



Willow Road Phase I Study Summary of CAG Meeting #12 and Public Comment Period

Date: November 10, 2011
Time: 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. CAG Meeting
8:00 p.m. to 8:50 p.m. Public Comment Period
Place: New Trier High School, Northfield Campus, Room C-234
Attendance: See Sign-in Sheet at the end of the Meeting Summary

IDOT is conducting planning studies along Willow Road from Waukegan Road (IL 43) to the Edens Expressway (I-94). The intent of the Community Advisory Group (CAG) is to provide a forum for community members to provide input into IDOT's project development process and provide feedback about their transportation needs and community issues throughout the study. IDOT will consider this input, along with all of its other work and analysis, to make their planning and design decisions.

At each meeting, topics are discussed with the CAG to solicit ideas and feedback. The topics discussed at CAG Meeting #12 included continued discussion regarding the Round #3 Analysis including recommended alternative, and next steps for the project.

I. Introduction (Pete Harmet)

Meeting Overview:

Mr. Harmet introduced a new CAG Alternate member from Northbrook, Mr. Bob Isreal.

The role of the CAG is to provide constructive feedback in a polite, professional, and civil manner. Meeting protocol will be for discussions to follow presentations. Due to the technical and complex nature of the material, new topics are introduced at a CAG meeting with supporting analysis for CAG's review following a meeting. This process allows the CAG Members to receive an overview of the technical material prior to reviewing and trying to process the sometimes very complex information on their own. Since this would be the last CAG meeting, no new material would be presented.

Mr. Harmet noted that this was the last Community Advisory Group Meeting. He thanked everyone for the time and effort they had put into this process. Mr. Harmet continued by say that the coordination does not end here but will continue with the Village of Northfield leading up to a public hearing in spring 2012.

Mr. Stenzel noted the topics to be covered during this meeting included the continuation of the discussions from CAG Meeting #11 on the Evaluation Round #3 analysis and then at the end of the meeting discussions will include the next steps moving forward.

II. Continued CAG Discussions

Alternatives Evaluation Round #3 Analysis – Presentation

At the last CAG meeting, the predicted number of Fatal/Injury Crashes by intersections was presented and a CAG member asked about the predicted number of Fatal/Injury Crashes by Section. These results included previously in the Round #3 Evaluation were shown to the CAG per the request. The predicted number of fatal/injury crashes per year vary by location with a difference of one-half crash per year. The two alternatives are basically the same at each location and both are better than the no-build alternative.

- Recapped the Alternatives Development and Evaluation Process:
 - Round 1 was conducted at a broad level of detail.
 - In Round 2, we added more detail and expanded the analysis for those alternatives that were carried forward.

- Round 3 added further detail to two alternatives carried forward.
 - The results of the Round 3 analysis were introduced at the last CAG meeting.
- Tonight, we will review the information presented last time, and answer any questions you may have.
- All alternatives are compared to the No-Build alternative and compared relative to each other.
- Round 3 involved new work including:
 - Level of Detail (more definition, identifying what alternatives look like)
 - Tools (Conceptual Layouts)
 - Comparison Criteria (construction and ROW costs details, additional engineering; and refined assessment of impacts)
- From the beginning of the study, we have discussed the desire for a transportation facility that meets transportation needs while incorporating the context of the surrounding area.
- CSS addresses all factors, so it is important to find an alternative that addresses safety, mobility, community and environment.
 - Pedestrian and overall safety is an important factor. We heard this through CAG input, through the Context Audit, and as a result of the technical analysis.
 - Mobility is also an important concern.
 - We have also heard the concern over the speed of vehicles along Willow Road.
- As presented at the last meeting, the project team investigated a modified version of Alternative 3.
 - 10-foot wide lanes, and
 - Speed limit of 30 mph.
 - These two features complement each other in terms of design and operations, and accomplished the objectives of calming traffic and keeping the roadway footprint small.
- Another context consideration is Community Cohesion.
 - The existing roadway condition already creates a barrier.
 - It is difficult today to walk across Willow Road – such as between the two parks.
 - It is also difficult to walk along Willow Road because of incomplete sidewalks.
 - The study has incorporated a Safety Toolbox to make walking across and along Willow Road safer and less of a barrier.
 - Also, the project team looked at a reduced roadway footprint.
- Alternative 2
 - Alternative 2 has an 8-foot wide curbed median, which could include landscaping.
 - The plan, as presented at the last meeting, includes a 10 foot wide shared path on the north side for pedestrians and bicyclists, and a 5 foot wide sidewalk on the south side of the roadway. We received feedback regarding the path and sidewalk widths which we will talk about later tonight.
 - Note, because there are curbs on both the inside and outside edges of pavement, the lane width would be 17 feet because it must be wide enough to allow vehicles and fire trucks to pass a stalled vehicle.
 - The extra width would be striped out.
- Alternative 3 - Modified
 - Alternative 3-Modified has 10 foot wide lanes, instead of the 11 foot wide lanes shown in the original Alternative 3. (The standard lane width is 12 feet)
 - It also has an 8 foot wide curbed median, which could include landscaping.
 - This means that the roadway width for Alternative 3 Modified is only 2.5 to 3 feet wider per side compared to Alternative 2.
- During CAG Meeting #11 we provided photos that compared the edges of pavement for each alternative. You requested that the project team stake out the edges of pavement for the alternatives. So, two weeks ago, we placed stakes at two locations on both the north and south sides of Willow Road.
 - The first one is along Willow near Churchill Street
 - The stakes closest to the roadway are Alternative 2 and three feet away is Alternative 3M.
 - The second location is along Willow Road near Bracken Lane.
 - The stakes closest to the roadway are Alternative 2 and three feet away is Alternative 3M.

- We received some initial feedback on the roadway layouts we presented at the last meeting. These are issues that the project team will consider as the process moves forward.
 - Speed zone limits
 - Drainage
 - Aesthetics / landscaping
 - 6-foot wide paths
 - Tighten corner radii
 - Additional engineering details
- The renderings provided at the last meeting were reviewed, starting at the west end.

Summary of Comments Received on Round #3 Alternatives

The presentation continued with a summary of the initial comments received at the September meeting as well as those that the project team has since received. Following are the comments received from West (Waukegan Road) to East (I-94 Interchange) limits of the project:

Waukegan Road and Three Lakes Drive Intersections

1. Reinstate the "No Turn on Red" both north and southbound Waukegan Road. IDOT is investigating this under the recommended plan due to the dual left turn lane requirements.
2. Tighten up pavement edges of Waukegan Road intersection especially the eastbound to southbound right turn; this is being incorporated as part of the engineering design work
3. Add continuous sidewalk or path along north side which may be possible if can be done within existing right of way.
4. Provide crosswalks at Three Lake Drive. Note: if a sidewalk or multi-use path is included on the north side of Willow at this location, then cross walks can be added.
5. Remove right turn lane at Three Lakes Drive into Kraft. IDOT is investigating the possibility of removing the right turn lane at Kraft.

