



**I-290**  
**Corridor Advisory Group and Task Force (CAG/TF)**  
**Meeting #12 Summary**  
**December 1, 2011**

The twelfth combined CAG/TF meeting for the I-290 Phase I Study was held on December 1, 2011 at the Carleton Hotel of Oak Park, 1110 Pleasant St., Oak Park, IL 60302 from 9:00 am to 11:00 am. The Meeting Agenda is included with this summary.

To announce the December 1, 2011 CAG/TF Meeting #12, an E-invitation was created. The invitation was sent out to all CAG and TF members on November 11, 2011. A previous, Save the Date email, was sent on October 18, 2011. The meeting was attended by 35 people. The following CAG/TF members were in attendance:

1. President David Pope – Village of Oak Park
2. Chuck Abraham – IDOT
3. Reginald Arkell – FTA
4. Michael Bolton – PACE
5. Claire Bozic – Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
6. Chris Byars – FHWA
7. Lenny Cannata – West Central Municipal Conference
8. JoEllen Charlton – Village of Forest Park
9. Rob Cole – Village of Oak Park
10. Christopher DiPalma – FHWA
11. Peter Fahrenwald – RTA
12. Tim Gillian – Village of Forest Park
13. Andrea Green – Friends of Oak Park Conservatory
14. Henry Guerriero – Illinois State Toll Highway Authority
15. John Kos – DuPage County DOT
16. Rick Kuner – Citizens for Appropriate Transportation
17. Phyllis Logan – 29<sup>th</sup> Ward, Community Advisor
18. John Loper – DuPage County
19. Brenda McGruder – CDOT
20. Ryan Mouw – CTA
21. Gary Neubeiser – Concordia Cemetery
22. Kevin O'Malley – CTA
23. Mark Pitstick – RTA
24. Teresa Powell – Village of Oak Park
25. Leanne Redden – RTA
26. Ryan Richter – Metra



27. Lori Sommers – Village of Maywood
28. Robert Vance – CTA
29. Russ Wajda – Village of Hillside
30. Amy Welk – IDOT
31. Norm West – US EPA
32. Tammy Wierciak – West Central Municipal Conference
33. David Baumgartner – Cambridge Systematics
34. Ron Burke- Active Transportation Alliance
35. David Moehring – Oak Park Resident

The meeting included a PowerPoint presentation (see attached) with the following agenda topics:

- Recap CAG/TF Meeting #11
- Purpose and Need Update
- Where we are in the Process?
- Summary of Round 1 Findings
- Additional Combo Alternatives Discussion
- Next Steps
- Travel Demand Modeling Workshop

During the presentation, CAG/TF members were invited to comment, ask questions, and provide input. Their comments are arranged in accordance with the presentation topics and are as follows below.

**CAG/TF #11 Meeting Recap:**

The meeting began with a recap of CAG/TF Meeting #11 which included: a description of the CAG/TF Meeting Format, a continuation of the single mode alternatives evaluation process and results, tolling/HOT lane legislation, and initial combination alternatives discussion.

There were no CAG/TF comments on the meeting recap.

**Purpose and Need Update:**

Additional Stakeholder input was sought on the Purpose and Need. The refined Purpose and Need was made available to the public on October 28, 2011, and the formal review and comment period ended at midnight on November 30, 2011. There were 12 comments received during this comment period. The main comments received included: place more emphasis on I-290 as a multi-modal corridor and clarify working relationship with transit agencies, and for additional consideration for the inclusion of: transit facility condition, needs related to frontage roads and railroads within the study area and environmental impacts.

There were no CAG/TF comments on the Purpose and Need Update presentation.



**Where are we in the Process? :**

At this time the chevron diagram (slide 9), which outlines the I-290 NEPA process, was used to show where we are with respect to the study process. We are wrapping up the Purpose and Need, and are working through the alternatives development and evaluation process, which will evaluate alternatives in detail and conclude with the identification of a Preferred Alternative. The first step is Initial Alternatives development and testing which will identify the alternatives to be carried forward into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for detailed environmental evaluation. The Initial Alternatives step consists of three rounds of evaluation. We have finished the Round 1 testing of single mode alternatives, and are moving onto Round 2 which will include assembly and evaluation of combination alternatives.

