



## Willow Road Phase I Study Summary of CAG Meeting #9 and Public Comment Period

Date: April 7, 2011  
Time: 6:00 p.m. to 7:50 p.m. CAG Meeting  
7:50 p.m. to 8:10 p.m. Public Comment Period  
Place: New Trier High School, Northfield Campus, Room C-234  
Attendance: See Sign-in Sheet at the end of the Meeting Summary

IDOT is conducting planning studies along Willow Road from Waukegan Road (IL 43) to the Edens Expressway (I-94). The intent of the Community Advisory Group (CAG) is to provide a forum for community members to provide input into IDOT's project development process and provide feedback about their transportation needs and community issues throughout the study. IDOT will consider this input, along with all of its other work and analysis, to make their planning and design decisions.

At each meeting, topics are discussed with the CAG to solicit ideas and feedback. The topics discussed at CAG Meeting #9 included the Alternatives Evaluation Round #1 Analysis and Public Meeting #2. The Round #2 Evaluation Methodology was also introduced.

### I. Introduction (Pete Harmet)

#### Meeting Overview:

The role of the CAG is to provide constructive feedback in a polite, professional, and civil manner. Meeting protocol will be for discussions to follow presentations. Due to the technical and complex nature of the material new topics are introduced at a CAG meeting with supporting analysis for CAG's review following a meeting. Topics introduced at one meeting will be followed up with a full discussion at the next CAG Meeting. For topics introduced at the CAG #9 meeting, follow up discussions will be held at CAG #10 on July 21, 2011, same location and time. This process allows the CAG Members to receive an overview of the technical material prior to reviewing and trying to process the sometimes very complex information on their own. There will be a public meeting in May followed by the CAG Meeting in July.

Mr. Harmet noted that the CAG is beginning the alternatives evaluation process and it is a process that adds detail as the evaluations continue. At the July meeting we will conclude discussion of Round #1 Evaluation and initiate discussion of Round #2 which adds more details.

Mr. Stenzel noted that the CAG will be continuing its discussion of Alternatives Evaluation Round #1 Analysis results. The CAG will also be discussing the up-coming Public Meeting and the Round #2 Evaluation.

### II. Continued CAG Discussions

#### A. Round #1 Evaluation

##### Presentation of Round #1 Alternatives Analysis Evaluation

- Sixteen alternatives have been identified based on suggested by stakeholders. Each of the alternatives is evaluated in terms of how it affects Willow Road.
- The evaluation process starts out at a broad level of analysis and then as the process moves forward becomes more detailed.
- Round #1 of the evaluation will be done in two parts: Initial screening and Purpose & Need Evaluation Factors. All alternatives will be compared to the No-Build Alternative as well as each other.

- Tools that will be used for the Round #1 Analysis are: Highway Safety Manual, CMAP Travel Demand Model, Highway Capacity Manual, Existing Aerial Photography, Maps and GIS
- The following Comparison Criteria are used in the evaluation: Calculated safety performance accounting for vehicles and pedestrians; Pedestrian Safety at the Willow Road/Sunset Ridge Road intersection; Level of Service (LOS) at Willow Road/Sunset Ridge Road intersection; Facility condition and design; and Flaw analysis
- Purpose and Need Screening performed based on safety, mobility, travel pattern analysis, facility condition and design, and a fatal flaw analysis. Below are the findings under each category.
  - Safety Findings
    - Performance ranges from 6.2 to 13.0 crashes per year
    - Regional alternatives perform worse, minimal change to Willow Road safety
    - In terms of Expected Crash Frequency (1 crash every X years) all of the alternatives were in the range of seven to nine years except for the alternatives with pedestrian refuge islands which have an expected crash frequency of 1 every 20 years. This prediction is the same for a two-lane or four-lane roadway with a refuge island.
  - Mobility Findings
    - No-Build at LOS F
    - Most Build Alternatives at LOS F
    - 4-Lane with Median had through movements at LOS D through 2040, while the overall intersection operated at LOS D until 2035 after which time it changed to a LOS E
    - Wide range in level of delay depending on alternative (ranges between 65 and 225 seconds)
    - Wide range in expected queues on Willow Road depending on the alternative (range between 420 feet and over 2,000 feet).
    - Regional Alternatives lowest performing
  - Travel Pattern Analysis Findings
    - Predominant travel pattern is between northwest and southeast
    - Model considers factors such as trip lengths, travel patterns, and levels of congestion
    - Regional Alternatives do not offer sufficient new access or added capacity to significantly alter travel patterns along Willow Road
  - Facility Condition and Design Findings
    - No-Build and Regional Alternatives include no improvements to Willow Road
    - Local Alternatives along Willow Road provide for reconstruction of the 60-year old roadway
  - Flaw Analysis Findings
    - Regional Alternatives involved most impacts and higher costs because of additional cost for ramps, bridges, and retaining walls as well as a typically larger footprint. Local Alternatives involved fewer impacts and lower overall construction costs
- Evaluation Round #1 Summary
  - Regional Alternatives did not address the Willow Road project needs as well as Local Alternatives
  - Local Willow Road Alternatives involved fewer impacts and overall lower construction costs than Regional Alternatives
  - Local Alternatives should be carried into Evaluation Round #2