Three Lakes Drive and Sunset Ridge Road Intersections

6. Add Intersection lighting, but possibly remove segment lighting as it may be too bright. At this time IDOT plans to include intersection lighting, but needs to discuss further with Northfield segment lighting.
7. Add patterned crosswalks at Sunset Ridge Road intersection. Including patterned cross walks (such as brick pavers) to make the cross walks at SSR and elsewhere more visible is possible and will be a follow-up item for discussion with Northfield.
8. Add Left turn phasing. Left turn phasing will be provided for all legs of the intersection.
9. Add crosswalk on north leg of intersection. A cross walk can be added to the north leg of Sunset Ridge Road if a sidewalk or multi-use path is added along the north side of Willow Road west of Sunset Ridge Road.
10. Add Right-in Right-out at Old Willow Road intersection. There is a possibility to provide right in-right out access at the Old Willow Road intersection, and we will work with Northfield to determine appropriate access for this location.
11. Add Left turn access at Whittier. The Left turn access at Whittier needs to be discussed further with Northfield as part of future meetings.

Willow Road in the S-Curve and Wagner Road

12. Add Left turn lanes at Bracken lane and Chapel Hill Court intersections.
13. Continue sidewalk along the south side of Willow to Graemere Street.
14. Provide left turn phasing for all directions at Wagner Road intersection.

East of Wagner Rd to I-94

15. There was a suggestion to eliminate the speed radar display sign.
16. Provide a shared path on the north side and a sidewalk on the south side.
17. Provide details near the bridge. Note: IDOT provided a typical section near the bridge in the handouts sent before the meeting and a copy was included in the packet.
18. Provide streetscape details east of the bridge. Note: A conceptual view of the bridge was shown. The project team will continue to work on this issue as the process moves forward. If a multi-use path is provided, a separation wall between the path and the roadway needs to be included, as shown on the left side. If a 10 foot wide sidewalk is provided, no wall is required. The typical sidewalk offset from the roadway is 5 feet wide. When sidewalk is adjacent to the back of curb, it is typically 7 feet wide. Exact details will be part of future discussions with the Village.

Central/ Happ Road to East Project Limit

19. Provide a crossing for the regional bike path along the UP Railroad. Note: A crossing for the bike path along the UP may best be accommodated through the signal at Happ Road.
20. Align through lanes at Central Avenue / Happ Road intersection. This will be aligned to the extent feasible without creating business relocations or parking impacts.
21. Provide ramp improvements to the Edens Expressway. Note: Ramp improvements will be included in the proposed plan.

Alternatives Evaluation Round #3 Analysis – CAG Discussion

Pedestrian Crossings

- CAG Members discussed the pedestrian tunnel between Clarkson and Willow Parks asking IDOT if it was still part of the plan. Mr. Harmet responded that there were several different comments on this including support for a tunnel, support for a pedestrian signal, and support for no pedestrian crossing at this location. The renderings provided to the CAG in July and September included the pedestrian underpass. At the September meeting IDOT noted that the general comments received were against the underpass. IDOT did not receive any further comment on this idea. The Village provided further comment on the issue indicating that some say it's a good idea, some say it's a bad idea, and others that support a mid block signal. There will be more discussion on the issue.
- A CAG Member noted, in reference to the pedestrian underpass issue, that there was a discussion of the impact of flooding and land availability on the feasibility of an underpass and that was why a mid-block pedestrian signal was looked at as an alternative. He, however, suggested that an overpass or underpass be examined again as part of a Phase 2 design study. He also noted in reference to slide 23, that the rendering showed the bridge and on the north side it showed a wall and a fence which he thought was a good treatment. He suggested that a similar treatment be considered for the south side of the bridge.
- A CAG Member then added in reference to the colored pavements that are shown on the renderings at the pedestrian crossings along Willow Road that he was deeply skeptical of colored pavements and in fact they do not have any real safety benefits, may be more costly to maintain, and less visible at night for drivers. He suggested that a standard crosswalk with a high level of reflectivity and appropriate lighting that helps to make pedestrians visible.
- A CAG Member was concerned, after discussions with other parents that the refuge islands could become a destination for children. The CAG Member was also concerned about the width of the sidewalk over the bridge and the height of the wall in terms of keeping someone from falling off into the street.
- A CAG Member asked in regard to the intersection at Waukegan and Willow if it was possible to include a crosswalk on the west leg of the intersection. Mr. Harmet said that IDOT will investigate the feasibility of the crosswalk.

- A CAG Member asked if the pedestrian only signal was still in the plan. Mr. Stenzel replied that it was still in the plan. Mr. Harmet responded that the best was to accomplish the pedestrian crossing near Bristol on the east end was still on the table. The location of the pedestrian crossing relative to the intersection is still something that needed to be examined. In response to a further question from the CAG Member, Mr. Harmet responded that all of the issues would be addressed as part of the Phase I process. Mr. Harmet added that there are specific details that need to be worked out and IDOT will reach out to the Village of Northfield to address those details.
- A CAG Member, in reference to the underpass, noted when this was first proposed during the Lakota Study he was excited about it and still thinks it is a good idea. It was the Member's understanding, however, that this idea was short-circuited mostly because of objections from Northfield residents. He further noted that one of the objections he keeps hearing is that there would be a drainage problem. He responded to this by saying that when it's raining and there is a drainage problem people will not be using the parks so the underpass will not be needed. Another CAG Member noted that one of the other contexts was to help children get to school. The first CAG Member responded that this made sense and the issue of an underpass should probably be a Northfield decision. A third CAG Member added that it should be Northfield's decision and just to clarify the record there has not been a consensus reached on the issue; there has not be consensus on anything but safety. In his mind the underpass is still on the table especially since Northfield's State Senator has promised an underpass in addition to a five-lane highway. Mr. Harmet responded that information was presented in July and again in September noting what the dialogue had been to that point and did not receive any comments either way. It sounds like there needs to be some more discussion on the issue.

Speed Limit

- A CAG Member, while applauding the 30 mph speed limit, wondered if this still was not too fast. He held up exhibits showing a 30 mph and 15 mph exhibit showing the view of a driver. The CAG Member said that this would make children traveling along the roadway safer. The CAG Member was struggling to understand how 30 mph should be the speed limit in an area where you have three parks, three schools, and two churches in addition to a very active, walkable community. The Member then said that what IDOT was doing with the speed was very dangerous. Mr. Harmet responded that the comparison would be between 35 and 30 mph.
- A CAG Member noted that a moderate speed does improve pedestrian safety and that we are better off with a narrower cross-section that minimizes the exposure of pedestrians. In addition, he noted that the narrower cross-section would reduce pedestrian signal time and help to improve mobility.
- A CAG Member noted that everything she had read indicated that slower speeds were also safer for motorists. The lower the speed the less severe the accident for motorists as well as pedestrians. She continued to express her concern as the CAG leaves the meeting tonight they will not know what the road will look like; what is being included and what is not. She asked for clarification on the time frame, i.e., for making these decisions, and whether everything will be decided by the spring. Mr. Harmet responded that yes, all these issues would be decided by the spring. He noted that one of the next submittals in the process is the plan and profile that shows details of centerline, right-of-way, and cross-sections.

