

Willow Road Phase I Study Summary of CAG Meeting #8 and Public Comment Period



Date: March 10, 2011
Time: 6:10 p.m. to 8:50 p.m. CAG Meeting
8:50 p.m. to 9:10 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 #8 included the Purpose and Need Document and the 2040 No-Build Traffic Forecasts. The Round #1 Evaluation, including the Purpose and Need Screening and the Flaw Analysis, and the Preliminary Findings were also introduced. In addition to the CAG #8 Meeting Summary, there is follow up information at the end of the document regarding two items, pedestrian countdown signals and the definition of an Urban District, that were discussed during CAG Meeting #7 on January 20, 2011.

I. Introduction (Pete Harmet)

Meeting Overview:

The role of the CAG is to provide constructive feedback in a polite, professional, and civil manner. Discussions will follow the presentations and, due to the technical and complex nature of the material, only an introduction of the new topics will be provided along with supporting analysis. These new topic briefings will be followed up with a full discussion of the topics at CAG Meeting #9 on April 7, 2011. This will allow the CAG members time to review and process the information. There will then be a public meeting in May followed by CAG Meeting #10 in July. At the July meeting we will conclude discussion of Round #1 Evaluation and initiate discussion of Round #2.

Mr. Stenzel noted the materials provided to the CAG Members as they came in: the Agenda, copies of the slide show, CAG Meeting #7 Summaries, and a CD containing the Traffic Report in both a red-lined version showing the changes in the report as well as a clean copy.

Mr. Stenzel noted that the CAG will be discussing the material presented at the meeting over a four month period.

Mr. Harmet indicated that if needed, along with the upcoming public meeting and CAG meetings, a Technical Advisory Committee meeting could be scheduled as well.

II. Continued CAG Discussions

A. Purpose and Need Document

Presentation of Purpose and Need Document:

- A draft copy of the Purpose and Need document was distributed at CAG Meeting #7. No comments were received prior to tonight's meeting.
- The Purpose and Need is a culmination of studies that had been undertaken since the start of the project.
- It is the first chapter of the environmental documentation that is done for every Phase I project; i.e., it is a standard part of the process.
- The Purpose and Need contains the purpose of the project: which is to address existing and 2040 transportation needs along Willow Road.
- The needs are: safety, mobility and facility condition and design.

Purpose Need Document Discussion:

- There were no CAG comments regarding the Purpose and Need Document.

B. 2040 Traffic Forecasts

Presentation of 2040 Forecasts

- CMAP recently released the 2040 Regional Plan which they have named: *GO TO 2040*.
- CMAP updates their plan every three-to-four years; every ten years there is a new look at the future resulting in completely new forecasts for the Chicagoland area.
- On roadway projects IDOT looks at a minimum 20-year planning horizon. Since we are now past 2010 we need to move forward with the 2040 forecasts.
- From this point forward, all traffic forecasts we examine will be for 2040 Build or No-Build.
- Exhibits were presented showing the 2009 existing traffic volumes and the 2040 No-Build traffic volumes.
- The 2040 versus 2030 numbers didn't reflect much of a difference between the forecasts.

Discussion of 2040 Traffic Forecasts

- A CAG member asked if the 2010 census data would be integrated into the model and how that would affect the forecasts. Ms. Bozic responded that 2010 census data had been released for redistricting purposes but that all of the data that CMAP needs to review the model has not yet been released.
- A CAG member asked Ms. Bozic when CMAP would receive the required census data. Ms. Bozic responded that she would find out what the schedule is for the release of the census data and provide it to the CAG. Mr. Harmet added that it is important to remember that the needs for this project are being driven by existing conditions. A CAG member said that existing conditions are not being reflected by existing census data.
- A CAG member asked how the current extremely high unemployment is considered by the model. Mr. Harmet responded that Ms. Bozic had discussed at previous meetings how the forecasts were prepared. Ms. Bozic added that when CMAP receives the 2010 census data they will know what the unemployment rate was in 2010. Looking to the future, no one expects the current unemployment rates to continue. She noted that unemployment has been declining over the last few months. She expected we would be recovered by 2040.
- A CAG member asked if employment data in the current CMAP model is from the 2000 census or are there things done in the interim to update the model. Ms. Bozic responded that there are things done in the interim to update the model.
- A CAG member asked what assumptions were used in calculating the forecasts for the Edens Expressway. Ms. Bozic responded that there was nothing done for the Edens Expressway that was not also done for all the other expressways and roadways in northeastern Illinois. Mr. Harmet added that in the analysis the Edens was not assumed to be widened and that the Willow Road interchange was evaluated and found to be operating at Level of Service D. He also noted that the interchanges would be examined as part of the alternatives analysis.
- A CAG member asked how data obtained from other households in northeastern Illinois pertains to the concerns of people in this community. Ms. Bozic explained that it is a process of statistical sampling to obtain a geographic and household type distribution that is representative of households in northeastern Illinois. Travel characteristics are assumed to be similar for households with similar socioeconomic characteristics. The CAG member then asked if surveys were distributed around Northfield. Ms. Bozic explained that 20,000 households were surveyed throughout the region so that the likelihood of anyone in the meeting getting one is relatively small.
- A CAG member asked how the CMAP numbers were used in a process that by law is supposed to be sensitive to the context in which a road is being built. Ms. Bozic explained that CMAP is generating data that is specific to the types of people and households living in Northfield, e.g., workers per household, household income, number of children, and average trip length. She noted that the travel behavior of people in Northfield is similar to people in other communities with similar socioeconomic characteristics. Mr. Harmet noted that the CAG has discussed this matter extensively and that the CMAP procedure is state-of-the-practice and federally endorsed. Further, it is not the CAG's purpose to deconstruct the CMAP modeling process. Ms. Bozic added that

extensive documentation on the process is available on the internet and that the link to the information had been given to the CAG previously.

- A CAG member asked if CMAP's forecasts have ever been compared to forecasts done by others to determine where the region is going. Ms. Bozic responded that CMAP does not compare its forecasts to what others are doing because it is not the purpose of CMAP. What CMAP does is to compare their model results, e.g., traffic volumes and vehicle miles of travel, to what they can count on the ground.
- A CAG member asked Ms. Bozic to comment on a statement attributed to the head of IDOT made at a very early Willow Road meeting that westbound traffic on Willow Road would increase 30 percent. Ms. Bozic responded that she could not comment without knowing the assumptions of the forecast behind the statement.

III. Introduction of Round #1 Evaluation

A. Purpose and Need Screening

Presentation of Purpose and Need Screening

- This is Round #1 in the Alternatives Analysis.
- Sixteen alternatives have been identified.
 - Five along Willow Road
 - No-Build Plus
 - 2-Lane with Median / 2-Lane with Median (2005 Plan)
 - 4-Lane with Median
 - 3-Lane Unbalanced Lanes with Median
 - 2- Lane with Roundabouts
 - Additional lanes on parallel routes
 - Dundee Road – Add Lanes
 - Lake Avenue – Add Lanes
 - Eight different interchange ideas
 - Full Interchange I-294 at Lake Avenue
 - Full Interchange I-294 at Dundee Road
 - Full Interchange I-94 (Edens Spur) at I-294
 - Full Interchange I-94 (Edens Spur) at IL 43
 - Full Interchange I-94 at Dundee Road
 - Full Interchange I-94 at Tower Road
 - Full Interchange I-94 at Willow Road
 - Full Interchange I-94 at Lake Avenue
 - Other Expressway
 - Eliminate Eastbound Lane Drop on the Edens Spur
- These sixteen alternatives were examined in the Round #1 analysis
- There are three other corridor specific options, i.e., alternatives 17, 18, and 19 that are considered options for the final alternative chosen for Willow Road.
 - Willow Road and IL 43 Intersection Improvements
 - Longer Eastbound-to-Southbound Willow Road On-Ramp to I-94
 - Pedestrian Friendly Modifications I-94 at Willow Road Interchange
- The evaluations determine how these alternatives affect Willow Road.
- Round #1 of the evaluation will be done in two parts:
 - Initial screening (develop initial list of alternatives)
 - Purpose & Need test
- All alternatives will be compared to the No-Build alternative as well as each other.
- Round #1 is a high level analysis
- Tools that will be used:
 - Highway Safety Manual