There were no CAG/TF comments on the Study Process.

**Summary of Round 1 Findings:**

This part of the presentation was to report the conclusions of the Round 1 evaluation. The initial alternatives evaluation step identified 7 transportation modes, which included a general purpose add lane, high occupancy toll lanes, high occupancy vehicle lanes, toll of all lanes, bus rapid transit, heavy rail transit, and express bus service. These 7 modes made up 21 single mode alternatives for Round 1 evaluation, based on: stakeholder input, technical analysis, purpose and need context screening, and fatal flaw analysis. The Round 1 overall conclusions showed that: single mode expressway alternatives have the overall best performance, stand alone single mode transit alternatives do not improve I-290 performance, new transit service diverts ridership from existing transit services, and transit alternatives have other benefits. As noted in the Alternatives Evaluation Report, the single mode test provides an understanding of alternatives performance and characteristics. This information, and stakeholder input, will be used to assemble the combination alternatives with the objective of maximizing performance of each mode. Also in Round 1, it was decided that the following single mode alternatives will not be carried forward: (1) arterial widening, because of excessive property impacts; (2) existing Blue Line conversion to BRT, because there is generally a similar performance to heavy rail transit and a similar footprint; and (3) transit along the Prairie Path, because of 4(f) impacts and ridership diversion from Metra.

**Comment: In the universe of managed lanes, wouldn't congestion pricing divert traffic off of I-290 on to the arterials of Madison and Washington during congested periods?**

Re: The expressway alternatives also include an expressway capacity improvement, so it works the opposite, people will come off the arterials onto I-290, and are willing to pay the premium for the faster service.

**Comment: Would the HOV/HOT lanes only be in the study area, or could they extend all the way into the city? Don't the managed lanes make the General Purpose lanes more congested?**

Re: IDOT is evaluating managed lanes all the way into the city. The modeling shows that there was a 44% decrease in congestion in the managed lane, and a 10% decrease in congestion in the local lanes.



**Comment: What is the statistical significance of relative comparison between the alternatives? What is significant and what is not important?**

Re: The model results are used for relative comparisons. Ultimately, the CMAP 2040 plan alternatives evaluation used a relative comparison, and is what our model is based on.

POST MEETING NOTE: CMAP goes through a certification review by the U.S. Department of Transportation (typically the FHWA and the FTA). As part of the certification process, the travel demand forecasting methods are reviewed, and during the last review, no needs for corrective action were found. The I-290 Study Team's model which is a refinement of the CMAP model is calibrated to match existing conditions. Thus, the appropriate level of model validation for the I-290 planning process has been undertaken.

**Comment: On slide 19, showing the transit diversions, what is the percentage of diversions from auto on I-290 to transit?**

Re: There are approximately 8,350 auto diversions to transit which comprises 34% of the 24,550 CTA Rail riders. These diversions come from all of the roadways, arterials and I-290 included.

**Comment: What percentage of trips are transit trips?**

Re: 20% of trips are transit trips, but this percentage only includes work trips.

**Comment: On slide 12 Single Mode Alternatives – Expressway Conclusions, it says that the expressway alternatives have the best safety performance, why are those the best?**

Re: The AASHTO Highway Safety Manual and Texas Roadway Safety Manual methodology were used, and the basis of this determination is person throughput and number of injuries. So, based on a greater person throughput in the study area the overall injury rate is going down, therefore showing improved safety performance.

**Comment: On slide 18 showing the traditional commute travel market, is there any discussion on the reverse commute market and what percentage of reverse commute travel is performed on transit?**

Re: This slide is provided as part of the overall summary of Round 1 conclusions. This graphic, and a similar graphic that depicts the reverse commute markets were presented in CAG/TF meeting #11.