#### Discussion of Safety And Mobility Analysis

- A CAG Member asked if in Round #2 it would be possible to add the Wagner Road intersection to the analysis. Mr. Harmet responded that in the second round of analysis all of the intersections would be evaluated.
- A CAG Member stated that they felt that the project team was mixing old methodologies (IDOT and FHWA manuals) and new methodologies (FHWA Highway Safety Manual). The Member continued that the HSM was a good methodology in terms of its analysis of excess crashes and wondered if the CAG's evaluations could rely solely on this manual instead of mixing and matching methodologies. Mr. Harmet responded that

the evaluation of police reports and the State's Five Percent Report actually results in a more robust analysis. This allowed analysis of more types of crashes than was possible with the HSM. The HSM was used as a tool to predict crashes and evaluate alternatives. The CAG Member asked if the HSM could be used to evaluate all of the existing intersections to make sure the locations with the most serious problems were being addressed. Mr. Stenzel added that the analysis of actual crashes addressed the existing condition and told us the locations with the most serious problems. The exciting thing about the Highway Safety Manual is that it brings together a lot of research in a manner unavailable until now and allows us to see what happens given different improvement strategies. Mr. Harmet added that the HSM does not break down the injuries and fatalities the way that the Crash Analysis did so that using only the HSM would result in less detail.

- A CAG Member asked why, if the CAG is waiting for the latest accident data, it was also not waiting to use the latest census data from the 2010 census instead of using 10-year old data. Mr. Stenzel responded that it was his understanding that the CMAP model is updated on a regular basis during the 10-year period between each census. Mr. Harmet added that the CAG has a robust analysis and that if there are any significant changes these would be evaluated. The CAG Member asked where updated census data could be obtained. Mr. Harmet responded that this was a national issue that the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning was involved with.
- Another CAG Member felt that it was a thorough analysis and provided a view of both the local and regional alternatives and how these alternatives would affect the region. The Member then asked if it was correct that as the number of alternatives is narrowed down that the other intersections would be evaluated. Mr. Harmet responded that this was correct and that Round #2 analyses would include all of the intersections and segments. The CAG Member then asked if there was any analysis of traffic being diverted to other roads in the area and how the alternatives affected other roads in the area. Mr. Harmet responded that there has been much discussion about cut-through traffic and that this was something that should be examined during Round #2 analyses. The analysis completed so far demonstrated that local alternatives performed better than regional alternatives; so the next question would become, how the local area is affected by the local alternatives.
- A CAG Member asked if, given the current evaluation, whether the 2005 Plan is now the safest plan. Mr. Harmet responded, based on the results of the crash analysis, that there was a .02 difference between the 2-Lane with Median and the 4-Lane with Median alternatives. Each alternative, however, is expected to have a crash every 20 years.
- A CAG Member asked if safety data were available for 10, 11, and 12-foot lane widths. In order to see how lane width impacts safety especially as speed increases on wider roads. Mr. Harmet responded that 11-foot lanes widths were chosen as a starting point in order to keep the project footprint small. Mr. Harmet continued that the Highway Safety Manual states that there is no difference in safety performance between a 10, 11, and 12-foot lane.
- A CAG Member asked if there was no difference in safety for different lane width would it not make sense to make the lanes as narrow as possible in order to minimize impacts from things like impermeable surfaces and crossing distance. The Member asked if the CAG could look at 10-foot lane widths. Mr. Harmet responded, yes.
- A CAG Member suggested that, in regard to lane width and the impact on safety, it would be interesting to look at the intersection of Winnetka Road and Green Bay Road.
- A CAG Member noted that Deerfield Road, which has an ADT comparable to Willow Road in Northfield, does have 10-foot lanes and is 30 mph. It seems to function very well and the narrower lanes seem to have a calming effect on drivers. The opposite seems to be true on Lake-Cook Road where the lanes are wider.
- A CAG Member noted that he did not think the ADT on Deerfield Road was close to the ADT on Willow Road. The previous Member responded that both roads have an ADT of over 27,000 and that the segment of Deerfield Road in question is the segment between Waukegan and Route 41.
- A CAG Member asked if the Mobility Analysis was done on the A.M. or the P.M. Peak. Mr. Stenzel responded that the analysis was done on the P.M. Peak.