- CMAP Travel Demand Model data
- Highway Capacity Manual
- Existing Aerial Photography
- Maps and GIS
- Comparison Criteria:
 - Calculated safety performance accounting for vehicles and pedestrians
 - Level of Service (LOS) at Willow Road/Sunset Ridge Road intersection
 - Facility condition and design
 - Flaw analysis
- Purpose and Need Screening
 - Safety
 - Vehicular safety for the section of Willow Road between Sunset Ridge Road and Wagner Road
 - Pedestrian safety at Willow Road and Sunset Ridge Road intersection
 - Highway Safety Manual (HSM) predicted average crash frequency (crashes per year)
 - Mobility
 - Willow road and Sunset ridge Road Intersection
 - Level of service, intersection delay, and queue lengths
 - Facility Condition and Design
 - Improvements to Willow Road
- Flaw Analysis
 - Impacts
 - Potential displacements
 - Land acquisitions
 - Floodplains and floodways
 - Conceptual Level of Construction Cost
 - Assumes reconstruction for all alternatives (2011 Dollars)
 - Does not include engineering, land acquisition, and other unique features
 - Costs used for relative comparisons in Evaluation Round #1
 - Costs will be refined at each round as more information on an alternative becomes available
- Navigating Around the Alternative Exhibits
 - Copies of *Volume 1: Alternatives Analysis Summary Report* and *Volume 2: Alternatives Analysis Exhibits* were distributed to the CAG Members
 - A CAG Member asked when these materials were available and said that it would be helpful if they were provided in advance of the meeting. Mr. Harmet responded that the materials were available today. He stated that as has been the approach used during this process, the CAG will first be briefed on a topic at a CAG meeting. The CAG will then have the opportunity to discuss the information over a number of months. The CAG will discuss these materials in April and again in July. If desired, a Technical Advisory Committee meeting can be scheduled in between the CAG meetings.
 - Members were asked to open *Volume 2* to Alternative 5
 - Aerial photos: green shading is the improvement footprint; the black line is the edge of pavement
 - The exhibit key in the top right corner shows the alternative location relative to Willow Road
 - The exhibit legend is in the bottom left corner

Discussion of Purpose and Need Screening

- In response to a question from a CAG Member, who noted that the number of lanes was not visible on the exhibit and asked if there was something that shows what the roadway looks like and would help differentiate them, Mr. Stenzel pointed out the Project Summary which lists the assumptions behind the development of the alternative. Mr. Harmet added that the green shading shows the right-of-way footprint. Yellow shading shows where the alternative is outside of the existing right-of-way; X's where there would be displacements. Mr. Stenzel added this is important because if IDOT rebuilds Willow Road as a 3-lane or 4-lane facility it will fit within the existing right-of-way.

- A CAG member asked if there was anywhere the exhibit showed the existing road as it is today. Mr. Stenzel explained that the existing road is 24 feet wide, where it is two lanes with no median, and 36 feet wide at the intersections. The member added that in the future it would be nice to see the existing roadway and the proposed on the same exhibit. Mr. Stenzel explained that we would get to that level of detail in the next round of analysis.
- A CAG member noted that in regard to Alternative 5 the Project Summary states: "Crosswalks with Pedestrian Signals at all signalized intersections" which would seem to indicate that there would be no crosswalks near the schools. The Member added this, therefore, seemed to be an alternative that would not be worthy of serious consideration. Mr. Harmet responded that all the alternatives were suggested by stakeholders. Another CAG Member added that since the start, safety has been the CAG's paramount consideration. Therefore, alternatives without crosswalks near the schools are fraudulent and represent an attempt to skew people's thoughtful consideration of the alternatives since they may discount Alternative 5 because it does not include crosswalks near the schools. Mr. Stenzel added that roundabouts could have pedestrian crosswalks they would not, however, be signalized. Another CAG member then asked how children would get to school in Alternative 5 and that a way had to be found to get children to school. Mr. Harmet responded that this was one of 16 alternatives, suggested by stakeholders that were being analyzed. Another CAG member added that if all the alternatives were as flawed as Alternative 5 it was going to be a long process.
- Another CAG member commented that the argumentative statements that were being made are not what the CAG was looking to do. Rather the CAG should be trying to understand the options that the CAG asked to be studied. Clearly there will be flaws in some of the alternatives but this is what the CAG asked to be studied. The CAG is spending time shooting down IDOT and the consultant when they have taken the CAG's ideas and put them down on paper. If CAG members have concerns these should be provided. Members should not continue to say IDOT has a flawed process. This is the process that the CAG asked for to study its alternatives. The Member continued saying that the previous discussion was inappropriate. The CAG Member agreed that safety was the number one concern but added these were not solved solutions. The CAG Member concluded saying the alternative shows roundabouts as the CAG requested. He could not believe that CAG Members were now complaining that it was included.
- Another CAG member added that he wanted to make sure that the alternatives were being provided to the CAG on a neutral basis. He didn't want alternatives to be dismissed, especially in the upcoming public meeting, because they did not have crosswalks and therefore did not address the community's number one concern. Mr. Harmet responded by saying that information on each of the 16 alternatives was being provide for the CAG to consider and provide comments.
- A CAG member asked if it would be possible to briefly look at each of the alternatives so the CAG members can understand what they are looking at and point out any flaws they may see. Mr. Harmet responded that this was possible. Mr. Stenzel reminded the CAG members that these exhibits are not at a very detailed level and there are many things not shown, e.g., tools from the Pedestrian Safety Toolbox that will be added as alternatives are further developed. Mr. Harmet asked the CAG members if they would like to go through each alternative and the members agreed.
- A CAG member asked why the intersection of Willow Road and Sunset Ridge Road was examined in the Round #1 evaluation rather than the intersection of Willow Road and Wagner Road. Mr. Harmet responded that this was discussed in the methodology; the reason being that the Sunset Ridge Road intersection is the more sensitive in terms of number of lanes and traffic volumes. A CAG member asked that when referring to a particular document (like the methodology document Mr. Harmet referred to) that speakers mention the specific document being referred to by name. Mr. Stenzel continued that the theory was that if the Sunset Ridge Road intersection worked at a particular level the Wagner Road intersection would be a little bit better. In later rounds of evaluation all intersections will be examined.

Discussion of Alternatives

- Mr. Stenzel then reviewed each of the alternatives.
 - Alternative 1: No-Build Plus
 - Spot improvements
 - Not a complete reconstruction
 - Updated signals
 - Close the Old Willow Road and Willow Road intersection on the west end of Old Willow
 - Some modifications to other intersections between Wagner Road and Old Willow Road / Northfield Road
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel noted that the green shading on the exhibits indicated where modifications would be made to the roadway. Where there is no shading there are no modifications to the roadway anticipated.
 - Alternative 2: Willow Road 2-Lane With Median
 - Approximately 36 foot wide roadway
 - Complete reconstruction
 - New sewer system
 - New signal system
 - Flush (painted) median
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel said that the purple on the exhibit indicated that the Willow Road bridge between Bristol Street and Old Willow Road/Northfield Road would be rebuilt.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel indicated that Willow Road needs to be reconstructed.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel indicated that the purpose of a median was to create space for left turns.
 - A CAG member asked if only flush medians were being considered.
 - Alternative 2A: Willow Road 2-Lane With Median (2005 Plan)
 - Whereas Alternative 2 keeps a 3-lane cross section from Sunset Ridge Road to Northfield Road, in Alternative 2A Willow Road tapers down to a two lane cross section between Sunset Ridge Road and Wagner Road.
 - East of Wager Road the intersections at Eaton and Dickens streets are closed and there is a right-in-right-out intersection at Churchill Street.
 - Alternative 3: Willow Road 4-Lane with Median
 - Two lanes in each direction
 - The median could be either a flush (painted) median or a raised (curbed) median possibly with landscaping.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel indicated that it would be either a 5-lane cross section (at intersections with a turn lane) or 4-lanes with a median.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel indicated that 11 foot lanes were assumed; therefore, the roadway would be 55 feet wide.
 - The alternative is similar to others in terms of improvements, e.g., new signals, but no cul-de-sacs.
 - Only the Willow Road / Old Willow Road intersection (west end) would be closed.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel indicated that currently the lanes on Willow Road are 12 feet wide.
 - Alternative 4: Willow Road Unbalanced Lanes with Median
 - A CAG Member asked why the alternatives up to this point had a predicted vehicle and pedestrian crash rate shown on the exhibit but starting with Alternative 4 only a vehicle crash rate is shown. Mr. Harmet responded that this information did not get onto the exhibit but is available in the presentation and on the first page of Volume 2.
 - The alternative has two lanes in one direction and one lane in the other direction with a turn lane in the middle.

