



I-290
Corridor Advisory Group and Task Force (CAG/TF)
Meeting #14 Summary
June 11, 2012

The fourteenth combined CAG/TF meeting for the I-290 Phase I Study was held on June 11, 2012 at the Carleton Hotel of Oak Park, 1110 Pleasant St., Oak Park, IL 60302 from 2:00 pm to 4:00 pm. The Meeting Agenda is included with this summary.

To announce the June 11, 2012 CAG/TF Meeting #14, an E-invitation was created. The invitation was sent out to all CAG and TF members on May 30, 2012. A previous, Save the Date email, was sent on May 9, 2012. The meeting was attended by 23 people. The following CAG/TF members were in attendance:

1. Claire Bozic – Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
2. Rob Cole – Village of Oak Park
3. Christopher DiPalma – Federal Highway Administration
4. Peter Fahrenwald – RTA
5. Tim Gillian – Village of Forest Park
6. John Kos – DuPage County DOT
7. Rick Kuner – Citizens for Appropriate Transportation
8. Brenda McGruder – CDOT
9. Mike McLaughlin – CTA
10. Teresa Powell – Village of Oak Park
11. William Barlow – Village of Maywood
12. Lenny Cannata – West Central Municipal Conference
13. Greg Dreyer – Illinois State Toll Highway Authority
14. Janine Farzin – CTA
15. Luann Hamilton – CDOT
16. John Hedges – Village of Oak Park
17. Laura Perna – Illinois Department of Natural Resources
18. Mark Pitstick - RTA
19. President David Pope – Village of Oak Park
20. Mike Sturino – IRTBA
21. Russ Wajda – Village of Hillside
22. Tammy Wierciak – West Central Municipal Conference
23. Kristen Andersen – METRA

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

- Where are we in the process?
- Recap CAG/TF #13
- Round 2 Conclusions
- Round 3 Initiation
- Next Steps
- Interchange/Access 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.

Where are we in the Process?: The project study team has completed Round 2 of the Alternatives Development and Evaluation phase of the Study with the completion of the ten combination alternatives evaluation. Recently the project study team has begun Round 3 by developing initial interchange concepts, and presenting the initial concepts to the individual communities and transit agencies for feedback.

There were no comments on where we are in the process.

Recap CAG/TF #13: At the last CAG/TF meeting, the initial Round 2 conclusions were presented. The initial modeling results for the combination alternatives show that the top Round 2 performers are: HOV 2+ with Express Bus and HCT, General Purpose Add Lane with Express Bus and HCT, and HOT 3+ with Express Bus and HCT. The project study team also introduced how interchange concepts will be developed.

There were no comments on the recap of CAG/TF #13.

Round 2 Conclusions: The Project Study Team walked through the ten initial combination alternatives which consist of two footprint variations, an alternative with HCT and one without HCT. There were a couple of updates to the evaluation: the model was refined to factor in the influence of tolling on Mode Choice which resulted in revised daily person throughput and overall safety performance, and the no build scenario access to employment was updated to represent the number of jobs accessible from the entire study area rather than from a location in the center of the study area. With the Round 2 initial combination mode modeling complete, the top five alternatives to be carried forward into Round 3 were identified: HOV 2+ & EXP & HCT, HOT 3+ & EXP & HCT, HOT 3+ & TOLL & EXP & HCT, GP & EXP & HCT, and HOT 3+ & TOLL & EXP. The Alternatives Identification and Evaluation report was updated to include the Round 2 evaluation and was made available for comment on the project website www.eisenhowerexpressway.com. Comment period for the updated report will extend through June 29, 2012.

Comment: Has a specific date for the Public Meeting been set yet?

Re: No specific date has been set yet. We are looking to have a Public Meeting sometime in August.

Round 3 Evaluation: In Round 3, the project study team will further explore tolling legislation and requirements, refine footprints and operational characteristics of the top 5 alternatives, and add interchanges and crossroads. The Round 3 Evaluation factors are performance, impacts, costs, and stakeholder input. The objective at the conclusion of Round 3 is to determine the alternatives to be evaluated in the draft EIS. Since the last CAG/TF meeting, the project study team met individually with transit agencies and each of the communities along the corridor to revisit existing deficiencies and constraints and present initial interchange concepts & evaluation for discussion. The next CAG/TF meeting will be in August to discuss initial Round 3 results.



Comment: Will this project incorporate the I-LAST rating system? I believe that something like this will help ease stakeholder concerns with sustainability and the environment.

Re: We will look into using the I-LAST rating system on this project in Round 3 along with the goals and objectives from October 2009 and the problem statement. Some of the I-LAST criteria are used for planning, design, and construction.

Comment: I understand that the Department is planning on redoing the Circle Interchange? Will this project interface with the I-290 Study?

Re: Our managed lanes alternatives stop just short of the Circle Interchange near Ashland to allow adequate weaving distance between the end of the managed lane and the Circle Interchange ramps. However, we will refine our precise limits as the Circle Interchange project advances.

Comment: Would a single toll lane be the first of its kind?