- A CAG Member stated, in reference to the issue of lane width, he felt that a 12-foot lane would be safer than a narrower lane because it would afford drivers the opportunity to focus their attention on the road in front of them. A CAG Member responded that with the additional lane width there is also more street-width for children to cross. Mr. Harmet responded that based on the research behind the HSM there is no safety difference between 10, 11, and 12-foot lanes. A CAG Member added that it may not make a difference for drivers but it does for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- A CAG Member asked if the HSM was addressing motorist safety only or also pedestrian safety. Mr. Harmet responded that if the HSM says there is no difference in safety he did not see why the CAG could not look at 10-foot lanes.
- CAG Member Stacy Sigman, Village Manager for Northfield, indicated that the Village has asked their engineering consultant to assist the Village in reviewing the Round #1 Evaluation materials. The Village has not yet received anything back from KLOA and only preliminary responses from Carl Bova. Ms. Sigman presented an outline of the comments to date, to Mr. Harmet, and indicated the Village's intention to obtain the additional detail, submit it for the public record, and would like all the CAG Members to receive the information when they do. Mr. Harmet responded they would. Mr. Stenzel added that a Technical Advisory Committee meeting could also be held to discuss the evaluations.
- A CAG Member noted that as she took her outing, i.e., the CAG field trip, today she crossed Willow Road on a couple of occasions and that she was unable to finish crossing the street before the light turned yellow. She suggested adding a few seconds would help. She added that the field trips were great because they gave people a chance to see what was actually happening.  
POST MEETING CLARIFICATION: The timings at the Willow Road intersections at Wagner Road and Sunset Ridge Road meet the MUTCD requirements for crossing times. At Sunset Ridge intersection, the flashing don't walk time is greater than the required minimum pedestrian clearance time. At Wagner Road intersection, the flashing don't walk time is less than the minimum pedestrian clearance time but the MUTCD allows the yellow and all-red intervals to be included with the flashing don't walk time to meet the minimum pedestrian clearance time.

#### Discussion of Alternatives

- A CAG Member suggested, given the positive impact of pedestrian refuge islands on safety, that this feature be added to all alternatives. Mr. Harmet responded that this feature would not be appropriate in some alternatives such as the roundabouts or alternatives where there is not a continuous median, e.g., the No-Build Plus or Alternative 2A. He continued that the refuge island was added to the Round #1 intersection analysis for the 3-lane and 4-lane options and that each performed equally well.
- A CAG Member representing the Northfield Park District, asked if it was correct that when the alternatives are narrowed down there will be a discussion about the impact on the land the Park District has next to the road for ball fields and soccer fields. Mr. Harmet responded to the extent there is sufficient detail on the alternatives this can be evaluated. He added that if the Park District has measurable criteria with which to evaluate impacts it should suggest them.
- A CAG Member asked if alternatives were being eliminated at this time. Mr. Harmet responded that Round #1 would not be closed out until the July CAG Meeting.
- A CAG Member noted that IDOT had been asked to mark on the existing road where the various alternatives would align. He noted that this had not been done and would be very helpful to give people context, e.g., how close will an alternative come to someone's home. The Member added that he did not think the CAG had been given anything that provides a context.
- A CAG Member said that this would help when Members took tours of the road so that people could see where the new edge of pavement would be under the new configurations.
- A CAG Member said that he did not think this was possible because there is nothing that says, if the road is widened 10 feet, it has to be 5 feet wider on each side.
- Mr. Harmet said that IDOT would accommodate the request, to mark the road, when the process was at that level of detail.

