weave problem.

8 And I understand what Bill is
9 saying about the use of Tri-State Parkway in the
10 offsetting peak hours, but I don't think that the
11 issue is the use of the Parkway on the off peak
12 hours. The question is what's the traffic on Grand
13 during these hours because that's where the
14 question is going to come up about the weave,
15 people trying make the cut across on Grand Avenue
16 when Grand Avenue traffic is heavy. Even if it's
17 the weekend and there isn't a lot of traffic going
18 over to the park, the industrial park, you're still
19 going to have traffic, significant traffic I would
20 believe on Grand Avenue.

21 So we still believe that the weave
22 issue is a valid concern which was raised to us by
23 the Village representatives.

24 We continue to believe that the

22

1 residents -- as was stated by Bill -- that the
2 residents, the existing residents, business
3 residents of the Parkway are not in favor of it but
4 we're not speaking for them.

5 But in the final analysis it's the
6 Village's decision and we think that the Plan

7 Commission should make this one of their
8 recommendations to the Village Board.

9 MS. KOVARIK: Then you raised a point
10 with the weave.

11 And in the study I do think it
12 points out -- and this may be information from Six
13 Flags -- that the majority of visitors are coming
14 from the south, that there was less people that
15 come from Wisconsin.

16 But couldn't a light be put at the
17 ramp? I get mixed up in my directions. Couldn't
18 there be a light there to let people go across if
19 there was really that much traffic? And then would
20 the State consider adding a light there to avoid
21 the weave at the ramp on Grand?

22 MR. GRIEVE: Boy, there's a lot of
23 historical baggage to that question.

24 Through the planning process for

23

1 all of Gurnee Mills there were numerous interchange
2 modifications proposed by the developers, by the
3 Toll Authority, by IDOT. We spent a lot of hours
4 and meetings trying to sift through all those
5 options.

6 When it all came down to the final
7 that IDOT and the Toll Authority really wanted to

8 keep the cloverleaf so they really weren't
9 entertaining any chances for lights at any of the
10 ramps.

11 Now certainly as part of the Toll
12 Authority study, overall study that Mr. Miller
13 pointed out a couple meetings ago that they will be
14 looking at some enhancements, whether it be the
15 Washington interchange gets a top priority. And
16 certainly through the process and Bud Reed's memo
17 that we should really be aggressive in trying to
18 get an interchange at Washington.

19 If that interchange does go in at
20 Washington that will provide another opportunity
21 for people to get into the park whether it be from
22 the north or the south.

23 MS. KOVARIK: I think that's another
24 reason why it's important to have Grand Tri-State

24

1 Parkway go through because if you do get the
2 Washington interchange and it starts developing
3 with office parks south of Washington, you know,
4 now you've kind of connected the two parks with a
5 public roadway between them and then --

6 MR. GRIEVE: Correct.

7 MS. KOVARIK: Otherwise we're going to
8 cut that whole south side of Washington off.

9 MR. GRIEVE: That's why I tried to point

10 out that right now we've got Hunt Club way on the
11 west and O'Plaine way on the east and the Tri-State
12 really creates a natural barrier no different than
13 a lake or a mountain chain, whatever you want to
14 call it.

15 And the Tri-State Parkway just
16 provides that one more level of opportunity for
17 people to focus their trips, their regional trips
18 on and off the interchange rather than having to go
19 all the way out to Hunt Club on the west or all the
20 way over to O'Plaine or other roads on the east.

21 MR. FRANCKE: I just want to say again I
22 think it may be a question of timing.

23 We're not suggesting that the
24 right-of-way not be established so that the

25

1 flexibility for the ultimate extension of Tri-State
2 Parkway is there.

3 But I want to remind everyone of
4 the testimony during the earlier sessions of the
5 public hearing in which Dave Miller indicated that
6 right now that the ramp, the southbound off at
7 Grand ramp is right now over capacity,
8 substantially over capacity.

9 Isn't that what --

10 MR. MILLER: That was really the north,

11 north to west loop.

12 MR. FRANCKE: Okay. The north to west
13 loop.

14 And again, what we're seeing is if
15 I look at Bill's report I understand what he's
16 saying and we don't disagree that by focusing on
17 these regional areas there's the potential for
18 keeping away from the Washington/Hunt Club routes,
19 what he calls the residential oriented routes.

20 But I think the question is one of
21 timing. And it might be after the interchange is
22 in that you do that or something, you know what I'm
23 saying, something like that.

24 MS. KOVARIK: But if your roadways are

26

1 on Lot 9 and it's platted this way, can the Village
2 come back and then take that and make that a
3 public road?

4 MR. FRANCKE: We're suggesting that we
5 would accommodate this right-of-way.

6 MS. KOVARIK: To get through to your
7 private road. Because your road, your internal
8 ring road is private, right, or would it be a
9 public road?

10 MR. FRANCKE: Well, I think that whole
11 question would end up being looked at if this got
12 extended.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Winter.

14 MR. WINTER: I have a few questions for
15 Mr. Grieve.

16 As far as the temporary lights at
17 120 and 21, is that something that can be done?
18 Would there be a possibility that the State says
19 no, you can't do that before the widening?

20 MR. GRIEVE: To be honest with you, the
21 State of Illinois' primary goal is to never put
22 another traffic signal up anywhere on any one of
23 their roadways.

24 But certainly this is a location

27

1 that they're very aware of that is very busy. And
2 in my conversations with representatives from IDOT,
3 they won't preclude the opportunity.

4 So if we all work together on this
5 and go at them from a regional type solution I
6 think that it will work out well. Certainly the
7 traffic counts that we conducted on Route 21
8 clearly meet the volume warrants. The question
9 then would just be getting them to work with us
10 until the final improvement or the widening project
11 is completed within the next five years.

12 MR. WINTER: As a follow-up, I still am
13 unclear. Mr. Miller when he initially presented

14 the traffic study I think he opted out or
15 recommended the 120 to Hunt Club and it seemed to
16 me that you thought that there was still some
17 potential for 21.

18 As a practical matter, how is the
19 signage going to be to alert motorists? I mean is
20 one of these roads going to be designated the
21 preferred route? They both are or how is that
22 going to work?

23 MR. GRIEVE: Under either routing
24 scenario or any routing scenario you pick it's

28

1 going to be a large education issue/problem for
2 certainly people who are coming from the regional
3 context who aren't that familiar with the road
4 system.

5 Metro talked about methods such as
6 working with the Toll Authority to put up the
7 flashing message boards on the Tollway far enough
8 distances to suggest things such as Six Flags Theme
9 Park this exit or Six Flags Theme Park wait until
10 next exit, that sort of thing.

11 And certainly there are the movable
12 sign boards as well that get put out where they
13 arrange everything from a police radar gun saying
14 you've just driven 45 miles an hour past this point
15 in a 35 mile an hour zone to when it's -- well, the

16 two seasons in Chicago are winter and
17 construction -- and construction season where you
18 see the sign that says improvements ahead, pick an
19 alternate route, expect traffic delays, that sort
20 of thing.

21 So that's -- I don't want to call
22 it a detail but it's almost a final detail that has
23 to be worked out on how that routing system gets
24 finally planned. I think you have to remember that

29

1 when Metro looked at their study they were the two
2 busiest hours possible which would be the weekday
3 evening and the Saturday early afternoon, something
4 like that.

5 What I tried to do was maybe, one,
6 take the sting out of some of the roundabout
7 routing that had occurred to make sure that all the
8 intersections worked okay during those peak hours;
9 but more importantly during the many other hours of
10 the day from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM on a weekday and a
11 lot of the other hours on Saturday provide that
12 extra flexibility to a system that really has a lot
13 more additional capacity available.

14 If you remember on Route 21 the
15 volumes were much lower on Saturday and certainly
16 on Tri-State Parkway the volumes were that much

17 lower. I apologize if I gave you a long winded
18 answer.

19 MR. WINTER: I'm just thinking Mr.
20 Miller seems to think that -- and you as an
21 independent study -- Mr. Miller thought that with
22 the widening of Hunt Club that there certainly
23 would be enough capacity there. You would agree
24 with that, right?

30

1 MR. GRIEVE: We concurred with the Metro
2 study findings that if you can work the routing
3 package that way and with the road improvement
4 program that they developed that the development
5 traffic can be accommodated.

6 What I tried to do is take it one
7 step further and say you know what, maybe there are
8 other ways that we can focus which would be the
9 vast majority of let's say theme park trips, 65
10 percent of them I believe, up and down the
11 Tri-State. We get them tighter to the site versus
12 traveling much more extensive roadways. And I
13 think that we've been able to come up with a couple
14 of ways that we can get them traveling tighter to
15 the site.

16 MR. WINTER: Well, the reason I'm very
17 curious about 21 is probably in the last six months
18 we have approved various developments along 21, two

19 of which are -- would be north and before you hit
20 Washington Street.

21 And I'm just -- you know, I'm very
22 concerned whether your plan is to have the signage
23 to go to Hunt Club and then figure that a lot of
24 people will see 21 maybe if there's a light there

31

1 as an alternative route just because they'll pass
2 it first and some of those people will catch that.

3 I was just wondering whether we
4 worked this out how this is going to get people to
5 the park.

6 MR. GRIEVE: Well, if I'm on 120, if I'm
7 getting off the 94 interchange at 120 and I start
8 heading west I would think that you could probably
9 put a sign up that says either take 21 or Hunt
10 Club.

11 Hunt Club will bring you out and
12 around back in I guess the back door for lack of a
13 better word, whereas 21 then would bring you in
14 from the east. There's certainly a balancing that
15 has to go on.

16 But the traffic engineers always
17 say that traffic is like water, they kind of find
18 their way around to whatever streets they think are
19 the best to take. That might be a silly analogy,

20 but it actually works.
21 Think of all the problems that the
22 residents have concerning the -- you know, their
23 concerns regarding cut-through traffic. Why are
24 people selecting that quality of routes, to avoid

32

1 Hunt Club and Washington because Hunt Club and
2 Washington is deficient right now.

3 And myself as a driver made it an
4 impetus to get off the major roads and look for
5 those alternate routes through neighborhoods.

6 MR. WINTER: I have one more question.
7 This relates to the Tri-State Parkway.

8 In your report on Page 4 of the
9 newest report dated September 30th, you have
10 specific -- you have at least three specific
11 recommendations in terms of the right-of-way.

12 It should be dedicated. In terms
13 of for uninterrupted stacking, you have certain
14 calculations for that.

15 Just so that I'm clear, those are
16 things that is it your view that they would be
17 helpful from the start to have these things
18 installed?

19 MR. GRIEVE: Absolutely. The 80 foot
20 right-of-way for Tri-State Parkway through the bulk
21 of the development site matches that 80 foot

22 right-of-way from my understanding in the existing
23 piece of Tri-State Parkway.
24 No different than when you get up

33

1 to 132 where you've got a lot of additional turn
2 lanes and a landscaping median or what have you.
3 When you get down to Washington
4 Street by their own studies there are additional
5 turn lanes needed anyway. Extra left turn lanes,
6 extra right turn lanes, traffic signals. And in
7 that area you're going to want to have a wider
8 right-of-way to be able to accommodate all those
9 extra lanes and medians and things such as that.

10 MR. WINTER: But it would be your
11 testimony that that's something that would be
12 certainly beneficial right now or at the start of
13 this development, correct?

14 MR. GRIEVE: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thanks. Anyone
16 else have some questions?

17 (No response.)

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I had a couple of
19 questions for the Petitioner. We had some
20 recommendations here from Bud Reed our Village
21 engineer and a couple of them I thought seemed that
22 we should take a look at. Kind of actually

23 surprised me.

24 He talked about the employee

34

1 entrance on Milwaukee Avenue. He says it's been a
2 long time in need of a left turn lane and then with
3 the additional employees using this entrance he
4 thinks that a traffic signal should be investigated
5 along with the left turn lanes.

6 Have you given some thought to
7 that?

8 MR. FRANCKE: I would just say that we
9 understand that issue and I believe that Great
10 America addressed that at one of your prior
11 meetings in which the proposed carwash was the
12 subject matter of the public hearing.

13 We understand that's an issue and
14 we are happy to sit down with Bud and the Village
15 to try and figure something out. I don't think
16 that's an appropriate subject matter for this
17 hearing.

18 That's for Great America. That
19 really has nothing to do with the entertainment
20 village.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think what he's
22 saying is that if you have additional employees I
23 guess you don't see them using this entrance. If
24 they're water park employees there's no need for

1 them to use this entrance?

2 MR. FRANCKE: No. And again, I think
3 this is something that we want to look at with the
4 Village but I'm just not sure that it's part of
5 this concept.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. The other thing
7 was this concern about traffic backups due to
8 collecting the entrance parking fees. And, you
9 know, I know I heard stories about this. I never
10 saw this for myself but he's saying that apparently
11 there's problems right now.

12 Is this something that you guys are
13 addressing not only for existing but also for the
14 entertainment village?

15 MR. FRANCKE: Well, again, I think that
16 part of the response to that, Mr. Chairman, is that
17 we obviously have to look at this issue when we get
18 into the details of the internal design which we
19 haven't begun to do with the Village engineer and
20 the Village traffic consultant.

21 We understand that we have to
22 address that issue. The reality is that we are
23 going to have a greater opportunity to do that on
24 this site with lesser projected traffic volumes

1 than currently are being experienced at Great
2 America because we're talking substantially less.

3 Everybody in the beginning I think
4 was the belief that we were mirroring, you know,
5 the traffic for the water park that's now being
6 generated by Great America. And I think hopefully
7 we helped people understand that that's not the
8 case, that the volumes, the size of the facility
9 and the volumes are going to be substantially less.

10 So in the first place your volumes
11 are going to be less. In the second place, the
12 opportunity to address that issue is going to be
13 much greater here than there has been in Great
14 America. And a lot of that I think will come with
15 later design and discussions between the engineer,
16 the Village traffic consultant.

17 And also I understand what Mr. Reed
18 is saying where he says it's been known to back up.
19 I think it's important to understand that those
20 situations have not been a regular occurrence.
21 They have occurred. We understand they've
22 occurred, but it's not like this occurs throughout
23 the summer. It's not as though this occurs every
24 summer and it's not as though it's only because of

1 Great America.

2 A lot of times what Mr. Reed is
3 referring to involves weekends where there are a
4 lot of other reasons why people are on 94 heading
5 north into the area.

6 So we understand the issue. We
7 understand that we should address it with respect
8 to the entertainment village. But we believe
9 that's an issue that needs to be given greater
10 detail at a later date.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I guess, you know, I
12 got the impression that they identified
13 specifically that these parking fees tends to back
14 the traffic up onto the public road system. And I
15 would agree with Mr. Reed. I just think that's
16 unacceptable.

17 I think you guys have to figure a
18 way of getting these people -- once they're on the
19 premises get them parked somehow. I don't know
20 what the solution is there, but to have it back up
21 on the public road system and continue to back up
22 actually onto the Tollway is, you know, just not
23 acceptable.

24 And I hope we're not going to see

38

1 the same thing at the water park. And I guess he's
2 kind of saying that he ties it in some part to the
3 collection of the parking fees. So just a point I

4 think that should be something that would need to
5 be addressed before this gets built so that we're
6 sure that we're not going to further add to this
7 problem or create a whole new one.

8 Are there any other questions from
9 the Commissioners on parking -- excuse me, not
10 parking -- on traffic? I've got parking on my
11 mind.

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'll leave it up to
14 you, Mr. Francke. Do you want to --

15 MR. FRANCKE: I was just going to ask
16 our consultant Mr. Miller if he had anything to add
17 on traffic before we leave the subject.

18 One of the things I did want to
19 identify that we were going to talk about a little
20 bit later but since it does relate to traffic I
21 just want to indicate that we do anticipate and I
22 believe in the materials that we've submitted to
23 you that we anticipate that there will be a
24 complete shuttle system, bus shuttle system that

39

1 will also directly affect traffic and trips between
2 uses on the site.

3 And that was a concern expressed by
4 other Commissioners at prior meetings -- by certain

5 Commissioners at prior meetings. And, you know, we
6 don't have any problem having an understanding that
7 when final plans come forward for the regional
8 hotel and conference center that great detail be
9 presented about what type of system will be
10 presented.

11 This is something that is already
12 in place for certain uses in the Village and in
13 other similar types of venues in other parts of the
14 country. Again, we're looking only for a
15 preliminary approval at this point so I think it's
16 premature to give specific detail about what would
17 be involved.

18 But that is part of our program and
19 we want to make it clear so that the public and all
20 Members of the Commission understand that.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay.

22 MR. MILLER: For the record, my name is
23 Dave Miller, Metro Transportation.

24 I just wanted to make a few brief

40

1 comments. Hal addressed the issue that we felt
2 regarding the weave at Grand Avenue so I'm not
3 going to go into that.

4 Regarding the temporary signals on
5 21 at 120. If you remember, as part of my original
6 presentation we had indicated that as a possible

7 alternative to the 120 to Hunt Club to Washington

8 and back.

9 I guess my initial concern with

10 that is a couple things. One is until 21 is

11 widened, as Bill mentioned, it is carrying a

12 substantial amount of traffic. In fact, it's

13 nearly at capacity right now.

14 And so how you would be able to

15 differentiate those people who would be able to use

16 it during the middle of the day versus the peak

17 hours I think would have to be part of some kind of

18 a traffic management plan that would be as part of

19 this overall thing in terms of the signing.

20 If in fact during certain hours you

21 would have to take people to Hunt Club versus 21,

22 that would all have to be worked out. But the

23 concern would be a couple of things.

24 One is adding more traffic to 21,

41

1 especially in the section south by 120 where it's

2 only two lanes and potentially further compounding

3 some of the problems with that.

4 The second is at the intersection

5 of 21 and Washington when we did our analysis at

6 that intersection we were starting to push the

7 limits of that with a single left turn lane. We

8 had talked about extending that left turn lane.

9 If we add substantially more
10 traffic to that intersection, especially during the
11 peak hours you could be looking at a major
12 renovation of that intersection including
13 northbound dual left turn lanes and some very, very
14 costly improvements that may only be short term
15 that once an interchange goes in at Washington may
16 not be necessary in the future. So I think you
17 have to look at all these things and balance those.

18 In concept, having an alternative
19 way of having traffic be able to use 120 to 21 I
20 think makes some sense. But you have to be looking
21 at it in the context of the overall picture.

22 As I mentioned, as we get into the
23 details there will be another level of analysis
24 that is what we would call the traffic management

42

1 plan. That's where you get into these issues such
2 as signing and really trying to look at it in a
3 much more detailed way.

4 That would also involve the
5 internal, the issue of the stacking issue. That's
6 a very important point and you don't want to have
7 traffic backing out onto the public roads.

8 Really the whole internal layout of
9 the park in terms of access and traffic and as it

10 relates to where the parking is going to be is
11 something that's going to need to be looked at in
12 much more detail.

13 Our initial focus has been more on
14 the regional and being able to make sure that
15 traffic could get to the site adequately and be
16 accommodated.

17 Internally how you handle that with
18 the stacking, where that's located, making sure
19 that you've got adequate number of lanes in order
20 to accommodate that peak hour traffic will
21 definitely be accommodated.

22 So I just wanted to address those
23 specific issues. If anybody has any questions I
24 would be happy to answer them. Yes, sir.

43

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Winter.

2 MR. WINTER: With regards to the 21 and
3 120, if temporary lights were to be placed at that
4 intersection, you know, I can envision the traffic
5 could back up almost onto 120.

6 Even though there's a long curve
7 there, you know, just the timing of those lights.
8 You know, that's why I'm very concerned about
9 diverting very much traffic on 21. I'm surprised
10 that, you know, that came up in this other study.

11 MR. MILLER: Well, I think that's a
12 legitimate point.

13 Those ramps are the old type
14 design. They're not the typical design that you
15 would have for a loop ramp right now. They're
16 inadequate from that standpoint and substandard in
17 terms of the geometrics.

18 Also, it's a one-lane approach
19 similar to what you have on the ramps coming off
20 the Tri-State at Milwaukee. And so that would be
21 another issue, would that ramp have to be widened
22 at those intersections to accommodate both left
23 turns and right turns.

24 That level of detail would need to

44

1 be looked at. But clearly your concern about how
2 much of that might back up, I think those are
3 things that need to be looked at in more detail and
4 that's why I guess my initial reservations about
5 putting those signals at those ramps, it isn't just
6 putting the signals there. You have to look at the
7 bigger picture and what other ramifications might
8 that have upstream at the various intersections and
9 specifically the Washington intersection.

10 So I think in theory in concept
11 especially with IDOT in a reasonable time period
12 can widen the road. And while they have programmed

13 moneys for the next five years to do a lot of the
14 detailed engineering I don't believe it was
15 actually to do the construction. So I think that
16 needs to be looked at in more detail.

17 So I think the concern about
18 putting those temporary signals on 21 is
19 legitimate. It's not to say that it can't work,
20 but I think it needs to be looked at in a little
21 bit more detail to see if there is a feasible
22 alternative.

23 How do you differentiate people,
24 some using that route, some using Hunt Club, how do

45

1 you determine during certain times of the day that
2 some people can use that ramp and others can't?

3 So I think if in fact that is to
4 become a recommendation it needs to be looked at in
5 more detail to see if it really is feasible.

6 MR. WINTER: As far as I know that the
7 presentation has been generally that separate trips
8 to the parks.

9 I haven't seen it in any of your
10 studies but if somebody went to say for instance
11 the theme park, did you look into how they could
12 maybe stay on the theme park property on the east
13 side and come out on Washington to get to the water

14 park?

15 MR. MILLER: You're talking about going
16 from existing Great America over there?

17 MR. WINTER: Right.

18 MR. MILLER: I believe that there is
19 some kind of a shuttle that's being considered.

20 Whether that would be through buses
21 or whatever, it is hoped and intended that if
22 somebody comes to either park, whether it's on the
23 east side or the west side, that you park once.

24 I don't think anybody really wants

46

1 people to go to one park and then get back in their
2 car and have to drive to the other.

3 So while the details of that
4 shuttle system I don't believe have been formally
5 worked out it's always been the intent as I
6 understand that to have that way. So if you've got
7 one bus that can accommodate 30 to 40 people you're
8 reducing that proportional amount of traffic.

9 So I believe ever since the very
10 beginning that's always been the intent is to have
11 that linkage both ways between the two parts.

12 MR. WINTER: A final question on the
13 Tri-State Parkway.

14 Could you repeat your comments from
15 a previous meeting as far as the weave factor.

16 MR. MILLER: Yes. Maybe if I could use
17 the aerial.

18 The issue is not so much the volume
19 of traffic on Tri-State Parkway because it is true
20 in the morning because of the business nature most
21 of that traffic is in by 8:30, 9:00 which is
22 typically before when you're going to have the
23 peaks to the site.

24 It isn't that volume on Tri-State.

47

1 The real issue, and Hal Francke addressed that, is
2 primarily the vehicles coming from the north on
3 Tri-State, getting off on this ramp heading west
4 and then crossing these three lanes of Grand Avenue
5 to get over into the left turn lane.

6 And on the middle of Saturday while
7 the traffic that would be on Tri-State Parkway
8 businesses would be relatively light because most
9 of those wouldn't be open that's not really the
10 issue. It's really this traffic coming off that
11 ramp having to cross three lanes to get over into
12 that left turn.

13 And I can't recall, I believe from
14 the end of this ramp to that left turn lane is 600
15 feet. It's a relatively short distance in order to
16 get across. So the real issue is not the volume on

17 Tri-State Parkway but this volume exiting that ramp
18 having to cross over those three lanes.

19 So whether that's in the morning
20 peak hour or on Saturday or in the evening peak
21 hour it's an issue. And so, as Hal mentioned, this
22 was a subject that came up at a previous meeting
23 very early in the process when we were working on
24 this project that staff had raised that concern.

48

1 And I think it's a legitimate concern.

2 Can it be solved? One suggestion
3 was a traffic signal at that ramp. The realities
4 of that are probably pretty slim. But it is
5 something that we took into account when we did
6 this revised traffic report to try and eliminate
7 that problem.

8 So that's -- that's still an issue
9 that I think everybody needs to be aware of. It
10 isn't just opening Tri-State Parkway to accommodate
11 north/south traffic. Again, if it's south that
12 makes some sense. But again, it's like the
13 Illinois 21 issue, you have to look at that in the
14 context of other issues.

15 MR. WINTER: You do see that, the
16 Tri-State Parkway accommodating northbound traffic
17 off of I-94?

18 MR. MILLER: Well, again, that's --

19 that compounds the problem.

20 Of all the movements at this
21 interchange the one that is the heaviest and is at
22 capacity is this northbound loop ramp to go west.
23 A typical practical capacity of a loop ramp like
24 that is about 1,500 to 1,700 cars in an hour. And

49

1 the counts that we got from the Tollway, and this
2 is a year old now, that ramp was carrying about
3 2,000 vehicles during I believe it was the evening
4 peak hour.

5 So obviously it's pushing its
6 capacity. So that was another reason we did not
7 want to be drawing any more of our traffic from the
8 south and add to that ramp. So that was part of
9 what drove us to be looking at the getting off at
10 120 and working the traffic up from that way.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I just have a follow-up
12 question. Let's say I'm living in Kenosha and I
13 want to come to the water park, how am I going to
14 get there? What route am I going to take?

15 MR. MILLER: Well, I'll go over some old
16 ground again.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: No, I just want to --

18 MR. MILLER: What we had recommended for
19 the traffic from the north was to bypass Grand

20 Avenue.

21 And again, we have talked with the
22 Tollway, we feel confident that we can get some
23 signing on the Tollway that would differentiate
24 this park from Gurnee Mills and Great America.