Re: Other highway projects in the region are looking into this concept as well.

Comment: At the end of the DEIS, what is the result?

Re: The preferred alternative will be selected for preliminary engineering, but will still require more detailed final design.

Comment: Can the CTA stations and interchanges be separated?

Re: We would like the CTA's input on this concept.

Interchange/Access Workshop: The objective of this workshop is to present the initial interchange concepts to the CAG/TF group for CAG/TF collaboration on any issues, and to collect additional input and feedback. At the end of this workshop, the study team will refine interchange concepts and test additional concepts based on stakeholder feedback received, then report back to the CAG/TF with the findings at the next CAG/TF meeting. The workshop was separated into five different areas:

A) 25th Avenue to 1st Avenue

Existing Conditions:

- 3½ interchanges in 1.5 miles
- Poor mainline weaving –high crash rates and congestion
- 25th Ave: Circuitous access/commercial corridor
- 1st Ave: LOS F/E, frontage road cut through traffic, intersection crashes.

Concepts Evaluated:

- 4 system concepts evaluated
- 3 different interchange concepts evaluated

Comments:

- This signal is really long, and the traffic backs up onto the 1st Avenue Ramp.
- Clarify which, if any, ramps to be removed.
- There is no existing sidewalk on East side of 1st Ave.
- Off-ramp /right turn pedestrian interaction is a concern.

B) DesPlaines Avenue

Existing Conditions:

- LOS B/D
- Confusing ramp and CTA station access



- Poor pedestrian and ADA access
- Not recommended for bike travel

3 concepts evaluated:

- Maintain existing ramp configuration
- WB on-ramp flyover:
 - o With traditional intersection
 - o With roundabout

Comments:

- If you were to move the CTA terminal west to 1st Ave (ComEd), then you could completely eliminate this interchange. The general traffic volumes here don't warrant an interchange.
- If there is new High Capacity Transit (HCT) extension west of Forest Park, there should be access to Forest Park Station from east.
- There is a need to improve pedestrian and bicycle access from south of I-290.
- Alternative B is the best alternative.

C) Harlem Avenue and Austin Blvd

Existing Conditions:

- LOS F/F
- Insufficient turn lane storage length
- Substandard turning radii for trucks
- Poor access to transit
- CTA station access on existing interchange bridge
- Non ADA compliant sidewalk/ramps, no bike lane/shoulder

Concepts Evaluated:

- Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI)
- Modified SPUI

Comments:

- Harlem Ave
 - o Home Ave pedestrian bridge could connect to Harlem Avenue station.
 - o Provide access from the back of the station for pedestrians and bicyclists.
 - o Provide a pedestrian flyover bridge at the southwest corner of Harlem Ave.
 - o The northbound right turn lane is still too short, unless two right turn lanes (duals) are provided.
- Austin Ave
 - o Extend the pedestrian path, and provide an under the road entrance pedestrian bridge closer to the CTA station.
 - o Existing traffic appears to turn right at-will. There needs to be an actual crossing control for pedestrians and bicyclists.

D) Austin Blvd and Central Ave System

Existing Conditions:

- Closely spaced interchanges
- High Volume ramps
- Constrained ROW (CTA and Columbus Park)

3 Concepts Evaluated:

- Full independent interchanges @ Austin and Central
- Consolidate all direct access at Central Ave – C-D road connection to Austin



- Partial access at Austin Blvd

Comments:

- There are two conflict points at the interchanges:
 - o The rights turn in front of bus lane onto the Austin and Harlem ramp.
 - o At Harlem, there are pedestrian conflicts to the CTA station. I would like to see an exhibit that shows all the potential conflicts.
- Is the LOS based on old or new HCM? Response: The LOS is based on old HCM. The Department has not yet adopted the new HCM.
- Are there any additional environmental impacts with the Texas U-turn? Response: The Department will analyze environmental impacts in Round 3.
- There is a conflict of right turns onto I-290 with the bus lane that serves CTA station.
- On matrix, For the 2040 No Build & EXP
 - o Number of jobs accessible (2.1-2.3)
 - Numbers are significantly higher than the March CAG/TF meeting
 - Suggest adding a note of explanation to the report. Response: it is currently noted in the report.

E) Laramie Avenue and Cicero Avenue System

Existing Conditions:

- Mainline Ramp Weaves
- High Crash Locations
- Cicero Avenue LOS F/E
- Poor Access to Transit @ Cicero Avenue
- Lack of turn lane storage
- Substandard turning radii

2 System Concepts Evaluated:

- Full interchange @ Cicero Avenue (SPUI) no ramps at Laramie Avenue
- Reverse existing ramps and add Texas U-turns

Comments:

- Concept A (SPUI at Cicero Interchange)
 - o There is a concern with pedestrian accessibility.
 - o Station platforms and widths would have to be altered.
- Concept B (Texas U-turn, flip-flop ramps)
 - o Reoccurring concern with pollution/environmental impacts
- There is a concern about extra traffic around residential properties on frontage roads.
- Improve pedestrian access to CTA station.
- Implement directional signage.