Roadside Features (Fences, Retaining Walls, Drainage)

- A CAG Member asked if ornamental fences and those fences can force or encourage people cross at locations that are safest are still part of the recommended plan. Mr. Harmet responded that as a tool box item fences are still being considered. A CAG Member asked if cross-sections were going to be available that showed any retaining walls from the bridge, past the park, to Wager Road. Mr. Harmet responded that an email was sent out in advance of the meeting with this information. The CAG Member then asked how far the wall went – did it go all the way to Wagner. Mr. Harmet responded that it would be the subject of further engineering studies, but it was unlikely it would extend to Wagner. In response to concerns expressed about the proximity of the wall to homes and the park Mr. Harmet noted that generally IDOT

would prefer to grade the site rather than use a retaining wall. This is an issue that IDOT would address with the Village of Northfield.

- A CAG Member asked about the 5 foot high wall shown on the cross-section contained in the October 27th email. Mr. Stenzel explained that the wall would be 5 feet down from the sidewalk. In response to a question from the CAG Member, Mr. Stenzel indicated that it was a retaining wall. Mr. Stenzel explained that the retaining walls were needed because we are in a floodplain near the river and the roadway in the future, like today, is going to sit higher than the adjacent ground. The retaining walls help to minimize fill in the floodplain and to avoid grading into people's property. A CAG Member asked, in reference to the same cross-section, how high was the proposed barrier with railing shown on the right side of the diagram. Mr. Harmet responded that the retaining wall would be 5 feet high and the fence on top of the wall would be four-to-six feet high.
- A CAG Member asked if the drainage and storm sewer components of the project will be worked on prior to the public meeting. Mr. Harmet responded that they would be worked on prior to the meeting.

Roadway/Median Design

- A CAG Member asked what the options were on the 8 foot medians. Mr. Harmet responded that the concept that was proposed is similar to what was proposed in the Lakota Study where there is a raised planter bed in the full width sections. In the narrower sections where you would be looking at a pedestrian refuge island there would not be landscaping. In the full sections, the curb and gutter would be six inches high and the planter bed would be between one and two feet high. The CAG Member thought that the higher planter beds would be a good idea because they would deter jay-walking between intersections and might also shield cars from traffic coming in the opposite direction.
- A CAG Member asked in regard to the width of the median and traffic island in the area around Three Lakes and going out to Waukegan she asked if it would be constructed as it looked in the rendering. Mr. Harmet responded that it would be a six foot island next to a 10 foot lane so it was pretty close proportionally. The CAG Member asked if this was sufficient to keep a car from jumping up on the median. Mr. Harmet responded that this was the treatment that was suggested in the Highway Safety Manual and in IDOT's Design Standards. Mr. Harmet added that the signals would be timed to allow people to get across the street and that the island was there only to accommodate someone who did not make it across. The CAG Member said she thought this was an important issue as well as determining if the size was sufficient.
- A CAG Member asked in reference to a section provided by IDOT staff in an email dated October 27, 2011; he noticed that the median was not included in the section. He was confused as to why the median was not included in the section and where exactly the section was located. The member noted that the cross-section was similar to what was shown on slide 22 which is the bridge section. Mr. Harmet noted that a 10 foot wide median would be to accommodate a left turn lane. The CAG Member said he felt there had to be some type of barrier to protect people from traffic since there was not evacuation point on the bridge. The CAG Member also wondered why additional information on the bridge was not presented, e.g., its width. He noted that currently the bridge is not wide enough to handle all of the proposed lanes, the median, and the sidewalks. Mr. Stenzel replied that the bridge will be wider but will stay within the existing right-of-way. He added that there are some questions that need to be answered, e.g., how wide the path should be, before the exact width of the bridge can be determined. The CAG Member wanted to know where the wall would be in relation to the sidewalk.
- A CAG Member clarified a previous comment made about the fence. The member said that the fence would not be keeping the cars from crossing into the sidewalk but keep children from crossing into the road. The purpose of the fence is to focus pedestrian to a safe crossing area.
- A CAG Member asked if the project still includes the ramp improvements at the Edens. Mr. Stenzel replied that it does still include the ramp improvements. The CAG Member asked if the recommended plan also included no right turn on red sign for the Waukegan Rd SB to Willow Road WB. Mr. Harmet responded that a no-turn on red sign is being considered in the context of the proposed improvements.

- A CAG Member noted that the northbound-to-eastbound right turn lane was still present at Waukegan and Willow and wondered if this was to remain. Mr. Stenzel responded that the turn lane is part of the plan at this time.

Lane Widths

- A CAG Member asked about the lane width on the Alternative 3-Modified noting that it was 11-feet but is now down to 10-feet. Given the high volume of truck traffic, the Member wanted to know how the narrower lane width performed in terms of pedestrian and vehicle safety. Mr. Harmet responded that overall volume is an input to the safety analysis; he noted that North Avenue in Elmhurst has a higher ADT than Willow Road with a similar lane width and seems to be functioning correctly. Mr. Harmet continued that IDOT was not aware of any issues with trucks.
- Another CAG Member suggested that based on a narrower field of vision was a good argument for having a wider lane width than 10 feet. Drivers may spend more time looking out for the car in the lane next to them with 10 foot lanes than they would with 12 foot lanes. An additional foot of lane width could be compensated for by adding some extra time for pedestrian crossings. Mr. Harmet responded that Alternative 3 was modified in response to this issue from the community and that the 10 foot lanes are compatible with a 30 mph speed limit. The CAG Member then noted that when traffic is heavy, cars will not be moving very fast, and when traffic is not heavy they will be moving at about 35 mph. The CAG Member suggested that in the next round of analysis the 30 mph speed limit should be further investigated to see if it is practical. Mr. Harmet responded that both safety and mobility are being improved and the overall objective is to develop a solution that considers all of the issues.
- A CAG Member noted that Mr. Harmet had said earlier that IDOT was not aware of any problems with 10 foot lanes from the experience on North Avenue. Mr. Harmet added that a tighter cross section will be less comfortable for vehicles going fast. He added that the objective was to come up with a series of complementary strategies that improved mobility.

Access

- A CAG Member in reference to Bristol Street, noted that other similar streets in the area such as Churchill are right-in right-out, that Bristol is not right-in right-out, and that many people park along Bristol when the area floods. He was not sure that the road could handle the traffic that would come from this street being full access. He was also concerned about the amount of time drivers would have to wait to make left turns and poor visibility. He thought that full access would be better at Churchill. He also noted that Bristol is the steepest street in Northfield and it can be a problem when the road gets icy. He was not sure that the context of the street was considered when the proposal was made to make it full access. Mr. Harmet responded that the Village had given IDOT a Master Drainage Plan and that this would be considered in the next phase of the project along with sight distance, vehicle stacking to create more gaps in traffic, the steepest hill in Northfield.
- A CAG Member asked a question in reference to access at Old Willow Road. The CAG Member noted that in previous drawings Old Willow Road was shown as being closed but in this exhibit it shows a possible right-in right-out configuration. She thought that this was a step in the right direction but thought that Old Willow Road should remain open for two reasons. The first is traffic that would be diverted from Old Willow, on to Willow Road and then on to Wagner. Another CAG Member added that she felt that the issue of Old Willow was critical and believed that it needed to be examined further. Both Members mentioned that many families have students in both schools a typical travel pattern would be to drop off a child at Middlefork turn right to Old Willow and on to Sunset Ridge to drop a child off at Sunset Ridge School. The Member noted that closing Old Willow would have a major impact on mobility and community cohesion. A third CAG Member added that he had gotten numerous calls indicating that closing Old Willow will have a major impact not only during school hours but every hour of the day diverting traffic to Willow Road and through other small neighborhoods in the community.
- A question was also raised in regard to the driveway that goes into Sunset Ridge School off of Old Willow. The CAG Member said that it was vitally important to the school and the way it functions that this driveway

remains open in both directions. She noted that during the day there are two gates to prevent cut-through traffic to the soccer fields, playground, and parking lot it also the only entry point for delivery trucks, garbage trucks, and everything else. The only alternative would be to open another access point on Sunset Ridge Road. The CAG Member added that this was an important context issue that is not easily measured but needs to be understood. She also noted that currently there is substantial queuing by westbound traffic on the gravel section of Willow Road as people wait to turn onto Sunset Ridge Road as sometimes children also are picked up at this location. The CAG Member said that this was not an issue we could walk away from.