50

1 And we would recommend and have
2 recommended that that traffic be routed south and
3 then would exit at Milwaukee here. And if you
4 recall as part of our plan we had recommended
5 temporary signals at both of these ramps with some
6 additional widening.

7 So we would be able to bring people
8 from the north, exit at Milwaukee, head north to
9 Washington and then over to the site.

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But let's say you know
11 where to go. I mean I would get off at Grand
12 Avenue and take Cemetery Road.

13 MR. MILLER: You can't stop people from
14 doing certain maneuvers.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I understand. But I
16 guess I don't understand what the Grand Tri-State
17 Business Parkway going through would have to do
18 with that. You could still recommend that they
19 bypass that interchange.

20 MR. MILLER: Correct. That is --

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I mean you used that as

22 an argument. You said that people are going to get
23 off, you showed somebody coming south getting off
24 on that ramp and then going to the Grand Tri-State

51

1 Business Park.

2 They're still going to do that if
3 they know where they're going, right?

4 MR. MILLER: Obviously if we can get the
5 people from the north to exit at Milwaukee, which
6 we're recommending, that issue of that weave is
7 reduced, yes.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I guess I'm just saying
9 that that's not an argument for not putting through
10 the Grand Tri-State Business Parkway because you
11 can still recommend that they bypass.

12 See, we have Cemetery Road so I
13 think the recommendation to put the Parkway through
14 is more to really relieve that Cemetery Road than
15 it is, you know, to eliminate the weaving. Because
16 you're going to have that anyway.

17 MR. MILLER: I believe, and Bud Reed had
18 brought it up in his points about the potential for
19 cul-de-sacing Cemetery Road.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Correct.

21 MR. MILLER: And I would concur with
22 that because I think there is a legitimate concern

23 that some people could bypass -- whether Tri-State
24 Parkway is extended or not people could bypass and

52

1 use Cemetery Road to get to Washington and over to
2 the site whether they're coming from I-94 or coming
3 from the west on Grand Avenue or from the north on
4 Hunt Club.

5 So that issue I think is kind of
6 independent and that is really a Village issue.
7 But I think the consideration of cul-de-sacing
8 Cemetery Road, exactly where you do that and how
9 you do that because our counts alone have indicated
10 that even without the site there is cut-through
11 traffic using Cemetery Road right now.

12 And so that issue of Cemetery Road,
13 somehow limiting cut-through traffic on that I
14 think is a very legitimate point.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But isn't he saying do
16 that in conjunction with the extension of the
17 Parkway? Bud is not here, is he?

18 MR. MILLER: I don't know if you need --

19 MR. WILDENBERG: Let me see if he's
20 here.

21 MR. MILLER: I don't know if you need to
22 do both of those at the same time.

23 But another issue with the
24 Tri-State Parkway -- and again, just -- I think

1 it's important when you're exploring these other
2 alternatives that you've got to look at all of the
3 issues.

4 Something that hasn't been looked
5 at in a lot of detail is that if you did extend
6 Tri-State Parkway to Washington what now happens to
7 that intersection at Washington. Is there going to
8 be enough capacity now to handle not only the site
9 traffic but additional traffic that's going to say
10 the businesses on Tri-State Parkway or people who
11 are using Tri-State Parkway as a cut-through to go
12 to Gurnee Mills or others.

13 Now have you created potentially
14 some additional congestion that could occur at
15 Washington. I don't believe either of us have
16 looked at that because we didn't look at Tri-State
17 Parkway as an extension. But again, that's --
18 whenever you're talking about any of these kinds of
19 improvements you've got to be able to make sure
20 that you're looking at all of the issues so that
21 you're not potentially solving one problem and
22 creating another problem at another location.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think that's what
24 we're trying to do here in all of these things.

1 Any other questions? Mr. Winter.

2 MR. WINTER: If you could keep that up.

3 With regards to your projections,

4 and I just don't recall if this was set forth or

5 not, what projections do you have of where this

6 traffic is going to come from to the site?

7 For instance, what percentage do

8 you anticipate would come off of the Tri-State at

9 the Belvidere or 120 interchange?

10 MR. MILLER: It depends on the type of

11 use for the regional uses such as the water park

12 and the hotels and I -- well, we don't have the

13 entertainment center.

14 Those two specifically we were

15 assigning more traffic to I-94. I believe the

16 percentage from the south that we were assuming for

17 those uses was 45 percent. So it's -- it is

18 higher and I think it was 30 percent for the north

19 so we were anticipating more traffic from the south

20 that would be going for those uses.

21 Now obviously we'll also have

22 traffic for the other uses such as the

23 entertainment village and those others but -- and

24 the theater. But that's why we felt very strong

1 that we had to intercept that traffic south of the

2 site which we have done at 120 and then work its
3 way up because we could not handle that traffic by
4 bringing it up to Grand Avenue and adding to that
5 loop ramp.

6 MR. WINTER: Then what is the percentage
7 for non Tri-State that will originate places other
8 than the Tri-State.

9 Is it the reverse? I mean is that
10 everything else? You said 45 percent for the south
11 and 25 percent for the north.

12 MR. MILLER: I think it was 20 percent
13 in the north the other 35 percent would be
14 distributed from the north on Hunt Club, west on
15 Grand Avenue, east on Grand Avenue, east on
16 Washington. You are going to have some traffic on
17 Washington that may come up 41 and take Washington
18 across. You'll have traffic from 120 from the
19 east. Traffic from 120 on the west.

20 And so the other approximately
21 third of the traffic will be distributed amongst
22 the other surrounding arterial roads.

23 MR. WINTER: That's why I think the
24 Tri-State Parkway would be very valuable for that

56

1 other 30, 35 percent where we don't have the weave
2 factor or the overloading of the ramp.

3 MR. MILLER: All we're saying is -- I

4 think is you've got to take all these other issues
5 into consideration and so I think we're not
6 necessarily disagreeing with that.

7 We were given some initial
8 direction of a concern of this weave. We were
9 trying to keep our plan to minimize the impact on
10 Grand Avenue between Hunt Club and Milwaukee and we
11 know that we can accommodate it on some of the
12 surrounding arterial roads that are widened and
13 have the capacity.

14 So I think it was in that context
15 that we originally did with the Tri-State Parkway.
16 I believe at the last meeting we did indicate that
17 we would reserve the right-of-way for that. And
18 then knew that if that load does anything how that
19 interplays with the site and feeding off of that
20 road again would be something that would need to be
21 looked at in more detail.

22 MR. WINTER: Again, just a comment. I
23 find it very strange that you wouldn't agree with
24 Mr. Grieve that that would instantaneously make it

57

1 a better situation to have that Tri-State Parkway
2 go through.

3 MR. MILLER: Well, as I said, what
4 impact is it going to have at Washington or Grand

5 Avenue.

6 I'm not sure that that has been
7 looked at in enough detail to see what if any
8 potential negatives that that would create.

9 There's no doubt that the road itself you could
10 design it such that it would have adequate capacity
11 to handle the traffic.

12 But are we creating additional
13 problems at either Grand Avenue or Washington and
14 then in terms of the mixing of much heavier traffic
15 on that road going through the industrial park
16 which I don't believe was designed to originally
17 accommodate a substantial increase in traffic.

18 It was going to include a buildout
19 of the property to the south but now you might be
20 drawing traffic from developments south of
21 Washington, you may be getting a substantial amount
22 of cut-through traffic on that roadway.

23 So I think it's really -- I'm not
24 necessarily disagreeing. I'm just saying that

58

1 there may be other issues that need to be looked
2 at.

3 MR. WINTER: But you don't have any -- I
4 mean you've already said you didn't look into that,
5 right?

6 MR. MILLER: That's correct.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Bud, since you
8 were nice enough to come out and face us, we're
9 talking about this extension of the Business
10 Parkway.

11 And you had brought up the issue of
12 at one time we previously discussed early on in the
13 Grand Tri-State Business Park development the
14 cul-de-sacing of Cemetery Road.

15 Were you thinking that that would
16 be done in conjunction with the extension of Grand
17 Tri-State Business Park to Washington?

18 MR. REED: It definitely needs to be
19 looked at. I don't know that it's been thoroughly
20 evaluated at this point in time. Depending on how
21 the park continues to develop on the west side
22 there certainly the Tri-State Parkway should
23 continue through. I think that's been the
24 Village's position for some time.

59

1 Along with that there have been
2 discussions with residents of Orchard Valley when
3 the industrial park went through that we look at
4 that. However, there has also been the purchase of
5 a school site or a school property at the location
6 right there at the north end of Cemetery Road.
7 That will also be -- have to play a factor in this.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think he answered my
9 question, though, is that you would never
10 cul-de-sac off Cemetery without the Tri-State
11 Business Parkway going through, though? That would
12 be --

13 MR. REED: I wouldn't anticipate that.
14 There would have to be a major outcry from the
15 residents to do that.

16 There's a lot of traffic that uses
17 that road now. I think a lot of it's industrial
18 park traffic and also traffic leaving Gurnee Mills
19 going south to Washington.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I think you
21 answered my question. Thank you.

22 Any other questions for Bud since
23 he's here? Mr. Foster.

24 MR. FOSTER: Hi, Bud. Concern has been

60

1 expressed about the weave coming from the Tri-State
2 south and getting off at Grand and going west and
3 having to make that turn at the Tri-State going
4 south.

5 And I think the traffic consultant
6 says about a 600 foot distance from the exit ramp
7 on Grand from the Tri-State over to the entrance to
8 the Tri-State Parkway. I just want to compare what
9 is the difference in terms of number of feet on the

10 other side of Grand, Grand going east to Dilley's

11 Road, that exit.

12 MR. REED: I don't know what the
13 distance is exactly, but it's a shorter distance.

14 MR. FOSTER: It's a shorter distance?
15 That's what I was trying to get a sense of.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Anything else?
17 Okay. Anything else on traffic in general?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Mr. Francke, do
20 you want to continue? I think fiscal impact next.

21 MR. FRANCKE: Yes. I wanted to respond
22 to one other -- I want to make one other point in
23 response to the second question that Commissioner
24 Winter raised about the dual use or dual

61

1 visitations to the two parks.

2 I just want to refer back to some
3 of the earlier testimony and I think this relates
4 to the comments earlier about the shuttle.
5 Remember that our testimony was that our whole goal
6 here is to create multi-day visits for people that
7 may now only be coming to the area for the one day
8 visit.

9 And again, the testimony was that
10 these will be independently ticketed theme parks.

11 So we fully believe, and Great America Six Flags
12 fully believes that people will buy a ticket and
13 spend the entire day at one park and then spend the
14 second day at the other park.

15 And I think the question was,
16 Commissioner Winter, whether or not there would be
17 visitors, a family that would come in the morning
18 and park their car and go to the water park and
19 then go to Great America in the afternoon and how
20 could we keep their car from going back onto the
21 system.

22 And I think we firmly believe that
23 that's not likely to occur very often and that with
24 the dual day dual theme back visitor that they

62

1 would be using that shuttle service. And I know
2 that came up in prior discussions and I just
3 wanted to clarify and refer everybody back to some
4 of that earlier testimony.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Foster.

6 MR. FOSTER: Mr. Francke, do you have
7 any data on what percent of Six Flags guests now
8 come from out of the area and stay in local hotel
9 properties so that they might be on the local
10 streets perhaps if they were doing kind of
11 multi-use or multi-site visits as opposed to people
12 who would be coming along the Tollways?

13 MR. FRANCKE: I have to direct that

14 question to someone else.

15 MR. FOERSTER: My lawyer says I have to

16 tell you who I am. Mike Foerster, Six Flags Great

17 America.

18 Mr. Foster, we don't honestly know

19 what percentage of people stay in the hotels.

20 Obviously the hotel occupancies during the summer

21 are virtually a hundred percent which would imply

22 that, you know, you have 5,000 rooms as I recall

23 from the study the Village did in the area that

24 that would equate to a lot of people that are

63

1 visiting us.

2 We certainly know that, you know,

3 65 or 60 percent of our visitation comes from south

4 of the Chicago area and the other percentage comes

5 from north of Wisconsin and out of state. We have

6 maybe 10 percent that come from other states and

7 other areas besides the Wisconsin and Illinois,

8 Chicago, Milwaukee.

9 So we have no way to get that

10 information. We could survey people, but that -- I

11 guess there's no good way to really answer how many

12 actually spend the night here. It's what we call

13 mother-in-law research. You kind of look at it and

14 think of it and say a lot of those people are
15 staying for the park. Some are staying for Gurnee
16 Mills. Many are staying for both. So I don't have
17 a real good response to that other than what I've
18 given.

19 MR. FRANCKE: Mr. Chairman, if we could,
20 subject to your, you know, the Commission's
21 discretion we would like to very briefly touch on
22 the civil engineering issues that we've submitted
23 material before we get into the fiscal impact.

24 We have submitted engineering which

64

1 we think that portion of the testimony is very
2 brief and probably will be less time consuming than
3 the fiscal impact. So if it would be possible
4 could we handle that first?

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Sure.

6 MR. FRANCKE: I would like to introduce
7 then Peter Manhard from Manhard Consulting who will
8 briefly discuss the issues of stormwater management
9 and the provision of sanitary sewer and potable
10 water service to the development.

11 MR. MANHARD: As Hal stated, I'm Pete
12 Manhard, vice-president of Manhard Consulting and
13 we've been hired to review the sanitary water and
14 storm drainage portions of this project.

15 And basically the sanitary sewer is

16 already in place. It was constructed with the
17 Grand Tri-State Business Park. There's an 18-inch
18 diameter sanitary sewer running along the westerly
19 portion of the property. That goes into a 21-inch
20 sewer along Washington Street that eventually goes
21 to the North Shore Sanitary District.

22 This sewer has more than adequate
23 capacity to handle the existing developments as
24 well as the proposed project.

65

1 Moving quickly to water, there is
2 an existing 24-inch main and 18-inch water mains
3 along Washington Street with the 16-inch stub
4 already at the proposed entrance to the
5 development. And there's also an existing 16-inch
6 water main along the existing Tri-State Parkway on
7 the north.

8 We will be looping this water main
9 as well as providing water main loops within the
10 development. And again, the Village's water system
11 has more than adequate capacity to service the
12 project as well as maintain the water necessary to
13 fill the theme park.

14 On drainage, the drainage goes
15 generally from north to south. There's slightly
16 less than a square mile of area that drains through

17 the existing wetlands and flood plain along the
18 westerly portion of the property.
19 That then drains under a 6 foot by
20 8 foot culvert underneath Washington Street and
21 then ultimately into the Des Plaines River. As
22 part of the original Grand Tri-State Business
23 Center the conservancy area or wetlands mitigation
24 area there was about the 20 some acre feet of

66

1 detention that was constructed within that area for
2 this property.

3 And in addition to that we will be
4 constructing more detention to meet the current
5 Stormwater Management Ordinance as opposed to
6 applying for a grandfathering.

7 So therefore we're going to meet
8 the Village's and the County's current Stormwater
9 Management Ordinances. And I'll leave it if
10 there's any questions. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any questions? Ms.
12 Kovarik.

13 MS. KOVARIK: You talk about the water
14 system being adequate. And I guess this is a
15 question for staff.

16 It's going to take 25,000 gallons
17 per day just to replace the water runoff and then
18 plus all this other stuff. Do we have a -- I was

19 under the perception that we had a watering
20 shortage because of the ban in the summer.
21 MR. WILDENBERG: The sprinkling
22 restrictions in the summer are required by the
23 State of Illinois for anybody drawing surface water
24 out of Lake Michigan. You have to control your

67

1 sprinkling in the summer.

2 MS. KOVARIK: So would the water park
3 have to control their water? I mean doesn't it
4 come from Lake Michigan, too?

5 MR. WILDENBERG: Yes.

6 MS. KOVARIK: So wouldn't the 25,000
7 gallons a day, wouldn't they have to have other --

8 MR. WILDENBERG: It's a different
9 application than residential sprinkling.

10 MR. MANHARD: As far as we were asked to
11 put what would be the maximum anticipated rate of
12 watering for the entire development.

13 We do not anticipate that we would
14 really be anywhere near that amount of watering
15 within this development. Just as part of our
16 report we were asked to say, you know, what would
17 be the maximum potential.

18 MS. KOVARIK: You actually have
19 1,500,000 gallons here but that included

20 landscaping. You have 25,000 --

21 MR. MANHARD: That's filling the water
22 park itself.

23 MS. KOVARIK: The 25,000 gallons?

24 MR. MANHARD: No, the 1.5 million

68

1 gallons is filling the water park itself. That
2 would be done similar to Great America. The water
3 rides in Great America are significantly larger,
4 probably three times the size of the water
5 necessary for the water park.

6 MS. KOVARIK: Is there a way that
7 there's access to wells or I mean you talk about
8 streams on the site and so that couldn't come off
9 the regular water system?

10 MR. MANHARD: No, it would be filled
11 from the regular water system.

12 MS. KOVARIK: I hate to see your water
13 bill. I don't have any other questions.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other questions?
15 Mr. Sula.

16 MR. SULA: A question for staff.

17 Does staff agree that the
18 capacities outlined here are not taken in isolation
19 just for this project where they might be taken in
20 disproportion and shared for the broader areas
21 around the property?

22 MR. WILDENBERG: I'm not sure I -- are
23 you talking about water?

24 MR. SULA: Well, the water and the sewer

69

1 I guess.

2 I mean are they using up the whole
3 capacity for the immediate area in a sense that is
4 disproportionate usage for their property as
5 opposed to the property south of Washington?

6 MR. MANHARD: We had projected about a
7 20 percent excess capacity in the sanitary sewer.

8 MR. REED: When the original system was
9 designed with the industrial park the sanitary
10 system had sufficient capacity to handle not only
11 improvements or development within this particular
12 area but also completion of the remainder of the
13 industrial park north of there as well as capacity
14 for Gurnee Mills which was just anticipated at that
15 time when the park went in.

16 There's also capacity remaining for
17 open downstream areas, one of the areas I believe
18 is the Woodlake Apartments which is presently under
19 consideration for the Village. A little bit
20 farther downstream along the Tollway and 21.

21 So as far as sanitary sewer,
22 there's plenty of capacity left in the line of

23 service. All of the undeveloped property, whether
24 they're taking a disproportionate share, it's not

70

1 disproportionate I wouldn't say. It's a large
2 volume, but the uses are quite large. It's not the
3 same as residential uses.

4 I wouldn't say there's a
5 disproportionate share being taken from either
6 water or sanitary, either one. The system is
7 designed to handle this area.

8 MR. SULA: So if the adjoining areas
9 were developed in compliance with the comprehensive
10 plan there would be adequate capacity to service
11 both needs?

12 MR. REED: I would expect there would be
13 adequate capacity to service all the needs of the
14 undeveloped property as well as maintaining the
15 existing needs of the residential properties around
16 it.

17 There's a lot of area that's
18 potentially residential just south of Washington
19 street there that could potentially develop and
20 utilize the system also. Just a system of
21 intermediate mains would have to be extended
22 through the area in order to service them. The
23 mainline system has plenty of capacity.

24 MR. SULA: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other questions?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I guess that's
4 it for right now. Mr. Francke, if you want to
5 proceed.

6 MR. FRANCKE: Yes. At this time I would
7 like to introduce Alan Krackauer who will present
8 to you his fiscal impact analysis. And with that
9 I'll turn the floor over to him.

10 MR. KRACKAUER: For the record, my name
11 is Alan Krackauer. I was asked by Six Flags to
12 prepare a fiscal impact analysis and we have done
13 so.

14 I think I presented this same study
15 in a similar format to a blue ribbon committee.
16 There have been some changes since that time that I
17 guess resulted from the actual change in the land
18 plan.

19 May I assume, Mr. Chairman, you
20 have copies of this?

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I have a copy.
22 Unfortunately, I think there's a couple
23 Commissioners who -- Mr. Foster, did you get a copy
24 of the fiscal impact?

1 MR. FOSTER: If that was in the packet,

2 no.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Jim, do you have it?

4 MR. SULA: I borrowed a copy.

5 MR. KRACKAUER: May I also assume you've

6 read it thoroughly page by page?

7 MR. SULA: I would not make that

8 assumption.

9 MR. KRACKAUER: Then I'll take a little

10 more time and go over what it is.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yes. You don't have to

12 go through every detail, but I would like a little

13 more thorough overview than just the executive

14 summary.

15 MR. KRACKAUER: Initially I think it's

16 important to understand what these fiscal impact

17 analyses are and what they are not and how they

18 should be used and how they should not be used.

19 Generally what they're intended to

20 do is to provide a general estimate of the revenue

21 that may be generated from a particular type of

22 lands use or the lack of revenue that may be

23 generated from a particular type of land use and

24 then to look at the costs the government would find

1 in supporting a particular type of land use.

2 And we know before we start these
3 studies that they're basically a broad based guide.
4 And if you look at this study or any other one
5 that's ever been submitted to you you'll find there
6 may be numbers such as \$2,464.13. But those
7 details are really not significant, probably not
8 even accurate because we're dealing more in a range
9 of what the overall surplus or deficit of revenues
10 and costs to government may be.

11 So it's a broad based planning tool
12 that assists in implementing your comprehensive
13 plan that you have and your zoning ordinance.

14 We know before we start doing these
15 studies there's a certain hierarchy of land uses.
16 For example, the land uses that produce the highest
17 level of revenue to the Village are commercial or
18 retail land uses because they have both real estate
19 tax and sales tax.

20 So undoubtedly those are the most
21 desirable form of development from a financial
22 point of view because in addition to the higher
23 level of revenue they generate no children into any
24 of the school districts.

74

1 The next tier down is offices. But
2 in offices we lose the sales tax and only have real
3 estate tax. And the next tier down would be

4 industrial. And then probably for I would say a
5 more moderate priced housing. Housing is the most
6 expensive form of land use to government.

7 And although we all have to have a
8 place to live housing is expensive because it has
9 greater demand on public services and a very
10 significant demand obviously on our school system
11 which is a major component of your tax bill.

12 If you take look at your tax bill
13 when you get home tonight or at some time when you
14 evaluate it, you'll find that the average resident
15 in -- I was going to say Vernon Hills -- in Gurnee
16 pays somewhere between 65 to 70 percent of their
17 dollars to your school district. That would be the
18 local district, that would be 50 or 56 and to your
19 high school district which would be High School
20 District 121.

21 So almost three-quarters, not quite
22 three-quarters but a substantial amount of money
23 that we pay in taxes not just in this Village but
24 throughout Lake County and throughout the

75

1 metropolitan Chicagoland area goes to our school
2 districts.

3 And as I go through the fiscal
4 impact analysis of this applicant's development

5 I'll try to emphasize for you what benefits if any
6 would accrue to the school district system.

7 If we start out on Page 1, and I
8 won't go through all the numbers for you, I'll
9 simply tell you what Table 1 is. It is a list of
10 the different types of components of their -- of
11 the developer's land plan.

12 They start out with the land, goes
13 through outlots, different hotel sites, parking
14 structures, the water park itself and different
15 infrastructure. And what we've done is we have
16 estimated the total value of each one of those
17 components.

18 And the object of doing that is to
19 come up with a total valuation of the entire
20 development. And from that total valuation we're
21 able to derive a general estimate of the real
22 estate taxes that would be presented.

23 Now before I came here this night,
24 tonight just about two hours ago I had a brief

76

1 conversation with your planning consultant, Mr.
2 Maiden over there. And he had questions as to how
3 we derived these numbers.

4 And perhaps tonight or at a future
5 point if there are any questions we can explain
6 those in greater detail to you. But the real issue

7 is to try to come up with a total valuation.

8 In this case there is approximately
9 377 million dollars. There's a tremendous amount
10 of money for any development. That's a very high
11 valuation for development. But built into these
12 numbers are uses that are very high value uses both
13 in terms of construction, the exterior shells and
14 the interior components.

15 As we go on to Table 2 there are
16 approximately if I count them, I'm going to
17 estimate, 11 or more taxing districts on your tax
18 bill. So that same tax bill that you have in your
19 home has -- let me count them -- 12 taxing
20 districts.

21 Some of you are in School District
22 56, some of you are in School District 50, all of
23 you are in High School District 121 I would
24 believe. And again if you look at those numbers

77

1 and if you look at tax rates that's where you're
2 able to derive the amount of money that you pay to
3 each one of these taxing districts.

4 The districts with the very highest
5 tax levels are District 121 High School District,
6 School District 56 and School District 50. And
7 then there are numerous other districts such as

8 Warren Township, the Forest Preserve, County of
9 Lake. And I will not go all over those.

10 But the reason we call out the
11 districts and show you the tax rates that were in
12 effect in 1997 is because we apply those tax rates
13 to the overall valuation that I just gave you for
14 the entire development.

15 From the total valuation we move
16 into something called the estimated assessed
17 valuation. And if you review this report you'll
18 find the way that it's done in a fiscal impact
19 statement may be different than the way that the
20 Township Assessor will do it.

21 These numbers look at a development
22 that is totally built out, totally occupied. So if
23 in the years ahead there would be one less hotel or
24 one more hotel, if the commercial uses were less in

78

1 size or greater in size then these numbers would
2 also be affected and they would have to be
3 adjusted.

4 So bear in mind when we look at
5 these numbers we're assuming the entire development
6 that's been explained to you I would assume at
7 previous meetings would be developed in the format
8 that is outlined.

9 And from the total assessed value

10 we come up with -- a total market value we come up
11 with an assessed value. And with that assessed
12 value we then apply a tax rate.

13 And if you turn to Table 4, this is
14 a summary of the estimated real estate taxes that
15 would be generated to all of the taxing districts.

16 So this shows the taxes that would
17 go to School District 56, 50, 121, the Village of
18 Gurnee, the County of Lake, the Forest Preserve,
19 Warren Township, there's a gravel fund on all of
20 our bills, the Gurnee Park District, the Warren
21 Newport Library, College of Lake County and the
22 Lake County water -- public water supply system.