- The analysis was run with two lanes westbound and then again with two lanes eastbound.
- In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel indicated that this type of configuration is appropriate when there is a greater amount of traffic in one direction compared to the other.
- In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel indicated that the configuration would always be the same, i.e., there would not be 2-lanes in one direction in the morning and then 2-lanes in the opposite direction in the afternoon.
- Alternative 5: Willow Road 2-Lane with Roundabouts
 - Roundabouts are a relatively new design in the United States. They are not a traffic circle.
 - The design tries to avoid school property as a result some land acquisition is required.
 - This is a two lane roundabout.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Harmet stated that the possibility of midblock signalized crosswalks, away from the roundabout, or some kind of grade separation is something that would have to be examined at a different level of detail.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Harmet stated the key to the roundabout design is the splitter islands that angle a vehicle in the proper direction to enter the traffic stream.
 - There would be no signals and the roundabouts would be signed for 25 mph.
 - A CAG Member noted a roundabout was built in Lake County at Everett Road and Riverwoods Road in Lincolnshire. In response to a question from another CAG Member, it was noted that the land use adjacent to this roundabout is forest preserve and residential.
 - A CAG Member asked if there was a design feature in roundabouts that would cause traffic to stop prior to the place where pedestrians would cross. Mr. Stenzel responded that there was and it would involve designing crosswalks in conjunction with splitter islands.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel indicated that the assumed speed through the corridor was 35 mph; the same as Willow Road is today.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel indicated that pedestrian underpasses had not been made part of any of the alternatives at this time. It was, however, a feature that could be examined at a later date. Mr. Stenzel continued that of all the items in the Pedestrian Safety Tool Box only pedestrian countdown signals and refuge islands were considered at the current analysis level. Other items in the Tool Box would be examined as the process moves to a greater level of detail.
 - A CAG Member asked if all of the tools in the Safety Tool Box can be applied to all of the alternatives; they have just not been mapped out at this time. Mr. Stenzel replied that this was correct.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel indicated that the cost for the alternative includes only the pedestrian countdown signals and the refuge islands. Mr. Harmet added that this was the case for all of the alternatives.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel indicated that there were no land acquisition costs in Alternatives 2 and 3. He explained that generally the right-of-way is 100 feet wide and the roadway way takes up 55 feet leaving approximately 20 – 25 feet on either side from the edge of the roadway. The current road is 24 feet wide; 36 feet wide at intersections with a turn lane. In addition, given the 10 foot wide shoulders even the four lane option, which includes curb and gutter, is not that much wider than the current roadway.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Ms. Meyerkord indicated that typically roundabouts are a yield on enter condition. On the exit side of the roundabout pedestrians and drivers will each have to look out for the other, however, the speed through the roundabout is only 25 mph.
 - A CAG Member clarified that typically the pedestrian crosswalks and the signing for the crosswalks are upstream of the yield sign for traffic entering the roundabout.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Harmet indicated that examples of roundabouts near schools would be provided to the CAG as well as information from the MUTCD (Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices) regarding signage and striping for roundabouts.
 - There was discussion regarding who suggested Alternative 5. A CAG Member stated that it was their idea and that they felt that 100 alternatives should be considered.

- Alternative 6: Dundee Road Add Lanes IL 43 to I-94 and Alternative 7: Lake Avenue Add Lanes IL 43 to I-94 have similar characteristics
 - A strip of right-of-way is needed along both sides of the roadway in each alternative.
 - In each alternative there are displacements.
 - Some proposed signals and intersection improvements would be needed to add the lanes.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel indicated that the alternatives did not include a full interchange at I-94.
- Alternative 8: Full Interchange I-294 at Lake Avenue
 - As with all of the interchange alternatives the design is for the most compressed type of interchange possible in order to minimize impacts.
 - The design avoids The Grove because of the need to avoid public lands. Therefore, in order to get full movement, ramps were added on the north and east side. As a result there are a lot of impacts including 147 residential displacements (due to an apartment building and condos) as well as 1 cemetery displacement.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel said that an I-94 southbound on-ramp from Milwaukee Avenue was not included because of impacts to the adjacent forest preserve.
- Alternative 9: Full Interchange I-294 at Dundee Road
 - This is a single point urban interchange (SPUI).
 - This type of design brings the ramps in close to the pavement and results in one intersection, with one signal, on the bridge over I-294.
 - Examples of this type of interchange can be found at I-80/I-94 at Torrance Avenue in Lansing, IL and on I-55 at Pulaski Road and Damen Avenue.
 - Land acquisition is required from the Cook County Forest Preserve. In addition, some homes would need to be acquired.
- Alternative 10: Full Interchange I-94 (Edens Spur) to I-294
 - Add the westbound-to-southbound and northbound-to-eastbound movements to the existing interchange.
 - Acquisitions would include businesses as well as residential properties.
- Alternative 11: Full Interchange I-94 (Edens Spur) at IL 43 (Waukegan Road)
 - Currently there is a partial interchange with movements to and from the west.
 - The design matches up with the existing intersections.
 - There is a strip mall in the northeast quadrant that would be severely impacted.
 - In response to question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel indicated that it does happen where there are three legs to an intersection, but it is rare. Mr. Harmet added that at this level we are trying to maximize performance so that if we take off a ramp there are fewer impacts but also decreased performance.
- Alternative 12: Eliminate Eastbound Lane Drop at Edens Spur
 - Added a lane to the Edens Spur at the point where it joins the Edens.
 - The challenge with this alternative is that it results in three on-ramps on the Edens within a very short distance.
 - The existing ramp in the northwest quadrant at Dundee Road and I-94 is substandard; this alternative would bring it away from the other ramp but results in a larger footprint and several relocations.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Harmet indicated that the general premise of all the regional alternatives is to serve travelers that are currently using Willow Road but that may switch their route if additional capacity or access became available at another location.
- Alternative 13: Full Interchange I-94 at Dundee Road
 - Creates a single point urban interchange at Dundee Road that eliminates the loop ramps and tightens up the interchange.
 - Does not include Alternative 12: Eliminate Eastbound Lane Drop at Edens Spur
 - Includes a new lane to separate traffic coming from the Edens Spur from Edens' through traffic in order to avoid a dangerous merge situation.