- A CAG Member noted that Willow Road was a regional road and was approved as part of the Strategic Regional Arterial System. While the road travels through the community the emphasis needs to be on mobility not access. He encouraged the design of the road to emphasize mobility and reduce driveways wherever possible including at the school. The CAG Member added that students should be dropped off away from Willow Road and on the collector roads. Mr. Harmet responded that we have heard some things tonight about travel patterns involving Old Willow and the school that will need to be discussed further with the Village and the school district.
- In response to a question from another CAG Member, a CAG Member noted that in a previous comment he did not say that mobility trumps everything but that Willow Road is a primary arterial and on this type of road mobility is maximized. The CAG Member then asked Mr. Harmet if he agreed with the statement. Mr. Harmet responded that he did not agree with that characterization but that mobility was one of several factors being examined. The goal is to improve existing conditions; let's improve safety and mobility and address community and environment. The CAG Member said that he understood that and added that by reducing conflict points both safety and mobility would be improved.
- A CAG Member asked if the 2005 Plan recommended cutting off streets and changing driveway access. Mr. Harmet responded that the Plan did include three cul-du-sacs east of Wagner Road. The CAG Member then asked what was the current thinking on these proposals. Mr. Harmet responded that this was one of the comments that was received and was something that IDOT would follow up with the Village on. The CAG Member then asked if there was any discussion regarding the driveways of individual homeowners. Mr. Harmet responded that right now the comments were about left turn access on the side streets and that IDOT would have to look at the other issue regarding the driveways in between in further detail.
- A CAG Member noted that one thing he has seen over the last two years was that proposals to limit the access to Willow Road are consistent throughout all the studies. The CAG Member encouraged IDOT to look at the access issues surrounding the schools. He felt that to the degree that access points can be limited it will improve safety. He felt that it was appropriate for access to be limited on a regional road like Willow Road. The CAG Member added that he felt that everything the CAG had been doing for the last two years was about context and that discussion of context had occurred at every meeting and that IDOT had been engaging the CAG to provide comments which is what the CAG is all about. He thought that the process has gone well and has included context.

Prior Rounds of Alternative Analysis/Past Studies

- A CAG Member added that a lot of money could have been saved, if reducing conflict points is the paramount thing, by building the 2005 shovel ready plan. The CAG Member asked Mr. Harmet what are the rules, regulations, and guidelines that the project team have been following for the last two years. Mr. Harmet responded that the CAG has been following the Context Sensitive Solutions Policy. In reference to the 2005 Plan, Mr. Harmet noted that what this process has demonstrated was that the 2005 Plan would do nothing for mobility and that it is not even the safest two lane alternative. Mr. Harmet added that IDOT has analyzed this in depth. The CAG Member responded that this analysis was done with flawed numbers and that he disagreed with Mr. Harmet's characterization. The CAG Member then asked what guidelines were being followed. Mr. Harmet responded the National Environmental Policy Act, the Department of Transportation's Context Sensitive Solutions Policy, and the Bureau of Design and Environment Manual. Mr. Harmet added that there was a lot of review done of the 2005 Plan and it was a very sound analysis. A

CAG Member asked if what the discussion was saying was that the wrong road had been selected for through traffic and that IDOT should be using Lake Avenue and Dundee Road instead. Mr. Harmet responded that the CAG has gone through a very extensive traffic analysis regarding where people are coming from and going to. In response to a comment from the CAG Member, Mr. Harmet said that the analysis included characteristics of the road and the entire network. Proposals to widen other roads were examined and they didn't make any difference because these were not the trips that were using Willow Road. Mr. Harmet referred the CAG Member to the previous discussions and documentation.

- A CAG Member said in response to questions about a street being closed off the context of the 2005 Plan was that the Governor had directed the head of IDOT and the Village of Northfield to work together to come up with a compromise plan for Willow Road. This was done – it was a compromise. IDOT compromised on having four lanes and Northfield compromised by having a significant number of their streets closed off to limit access as IDOT wanted. He added that right now there is no incentive for Northfield to close off any street or driveway because there has been no compromise coming Northfield's way. The member said that the context of why street were closed before was the give-and-take on both sides; and there has been not any compromise now.
- A CAG Member added that while you may be unconvincing the citizens who drive on the streets to be closed you are making things better for all the other residents of Northfield that drive on Willow Road. The CAG Member added that since it was a good idea in the 2005 Plan it might still be a good idea now.

Sunset Ridge School Access

- A CAG Member asked if in any of the studies that have been done anyone has studied the school traffic patterns. Mr. Harmet responded that as far as this study goes that is what IDOT is going to do but that he could not speak to the previous studies.
- A CAG Member noted that it did not seem any different to him if people queued up on a gravel portion of the road or a new four lane road. It seems to him what is needed is an area in the school or possibly a right turn lane where there will not be queuing up on the roadway. He said he knows that school districts have built areas for people to queue up and wait to either drop off or pick up their children. District 27 is an example.
- In response, a CAG Member said that she did not have any problems with the previous statement but the issue was school's very limited footprint. She appreciated the point.
- A CAG Member asked for clarification regarding the queuing on Willow; he was informed that the traffic was queuing to turn into the driveway at the school. The CAG Member then asked if there was room to add a right turn only lane at this location. Mr. Harmet responded that this possibility could be explored. In response to a comment from another CAG Member, Mr. Harmet indicated that it could be signed to indicate that it was for access into the school.

Study Process Comments

- A CAG Member, noting that the CAG was having a good discussion regarding context. He thought there should be many more meetings. Mr. Harmet responded that this was beginning of very focused coordination with the Village. He added that the CAG has discussed context throughout the process. Mr. Harmet noted that most of the first year of the project was spent not doing any analysis but gathering stakeholder feedback, generating alternatives, and developing evaluation criteria. Alternative 3 – Modified speaks very much to context, it is not the standard solution. The CAG has accomplished the big picture concept and now IDOT will focus on details that will be very Northfield specific and continue the process with the Village of Northfield and the other villages as appropriate.
- A CAG Member noted that she thought it would be very important to show homes adjacent to the roadway on the cross-sections to be developed later in the process. She noted that there are some homes very close to the road and it will be important to see how the homes will be impacted by the grade change.
- A CAG Member asked how the non-Northfield stakeholders were going to be involved in the next phase of the process. Mr. Harmet said that IDOT will keep Winnetka informed as to what is going on at the east end and Northbrook and Glenview informed about the west end. The focus of the project will be on the middle section with Northfield.