23 And when you add all those numbers
24 up we are in excess of about 8 million dollars on

79

1 annual reoccurring revenue.

2 So looking from the actual market
3 value translated into tax rates we estimate at full
4 development and full occupancy approximately 8
5 million dollars of annual reoccurring revenue every
6 year if the development holds stable.

7 The most significant thing of that
8 8 million dollars is to recognize that School
9 District 56, School District 50, School District
10 129 -- 121 will receive about 67 percent of those

11 tax dollars.

12 The other thing that's significant
13 is to recognize that unlike housing developments
14 this development generates no students into the
15 school system. So any dollars that the school
16 district gets, whatever they may be, are pure
17 surplus tax dollars.

18 In a housing development we'd have
19 to take the cost of education and hard core costs
20 off this list in order to arrive at a net value.
21 But in a non-residential development of this nature
22 there are no costs to that district.

23 As well as I might add there are no
24 costs to other taxing districts such as the County

80

1 of Lake, the College of Lake County, the library,
2 the park district, Warren Township, the Forest
3 Preserve.

4 The Village of Gurnee does incur
5 costs and we'll go over those later. But the main
6 point is the school districts are the primary
7 beneficiary of these types of non-residential
8 developments.

9 After looking at the real estate
10 taxes which we did that are in the range of about 8
11 million dollars we then have to take a look at
12 other types of taxes that would accrue in this case

13 particularly to the Village of Gurnee.

14 And I'm going to add up later for
15 you the numbers, the dollars, I'll take the real
16 estate tax, the sales tax and other taxes that are
17 estimated to come from this development and
18 illustrate to you how those relate only to the
19 Village and sort out the rest of the taxing
20 districts.

21 The retailers occupation tax which
22 is what we call the sales tax in Lake County. And
23 where we are today is about 6 and a half percent.
24 And of that the State of Illinois gets the most

81

1 money, they get 5 percent. The Village gets a 1
2 percent rebate so you really get very little of the
3 sales tax that the State collects. And I don't
4 know why.

5 Lake County gets point 25 percent,
6 about a quarter of a percent. The RTA, the
7 Regional Transportation Agency gets a quarter
8 percent. And all of that as I said adds up to
9 about 6 and a half percent.

10 So what we tried to do is take a
11 look and determine based on this development
12 program how many sales tax dollars could be
13 generated to the Village when this development is

14 fully occupied.
15 And if you look very briefly move
16 ahead to Table 7. We've taken the actual uses,
17 we've taken the square footage of each development,
18 the type of sales that they will have, the
19 estimated rate of sales and then we've come up with
20 a total number of total annual sales projections.
21 And that total number is in excess of 121 million
22 dollars.

23 And then if you take 1 percent of
24 that which is what the Village rebate is generally

82

1 from the State of Illinois, we end up with in
2 excess of about one million dollars that goes
3 directly to this -- to the Village of Gurnee.

4 It's further necessary to have a
5 footnote here to recognize that school districts do
6 not get sales tax. Sales taxes come directly to
7 this local level of government. The school
8 district only is receiving real estate tax.

9 Currently, at least as of about
10 1997, the Village of Gurnee's real estate -- sales
11 tax revenues were in excess of 7 million dollars.
12 So that will give you an idea of how one million
13 relates to your total take of approximately 7
14 million dollars. And that was based on their
15 annual financial audit.

16 Then there are miscellaneous taxes,
17 and I won't spend a lot of time going into these.
18 One of the miscellaneous taxes is your Gurnee
19 amusement tax. You have a tax that you assess
20 based on the price of a ticket.

21 So if the ticket is five dollars or
22 less the tax is 15 cents. If the tax is five to
23 ten dollars -- if the ticket is five to ten dollars
24 the tax is 30 cents. And if it's over ten dollars

83

1 for the ticket the tax is 40 percent -- 40 cents.

2 And what we have done is projected
3 the usage of the water park and the performance
4 theater. We have applied the 40 cent tax and we've
5 come up with approximately in excess of \$240,000 on
6 an annual reoccurring basis. And once again, those
7 numbers only come into play if and when the water
8 park is built and if we reach a capacity of 500,000
9 people over a period of one year and if the
10 performance theater is developed and if we have a
11 capacity there, attendance of over 104,000 people
12 on an annualized basis. That tax again is rebated
13 in total to the Village of Gurnee.

14 You also have another tax called
15 the hotel/motel tax and you receive about 80
16 percent of that tax. The other 20 percent of it

17 goes back to the Lake County Convention and
18 Visitor's Bureau.
19 Currently your Village receives
20 about -- and this is as of 1997 -- approximately
21 \$576,000 a year from your hotel/motel tax. The
22 three hotels that the applicant has projected are
23 expected to generate revenues in the form of a tax
24 of about \$304,000 -- I'm sorry -- \$1,200,000 to the

84

1 Village.
2 So that would exceed, it would be
3 almost twice as much as current tax that's coming
4 from the hotel tax at this time.
5 If we turn ahead, I'm going to have
6 you jump ahead, if you will, and I'm going to give
7 you a page here in a moment. If you turn ahead to
8 Page 28 and then we'll go back to Page 24 but if
9 you just move ahead for a moment to Page 28.
10 There was a summary of the total
11 fiscal impact revenue to the Village. Property
12 taxes are really not significant, they're only
13 about \$277,000. The amusement tax is approximately
14 240,000. The hotel room rental tax is high, it's
15 over a million, a million two in this case. And the
16 sales tax is high, it's about a million two.
17 And when you add all of those up
18 you come up to close to 3 million dollars of total

19 revenue on an annual reoccurring basis. And even
20 if in this instance the market value of the
21 development that we proposed was considered to be
22 high, you could see that our real estate tax
23 perspective that would not be significant.

24 Now if you look down you'll find

85

1 that we've also projected that there are costs to
2 the Village, that along with the revenue government
3 incurs costs. And there's a variety of costing
4 techniques that the practitioner can use.

5 And in this case I used something
6 called the employee anticipation technique. And
7 what that means rather basically is that every
8 person who comes to work in the Village, whether
9 it's the Village hall or in an office building or
10 at Gurnee Mills or at Six Flags or wherever they go
11 or at this development, every employee, every human
12 being that comes to work here during the day on a
13 limited basis has some cost to government.

14 We use the roads, we make use of
15 police, we make use of fire. We all have some
16 burden. Our burden from non-residential uses is
17 nowhere near as great as the cost of government
18 that we impose when we live in a single family home
19 where we have larger families. Those costs are

20 substantially higher.
21 So to determine what the costs are
22 I selected this method. You can select any one you
23 wanted. There's about three others. They're all
24 relatively complex.

86

1 And the way we do this is to start
2 out by determining how many people would be
3 generated from this whole development once it was
4 built. And I have done that on Page 24 with the
5 help of Six Flags and Prism. We've estimated that
6 there will be in excess of a thousand people -- and
7 when I say people, I mean full-time population
8 equivalents. That could be people working only
9 three months a year but we'd have to have at least
10 three or four of those to get to a full-time
11 population equivalent. Some of those people
12 obviously are working full time.

13 Then using a series of ratios we
14 try to take a look at what those people will cost.
15 And we've broken that down into the categories of
16 general government, public safety, highways and
17 streets, debt service and statutory expenses.

18 And from that -- it will take you a
19 while to go through that, but from that we have
20 estimated that there will be in excess of \$300,000
21 in cost to the Village itself in order to support

22 this development when it's fully built.
23 So if we take the \$300,000 away
24 from approximately the 3 million dollars there's a

87

1 general surplus of annual reoccurring revenue in
2 excess of 2.5 million dollars a year.

3 And even if we took half that
4 amount, even if you said I don't believe your
5 numbers, Mr. Krackauer, I think you've been too
6 generous, even if we took half that 2.6 million
7 dollars, that's really dropping it, we still would
8 have a very, very significant surplus of tax
9 dollars to the Village.

10 And even if we raised the \$300,000
11 to \$600,000 and left the revenue component we still
12 would have in excess of two million dollars. So no
13 matter how you would manipulate it there still are
14 very substantial revenues that accrue to the
15 Village from this particular type of development.
16 And that's to be expected.

17 I normally recommend that when you
18 look at these numbers that you do apply some factor
19 in your mind that you think is reasonable in terms
20 of manipulating the numbers.

21 In other words, if it's a dollar
22 take a look at what 75 cents would actually be.

23 And that I think might give you even a better
24 perspective, or if it's a dollar add a quarter, and

88

1 somewhere we will be within that range.

2 Lastly, do these kind of studies
3 really work. I mean what has time told us. We
4 know for one thing that this process or processes
5 like this have been used for about forty years. I
6 have practiced now for about 33, 35 years so
7 they've been used before I began my practice as an
8 urban planner.

9 I know I did a similar study in
10 Vernon Hills about a decade ago for Gregg Land that
11 had -- it was a thousand acre development, it's a
12 mixed use development. And I know when I did that
13 and I presented all the numbers I was told they
14 could never be that high. They not only were that
15 high today but they are higher.

16 So this is not a precise process
17 but it's a reasonable process that allows a local
18 level of government and a planning commission such
19 as yourself to get a general handle on whether or
20 not something like this will produce a surplus of
21 tax revenue.

22 And I think no matter how we look
23 at the numbers the answer is yes, it will produce a
24 surplus of tax dollars, it will have a significant

1 benefit to the school districts, it will produce no
2 children into that system.

3 And then in terms of summary, if
4 you want to go back to the very first page after
5 the table of contents I think that there's about
6 four or five factors that I'd just like to
7 reiterate.

8 Number one, when the entire
9 entertainment village is developed we should be
10 somewhere in the range of a 2.5 surplus of tax
11 dollars only to the Village of Gurnee. The market
12 value of this whole development is estimated by the
13 developer to be approximately 377 million dollars.

14 The annual reoccurring revenues
15 from the property tax to all taxing districts, that
16 is the Village, the park district, the County is in
17 excess of 8 million dollars based on the costs that
18 we projected.

19 Costs to the Village of Gurnee
20 every year to support this development are in
21 excess of \$300,000. School Districts 121, 56 and
22 50 will benefit significantly with combined annual
23 reoccurring revenues estimated to be over 5.8
24 million dollars without any generation of children

1 into the system.

2 And lastly, and I think it's
3 important to recognize that the subject property as
4 I recall was currently zoned industrial. And we
5 compared or made an effort to compare how much
6 revenue would come from an industrial development
7 versus this type of development which is called an
8 entertainment village.

9 The industrial development
10 generated about 35 million dollars and this
11 development generates -- or I'm sorry, has an
12 assessed value, the industrial development has an
13 assessed value of 35 million dollars and this
14 development has an assessed value of 126 million
15 dollars.

16 So there's a significant difference
17 between an industrial development and a development
18 that would have commercial, sales tax,
19 entertainment tax, and motel/hotel tax. And that I
20 think is only logical given the type of land use
21 that you have. You could have probably guessed
22 that to be correct before we started.

23 So in a nutshell that's the type of
24 study we did. There are two other things in here

1 that I won't go over those tonight but there's

2 another factor that we were asked to take a look
3 at. And that was to determine how much revenue
4 would flow to the State of Illinois. They're the
5 largest taxing district, that's contained in here.

6 And lastly, we were asked by the
7 developer to look at the long-term economic and
8 growth patterns of the whole Village. To say if
9 you take all of the land in the Village that's
10 vacant and if you contrast that to the Village's
11 comprehensive plan and you assign a modest value to
12 that property what would the ultimate projection of
13 revenues be from the land you have yet to use. And
14 that's something that you may want to take a look
15 at and work with.

16 Lastly, I would just simply say
17 that if there are any questions from yourself or
18 from Mr. Maiden or the staff we'll try to explain
19 those in as much detail as we can tonight. And if
20 we need to go back and provide you with comparables
21 so that we can prove our point. If necessary, we
22 will be happy to do that also. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you. Let me just
24 start with one question before I turn it over to

92

1 the other Commissioners.

2 One of the things that always --
3 that struck me because I had heard this number

4 before is the cost to the Village. And, you know,
5 I know you said these are estimates and you could
6 double that if you want and those kind of things.

7 But you base it on employees that
8 would be generated by the different uses that would
9 be on this property. Now are you telling me that
10 if let's say I just built a big office building
11 there and I was going to have 1,084 employees,
12 would your numbers come out to be the same, would
13 it be \$317,000 to the Village in cost?

14 In other words, it's strictly based
15 on the number of employees?

16 MR. KRACKAUER: It's based on a series
17 of formulas that would indicate how intense the
18 development -- it would be based on a series of
19 formulas that would indicate how intense the actual
20 development program in the Village is.

21 But the answer probably would be
22 no, it would not be that intense. What I did here
23 is I increased the actual formulas that we use in
24 the handbook because when I presented this

93

1 originally to the staff or I think it was the blue
2 ribbon committee the people felt -- I think we were
3 at about the \$200,000 range and people felt that
4 that was too low so I increased it.

5 So the answer to your question
6 would be no, it would be less than that. But it's
7 ironic that all of us do cost money for the city
8 that we work in. And it's not a tremendous amount
9 of money because we spend money there. And I
10 didn't include that. It's included in here in one
11 paragraph but most of us every day when we go to
12 work on an average spend at least five dollars a
13 day, some amount. If you do your grocery shopping
14 you spend a lot more, if you buy gas you spend
15 more.

16 But we all spend on average of at
17 least that amount of money. So the community still
18 gets back from us in some form of revenue even
19 though we're costing that community money.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I understand that. But
21 I guess what I'm puzzled at, don't you have to
22 figure somewhere in the equation that you're going
23 to have, I don't know, how many people are going to
24 visit this place in a year's time, a couple of

94

1 million?

2 MR. KRACKAUER: 500,000.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: 500,000 is the water
4 park. But with the hotel and all the other uses I
5 would think you're taking millions of people that
6 wouldn't be generated let's say by an office

7 building.

8 MR. KRACKAUER: Well, some of that, yes
9 and no. But a lot of that is double counting
10 because many of the people who go to Six Flags are
11 also people in part that go to the water park.
12 And the people who stay in the motels and the
13 people who use the restaurants theoretically are
14 the same people who are either using the water park
15 or Six Flags.

16 So part of that is correct. Part
17 of it is a double counting process that would be --
18 I have not been able to sort out. I had been asked
19 that before.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I guess it just
21 seems to me that, you know, when you look at 1,084
22 employees I understand that they might cost the
23 Village even like you say \$200,000; but when you
24 consider the new people that will be visiting this

95

1 place, the additional people that we'll be bringing
2 in our Village and you consider just traffic
3 accidents, for example, that the police have to,
4 you know, investigate and things of that nature, it
5 seems to me that that raises the cost let's say per
6 person substantially.

7 And I mean I just think that number

8 would be much larger. Maybe I'm missing something.

9 MR. KRACKAUER: It's a good point and
10 it's a question I asked myself.

11 And I went back and I'll tell you
12 what we did. We went back to Mr. Foerster from Six
13 Flags and we said -- because his development is
14 much larger, they have a lot more people, I don't
15 know how many a year.

16 MR. FOERSTER: Three million and one.

17 MR. KRACKAUER: Three million and one.
18 They have a lot more than we're anticipating. This
19 is relatively small.

20 And I spoke with him and he could
21 tell you in greater detail than I could about the
22 services that he extracts from the Village that he
23 needs in order to run that business in terms of
24 police protection because police protection and

96

1 ambulance usage I would think are the two highest
2 cost factors.

3 And in reality they use I'm told a
4 very limited amount of police personnel because
5 they have a lot of their own private security.
6 They do require ambulance service both public and
7 they use private depending on the situation.

8 So the costs that they incur
9 publicly for police and fire related purposes in

10 context to three million visitors a year is

11 relatively minimal.

12 And the development that we're

13 talking about, if you think about it, the cost of

14 public maintenance for streets and roads is limited

15 because there's one major collector street that

16 goes through this development that will be

17 dedicated and that will require public usage.

18 The parking lots and all the other

19 little local streets as I recall are private. The

20 entertainment facilities and the bigger hotels have

21 their own private security personnel to supplement

22 to some extent the sworn officer personnel that

23 come from the community.

24 And in reality you really don't

97

1 need that much of a draw on the services of local

2 government. If there were an extraordinary number

3 of accidents that were to come from this

4 development and we were to tie up a tremendous

5 number of police personnel that would help raise

6 the costs.

7 But I think our police, our safety

8 budget was somewhere in excess of \$200,000 and in

9 my mind that seems adequate. And another way you

10 could check on what I'm telling you to be sure if I

11 know what I'm talking about is to sit down with the
12 police department and the fire department and the
13 people who actually provide these services to Six
14 Flags and determine the amount of man hours that
15 they put in and then contrast that with the revenue
16 that they get from Six Flags because you have to
17 remember Six Flags entertainment tax is about a
18 million dollars a year alone and the taxes are not
19 meant to go into a municipal budget simply to
20 produce a surplus.

21 Taxes are to go into a municipal
22 budget in turn for service provided. I think
23 that's what all of us expect when we pay our taxes,
24 we pay our taxes and in return we expect a service.

98

1 So I think if you take a look to
2 every department head in the Village and ask what
3 service do you provide to Six Flags and then look
4 at total revenue that came out of Six Flags I think
5 you'll find this still is way beyond any service
6 demand costs.

7 And then I think you'll also find
8 that even if we reduce my numbers dramatically and
9 ask the very same department personnel based on
10 your experience in Six Flags what do you think your
11 services will be in entertainment village you'll
12 find the same scenario, that there will be a

13 significant surplus of revenue that will flow to
14 the community.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I didn't question that.

16 I think that there's no question that the revenues
17 will come out higher.

18 But I'm just interested in, you
19 know, how you come up with this number on the costs
20 to the community. Mr. Foerster.

21 MR. FOERSTER: I just wanted to comment,
22 I'm sorry. Sorry, Alan. You know as a byproduct
23 not part of this process but as part of the
24 amusement tax rebate that's been done on for a

99

1 number of months I know there was a study that was
2 looked at to determine how much we do cost the
3 Village.

4 And my recollection, some of you
5 may have a better recollection, but it was in the
6 neighborhood of 300 to 350 thousand dollars a year.
7 So if you compare that based on what Alan is
8 predicting I think it's in that ballpark for those
9 services.

10 MR. KRACKAUER: I had mentioned one
11 thing, and I'll respond. I had mentioned going to
12 the department heads and doing that because that's
13 another recognizable method, sort of a case study

14 method of what you can do or the staff can do or
15 Mr. Maiden or whoever does those things can do to
16 confirm the numbers that I have.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Any other
18 questions? Ms. Kovarik.

19 MS. KOVARIK: I just want to clarify the
20 assessed value.

21 At the 126 million. Gurnee Mills
22 is assessed at 40 million and Six Flags in your
23 report is assessed at 24.8. Gurnee Mills has two
24 hotels, two theme restaurants plus dozens of others

100

1 and you're assessing the Village almost three
2 times -- this development almost three times what
3 Gurnee Mills by itself is assessed at. And Gurnee
4 Mills and Six Flags combined, this new development
5 would be two times the assessed values of those.

6 Why is this one so much higher or
7 so much more than some of the ones we had that are
8 existing in the assessed value?

9 MR. KRACKAUER: If you look at Gurnee
10 Mills and a number of structures that you have in
11 town they're older. They're not contemporary,
12 they're not new.

13 And the cost of construction is --
14 was and today probably still would be substantially
15 less than what they're providing.

16 They were asked, the applicant here
17 was asked to provide a very high quality
18 development. Some of the restaurants are themed
19 restaurants and they are coming in at a very high
20 dollar value per square foot.

21 The numbers that we have in here in
22 terms of costs, let's just pull one out, for
23 example, the Village center we have six buildings.
24 We're saying retail according to the developer is

101

1 approximately \$300 a square foot. The theme
2 restaurants are \$261 a square foot. Those are high
3 numbers.

4 MS. KOVARIK: High numbers or realistic?

5 MR. KRACKAUER: They're realistic
6 numbers based on the quality of development that
7 they propose to provide.

8 And what I did to check on myself
9 is I checked on them. These numbers came from the
10 applicant, the developer.

11 And I would call up Mr. Rogers
12 periodically and I would say where did you get
13 200 -- I want to know where \$261 came from and he
14 would cite me a source. Well, this building was
15 just built in Chicago or in Michigan and it's \$261.
16 We went to the architect, we spoke to him and

17 that's what it cost.

18 This is not just the outer shell.

19 It also includes interior refurbishing. So if you
20 get into a theme restaurant they're extraordinarily
21 expensive but they also produce an extraordinary
22 amount of money, far more than any of the
23 restaurants that we have in town.

24 MS. KOVARIK: So if this is based on the

102

1 construction and quality of construction, over time
2 does it go down because now that construction would
3 be out of date and -- the assessed value never
4 seems to go down. Is it pegged?

5 MR. KRACKAUER: Nothing in life goes
6 down. Your taxes will never go down. There's just
7 a few things in life that are certain.

8 And in this case the destination
9 motel, those are factual numbers that come from
10 people in the hotel industry. And we -- if you
11 like, if you want to pick any of them out tonight
12 or tomorrow or next week we'll actually give you
13 examples of where they came from and illustrate
14 what they are.

15 But I think the difference between
16 this development and Gurnee Mills and some of the
17 other things you've seen is that these are going to
18 be -- these are going up, they're brand new, they

19 are a higher end, if you will.
20 And that's not to imply that other
21 developments are lower end, but this is pretty high
22 end construction. And the hotel costs to date,
23 believe it or not, are expensive. That's what it
24 costs to build a hotel. And I'm not talking about

103

1 a Budget 6 or a low end hotel. These are the
2 numbers that the developer is very comfortable
3 with.

4 The performance theater is \$6,000 a
5 seat, that's how they do it. I didn't realize that
6 until we got into it. Again, I asked him would you
7 please go back and find me something that looks
8 like performance theater and he went to his
9 architect who had designed several of these. And I
10 think it's the same architect who has been doing
11 the land planning on this project and they came up
12 with \$6,000 a seat.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Sula, did you have
14 some questions?

15 MR. SULA: One question.

16 How many hotel rooms do we have in
17 town right now? I'm just trying to get an
18 understanding of how this million two relates to
19 the less than 600,000 that we get right now.

20 MR. WILDENBERG: We can find out, but I
21 don't have that number.

22 MS. VELKOVER: I don't know off the top
23 of my head.

24 MR. SULA: That's all I had right now.

104

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Anything else?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I have one question. I
4 guess it might be for Mr. Francke or someone else
5 in the group.

6 This is fiscal impact. We've given
7 all of these numbers and, you know, talked about
8 the amount of tax dollars that we would receive.
9 There obviously is a cost for the infrastructure
10 improvements, particularly the road improvements.

11 Is there going to be any request
12 for some let's say rebate of any of the tax
13 dollars? Mr. Francke? That's assuming that let's
14 say you were to finance the improvements.

15 MR. FRANCKE: Right. We have indicated
16 in prior meetings that the whole question of how
17 the major improvements that we've talked about in
18 the planning process, how they will be paid for,
19 how they will be financed, we assume that that
20 discussion will take place at the Village Board.

21 We know that those issues now go

22 through a public hearing process. To be honest
23 with you, we have not had detailed discussions
24 about that with anybody at the Village at this

105

1 point, the whole issue of financing.

2 That's been raised, you know, the
3 whole issue of financing costs of major
4 improvements was raised at the blue ribbon process
5 and it's been raised I think in the early stages by
6 several of you.

7 And we have indicated that we
8 anticipate those discussions having to be resolved
9 by the Village Board before we think anything is
10 finalized here.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Ms. Kovarik.

12 MS. KOVARIK: This is really not a
13 Planning Commission issue but it raises another
14 question of mine.

15 If you had financing for the
16 project in place wouldn't you have taken that into
17 consideration, the financing you need for
18 infrastructure improvements?

19 MR. FRANCKE: Again, there's certain
20 assumptions that have to be agreed to with the
21 Village in terms of descriptions of improvements,
22 timetable for construction and those types of

23 things that we still need to finalize with the
24 Village before we fully finalize, you know, the

106

1 issue that you're referring to.

2 MS. KOVARIK: Taking the Village out of
3 it, just financing it wouldn't you if you had
4 gotten backers or investors or loans or financing
5 or whatever wouldn't you have had to give them a
6 total cost of the project in order to even talk
7 about getting financing?

8 MR. FRANCKE: Again, we've made certain
9 assumptions about what we'd have to do.

10 Whether or not those dovetail with
11 what the Village requires remains to be seen. And
12 I think as we've indicated in prior meetings that
13 the two components that are going to be initiated
14 first are the employee housing and the water park.

15 And I think that, you know, those
16 don't require the full, you know, extent of
17 improvements that we've talked about in these
18 hearings. So we haven't had to address the issue
19 of how do we finance all of the improvements.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, that's something
21 I think that would be part of the Plan Commission's
22 responsibility if you're talking about addressing
23 or implementing only a portion of the road
24 improvements based on let's say a partial buildout

1 in the development.

2 Isn't that something we would have
3 to discuss at this level?

4 MR. FRANCKE: I believe that the
5 testimony in that regard for what we're asking for
6 preliminary approval for today has already been
7 addressed.

8 I believe that, for example, both
9 traffic consultants have agreed that for what we
10 are seeking approval for today -- just jumping to
11 the extreme end of the spectrum -- I think both
12 traffic consultants agree that an interchange at
13 Washington and the Tollway is not necessary, okay,
14 as an example.

15 I think both consultants agree that
16 improvements to Washington are needed, that we have
17 discussed are needed today without any of this
18 development. And we understand that those
19 improvements are going to have to be constructed
20 right in the up front stages.