Discussions Regarding Posted Speed (Park Zone, School Zone, Regulatory)

- A CAG Member asked, as a follow up to a request from a previous meeting, about park zones in Glenview and IDOT's policy on park zones. A CAG Member from Glenview said that he had just sent information to IDOT on park speed zones for distribution to the CAG. The Member added it was part of a 2006 law aimed at helping pedestrians walk to parks. The Village of Glenview's Board discussed the matter in 2007 but due to concerns involving signage, enforcement, and potential driver confusion they did not act on the matter. Subsequently, Glenview has not enacted any park speed zones.
- A CAG Member added that she had done research into the park speed zone and that State law seemed to be that if a park was within 50 feet of a roadway a park speed zone could be established. By her measurement Clarkson Park is within 50 of Willow Road. The Member asked if Mr. Harmet could help establish such a zone. Mr. Harmet responded that he would talk to the representative from Glenview and discuss the matter with IDOT's Bureau of Traffic.
- A CAG Member noted, in reference to park zones/school zones and an IDOT worker who was working along Willow Road and was hit by a vehicle driven by someone using a cell phone, State laws that require drivers to slow down in a construction zone. He continued that within the last year the Governor applied the same standard to school zones with the same penalties. He asked why IDOT workers get preferential treatment to his children who cross Willow Road every day. Mr. Harmet responded that IDOT had previously provided a response to the school zone issue which explained IDOT policy and that the CAG would consider the school zone issue again as it moves through the evaluation of alternatives.
- A CAG Member asked how a park zone could be secured if school zones were not in the cards. Mr. Harmet responded that IDOT would review the park zone policy.
- A CAG Member asked what was offered to the school districts in order to maintain safety, where school speed zones were removed as a result of the research done for this project. Mr. Harmet responded that he was not aware of the details on this matter. The CAG Member then asked if the IDOT person who handled this matter could come and discuss the impact on safety of removing the school speed zones. Mr. Harmet noted that the issue of school speed zones had already been discussed at previous CAG meetings and would be considered again as part of the next round of evaluation. The Member added that she was not satisfied with the way the issues of school speed zones had been handled.
- A CAG Member added that it was not the intention of the CAG to have speed zones removed from schools as a result of their request. She asked why IDOT could not just leave all the zones and change their policy. Mr. Harmet responded that the school zones would be considered as part of this study during the alternatives analysis.
- A CAG Member asked if school zones were not being denied. Mr. Harmet responded that under current conditions a school zone is not warranted. He continued that school zones would be considered as part of the tool box and applied to alternatives in the next round.
- A CAG Member asked if, in the absence of a time line for the project, a tool from the toolbox could be used before any others prior to something like a four-lane build out. Mr. Harmet responded that it depended upon which tool it was. The Member said he was referring to school zones. Mr. Harmet repeated that under existing conditions a school zone was not warranted.
- A CAG Member noted, in reference to Mr. Harmet's comments about a school zone not being warranted under IDOT's policy that Northfield did meet the Federal guidelines for school zones. The Member continued that this was District 1's standard and how District 1 was applying the guidelines. The Member continued that Northfield has FOIA'ed records and it is very inconsistent how IDOT has applied its policy District to District. The Member disagreed that a school zone was not warranted on Willow Road, it is warranted under Federal policy, it was just not warranted under how District 1 interprets IDOT's Policy. Mr. Harmet said the statewide policy on school zones was mailed to the CAG and that he thought it made very clear when school zones were warranted and when they were not.
- A CAG Member asked if Mr. Harmet could confirm that District 1 applies the school zone standard differently than other Districts in the State. Mr., Harmet responded he could only speak to District 1, which is in compliance with the policy.

