



## I-290

### Corridor Advisory Group and Task Force (CAG/TF)

#### Meeting # 4 Summary

**April 29, 2010**

#### **Summary**

The fourth combined CAG/TF meeting for the I-290 Phase I Study was held on April 29, 2010 at the Oak Park Library, 834 Lake Street, Oak Park, IL from 9:00 am to 12:00 pm. The Meeting Agenda is included with this summary.

To announce the April 29, 2010 CAG/TF Meeting #4, an E-invitation was created. The invitation was sent on April 16, 2010 to 13 CAG members and 122 TF members. A previous, Save the Date email, was sent on March 10, 2010. The invitation included document links to the Problem Statement and the Existing Transportation System Performance (ETSP) report. The meeting was attended by 34 people. The following CAG/TF members were in attendance:

1. Neil Adams – Oak Park Park District
2. Lou Arrigoni – Village of Bellwood
3. David Boulanger – Oak Park Township
4. Claire Bozic – CMAP
5. Mayor Anthony Calderone – Village of Forest Park
6. Lenny Cannata – West Central Municipal Conference
7. Rob Cole – Village of Oak Park
8. Bill Darr – Village of Bellwood
9. Dennis DiPasquale – Village of Westchester
10. Tim Gillian – Village of Forest Park
11. Brian Gorka – Village of Westchester
12. Mike Grandy – Oak Park Park District
13. Henry Guerriero – Illinois State Toll Highway Authority
14. Rich Hazlett – CDOT
15. John Kos – DuPage County DOT
16. David Kralik – Metra
17. Rick Kuner – Citizens for Appropriate Transportation
18. Tam Kutzmark – DuPage County Mayors and Managers
19. William Lenski – Regional Transportation Authority
20. Phyllis Logan – 29<sup>th</sup> Ward, Community Advisor
21. David Moehring – Oak Park Resident
22. Gary Neubieser – Concordia Cemetery
23. Laura Perna – IDNR
24. President David Pope – Village of Oak Park
25. Teresa Powell – Village of Oak Park
26. Robert Schillerstrom – DuPage County



27. Lorraine Snorden – PACE
28. Lori Sommers – Village of Maywood
29. Mike Sturino – IRTBA
30. Robert Vance – CTA
31. Tammy Wierciak – West Central Municipal Conference
32. David Tomzik – PACE
33. Norm West – US EPA
34. Chuck Kadlec – IDOT –DPIT

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

- Problem Statement
- Technical Analysis Findings – Part Two
- Existing Transportation System – Summary of Findings
- 2030 Baseline (No Build) Forecasts
- Initial Purpose & Need Discussion
- Next Steps

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 below.

Minor adjustments to the **Problem Statement** were presented to the Group. These minor adjustments were made to better address comments provided at the previous CAG/TF #3 meeting. There were no additional comments on the Problem Statement.

**Technical Analysis Findings - Operations Analysis:** The initial Operations Analysis was presented to the Group. The analysis is continuing and more detailed information will be presented at the next meeting.

**Comment: Suggestion to extend the study area to the East similarly to how it was extended to the West.**

Re: The study area has been considered to go farther to the East, but not as far as the Circle Interchange. The most likely location will be where the operations will return to free flow conditions. Study area limits will probably be more of a concern in the alternatives phase.

**Comment: Will a CORSIM or VSIM model be used to look at the travel patterns?**

Re: Yes, modeling simulation programs will be used to evaluate roadway operations and to help the group understand roadway operations.

**Comment: Is the current resurfacing project worth the money or are there longer term maintenance materials that can be used instead of asphalt? How about a permeable pavement in specific sections?**

Re: Resurfacing has a 10-12 year life span but is a relatively quick repair requiring only a single year of construction. Reconstruction could cost 10 times the current project amount and be spread over multiple years. The Project Study Group (PSG) is aware of the need to address sustainability and it will investigate sustainable options for construction during the Alternatives phase.



**Comment: When looking at the CMAP congestion scans, won't the congestion eventually extend all the way into the city? (Basically pushing the congestion from one area of the city to another)**

Re: The study area focuses on the 50 yr old pavement section that needs to be reconstructed. We may broaden our study area to evaluate larger areas, as needed, to fully evaluate the Alternatives.

**Comment: Is the No-Build option a real option? Is population, employment, and socio-economic considered fully for the no build, and aren't there possible negative consequences with not doing anything?**

Re: Yes, the No-Build Alternative is at the top of the list of Alternatives. The consequences of doing nothing will be evaluated through the NEPA process.

**Comment: How were the failing intersections determined? How is LOS determined?**

Re: The process starts with manual vehicle counts at each intersection to determine the volume of existing traffic on each movement (left turns, right turns and through movements). This data is then placed in highway capacity software to evaluate the intersection performance under the demands of the existing traffic volumes. Level of Service (LOS) is determined by the resultant vehicle delay that occurs at each intersection movement and cumulative for the entire intersection.

**Technical Analysis Findings - Crashes: Preliminary crash results were presented to the Group. More detailed crash information will be presented at the next meeting after the crash analysis has been completed.**

**Comment: How many crashes were drug and alcohol related?**

Re: This information can be determined from individual accident reports and presented at a future meeting.

**Comment: How does the crash history on this segment of roadway compare to other freeways in the Chicago area.**

Re: We are still in process of determining comparable crash rates with other area expressways.

**Comment: On the cross roads, what is the main cause of left turn crashes?**

Re: The detailed information will be provided at the next presentation.