21 So I think that the Plan Commission
22 in the testimony has addressed this issue to a
23 large extent.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I guess I

1 misunderstood you.

2 You made it sound like if you just
3 go forward with the water park and the employee
4 housing that you might not need to put all those
5 road improvements and putting aside the
6 entertainment center that somehow the road
7 improvements would be less than what you presented.

8 MR. FRANCKE: No, I would have to refer
9 back. I don't -- I would have to refer back to the
10 traffic report and perhaps have Dave Miller address
11 the details of what was proposed.

12 My recollection is that everything
13 that Dave talked about would -- you know, not the
14 interchange, but everything else would have to go
15 in as part of the water park proposal.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Well, then I
17 misunderstood you the first time.

18 MR. WINTER: Just to follow-up on that,
19 though.

20 How is that going -- we now have a
21 revised PUD plan. Nothing in that plan talks about
22 the roads. Where does -- where do you present
23 that, that those roads will go in as part of the
24 approval of the PUD?

1 MR. FRANCKE: Well, as I envision the

2 process, our traffic consultant has submitted a
3 report that has made recommendations for necessary
4 traffic improvements. Your traffic consultant has
5 analyzed those and concurred with them, commented
6 on them in certain respects. He has suggested or
7 supplemented them with his own representations.

8 What I would see coming out of this
9 process is that you would take under advisement the
10 testimony you've heard from both the consultants
11 and from the public and make your recommendations
12 as to what improvements should be made and when
13 those improvements should be made.

14 And that that would be passed up to
15 the Village Board. And then based upon your
16 recommendation and their own considerations and
17 further input they may have to reach final
18 conclusions as to what are the conditions to the
19 PUD which have to be incorporated into the special
20 use planned unit development permit and ultimately
21 the development agreement.

22 MR. WINTER: But it's fair to say up to
23 this point you're not proposing revealing to us
24 what improvements that you would -- that we've

110

1 talked about that would be a condition precedent to
2 approval of the PUD, you're relying on us to
3 consider the testimony and to draw those

4 conclusions, correct?

5 MR. FRANCKE: Well, again, I think we've
6 identified the improvements that we recommend and
7 things that should go in to initiate or to open for
8 business, if you will, the uses that we've talked
9 about.

10 I think, you know, the issues that
11 have been discussed tonight indicate or the
12 discussions that have taken place tonight and some
13 of the materials that have come out prior to this
14 evening indicate to me that there are some
15 improvements that there is real uncertainty as to
16 what the Village's desire might be.

17 And, for example, we talked about
18 the extension of Tri-State Parkway. Mr. Reed
19 indicated in his memo the cul-de-sacing of
20 Cemetery. There has obviously been a lot of
21 discussion about the interchange and yet there have
22 been some questions in prior hearings from members
23 of the audience as to whether there should be an
24 interchange or whether some of the residents want

111

1 the interchange there.

2 There are definitely improvements
3 over which there are open issues that I think the
4 Plan Commission needs to resolve and make a

5 recommendation on to the Village Board.

6 Those are three that I can think of
7 right off the top of my head. The one that was
8 talked about this evening about Milwaukee Avenue
9 and 120. Commissioner Winter, you yourself raised
10 some real serious questions or concerns about
11 whether that would be appropriate.

12 So I think those are the types of
13 things where we need your recommendation. I think
14 the Village Board needs your recommendation.

15 MR. WINTER: Yeah. And like I say, I
16 understand that in the reports there's references
17 made. But unlike the PUD that you proposed, that's
18 something that still has to be created and more
19 formally as to what those conditions are. And I
20 guess you've made that clear that we'll have to do
21 that.

22 Because, for instance, the
23 Tri-State Parkway I think is very important and
24 while there may be some disagreements about that I

112

1 think we've received a lot of useful information on
2 that that could guide us in making a specific
3 recommendation for that.

4 MR. FRANCKE: I think if I could by way
5 of example refer back to a project that Mr. Reed
6 referred to that just came through the process and

7 that I was associated with, that I am associated

8 with.

9 And that was the Woodlake project
10 that he made reference to on Milwaukee Avenue. If
11 you recall, in that process there was discussion at
12 this body about what would be the appropriate
13 improvements for Milwaukee Avenue at that location.

14 And there was a lot of thrashing
15 out of issues that were raised and there was
16 testimony again by a traffic consultant and the
17 Village consultants. And the Plan Commission made
18 recommendations with respect to, you made
19 recommendations with respect to a signal
20 installation and turning lane movements at the
21 south access to that property.

22 Those recommendations ended up
23 being incorporated in that development in an
24 annexation agreement. And so your recommendations

113

1 were taken by the Village Board, they were
2 ultimately made a condition to development approval
3 and reflected in the annexation agreement.

4 I think that the process is the
5 same here.

6 MR. WINTER: Thanks.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other questions?

8 Mr. Cepon.

9 MR. CEPON: I have one. What is your --
10 assuming this would be okayed by the end of the
11 year seeing as we're in October, what would your
12 projected buildout be?

13 In other words, what timetable do
14 you have as to how long this would be and when --
15 actually when it would actually begin?

16 MR. FRANCKE: Well, again, I think we
17 have indicated in prior meetings -- I'm not sure if
18 we've said it specifically -- our intent would be
19 to move forward immediately next year with the
20 employee housing facilities for the theme parks;
21 also move forward immediately with the water park
22 so that it was ready for opening in the year 2000.

23 The hope would be that the regional
24 hotel and conference center would follow closely

114

1 thereafter after the opening of the water park.

2 And I think the balance of the development would be
3 dependent upon market conditions.

4 But those -- those are the three
5 components -- well, two of those components are the
6 ones that we're seeking preliminary approval for.

7 The only other -- the only other -- I'm trying to
8 think. The rest of the development really we're
9 only asking for conceptual approval for.

10 MR. CEPON: So basically you're asking
11 for employee housing, the water park and a hotel.

12 MR. FRANCKE: Conference center.

13 MR. CEPON: Conference center.

14 MR. FRANCKE: Right.

15 MR. CEPON: Between now and the year
16 let's say 2004, give or take?

17 MR. FRANCKE: I can't address that.

18 MR. ROGERS: I'm John Rogers, I'm a
19 principal at Prism development.

20 We're looking at a buildout like
21 Hal talked about where we would spearhead the first
22 three uses which was employee housing, the
23 destination hotel conference center and the water
24 park.

115

1 The other part would be it is
2 market conditions. And what we're doing now is
3 we're testing those market conditions and we're
4 seeing good responses overall. But again, they're
5 looking -- our investors, I think the question that
6 was asked is they want to make sure that it's going
7 to be a quality development and so part of this
8 process is to do more clarification with our
9 investors to show how this in fill of the village
10 itself would be built.

11 And we're playing with scenarios
12 with that right now. So we're in that aspect of
13 modeling where we're looking at in fill with the
14 village.

15 To get us to the point of how long
16 it's going to take is typically a 500 room hotel,
17 the ones we've built in the past, they take a good
18 two and a half to three years from start to finish.
19 Usually a 500 room hotel takes about 18 to 24
20 months to build specifically with the convention
21 center.

22 And that, when I say three years
23 that also includes financing and all of the
24 building requirements with the architects for

116

1 permitting.

2 And so if you add that to the
3 timeline it easily gets into 2001, 2002. And then
4 when you do things in parallel with the balance of
5 the village you're getting into 2003 and 2004 at
6 full maturity.

7 And as you can see from what
8 Mr. Krackauer put down there's a -- the development
9 that we're looking at has so much excess square
10 footage and as you know through the development
11 standards to the FAR. So at full maturity we're
12 looking easily at 2003 to 2005, 2004 as it goes

13 through.

14 MR. CEPON: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other questions?

16 Mr. Sula.

17 MR. SULA: Just a comment to close a

18 perspective issue that I was trying to raise

19 before.

20 Based on the existing number of

21 hotels in town these rooms would go for roughly

22 twice the average rate of the existing hotel rooms

23 in town according to these studies.

24 MR. ROGERS: Would you like me to

117

1 comment on that?

2 MR. SULA: Sure.

3 MR. ROGERS: Good. I think it's been --

4 from talking to staff and in talking to Village

5 residents and in talking to individual

6 Commissioners there is a large concern that you --

7 that we heard specifically through the blue ribbon

8 committee that you did not want an inexpensive

9 motel type of development here.

10 The hotel that we are considering

11 is a full-service hotel. And the type of average

12 daily rates, ADRs that we look at that's consistent

13 with a full service hotel that also has a

14 convention center. And you're talking white
15 tablecloth service, you're talking an upper end
16 operator. And that's what we've envisioned as
17 well.

18 So the dollars that you see which
19 generates the ADR all generates from the valuation.
20 And as an example right now in downtown Chicago
21 we're developing a Marriott and it's coming in well
22 in excess of \$165,000 a room. And it's very, very
23 limited service. It's a nice Marriott product,
24 it's a suite product. But I know it's downtown

118

1 Chicago and you could argue that.

2 But if you put a full service it
3 gets into the \$165,000 key range. Now remember,
4 what that includes is not only the hard costs of
5 construction, it's also the carrying costs on
6 interest loans which is very high. These things
7 generate about \$400,000 a month in interest carry.
8 Also the costs of what we call FFE, furniture
9 fixtures and equipment which is a lot higher than a
10 normal motel.

11 And then all of the costs that will
12 be called back of house where most likely you would
13 have more than one kitchen for a facility of this
14 size and your buildout from the FFE for millwork
15 would be relatively extensive versus what you see

16 in a normal limited stay or limited service
17 facility.
18 So quite honestly the 165 which
19 generates the ADRs at I think it's 136 ADR, that's
20 a rack rate. And that's just an average.
21 Sometimes it's going to be in the eighties like in
22 the winter and in the summer maybe 150. So that's
23 just an average daily rate based on a 78 percent
24 occupancy or 72 percent occupancy.

119

1 So that's how we generate those
2 analyses. And believe me, the Marriott -- the two
3 Marriotts and the Hyatt that we've developed and
4 the Hotel Sofutel, this is all within the range and
5 the Hotel Sofutel as you know in Rosemont, that
6 came in close to 150 a key back in 1988, '89. So
7 just to give you a time frame.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Just as a
9 follow-up question, I notice that we're using the
10 word convention center rather than conference
11 center.

12 MR. ROGERS: I'm sorry.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: It's also written.

14 MR. FRANCKE: It's referred to back in
15 difference places as either a hotel conference
16 center or a convention center.

17 The only reason I can tell you from
18 a document standpoint, for example, in the revised
19 development standards that you received I've tried
20 to be consistent referring only to it as a
21 convention center.

22 That is because again that is the
23 term that's used in the existing OIP. The existing
24 special use permit for the Tri-State Industrial

120

1 Park identifies convention centers as an existing
2 authorized special use on this property.

3 We're not adding that to the list
4 of special uses. It's there now. So I was trying
5 to use the term that's in place right now.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Does it have any other
7 meaning in the industry as far as to me convention
8 center seems to be --

9 MR. FRANCKE: Is there any in the
10 industry? Is there any -- I mean if you're more
11 comfortable with conference center as opposed to
12 convention center I think that's fine with us.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I want to know what it
14 means. Is there really a terminology here where
15 once you get to a certain size you call it a
16 convention versus conference?

17 MR. ROGERS: Actually, they kind of meld
18 one into the other.

19 A convention center as defined that
20 we've built out before is usually a meeting space
21 facility. A conference is more where you have
22 trade shows where you may have, I don't know,
23 Northern Dentists Association and they may show
24 products.

121

1 So -- or I'm sorry, I reversed it
2 around. A convention center is the trade shows,
3 conference is where you have the smaller groups.
4 And the way we designed these facilities you have
5 it adaptable either way. And that's what we did
6 with the architects to make sure that some rooms
7 will be partitioned out for meeting spaces and some
8 would open up to give the flexibility.

9 And the key is flexibility for
10 these facilities. That's what makes it viable for
11 a convention situation versus a conference which is
12 just meetings. I apologize for the mixup.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I think what I'd
14 like to do now is open the floor to the public and
15 get your comments and questions and then come back
16 to the Commissioners.

17 And I think we need to kind of
18 voice what our concerns are about this whole thing
19 and be pretty open about it. So I'm going to open

20 the floor to the public now. And if you could
21 state your name and address for the record.

22 And I would appreciate it if we
23 could keep the discussion to the points that have
24 been raised this evening which are primarily

122

1 traffic, fiscal impact and also the engineering.

2 Because we have had a series of
3 meetings where at each one we try to keep it to the
4 point. So with that in mind please proceed. If
5 you could also address your comments to the
6 Commission and not to the Petitioner.

7 MR. SILHA: Gary Silha, 6180 Indian
8 Trail Road.

9 One of the financial impacts of
10 this development which is not discussed tonight was
11 the impact on homeowners' property values. Now,
12 about three months ago I requested from the
13 developer a list of the benefits that this
14 development was going to provide residents of
15 Gurnee.

16 He was kind enough at the very next
17 meeting to provide us a list of benefits, one of
18 which was surprisingly enough that this was going
19 to increase home values for Gurnee residents. Now
20 I can only assume when he put that into testimony
21 that he had a study to back that statement up. And

22 if there is a study I would appreciate him making
23 it public.

24 I would be glad, I could bring a

123

1 copy, I will bring a hundred of them and put them
2 on the table right here for the next meeting.

3 This is I believe the number one
4 concern of many of the people sitting here tonight,
5 that's why they've come tonight.

6 Common sense tells me that if
7 you're going to increase traffic, if you're going
8 to commercialize Washington Street, increase the
9 lighting in that area, the noise, home values are
10 not going to go up. So I would like to see a study
11 that supports that statement.

12 In reference to some of the
13 testimony tonight on the most recent fiscal impact
14 analysis, Kristy, I think you had a very good
15 question. To be honest, I questioned the response
16 that was given to your question. And that was in
17 reference to assessed values.

18 Gurnee Mills being assessed at a
19 certain level and why this was not in line with
20 Gurnee Mills. The response was that it was based
21 on construction costs. Now I'm not a -- I don't
22 work for the city but my basic understanding is

23 that assessed values are not based on cost of
24 construction. If you have a home that's 50 years

124

1 old and it costs \$3,000 to build that home 50 years
2 ago it's not assessed today at \$3,000, it's
3 assessed at market value.

4 So the fact that Gurnee Mills was
5 built ten years ago at a much lower cost than what
6 they're contemplating today has absolutely nothing
7 to do with today's assessed values of this
8 development.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I could probably maybe
10 help clarify that a little bit.

11 I think that may be true with a
12 home that was built 50 years ago. But if you were
13 to build a home today or let's say you were to buy
14 a home, I think the Assessor considers what you
15 paid for that and that's going to be somewhat
16 related to the construction costs. So I'm not so
17 sure that you can use a 50 year old home as an
18 example.

19 In other words, they're going to be
20 looking at construction of this. In other words,
21 somebody is willing to pay to have that particular
22 building built at that cost. So, in other words,
23 they're willing to pay for that at that point.
24 They may be able -- once it's built they may be

1 able to sell it for more, I don't know.

2 MR. SILHA: That might be true but the
3 assessed value of Gurnee Mills should have
4 ultimately gone up because it's ultimately based on
5 market value.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Maybe it should go up
7 if it's --

8 MR. SILHA: But the response given I
9 think is inappropriate. It's not based on the cost
10 of that construction. I agree with what you're
11 saying halfway, but Gurnee Mills should have also
12 gone up then.

13 And since there is that variance
14 between what Gurnee Mills is being assessed at and
15 what we're looking at here --

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We don't know. Maybe
17 Gurnee Mills may have gone up since it was
18 constructed. I think his point was that the
19 construction that they're planning on building here
20 is better construction.

21 In other words, the cost per square
22 foot would be greater than if you built buildings
23 that were at Gurnee Mills today. He did say it was
24 an older facility, too, which I agree with you just

1 because it's an older facility doesn't make it
2 worthless from a market standpoint.

3 MR. SILHA: Okay. Another explanation
4 was given that the fixtures in this facility were
5 going to be much nicer, we're assuming a Sheraton
6 Hilton with very nice fixtures.

7 It's my understanding that fixtures
8 in the facility have nothing to do with assessed
9 value. Whether that facility is Motel 6 or a
10 Hilton, Motel 6 have an obviously lower level of
11 fixtures has nothing to do with assessed values.
12 It's the market value of that property.

13 And the fact these numbers in the
14 study were based on what was in -- assumed in that
15 structure makes these numbers invalid.

16 In reference to the property tax
17 revenues as quoted in the study. Just to put
18 things in perspective as a comparison to the
19 property tax revenues collected for the current Six
20 Flags property.

21 To School District 50 we currently
22 collect about \$202,000 a year in property tax
23 revenues from Great America. What this study is
24 quoting for annual property tax revenues to School

1 District 50 is almost fifteen times what we're

2 currently collecting on Great America at 2.9
3 million.
4 Similarly, High School District 121
5 we're collecting 434,000 a year from Great America.
6 This study is based on 2.2 million going to
7 District 121. Gurnee Park District, \$68,000 from
8 Great America is what we're collecting now. This
9 study is using 331,000 in its numbers. These
10 numbers are greatly inflated.

11 And in reference to the study in
12 the village center that the sales rate per square
13 foot is quoted at \$300 per square foot, I would be
14 interested in hearing why that was changed from
15 \$125 per square foot which was the original
16 assumption in the original fiscal impact study.

17 We have heard no testimony over the
18 last several months as to what has changed in
19 reference to the village center that would increase
20 that number from \$125 to \$300 per square foot.

21 The sales tax revenue also in this
22 most recent fiscal impact study shows 216,000
23 coming to the Village as a result of the convention
24 center. I would question whether conventions is a

128

1 sales tax eligible item. I'm not a hundred percent
2 on that, but that's something for staff maybe to
3 tell us.

4 Finally, hotels two and three, this
5 study shows almost 35,000 in sales tax revenue from
6 each hotel which when you calculate that out based
7 on the number of rooms, 200 rooms and the 70
8 percent occupancy ratio that the study assumes, it
9 works out to \$67 a night being spent on food for
10 every person who stays in one of those rooms at
11 these hotels which seems awfully high. Yeah,
12 everyone is eating a tremendous amount of food.

13 Also, when you consider the
14 assumption in the study for the restaurants that
15 are also being proposed is that the number of
16 people that stay in the hotel are going to go to
17 those restaurants and the sales tax revenue in the
18 study is being generated by those meals spent.

19 How can you have it both ways?
20 Again, the numbers I feel are greatly exaggerated.

21 And finally, someone asked tonight
22 about the roads. I forget how it was phrased, but
23 in general the question referred to who is going to
24 pay for these roads, the Village, the developer.

129

1 The response, no offense, but that
2 was the biggest dance I've ever seen. I have a
3 document here generated by Prism Development. You
4 might all have a copy of it. If you don't I would

5 be glad to show you mine.

6 And I'll quote. It states here,
7 "Six Flags and Prism will provide private funding
8 for all phases of the entertainment village except
9 infrastructure improvements and the events center."

10 Tonight it was stated that we
11 haven't decided according to the developer what
12 we're going to do in terms of the roads. They
13 decided a long time ago--they're not paying for
14 them; we are, the residents.

15 I'll tell you this whole thing, I
16 feel the numbers are inflated. I feel there is tax
17 revenue of some value. I would hope that this is
18 dug into quite thoroughly. I only looked at the
19 numbers for a half hour and I saw tremendous errors
20 in the numbers.

21 I would hope that the Village has
22 someone look at these numbers very thoroughly. I
23 think if the home property issue is not examined
24 very thoroughly it would be very irresponsible of

130

1 this committee who is looking at this.

2 My understanding is in order to
3 change the zoning on this property there has to be
4 in the opinion of this committee a material benefit
5 to this community for doing so. I think the -- one
6 of the things that has to be taken into account is

7 home property values.

8 It's fine that this is going to
9 throw off some tax revenue and that for me as a
10 resident may save me a couple bucks. Although I
11 don't think it's going to be that great, I'd rather
12 pay the taxes.

13 But as you're putting that money
14 into my pocket, don't lose sight of the fact that
15 there's another hand by the developer in my other
16 pocket taking money out for road improvements and
17 causing property devaluation. On a net basis I
18 don't see a material benefit to me as a resident of
19 this community. And that's what we have to
20 concentrate on.

21 We can talk about curb cuts, we can
22 talk about height of the buildings, everything.
23 There's a lot of detail that we've gone over the
24 last year on this stuff and we can get lost in that

131

1 detail. We've got to look at the big picture here.
2 Thank you.

3 MS. COURSHON: Mary Courshon, 55 Silo
4 Court.

5 We again expanded further the
6 possibility of continuing Tri-State Parkway through
7 to Washington Street this evening. And as I recall

8 at our last meeting, the nice woman who represented
9 the industrial park at that meeting voiced that
10 the -- our industrial neighbors in that park would
11 be opposed to using that as an access for this
12 water park.

13 Not that they would be opposed to
14 extending the Parkway for further industrial
15 development as this, but strictly for the Tri-State
16 Parkway to be used for water park access.

17 I must confess that as a result of
18 her presentation it finally dawned on me why the
19 Village sent out an RFP for a hotel convention
20 center in the first place. The truth is as
21 residents I'm not sure any of us realize the
22 quality and the caliber of industrial neighbors
23 that Gurnee has in fact attracted to this
24 industrial park and it would behoove us possibly to

132

1 look into having a hotel conference center
2 specifically to have those corporations be able to
3 have international conferences at Gurnee which
4 could be an attraction.

5 However, to put the cart before the
6 horse and say that it's more important to have
7 employee housing and a water park and the heck with
8 the residents and the industrial neighbors is a
9 little strong to me.

10 I would still like to revisit the
11 likelihood of Six Flags tunneling under the Tollway
12 to create their own traffic solution so that they
13 assume all of the costs for developing those roads,
14 maintaining those roads, and finding their own
15 traffic solutions.

16 The first meeting that we had a
17 question was asked as to whether or not there were
18 any studies done at the local hotels regarding
19 winter occupancy as to why we would need to add an
20 additional 900 hotel rooms that could conceivably
21 go empty all winter long since the water park isn't
22 going to be operational and the entertainment
23 village of course isn't going to be present and
24 accounted for yet.

133

1 Apparently the fiscal impact study
2 is again quoting motels two and three. It is my
3 understanding the testimony at the last meeting
4 eliminated one of those hotels.

5 When we talk about -- skip it.
6 When we talked about the civil engineering we
7 talked about the water impact. I was very confused
8 about that as I was present for testimony regarding
9 the Jewel at the intersection of 120 and O'Plaine
10 Road and the Jewel was denied access as I recall to

11 water without specifically constructing some very
12 special things of their own to have access to that
13 water they could not tunnel into the system, they
14 could not create anything and testimony received
15 here this evening is just a few short blocks away
16 on Washington Street. You can just about do
17 anything you want without any access problems.

18 And I find that the Jewel would
19 probably generate significantly less as far as
20 sewer and water usage as compared to a water park
21 hotel complex.

22 MS. VELKOVER: If I could just clarify
23 that.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yeah, go ahead.

134

1 MS. VELKOVER: In the case of the Jewel
2 they're not annexed into the Village at this time.
3 They would have to annex. There was a question
4 about where they could get utilities if they did
5 not annex.

6 They would have to go either to
7 Waukegan or in regard to sanitary there is a force
8 main going on O'Plaine Road. You cannot cap into a
9 force main for sanitary. And this isn't the same
10 situation, it's not a force main that they would be
11 tapping into.

12 So water and sewer is available to

13 this site.

14 MS. COURSHON: Because it doesn't have
15 a force main.

16 MS. VELKOVER: It's not a force main
17 situation.

18 MS. COURSHON: But you could understand
19 why I would be confused.

20 MS. VELKOVER: Yes.

21 MS. COURSHON: As we were talking about
22 the sales number projections that have been arrived
23 at by the Petitioner, I'm somewhat confused as the
24 Petitioner is seeking conceptual approval and I

135

1 would like to know the general value of what
2 something generating a million dollars in concept
3 looks like.

4 Is that something similar to me
5 conceiving that I'm going to win a million dollars
6 in the Publishers Clearinghouse sweepstakes?

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, it was all based
8 on the premise that this eventually would be fully
9 built out. Fiscal impact was based on that
10 premise, that was brought up front.

11 MS. COURSHON: Exactly, but --

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And it may never
13 develop into that.

14 MS. COURSHON: So that the money that's
15 being printed on these fiscal studies is simply
16 conceptual cash, it's not really actual cash.

17 And if it doesn't ever get built
18 out then this concept really is just another
19 concept; is that correct?

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That would be correct,
21 absolutely. There's portions that would be built,
22 you know, and then there's a question as to whether
23 the numbers are really real or not.

24 MS. COURSHON: That's right. Thank you.

136

1 They're conceptual numbers.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But clearly the
3 portions that would be built out would be
4 generating some tax revenue. However, there would
5 be some impact costs to the Village as well and
6 each one would have to be weighed separately.

7 MS. COURSHON: The Petitioners also
8 presented a couple times during testimony that what
9 is intended to be built here is high end, high end
10 hotel.

11 The presentation that we saw, the
12 slide presentation with the Virgin Records and the
13 palm trees and the other presentations that they
14 have so that it would not be competitive to Gurnee
15 Mills so we do not have to worry that that would

16 be, you know, take any business away from already
17 established clientele here.

18 I would like to just put something
19 on your mind is that one of the reasons that Gurnee
20 Mills is popular is its concept as an outlet mall
21 for a very large cross-section of individuals.