- A CAG Member stated that District 1 applied District 1, State, or Federal policies depending upon which fit its position. The Member asked for consistency in the use of standards. Mr. Harmet responded that the CAG would consider the school zone issue as part of the alternatives evaluation.
- A CAG Member added that since higher speeds result in more frequent and more serious accidents would it be possible in the Round #2 Evaluations to look at a 30 mph speed limit on Willow Road as well as a 35 mph on Willow Road. Another CAG Member added that consistency and communication of speed limit changes were important for motorists who are not from a given town.
- A CAG Member asked if analysis was to be done assuming a 30 mph speed limit on Willow Road, instead of a 35 mph speed limit, could an analysis also be done with an assumed 40 mph speed limit. The CAG Member added that on the subject of school zones, there are options other than school zones to address the safety of children. Mr. Harmet responded that the CAG has a whole tool box of options to consider as a part of this process.
- A CAG Member added that based on her own research of the HSM and other documents that an increase in the speed limit from 35 to 40 mph would increase fatal crashes by a factor of 1.9.
- A CAG Member added that it would be interesting to see what the actual speeds are that people are driving on other roads in the area such as Lake-Cook Road, Dundee Road, and Lake Avenue. The Member added this would help the CAG address safety as part of the alternatives analysis since the road would be much closer to the schools and houses in the community. Mr. Harmet responded that IDOT will evaluate a 30 and a 40 mph speed limit on Willow Road but would not be looking at other roads. The CAG Member asked if data on average speed existed for the other roadways. Mr. Harmet responded that he was not aware of this type of database.
- A CAG Member expressed skepticism regarding the effectiveness of speed zones at low to moderate speeds when the roadway is not designed for those low to moderate speeds. The Member continued that the better approach was to determine what the appropriate speed was for the road and design the road for that speed.
- A CAG Member asked the other Member if in his experience it was better to have a consistent speed limit, say 30 mph, or go back and forth from 30 to 25 to 30. Mr. Stenzel responded that he did not believe that there was one answer that fit all situations and that it was dependent on local circumstances, e.g., the distance that different speed limits would be in effect. A CAG Member noted that the context of the previous question was a 1.2 mile stretch of Willow Road where there are multiple speed changes so the question was valid. He noted that Glenview did not implement a park zone because of the fluctuating speeds. He felt it would be interesting to look at reducing the speed along Willow Road to 30 mph in the corridor.
- As CAG Member asked if the CAG recommended a specific speed limit for the corridor would that influence the speed limit that IDOT would set. Mr. Harmet responded that there are many things being considered as part of the evaluation and that he was unable to give a yes or no answer to the question at this time. The Member continued that he felt that IDOT had responded to the CAG's wishes in terms of the alternatives and the evaluation of alternative and that a lower speed on Willow Road seemed like a good alternative. The Member added that a well designed road would be a much safer road than a road that was not designed properly. The Member said that speed limits and the design of the road are important and that the information that has been provided has been outstanding and that it has addressed every question that has been asked. The Member concluded by saying that if everyone agrees that lowering the speed limit would be a good thing IDOT should put a high level of importance on that agreement.

#### Discussion on CSS and CAG Process

- A CAG Member noted that this study followed principles of context sensitive design. He continued that given the context of Willow Road the selection of the intersection of Sunset Ridge Road and Willow Road was convenient for IDOT but that the intersection of Wager Road and Sunset Ridge Road should have been chosen for the analysis because it is surrounded by churches and schools. He felt that the Wagner Rd intersection should have been the intersection for Round #1. Mr. Harmet responded that context sensitive solutions does include addressing mobility; it addresses

all users and factors. The CAG Member responded that the process seems to be driven by what federal manuals and guidelines say rather than how things affect the people that live in the neighborhood. Mr. Harmet added that all of the manuals mentioned are part of the context sensitive process and that, as had been mentioned before, the Sunset Ridge Road intersection was selected for the analysis because it was the most sensitive to changes in traffic. The CAG Member continued that emphasis was being put on FHWA's manuals, IDOT's manuals, and generating numbers but not on the neighborhood. Mr. Harmet reminded the CAG that the first nine months of the process was spent talking about everything but numbers.