**Comment: The reason that I am concerned with this is because the impact of the reverse commute is felt worse in the evening. We want to be able to separate the directional transit usage.**

Re: This data was presented at the CAG/TF #11 Meeting in September, and the graphic is shown in the presentation as Slide #21 on the website. Here is the link:

<http://www.eisenhowerexpressway.com/pdfs/i290cag112011sep28r1.pdf>



**Comment:** Does the graphic on Slide 18 represent a 24 hour period or a peak period?

Re: It is the peak period.

**Comment (from CMAP):** It is important to note for the PM peak, the trip origins in the AM peak generally become the trip destinations in the PM peak.

**Comment:** Have you considered any tolling options with no expansion of the existing 6 lane section?

Re: Yes, this option was evaluated in Round 1 and presented in CAG/TF meeting #11. It shows congestion on the arterials. This information has been posted to the website in Appendix D of the Alternatives Identification and Evaluation Report.

Here is the link: [http://www.eisenhowerexpressway.com/info\\_center/reports.aspx](http://www.eisenhowerexpressway.com/info_center/reports.aspx)

**Comment:** For the single mode auto alternatives, by how much does the study area person throughput change?

Re: There is a relatively small change because this is an already very saturated network.

**Comment:** The current regional population is approximately 8-9 million, and the 2040 forecast is 11 million.

**Comment:** On slide 19, do these numbers project any substantial land use changes that are stimulated as a result of the improvements?

Re: A plan for a robust feeder service is included with the transit improvements which assumes that an intensified land use was supporting this service. 2040 forecasted land use is used in the model, and this takes into consideration the village's land use plans. It is also important to note that the difference between build and no build population/employment in the study area is relatively minor. In an FTA alternatives analyses, land use projections are not used. They just use the existing land use.

**Comment:** On slide 14, what does it look like 5-10 years out? Will there be some level of induced demand and some level of remote development?

Re: A build and no build alternative are developed for the DEIS alternatives, which will look at the induced demand. Redevelopment doesn't change that much because development is already saturated.

**Comment:** On slide 19, the number of auto diversions assumes that the CTA is a stop and go operation and not an express service. Will you be looking at an express component later, and what will those impacts to auto diversions be?

Re: We may consider an express operation further along in the study process. However, this would most likely not result in more auto diversions because this is a service that Metra already provides. Currently, the only CTA service that has express service is the purple and red line. Those lines have between 145,000 and 150,000 riders a day. Whereas the CTA Blue Line Forest Park Branch only has 35,000 riders a day. This line does not warrant an express service at this time.



**Comment: On slide 18, it seems that people in the west do not have convenient access to transit, and they are not taking it because it is not close to their origin or destination.**

Re: There are other factors to consider such as parking fees, gas prices, and personal safety. The population densities to the west of the study area also do not typically support a transit system that could capture a majority of those trips.

**Comment: Wouldn't safety be better with transit? It seems that getting people off of the roads and on trains is safer.**

Re: Because new transit alternatives have a majority of ridership via transit diversions, we need to look at configuring these alternatives so that they are working well together – they should be diverting auto trips or creating new transit trips.

**Comment: People just want to take the fastest route, what is wrong with transit diversions?**

Re: Reducing transit ridership on current transit lines is not a goal of our study. This is why we look at combination alternatives. We want to make other options better. There is no standalone alternative that benefits everyone.

**Comment: I-290 is over capacity and congestion will continue to get worse, more capacity is needed. Some people will never take a bus or train. The modeling shows that new rapid transit service will just move things around. We need to find a way to get more cars into the city.**

**Comment: In terms of transit diversions, taking buses off the road may be a good thing.**

Re: The idea is to make all services better. We can't endorse a transit diversion.

**Comment: Transit diversions may not be a bad thing. The most efficient operation comes forward.**

Re: We can't endorse transit diversion that benefits one transit service over another.

**Additional Combo Alternatives Discussion:**

We are starting Round 2 with 10 initial combination alternatives as shown on slide 23. These ten include: an expressway mode capacity improvement (general purpose lane or a managed lane), combined with an express bus from Forest Park or Mannheim, and each expressway/express bus alternative is also paired with a High Capacity Transit (HCT) extension along I-290 to Mannheim Road. High capacity transit extension alternative alignments along the Illinois Prairie Path from the Forest Park CTA Terminal will not be carried forward. Because of the transit component in the combination alternatives, the I-290 Study is a starting point for evaluation of corridor transit alternatives, but to be eligible for federal funding, a major new fixed guide way transit project must go through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts process. This process will have to be initiated through the transit agencies.