22 And I'm not really clear as to why
23 a high end village entertainment sort of thing
24 happening with a couple of more themed restaurants

137

1 would be more attractive to individuals coming to
2 drop 35 dollars a day per person to go to one
3 destination, which is Great America, on one day;
4 and \$35 -- I think they said the charge is going to
5 be quite similar -- to the water park as a separate
6 charge on a second day and then in the meantime
7 they're going to go and shop and pay maybe twice as
8 much for something as they could to go to Gurnee
9 Mills. In addition to twice the rate at the
10 hotels.

11 This to me doesn't make any sense
12 for my budget and I'm not sure exactly who you're
13 planning on attracting for that. Just a comment.

14 According to the testimony the
15 Route 21 improvement is somewhere around the next
16 five years to be happening here. And that

17 temporary signals would certainly be a Band-Aid but
18 of course if we do not have the impetus for even
19 putting a Band-Aid on that process because the
20 water park wouldn't go in we really wouldn't get a
21 Band-Aid on that anyway.

22 So I'm not really clear as to if
23 this is part of the process and it's not a
24 construction why would we incorporate it into geez,

138

1 this is something that's coming along in the
2 package when in fact it's not part of the package.

3 If we in fact do choose to pay --
4 complete the construction of Tri-State Parkway
5 coming out onto Washington I'm not really clear how
6 this is going to impact the future development of
7 the off ramp and stuff like that onto Washington
8 Street because we already did discuss the traffic
9 signal configuration.

10 In the big picture plan that would
11 be the best deal we could possibly get -- tongue in
12 cheek here -- is to have those off ramps on
13 Washington. And if we do that and the Grand
14 Tri-State Parkway, what does that look like? Is
15 that going to create a similar situation that we
16 already have at the intersection of 120 and
17 O'Plaine and that East End or something like that
18 where we can't exactly get things together.

19 And that was one of the traffic
20 factors that we were concerned about at that
21 construction site.

22 I am very concerned that the
23 Village encouraged the developer to remove the
24 traffic from Grand Avenue as he has testified here

139

1 this evening. I would like to know how that is
2 consistent with the comprehensive plan.

3 The consistent references to the
4 Village suggest that this development is a foregone
5 conclusion and that the Village, not the Plan
6 Commission, is circumventing the comprehensive plan
7 and in fact disregarding the process of the
8 Planning Commission public hearing and the input
9 that would be available from the industrial and
10 residential neighbors.

11 I am very concerned about that
12 theme that has been presented over the course of
13 several months and I wanted to make sure that I
14 interjected that into the record. And that's all
15 for now.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

17 MR. WALLACE: Bob Wallace, 1446
18 Kingsbury Court.

19 I have a number of issues I'm going

20 to bring up and a number that I'm not going to
21 bother with.

22 First, I want to go back to the
23 traffic issues. The dance that the developer has
24 done would do Fred Astaire proud. They have

140

1 mentioned every other party as being responsible
2 for the roadways but themselves.

3 I was on the committee looking at
4 the events center, looking at the village. You
5 know, we came up with some answers that don't match
6 either of the traffic consultants any more and I
7 want to challenge them.

8 All we saw was that Washington
9 currently is at acceptable levels by IDOT standards
10 for level of service. The lowest level we saw at
11 its worse point on Washington other than the
12 Milwaukee and Washington crossroad was a Level C.
13 It's an acceptable level. It doesn't hurt
14 residents in Gurnee. It may hurt people in
15 Grayslake, it may take a lot more time for people
16 in Hainesville.

17 But I'm a Village of Gurnee
18 resident, I care about the residents of Gurnee not
19 those other towns. First issue.

20 Secondly, construction traffic has
21 not been addressed in the PUD. It should be in

22 there hopefully. That type of traffic will cause
23 more backups than any other. Trucks don't move
24 quickly, they drop mud. They're going to cause

141

1 accidents. And if they're using Washington, which
2 primarily is a residentially driven street. People
3 that are going to and from there aren't reaching
4 businesses on Washington, they aren't going
5 specifically to Amoco.

6 They're going to homes in South
7 Ridge, they're going out to Arbordare, they're
8 going to Bittersweet. It's used for residential
9 drivers. I don't see a lot of trucks on it.

10 Next I'd like to go to the assessed
11 valuation issue. You've stated that you've
12 included what goes on the inside of these
13 buildings. Well, that isn't part of the assessed
14 valuation.

15 If I put a five million dollar
16 picture in my house it doesn't make my house worth
17 \$5,250,000. It just doesn't happen. That's
18 personal property. My car that sits in the
19 driveway, it's personal property, it's not
20 assessed. The shell of the buildings are what's
21 assessed by the Assessor, the property that they
22 sit on. So those valuations are way out of line.

23 I can't even imagine why they're that high.

24 Another comment was made about

142

1 service -- the taxes that this development would

2 pay being greater than the services received.

3 That's the way it is. There is no ifs, ands or

4 buts. If it wasn't, guess what, I have no kids at

5 Warren High School, I shouldn't be paying Warren

6 high school taxes based on your ideas.

7 I'm also wondering basically, Jon,

8 I don't know if Bud left and Tracy, have you seen

9 any architectural plans from the developer on

10 these. And if so why hasn't the Plan Commission

11 seen what this hotel is going to look like. They've

12 asked for more specifics on the buildings that are

13 going to go up. So hopefully we can find out if

14 you've seen those.

15 Lastly, I'm going to go to why if

16 Route 21 is supposed to be expanded to five lanes

17 that's not going to help if this development opens

18 in 2000. In 2003 we can expect to have the five

19 lanes. It's going to be a nightmare. It will kick

20 traffic down to Hunt Club Road, it will kick them

21 to our residential streets even though those

22 streets are controlled by other taxing authorities.

23 Hopefully we can get something done

24 up front, the developer can put up some money, put

1 up some benefits to this community instead of just
2 trying to take from all the different taxing
3 bodies. Thank you.

4 MS. CEDERLUND: I'm Diane Cederlund, I
5 live at 252 Hillendale. Just three quick points.

6 First of all, I would encourage the
7 Planning Commission to look at themselves as
8 ambassadors for families, not necessarily
9 ambassadors for business or for large entities.

10 The second thing is I need a
11 little bit of clarification on I think I heard
12 someone say that there was a partial property that
13 was bought by the school district. Is that on that
14 strip that's on Washington Street or -- it's on
15 Cemetery?

16 How will -- if the future does hold
17 a great population boom, how will that
18 Washington/Hunt Club/Cemetery industrial park be
19 affecting that school area. Obviously safety is a
20 real key issue for students who might be picking up
21 buses and crossing streets and things like that.
22 How that complex might possibly impact that for the
23 future.

24 And the third area that I have to

1 address is the fact that if the benefit for this is
2 financially in terms of 15 percent or 15 times the
3 operating budget that is currently here and we are
4 not adding any new additional students then -- and
5 we seem to be operating fine financially in terms
6 of the educational community and I'm not getting
7 any -- receiving any benefit back from this, why
8 are we necessarily having to ask for that kind of
9 economic windfall so to speak?

10 And that's where I get back to
11 asking the community, asking the Village Planning
12 Commission to look at themselves more or less in
13 terms of financially responsible individuals as
14 well as being more ambassadors for the family
15 instead of being ambassadors for business. Thanks.

16 MR. HUDSON: Hi. George Hudson,
17 Winchester Estates, Gurnee resident here.

18 My concern is the value that this
19 is going to add to our community isn't the right
20 thing for our community. And what is it going to
21 do, is it going to add value to us?

22 Right now tonight they discussed
23 traffic plans. I didn't see any sound studies on
24 how that traffic is really going to go in a proper

1 way. Right now they have traffic coming off 120,

2 going up Hunt Club up to Grand. I mean right now
3 we all know our roads don't move well on peak
4 hours. And Illinois in this area is very slow
5 about putting in lights and widening roads.

6 I don't think a park should be
7 opened or even approved until those roads are
8 approved and in place for that traffic to be
9 handled. Otherwise, there should be no business
10 there.

11 Who is going to pay for all this?
12 The Village? The State? The County? There's a
13 lot of expenses there. For the value of this in
14 our community is it worth all these expenses and
15 the aggravation to the community. When you put a
16 park like this in people drive all over the place,
17 it adds to the crime, it adds to the garbage on the
18 road, pollution in the community, extra noise.

19 I just don't see a value to it. I
20 don't see that their traffic plans are really well
21 sounded, well prepared and well studied. Thank
22 you.

23 MS. ALBRECHT: Hi. I'm Vicky Albrecht,
24 4210 Cobblestone Court. I am also vice-president

146

1 of Tri-State Realty. We've been marketing the
2 Grand Tri-State Business Park since the late 1980s.

3 And I guess the one comment as a

4 resident and as a business owner in the community
5 here, particularly a business owner that's
6 attracted a lot of companies, high quality
7 companies up here because I love my community, my
8 family has been here since 1974 and we've seen all
9 of the growth here. Balanced growth, sustained
10 growth and cooperation from the residents and
11 companies, our Village staff is so important and it
12 is good we have this forum.

13 I guess my comment is we meaning
14 the Grand Tri-State Business Park and its tenants,
15 they're residents, too. And my comment about -- I
16 won't go into reading my comments from the last
17 meeting but I guess as far as just summarizing
18 after listening to the reports again this evening
19 by Mr. Grieve I would like to comment that the
20 present land use and future land use of the Grand
21 Tri-State Business Park includes significant office
22 development coming online, another 120,000 square
23 feet of office space.

24 We've got another 27 acres left,

147

1 most of it fronting the Tollway and we expect that
2 also to be a high end use, primarily office. Those
3 numbers are not in any of Mr. Grieve's projections
4 for future traffic considerations.

5 We also have parcels that are still
6 vacant but expecting development such as the site
7 known as the Chichugi (phonetic) site which is
8 across the street from the four phases of the Grand
9 Tri-State Business Park.

10 At that point and as I envision the
11 winding nature of that road and as all of the
12 parcels are built out it will create blind areas
13 that will obscure -- that will be obscured by these
14 office and industrial buildings.

15 And combining all of the business
16 traffic which includes employees of the park, and
17 that includes future employees of the park along
18 with this non-business traffic funneling through
19 this area will undoubtedly with the winding nature
20 of that road, you've all traveled it, I think it's
21 going to present some major safety concerns.

22 And I think that was something that
23 Bud Reed originally told the Prism Group or
24 actually Dave Miller in his preliminary traffic

148

1 findings and that's why it was never addressed.

2 So I find it very interesting why
3 at this point this information is coming out. It
4 is very, very -- I think that it's a Band-Aid
5 approach to the solution. It would also create a
6 cut-through road undoubtedly from Grand Avenue and

7 all of those retail areas through a high quality
8 corporate park. It is our only corporate corridor
9 in Gurnee.

10 Now think about that as you drive
11 through Lincolnshire and you see high quality
12 business parks, those people, those companies
13 employ professional and technical -- or provide
14 professional and technical jobs for all of those
15 companies.

16 That is what we're trying to locate
17 in Gurnee. And we have recently put W.W. Grainger,
18 attracted them to 40,000 square feet in the
19 business park. They are providing jobs for our
20 community.

21 You need all facets of development
22 in a community. You need of course the
23 residential, but we need to have thoughtfully
24 planned out commercial, industrial, office,

149

1 everything that provides for balanced growth.

2 Because at some point there will be
3 downturns, whether it be a recession that will
4 affect the manufacturers or the commercial
5 entities, the retail entities, you cannot just have
6 one without the other.

7 And so once again this forum is

8 important but please reconsider Grand Tri-State
9 Parkway. And certainly that south -- that ramp
10 that exits coming from the south on 294 and then
11 you have to jump over to the west.

12 Many residents of the park -- I
13 mean if that's from a marketing angle when we're
14 marketing that park that's the one objection we
15 always have to fight. And I can tell you if you
16 start having non-business traffic, especially
17 people from outside the area trying to use those
18 ramps it's going to create a nightmare and very
19 serious safety hazards.

20 As for the residents that don't
21 know about the 20 acres that Woodland purchased,
22 it's at the corner of -- if you're coming around
23 the bend to the stop sign where Cemetery Road and
24 Tri-State Parkway meet it's -- there was a little

150

1 house with a Coldwell Banker sign on it for a long
2 time. That property was purchased.

3 And for us that have children in
4 Woodland School, they are talking about having more
5 referendums to build more schools. So it's coming.
6 And in that case you really have to stop and think
7 about well thought out commercial developments in
8 your community and how are they going to benefit
9 you.

10 I sat on the blue ribbon committee.
11 I looked at the numbers, too, just like everybody
12 else. And I've dealt with a lot of developers from
13 all over the country. And these people have put
14 together a team that I am convinced are just top
15 notch and exceptional.

16 So weigh everything as you hear it.
17 And the traffic issues are something we all need to
18 work through, of course. But that's just my broad
19 based statement how I see everything on a larger
20 scale.

21 But to get to what I'm here to talk
22 about, please reconsider the Tri-State Parkway for
23 the reasons that I've expressed. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Could I ask you a

151

1 question?

2 MS. ALBRECHT: Yeah.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Right now it appears to
4 me and I think our staff has indicated to us that
5 actually a lot of people in that Grand Tri-State
6 Business Park that exists now use Cemetery Road to
7 access to Washington; is that correct?

8 MS. ALBRECHT: I don't know. I don't
9 know if that's true. I mean I know many come in
10 right off the Tri-State Parkway.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: It makes sense. I mean
12 if people are coming from Grayslake and come down
13 Washington, go over to Cemetery and then to Grand
14 Tri-State Parkway.

15 MS. ALBRECHT: Or they're coming up Hunt
16 Club Road and going over on Grand as well.

17 I don't know how I can answer that
18 because I don't have that information.

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I wouldn't do that.
20 But anyways, I think our staff has indicated that.

21 If that were true, doesn't it go
22 the other way, too? In other words, that the
23 business park is impacting that's basically a
24 residential road. And if that is true wouldn't

152

1 that make sense to provide an access to the
2 business park from Washington? I mean doesn't that
3 help the business park?

4 MS. ALBRECHT: An exit to the business
5 park from Washington?

6 What I'm talking about is you're
7 talking about Tri-State Parkway connecting with
8 Grand Avenue and running the traffic through the
9 Tri-State Parkway to Washington, correct?

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Right. But it helps
11 the business park, too, because now you can access
12 the business park directly through the Parkway.

13 MS. ALBRECHT: We have discussed that.
14 We've had numerous business park owners, we had
15 Prism in talking with them, talking about their
16 plans.

17 They really didn't have too many
18 objections with the actual land use, but they
19 wanted to know how Tri-State Parkway was going to
20 be impacted because of the employee and the truck
21 traffic.

22 And I'm here to tell you and
23 something that has not been addressed in
24 Mr. Grieve's report is that there are projections,

153

1 we've got new buildings going up, we've got a lot
2 of proposals out and we're filling them up. I
3 guess it's a good problem because we're bringing
4 companies in here.

5 Those cars are going to increase
6 dramatically on Tri-State Parkway. That's what I'm
7 trying to get across to you.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I understand that it
9 will increase. But that's got to increase some
10 place.

11 If you want this development in the
12 traffic has got to go some place. And I can tell
13 you if the Grand Tri-State Business Parkway isn't

14 put through it's going to go on Cemetery Road. And
15 Cemetery Road is not designed to handle that much
16 traffic.

17 MS. ALBRECHT: And Grand Tri-State
18 Business Park, the Grand Tri-State Business Park is
19 not designed to handle the flow of traffic that
20 would be brought in with a theme park and also
21 people that are not local residents.

22 You're bringing in people that are
23 from all over the area that are not familiar and
24 may have never driven that stretch of property

154

1 before. And that's not a major thoroughfare,
2 that's a winding serpentine road going through a
3 business park. It doesn't make sense.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you.

5 MR. CUMMINGS: Good evening. My name
6 is Edwin Cummings. I live at 7254 Presidential
7 Drive.

8 I heard a lot of interesting
9 testimony here this evening and I think that
10 basically what this eventually is going to come
11 down to is a benefit versus burden analysis on the
12 part of the Commission and ultimately the Village
13 Board. And some of the information we've heard
14 here tonight I think is real germane to those
15 issues.

16 Most noteworthy is the fiscal
17 impact information. Obviously if there is a
18 significant economic benefit to the community then
19 that might be something that the Village of Gurnee
20 would be interested in.

21 But interestingly we heard a lot of
22 testimony that was in a very carefully planned out
23 presentation, essentially what it comes down to
24 from an economic benefit standpoint is not that --

155

1 necessarily that the property tax amount because
2 the percentage that the Village gets from property
3 taxes as you all know is relatively very small.

4 That wasn't highlighted in the
5 presentation here tonight. They used a round
6 figure of approximately 8 million dollars and then
7 there was the issue about the actual assessed
8 valuation which was brought up by the
9 Commissioners.

10 But getting to the other issues
11 that they presented, the other three areas were the
12 sales tax, the hotel tax and the amusement tax.
13 And they came up with a formula which essentially
14 provided a net return to the Village coffers of
15 approximately 2.5 million dollars I believe.

16 However, I think that this

17 Commission is smart enough and has enough
18 experience and enough expertise to know to take a
19 hard look at these numbers and ask the hard
20 questions.

21 And we heard a lot of them here
22 tonight and I've got to congratulate you for that.
23 But I think that once you do that those numbers are
24 not really going to be as bright as they appear.

156

1 And from my perspective as a
2 resident of Gurnee given the other issues that
3 we've heard here tonight about the traffic
4 complications and the need for repair of roadways,
5 I just don't see how we have a benefit which
6 outweighs the burden to the taxpayers and the
7 citizens of Gurnee.

8 I mean this is really going to have
9 an adverse impact upon all the residents in this
10 area including what was brought up earlier by one
11 of the members of the public here about the
12 property values.

13 And these are issues that they have
14 been silent upon. An interesting question which
15 was raised by the Commission and again there was a
16 lot of speech given by the Petitioners, but I don't
17 know that we have a lot of real answers here this
18 evening, what is the impact actually on the

19 roadways within the Village.
20 And as you recall very early on in
21 the presentation this evening there was a
22 representation that I think 65 percent of the
23 traffic came into this area from Tollway usage.
24 However, when Mr. Krackauer was up here and the

157

1 issue was raised about what impact it would have on
2 the wear and tear of roadways and things like that
3 the story was a little bit different.

4 And I think that we're all smart
5 enough and know enough that there is going to be a
6 significant impact upon the Village streets. Maybe
7 some of these are even State highways which is
8 IDOT's problem or County roads or Township roads,
9 but ultimately that comes out of the taxpayers'
10 pockets. And that's through real estate taxes.

11 So maybe that's not necessarily a
12 Village issue but it's something that I think is
13 worth considering.

14 But overall given all the burdens
15 that we're looking at and the inconveniences and
16 the annoyances and the sentiment of the residents I
17 just don't see how the benefit would justify
18 allowing this to go forward. Thank you.

19 MR. SLINGHOFF: I'm Michael Slinghoff,

20 257 South Ridge Drive.
21 I just have a quick question. A
22 lot of studies have been going on and I'd like to
23 know if a study has been done on what impact the
24 Paradise Village up in Kenosha is going to have on

158

1 this.
2 I'm sure everybody is aware of
3 that, we're all educated. They're going to put up
4 a casino, two hotels, a golf course, the dog track
5 already exists there. Just wondering. It's only a
6 short fifteen minutes away.

7 Why do we need something this
8 close. It just doesn't seem to be making sense.
9 So that's all I have to say. Thank you.

10 MR. BOYOLAN: Jim Boylan, 16798 Orchard
11 Valley Drive.

12 I'd like you to reflect upon and
13 I'm sure you've done your homework, but be careful
14 about IDOT support. IDOT has wanted, for example,
15 to widen Route 22 all the way from Lake Zurich to
16 Highland Park for ten years. They've had it as a
17 priority in their budget for five years. They
18 still don't have a nickel.

19 And the concern is that we go, if
20 we don't do our homework, on the assumption that
21 IDOT will come through with some money for 21 or

22 other parts of the road system. It may be in their
23 plan but in fact we've got a facility, we've got
24 the traffic and no State money. That's the only

159

1 comment that I wanted to make.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

3 MR. FERRARO: My name is Anthony

4 Ferraro. I live at 522 Patriot Court here in

5 Gurnee. A couple of points.

6 Number one, I work in Rosemont.

7 And it's a wonderful police to work but I wouldn't

8 live there for a day. Regardless of what God

9 Stevens tries to tell you. When that convention

10 center or the Rosemont Horizon has an event it's

11 impossible to get around there.

12 Second thing, if there is a desire

13 to increase tax revenues, the commercial way to go

14 may be the only way to go. But I would prefer to

15 have my children working for a Fortune 1000 company

16 that's got an office here in Gurnee than being a

17 busboy at a hotel. No disrespect to busboys,

18 that's just the way I see it.

19 The other comment is, you know,

20 I -- there's some I have to water every other day.

21 I heard that we had to put in some sort of either a

22 tower or an accelerating system that increased the

23 water pressure. I don't know how all of a sudden
24 we don't have a water pressure problem in Gurnee

160

1 when we're going to have a water park installed.

2 I mean these are the kinds of
3 things I would like everybody to think about. A
4 lot of it is common sense. We want Gurnee to be
5 Gurnee. We want it to look pastoral. If there's
6 going to be some increase in the tax base then
7 let's have it be intelligent and not sensational.

8 I just came from Orlando this
9 weekend. Have you ever been to Orlando? It's a
10 nightmare. Are you going to turn this into
11 Orlando? So I would just ask you to consider that.
12 Thank you.

13 MR. SHARON: My name is John Sharon. I
14 live at 652 Lexington Square West.

15 I would just ask the Board to
16 consider the human factor really because we keep
17 talking about the financial end of things here.
18 Our taxes are so low and frankly the city has done
19 a good job of keeping our taxes very low.

20 You've done such a good job of
21 keeping our taxes low that we don't need them much
22 lower. How much lower can they go?

23 So if they put in this big
24 development and they make X number of millions of

1 dollars of tax revenues available to the Village,
2 what it's going to do to my taxes, is it going to
3 take my \$200 tax and make it 175?

4 For 25 bucks what do I get? I
5 guarantee I'll lose more than \$25 in my home value
6 because even if I don't live right next to it it
7 impacts all of us. So the human value, the human
8 factor is so much more important here than the
9 financial factor. Thank you.

10 MS. KLEIN: Diane Klein, 6114

11 Honeysuckle.

12 Just to state really a concern. I
13 don't know where the change of moving everything
14 off or the desire to move off of Grand and not to
15 Washington, Grand is a commercial Road, Washington
16 at this point isn't.

17 It might be in your plan later on,
18 but it's not to the same degree that Grand is.
19 Also, if you open up the Tri-State Parkway to
20 Washington, is that going to be another red light?

21 And if they have -- if the park
22 goes in will we have the red light right after the
23 viaduct, a red light at the Tri-State, and a red
24 light at Cemetery or are we at South Ridge going to

1 lose our red light? We'd never get out of the
2 subway. That's it.

3 MR. LOWE: Hi. My name is Kevin Lowe.
4 I live at 271 Big Terra Lane and I just want to say
5 I concur with all the citizens that have come forth
6 with the issues so far.

7 But what I do want to just touch on
8 the business issue. And that is I don't see the
9 business justification. To touch on what Mr.
10 Foster asked, and I'll just ask this specific item,
11 specifically he asked about the hotel overnight
12 stays.

13 And my understanding is the general
14 manager at Six Flags got up here and said he did
15 not have that data. And I'm hearing part of the
16 justification for the hotel complex, for the
17 destination hotel as it's being branded, is to
18 provide for overnight stays for people to visit the
19 two facilities on different days. Yet there's no
20 data. I don't know how you can make a go/no go
21 decision on a hotel without that data.

22 Secondly, if it is a high end motel
23 I don't know who the target audience is or which
24 segment these guys are trying to position for, i.e.

1 are these the conventioners or are these people

2 that would otherwise be staying in the Holiday Inn
3 or the Hampton Inn.

4 And if so, if the latter, is that
5 not going to cannibalize the existing peripheral
6 hotel business we have now? So that's my point,
7 just the justification.

8 MR. WASSER: Hi. I'm Jim Wasser, 4850
9 Kingsway West. I'm at a disadvantage because I
10 wrote a lot of these notes about three and a half
11 hours ago or three hours ago so bear with me.

12 We talked about how the people that
13 are going to the park are going to get around. How
14 am I going to get around being a resident of
15 Gurnee?

16 Going down Washington, I left 120
17 and O'Plaine Road two weeks ago, it took me 20
18 minutes to get to the mall. That's not with
19 another 5,000 cars on the road.

20 I must have heard ten times they
21 will be addressed later. It's already 10:30. How
22 late are we going to stay to hear when those --
23 when those issues are going to be addressed?

24 So far Gurnee grows at a rate of

164

1 around 12 percent per year. Well, Abbott grows at
2 12 percent per year, so does Baxter, so does my
3 company. How much more do we want to go? Twenty

4 percent? Thirty percent? I think 12 is enough for
5 a 100 billion dollar company. I think it's enough
6 for the Village of Gurnee.

7 And to go on the comment of
8 Orlando, Orlando is a very heavily congested area
9 but that park built its own exit ramps and they
10 built their own entrance ramps and they paid for it
11 and they also planned a lot better than what I've
12 heard.

13 Walt Disney bought the land, then
14 he planned the villages around it. There's a big
15 difference here.

16 And we should be working as the
17 residents, as you the Planning Commissioners and
18 the Village Trustees to make Gurnee known for its
19 school district, not for its entertainment district
20 or its shopping district. Thanks.

21 MR. LAKE: Fred Lake, 6104 Indian
22 Trail. I'll try not to rehash anything that's
23 already been said.

24 But maybe in closing tonight we'd

165

1 like to remind everybody that there was a
2 tremendous amount of time and effort and money put
3 into the Village Comprehensive Plan. That plan
4 called for an industrial park on that property.

