



I-290
Corridor Advisory Group & Task Force
Meeting #2 Meeting Summary
January 19, 2010

Summary

The second combined CAG/TF meeting for the I-290 Phase I Study was held on January 19, 2010 at The Carleton of Oak Park Hotel, 1110 Pleasant Street Oak Park, Illinois from 9:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m. The Agenda for the Meeting is shown on the attached sheet.

The meeting included a PowerPoint presentation (see attached) which:

- Reviewed the Study Process
- Recapped CAG/TF Meeting #1 and Public Meeting #1 comments
- Discussed the Draft Problem Statement created using stakeholder feedback from CAG/TF Meeting #1 and the Public Meeting #1 comment period, and
- Reviewed the Technical Analysis Approach for the corridor.

To announce the January, 2010 CAG/TF Meeting #2, an E-invitation was created. The invitation was sent on January 6, 2010 to 13 CAG members and 115 TF members. The meeting was attended by 35 CAG and Task Force members. The following CAG/TF members were in attendance:

TABLE 1

1. Michael Bolton – Pace
2. John Loper – DuPage County*
3. Sandy Lentz – Friends of the Oak Park Conservatory
4. President David Pope – Oak Park
5. Lou Arrigoni – Bellwood Engineering Consultant
6. Teresa Powell – Oak Park Village Clerk*

TABLE 2

1. Tam Kutzmark – DuPage Mayors & Managers
2. Phyllis Logan – Representing 29th Ward Alderman
3. Henry Guerriero – Illinois Tollway*
4. Brenda Smith – 29th Ward

TABLE 3

1. Rick Kuner – Citizens for Appropriate Transportation



2. Mike Grandy – Oak Park Park District
3. Brian Gorka – Village of Westchester
4. Robert Vance – CTA*

TABLE 4

1. Lenny Cannata – West Central Municipal Conference
2. Bill Darr – Bellwood Consultant
3. Rob Cole – Oak Park Asst. Village Manager
4. Mayor Anthony Calderone – Forest Park*
5. Mike Sturino – IRTBA*
6. Jim Bosma – Village of Oak Brook *

TABLE 5

1. Jose Rodriguez – CMAP
2. Lori Sommers – Maywood Community Development Director
3. Sheila Atkins – Cook County Office of Capital Planning and Policy
4. Luanne Hamilton – Chicago DOT
5. Gary Neubieser – Concordia Cemetery
6. JoEllen Charlton – Forest Park Planning Consultant
7. Tim Gillian – Forest Park Village Administrator
8. Bill Lenski – RTA
9. Fred Brandstrader – Cap the Ike Stakeholder Advisory Committee

TABLE 6

1. Dennis DiPasquale – Village of Westchester*
2. Dan Donahue – Bellwood Consultant*
3. Tammy Wierciak – West Central Municipal Conference*
4. Ryan Richter – Metra*

*Denotes new attendee

Note: Michael King – Illinois Toll Highway Authority was present, but did not participate at a table.

Draft Problem Statement Comment/Feedback

The CAG/TF members were invited to submit comment/feedback about the Draft Problem Statement sent with the E-Invitation from January 6, 2010 to January 18, 2010. One comment was submitted prior to the January 19, 2010 meeting. During the January 19, 2010 meeting, CAG/TF members were encouraged to provide comment/feedback regarding the Draft Problem Statement to the Project Study Group.



Draft Problem Statement

The I-290 study area is a multimodal corridor with a complex network of roadway, public transit, freight railroad, and non-motorized facilities and services. Improved mobility, modal options, and integration of transportation and land use are desired to support economic development and enhance the quality of life. Study area roadway related issues include infrastructure condition, traffic congestion on the Eisenhower Expressway and arterial roads, safety, truck traffic, and the resultant noise and air pollution. Public transit related issues include lack of modal choices, connectivity, access, speed of service, and infrastructure condition. Improved connectivity, accessibility, safety, and suitability of pedestrian and bicycle facilities are study area non-motorized transportation related issues.