The Draft Alternatives Evaluation Report is now available on the project website. It is an interim report summary of: the alternatives development and evaluation process, evaluation measures, initial



alternatives identification and screening, and Round 1 findings. This draft document will be updated as the process advances.

**Comment: Do I understand correctly that the first part of a New Starts project is the Alternatives Analysis, and the RTA could use the report from the IDOT Phase I Study?**

Re: Yes, this document could be the foundation of a future Alternatives Analysis. However, the Draft Alternatives Evaluation Report would not be the same as a Draft Alternatives Analysis conducted by the transit agency.

**Comment: On Slide 32 which explains the FTA New Starts Process, which box would be completed after this study?**

Re: Several parts of different boxes would be completed, including the Alternatives Analysis study, Preliminary Engineering, and Environmental Impact Statement. The I-290 Study could provide the NEPA Studies and Engineering for transit extensions in the I-290 R.O.W.; if I-290 is reconstructed with this space provided, the cost of implementing a future transit project would be reduced.

**Comment: Based on what you know already, what is your guess of the likelihood of funding this improvement?**

Re: This is a beneficial and needed project, and we will know more about funding when the alternatives take better shape. This study will also include a financial plan.

**Comment: Considering that all of the transit projects around the country are competing for New Starts money, there must be some numbers that fit. Possibly increasing ridership and safety will help us move up in the pecking order.**

Re: This will all be looked at in the alternatives evaluation and the financial plan.

**Comment: For the modeling, if we look at High Capacity transit as being the most expensive alternative, will we still need to do an alternative analysis?**

Re: Correct, an FTA alternative analysis would still need to be completed. It does not affect what may be looked at as part of the New Starts process.

**Comment: New Starts in this region are at risk because of the backlog of the State of Good Repair needs. It is necessary to take care of the State of Good Repair before we can get New Starts money.**

Re: We want to continue the planning, even though this is an issue, so that we can have a comprehensive view of the corridor. New Starts Section 5309 funding is available nationally for new fixed guideway transit projects. However, current New Starts projects in the region are on hold due to the existing backlog of transit capital funding requirements.

**Comment: Will the Eisenhower be rebuilt regardless of the outcome of this (transit) study?**

Re: Yes, the pavement is well beyond its useful life. The safety and congestion needs also have to be addressed.



**Comment: Does the HOV concept need the same legislation as the Tolling concepts?**

Re: The HOV lanes are not as complex as the toll scenario.

**Comment: On slide 28, where the combination alternatives characteristics of the HCT extension to Mannheim are presented, how would the HCT station fit into the cloverleaf interchange at Mannheim Rd?**

Re: We are still at a very high level of evaluation, and will continue to discuss these details in the future.

**Comment: The travel market map covers a large area, but the study area is smaller. How do you account for all the other projects in the area?**

Re: The projects outside of the study area are in the regional plan, and our modeling extends beyond the study area. We plan to make adjustments to the study area if needed. This stretch of road in the study area is older and has a higher crash rate than others in the region.

**Comment: Would additional modeling of the region be necessary for this project to be included in the New Starts process?**

Re: As a part of this study we will consider additional modeling of the region, as appropriate. This could be included in a future New Starts.

**Comment: Does your model also include other transit projects outside of the study area?**

Re: Yes, we showed a map at the July CAG/TF meeting that included bus feeder services. All other regional transit projects in the constrained Go To 2040 plan are accounted for.

**Comment: With regards to the Mannheim terminus, is the Pace J-Line included in the model? If this project were implemented it would have a significant impact on the I-290 Study.**

Re: The J-Line is not included in the model because it is not fiscally constrained in the GO TO 2040 Plan. For the purpose of this study, we assumed what was in the plan included a background bus network. The FTA process would only use the fiscally constrained projects as well.