5 And if that is built out, as was
6 mentioned by the young lady a little earlier, we'll
7 have a lot of high paying professional and
8 industrial jobs there that will bring in the same
9 tax base that will generate a lot less traffic.

10 A question that occurred to me, and
11 it may have been answered, but it directly has to
12 do with the roads. There's been discussion about
13 the new interchange off of Washington and the fact
14 it had to be south of Washington because otherwise
15 it would be too close to the Grand Avenue
16 interchange.

17 I'm wondering if it was discussed,
18 and if it was I apologize, if they ever put through
19 the Route 53 extension and it goes down to 120 and
20 there's obviously an interchange at 294 and 120 is
21 that going to be too close to the Washington Street
22 interchange? And I don't know how that would
23 affect that.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We discussed that.

166

1 That is not --

2 MR. LAKE: I apologize. The only other
3 thing that I might mention is they mentioned about
4 these jobs that would be created.

5 Most of the jobs at Six Flags are
6 six bucks an hour. We need this low income housing

7 for the six dollar an hour guys that are there.
8 They're doing so well that I noticed in the paper a
9 couple weeks ago that they're just laying off like
10 20 percent of their full-time staff at Six Flags.
11 Maybe things aren't so good. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

13 MR. SAUNDERS: John Saunders, 238
14 Hillendale Court. I guess if I judged the
15 sentiment of most of the residents here it seems to
16 be that they are challenging the impact of this
17 development on the quality of life.

18 And the thought that occurred to me
19 was as the planning board there is no obligation to
20 go forward with this. And I think one of the
21 things that should be considered, all other
22 arguments aside for fiscal or whatever, is the
23 sentiment of the residents.

24 I mean you are our representatives

167

1 to the Village of Gurnee to fulfill this function.
2 And we appreciate the work that you put in. It's a
3 lot of work. You go to a lot of these meetings, a
4 lot more than I do.

5 But to represent the residents, if
6 the residents don't want it and since the use is
7 not already approved, I mean I understand if the

8 planning use is already approved then if a
9 commercial development comes in with a use that
10 meets that approved -- a plan that meets that
11 approved use you are under an obligation. But at
12 this point you're not.

13 And if the residents don't want it
14 the residents can say no. And I feel that's what
15 most of the residents are saying at this point.

16 Thank you.

17 MS. SABORA: Hi. My name is Gail
18 Sabora. I live at 6216 Sleepy Hollow. And I did
19 come to this meeting with many issues which just
20 basically have all been addressed.

21 Mostly my property taxes, my water
22 pressure, who is going to pay for the roads. I
23 found it very amusing to find that these were all
24 just assumptions on who was going to pay for the

168

1 road work.

2 I did highly agree with that
3 comment about, you know, in Orlando that the people
4 bought the land and then they -- then they did
5 their building on it. I feel that, you know, if
6 you want to do this then -- you know, if the
7 Petitioner wants to do this here then they need to
8 find a way to get the roadways to work.

9 I don't -- you know, I bought my

10 house, I knew what I was getting into before I
11 bought my house. I feel that the people in that
12 industry that the Petitioners are in would also
13 have that knowledge to look into this before, you
14 know, they buy this land and then they come up with
15 what they want to do.

16 My other basic issue, though, is
17 that with all this that is predicted, all this
18 traffic and all these roadways and everything that
19 it's going to do I don't even know how I can get to
20 the post office on Saturday. And that's a big
21 issue with me.

22 I moved to Gurnee because I wanted
23 to move to Gurnee. I didn't want to move to
24 Schaumburg. And I feel like we're turning into a

169

1 little Schaumburg. Thank you.

2 MR. BREISBLAT: I'm Rod Breisblatt. I
3 live at 15575 West Washington.

4 I am not a Village resident. You
5 know, I'm probably the one person here that's
6 closest to this development. Our little island of
7 property which is bordered by the Tollway,
8 Washington Street and 21 is not -- part of that is
9 not in the Village.

10 So my comments might be a little

11 callous and they might seem a little personal. But
12 I agree with some of the things that the residents
13 have been saying.

14 First of all, I'd like to thank the
15 Commissioners for doing this job because for the
16 life of me I don't understand why you do it.

17 Last month Commissioner Kovarik
18 finally brought to light or the question about
19 what's going to happen to that property where the
20 Tollway interchange is going to be or the proposed
21 Tollway interchange is going to be.

22 And it was quickly told to me by
23 Mr. Francke that it could be just quick take and
24 we'll deal with it later. And I dealt -- I talked

170

1 to Mr. Rogers later and he said well, it's not
2 their desire to do it, it's the Village.

3 So I wish somebody would talk to me
4 and tell me what's going to happen. Because of the
5 five homes on the east side of the Tollway that
6 could be affected by this, I own two of them. My
7 parents own the third one. I don't know what to do
8 with them.

9 My wife wants to know if we can
10 paint the bedroom. I'd like to know that. I had
11 one house that is possibly a rental house that
12 needs some construction to it, but I'm not going to

13 put the money into it if next week you're telling
14 me it's not worth anything and they just bulldoze
15 it. I would like somebody to tell me what's going
16 to happen with the Tollway interchange.

17 Either tonight you tell me or I
18 would appreciate someone personally telling me
19 either from the Village, Prism or Six Flags. Thank
20 you.

21 MR. PAPIERNAK: My name is James
22 Papiernak, 6072 Indian Trail Road.

23 Obviously this can't be done
24 without an interchange, the Tollway. So if the

171

1 members of the Village don't want it.

2 If the theme restaurants currently
3 in Gurnee Mills are at capacity -- are not at
4 capacity in a blooming economy how do they expect
5 to pack them into the new ones and still turn a
6 profit.

7 How do you fill an expensive room
8 hotel with a clientele from a water park all 20
9 miles away from the airport.

10 Again, what's going to happen to
11 the property values of my home? If the economy
12 downturns how is this -- how is this project going
13 to suffer and will our taxes rise and will we

14 suffer from that?

15 And finally, I'm concerned that we
16 don't have a little cooperation from Great America
17 that we had from -- I was here a couple weeks ago
18 when we had that gentleman present that property
19 off of Washington and he seemed to adjust his plan
20 immediately with the concerns and work together
21 with the community.

22 And the community that was
23 bordering their plan was very receptive then
24 because they were working very well with us. I am

172

1 concerned that we don't see this level of
2 cooperation with this plan and I'm wondering if
3 this is going to continue in the future. That's
4 it. Thanks.

5 MS. PAPIERNAK: Rachel Papiernak, 6072
6 Indian Trail Road. I also share the concern of the
7 keep the traffic off of Grand or don't make it any
8 worse than it is.

9 And people made comments of well,
10 Washington is residentially orientated. No, it's
11 not orientated, it is residential. So that's a
12 fact.

13 The other thing is these road
14 changes, this to me is like throwing up a deck of
15 cards and seeing where they land because nobody is

16 taking ownership for any of this because it's all a
17 bunch of like things flying around in the air.

18 We can't assume anybody is going to
19 pay for it, it's not going to be done, and we've
20 all seen how long it takes to plan a road change,
21 actually engineer the road change and implement the
22 road change.

23 So is that going to be done before
24 they implement that park? How do I get around?

173

1 My last thing is what about the
2 homes in our subdivision of South Ridge. Towards
3 the west end of it there are a lot of homes that
4 back up pretty close to Washington. What about
5 those houses? Are we going to condemn those and
6 just bulldoze the street through those?

7 As far as financial things, the
8 impact of my home. What if I'm ready to sell my
9 home and I say to someone well, you know, the water
10 park is over there, just -- you know, just don't
11 leave your house on Saturday until like seven at
12 night.

13 And then I think that the Village
14 seems to be putting all of their eggs into one
15 familiar basket here. We've got a lot of
16 entertainment orientated stuff already that if we

17 keep doing this it's all in the same direction and
18 if there is a change in economy or market share
19 that we have a major downturn in a lot of our
20 Village instead of just a few areas here and there.

21 And I also share the question of
22 what about the theme restaurants that already exist
23 up at Gurnee Mills, what's the impact on them?
24 Thank you.

174

1 MR. RASPIN: Tom Raspin. I'll try and
2 keep this brief, I know it's rather late.

3 One of the key marketing tools and
4 I think you have to remember is word of mouth. Do
5 we want to hear a conversation in a water cooler in
6 the year 2005 that says I want to live in Gurnee
7 because of good schooling, good professional jobs?
8 Or do we all want to say I don't want to be in
9 Gurnee, I have the theme park to deal with, we have
10 an additional 500,000 people coming in to go to
11 that park. That doesn't sound like a very good
12 place to live.

13 Word of mouth is a very powerful
14 tool of advertising. It's something to think
15 about.

16 The other side as far as the
17 traffic since that's a major concern tonight, what
18 kind of value do we put on anybody's life that if

19 we have a problem in this weaving or additional
20 traffic. I didn't see any numbers on that.

21 That's going to be a tough thing to
22 answer for. That's all.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do we have anyone
24 else? If we're doing second rounds here, is this

175

1 new stuff now?

2 MS. COURSHON: Yes, it is.

3 What I'd like to interject is also
4 at the last meeting the Chamber of Commerce was
5 represented talking about the destination location
6 and what a great idea it is to have this here.

7 They can have the great idea in
8 Waukegan. Based on what was presented as testimony
9 this evening the plan of attack is to get this
10 employee housing that this Village has nixed on two
11 separate occasions under construction first.

12 Then the water park and then the
13 stuff that was really addressed in the RFP and then
14 the entertainment village.

15 I would suggest there are plenty of
16 opportunities to put apartments or employee housing
17 in Waukegan. There is public transportation
18 readily accessible and they don't have to haul them
19 all the way to Carthage College.

20 But if that is the only pig in a
21 poke that we have to purchase so that they get
22 employee housing, they can move it on down the road
23 as far as I personally am concerned.

24 I would like to suggest that as we

176

1 have talked about all of these concepts and we have
2 talked about trying to make the entertainment
3 village and the hotels and the water park more
4 desirable, more palatable, work with staff to make
5 it architecturally pleasing, work with the road
6 commissioner to make the traffic something that
7 won't make people want to blow their brains out
8 every morning, as those things happen and we become
9 more attractive it's reminiscent to me of a childhood
10 prank where you take some dog poo and you put it in
11 a brown bag and then you put it on somebody's
12 front porch and you light it on fire.

13 And I would like to suggest to the
14 Commissioners that it doesn't matter whether it's
15 in this bag or it's in this bag, the contents of
16 the presentation remains the same.

17 MR. DOLLMAN: Good evening. My name is
18 Jim Dollman. I live at 6148 Indian Trail Road.

19 I'd like to actually see what are
20 the sites that we talked about this 8 million
21 dollars in taxes at maximum capacity. I know that

22 it's been discussed already but I don't see where
23 that maximum capacity that we talked about is.
24 It could be a partial development

177

1 completed. I would rather see a real true
2 comparison based against the -- to compare it with
3 the commercial park that the lady who was here
4 earlier. Take a look at a tax base that's
5 definitely guaranteed year after year after year
6 based on that corporation being there versus a
7 retail water park.

8 And I also wanted to see how a
9 water -- you know, on Washington Avenue and the
10 south side of Washington there's some nice pieces
11 of property there that I always envisioned some
12 beautiful two, three, four, five hundred thousand
13 dollars homes going into. I don't think they'd
14 want to look at a water slide. Thank you.

15 MR. FRANZ: Jim Franz, 722 Shepherd
16 Road. I guess I have a little bit different take
17 on things.

18 First of all, as a homeowner, a
19 property owner some of my concerns are more about
20 some of the things people are saying. They just
21 mentioned that a new school might go in near the
22 Tri-State, there's already talk about the high

23 school being pretty full.

24 I came to this area when there was

178

1 only a small high school, there was Gurnee grade
2 school, there was a small Viking School, a small
3 Spaulding School. The schools have continued to
4 increase.

5 Originally I came from a community
6 that didn't pay any attention to commercial
7 development, they allowed continued residential
8 development and the community is very strapped
9 right now. Their school system has gone down as a
10 result of that because they do not have the base of
11 businesses that actually generate revenue to help
12 support those kind of businesses.

13 And some of the other things that
14 people have addressed, I guess the one thing about
15 home values, you know, I guess one question I would
16 have is I guess if there's a real question of home
17 values, there's like million dollar homes going up
18 near Gurnee Mills and they continue to be built.

19 I'm not sure if it's going to -- a
20 development like this -- dramatically decrease just
21 because of that. I attended a lot of these
22 meetings throughout the last year or so. A lot of
23 people talked about quality of life. I happen to
24 live, work, go to church in Gurnee here. I like

1 doing things in Gurnee.

2 I've actually enjoyed the
3 development that has gone on and I'm thankful for
4 the community that they've planned it the way it
5 has been. I don't have to commute to Rosemont. I
6 do things here. And the fact is I don't like
7 having to go to Rosemont and other places for any
8 other kinds of entertainment. I don't like driving
9 to the city.

10 Talk about my impact, I don't like
11 having to drive just to go to a nicer restaurant
12 all the way to Chicago and face the traffic going
13 into Chicago.

14 Also, as far as traffic goes, I
15 have more problems trying to go some place in the
16 morning at 7:30, 8:30 in the morning because of all
17 the people who are commuting to communities outside
18 the Gurnee area who live in this area and commute
19 out. And also the same thing in the evening when
20 they're all heading back in.

21 And I enjoy things that are in this
22 community that benefit people like me who do own a
23 place and hopefully I don't have to have real high
24 taxes as things go on -- as things start collapsing

1 as all these developments go up and a lot of people
2 who are probably in those developments will only
3 be here two or three years before they get
4 relocated.

5 And I'm a long-term person in this
6 community. So I encourage the Commission again to
7 obviously look at things in a proper way to make
8 sure it's done, value, look at all angles.

9 There's some things obviously that
10 have to be looked at but also consider that there
11 are more residents than just, you know, one
12 subdivision in the community that, you know,
13 garnered support to come in also. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. It looks like
15 that's about it so the floor is closed to the
16 public. And I think --

17 MR. SULA: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest
18 just a five or ten minute break?

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: A break. Okay. Let's
20 take about a five minute break. Only five minutes.

21 (Recess taken.)

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Meeting will come to
23 order. I would just like to put on the record that
24 Mr. Smith has left. It's his 31st anniversary

1 tonight so he had to go home at least for desert.

2 So I apologize for that, but I think it's
3 understandable. Just to show you the dedication
4 the man has, we did note it was his anniversary.
5 That's how important he felt this was.

6 The way I'd like to handle this is
7 instead of just going to each specific question and
8 concern that's been addressed, typically the way
9 it's really supposed to work is those questions
10 are, as you did, presented to the Plan Commission
11 and the Commissioners take those under advisement
12 and address the Petitioner if they feel they're
13 important points.

14 And I believe most of the points
15 that were made are important points. But because
16 of the late time I think most of you would like to
17 know basically what the concerns of the Plan
18 Commissioners are and what their position is at
19 least at this point in time.

20 I would like to answer the one
21 question, though, on the man about the -- that
22 asked about whether he should paint the bedroom or
23 not. My answer to him is I would go ahead and
24 paint that bedroom because by the time those ramps

182

1 are in it's going to be due for another repaint.

2 MR. BREISBLATT: I didn't want to hear
3 that.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Sneaky way of getting
5 out of the job.

6 So with that in mind then I'll open
7 it up to the Commissioners. And if they -- I would
8 really like them to address what their concerns are
9 considering the input from the residents and if
10 they can what their position is, what they'd like
11 to see the Petitioner address because I don't think
12 we're going to be in a position to vote on this
13 tonight.

14 But I think the Petitioner needs to
15 know where they stand and what they need to work on
16 when they come back for the next meeting. Mr.
17 Winter.

18 MR. WINTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 I would like to make some remarks
20 and say that I know it's been alluded to that we
21 have spent a lot of time. I was just talking to
22 Mr. Foster and I think we spent maybe close to 40
23 hours in the last calendar year in meetings of this
24 Commission and through other processes looking at

183

1 this.

2 It's hard to absorb all this
3 information and I know it's very hard for the
4 public that doesn't have access to all this

5 information.

6 A couple things, though, that are
7 very important to me and I think I'd like to let
8 everyone know about is that I really think that
9 we're looking here at whether this particular
10 property should remain industrial or whether we
11 should consider this expansion of -- and really
12 these are -- this is my characterization of this
13 and you may not agree with it, but that this is an
14 expansion of an already existing entertainment
15 complex.

16 And in large measure this may have
17 predated a lot of the residents in the area. I
18 think that is significant because this literally is
19 right across the way from the right-of-way of the
20 Tollway. And so knowing that Great America is
21 there and knowing that this property is now being
22 proposed for use by Great America, that's very
23 important to me.

24 And I think of that as a resident

184

1 as if I had lived in South Ridge or one of those
2 other residential areas there and I think that's --
3 that has a great impact on me. I would say that I
4 would feel differently if Great America hadn't been
5 there.

6 Another area that I would like to

7 comment on is I think that the public made many
8 very accurate observations regarding the assessment
9 that we received today. I think it's just an
10 approximation and I think that perhaps the author
11 of this wanted to present a -- you know, maybe
12 not -- he didn't want to overstate it but certainly
13 wanted to show the full impact that this could
14 possibly have on the community.

15 I think, though, and it was also
16 mentioned but not as in great a detail is that when
17 you do compare industrial with the proposed uses
18 here that generally you can make a good argument
19 that the amusement park with the other taxation
20 avenues that are there could mean a better benefit
21 to the community.

22 Certainly better than housing, but
23 that's not really in the picture. But even in
24 comparison to industrial. And I think that's

185

1 important.

2 I certainly agree with many of the
3 residents that -- in fact, there was a disclaimer
4 to the report that you didn't get to read but I got
5 to read. And it says in there, you know, no
6 responsibility is assumed for the accuracy of the
7 information. So this isn't written in stone.

8 I suppose it's even possible that
9 it could be better than what's projected, but I
10 certainly don't accept these figures. I know these
11 are an approximation and there's a lot of
12 assumptions made.

13 Having made those observations
14 about this property, and maybe you've guessed it
15 from my line of questioning, my concern is the
16 traffic.

17 And again we had the Metro traffic
18 study. And I think what's really important is in
19 that study it did give some projections of what the
20 traffic would be if this were built out to be
21 industrial.

22 And there hasn't been much
23 discussion about that, but some of those numbers
24 can range up to 4,000 cars during these peak

186

1 periods. And even some more conservative estimates
2 show it at 21 to 24 hundred vehicles at peak hours.

3 That was important for me because I
4 wanted to compare that to some of the estimates
5 with the theme park, the hotels and what they're
6 presenting here. And it actually compares pretty
7 good because some of these numbers here -- well,
8 the range depending on how much they build this out
9 can range anywhere from 28 to 36 hundred. And

10 those are really at the maximums with the study.
11 And they've made some concessions in some of the
12 revised plans regarding the outlot.

13 So I think that what I would like
14 to focus on is the traffic concerns. I think that
15 we will have a traffic problem regardless of
16 whether it remains industrial or whether it becomes
17 an expansion of the entertainment complex as I have
18 described it.

19 And I would just like to say and to
20 tell the Petitioner that on Pages 48 and 49 of the
21 Metro study plan it gives the 1998 buildout
22 proposal. I think all of those improvements would
23 have to be a pre-condition in my mind for improving
24 or accepting the proposal or the concept of the

187

1 proposal.

2 And as the two pages suggest,
3 there's just enumerated many things here. In
4 addition to that, I would refer to Mr. Grieve's
5 report. And that being Page 4 that talks about the
6 Tri-State Parkway, specific recommendations that
7 were not included in the Metro report but they're
8 listed on Page 4 primarily in Mr. Grieve's report.

9 In addition, I think additional
10 provisions would have to be made regarding the 21

11 and 120 intersection. I asked many questions of
12 the Petitioner regarding that and I think certainly
13 by the time of the next meeting something could be
14 drafted that would spell that out.

15 I would also make this other
16 observation, the public has made it numerous times,
17 about the cost of these improvements. Whatever the
18 values are as far as the assessment, the report we
19 received tonight, certainly the roads are not
20 factored in.

21 And that would be perhaps not
22 important at this stage but something that I'd want
23 to have in the public record for the full board to
24 know that, you know, obviously if these roads are

188

1 going to become the responsibility of the residents
2 in any form that that would be a concern.

3 And that even if we considered some
4 of these numbers optimistic in terms of the plan it
5 would even be far worse if we don't have the true
6 costs of what this development is going to be.

7 So really those are the major
8 issues. There are so many other issues but those
9 were the issues that immediately drew my attention
10 to this proposal.

11 And I think the fact that Great
12 America has been a very important aspect of this

13 community all throughout its growth and I think the
14 fact that they've done a good job and if they can
15 expand this and give us better roads and really
16 just building out the proposal that they have would
17 in fact give us better roads that would be a
18 benefit and that's something that we otherwise
19 would not be able to have in the community.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you.
21 Anyone else? Mr. Sula. I saw Mr. Sula's hand
22 first. Sorry.

23 MR. SULA: Just a couple other comments
24 to add here.

189

1 One of the keys to a successful
2 community is to have a good blend of commercial,
3 retail and residential. Those communities that
4 have the strongest schools are the ones that have a
5 good blend of ability to draw tax dollars from
6 non-residential areas which does go hand in hand
7 with higher home values ultimately as the school
8 systems improve and the homes don't have to bear a
9 disproportionate brunt of the tax burden.

10 I believe that this particular
11 proposal does have a higher use in that it does
12 bring the retail aspect to it which brings sales
13 tax dollars that wouldn't otherwise be there in a

14 pure industrial setting.
15 Traffic is a concern. And I agree
16 totally with what Brian said. We have issues now.
17 In the grand scheme of things if we take a step
18 back and try to put this in perspective we're
19 probably talking adding five percent to the outside
20 visitors that already come to town because of
21 Gurnee Mills and the existing Great America
22 complex.
23 Some might say five percent is a
24 big number, some might say it's a small number.

190

1 I'll say that it's significant and we have to make
2 sure that we do get the traffic issues right. I
3 have driven through various communities on
4 Saturdays. And right now we don't have a
5 Naperville or a Schaumburg or an Orland Park or a
6 Vernon Hills. And I'd hate to see us turn into
7 something that does get gridlocked like some of
8 those other communities are right now.

9 We do have the benefit of the
10 Tollway being so close to allow easy access for
11 people to get in and out without disrupting the
12 vast majority of the community. And we have to
13 make sure we come up with the appropriate traffic
14 plans to continue that trend. That's all I had.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Cepon.

16 MR. CEPON: I have a little background
17 for some of these people.
18 But for the residents if you look
19 back at the history of this property we're talking
20 about I think back in whenever Marriott owned Six
21 Flags or started Six Flags back in the seventies
22 they owned this property. I mean they owned this
23 property so it was basically their property back 25
24 years ago or whatever and for whatever reason they

191

1 sold it.
2 And then I believe it was turned
3 into an industrial zoning at that time. I don't
4 know what the original zoning was, but at one time
5 Marriott did own the property so I would assume by
6 that that they were thinking about expanding on
7 that side of the Tollway eventually, you know, at a
8 future date. So just keep that in mind when you're
9 concerned about the change in zoning.
10 The other concern I have is the
11 traffic also that I think definitely that
12 Washington Street has to have the five lanes done
13 before we even consider anything of this magnitude.
14 And Hunt Club which is in the
15 offering I guess in the next couple of years is
16 also supposed to be expanded but it would be really

17 nice if we could have that Tollway interchange.

18 Then I think everybody would feel a whole lot

19 better.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you. Ms.

21 Kovarik.

22 MS. KOVARIK: I think I had the most

23 time to go through this so I'm probably going to

24 have the most questions.

192

1 First I would like Six Flags to

2 comment on if the retail aspect of the development

3 and the water park are equal in acreage size. Do

4 you believe that the retail aspect in the hotel is

5 critical to the viability of the water park? Is

6 that why the development is together?

7 MR. FOERSTER: Do you want an answer now

8 or --

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You can go ahead and

10 answer, sure.

11 MS. KOVARIK: I have mostly questions

12 and then a few comments.

13 MR. FOERSTER: The answer is the hotel

14 capacity is critical for the water park because it

15 is a multi-visit product as we've talked about.

16 It is not something that you will

17 come to the water park, spend three hours, go to

18 the theme park for four or five hours. It is an

19 independent day visit. That's been the historical
20 pattern at the parks that we have that have them
21 and that is our objective.

22 To do that we do not have hotel
23 capacity. A reference I made was to the Village
24 study that they commissioned by ARA in '96 that

193

1 evaluated this whole -- really started I guess this
2 process in many ways. And it looked at the number
3 of hotel rooms, the percentage of occupancy.

4 We now know again by mother-in-law
5 type research meaning stuff you hear on the street
6 from people's opinions, but we know that the
7 Convention and Visitors Bureau and we get a lot of
8 inquiries of people that want to come visit that
9 they can find no motel space within 20, 30 miles of
10 us.

11 So if we want to build this
12 facility we believe to meet hotel capacity locally,
13 the only way we can make sure that happens is if we
14 build it. Disney makes a huge impact with the
15 hotels that they have. We're not trying to do
16 that, but we think that a good high quality hotel
17 product as we propose with the conference
18 facilities to provide the year around use that
19 we've talked about is a big plus.