- A CAG Member wanted to remind everyone in the room that there was consensus that safety was a top priority. She added that everyone agreed that safety had to come before mobility. Mr. Harmet responded that this has been a dominant factor throughout the process and that a safety toolbox was put together before any alternatives were drawn up.
- A CAG Member asked for clarification on the process moving forward. Mr. Harmet noted that the process would move forward in coordination with the Village of Northfield. Items to be discussed would include safety toolbox items as well as context items. Specifically these items would include: left turns into side streets, cul-du-sacs of some side streets, a pedestrian underpass, the closure of Old Willow, access to Sunset Ridge School, medians and refuge islands, bridge design (including walls and sidewalks), as well as environmental issues. All of these will be reviewed with the Village. Mr. Harmet responded that IDOT would coordinate with the Village directly on these issues to work out the details and then in early spring have a public hearing where we bring all the work together and have another public comment period. Then IDOT would consider all of the comments and wrap up the planning process. Then Phase II, or final design, would move forward from that point. This is another level of detail where a set of plans would be developed that a contractor could use to bid on and build the project.

Alternative Evaluation Summary - Presentation

The first year of this study focused on gathering data to thoroughly understand the transportation needs. This included both stakeholder perspectives and technical analysis. Technical experts were invited to educate the CAG on safety and traffic- such as Jeff Shaw from Federal Highway Administration and Claire Bozic from CMAP. A very thorough analysis was conducted- reviewing police reports for crashes along Willow Road, counting traffic at intersections, and evaluating safety and mobility. A total of 16 alternatives were generated by the CAG. These alternatives were developed and evaluated. This has generated lots of data, reports, and graphs. The focus of tonight's presentation is to discuss the Evaluation Round 3 technical analysis results.

Overall Safety

- The difference between Alternatives 2 and 3 Modified is relatively small (45 versus 48 predicted crashes per year – or about 6%) .
- Both are much better than the No Build Alternative, where there are 65 predicted crashes per year.

Pedestrian Safety

- Alternatives 2 and 3 Modified are the relatively same. Predicting 1 pedestrian crash every 20 or 21 years. (These are for the key intersections where there are school crossings.)
- Both are much better than the No Build Alternative, which predicts 1 pedestrian crash every 7 years

Mobility

- Alternative 3 Modified is LOS D. It is significantly better than Alternative 2 and the No Build Alternative, which are both at LOS F.
- No Build and Alternative 2 would also be worse than existing conditions.

Cost

- The costs estimate for Alternatives 2 and 3 Modified are relatively the same, which is due to: same improvements west of Sunset Ridge Road, east of Wagner, and 2.5 to 3-foot difference in pavement edge per side.

In summary, Alternative 3 Modified provides the best overall performance and better incorporates safety, mobility, community and environment.

- Pedestrian Safety is similar (20.5 vs. 20.0 years)
- Overall Safety is similar (within 6%)
- Mobility is significantly better (over 40%). At some intersections like Sunset Ridge mobility is over 100 percent better.

- Footprint is similar (2.5 to 3 feet per side)
- Cost is similar (within 3%)

So, it is Alternative 3 Modified that will be carried forward as the Recommended Alternative. Additional detail will be added including geometric items such as actual corner radii dimensions, retaining wall locations, and any environmental impact identification. Coordination with Northfield will be held as these details are worked out.

Alternative Evaluation Summary – Discussion

Overall Safety

- A CAG Member added, stating that he is the newest Trustee in Northbrook, a civil engineer, and has sat on many similar committees before, he has watched the process over the last two years (previously from the audience) and he has seen much sensitivity to the context of the project being applied by IDOT in terms of adhering to, listening to, and adhering to what he sees as a commitment to safety which is paramount and mobility which is what the Department of Transportation's mission is all about. We are trying to develop our economy not at the expense of children or education to benefit all. This is a necessary access point for Northfield, Northbrook, and Glenview. To throw kids down as being killed at all times of the day and night is to create an illusion that is just not there. He has seen the development of two viable alternatives, one is a variant of what was proposed originally as the compromise solution for a two lane road that was safer than what was originally provided. This alternative have been developed further and what you find out is that by making it safe you end up with a roadway that is narrower than just building out the two lane road and providing the mobility that we are all asking for. The member asked not to miss the opportunity to provide a service for all of us. The differences in safety and cost between the two alternatives that have been brought forward make it apparent that selection of the four lane road is the best way to go.

Pedestrian Safety

- A CAG Member asked how the pedestrian crossing between the two parks compared to the crossing east of the Edens where the horse trail and the jogging trail cross Willow Road. Mr. Stenzel replied that it was not near a street and so was similar to this situation. The CAG Member added that this seems to have worked out reasonably well.
- A CAG Member asked if CAG Member Tom Murtha or Bill Baltutis had any knowledge of studies or from personal experience that show the relative safety and effective of a cross-walk placed between two intersections on a four lane road. Mr. Murtha responded that one thing to consider is that placing a crosswalk away from an intersection may improve safety because it reduces conflict points. A concern is that traffic controls are sufficient to insure that traffic stops. Mr. Harmet added that the last meeting summary included examples of mid-block crossing locations that were shared in response to a question from the last CAG meeting.
- A CAG member noted that he supports the underpass if it can be done. From a planning perspective he thinks that IDOT has done a really good job, everyone has had their chance to voice their opinions, and he feels that we have to move forward. He likes what he sees with the four lane road.

Mobility

- A CAG Member stated that the most important chart is the one that showed the level of service improving in the short run but that Willow Road would be back where it is today in three-to-five years. He said that IDOT's own data shows the road will fail in three-to-five years. He then referred to Lake Cook Road as an example that shows no matter how many lanes you add it will always come back to a failing grade. The CAG Member added that the context sensitive process was building a road that will fail and destroy the context of the Village of Northfield in the process. Mr. Harmet responded that he thought the CAG Member mis-characterizes what CSS is. It is about all of the factors mobility, safety, community, and environment. There are capacity improvements being undertaken throughout the state and the county. The project team has undertaken a state of the practice in traffic forecasting process, and included outside experts to answer questions, and provide details about the forecasting. The forecasting process shows an LOS D in 2040 which is the national standard for urban areas. IDOT's data does not show what CAG Member was offering.

- A CAG Member found it curious that Glenview Road through Glenview's business district has been reduced to three lanes, Northbrook/Shermer Road has been reduced to three lanes, Techny Road has been altered to reduced mobility. So some of the regional roads that can handle more traffic Glenview has reduced. The previous CAG Member (from Glenview) responded that the roads mentioned are not SRA roads.
- A CAG Member noted that when the Edens Expressway was built IDOT wanted to have an interchange at Glenview Road and Glenview said no.
- A CAG Member commented, noting that this was the last CAG Meeting, he wanted to acknowledge that this has been difficult and he appreciates that in most circumstances the CAG has had a very focused dialog about the objectives. He appreciates the relationships that have been built between CAG Members. He thinks conclusions have been reached that will help this study move forward. He wanted to thank IDOT and the CAG Members for participating on this committee.