**Comment (from PACE): We just recently finished working with CMAP to code the J-Line. It would be a very small starts project, and would connect to the Addison corridor market.**

**Comment (from Oak Park): The J-Line is a keystone of the Cook-DuPage Corridor Study, and is very important to us.**

**Comment: I have some specific suggestions for combination alternatives. It appears that this process is driven by the model, and history shows us that adding additional capacity is short lived. People are currently tolerate of 17 hours of congestion, and will continue to be tolerant of additional congestion. I would love to see an alternative that goes all the way out to Oak Brook with additional pedestrian and bike accommodations to help with the transit. This would help the congestion problem.**



**Comment: We have not yet discussed large Park and Ride lots which would lead to greater transit usage. It would be helpful to get people out of their cars before they get into the system. Is it possible to build the decks over the expressway?**

Re: A cover over the expressway has been discussed, but not in that much detail. We will discuss park and ride lots as we move forward with more detail in the process. We are at too basic of a level now.

**Next Steps:**

The next steps in the initial alternatives identification process will be the evaluation of various combination mode alternatives to identify any synergies gained by combining transit and expressway modes. With this evaluation we will be able to further refine a more focused set of combination alternatives and begin the evaluation of interchanges, crossroads, and frontage road concepts in Round 3. At the end of Round 3 we will identify the alternatives to be carried forward for detailed environmental evaluation in the DEIS.

The CAG/TF meeting #13 will be tentatively held in February 2012. The topics of this meeting will be: finalization of Purpose and Need until DEIS, combination evaluation results, and cross road interchange approach.

There were no CAG/TF comments on Next Steps.

**Travel Demand Modeling Workshop:**

At this point in the presentation, Claire Bozic from CMAP gave a presentation on the CMAP Regional Travel Demand Model. CMAP's travel demand model is used to develop the past six regional transportation plans. They place a high priority on improving methods to remain policy responsive and state-of-the-practice. The travel demand model is used to develop long range transportation, regional air quality conformity analysis, and prepare travel forecasts on a regional and project level. The model is based on four steps: trip generation, trip distribution, mode choice and highway and transit assignment.

**Comment: Is CMAP obligated to use the most recent Census data? What happens if we enhance Central Business District or there is redistribution?**

Re: Yes, CMAP uses the most recent Census data. The process starts with the regional expectations and then adds in policies related to infill development and increased transit usage. Municipal plans are also reflected in the CMAP model.

**Comment: In relation to infill development, will this affect the alternatives?**

Re: The I-290 analysis is done by PB, and given that the study area is a mature, developed area, small changes will not affect the total demand on the highway.



**Comment: What if a large residential development or a new transit station was built? Would this affect the model?**

Re: It depends on the scale of the development and the context of the development as to what a market may do.

**Comment: In regards to the value of people's time, if people currently have the tolerance for congestion and then you add a lane, will the tolerance develop again? If this is true, then by adding capacity, we will not be better off.**

Re: This is not true. We need to look at development too. Sometimes things develop because they are built around a new road or transit facility.

**Comment: Is it true that the regional model is better for regional scale work rather than small detail such as an interchange or an intersection?**

Re: The model is not appropriate for specific parcels. You will need community planning for that level of detail. The model is at a quarter section (½ mile by ½ mile in size) level of detail for population and employment forecasts.

Next, the I-290 Phase I Study Travel Demand Model was presented. The I-290 travel model used the CMAP regional travel demand model as a starting point, and then improved the model for use in the I-290 Study to address project evaluation needs. The updates used for the I-290 travel model included: updated trip generation model based on survey data, updated mode choice model, implemented tolling procedures, updated time-of-day factors, and developed income stratification for work trips. Updates for the I-290 Highway network included additional network detail in the study area including frontage roads, detailed interchange coding, collector-distributor roads and collector streets. Updates for the I-290 Transit network included: verified transit network coding in study area, updated transit fares, and updated transit network path building. For the Round 1 Screening, the model developed travel performance results which were used as a relative comparison of single mode alternatives versus the 2040 Baseline (No Build). The travel performance results include the entire region, as well as the detailed study area.