20 MS. KOVARIK: All right. I traveled to
21 St. Louis to observe the Hurricane Harbor that's
22 being built at the Six Flags there in St. Louis.
23 Can you compare what you're doing
24 here to what they're doing because they do not have

194

1 hotels or retail or anything, it's just strictly a
2 water park.
3 MR. FOERSTER: The park they're putting
4 in in St. Louis -- by the way, there's a Ramada
5 right at the park that the park owns, by the way.
6 The park size, that water park is
7 one-half of the size of this property. And they
8 are also right now because they're downsizing it
9 because they don't have the population base and
10 they don't have the infrastructure meaning hotels
11 or roadways, et cetera, they're also very likely
12 not going to charge for that water park, it's going
13 to actually become an additional segment of their
14 existing theme park and you will pay one price to
15 go into the theme park and you can walk from the
16 theme park to the water park.

17 MS. KOVARIK: That's what I gathered.

18 MR. FOERSTER: Our size and our volume,
19 our attendance here is typically more than double
20 what their annual attendance is. So we're really
21 dealing with a different scale.

22 MS. KOVARIK: They were very nice and
23 very helpful, but they didn't know very much about
24 your project.

195

1 MR. FOERSTER: Well, theirs is much
2 farther along.

3 MS. KOVARIK: Yes, it is. Okay.

4 My next question is then on the
5 conservation areas, and there's a good amount of
6 acreage being dedicated conservational which I
7 thought was very attractive to put aside that much;
8 but then when I'm reading the development standards
9 you talk a lot about the Corps, Army Corps of
10 Engineers.

11 Is that land not buildable? Is
12 there wetlands that you can't do anything with it
13 so you really have no choice?

14 MR. FOERSTER: It's a conservancy area
15 that cannot be built on, that's correct.

16 MS. KOVARIK: So moving some of these
17 buildings is kind of out of the question then.

18 You talk about the destination
19 hotel and they had 500 rooms and 65,000 square feet
20 of meeting space.

21 Was that the last meeting we had
22 with Mr. deFlan.

23 MR. DeFLAN: 130.

24 MS. KOVARIK: Well, that kind of leads

196

1 into my next question because in the development
2 standards you kept talking about 130,000 square
3 feet but the rendering we had from September 14th
4 was 65,000 square feet.

5 MR. ROGERS: It's on two levels.

6 MS. KOVARIK: I wasn't sure if this was
7 a whole another building that had gotten added.

8 MR. ROGERS: It's two levels.

9 MS. KOVARIK: So the convention center
10 is actually within the hotel destination and it is
11 within Lot 4.

12 But within the development
13 standards on Lot 4 you ask for conceptual but then
14 you want preliminary on the destination hotel and
15 they're within the same lot.

16 I wasn't sure how you were going to
17 get conceptual and preliminary without subdividing
18 the lot.

19 MR. FRANCKE: I think that I'd have to
20 go back and look at that. I didn't think there was
21 an inconsistency there in the sense that from a
22 planned unit development perspective we're looking
23 for a preliminary approval for the hotel but Lot 4
24 is a lot more than just a regional hotel and

1 conference center.

2 MS. KOVARIK: Right, the village center
3 is the 23 acres.

4 MR. FRANCKE: And we're only looking for
5 conceptual approval for that.

6 MS. KOVARIK: Right. But then --

7 MR. FRANCKE: Within that we're looking
8 for approval of a special use for the regional
9 hotel and conference center.

10 Again, we're proposing to make
11 hotels special uses on this property. Right now
12 they're permitted uses. So we're proposing so that
13 you have greater control over that because it was
14 an issue you expressed that hotels become special
15 uses on this property.

16 However, we're asking for special
17 use approval today for that regional hotel and
18 conference center.

19 MS. KOVARIK: So are you not asking for
20 preliminary plat approval for the hotel?

21 MR. FRANCKE: I think for that, yes.

22 When you say plat are you saying
23 plat of subdivision or PUD plat? Because I don't
24 know that it needs to be at this point -- we're not

1 at that stage, point where it needs to be on its
2 own lot of record if that's what you're suggesting.

3 But I think that it is -- we have
4 provided, that's one of the elements, for example,
5 that we have in response to one of the questions
6 that one of the members of the public raised,
7 that's one where we have presented some preliminary
8 plans I mean much farther along in terms of
9 renderings and layouts and floor plans that go way
10 beyond just conceptual.

11 MS. KOVARIK: All right. On the first
12 page you do say you want conceptual planned unit
13 development approval for the village center.

14 MR. FRANCKE: Correct.

15 MS. KOVARIK: And then on Page 15 you
16 say you want preliminary planned unit development
17 approval for one hotel that is to be a regional
18 hotel and convention center.

19 Are those not on the same lot?

20 MR. FRANCKE: They are.

21 MS. KOVARIK: Can we do that, do
22 conceptual and preliminary on the same lot? All
23 right.

24 The village center, again going

1 back now taking off the convention center part,

2 you've got 175,000 gross square feet of retail and
3 125,000 square feet of restaurant. Is that still
4 correct, those lot sizes?

5 MR. FRANCKE: Yes.

6 MS. KOVARIK: The restaurants, you're
7 talking about three themed restaurants being more
8 for the hotel and the extended travelers.

9 And your retail space, all the
10 retail uses that you're asking for all appear other
11 than gift shops all accessory uses to the hotel or
12 support for the hotel.

13 Where are the retail uses coming in
14 that we have talked about that this would be
15 something the whole community would be coming to
16 visit, stay. You know, not just extended
17 visitors.

18 MR. FRANCKE: This is one of the areas
19 I'm sort of glad you asked that question because
20 another comment that came from the public that I
21 can understand why the public would perhaps
22 perceive this.

23 But there was a question made by
24 one resident about how there hasn't been

200

1 responsiveness on our part in terms of adapting our
2 plans to the desires of the Village or as expressed
3 by the Plan Commission to date.

4 Obviously as someone who has been
5 involved in it over the six months or whatever that
6 was referred to before and having gone through
7 numerous drafts and re-drafts of those development
8 standards that you have seen but obviously a lot of
9 members of the public haven't seen, you know that
10 in fact we have been significantly responsive to
11 the concerns that have been expressed by all of you
12 and by your staff.

13 One of those responses has been to
14 eliminate from our list of uses those types of
15 uses. So when you say where are they now we have
16 eliminated them because you've asked us to do that.

17 MS. KOVARIK: So these renderings of
18 these people coming from all walks of life shopping
19 and sitting and drinking coffee and --

20 MR. FRANCKE: Right, they're gone.

21 MS. KOVARIK: Okay.

22 MR. FRANCKE: They are not -- they're
23 not -- well, they're not totally gone but they are
24 not referred to. They are not --

201

1 MS. KOVARIK: They're not on your list
2 of retail uses.

3 MR. FRANCKE: Right. And they're not
4 referred to, that's not referred to anywhere as an

5 exhibit to any of the PUD ordinance or standards or
6 anything.

7 MS. KOVARIK: All right. So the
8 village center will really just be comprised of the
9 theme restaurants for the people coming from out of
10 town, retail gift shops and then retail uses that
11 support the three hotels. It's not --

12 MR. FRANCKE: I mean I'd have to go back
13 and look at the list. I mean there's -- our goal,
14 I'd have to go look back and look at this extensive
15 list of the uses that we've put in there.

16 But our goal was to make all of
17 those uses as you indicated before ancillary and
18 accessory, somehow tied to the other principal uses
19 within the development.

20 And again the whole concept of the
21 village because of the concerns you all expressed
22 of being able to get our arms around it today based
23 upon what we were saying, we've pulled that all
24 back to just conceptual approval so we have to come

202

1 back and show you a lot --

2 MS. KOVARIK: So we're really out of the
3 whole entertainment village.

4 But it's for the people that are
5 visiting the parks and staying there, it's not like
6 I'm going to take my family there and spend an

7 evening.

8 MR. FRANCKE: No, I don't think that's
9 correct. We hope you do and we anticipate it will
10 become an active and valuable asset for the
11 residents of the Village, not just out of towners.

12 But it is still an entertainment
13 village. Our development standards indicate it's
14 still an important component of our plan.

15 MS. KOVARIK: More like a Paradise
16 Island type.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Pleasure Island.

18 MS. KOVARIK: Pleasure Island.

19 MR. FRANCKE: Exactly. That's still
20 part of our proposal. We're just saying that we
21 will come back to you and show you greater detail
22 at a later time.

23 MS. KOVARIK: But this isn't like the
24 Weston, Virginia project or --

203

1 MR. FOERSTER: It could be.

2 MS. KOVARIK: That's what I struggle
3 with.

4 MR. FRANCKE: Unlike Mike Foerster, I
5 don't know what that is. I know Pleasure Island
6 down in Florida, that I've seen.

7 And that's the concept I believe of

8 what's proposed there and we've tried to narrow our
9 list of uses.

10 MR. FOERSTER: To be entertainment
11 oriented.

12 MR. FRANCKE: To be ancillary.

13 MS. KOVARIK: I was expecting to see
14 retail services like I would find not at Gurnee
15 Mills but just that I would go drive to to do some
16 shopping and then leave.

17 MR. FRANCKE: We have tried in our
18 revised standards to address the concern that was
19 expressed by the residents and by members of the
20 Commission we're just creating another commercial
21 corridor, another Gurnee Mills, okay.

22 And we've tried to address that
23 concern by narrowly tailoring the use list of
24 retail -- potential retail uses in this area.

204

1 But, you know, I find it -- I found
2 again referring back to some of the comments of the
3 public that one of the questions that was raised
4 about, you know, would I as a resident come and
5 shop here or spend this kind of money if I could go
6 buy the same thing for less dollars at Gurnee Mills
7 or something.

8 Again, we've tried to make it so
9 that that is not the situation. We're trying to

10 distinguish as you had requested and what we're
11 really trying to do is the same thing that I heard
12 at a recent interesting Village Board meeting
13 where, you know, it was indicated that what's wrong
14 with the Village trying -- the existing, you know,
15 Village residents trying to get the out of towners
16 to come in and spend the kind of dollars that were
17 referred to earlier.

18 I mean I don't understand what's
19 wrong with that. That was the goal of capturing
20 the out of town dollars here and letting them spend
21 that 35 dollars that was referred to before which
22 will only be to the benefit of existing residents.

23 MS. KOVARIK: Right. And I would
24 support that more so than trying to create a

205

1 commercial corridor for shopping which was my
2 perception of where you were at.

3 MR. FRANCKE: In our revised development
4 standards we're trying to address that.

5 MS. KOVARIK: All right. Can I just go
6 through some things in the development standards
7 themselves and ask some questions? I know it's
8 late, I'm sorry.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yeah. Or if you want,
10 you know, you could -- I think the last meeting we

11 said if you wanted to -- if there's a number of
12 things you might want to mark those and you could
13 either discuss it later with them and they can
14 address that at the next meeting or we can send
15 them a --

16 MS. KOVARIK: I wouldn't mind doing
17 that. A lot of them are just clarifications and
18 things that I'm not sure why they're in here and it
19 is almost like every page so.

20 MR. FRANCKE: It's --

21 MS. KOVARIK: I got my package last
22 night. So I got an advantage over everybody else
23 because I was able to spend all today reading this
24 and comparing it and all of that.

206

1 MR. FRANCKE: We would be happy to. If
2 you want to mark it up and send it us, we'd be
3 happy to respond if you want to get together with
4 staff and provide those comments.

5 And as I say, as these guys know, I
6 get paid by the hour, I'd be happy to stay here
7 until four in the morning.

8 MS. KOVARIK: I'm not.

9 MR. SULA: We don't.

10 MS. KOVARIK: I think that everything in
11 here really only boils down to two concerns.

12 I am concerned about some of your

13 permitted uses that are typically special uses
14 elsewhere. Primarily the restaurants, serving of
15 alcoholic beverages, and outdoor seating. Those
16 are typically special uses and I'm not comfortable
17 making those permitted.

18 And then traffic. And I really
19 liked all the suggestions and recommendations that
20 I saw in Mr. Grieve's report earlier. They made a
21 lot of sense. So I think there should be some way
22 to compromise to keep some of this traffic off Hunt
23 Club and Washington and utilize the regional routes
24 because this is a regional attraction.

207

1 And I will fax, I can really fax
2 this to your office and then respond that way.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Carl, you wanted to
4 comment. Mr. Foster, did you have anything?

5 MR. FOSTER: I suppose so. Some of my
6 comments, I don't know, may be misinterpreted.

7 But I guess I want to say first to
8 the Petitioner I sometimes wonder based on what
9 I've been hearing tonight it may be in your
10 interpreting what people are saying about the
11 development that maybe some of it has been
12 misinterpreted because I would say from my
13 standpoint that I think it's critical whatever way

14 this decision goes that what you propose is a
15 development that actually has the kind of synergy
16 to be successful.

17 And what I'm beginning to hear now
18 which actually concerns me which is where I stand
19 on the terms of this development is kind of a water
20 park, employee housing and hopefully a hotel and
21 maybe depending on the market a few more things
22 down the road.

23 That makes me more nervous than
24 what I would consider a destination full quality

208

1 high upper end entertainment center that people
2 would want to go to.

3 In other words, I'm saying I'm now
4 almost a little concerned that as you try to pull
5 things apart and separate we don't have enough to
6 make it a destination because the last thing we
7 need is a great hotel and there's nothing you can
8 do once you get there.

9 Because we don't have as you know
10 the population density here to support, you know,
11 the kind of night life and stuff that people who
12 come for meetings and conferences and conventions
13 may want unless you put something there. I'm just
14 putting that as an opinion.

15 MR. ROGERS: We agree with you. We

16 also presented an extensive list of synergistic
17 aspects, I'll be more specific, of permitted uses
18 or maybe special uses.

19 I'm not going to go into the
20 refinement of the planned development that we
21 thought would be tailor made to make this a more
22 synergistic development, night life, family
23 oriented.

24 And we've pulled all that out by

209

1 suggestions of staff that everybody is scared that
2 we're going to compete with Gurnee Mills. And it
3 literally is apples to oranges and we've known that
4 from day one.

5 We've tried to explain, it's a
6 difficult concept. But the dollars per square foot
7 that we are going to use to build out this if you
8 look at that from an economic standpoint and the
9 kind of dollars we need to get from rent just from
10 a pure economics versus what they do at Gurnee
11 Mills, it's night and day.

12 I mean we're talking a whole
13 different retail concept. The type of buildout
14 they have there versus the type of buildout that
15 we're anticipating of the quality and what we need
16 to maintain that synergy, we have been advised to

17 take all that out.
18 And quite frankly I think, you
19 know, I'm -- like my lawyer is telling me one thing
20 and we feel something else different and we're
21 hearing things from the Village so we're in a
22 quandry ourselves.
23 MR. FOSTER: Let me say this. You know,
24 with all of our opinions I mean I take the position

210

1 that you are supposed to be the experts, the
2 development people and have some expertise in this
3 field.

4 But the last thing we would want to
5 see is an attempt that ends up being less than
6 successful. I mean, for example, when I go to Old
7 Orchard I think that's a fabulous development, it's
8 got very pedestrian oriented spaces. And whether
9 or not that's something that we want in Gurnee,
10 that's a separate decision.

11 But my point is if you're going to
12 have something let's make it something that's going
13 to be something that somebody wants to go to. And
14 Gurnee Mills has no pedestrian quality about it at
15 all.

16 So I think sometimes you verbalize
17 a distinction but maybe the distinction did not --
18 as Mr. Francke talks about putting our arms around

19 it somehow in what you have put in paper the
20 distinction or what niche you're really trying to
21 get, that never quite came across.

22 You know, it's clear to me Gurnee
23 Mills is an outlet center, that's totally
24 different. I mean there's another fifty different

211

1 possibilities in retail besides outlet. And if
2 this is to be one of those then tell us what it's
3 going to be.

4 So that's a comment. And when
5 people tell me we're going to see what the market
6 is going to do, based on how the stock market is
7 going I'm not sure what that means because it might
8 mean that we now have a two-story hotel because
9 that's what the market dictates. And I guess my
10 opinion is that's not what I was hoping for in this
11 development.

12 Quality of life issues such as the
13 residents have expressed, I think those things are
14 very, very important. And I'm willing to state
15 that as major developments such as this that have a
16 great deal of impact on our community come to town
17 I take the position yes, tell the community, tell
18 these residents, tell us what kind of things can
19 you offer that can be community benefits that

20 enhance the quality of life.
21 And so on that note I would hope
22 that the conservation area easement that we just
23 discovered is because you can't build on it, but I
24 know it has been described as a place where school

212

1 groups or residents or whatever, educational. But
2 maybe it's important that that gets built along
3 with the water park or that gets -- that gets
4 developed so if I want to take my kids over to look
5 at a mox (phonetic) or whatever I want to look at,
6 that's there for me.

7 Or I think I mentioned several
8 months ago that I'm on the page that a performance
9 theater or a cultural center would be a great
10 amenity for this community.

11 Now it's not clear to me if your
12 performance theater is the same thing as going to
13 Six Flags and Bugs Bunny is dancing on stage or is
14 this a performance theater where we're going to
15 have, you know, theater and we're going to have
16 outside performers that come in and a resident can
17 pay \$25 or \$35 and see top quality entertainment if
18 that's our choice.

19 But I'd like to say that's an
20 enhancement to our quality of life because as one
21 resident says, that will give me an option for not

22 going downtown and paying \$20 a night and two hours
23 of travel, et cetera, to have that cultural amenity
24 which I think would be nice in this section of Lake

213

1 County.

2 So I'm just saying I do think there
3 are some things that can enhance the quality of
4 life but I'm not hearing you say those things
5 today. And one time you talked about a skating
6 rink, maybe now that they're building one at the
7 Mills that's not important.

8 But if the outdoor ice skating rink
9 is something you still propose, that could be a
10 quality of life enhancement, perhaps maybe it would
11 be to the park district, that's not my issue.

12 But I'm not hearing these things
13 come to the forefront so residents can feel like in
14 return for aggravation or consternation we also are
15 getting something that makes our life in Gurnee
16 better.

17 Just in terms of anything else I
18 want to say in terms of the traffic as my fellow
19 Commissioners are mentioning, that certainly is a
20 concern. And I think my concern is more it doesn't
21 seem we have a best route to get there.

22 I sometimes take the position, you

23 know, hold to your guns and let the vote go where
24 it falls because when you try to come up with five

214

1 different ways based on five different opinions
2 that doesn't tell us anything.

3 One night our Chairman said, you
4 know, we'll get off at 120 and somebody could pick
5 up and go O'Plaine Road, we can go Hunt Club Road.
6 Is a long way way, a circuitous way to get back to
7 this destination. It does trouble me that there
8 doesn't seem to be a best way to get there.

9 But if this is what you're
10 advancing, let's try to pick out what is the best
11 to get there, the best to do in terms of traffic.
12 I have concerns about traffic and I guess I agree
13 with the other Commissioners that all the
14 recommendations that are actually in both traffic
15 reports will certainly need to be implemented.

16 I'll take the position tonight that
17 the financing element is not quite in my purview as
18 a Plan Commissioner and, you know, that's a whole
19 different topic.

20 I have always felt that having a
21 destination hotel conference center is very
22 important for the economic viability of Gurnee, but
23 I'm on the page let's have a top class one if we're
24 going to have one.

1 We've had some experiences in terms
2 of my family dealing with the Radisson in Pleasant
3 Prairie and the truth is they're booked up on
4 weekends through the year 2000 which I think
5 somebody must need that.

6 So I think anecdotally and I think
7 vacancy wise there is a market for the business
8 hotel in this community if it's done well. If
9 that's what you're proposing then, you know, I'm
10 saying put it out there. I feel that it's good.

11 But my concern right now, though,
12 is that this doesn't become so disjointed that the
13 most we end up with is employee housing and a water
14 park because to me that's not the intent of the
15 Village concept. I understand that it might be
16 phased in or gradually put in, but I'm just little
17 concerned in that area.

18 MS. VELKOVER: I want to address one
19 thing. I'm a little concerned by the statement
20 that they made that basically the entertainment
21 village uses have been kind of taken out by staff
22 or whatever.

23 What we've done, there was a lot of
24 concern by the Plan Commission initially in the

1 process that a lot of the uses that were in some of
2 the earlier drafts of this document were just
3 general retail that could, you know, basically
4 compete with Gurnee Mills or any other commercial
5 center in the community.

6 And what happened was we tried to
7 structure those so that they were -- some of them
8 were accessory to the hotel uses but also that they
9 were unique retail. They weren't -- at one point
10 there was in here a call out for a video store.
11 Well, we don't want Blockbuster on this piece of
12 property. We wanted it to be a unique
13 entertainment opportunity.

14 And what happened with this use
15 list is that it's been tailored so that we, you
16 know, tried to help the Plan Commission get their
17 arms around this, that it's not going to be another
18 typical strip commercial center, that it's going to
19 be very unique and entertainment related.

20 And I think if you look through
21 this use list there still are the opportunities for
22 some night life there, restaurants, gift shops,
23 some entertainment types of retail uses but not
24 your typical Sports Authority, Kmart, Taco Bell

1 type of uses that the Plan Commission had a lot of

2 concern with.

3 MR. FOSTER: Just to be clear, I
4 understand exactly what you're saying, Tracy. And
5 I don't want it to come across that, you know, I'm
6 feeling or that I'm suggesting that somebody has
7 directed the Petitioner to do something.

8 I'm only saying that what we hear
9 from the Petitioner is almost some type of a
10 retrenching from what I would consider a viable
11 concept.

12 You know, I don't want us to get a
13 Blockbuster over there either or a Taco Bell. I
14 never envisioned that. But what I'm saying is
15 almost I'm hearing the lack of vision, you know.
16 So you're saying something about staff. I don't
17 know about that part. I'm just saying you have
18 kind of retrenched.

19 MS. VELKOVER: And I was responding to a
20 comment by them and not by you.

21 And again I think and they should
22 clarify this but they pulled back to -- the
23 entertainment village to conceptual because they
24 don't have any specific users at this point.

218

1 They do have plans immediately for
2 the water park and employee dorms and hopefully in
3 the near future the convention center hotel. And I

4 think Mr. Rogers did indicate that they've been out
5 there and, you know, testing the market for those
6 other types of uses and maybe you could speak to
7 that.

8 MR. ROGERS: I think an important aspect
9 here is economics. We cannot go to a quality
10 hotel, the Marriotts or the Hyatts of the world,
11 the Doubletrees, the really nice end Doubletrees,
12 without zoning. It doesn't work that way.

13 They get too many proposals. And
14 when you go to Washington, D.C. to the Marriott
15 Corp. they don't want to spend time with you. The
16 first thing they say is do you have entitlements,
17 what are your limits. They want to know
18 specifically what you can and cannot do there. So
19 we have tried to make this in a way that is
20 palatable to everyone.

21 And another thing is on the
22 conceptual aspect of the retail that we like and
23 thought of, I believe that in our mind we have a
24 good idea of what we want. We do not want a Taco

219

1 Bell. We have never wanted a Taco Bell. What we
2 want is quality retail that doesn't compete with
3 Gurnee Mills. We've said that over again.

4 We gave some examples in the slide

5 show presentation. Some people liked it, some
6 people didn't. We tried to show a cross-section of
7 what's out there.

8 I'm not trying to defend ourselves
9 so much, but I'm trying to say that the product
10 that we have in mind is more indigenous to the
11 Midwest. It hasn't really been done yet. When you
12 look at Los Angeles or the ULI book you see stuff
13 that is very like Universal Citywalk. We don't
14 want the neon craziness of that. We showed you
15 examples of Quebec which is extremely successful
16 with quality retail.

17 A lot of it may be studios where
18 they make things or high end retail or crafts and
19 that's still where we would like to go. So we've
20 kind of limited ourself and put this into a
21 conceptual just to get through this first phase.

22 And then as we become more mature
23 ourselves we can start going to those retailers
24 that fit within the image of what we have in our

220

1 mind of what's going to be successful overall to
2 support Gurnee Mills because it's a different
3 market. It's a different market segment.

4 MR. FOSTER: Well, let me say this. And
5 I know one of the residents said this and probably
6 for a different purpose.

7 I mean the Village's initial RFP
8 was really around some kind of, you know,
9 conference/hotel use. So I mean a part of me feels
10 that, you know, for at least a year and better
11 there has been some expectation that if this
12 development goes forward that the key result is
13 going to be something that's around the original
14 intent of the RFP.

15 But what sometimes is coming across
16 now that, as this resident pointed out, it's
17 employee housing and a water park. And so that --
18 you know, it's kind of like the original concept
19 was for a hotel conference space. And so if we end
20 up with the water park and employee housing that's
21 a little bit different.

22 That's all that I'm saying.
23 Regardless of how somebody feels about it, you
24 know, there's been a lot of time spent on this

221

1 effort in the blue ribbon committee, et cetera, et
2 cetera. I understand market conditions.

3 MR. FOERSTER: I think the response that
4 you made, Lyle, was correct.

5 But we got asked the question what
6 you would foresee being built first. And the
7 answer is I can build housing in six to eight

8 months, I can build a water park in a year and it's
9 going to take me 24 months to build a hotel.

10 So if they all started today
11 they're going to come online at different times.
12 We don't want to hold off building a water park for
13 two years just because the hotel isn't ready. So I
14 mean that's the answer.

15 We're going to build all three of
16 those, we're asking for the preliminaries to get
17 going so we can shop it as John said so we can come
18 back for finals and give you details, specifics,
19 it's going to be this, it's going to be that for
20 your final approval and get going on it.

21 But they have different timelines
22 for construction. We talked about the highway
23 issues. It's the most frustrating thing that I
24 deal with -- maybe not the most but pretty close to

222

1 the top. But we can't even get into those issues
2 because we don't have zoning.

3 No one will talk to us, they'll say
4 well, you don't have zoning so why should we -- you
5 know, we can't address your problems.