- Much of the interchange fits within the existing footprint because of the tight configuration.
- In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Harmet indicated that this alternative did not consider a proposed local industrial development at the intersection of Dundee Road and Skokie Boulevard.
- A CAG member noted that approximately 10 - 15 years ago CATS through the CMAQ (Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality) Program funded an interchange modification project anticipating redevelopment in this area but it was dropped by Northbrook due to excessive cost. In response to a question from another CAG Member, it was noted that the cost was Northbrook's and not IDOT's because at the time Northbrook was pursuing the project.
- Another CAG Member noted that there was nothing in the Northbrook development that was industrial. At one point it was suppose to be office but is now viewed as a multi-use development including residential, retail, and hotel.
- Alternative 14: Full Interchange I-94 at Tower Road
 - The design is for a single point urban interchange (SPUI) to keep the ramps in tight.
 - There is some acquisition in the southeast quadrant including forest preserve land.
 - The footprint generally fits within that of the existing interchange.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Harmet indicated that before the CAG discussed combining alternatives the group should first discuss the results of the evaluation and then determine the next steps.
- Alternative 15: Full Interchange I-94 at Willow Road
 - The design is for a single point urban interchange (SPUI).
 - There is some land acquisition in order to accommodate ramps and some street closures.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member about adding toll booths to the Willow Road interchange at I-294, Mr. Harmet responded that the summary from the last meeting included notes on toll pricing. He continued that the Tollway maintains an average cost per trip and that while a traveler may not pay on a ramp they will pay a toll on the mainline toll facility. Therefore, a new toll plaza will not affect travel patterns.
 - In response to a question from a CAG Member, Mr. Stenzel indicated that this alternative does lengthen the existing ramps.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel said that avoiding construction in a flood plain is the goal. Otherwise, the water being displaced by the construction has to go somewhere else and the rate of mitigation in a floodplain may be greater than one-to-one.
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel said that the idea of the SPUI was to have a single intersection. It would be possible, however, to bring the free flow off-ramps into the intersection if the desire was to eliminate the free flow movement.
 - A CAG Member suggested designing as a T intersection similar to Lake Cook Road.
- Alternative 16: Full Interchange I-94 at Lake Avenue
 - Alternative is designed as a single point urban interchange.
 - The alternative has significant impact in terms of displacement and street closures because of the build area needed to accommodate the ramps but doesn't have much impact on traffic numbers.
- The following three options can be added to any of the other alternatives.
- Option 17: Longer Entrance Ramp Eastbound Willow Road to Southbound I-94
 - In response to a question from a CAG member, Mr. Stenzel said in this Option the westbound-to-southbound ramp would stay the same.
 - A CAG Member asked if it would be possible to have a left turn onto the ramps with a signal rather than an interchange. Mr. Stenzel replied that this was an option that could be examined.
- Option 18: Pedestrian Friendly Modification I-94 at Willow Road Interchange
 - This option includes removing the existing northbound-to-eastbound ramp and reconfiguring the existing northbound-to-westbound ramp to accommodate left and right turns at a new signalized intersection at Willow Road.

- Option 19: Willow Road at IL 43 (Waukegan Road) Intersection Improvements
 - Widen to include dual left turn lanes on all approaches as well as a northbound-to-eastbound right turn lane.
- A CAG Member asked if there were any modifications to the analysis intersection other than the number of through lanes. Ms Meyerkord responded that there were not and that none of the alternatives included dual left turn lanes at Willow Road and Sunset Ridge Road.
- A CAG Member asked if any of the alternatives included a designated right turn lane. Ms. Meyerkord responded that only Alternative 2A, i.e., the 2005 Plan, has an eastbound-to-southbound right turn lane
- A CAG Member asked if it was possible for this study to look at congestion on the eastbound Edens Expressway during rush hour. Mr. Harmet responded that the Willow Road interchange has been analyzed as a part of this effort and that some deficiencies have been identified. An examination of adding lanes to the Edens Expressway, however, is not part of this analysis.
- A CAG Member stated that the process had to examine the impact of the Edens Expressway because it was required by law as part of the logical termini for the study. Mr. Harmet responded that modifying the Edens Expressway was not a part of this process and that the logical termini for the study is the interchange with the Edens Expressway not the Edens Expressway.
- Mr. Stenzel added that in the existing and proposed conditions the ramp terminals will be examined where they merge onto the Edens. In this way we will then know how well the ramps are working.
- A CAG Member stated that widening Willow Road to the Edens Expressway, past the 2005 Plan, will not improve the situation on Willow Road due to the congestion on the Edens Expressway. Mr. Harmet responded that we will address the issue of how Willow Road traffic interacts with the Edens Expressway through an examination of the operation of the interchange.
- A CAG Member asked how the gridlock on Willow Road west of Waukegan Road was being addressed in this process. Mr. Harmet responded that this process was addressing the issues on Willow Road between Waukegan Road and the Edens. He added that the planning process on Willow Road from Waukegan Road to Milwaukee Avenue was completed about 10 years ago.
- A CAG Member stated in the Flaw Analysis that the evaluation needed to include an assessment as to whether a particular alternative makes sense long term. A study done by the Metropolitan Planning Council (MPC) found that roads that had been widened improve in the short term only to return to gridlock in five to ten years. The CAG Member felt that the MPC study supported the idea that led to the 2005 Plan, i.e., just building more lanes was not going to solve a long term problem, because all the studies show that the road will return to gridlock in five to ten years. Mr. Harmet, referencing a study done at the University of California at Berkeley, said that not all studies show this to be the case. In the case of Willow Road IDOT is modeling alternatives for 2040 conditions in order to look at the long term. Further, two-thirds of IDOT's program is rehabilitation, so IDOT is not trying to widen every road; development and socioeconomic growth far outpace investment in infrastructure.

Presentation: Evaluations for Round #1 – Safety

- Methodology
 - Followed Highway Safety Manual (HSM) for segment and intersection analysis
 - Relative comparison, not an absolute prediction of crashes
- Assumptions
 - Each build alternative compared to the No-Build Alternative
 - 2040 AADT volumes used
 - Old Willow Road at Willow Road Skewed/Y-intersection closed for all local Willow Road Alternatives
 - Engineering detail will be added in later rounds including additional safety features from the tool kit.
- Findings
 - Regional alternatives perform worse, minimal change to Willow Road safety
 - Performance ranges from 6.2 to 13.0 crashes per year on Willow Road

- Pedestrian crash frequency for Willow Road at Sunset Ridge Road intersection went as low as .051 for 4-lane with curbed median and refuge islands which equates to one pedestrian crash every seven to nine years. Most of the results are similar because it is a signalized intersection.

Discussion: Evaluations for Round #1 – Safety

- A CAG Member asked if the results considered the severity of the accidents. Ms. Meyerkord responded that for pedestrians it is the total of pedestrian-vehicle crashes. Mr. Harmet added that there are many variables considered in the crash prediction statistics and that what is shown to be a big driver of safety is not the number of lanes, but whether or not there is a refuge island for pedestrians.
- The CAG Member then asked, stating that the analysis has shown that the road was not safe now, how the severity of accidents was going to be impacted with more lanes and cars driving faster. Ms. Meyerkord responded that the vehicular crashes were the total of injuries and property damage. She added that in the appendices the CAG Members were given there are spreadsheets that provide data on the number of crashes by type. The CAG Member asked if data were available on the number of fatalities, Ms Meyerkord responded that fatalities and personal injuries are one category and not separated out.
- A CAG Member asked if the driving factor in the number of crashes predicted between alternatives, other than the design of the alternative, was the volume of traffic. Mr. Stenzel replied that it was the configuration of the road and the volume of traffic. Mr. Harmet added that many of the alternatives are close to each other in terms of traffic volumes but the presence of a refuge island reduces crashes by 50 percent according to the pedestrian safety manual.
- A CAG Member, noting that Alternative 5 has a low pedestrian crash frequency, asked what type of pedestrian crossing was assumed. Mr. Harmet responded that it would not have signals or pedestrian countdown timers; just the basic configuration of crosswalks for a roundabout was assumed.
- A CAG Member asked if a curbed median or refuge island, as in Alternative 3, were to be added to the other alternatives would the expected crash frequency decline. Mr. Stenzel responded that it would decline but to add a raised pedestrian median to a two lane alternative would impact the design in other ways. For example, it may require the removal of the outside curb, in order to allow a stalled vehicle to move off of the roadway, or wider lanes to allow vehicles to move around a stalled vehicle.
- A CAG Member asked if the data were showing that a 4-Lane Willow Road is more deadly than a 6-Lane Dundee Road or 6-Lane Lake Street. Mr. Harmet responded that this was not correct. The table showed the impact on safety, i.e., predicted crashes, on Willow Road from widening Dundee Road or Lake Street, not the predicted crashes on Dundee Road or Lake Street. The statistics all pertain to Willow Road.
- A CAG Member questioned the 50 percent crash reduction for pedestrian refuge islands stating that the HSM says pedestrian refuge islands appear to reduce pedestrian crashes but may increase total crashes as vehicles collide with the island and the magnitude of the crash effects is not certain. She added that the HSM is uncertain on the issue. Mr. Harmet responded that the HSM gives a crash reduction factor of approximately 0.44 and this was what was used in the analysis.
- A CAG Member asked if it was possible to get all of the assumptions and background data that went into the analysis. Mr. Harmet responded that it was on the disk provided to the CAG Members.
- A CAG Member asked if the people that compiled the analysis would be available to the CAG to question. Mr. Harmet responded that those people were present.
- A CAG Member noted that by 2040 Alternative 3, 4-Lane with raised median will be back to LOS F supporting the findings of the previously discussed MPC study. Mr. Harmet responded that this assertion was incorrect. The results show LOS D for all movements until 2035, and all through movements through 2040. The intersection goes to LOS E between 2035 and 2040. The CAG Member responded, for the record, that IDOT supports adding lanes even though numerous studies have shown that road development by just adding lanes doesn't work. This explains why everywhere around the county road diets are being implemented, e.g., Sheridan Road in Wilmette and Glenview Road in Glenview. The CAG Member stated that the 5-lane road doesn't work.
- A CAG Member added that following this logic the Edens Expressway should never have been built. Mr. Harmet added that roads are being widened all over the country as well.