Cost

- A CAG Member asked how we can know that the costs are similar when, as we have seen tonight, the CAG is just starting to get into the actual details in terms of the context of the road and what safety tools are included or not, for example an underpass would be a significant cost. Mr. Harmet responded that in the Alternatives Round #3 report a detailed cost breakdown was provided for both alternatives; it shows that the alternatives are within three percent of each other in terms of cost.
- A CAG Member asked in reference to construction costs, that she was looking at the September materials and she did not see where the costs are within three percent of each other. In referring to a slide from the September presentation, she noted that the Alternative 2 was yellow in terms of construction costs and Alternative 3 was red which had been designated lowest performance and Yellow next best performance. Mr. Harmet responded that the CAG Member was looking at Round #2 Evaluation results not Round #3. Round #2 evaluation was closed out in September and Round #3 was introduced. Mr. Harmet said that IDOT could provide the cost information again if the CAG Member would like.
- A CAG Member offered a context sensitive comment about the Village of Northfield; he wanted to know who will be responsible for the utility costs and relocating utilities associated with the project. Mr. Harmet responded that generally speaking with any project there are local costs and these items that need to be identified and discussed further. The CAG Member then asked if IDOT was planning on widening Willow Road against the wishes of the Village of Northfield and sticking Northfield with the bill for moving sewers, water mains, and things like that. Mr. Harmet responded that these issues had to be identified and discussed further.
- A CAG Member asked if the utility costs were included in the costs that had been developed. Mr. Harmet responded that he thought these costs were covered by the 25 percent contingency included in the project cost.
- A CAG Member reiterated the question he asked previously which was if IDOT has a shortfall in terms of funding for drainage and moving utilities why shouldn't that cost burden be spread among all the communities that claim to have a stake in Willow Road.
- A CAG Member asked why the utilities were put under state property rather than Northfield property. Mr. Harmet responded that generally speaking you are going to find public utilities in the public right of way. Private companies may purchase an easement outside of that right of way. It's easier because if there is a need to go in companies can go in by permit the only condition being if something changes on the roadway then they would have to move it. If it is outside of the right of way they bear the upfront cost but then someone would have to move it for them

Other Comments

- A CAG Member noted that he generally agreed with the recommendation for Alternative 3 – Modified and that IDOT had done a good job of evaluating the alternatives and presenting the group with information on the alternatives. He asked how the process of refining the alternative with the Village of Northfield will work, e.g., in terms of the overpass or underpass. He asked if the Village decides it wants the underpass will it be included. Mr. Harmet responded that IDOT will do specific outreach with Northfield, review the comments,

and look at the impacts of doing various options. In terms of this specific issue there are three options on the table: an underpass, a pedestrian crossing, or do-nothing.

- A CAG Member offered a comment, with all due respect, that it was very difficult to walk away without some concrete answers to these questions and that the CAG got to where it is based on IDOT's analysis and not consensus. Mr. Harmet responded that a lot of constructive feedback has been received, e.g., the 30 mph speed limit and the 10 foot lanes come from Northfield CAG members. The process is moving into a more focused phase with the Village of Northfield that is geared toward addressing community specific issues. The CAG Member then asked, just to be clear, if the final decisions rest with IDOT. Mr. Harmet responded yes.
- A CAG Member said that this meeting reminded him of the first CAG Meetings with the back and forth discussion. First, he had been involved for 2 and one-half years and has spent a lot of time and heard about the different plans and from his standpoint the Village of Glenview is a stakeholder and should be involved in the second phase. This is a state road not a Village of Northfield Road. Second, he noted that important areas to Northfields tax base downtown and Kraft are four lane roads. In regard to the discussion regarding big box stores, he thought probably there are a lot of Northfield residents that shop in Glenview and use Glenview roads. Glenview has had to expand its roads; he saw this as being part of progress. He supports a four lane road as does the Village of Glenview because it is a regional road that people use to get to the Edens just as people from Northfield use Glenview roads to get to I-294 to get to O'Hare. He is satisfied with the documents and information that have been presented as well as the entire process. It has been very well done. In his role on the Village Plan Commission he looks not only at what is best for the Village and the petitioner but also the region. He understands that Willow Road is important to the Village, however, it is a regional road it has to be looked at as all of us are stakeholders. The safety issues are important and he believes that they have been addressed.

III. Post CAG Meetings / Next Steps – Presentation

- There will be continued coordination with the Village of Northfield to work out the details over the next few months.
- Coordination will also occur with the other villages as needed.
- Public Hearing in early 2012 (probably Spring). Before the hearing, we will share the information with the four Villages. The hearing will describe the process we went through, present all the information, show all the alternatives, show the results of all the studies, and give opportunity for public input.

Discussion

- A CAG Member wanted to make sure that the public meeting was going to be sometime in 2012. Does the CAG have IDOT's assurance that all the issues that have been pushed to Phase II will all be addressed and worked out before going to the public meeting. Mr. Harmet responded that IDOT will work hard with the Village to work out all the details and that IDOT will assess where things are at before contemplating a public hearing. The CAG Member asked if there was a date by which time the public hearing had to be held. Mr. Harmet responded, no. The CAG Member then asked if all issues weren't resolved by spring would IDOT postpone the meeting. Mr. Harmet responded that IDOT would consider postponing the meeting.
- Mr. Harmet thanked the CAG Members for the time and patience they had given to the process. It was great to have so many people engaged in the process. He believes that a lot has been accomplished. There is a very thorough understanding of the transportation needs. There was a wide range of alternatives, going well beyond the boundaries of the Willow Road study area, looked at and the gathering of an unprecedented amount of stakeholder feedback, the evaluation criteria that helped to develop a plan that addresses many issues. Mr. Harmet thanked everyone again and opened the floor up for public comments.

IV. Public Comment Summary following Adjournment of CAG Meeting

The following comments were made during the public comment session that immediately followed CAG Meeting #11. The following reflects a summary of the comments or questions and is not meant to be verbatim. The name and residency of the speaker is listed with the comment. Any consultant presentations are held to the end of the public comment section and are limited to 10 minutes.

Comment 1 (Pat Dietz, Northfield)

Ms. Dietz asked why the three lane alternative that was approved never given a chance. IDOT is going to widen Willow Road to 4 and 5 lanes but never gave the 3 lane alternative a chance.

Comment 2 (Linda Vieth, Superintendent of Sunset Ridge School District 29)

Ms. Vieth expressed on behalf of the students who attend the Northfield schools her disappointment in the decision that IDOT has made. It is going to be difficult to explain to children that the desire of motorists to arrive at their destination a few minutes sooner was perceived as being more important than their safety. She wondered what would be next? How wide will the road be? How fast will cars be allowed to travel. What safety measures will be put in place? Safe access to the schools and parks must be maintained. This includes school access, keeping Old Willow Road open, and longer walk cycles. You touched on some of these issues tonight and we appreciate that they are being considered and listened to. Safety must be the priority moving forward. Please work with us.