- A CAG Member complimented IDOT on the process and said that from his perspective the Context Sensitive Solutions process was being followed. He added that the data was well presented and the format makes it easy to follow. The presentation helped to elevate his level of understanding of the impact of the regional and local alternatives on Willow Road. He continued that it was important to continue the discussion of context in Round #2 and address how the alternatives affect parks, schools, and home values. He again complimented the process and added that the study has been focused on Context Sensitive Solutions from his perspective.
- A CAG Member expressed his frustration at the total lack of context in this part of the process. A lot of data has been distributed but the Member did not see where the context analysis, required by law, was addressed. For example, the Member did not see any analysis of the impact on home values of the alternatives. The Member felt that the context analysis that was done previously was not being applied in the analysis of the alternatives. As an example the Member pointed to the impact of increased highway noise on residential properties as well as the schools. The Member continued that the process throws a lot of data at people that hides the context within which decisions are to be made, Mr. Harmet responded that the first nine months of the process were spent examining the context of the project. The evaluation process was laid out. It is a process that adds detail as it proceeds. This is precisely the planning process; this is precisely the context sensitive solution process. Mr. Harmet noted that the CAG member may be mischaracterizing what CSS means.
- A CAG Member noted that he attends these meetings because he is trying to participate in a community advisory group evaluating various scenarios. At some point he will make an appropriate decision. IDOT has supplied a great deal of information and will continue to do so – the Member is appreciative.
- A CAG Member responded that Members were also at the meetings to provide input and make their interests known.

#### Discussions Related to Upcoming Public Meeting and Funding

- A CAG Member asked if the Public Meeting was still being held even though there are 16 alternatives. Mr. Harmet, responded that yes there would be a Public Meeting in order to get everyone's input on the analysis and findings to date.
- A CAG Member asked if any new data, that the CAG has not already seen, would be presented at the public meeting. Mr. Harmet responded that no new data would be presented.
- A CAG Member asked how responses would be gathered and gauged at the public meeting. Mr. Harmet responded there will be an opportunity for written comments, a court reporter will be present, and mail in comments will be accepted up to two weeks after the meeting. He continued that a summary of the comments will be available for the July CAG Meeting.
- CAG Member Phoebe Raymond asked in regard to the May 16<sup>th</sup> Public Meeting would the project be presented in the context of the State's current budget situation. She continued that one of the items that has been taken off the table is the cost of the project. She noted that in recent meetings on education with State Representatives Susan Garrett and Daniel Biss she was asked to make recommendations on cutting money from the education budget. Then at CAG meetings she is being asked how to spend. Mr. Harmet responded that IDOT goes through a planning process whether a project is funded or not. It has also been noted from the beginning that the number in the budget is a placeholder. He noted that cost information was part of Round #1. Ms. Raymond continued by asking what do members say when someone at the

public meetings asks what this project means for Illinois. Mr. Harmet responded that at this point we are going through a planning process; we are not obtaining funding. He continued that IDOT goes through a planning process on many projects without funding such as the Elgin-O'Hare Expressway.

- A CAG Member asked if either Mr. Harmet or Mr. Stenzel had any political clout that could get the Governor or the State Senator to attend the Public Meeting. The Member suggested that the CAG should extend an invitation to both the Governor and the Senator to attend the Public Meeting. Mr. Harmet responded that the CAG Member was free to send such an invitation.
- A CAG Member disputed a claim that the project was not fully funded noting that the Governor's budget has \$32 Million allocated for Willow Road and called into question the increase in estimated construction costs since the 2005 plan. He added that the 2005 Plan was designed so that if it was wrong the road could be improved without ripping up the road. He continued by noting that many roads are being put on road diets because 5 and 6 lane roads do not work. The Member noted a recent discussion he had indicated that the 2005 Plan would create 400 hundred jobs. Mr. Harmet responded that this has been a very professional and comprehensive process with many opportunities for constructive feedback. He continued, in response to the road diet issues which is brought up at every meeting, that Mr. Jeff Shaw the expert from the FHWA indicated that road diets work where the ADT is 17,000 or less. Mr. Harmet noted that the classic case for road diets is a 4-lane road, with an ADT less than 17,000 that is narrowed to three lanes. The CAG Member responded that he was not advocating a road diet but that a 3 lane shovel ready plan is available for \$5 Million instead of \$32 Million that would put 400 people to work. He continued that the 2005 Plan could be built; we could see how it works, and if it does not work the fourth lane could be added. The CAG Member added that he spoke to the head of the Transportation Center at Northwestern University and he said he could pull files that support the proposition that road widening does not work.
- A CAG Member suggested that the process move on and that the point had been made regarding the 2005 Plan. The Member thought it was inappropriate to stop the process now, while alternatives are being considered, and build the 3-Lane Plan. The Member continued that he would like to go through the process and then make the decision as to which was the best alternative. He further noted that nothing is written in stone regarding the State's budget.
- A CAG Member added that the project needed to be put in the context of what is happening to the State of Illinois' budget. Mr. Harmet responded that planning goes on regardless of funding.
- A CAG Member noted that the 2005 Plan had a horizon year of 2012. The Member did not think this was a great plan given that it was already 2011.
- A CAG Member said that at a previous meeting a chart (prepared by Northfield's consultant Cooper Engineering) was distributed which indicated that traffic had gone down in the last five years on streets like Lake Avenue, which seemed to refute the idea of cut-through traffic. Mr. Harmet responded that those charts had been discussed in detail and that they did not prove that traffic was declining in northern Cook County. The CAG Member said that he believed that it proved that people were not cutting off of Willow Road to go to Lake Avenue.