- A CAG Member indicated that although Mr. Harmet claimed the predicted LOS as fact, it is not proven. Mr. Harmet's indicated that the determination of LOS is part of the planning process and the professional standard is being practiced.

Presentation: Evaluations for Round #1 – Mobility

- Methodology
 - Used forecasted 2040 No-Build and 2040 Build AADT
 - Travel Pattern Analysis (Select Link Analysis)
 - The predominant travel pattern is northwest to southeast with 40 percent local and 60 percent regional.
 - New access points or improved capacity elsewhere can alter travel patterns allowing us to model new interchanges and road widenings
 - The model considers factors such as trip lengths, travel patterns, and levels of congestion.
 - Used HCS to analyze level of service (LOS) and queue lengths
- Assumptions
 - 11-foot lane widths
 - Included pedestrian volumes, i.e., took into account the time it takes pedestrians to cross the street
 - Regional build alternatives included no improvements to Willow Road. The analysis reflects the extent to which an alternative takes away traffic from Willow Road.

At this point in the presentation additional comments concerning safety were taken from CAG Members. A CAG Member asked if the predicted vehicular crashes include the intersections of Willow Road and Sunset Ridge Road and Willow Road and Wagner Road or just the roadway segment between them. Mr. Stenzel responded that the segment analysis was just the segment and not the intersections. The CAG Member asked that if the worst accidents occurred at the intersections why these were not included in the analysis. The CAG Member said it would be helpful to see how intersections are affected by the alternatives and not just the segments. Mr. Harmet replied that the crash rates were highest in the two lane section and the two lane section was selected because the most significant changes to the width and traffic flows would occur in this location. What we are doing is making a relative comparison across all the alternatives. At this scale of study IDOT is looking at how this segment performs under both local and regional alternatives. The analysis will be expanded to include intersections as more detail is developed.

The Mobility discussion resumed.

- Findings
 - Criteria
 - Intersection Level of Service
 - Intersection Delay (in seconds)
 - Queue length on westbound Willow Road (in feet)
 - Queue length on southbound Sunset Ridge Road (in feet)
 - No-Build is LOS F with 157 seconds of intersection delay per vehicle
 - Most Build Alternatives show results very similar to the No-Build
 - Alternative 3 (4-Lane with Median)
 - Through movements in 2040 LOS D
 - Intersection LOS D until 2035
 - In 2040 the intersection is at LOS E
 - Delays range between 65 and 225 seconds
 - Queues range between 420 and over 2,000 feet
 - Regional Alternatives are the poorest performing in terms of how they affect Willow Road.

Discussion: Evaluations for Round #1 – Mobility

- A CAG Member asked what the limits of the delay would be, i.e., from where to where. Mr. Stenzel responded that the average delay would be for a motorist waiting at the intersection, e.g., a driver probably would have to wait through one green light because the queues do not clear.
- Mr. Harmet added, in reference to an earlier question regarding the ability to combine regional alternatives that what the results show is these alternatives do not attract traffic from Willow Road and, in addition, have more impacts and costs. A CAG Member added that the CAG has not had a chance to examine the data or have their experts examine the data so that this may be incorrect. A CAG Member stated that improving Dundee Road would remove traffic from Willow Road. The CAG Member doesn't believe IDOT's numbers are correct since he doesn't know the data that was used.
- A CAG Member asked if any of the alternatives assumed that the signals would be modernized and interconnected. Mr. Harmet responded that this was the assumption for all of the local alternatives.
- A CAG Member asked if there was any option that would get the Willow Road LOS above D and was any consideration given to a 4-Lane with Roundabouts Alternative. Mr. Harmet responded that the idea with the roundabouts was to test, given that the intersections are breaking down, what would happen if we put in roundabouts and kept the segments at two lanes. Mr. Harmet further noted that the roundabouts were already two lanes and that the only way to get Willow Road above a D would be substantially lower traffic or adding more lanes. The CAG Member asked if adding more lanes to the roundabout was an alternative that could be investigated. Mr. Harmet said he thinks IDOT is investigating a pretty good mix of alternatives and he did not foresee adding additional local alternatives.
- A CAG Member asked what the current delay was. Ms. Meyerkord responded that the delay today is 112.9 seconds.
- A CAG Member asked if drivers would be able to make left turns from residential streets if there was a curbed median. Mr. Harmet responded that these intersections would be right-in-right-out unless there were places designated for a break in the median.
- A CAG Member asked if a road opens up to traffic (gets traffic through) how the cars being pulled in from the side streets are taken into account. Mr. Stenzel said that the model accommodates for the most efficient route.
- A CAG member asked, in reference to Alternative 3, what the delay and queue lengths would be when the intersection is operating at LOS E. Mr. Stenzel replied that data in the table reflects LOS E.

Presentation: Evaluations for Round #1 – Facility Condition

- Methodology
 - Does the build alternative include improvements to Willow Road itself?
- Assumptions
 - Build alternatives only included improvements relevant to the alternative
 - Other parallel routes and interchange alternatives did not include improvements along Willow Road corridor
- Findings
 - No-Build and Regional Alternatives do not include improvements to Willow Road
 - Local Alternatives along Willow Road provide for reconstruction of the roadway

Discussion: Evaluations for Round #1 – Facility Condition

- Mr. Harmet noted that at the start of the process the thought was if the Regional Alternatives made a difference to Willow Road the No-Build Plus could be added to address Facility Condition. At this point in the analysis, however, this strategy is no longer viable since the Regional Alternatives are not having much of an impact.

B. Flaw Analysis: Impacts and Conceptual Costs

Presentation: Evaluations for Round #1 – Flaw Analysis

- Potential Displacements
 - Residential
 - Business
 - Open Space
- Potential Property Acquisition
- Potential Floodplain and Floodways
- Conceptual Level of Construction Costs (2011 Dollars)
 - Does not include land acquisitions, relocations, mitigation, and engineering costs
 - All roadway and bridges reconstructed
- Findings
 - Regional Alternatives involved most impacts and higher costs
 - Additional cost for ramps, bridges, and retaining walls
 - Typically larger footprint
 - Local Alternatives involved less impacts and lower overall construction costs

Discussion: Evaluations for Round #1 – Flaw Analysis

- A CAG Member asked what the basis for the costs was comparing the \$23 million cost for Alternative 3 with the \$31 million cost that appear in IDOT's program. Mr. Harmet noted the assumptions behind the costs on slide 29. These costs are for construction only and do not include land acquisition, relocation, mitigation, or engineering costs. Mr. Harmet also reminded the CAG that the \$31 million was a budget placeholder until a more detailed estimate could be developed. The CAG Member added, for the record, that the data in the table was flawed and would be shown as such under further detailed analysis and that the discussion would turn back to a blend of alternatives.
- A CAG member asked why the cost for constructing two lanes on Dundee Road or Lake Avenue was so much greater than constructing two lanes on Willow Road. Mr. Stenzel responded that the costs reflect the reconstruction of two lanes on Willow Road; but, the reconstruction of four lanes plus the construction of two new lanes on the other roads. In addition the length of the improvement on Dundee Road and Lake Avenue is longer.
- A CAG Member noted shock at the costs involved in the process and the alternatives and felt that the nation needed to change the way it spends money. The CAG Members aid that this whole process is completely wasteful and asked if there is a budge or top cap that IDOT has to work within. Mr. Harmet responded that the process was to develop a range of alternatives to improve Willow Road and that the extent of the analysis was being driven by the CAG itself. Mr. Harmet noted that the CAG was here today because of issues along Willow Road in terms of accidents, congestion, and facility condition. The planning process puts all these things on the table to determine an appropriate course of actions. The CAG Member said the waste is shameful.