6 We'd love to know how much the
7 highway is going to cost, then we could address
8 that issue because everybody wants to know who's
9 going to pay for it. If it's two million dollars,

10 you know, I would submit to you that somebody over
11 in my place is going to write a check.

12 If it's fifteen million dollars it
13 becomes pretty difficult to justify it with a 25
14 million dollar water park. But we can't even get
15 the answers to those questions because we've got to
16 at least get our conceptual zoning so we can bring
17 some of the other players, the County for example,
18 to the table to start talking about these issues.

19 So we're a little frustrated as you
20 are. I think we do have a vision of what we want
21 and John is correct and I will perhaps disagree
22 with him, we may have conveyed something
23 incorrectly.

24 We're happy -- I'm happy as the

223

1 property owner with the use list that we have, you
2 know, in the draft agreement. You know, we went
3 through that, as Tracy said, you know,
4 cooperatively. We deleted a lot of stuff that was
5 in there that we felt realistically really doesn't
6 fit our image.

7 We did try to tie back everything
8 either ancillary to the hotel that you could make a
9 connection, A, someone in a hotel would want to
10 do this; or B, to have an entertainment

11 relationship that it is such as the high scale
12 themed restaurants that has entertainment in the
13 restaurant and alcohol and outside seating, you
14 know, the image of the person sitting on the patio.

15 Well, that's fine. I mean we want that. That's
16 what is in the development standards.

17 So we're trying to get our arms
18 around it as well. But we're committed in doing
19 those pieces and we would love to do the rest of as
20 well. But as John said, we've got to be able to
21 shop that and we can't talk to people until we at
22 least have some preliminary basis of zoning because
23 no one will talk to you other than in a very broad,
24 yeah, we would be interested, why don't you just

224

1 come back and see us when you have your zoning.

2 So long winded answer, I apologize

3 Hal, did you want to add?

4 MR. FRANCKE: No.

5 MR. FOERSTER: I overdid it.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Foster.

7 MR. FOSTER: What he just said is
8 exactly what I'm talking about is that X months
9 later, you know, it just seems like the point
10 you're at is shopping.

11 So maybe there's some expectation
12 that there's clout that you as the Petitioner has

13 that I guess you have but they won't even talk to
14 you versus what you just said.

15 Which makes me concerned that two
16 years from now if you even have zoning you can
17 still come back and say we're still shopping this
18 and we've got, you know, employee housing.

19 MR. FRANCKE: Well --

20 MR. FOSTER: You don't have to convince
21 me. I'm just giving my comments.

22 MR. FRANCKE: I understand your concern
23 and we wouldn't have come to this point and the
24 individuals from Prism in particular wouldn't be

225

1 here through all of this time if they weren't eager
2 to and -- eager to develop and provide the amenity
3 that you're talking about in terms of this hotel in
4 direct response to the RFP which as you indicated
5 was the first official, if you will, document that
6 made reference to that. And that's almost two
7 years ago.

8 Since you've indicated, you know,
9 you made reference to the Radisson over the border
10 and somebody in the audience made reference to
11 what's now in the pipeline in Kenosha. We've said
12 in prior meetings that people recognize there's a
13 regional opportunity here. It's not a secret here

14 in Gurnee, there is a regional opportunity for this
15 type of facility.

16 The Village Board recognized it,
17 you know, some two years ago. Other people have
18 since come to realize it, recognize it. And as
19 Mike and John just indicated, at some point we have
20 to get past square one if we're going to get people
21 who have expressed an interest to come forward.

22 If your concern is that we're going
23 to -- again, we've stepped back and we've said we
24 want conceptual approval only for the village, we

226

1 want the special use permit approved and we want
2 the preliminary approval.

3 If your concern, Commissioner
4 Foster, is that we haven't been giving enough
5 details to get our hands around it or our arms
6 around it, that's my response is that's why it's
7 called preliminary approval.

8 We have to bring you more detail,
9 definitive information to you that you feel very
10 comfortable that you're getting what you always
11 wanted to get. And I believe that, you know, your
12 Ordinances specifically provide that if we don't
13 bring the definitive proposal back to you within a
14 defined period of time, which isn't to say we won't
15 want to talk to you about that period of time, but

16 there is a defined period of time within which we
17 either develop or those approvals go away.

18 The truth of the matter is those
19 types of -- that type of development, that specific
20 development will require the input of a lot more
21 parties than are sitting here right now. Whereas
22 the water park and the employee housing for all
23 intents and purposes you have the parties sitting
24 here right now and we know the needs. It's not as

227

1 tied to the market conditions and you have the
2 party sitting here right now so it's logical for us
3 to say those are the uses that are likely to
4 proceed first.

5 MR. WINTER: Mr. Chairman, I have a
6 quick follow-up to what Mr. Francke said.

7 In comparing the traffic studies
8 there were certain square footage provided for us
9 even conceptually for the village center. When I
10 look at the PUD I think that's reflected indirectly
11 or maybe directly in the floor area ratios.

12 MR. FRANCKE: Directly.

13 MR. WINTER: Except not in square
14 footage for me to be able to say oh, the guy who
15 did the traffic study is right.

16 And, for instance, I know through

17 this process some of these assumptions did change,
18 for instance, for the hotels. They were really
19 basing it on 700 rooms and not 900 rooms.

20 That's why for the next meeting I'd
21 like to see that. I don't know whether that's a
22 function of staff or if you know the answer to that
23 more readily. I'd like to see how there's going to
24 be assurances that we don't end up with, you know,

228

1 600,000 leased square feet of retail that somehow
2 conceptually got approved because the FARs were
3 ratios that didn't translate into what was shown on
4 the traffic studies.

5 MR. FRANCKE: I think that Tracy can
6 respond to that.

7 MS. VELKOVER: Well, you have in this
8 document each individual parcel has a floor area
9 ratio.

10 MR. WINTER: Right, Page 11 is what I'm
11 looking at, the new one.

12 MS. VELKOVER: And we have to go through
13 this document again but I mean the intent was to
14 tie it to the traffic study so that what is called
15 for in this document directly relates to the
16 traffic study.

17 MR. WINTER: I wonder if there could be
18 a third column with the square footage on it so we

19 could see that that adds up.

20 MS. VELKOVER: I see what you're saying.

21 So you want the floor area ratio just translated

22 into vertical inch per lot.

23 MR. WINTER: Right. Because for

24 whatever reason that's what they used.

229

1 MR. FRANCKE: I think -- I can't think

2 or believe that that's a problem. Breaking it down

3 parcel by parcel may be a problem because I think

4 that -- I'd have to think about that.

5 But I think the general sense of

6 what you're saying is not a problem for us because

7 it's been made very clear to us by staff that the

8 development standards have to tie to the

9 assumptions that were made in the traffic report.

10 And that's true for this

11 development, it's true for other developments that

12 have been brought before you.

13 MR. WINTER: Because that would be a

14 great disappointment that the traffic doesn't get

15 better because it isn't --

16 MR. FRANCKE: And the interesting thing

17 is that's one of many, many aspects that were

18 not -- you know, again I appreciate that a lot of

19 the residents have left because of the hour but

20 that's an example of the type of aspect that
21 doesn't exist under the existing zoning.
22 When you talk about benefits to the
23 community, you know, not only is there no
24 obligation basically to do any of the off-site road

230

1 improvements under the existing zoning despite the
2 existing approvals for, you know, potentially
3 millions of square feet of development, but the
4 very comment that you just made, Commissioner
5 Winter, about tying the development approvals to
6 the assumptions that were made in the traffic
7 study. That, too, is something that doesn't even
8 exist right now within this. But in order to
9 change it we want to have that.

10 And we've indicated that we're
11 prepared to do that again as one of the benefits of
12 this whole proposal.

13 MR. WINTER: And to go on that comment,
14 the conservatory area, obviously that could have
15 been fragmented, it was developed under the current
16 zoning. And so that really will be a benefit
17 because we've seen all the diagrams where that will
18 be a very prominent area for the residents to see.

19 MR. FRANCKE: And again we've always --
20 as was indicated, we've always talked about public
21 access to that area and in fact that's why in the

22 last presentation we made reference to the
23 possibilities that the outlot that was being left
24 on the plan, I think it's Outlot 8 at the far

231

1 western extreme of the property would be available
2 as an area to provide parking and direct access or
3 public transportation access or some kind of access
4 for the public directly to the conservation area.
5 Again, something that isn't contemplated at all
6 under the existing zoning or provided for.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Butch, did you want to
8 say something?

9 MR. MAIDEN: In the floor area ratio
10 that could be a little misleading. Originally they
11 asked us what they're permitted under the zoning,
12 we asked them what are all the other factors that
13 they're asking for, what's the height, what's the
14 parking, what's the setback and then we worked
15 backwards to these.

16 These may be slightly high on some
17 of them, but that's all we did was, for example, we
18 rounded off at point 01 for the floor area ratio.
19 Probably you're going to find it's even going to be
20 less than that, we just rounded it off because
21 that's about as low as we could get for a floor
22 area ratio.

23 So I don't know if just having that
24 extra column that may be a little misleading

232

1 because that's probably not what they're going to
2 build. What they used in the traffic study
3 probably does relate to what height, setback,
4 parking, all the rest of the controls.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I guess -- Brian.

6 MR. WINTER: I would be satisfied I
7 guess with that analysis in written form so that we
8 can see and make the translation.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I guess I'm the
10 last one here and it's pretty late so I -- just a
11 couple of comments because there was one thing that
12 wasn't addressed.

13 And that was the comprehensive
14 plan. And I know there was some comments by the
15 citizens in regard to maybe not complying with the
16 comprehensive plan.

17 But I think if you look at the
18 updated comprehensive plan we did discuss the
19 possibility in this corridor of expansion of Great
20 America and also a hotel conference facility.

21 I think it's consistent with the
22 comprehensive plan. The one area I think that the
23 Commissioners when we went over the comprehensive
24 plan was concerned about was the commercialization

1 of Washington. We did not want to see that.

2 I think that the Petitioner has
3 gone a long way in meeting that, especially with
4 the change in the outlots. The one concern I do
5 have, though, is the lack of definition of the
6 hotels. Not the destination hotels but the other
7 hotels that are planned.

8 And I think it's -- and I keep
9 losing track but is it a total of four now that
10 would be including the destination hotel?

11 MR. ROGERS: No, Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: A total of three?

13 MR. ROGERS: The destination hotel is
14 envisioned as 500 rooms and then we are looking at
15 two additional hotels at 200 rooms each.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. But the outlot
17 has the possibility of putting a hotel on it?

18 MR. ROGERS: As a special use.

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Right, okay. So
20 there's a possibility of four hotels.

21 MR. FRANCKE: We're not asking for that
22 special use now.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I understand. You're
24 asking for a special use on two of the hotels that

1 would be on the -- at the village center.

2 MR. ROGERS: No, one of the hotels,
3 correct?

4 MR. FRANCKE: We're asking for special
5 use approval for three of the hotels.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: A destination hotel and
7 two additional ones. It's the two additional ones
8 that I'm concerned about.

9 I don't feel, you know, at this
10 time with the information that we have that I would
11 recommend to the Village Board to approve special
12 uses of hotels that we don't really know what
13 they're going to look like. So that's a concern I
14 have. Not in the destination hotel but on the two.

15 MR. FRANCKE: But again, we're
16 addressing in the traffic, their impact was
17 addressed from traffic which is everybody indicated
18 their principal concern.

19 I understand your concern about you
20 don't know what they're going to look like. I can
21 understand your concern about perhaps a lack of
22 definition to give the assurance that it's a
23 certain type of hotel.

24 I understand those and I don't have

1 any problem further refining the development

2 standards to give you that definition. But I don't
3 understand why, you know, we've provided testimony,
4 just again Mike Foerster reiterated it tonight of
5 the need for additional hotel rooms.

6 And that's the fundamental inquiry
7 on the special use, is there a public need, is
8 there a need for the public health and convenience,
9 the welfare and convenience. And we've stated from
10 day one that there is a need for these hotel rooms.

11 We have no problem coming back for
12 the architecture, for the layout, for the landscape
13 plan, all those things. But we need to know again
14 to go to market. We don't want to have to tell
15 people that you have to go back and see if the
16 community is going to decide whether or not there
17 is a need which is the inquiry for special use.

18 So we do want the pre-approval. We
19 backed off the fourth one. You were confused about
20 whether it was three or four. We did ask for four.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I know, the outlot.

22 MR. FRANCKE: We did want the fourth
23 pre-approved special use for the outlot. We've
24 abandoned that for now.

236

1 We just said identify it as a
2 special use and we'll come back for that and go
3 through that inquiry if we want to put it on the

4 outlot.

5 But internally we think we've
6 made our case for need and given you the assurances
7 at a later date to control all those things you're
8 concerned about. And today we're prepared to give
9 you more definition if you want to tell us what it
10 is that will give you the comfort. If it's a
11 certain type of hotel, we're prepared to do that,
12 but we do want the special use permit.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I guess I'd have to say
14 before I comment on that I want to do a little
15 studying before the next meeting on exactly because
16 that's -- maybe legally that may be the definition
17 of special use but I don't think that's the way
18 we've applied special uses as a Plan Commission in
19 the past.

20 I mean I could just use the example
21 of the carwash that just came in. No one said that
22 a carwash can't be put on that property. We just
23 said that you have to come before the Plan
24 Commission and meet all of the concerns that may

237

1 come with that particular use. And they did that
2 and they got a special use.

3 I think that the Commission
4 recognized that if they met all of those

5 requirements that, you know, in a way we're legally
6 required to allow him to put that use on there
7 because that use is specified as a use in that
8 zoning district but they need to meet special
9 requirements.

10 I look at that and the hotels as
11 the same light. I mean you might as well just make
12 it a permitted use then.

13 MR. FRANCKE: Well, that's what it is
14 right now.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, as Mr. Winter
16 indicated, you're looking for some change here
17 and --

18 MR. FRANCKE: What type of special --
19 with the carwash, I understood, I was at at least
20 your first meeting on that. I agree with you, I
21 think that the special use, my interpretation of
22 special use is it's perhaps both of what I'm saying
23 and what you're saying.

24 Typically a special use is a

238

1 question of analyzing the public need for the use
2 at that location. And then, like you said, the
3 special considerations have to be taken into
4 account because of the uniqueness of the use.

5 In that particular case probably
6 the most unique issue or question was the stacking,

7 right. Because of the unique aspects of a carwash
8 perhaps noise or stacking. It has -- a carwash has
9 unique issues that require it to be considered as a
10 special use. As typically does a drive-thru, a
11 drive-thru bank, a drive-thru restaurant.

12 What are those types of issues that
13 you perceive, if I can ask the question, with a
14 hotel?

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I think all
16 those things as well. The traffic, the aspects of
17 the architecture. And in particular -- in fact,
18 we're going to be reviewing our Zoning Ordinance
19 and we probably will be looking at making hotels
20 special uses in the standard C/B-2 District.

21 And that's -- I'm just telling you
22 the way the Commission felt. I was trying to
23 address your compliance with the comprehensive
24 plan.

239

1 And I think it complies with the
2 comprehensive plan, but it also raises the concern
3 that the Commissioners had when we did the update
4 on the comprehensive plan of the random nature of
5 the hotels that we have built here now in
6 architecture and location.

7 And I think we're being concerned

8 about that here and I think we want to see where
9 these sit and how compatible are they with the
10 existing architecture that you have.

11 And if we just give you that it's
12 kind of like a pre-approved special use. I don't
13 understand that.

14 MR. FRANCKE: No, because we've agreed
15 that we have to come back and satisfy you on
16 architecture. We feel we've already made the case
17 on traffic other than satisfying you with respect
18 to internal circulation.

19 We have to come back to you for
20 internal circulation. Because it's preliminary
21 approval we have to come back. And we have to come
22 back to you for architecture.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Don't you trust us that
24 once you meet those things that we'll give you a

240

1 special use?

2 MR. FRANCKE: How do you answer that
3 question?

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I think that's
5 the truth, I think you don't trust us.

6 MR. FRANCKE: It's not a question of
7 trust or not trust. It's a question of, as I said
8 before, being able to go out to the marketplace and
9 say that the approval, you're going to have it.

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I mean I admit I don't
11 trust you, I think that we may end up with hotels
12 that don't look the way we want them to look.

13 MR. FRANCKE: We are going to be bound
14 by standards that you make us live with and
15 procedures that we are required to live with.

16 There are numerous planned unit
17 developments that have been approved that have to
18 go back through rigorous plan considerations by the
19 Plan Commissions and the Village Board. Not just
20 in this Village but in other villages that are way
21 out ahead of the marketplace and are able to bring
22 people to their community ahead of others because
23 they're able to say it's zoned for the office use
24 already, you don't have to go through the, you

241

1 know, the rezoning process, the public hearing,
2 it's there.

3 We're not telling you you don't
4 have to go -- I mean I can give you specific
5 examples right now where you don't have to go --

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I understand it makes
7 it easier, but there's people that will come before
8 us all the time for special use permits and they
9 come in.

10 The carwash was a good example. He

11 put a lot of work into the design of that and he
12 came before us and trusted that if he met the
13 requirements that we would give it to him because
14 that's our process.

15 You know, I will let the other
16 Commissioners decide on their own. But my
17 viewpoint is that I don't like the idea of what I
18 would call pre-approved special uses. The
19 destination hotel, you've defined that to the point
20 where I think we can make that move.

21 But that's -- those are my
22 concerns. And, you know, that's something you
23 might want to address more at the next meeting.

24 I think -- Mr. Winter I think

242

1 stated my viewpoint on the traffic. I do feel that
2 it would be in the interest of the public and also
3 the Village Board if you gave us some idea of how
4 those road improvements were going to be paid for.

5 I realize that these fiscal impacts
6 may be a little bit out of the Plan Commission
7 area, but we do review fiscal impact reports. And
8 frankly, that report is meaningless if we don't
9 know what the impact of the major infrastructure
10 costs are to the public.

11 So I really think that it would be
12 good to address that at least as far as your

13 initial idea. I realize that there may be
14 alternatives that could be proposed to the Village
15 Board and that might be done, but initially it
16 would be good to know your thoughts on how these
17 things are going to be paid for.

18 I think that the -- just to address
19 some of the concerns of the residents, I know
20 there's not many here. But Mr. Silha was concerned
21 about the report, fiscal impact report. I actually
22 tend to agree with him. I think the report was
23 overly optimistic and I do have some questions on
24 the numbers that were presented there and obviously

243

1 they're presented in the best light that you can
2 provide.

3 But I feel that it's difficult to
4 accept those numbers, let me put it that way, both
5 from the standpoint of the tax generation and also
6 from the standpoint of the cost to the community.

7 MS. VELKOVER: Don, can I just say that,
8 you know, we got this packet before we sent it out
9 to you on Friday afternoon maybe just an hour
10 before it was mailed out and staff has not had any
11 time to take a look at it.

12 Butch's office will be taking a
13 look at that fiscal impact in more detail. So I'm

14 sure we'll have some more comments before the next
15 meeting to you on that.

16 By no stretch of the imagination
17 has it been reviewed and signed off by the Village
18 at this time.

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. But back to the
20 positive note.

21 I think that, you know, on the
22 overall standpoint when you look at the
23 comprehensive plan I think that this is something
24 that meets that plan except for the concerns that I

244

1 had.

2 So any other comments from the
3 Commissioners?

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: If not, I would say
6 that -- Mr. Francke, do you have a comment?

7 MR. FRANCKE: I just want to make one
8 last comment on your second to last question or
9 comment about the infrastructure financial cost.

10 Because I don't want to leave the
11 impression which apparently some members of the
12 audience got perhaps because they felt I was, as
13 they say these days, parsing my words too carefully
14 or something.

15 We understand and we have

16 identified and you've discussed this evening the
17 improvements that need to be done today with this
18 development or without this development and the
19 improvements that need to go in for sure for the
20 water park and the hotel use, the regional hotel
21 use to be possible.

22 And we have never said that we
23 don't intend to be substantially investing into
24 these improvements. What we're really -- and I

245

1 went back and looked at it while the comments were
2 being made, are the same types of guidelines that
3 were set forth by the blue ribbon task force.

4 Is it possible that when we get to
5 the Village Board knowing that some of the
6 improvements we're going to be making are going to
7 be fixing existing deficiencies, is it possible
8 that we're going to be opening up a dialogue with
9 them so that there's no direct investment by the
10 Village or its residents in this infrastructure
11 construction but there might be indirect along the
12 lines similar to what the Village has done in other
13 developments, absolutely, there is that possibility
14 that that discussion will take place.

15 But are we saying here that we're
16 going to end up looking for the Village to or the

17 existing residents to invest directly or to pay for
18 these improvements, we're not suggesting that.

19 Again, in terms of community
20 benefits, we all know on this development and other
21 developments, County roads, State roads, the County
22 as someone said will put these on their plans, road
23 improvements on their plans. IDOT is putting road
24 improvements on their plans. Both those

246

1 jurisdictions will tell you what problems they're
2 having right now with financing.

3 To the extent that those
4 improvements are needed today, I would submit to
5 you that the private sector is the most likely and
6 readily and available source of financing the
7 needed improvements.

8 So I don't want to leave the
9 impression that we don't anticipate a major
10 investment in these improvements which will clearly
11 benefit this development. There's no doubt in my
12 mind that it will be a major investment.

13 Is it a hundred percent, a blank
14 check, whatever is needed all the way up through
15 and including the Tollway interchange at a cost of
16 24 million dollars? The answer is no.

17 But we understand that that issue
18 has to be addressed and we know it will be

19 addressed before the Village Board acts on it. If
20 it's the Plan Commission's desire to incorporate
21 the types of -- which is what I'm hearing or I'm
22 hearing from the residents the types of, you know,
23 recommendations to the Village Board that came out
24 the task force, you know, which is that, you know,

247

1 the Village shall not directly invest any funds in
2 the infrastructure roadway improvements, under no
3 circumstances should residents be liable for
4 payments of return of capital.

5 I mean we understand all that. We
6 have no problem with that and you should make that
7 part of your recommendation.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I guess I just
9 looked at it from the standpoint of past petitions.
10 Typically what's done -- in fact, I can't think of
11 any that haven't done this -- and you've been
12 involved with some that have been presented before
13 us.

14 You come in and say we're going to
15 put these improvements here, we've not going
16 to put this improvement in because that's going to
17 be done by the State or something like that. We
18 usually have a pretty good idea of what the public
19 is getting --

20 MR. FRANCKE: I think we've done that.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: -- for a particular
22 development.

23 MR. FRANCKE: I think we've done that in
24 Dave Miller's report and now you're talking about

248

1 Bill Grieve's report. I think we've done that.

2 I think -- and the one improvement
3 that we've talked about to date that we know is
4 already being done and it's not just planned but
5 it's financially programmed for by the County is
6 Hunt Club.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Correct. And you
8 stated that, I understand that.

9 But are you telling me that you're
10 going to put in the improvements along Washington?
11 Because I don't think you've ever said that.

12 MR. FRANCKE: We believe --

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You just say they're
14 needed.

15 MR. FRANCKE: Yes, those improvements
16 will go in as part of this development.

17 MS. VELKOVER: I think we can maybe try
18 to address some of the concerns by maybe addressing
19 some of the traffic improvements in the PUD.

20 The draft that you have, this is --
21 the standards that we have right now address

22 architecture, floor area ratios and stuff like

23 that.

24 But if you want to, we could

249

1 probably get into some of the -- you know, it will

2 be ultimately in the PUD documents so I'm sure that

3 the Petitioner could put those in at this point so

4 you could take a look at those.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. That's fine.

6 Anything else?

7 MR. GRIEVE: Just one quick comment.

8 You got the great equalizer

9 sitting over in Libertyville, that's the Lake

10 County Division of Transportation. As soon as they

11 touch Washington Street with any type of driveway,

12 that's when the whole mechanism starts from the

13 County's perspective of requiring them to do

14 whatever they deem necessary all along Washington.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay.

16 MR. FRANCKE: And those people he's

17 referring to are very reasonable. We're looking

18 forward to our discussions. We're looking forward

19 to our discussions with them.

20 But as Mike said before, we have to

21 get past square one. At this point they're waiting

22 to hear what you say before they get into

23 definitive discussions with us.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Are you ready to -- is

250

1 November 4th acceptable for a continuance?

2 MR. FRANCKE: Based upon my prior

3 discussions at the break with you I think that's

4 our best alternative.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. So I'll

6 entertain a motion -- oh, would you like to do it

7 earlier, 7:00 again?

8 MR. FRANCKE: That's fine with us.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. So I'll

10 entertain a motion to continue this to November 4th

11 at 7:00 here at the Village Hall.

12 MR. SULA: So moved.

13 MR. FOSTER: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All those in favor of

15 the motion signify by saying aye in the roll call;

16 those opposed nay. Roll call, please.

17 MS. VELKOVER: Winter.

18 MR. WINTER: Aye.

19 MS. VELKOVER: Foster.

20 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

21 MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.

22 MR. CEPON: Aye.

23 MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.

24 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

1 MS. VELKOVER: Sula.

2 MR. SULA: Aye.

3 MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries

5 and it is so ordered.

6 MR. CEPON: I'll make a motion to

7 adjourn.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All those in favor of

9 the motion signify by saying aye.

10 (Aye responses.)

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Opposed, nay.

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Meeting adjourned.

14 (The hearing concluded at 11:59 p.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS:
COUNTY OF L A K E)

I, SANDRA K. SMITH, do hereby
certify that I am a court reporter doing business
in the County of Lake and State of Illinois; that I
reported by means of machine shorthand the
testimony given at the foregoing Report of
Proceedings, and that the foregoing is a true and
correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken
as aforesaid.

SANDRA K. SMITH, CSR, RPR
Notary Public, Lake County, IL
CSR License No. 084-003104