Comment 3 (Robert Soare, Northfield)

Mr. Soare has been a resident of Northfield for over 35 years. He said that the Northfield side did not seem particularly concerned about safety when he spoke in July about two people who were killed on a dangerous road. But now safety is their concern and has always been their first concern. This is nice. They are also concerned about children crossing Willow Road. They were not so concerned in July when Mr. Soare spoke about crossing Willow Road at Bristol between the parks. There was a campaign about this; the signs said "My children cross Willow Road." The implication of these signs is a lie. The implication is that my children now cross safely but if there is a four lane road it would be unsafe. There has been too much emotion and too little reason in these discussions. An IDOT official came to Clarkson Park to review the situation. And in the parking lot was a family that tried to cross Willow Road at Bristol, they could not cross, so instead got in their car and drove. Mr. Soare then asked the representatives from Northfield suppose a child wanted to cross from the school to the park at Bristol, and suppose that day he forgot his drivers license and his Mercedes – how is he going to get across the street. Is this what we mean by my children cross Willow Avenue? The 800 pound gorilla in the room is the money – it is always about the money. He noted that what the Village has spent and the private money that has been raised to fight the road totals \$1 million. This from a Village that we heard a little while ago has very little money. Why? Where did the money come from? Maybe they raised the money to preserve Mayberry. Why would they spend a million dollars? It's about real estate values. It's not about safety, or children, or death on the road. Mr. Soare expressed enormous admiration for the IDOT people, for their patience in this process in the face of naked aggression and rudeness. He favors a four lane road and believes that only about 10 percent of the residents of Northfield have a vested interest in this and most people are tired of this. Make the road four lanes and make it safe.

Comment 4 (Linda Garard, Northfield)

Ms. Garard has been involved with Willow Road for over 20 years. She was one of the people that started the Northfield Conservancy which was not started to block the widening of Willow Road but to block development. Northfield came up with an agreement with IDOT for a 3 lane road. She is upset that Senator Schoenburg has never shown up. Part of the agreement was that if the three lanes did not work IDOT could come back and do four. We went through Phase I and then Senator Schoenburg comes out of left field and says no. How much time and money has been wasted. None of this is based on any traffic numbers it is all political. A community should have the right to determine what it is going to look like. Instead whatever IDOT wants to do will happen and it doesn't seem right. She asked what everyone was going to gain by this – she did not get it. You're going

to be able to go from the Edens to Northbrook a minute faster. Meanwhile on the weekends you can lay down on the street and no cars come. Why have such a large street that we don't need? It is crazy that IDOT will not give Northfield a school speed zone because the crossing is protected by a light. The trend now is to put roads on a diet. She feels that she has no options. After IDOT puts the four lane road in and the first person is killed – it is all on IDOT.

Comment 5 (Rob Neustedt, Northfield)

Mr. Neustedt has been a resident of Northfield for 15 years. He disagreed, with all due respect, with a previous speaker and felt that there are more than 10 percent of the people of Northfield who do not favor widening Willow Road. He then addressed the people from Northbrook and Glenview, saying they have many large streets but Northfield only had one and it bisects the community. This is something the people of Northfield have to live with every day. Yes, safety is the main issue. Mr. Neustedt then asked where in the plan was the pedestrian overpass? Are overpasses in the plan or not, and if not, why not? He was aware of the problems with underpasses; they're dark, unsafe, they flood. Pedestrian overpasses make a lot of sense and Northfield should not have to bear the cost of them because Northfield will have to bear a lot of other costs.

Comment 6 (Betsy Kochvar, Northfield)

Crossing Willow Road at Wagner is dangerous right now. Ms. Kochvar noted that the crash that Mr. Soare referred to was a DUI and had nothing to do with pedestrian safety. The issue is the safety of the children. She also concerned about drainage along the road. She felt that the size of the retention pond that would be required by the roadway would very large. She did not think that safety or drainage had been addressed. She did not think that the refuge islands were the solution. She did not think that the recommendation was safe for the children.

Comment 7 (Lizzie Kinnich, Northfield)

Ms. Kinnich wanted to comment as to whether the process has really been a context sensitive process as outlined on IDOT's web site. According to the website the CSS discussions were suppose to include an in depth analysis of environmental impact, air quality impact, noise, property values, and community character. With the exception of safety she did not think these things were discussed appropriately until the very last meeting. With the exception of safety she does not think a CSS process took place. She felt that the meeting tonight was the first meeting that truly focused on contextual issues.

Comment 8 (Andrew Kurz, Glenview)

At the spring open house we learned that the least cost Willow Road options were local. Any option to expand facilities in the region were more expensive than options to expand Willow Road itself. One reason for the lower cost is that the State of Illinois already owns sufficient right of way along Willow Road and no costly real estate purchases are required. Illinois obtained these rights of way in 1946. This means that IDOT build the Edens Expressway in 1951 already planning for Willow Road to be a key thoroughfare. It means that Northfield has known for 65 years that IDOT had acquired the land to expand Willow Road. The feign surprise about expansion only shows inexcusable ignorance. This means that Northfield knew IDOT was going to expand Willow Road yet it built a schools, parks, and churches right on Willow Road. It means that for 60 years Northfield has enjoyed instant access to the expressway that has greatly increased its growth and property values. For 60 years Northfield has treated Willow Road as its own private land – Northfield does not own that land. Over 80,000 residents in the northwest suburbs also have ownership rights to that land and how it is used. Northfield is concerned about its children, yet endangers children in other communities with diverted traffic. Northfield has the audacity to claim that their children are more precious than children in other communities. If their children are so precious then why hasn't Northfield employed school buses to deliver children safely to the school's doorstep? If safety is so important why hasn't Northfield installed sidewalks on the north side of Willow Road which can deliver children safely to marked intersections? Why haven't fences been installed to keep children from crossing where it is not safe? What this means is that Northfield's arguments about safety don't wash given safety steps the Village could have taken but did not. What it does suggest is that Northfield refuses

to accept regional traffic growth and wants to maintain the status quo. It suggests that Northfield wants to refuse its neighbors their right to efficient transit through Northfield. It is time to build the four lanes. Consultants have provided solutions some of which have already been built in Northfield's downtown.

Comment 9 (Scott Nemanich, General Counsel, Sunset Ridge School District)

Mr. Nemanich has been counsel to the school district for 22 years. In response to the previous speaker the speaker noted that the school has been at its current location for 75 years. The next step is coordination with the Village of Northfield. The speaker asked that the school district be included in future coordination, because we do care about our children and their safety. We look forward to working with the Village and IDOT.

Comment 10 (John Nicolau, Glenview)

Mr. Nicolau is a 20-year resident of Glenview. He suggested that common sense take a hold here at some point. He has four children and they live right off Wagner Road. If Northfield wants to keep Willow Road two lanes so-be-it even though they do not own it and it is a Strategic Regional Arterial. Then close off Wagner and Sunset Ridge at Willow or Winnetka so that the traffic is not forced onto these streets. The safety of children should be the paramount concern for everyone. He is concerned about the safety of children in Northfield, but equally concerned about the safety of children in Northbrook, Glenview and Winnetka. He noted that people throughout the area navigate four lane roads with schools, residences, parks, shopping centers, and retirement communities along them safely. It is possible with the proper design and safety tools.

Comment 11 (Zack Lazare, Northbrook)

Mr. Lazare lives in Northbrook on Happ Road. He pays a great deal in taxes to Sunset Ridge Schools and the Northfield Park District. He was very appreciative that another speaker spoke about Wagner. His concern is for himself and his grandchildren on Happ Road. People turn down Happ when they see Willow Road backed up and come zooming down Happ. He does appreciate the police presence on Happ. Since he moved to Happ Road he has seen it expanded. The fact is change does come. He recalls when the environmental group formed and they were trying to work out details on Happ Road. There have been some accommodations such as when Northfield sold off part of its corner to Kraft. A few years ago he was appalled when the answer of Northfield to Willow Road was to widen Voltz Road and tie into Tower Road.