**Comment: Do you look at similar detail for transit?**

Re: Transit mode choice is figured into the model, and it will choose between transit and bus. All of the fixed-route bus, rapid transit and commuter rail services are included in the transit network. Access to transit by walking, park-and-ride, and bus transfers are also represented.

**Comment: Given the quarter mile model scenario, do you look at associated socioeconomic factors?**

Re: Socioeconomic characteristics at that level are inputs to the travel model. Socioeconomic factors will also be looked at with the build alternatives in the DEIS.

**Comment: It doesn't seem that the changes are being looked at for quarter mile sections.**



Re: This model is not intended for parcel level evaluation. It is intended for major project level evaluation.

**Comment: Will you be looking at mode split measure for each alternative's evaluation?**

Re: Yes, it has already been included in the travel performance measures. It was called new transit trips.

**Comment: What will the metrics be that will balance the decision making?**

Re: Alternatives are evaluated based on a large range of factors. The model does not make the determination.

**Comment: Does CMAP have a goal from the 2040 plan for what transit mode share should be, and if so are we achieving those goals?**

Re: The GO TO 2040 plan does have certain regional goals, but it is too early in the study to measure against them.

**Comment: Could we include a goal for this project to double the transit trips, and have an overall 10% increase in the region?**

Re: The I-290 Phase I Study has a number of goals which need to be worked on simultaneously. We do not want to increase the use of one mode and compromise another. We need to configure modes and then craft a reasonable situation.

**Comment: Are local communities providing input with land use development that may affect the model?**

Re: CMAP tracks development, and local communities provide input. Later in the alternatives development we expect that the communities may have new or updated information to share.

**Comment: How is access to transit accounted for in the model?**

Re: Access to transit is based on the amount of transit service and the time it takes to get there. A Monte Carlo simulation is used to estimate transit access times.

**Comment: How are transit headway times taken into account?**

Re: These times are an important part of the process, and undergo careful review. They are important because waiting times are more important than the amount of time to take the trip. The model reflects actual headways (frequency of service) which reflect the service schedules provided by the transit operators.



POST MEETING NOTE (Comment Form submitted after the Meeting):

**Comment: Per CMAP 2040, what would it mean to double transit trips of slide 19?**

Re: The doubling of transit trips has not occurred under any of our performance modeling, and we do not have any pre-determined goals for transit usage. The goal is to maximize performance for all modes.

**Comment: Regarding slide 13 – How does the addition of HOV, HOT, or tolled lanes impact transit performance?**

Re: Based on preliminary single mode modeling results, the addition of HOV, HOT, or tolled lanes negatively impacts transit. These single mode alternatives take away transit trips. We will need to look at this further in depth during the combination alternatives analysis. The ultimate goal of this study is to make all services work better.

**Comment: On Slide 19, measures Blue Line rail extension to Oak Brook, which is contradictory to slides 27 – 29. Oak Brook Extension performs measurably better than an extension to Mannheim relative to “daily person throughput” and “new job accessible.”**

Re: Slide 19 represents the conclusions from Round 1 single mode alternatives analysis. For the first round of analysis, the Blue Line extension was modeled as a single mode out to Oak Brook. Based on these results, for Round 2, the Blue Line extension was only modeled to Mannheim Rd. The majority of the beneficial features of the HCT extension were realized within the first 3.5 miles of the 8 mile extension to Oak Brook. This does not preclude HCT extensions further west in the future. We take into account a large number of evaluation criteria, not just daily person throughput and new job accessibility.

**Comment: On Slide 19, underestimates transit diversions from automobiles because it does not consider express bus or express rail from Oak Brook to West Loop Transit Center (Congress and Clinton). Please model to demonstrate if greater “Park and Ride” diversions will impact auto diversions. (Reference comment by Mike from PACE on parking decks above or adjacent to expressway)**

Re: The West Loop Transportation Center is included in the CMAP GO TO 2040 Plan under fiscally constrained projects and is, therefore, factored into the modeling results. Metra express service is likely to continue to the West Loop Transit Center as well. We have noted the comment regarding park and ride lots, and we will discuss them as we move forward with more detail in the process. We are at too basic of a level now.