



**I-290**  
**Corridor Advisory Group & Task Force**  
**Meeting #3 Meeting Summary**  
**February 17, 2010**

**Summary**

The third combined CAG/TF meeting for the I-290 Phase I Study was held on February 17, 2010 at the Oak Park Public Library, 834 Lake Street, Oak Park, Illinois from 9:00 a.m.– 12:00 p.m. The Meeting Agenda is attached to this Summary.

To announce the February 17, 2010 CAG/TF Meeting #3, an E-invitation was created. The invitation was sent on February 5, 2010 to 13 CAG members and 122 TF members; the meeting was attended by 28. The following CAG/TF members were in attendance:

1. President David Pope – Village of Oak Park
2. Lou Arrigoni – Village of Bellwood
3. Michael Bolton - Pace
4. Jim Bosma – Village of Oak Brook
5. Clair Bozic – CMAP
6. Fred Brandstrader – Cap The Ike
7. Lenny Cannata – West Central Municipal Conference
8. JoEllen Charlton – Village of Forest Park, Planning Consultant
9. Rob Cole – Village of Oak Park, Assistant Village Manager
10. Bill Darr – Village of Bellwood, Consultant
11. Dennis DiPasquale – Village of Westchester
12. Tim Gillian – Village of Forest Park, Administrator
13. Brian Gorka – Village of Westchester
14. Henry Guerriero – Illinois State Toll Highway Authority
15. Rich Hazlett – CDOT
16. John Kos – DuPage County DOT
17. Rick Kuner – Citizens for Appropriate Transportation
18. Tam Kutzmark – DuPage County Mayors and Managers
19. William Lenski – RTA
20. Sandy Lentz – Friends of the Oak Park Conservatory
21. Phyllis Logan – 29<sup>th</sup> Ward, Community Advisor
22. Gary Neubieser – Concordia Cemetery
23. Laura Perna – IDNR
24. Leanne Redden – RTA
25. Ryan Richter – Metra



- 26. Robert Vance – CTA
- 27. David Moehring – Resident, Oak Park
- 28. Mark Pitstick – RTA

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

- Recapped the Study Process,
- Explained the EIS process and EIS content,
- Discussed the revised Draft Problem Statement, and
- Reviewed the Technical Analysis Findings – Part One

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

#### **Recap of Study Process**

**Comment: When will the Task Forces and CAG memberships be separated?**

Re: Task force members will be separated from the CAG members when technical issues that require their expertise are developed. This will likely be during the alternatives development and refinement.

**Comment: When can we invite more TF members?**

Re: Membership is open to those w/expertise or interest in the project, balanced w/concerns about group size and proportionate representation.

**Comment: What is the weighting for decision making between the CAG and Task Force members?**

Re: There is no weighting of input. However, as the process advances to a greater level of detail, and community specific issues emerge, we will rely more on community leaders.

#### **EIS Process**

**Comment: How will air quality be included in planning given Chicago area does not meet air quality standards according to USEPA.**

Re: Air quality will be evaluated during the alternatives analysis phase of the Study.

**Comment: We will be able to analyze Greenhouse gas emissions?**

Re: We will need to research this issue further.

**Comment: In what phase does the Design Report and the Interchange/Intersection Design Study occur?**



Re: Design Report and IDS's describe the preferred alternative, so it's after a preferred alternative is identified.

**Comment: What is the speed relationship between congestion and the posted speed limit? Maybe it would be better to lower the speed limit?**

Re: Lowering the speed limit wouldn't reduce congestion. In addition it wouldn't be appropriate on the interstate system.

**Comment: What models will be used to determine increased runoff from the increased impervious area? Larger amounts of runoff will affect the quality of the Des Plaines River.**

Re: The hydrology and hydraulics of the proposed improvements will be evaluated along with pump station #4 that empties the roadway, CTA and freight rail area into the Des Plaines River.

**Comment: What level of design detail that will the report address transit improvements?**

Re: Level of transit improvements will be determined in coordination with FTA and transit agencies.

### **Revised Problem Statement**

The Draft Problem Statement presented at CAG/TF #2 was revised based on input from the CAG/TF members. The revisions are shown in red in the text below.

*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 **that is a critical component of the regional transportation system.** Improved mobility, modal options, **connectivity (north-south and east-west)**, and integration of transportation and land use are desired to **support urban reinvestment, access to jobs, and physical community cohesion economic development and enhance the quality of life.** Study area roadway related issues include traffic congestion on the Eisenhower Expressway and arterial roads, infrastructure condition, safety, truck traffic, and the resultant noise and air pollution. Public transit related issues include lack of modal choices, connectivity, **reverse commute options**, 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, **and mitigating** 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 Revised Problem Statement during the CAG/TF member and Study Group discussion, the following items were identified by the CAG/TF members in attendance:

- There is a discrepancy between draft and on screen revised Problem Statement.
- The PS needs to explicitly state Environmental Justice to more adequately address racial and low income issues,
- Suggest equal opportunity to access jobs,
- “Parity” or “Equity” would be better for inclusion into the PS,
- Don’t make PS too specific as to eliminate opportunities,
- I-290 was designed as a multi modal corridor but since its construction, all of the subsequent major investment has been in the highway mode w/o transit upgrades.,
- Disparate impacts, clarify in PS,
- There is no way to evaluate the Economic Justice portion of the statement,
- Bracket with the addition of community mobility,
- This is a regional facility,
- Suggest “This is a regional system but with community or local goals within or related to the system,”
- How to measure impacts – there should be a weighting structure for daily vs. occasional users.  
Suggest investment that discourages sprawl. Don’t want to invest in sprawl supporting alternatives. Revitalize older, inner ring suburbs,
- PS does show a lot of stakeholder ownership. Suggested if you are a designer, what is the real problem here can be reduced to 4 points:
  1. Reduce traffic congestion
  2. Identify alternative transit
  3. Sensitivity
  4. Responsibility to environment
- This statement will be the metric against which we are going to compare alternatives. Would like a physical connection or an explicit statement – elements included that indicate the “real problem” – to “limit exurban sprawl.”

### **Review of Technical Analysis Findings – Part 1 (Cook DuPage)**

**Comment: Size of arrows does not indicate relative size of travel market within the 5 identified study area travel markets.**

Re: In this graphic, the arrows just indicate the markets, detailed info on the relative size of the markets is in the following tables.

**Comment: What is the percentage of bus versus rail in transit category?**



Re: We do not have the information with us at this time but detailed info may be available in Cook Dupage study.

**Comment: The problem is like an economic barbell – the study area is mostly residential with jobs past either end in DuPage and the CBD. Reverse commute has a lower transit % because transit stops in residential area rather than employment area.**

Re: Noted

**Comment: A major traditional and reverse commute corridor improvement is being constructed with the UP west 3<sup>rd</sup> track.**

Re: Noted

**Comment: What is the definition of Reverse Commute Travel Market and how is it different than south Central Cook Travel Market?**

Re: Reverse is from east of Cicero to west of Cicero commute, South Central Cook goes in the same direction but is from different origins.

#### **Review of Technical Analysis Findings – Part 1 (Metra)**

**Comment: Why not include the Milwaukee-West Metra line in study area, it is as far north as BNSF is to south of I-290.**

Re: This line does not serve trips through corridor like the other identified lines.

#### **Review of Technical Analysis Findings – Part 1 (CTA)**

**Comment: Is the CTA information current?**

Re: Yes, it is from 2009.

**Comment: I thought ROW was reserved for a 3<sup>rd</sup> track.**

Re: ROW was reserved, but the new ADA requirements for wider platforms would utilize this existing space.

**Comment: Is the unused capacity of Blue Line based on frequency of service?**

Re: Yes, more trains could be run with reduced time between trains. However, main line demand is with the OHare branch rather than Forest Park branch.

**Comment: Did you include all routes and not just the ones primarily in the study area?**

Re: Every route that stopped within study area was included even lines that only briefly enter the study area.

**Comment: How will the study address service cuts.**

Re: Data is currently unavailable, also service cuts may be restored, so it is too soon to say how it will affect study.



**Comment: We have 33% traditional market served by transit. What is a reasonable target? In terms of encouraging transit use, what is the threshold where people will choose transit?**

Re: PACE uses about 1 ½ times the auto trip time, or less. However, you must consider door to door time – this includes getting from your origin to the transit, parking time, waiting time for transfers, and getting from the transit to your destination as well as the transit trip time. The cost of the trip and the cost of transfer is also a consideration.

### **Review of Technical Analysis Findings – Part 1 (Roadway)**

**Comment: Will the study evaluate congestion pricing?**

Re: We expect that a wide range of alternatives will be addressed, including congestion pricing.

**Comment: Fixing intersections to allow wide turns may introduce difficulties for pedestrians and transit access. Fix one problem, create another.**

Re: Need to balance deficiencies with standards and may require a design exception to accommodate with best compromise.

**Comment: What are people doing in their trips, how do people decide to enter the CBD, and how can we create a deterrent to auto travel?**

Re: It is not the intention of the study to deter travel by any particular mode only that a multi-modal approach will be undertaken.

**Comment: Inadequacy of gore/radii/shoulder. What is the crash history when compared to other roadways that are optimally designed? Suggest allowing exceptions where there is no demonstrated safety problem.**

Re: Crash history of the expressway is currently underway and the results have not been completely evaluated yet.

**Comment: Concerning outfalls, too much runoff may cause too dramatic a rise in river levels. Flooding of roadway may be best option.**

Re: A detailed drainage study will be performed.

**Comment: Mitigate negative effects of water quality, use green highway elements to reduce runoff and recharge groundwater.**

Re: The drainage study will evaluate these methods.

**Comment: Is it difficult to pump storm water into a waterway? Outfall into Deep Tunnel may be a better option than Des Plaines river?**

Re: Pump station needs to be addressed regardless of the outcome of this study.



After the discussion and presentation, members were asked to “save the date” of March 17, 2010 for the next CAG/TF meeting at which time the Technical Analysis/Findings Part 2 will be presented and discussed.