IV. Introduction of Preliminary Findings

Presentation on Preliminary Findings

- Evaluation Round #1 provides an initial screening
 - How well did the build alternative meet the Purpose and Need of the Willow Road Study?
- Relative comparison of alternatives to each other
 - How did the build alternative improve Willow Road from IL 43 to I-94?
- Flaw Impacts
- Regional Alternatives did not address the Willow Road project needs as well as Local Alternatives.
- Willow Road Alternatives (the Local Alternatives) involved less impacts and overall lower construction costs than Regional Alternatives.

Discussion on Preliminary Findings

- A CAG Member noted that these results were based on IDOT's assumptions which the CAG does not know are correct.
- A CAG Member asked why 11 foot lanes were assumed rather than 12 foot lanes. Mr. Harmet replied that the range of standard lane widths is 10 – 12 feet; the process started with 11 foot lanes but how the road looks with 10 foot or 12 foot lanes could be examined later in the process. The minimum width for a road like Willow Road is 10 foot lanes.
- A CAG Member noted that Deerfield Road has 10 foot lanes and is similar to Willow Road in terms of AADT.
- A CAG Member noted that the lane width on Lake Avenue is 12 feet.
- A CAG Member asked why the cost for Alternative 2A (2005 Plan) was \$14 million when the original cost was \$7 million. Mr. Harmet replied that the cost for Alternative 2A was for a complete reconstruction whereas the 2005 Plan was a partial reconstruction.

V. Next Steps

- Discuss material at next CAG Meeting (April 7, 2011)
- Discuss alternatives to carry forward to Evaluation Round #2 and show at Public Meeting
- Hold Public Meeting #2 (May 16, 2011)
 - Progress of study since Public Meeting #1 (March 4, 2010)
 - Technical Analyses (Crash, Traffic, Physical Inventory, Travel Demand Model, Safety Tool Box)
 - Purpose and Need Document
 - Alternatives Studied (Findings of Round #1 Evaluation)
- Convene July CAG Meeting to review public input, finalize Round #1 and move to the Round #2 Evaluation

- A CAG Member asked what was going to be shown at the Public Meeting saying that there will be confusion if the drawings presented at today's CAG Meeting were shown because they were not in enough detail. Mr. Harmet responded that everything discussed at today's meeting, and all the work done up to this point, will be shown at the meeting. In addition there will be staff available to help explain the exhibits and reports.
- A CAG Member asked if it would still be possible to make decisions on the Alternatives after the April CAG Meeting. Mr. Harmet responded that the Round #1 Evaluation would not wrap up until the July CAG Meeting.
- A CAG Member asked what the purpose of the upcoming Public Meeting was saying that the analysis did not take safety into account among other things, was confusing, and was not going to result in meaningful feedback. Mr. Harmet responded that the Public Meeting would result in meaningful feedback; this was a comprehensive analysis with tremendous amounts of information that will be summarized for the meeting.
- A CAG Member said that the info that would be presented doesn't touch on the CAG's #1 concern of safety; that the alternatives don't show any of the safety features discussed with the CAG. Mr. Harmet said that safety was analyzed and this is an ongoing process that adds additional detail.
- A CAG Member asked if all the alternatives would be shown at the Public Meeting. Mr. Harmet responded that they would be shown along with the findings to date that the Regional Alternatives do not perform as well as the Local Alternatives.
- A CAG Member asked if the public would be told that Northfield has not had a chance to review the data being presented or challenge any of the assumptions being made and these are not approved. Mr. Harmet responded that the CAG is one of many forums in which information is shared and IDOT will share the same information with the public that it has shared with the CAG.
- A CAG Member thanked IDOT for the manner in which information is presented. The Member felt that getting materials at the meeting and then having the information explained rather than just receiving the materials at home without explanation made things easier. The Member continued, making reference to a previous comment about getting people to the Edens that the project was about more than that, it is also about getting people through the entire corridor. The Member also said that safety was part of the analysis and that IDOT is completely in-tune to the safety issues. Mr. Harmet added that all of the assumptions and analyses behind the crash projections have been provided to the CAG and that this was a state of the art / state of the practice analysis.

- A memorandum was distributed to the CAG with possible dates for a walking tour of the corridor. IDOT will coordinate the tours.
- A CAG Member, in reference to public comments made during CAG Meeting #7 regarding problems with drivers refusing to obey school zones, yielding to pedestrians in crosswalks, and speeding along Sunset Ridge Road endangering children, stated that as sympathetic as he was to this situation it was not a reason to double the width of a road with two schools on it in Northfield. They were describing a violation of the law; it is a police enforcement problem and something that the police need to address. People are not going to stop breaking the law because \$30 million is spent to widen Willow Road.
- A CAG Member, in reference to previous comments made about congestion on the Edens Expressway, agreed with IDOT that this is beyond the scope of this project. North suburban communities that are concerned about congestion on the Edens are encouraged to engage IDOT on the issue.

VI. Public Comment Summary following Adjournment of CAG Meeting

The following comments were made during the public comment session that immediately followed CAG Meeting #8. 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. All consultant presentations are held to the end of the public comment section and are limited to 10 minutes.

Comment 1 (Sergio Markovitch, Northfield)

The commenter wanted to know how the human factor was taken into account in this type of project. Mr. Harmet responded traffic modeling accounts for travel behavior, in a process that has been refined since the 1950s, existing traffic was counted, and 635 police reports were reviewed so the process includes a lot of data about Willow Road and how people behave. The commenter went on to note that Willow Road is Northfield's main street with two schools and two parks. He said that the number one issue in Northfield is flooding and hoped that this would be taken into account. This stretch of Willow Road with its two parks is the life of Northfield. This is where the kid's playing fields are, this is where the Village fair is, the Middlefork School fair, and an ice rink at Clarkson Park. There is no doubt in his mind that the human factor, with the roadway that is proposed, is going to go out the window. Northfield will no longer have a main street; and the chance of existing activities continuing with a four lane highway is very slim. He said that the crime rate in the Village, as well as the impact on the crime rate of a 4, 5, or 6 lane highway through the Village, needs to be taken into account. He concluded his remarks by asking the CAG what one child abduction was worth.

Comment 2 (Bob Israel, Northbrook)

Mr. Israel asked for verification that approximately 40 percent of the traffic on Willow Road is internal to the area. Noting that a good deal of the traffic along Willow Road is internal to Northfield area, Mr. Israel thought that traffic on side streets is local traffic trying to avoid the other traffic on Willow Road. He commended IDOT and at least a majority of the members of the CAG for keeping this a very professional process. IDOT is looking at this study as an unbiased arbiter. They have no reason to come in except where other people have raised an issue with a State roadway. He thanked IDOT for doing this. He also thanked a majority of the CAG for keeping the process professional and asking intelligent questions.

Comment 3 (Lizzie Kinnich, Northfield)

Ms. Kinnich asked IDOT if in the interest of transparency, the 4-Lane with Median Alternative would be renamed the 5-Lane Alternative since that is what it is. There would be 5-lanes of traffic at the critical intersections where Northfield residents and children cross for churches, parks, schools, etc. She felt that to call this option 4-Lanes with a median is misleading to the public and not really reflective of IDOT's good faith efforts at complete transparency in the CSS process. While this is an emotionally charged issue for everyone she believes that the surrounding communities do empathize with Northfield's safety concerns. This is an important distinction for people to understand when they hear or read about the proposed options. Ms. Kinnich appreciates IDOT considering this suggestion.