**Comment: Has the Department considered additional signage to address weaving caused by unfamiliar motorists performing last minute left-hand exit maneuvers?**

Re: The expressway is signed according to federal guidelines with advance signs provided at 1 mile and ½ mile spacing.

**Comment: How many crashes can be attributed to the left hand exits?**

Re: The Project Team is evaluating left hand exits areas to determine the number of crashes that may be associated with these maneuvers.

**Comment: Need to engage Oak Park sooner rather than later, when discussing these ramps**

Re: These ramps may be part of future alternatives development.



**Comment: Are there higher crash rates, especially for pedestrians, because of the narrow shoulders and lack of vehicle storage areas along the expressway?**

Re: This information can be obtained from the detailed crash reports.

**Excessive Speeds, drug, alcohol, and sunshine glare are all issues as well. (Not just congestion) These should be identified and addressed.**

Re: Further Analysis will provide this kind of information.

**Comment: Crashes west and east of study area need to be factored into the analysis. What are the congestion and safety implications, in other sections, resultant from actions performed within the study area?**

Re: These considerations will be included with the alternatives.

**Comment: How many crashes are related to distracted drivers? Need to determine this proportion.**

Re: We only get as much information as has been written in the crash report. This type of information not normally volunteered by motorists involved in the crashes.

**Existing Transportation System – Summary of Findings: A recap of the ETSP Findings to date was presented. There were no comments resulting from this presentation.**

**CMAP 2030: A presentation of the PSG modeling efforts was conducted that included the 2010 model validation, 2030 No-Build Model development and the 2030 Travel Model Findings**

**Comment: Are there plans to adopt the 2040 RTP? How does this affect the work that is going on now?**

Re: We need to work with the current plan in order to follow NEPA guidelines. The PSG will use 2040 information when it becomes available and adjust our work accordingly. We don't feel that this information will change considerably.

**Comment: How does the travel time model determine modes and routes of projected travel?**

Re: Travel Time skims are based on the most efficient trip and give consideration to different modes of travel. Regional travel times are about the same in either the CMAP 2030 or the "baseline" 2030 w/HOV removed. This considers all arterials, expressways, and the entire network. It is a very mature area. We will revisit this during alternatives phase.

**Comment: How does fuel price factor into the model?**

Re: The issue is what percentage of their budget does the average person spend on fuel? All other costs are also factored into the equation. The relative costs of transportation, when compared to an individual's budget, will likely remain the same at 10% of budget no matter what fuel price climbs to. Other budgetary factors will be adjusted to keep the percentage at 10%.

**Comment: Was Peotone Airport included in the model?**

Re: Yes, the 2030 model includes the impact of a third airport.



**Comment: If accessibility doesn't change, when the HOV project is removed, does this mean the project is not effective?**

Re: This is not a measure of effectiveness, it is a process to establish a no build baseline, one should not read more into it at this point. No change in accessibility is often expected in older, established transportation networks. There will likely be many other methods for measuring performance.

**Comment: If a HOV lane moves more people, how is there no change in accessibility? Is there no appreciable change region-wide, or in the I-290 corridor only?**

Re: What this really means is that population and employment patterns are not anticipated to change much with one additional HOV lane in each direction per CMAP 2030 plan vs. no build.

**Comment: For those neighborhoods to the east where 40% of households do not own a car, how do we link them to a job they can access? Enable connectivity?**

Re: This will be addressed in the alternatives phase.

**Comment: How are trips estimated in the travel model where people don't take the shortest route, but go another way to avoid tolls?**

Re: Tolls are included in the decision making process, every modeled trip has an associated cost based on several factors.

**Comment: Should we consider a combination of housing and transportation costs when figuring benefits of project?**

Re: Housing costs are not currently considered in current practice or outlined in the NEPA process. Having said that, we would like to work with the CAG to define evaluation measures.

**Comment: CAG #3 indicated 33% transit market share, what you are presenting is lower. Shouldn't we be trying to elevate the regional transit use to 20-30%, think of future generations?**

Re: The 33% market share was based on one travel market, the traditional commute.

**Comment: What about non work trips and transit %?**

Re: Transit tends to be more efficient w/longer trips and less efficient for shorter non peak trips. There are few transit trips to grocery store, etc.

**Comment: - How do we transition using this project as a catalyst for the betterment of the Cook DuPage corridor?**

Re: We need things we can actually measure in terms of evaluation criteria.

**Comment: Is it entirely unreasonable to assume that fuel costs will not rise astronomically? How does this reality become part of the equation?**

Re: We rely on CMAP to predict these trends. We will not craft a scenario that changes those assumptions.



**Comment: Lots of existing freight rail and transit in place, why not take advantage of what we already have - business renaissance due to changing economics and increased cost of transportation. Study area is well positioned to revitalize local industries to manufacture “green” energy products.**

Re: The corridor transportation networks will remain intact and could be utilized for future business opportunities and growth.

**Comment: When we get to the alternatives phase will we be discussing congestion pricing?**

Re: Yes.

**Purpose and Need:** The development of the project Purpose and Need was presented including how it is shaped by the Problem Statement, the identified needs for the project and stakeholder goals and objectives.

**Comment: Link between transportation and land use as a P&N point. This is an opportunity to steer the study to address non-transportation purposes and these can be better enforced if included in P&N.**

Re: P&N is 1<sup>st</sup> threshold; other considerations also come into play as study progresses. This is a formal process and it needs to satisfy transportation need. It may not solve all problems but should strike a balance w/environment and community.

After the discussion and presentation, members were asked to “save the date” for a meeting in Late June/Early July.