Comment 12 (June O'Donoghue, Northfield)

Mrs. O'Donoghue asked IDOT about the agreement for the 2005 Plan, which was not followed, and wondered if the word of IDOT is good. She does not know what happened but all of the sudden Jeff Schoenburg announced Willow Road was going to be four lanes and somehow the agreement that all the Villages agreed to was no longer valid. So don't mind us if were a little skeptical of anything IDOT agrees to today. IDOT has said they would work with the Village of Northfield; who is the Village of Northfield? The Village of Northfield is all the people who live here. She lives on Sunset Ridge Road and gets a lot of traffic – she thinks it is 6,000 cars per day coming from Northbrook south that turn on Willow Road. The traffic on Wagner or Sunset Ridge is north-south not east-west. This is not what is causing the problem it is the backup on the Edens, the spur, the beltway, and I-294. These are the problems that should be dealt with.

Comment 13 (Carl Bova, Cooper Engineering representing the Village of Northfield)

Many unsolved issues remain as well as many details. Some of these elements include: storm water, i.e., if you increase the number of lanes from two to four you are doubling the amount of runoff, the road profile which was discussed in great detail with respect to the bridge, retaining wall lengths and heights, property values, mid-block crossings, thoughtful typical sections, preservation of access and mobility, sidewalk widths, green space and parkways, tightening of turning radii at corners, use of countdown timers and refuge islands, median widths, plantings within the medians, the aesthetics and the width of the bridge, realignment at Happ / Willow, the highpoint at Waukegan Road, a transition in the speed limit east of Waukegan Road (Mr. Bova recommended this be done west of Willow Road), and the Lakota Study. Incorporation of these elements to the satisfaction of the residents of the Village of Northfield because of their proximity to Willow Road is necessary to the success of

the project. He encouraged that the roadway be designed from the outside of the right of way to the centerline. Outside in design with respect to school access, Old Willow, the retaining walls, the sidewalk widths, speed, the bridge, sunken sidewalks, and the other items that were discussed this evening. This team needs to design Willow Road intersections to operate far safer for pedestrians and motorists alike than the older Willow Road intersections just slightly to the west.

Comment 14 (Kate Rekett, Northfield)

All of this time and all of this effort to save at most 59 seconds?

Comment 15 (Jamie Garard, Northfield)

Mr. Garard has been a resident for 53 years. Upon reflection he feels like we always want to move things faster. He is disappointed because two years ago a gentleman had asked if at the end of the process we don't agree would IDOT push through 4 lanes. IDOT said, no we have to let the process work. He sees a lot of dejected faces of people who spent a lot of time for naught. The four lane option has been forced down Northfield's throat. The decision tonight was to go against an agreement and build 4 lanes rather than 3 lanes first as agreed to in the 2005 Plan. He thinks that the chore going forward will be most difficult because IDOT is not going to give Northfield the things Northfield needs.

Comment 16 (Jennifer Trimble, Northbrook)

She has lived in Northfield / Northbrook her entire life. You are complaining about Willow Road now but if you make it bigger you will have the same complaint. If you build a bigger road there will be more traffic. Why don't you just leave it with the three lane option? We've all chosen to live in Northfield, why change it?

Attendance Roster - CAG Members

Community Advisory Group Meeting #12

Willow Road Study: Illinois Route 43 to Interstate 94
 November 10, 2011; 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
 New Trier High School, Northfield Campus, Building C, Room 234



	CAG Member	Community	Email Address	Present (Please initial)
1	William J. Baltutis	At Large	bill_baltutis@baxter.com	WJB
2	John Birkinbine	Northfield	jbirkinbine@sbcglobal.net	JJB
3	Hallie Bodman	Northfield	ahkbod@aol.com	HB
4	Steve Bucklin	Glenview	sbucklin@glenbrooksecurity.com	SB
5	Dan de Loys	Northfield	ddeloys@comcast.net	DDL
6	Rick Filler	Glenview	rfiller@harlemirving.com	
7	Tensley Garris	Northbrook	tensley@northbrookchamber.org	TG
8	Robert Hayward	Northfield	robert.hayward@kirkland.com	
9	Todd Heller	Northbrook	todd@thellerlaw.com	
10	Steve Hirsch	Northfield	sbhirsch@hotmail.com	SH
11	Kate Katz	Northbrook	Kk2667@aol.com	
12	John Kemper	Northfield	jkemper@mac.com	JK
13	Peggy Kozminski	Northfield	kozpbs@comcast.net	PK
14	Penny Lanphier	Winnetka	lanphieriv@sbcglobal.net	PL
15	Jeffrey G. Liss	Winnetka	JGLJGL@aol.com	JGL
16	Tom Murtha	At Large	tmurtha@cmap.illinois.gov	TM
17	Patrick O' Donoghue	Northfield	northfieldpat@yahoo.com	POD
18	Buggie O'Grady	Northfield	buggieogrady@yahoo.com	BOG
19	Don Owen	Glenview	dowen@glenview.il.us	DO
20	Jim Patterson	Glenview	jimpattersonjr@pattersoncompany.com	JP
21	Phoebe Raymond	Northfield	nomedad@mindspring.com	PR
22	Stacy Sigman	Northfield	ssigman@northfieldil.org	SS
23	Stephanie Stuckey	Northbrook	sstuckey@ups.com	
24	Scott Turban	Northfield	scottturban@aim.com	ST
25	Don Whiteman	Northfield	kk9h@me.com	

Attendance Roster - CAG Alternates

Community Advisory Group Meeting #12

Willow Road Study: Illinois Route 43 to Interstate 94
 November 10, 2011; 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
 New Trier High School, Northfield Campus, Building C, Room 234



	CAG Member	Community	Email Address	Present (Please initial)
1	Melissa Bianucci	Northfield	bianucci@comcast.net	
2	Juli Blunt	Northfield	jrb.freshideas@earthlink.net	
3	Jack Bodman	Northfield	jpbod@viennabeef.com	
4	Jeff Brady	Glenview	jeffb@glenview.il.us	JB
5	Sydney Clark	Northfield	sclark4994@yahoo.com	sc
6	Pat Doherty	Northfield	dohertypat@aol.com	
7	Nancy Firfer	Glenview	nancy.l.firfer@cm2020.org	
8	Nancy Garrity	Northbrook	ngarrity@ups.com	
9	Becky Hurley	Winnetka	hurley5@comcast.net	
10	Don Kopec	At Large	dkopec@cmap.illinois.gov	
11	Brian Kozminski	Northfield	bkozminski@llegal.com	
12	William Lustig	Northfield	blustig@northfieldil.org	WL
13	Kathy Miles	Glenview	gcstaff@glenviewchamber.com	
14	Brian Moran	Northfield	bmoran@femorran.com	
15	Sean O'Grady	Northfield	sogrady@northshore.org	
16	Anne Peterson	Northfield	apeterson70@comcast.net	
17	Kate Rekett	Northfield	kate@sutherlandhomes.com	KAR
18	Charles Shabica	Northfield	cshabica@comcast.net	CS
19	Theresa Snyder	Northfield	theresasnyder14@gmail.com	
	Bob Israel	Northbrook		