Comment 4 (Tom Kloempken, Glenview)

In reference to concerns expressed during the meeting about backups on the Edens Expressway, he remembers very few occasions when traffic from the Edens backed up onto Peterson / Cauldwell or Touhy, areas he traveled regularly before moving to Glenview. He uses Lake Avenue and has never experienced serious backups on Lake Ave. One group he feels is missing from these meetings is the local business people. He feels that these people are between a rock and a hard place. He also feels that people in Northfield that may support the project are intimidated and will not participate as a result. There are not enough police to handle all of the problems. One of the things that Mr. Kloempken sees now is significant cut through traffic in his neighborhood to avoid Willow Road.

Comment 5 (Carl Bova, Cooper Civil Engineering - Representing Village of Northfield)

Mr. Bova asked, in reference to the Mobility results, why the regional intersection delays are larger than the intersection delays for the local alternatives. Mr. Harmet responded that the alternatives have different traffic volumes which are in the report. Mr. Bova then asked how the 10-15 year old Phase I project west of Northfield factored into the Willow Road project. He also requested a copy of the Phase I study be sent to the Village. Mr. Harmet responded that he thought the EA had already been sent to the Village but he would check to make sure. Mr. Bova asked if the project had been programmed by the State, Mr. Harmet replied that it had not. Mr. Bova also asked if it was to be programmed would it be done after Willow Road through Northfield. Mr. Harmet responded that this had not been contemplated. In response to a question from Mr. Bova, Mr. Harmet explained that the project would result in 6-lanes west of Waukegan Road and then transitioning to whatever is in Northfield. Mr. Bova then noted that the effect of these improvements would be an additional lane from I-294 to I-94. Mr. Harmet responded that this was correct.

Attendance Roster - CAG Members

Community Advisory Group Meeting #8

Willow Road Study: Illinois Route 43 to Interstate 94
 March 10, 2011; 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 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	JLB
3	Hallie Bodman	Northfield	ahkbod@aol.com	AHB
4	Dan de Loys	Northfield	ddeloys@comcast.net	DdeL
5	Rick Filler	Glenview	rfiller@harlemirving.com	
6	Tensley Garris	Northbrook	tensley@northbrookchamber.org	
7	Ted Greene	Northfield	ted@tgreenefamily.com	
8	Robert Hayward	Northfield	robert.hayward@kirkland.com	
9	Todd Heller	Northbrook	todd@thellerlaw.com	
10	Steve Hirsch	Northfield	sbhirsch@hotmail.com	
11	Kate Katz	Northbrook	Kk2667@aol.com	KK
12	John Kemper	Northfield	jkemper@mac.com	JK
13	Peggy Kozminski	Northfield	kozpbs@comcast.net	PBK
14	Penny Lanphier	Winnetka	lanphieriv@sbcglobal.net	
15	Jeffrey G. Liss	Winnetka	JGLJGL@aol.com	JGL
16	Kathy Miles	Glenview	gcstaff@glenviewchamber.com	
17	Tom Murtha	At Large	tmurtha@cmap.illinois.gov	
18	Buggie O'Grady	Northfield	buggieogrady@yahoo.com	
19	Don Owen	Glenview	dowen@glenview.il.us	DO
20	Jim Patterson	Glenview	jjmpattersonjr@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	
25	Don Whiteman	Northfield	kk9h@me.com	DW

Attendance Roster - CAG Alternates

Community Advisory Group Meeting #8

Willow Road Study: Illinois Route 43 to Interstate 94
 March 10, 2011; 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 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	jbod@viennabeef.com	
4	Jeff Brady	Glenview	jeffb@glenview.il.us	JB
5	Steve Bucklin	Glenview	sbucklin@glenbrooksecurity.com	
6	Sydney Clark	Northfield	sclark4994@yahoo.com	
7	Pat Doherty	Northfield	dohertypat@aol.com	
8	Nancy Firfer	Glenview	nancy.l.firfer@cm2020.org	
9	Nancy Garrity	Northbrook	ngarrity@ups.com	
10	Becky Hurley	Winnetka	hurley5@comcast.net	
11	Don Kopec	At Large	dkopec@cmap.illinois.gov	
12	Brian Kozminski	Northfield	bkozminski@llegal.com	
13	William Lustig	Northfield	blustig@northfieldil.org	WL
14	Brian Moran	Northfield	bmoran@femorran.com	
15	Patrick O' Donoghue	Northfield	northfieldpat@yahoo.com	PO
16	Sean O'Grady	Northfield	sogrady@northshore.org	
17	Anne Peterson	Northfield	apeterson70@comcast.net	
18	Kate Rekett	Northfield	kate@sutherlandhomes.com	KR
19	Charles Shabica	Northfield	cshabica@comcast.net	
20	Theresa Snyder	Northfield	theresasnyder14@gmail.com	TS
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				



Attendance Roster
Community Advisory Group Meeting #8
 Willow Road Study, Illinois Route 43 to Interstate 84
 March 10, 2011; 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.
 New Trier High School, Northfield Campus, Building C, Room 234

Name (Please Print)	Address	Phone Number	Email Address	Representing	Add to Mailing List?
1 DAN REGAN	Zip	(312) 337-7400	dan-regan@jtp.com	Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
2 TON KLOEMPKEN	1808 CAMDEN DR C-LEA VIEW ZP 60025	(847) 832-9232	T.KLOEMPKEN@CCMCAST.NET	Self <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
3 John Gauer	715 Bascom Nilesen Zp 60053	(815) 446-7065		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
4 Kevin McClellan	715 VILLARD N8 Zp 60062	() 847-272-2629	Km.mcclellan@aol.com	Self <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
5 Robert McClellan	515 Volte Rd Northbrook Zp 60062	() 847-272-2629	↓ 11	Self <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
6 Jim Huston	Tritone Zp	()		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7 William Yodice	Zp	(312) 337-7400	jilliam-yodice@jtp.com	Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
8 Claire Bozic	Zp	()	cbzic@comp.illinois.gov	Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
9 Tracey Foxleak	Zp	()		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
10 Kelly Estabrooke JEFF ESTABROOKE	1620 N Pleasant Naperville Zp 60093	(847) 441-6239	Kestabrooke@packagingcorp.com	Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>



Attendance Roster

Community Advisory Group Meeting #8

Willow Road Study, Illinois Route 43 to Interstate 94
 March 10, 2011; 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.
 New Trier High School, Northfield Campus, Building C, Room 234

Name (Please Print)	Address	Phone Number	Email Address	Representing	Add to Mailing List?
1 ROBERT MOSS	2431 FOX MEADOW Zip	(847) 416 2425	marr@bmass@aol.com	Self <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
2 Lizziekirnich	230 Greenview N.E. Zip	()		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
3 Sam Alonzi	619 Arbor Lane Zip	()	salonzi.dmsn.com	Self <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
4 Janda - Voelt	525 Sunset Ridge Rd N.E. Zip	()		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other: Dist. 29 <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
5 GEORGE N. SPANIAR	578 SUNSET RIDGE ROAD Zip	(312) 745 7846		Self <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
6 TOM Donquette	1 Rollinbridge Zip	(847) 778 3765		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
7	Zip	()		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
8	Zip	()		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
9	Zip	()		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
10	Zip	()		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>



Attendance Roster

Community Advisory Group Meeting #8

Willow Road Study: Illinois Route 43 to Interstate 94
 March 10, 2011: 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.
 New Trier High School, Northfield Campus, Building C, Room 234

	Name (Please Print)	Address	Phone Number	Email Address	Representing	Add to Mailing List?
1	CARL BOVA	1322 ROSALIE ST EV Zip 60201	(847) 864-5313	carlbova@comcast.net	Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other: WILLAGE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: UNIDENTIFIED <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	TOM HOFFMAN	8678 RUSSELL CRVSTAL LA Zip IL 60012	() 815 455-1260	thoffman@bepurd.com	Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other: WILLAGE <input type="checkbox"/> Other: OF COMM <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
3	Bob Ismail	1431 Hillside Zip 60062	()	RP15ms1@att.net	Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
4		Zip	()		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
5		Zip	()		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
6		Zip	()		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
7		Zip	()		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
8		Zip	()		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
9		Zip	()		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
10		Zip	()		Self <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

Definition of an Urban District: Follow-up from CAG Meeting #7

The bolded text in the following excerpt from the CAG Meeting #7 Summary (second bullet on page 5) questions why Northfield is not considered an Urban District adjacent to Willow Road.