The existing built environment presents significant challenges in improving the corridor's transportation elements. Sustainable solutions to transportation problems need to be developed, while avoiding and minimizing impacts to the surrounding environment. These solutions need to be cost-effective and may require substantial funding. The solutions also need to be coordinated with all modes, promote economic development, and be integrated with community land use plans. Stakeholder participation in arriving at workable and effective solutions is a fundamental part of the process.

A variety of comments were received on the Problem Statement during the CAG/TF member and Study Group discussion, the following items were identified by the CAG/TF members in attendance:

- The Problem Statement should include a statement that there are too many vehicles using the roadways and that there need to be better alternatives to automobiles,
- The Problem Statement needs to elaborate on the lack of modal choices especially for the reverse commute,
- Strengthen the Problem Statement by using the word environment rather than just air and noise pollution,
- The language of the Problem Statement needs to reduce the emphasis on the word "Minimize" and instead focus on ways to "avoid" or "mitigate",
- Include a statement of the importance of access to job centers,
- There needs to be greater emphasis placed on "Connectivity" – E/W and N/S to support neighborhoods and communities,
- Need to insure that north south transit and highway connections are also taken into consideration,
- Insure that transit solutions work for all users in the corridor. Note that express bus service does not include the Austin neighborhood,
- Include a statement about reinvestment and redevelopment,



- The Problem statement should indicate that there are Regional Transportation issues and not focus on “Parochial” interests,
- There is a need to look at North South linkages,
- The Statement needs to indicate the importance of the “Movement of Goods” in the corridor,
- The first sentence needs to include: “critical component of a region-wide transportation corridor”
- Include that we should reverse the patterns of socio-economic isolation and community decline wrought on the “environment” by decades of over-reliance on urban highways as the way to meet the region’s transportation needs.

The following mentioned items will be considered later in the study process:

- Can a statement on the need to add capacity be included?
- The problems will be much greater if you try to expand the roadway,
- The Problem Statement should indicate that there are not enough lanes on the expressway,
- Include performance measures in the Problem Statement,
- Need to include that regional improvements to transit are needed,

Technical Analysis Approach

Following the discussion of the Problem Statement, the approach for the Technical Analysis was presented. The presentation included:

- Introduction of the Travel Demand Model,
- Discussion of the Travel Demand Forecasting
- Definition of the Study Area, and
- Introduction of the approach to analyze the existing conditions of the Major Transportation Elements including Roadways, Public Transportation, Freight Railroads, Non-Motorized Transportation, Socioeconomic and Land use.

The following discussion occurred during and immediately following the presentation of the Technical Analysis Approach:

Comment: Environmental issues are an existing and baseline condition that needs to be on the list.

Re: While not part of the inventory of existing physical conditions, environmental issues will be addressed with the analysis of the alternatives.

Comment: Request that traffic volumes are provided for number of cars using I-290.



Re: Traffic volumes will be provided.

Comment: What level of investigation will or has been done to document the condition of the Blue Line?

Re: Data has been requested from the CTA to document these conditions.

Comment: The cumulative total of ridership on the two Metra Routes is actually about 10 million riders annually for each. Can we capture the total number of passengers passing through the study area rather than focusing on stations within the corridor?

Re: Analysis of all modes will be based on consistent data and will identify ridership originating within and passing through the study area.

Comment: How will money and contracts for construction be distributed such that local communities can benefit from available construction dollars?

Re: Local training and education on contracting, bidding and related costs can be accommodated. At a later stage in the project when the improvements were nearing the design stage (beyond Phase I).

Comment: What if there is no money available (to construct the improvement) at the end of the study?

Re: The project will go through the same funding process like other IDOT projects. Can't predict what will happen.

Comment: The Federal Railroad Administration and the Federal Transit Administration should be invited to join the process.

Re: The Federal Agencies are invited into the process through coordination with the Federal Highway Administration.

Next Steps

The study team will make the above changes to the Problem Statement, and send the final to CAG/TF members via e-mail. The next CAG/TF meeting is anticipated for February 17, 2010 at which time the revised Draft Problem Statement and Technical Analysis Findings – Part Two will be discussed.