- A CAG member asked if anyone knew why the speed limit on this section of Willow Road is 35 mph. Mr. Harmet responded that IDOT would follow up and provide this information. He added that the Bureau of Traffic does speed studies to determine appropriate speed limits and that there is a State policy on establishing speed limits. **The CAG member responded that she had read the policy and that it states the speed limit in an Urban District should be 30 mph and she did not understand why Northfield would not be considered an Urban District.** Mr. Harmet said that IDOT would follow up on this and that the key issue is the definition of Urban District. POST MEETING NOTE: Speed study was provided to the Village of Northfield on February 22, 2011.

As noted in this excerpt, the speed study was already provided to the Village of Northfield. In response to the question regarding the definition of an Urban District, following is the Illinois Vehicle Code definition of an Urban District:

(625 ILCS 5/1-214) (from Ch. 95 1/2, par. 1-214)
Sec. 1-214. Urban district.

The territory contiguous to and including any street which is built up with structures devoted to business, industry or dwelling houses situated at intervals of less than 100 feet for a distance of a quarter of a mile or more.

(Source: P.A. 76-1586.)

This can also be found using the following link:

<http://ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs5.asp?ActID=1815&ChapterID=49>.

The interval (spacing) between businesses, industry and dwellings have been reviewed along Willow Road between Illinois Route 43 and Interstate 94. There are no ¼ mile segments which do not have at least one gap of greater than 100 feet between the identified types of structures. Some of the more substantial gaps include the open space at the schools and churches in addition to the parks and the Middle Fork North Branch of the Chicago River. Based on this, the area of Northfield along Willow Road in the project limits is not defined as an Urban District.

Pedestrian Countdown Signals: Follow-up from CAG Meeting #7

The following comment from the CAG Meeting #7 Summary (page 3, 3rd bullet from bottom) questioned the safety of pedestrian countdown signals.

- A CAG member asked if pedestrian countdown signals were safer for cars or people. He noted behavior he has observed in downtown Chicago where drivers see the countdown signals and speed up in order to make it through a light. Mr. Stenzel replied that the countdown signals help pedestrians to determine if they have adequate time to cross the street. Mr. Harmet added that the empirical information from the report distributed in November indicated a crash reduction factor of 26 percent for countdown signals.

A literature search was conducted and is summarized below.

Introduction

Listed below are the findings from a review of the literature review on the safety impacts of pedestrian countdown signals (PCS). The review attempted to answer questions posed by members of the Willow Road Study Community Advisory Group (CAG) during CAG Meeting #7. These questions were:

- What is the safety experience of pedestrians and cars at intersections that have countdown signals?
- What is the safety experience of children, as compared to adults, at intersections that have countdown signals?

Findings

Overall pedestrian countdown signal have the following impacts on pedestrian safety:

- Provide additional information to pedestrians when crossing a street;
- Result in fewer pedestrians in the crosswalk when conflicting traffic receives a green light;
- Discourage pedestrians from starting to cross with too little time left;
- Encourage pedestrians to seek refuge on islands when too little time is left to finish crossing;
- Reduces pedestrian-vehicle conflicts and injuries; and,
- Improves understanding of the information being conveyed by the signal.

Overall pedestrian countdown signal have the following impacts on vehicle safety:

- Did not seem to encourage more aggressive driving behavior;
- Reduces pedestrian-vehicle conflicts and injuries;
- May decrease incidence of red-light running and vehicles that finish crossing an intersection on the red signal;
- Drivers may use the information provided by the PCS to improve driving decisions;
- Reduce the occurrence of all crashes especially at intersections with relatively high vehicle volumes and crashes of all types; and,
- Vehicle speeds were found not to increase as the pedestrian timer wound down.

Pedestrian Countdown Signals: Follow-up from CAG Meeting #7 (Continued)

In terms of child safety:

- No information was found to differentiate the safety impacts between adults and children.
- Members of the ITE and others involved in the research reported here noted the following as criteria that may be used in installing PCS:
 - School zones;
 - High pedestrian or vehicle volumes;
 - Presence of old or very young pedestrians; and,
 - Along pedestrian access routes or near pedestrian activity centers.
- The Safe Routes to Schools Guide includes pedestrian countdown signals as an engineering strategy to be considered at signalized intersections.

Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices

- All pedestrian signal heads used at crosswalks where the pedestrian change interval is more than 7 seconds shall include a pedestrian change interval countdown display in order to inform pedestrians of the number of seconds remaining in the pedestrian change interval.

References

Bundy, Brandon and S. D. Schrock. Modification of Driver Behavior Based on Information from Pedestrian Countdown Timers. In *Proceedings of the 2007 Mid-Continent Transportation Research Symposium*, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, August 2007.

Eccles, K. A., R. Tao, and B. C. Mangum. Evaluation of Countdown Pedestrian Signals in Montgomery, County Maryland. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, No. 1878. Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 2004, pp. 36 – 41.

Huang, H., and C. V. Zegeer. *The Effect of Countdown Pedestrian Signals in Lake Buena Vista*. Florida Department of Transportation, November, 2000.

Huey, S. Brian and D. Raglund. *Changes in Driver Behavior Resulting from Pedestrian Countdown Signals*. Safe Transportation Research & Education Center, Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California Berkeley, April 2007.

Manbisan, Shashi S. and G. J. Karkee. Do Pedestrian Countdown Signals Influence Vehicle Speeds? In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, No. 2149. Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2010, pp. 70 – 76.

Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, 2009 Edition. Part 4, Chapter 4E, Pedestrian Control Features, Section 4E.07 Pedestrian Countdown Signals. P. 499. Federal Highway Administration, United States Department of Transportation, 2009. http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/pdfs/2009/pdf_index.htm. Accessed March 2011.

Markowitz, Frank and D. Ragland. FHWA PedSafe: *The San Francisco MTA/UC Berkeley Pedestrian Safety Program*. Slide presentation from Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting, January 11, 2009. Accessed February 2011.

The New York City Pedestrian Safety Study and Action Plan. New York City Department of Transportation, August 2010.

Pedestrian Countdown Signals: Follow-up from CAG Meeting #7 (Continued)

PEDSAFE Pedestrian Countdown Signals (1 of 2) Case Study 62. http://www.walkinginfo.org/pedsafe/case_studies.cfm. Accessed February, 2011.

PEDSAFE Pedestrian Countdown Signals (2 of 2) Case Study 63. http://www.walkinginfo.org/pedsafe/case_studies.cfm. Accessed February, 2011.

Pulugurtha, S. S., A Desai, and N. M. Pulugurtha. Are Pedestrian Countdown Signals Effective in Reducing Crashes? Abstract - PubMed.gov, U.S. National Library of Medicine, National Institute of Health. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21128194>. Accessed February 2011.

Safe Routes to School Guide. http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/guide/engineering/traffic_signals.cfm. Accessed February 2011.

Schattler, Kerrie L., J. G. Wakim, T. K. Datta, and D. McAvoy. Evaluation of Pedestrian and Driver Behaviors at Countdown Pedestrian Signals in Peoria, Illinois. In *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 2002*. Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2007, pp. 98 – 106.

Stollof, Edward R., H. McGee, and K. A. Eccles. *Pedestrian Signal Safety for Older Persons*. Institute of Transportation Engineers Sponsored by AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety, Washington, D.C., July, 2007.

VDOT Pedestrian Countdown Signals Being Upgraded Throughout Northern Virginia. In Virginia Department of Transportation, *Newsroom*, December 2008. http://www.virginiadot.org/newsroom/northern_virginia/2008/vdot_pedestrian_countdown_signals37547.asp. Accessed February 2011.

Wisconsin Safe Routes to School Toolkit. Wisconsin Safe Routes to School, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Madison, WI, Fall 2007.