### **III. Public Meeting #2**

#### Presentation of Round #1 Evaluation

- Update the Public on Progress to Date
- Present Technical Analyses
  - Crash Report
  - Traffic Report
  - Physical Inventory Report
  - Travel Demand Modeling
  - Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Tool Box
- Purpose and Need Document
- Display all No Build and Build Alternatives

- Present Findings of Round #1 Evaluation of Alternatives
- Request Public Input and Comments
- Monday, May 16, 2011
  - 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
  - New Trier High School Cafeteria, Northfield Campus
  - Open House Format
- Continuous Audio Visual Presentation
- Written Comments Area
- Court Reporters
- Exhibits Area
- Reports and Documents Area

Continued Discussion of Public Meeting #2

- Mr. Harmet noted that there would also be staff present at the meeting to answer comments.
- A CAG Member asked if in addition to the displays, will there also be materials that people can take home. Mr. Stenzel responded that there will be a brochure that people can take home and people will be directed to the project web site which has all of the documents that the CAG has received.
- A CAG Member asked how the concepts which the CAG has been dealing with can be effectively addressed in a 15-minute presentation. The Member suggested that it might be more comprehensible for those attending if there were 30-minute presentations, on the hour, with a half hour in between presentations to give people time to view the exhibits or talk. Mr. Harmet responded that the 15-minute presentation would address the overall process, the findings to date, and the next steps. Staff will then be available to answer specific questions.
- A CAG Member asked if the presentation would mention that the CAG is disputing the facts that have been presented. Mr. Harmet responded that, just like at the CAG meetings, IDOT is seeking comments on the analysis. The CAG Member responded that the presentation will not address the arguments that the CAG has with the evaluations. Mr. Harmet responded that IDOT has addressed constructive comments in great detail and would continue to do that.
- A CAG Member asked if it would be possible to get a copy of the PowerPoint presentation prior to the meeting. Mr. Harmet responded that if the presentation is done ahead of time it will be provided to the CAG.
- A CAG Member asked how long the public comment period was open after the meeting. Mr. Harmet responded that it would be two weeks. The Member then asked if all the material would be available on-line. Mr. Harmet added that the public comments would also be summarized and made available.
- A CAG Member asked if it would be easy for people to find documents on the web site that they saw at the meeting. Mr. Harmet said there are pull down menus that list everything that is available but that he could not predict what someone might want to review so it would not be possible to just have a link up front.
- A CAG Member requested that when the public comments are summarized they be broken out by whether they were received in written form at the meeting, written form after the meeting, or from the court reporter so the comments are broken out by the means in which they were received. The Member also asked if the court reporter comments would be preserved. Mr. Harmet responded that they would.
- A CAG Member asked for a quick summary of what was in the Physical Inventory Report. Mr. Harmet responded that this was presented last fall and it contained a description of the physical features of the roadway and there is now a red-line version that has been posted on the web site.
- A CAG Member asked how the context sensitive component of the analysis would be made part of the upcoming public meeting. Mr. Harmet responded that the presentation would focus on the work that has been done to date and seek people's comments. The process and the pieces of the process would be covered.

#### IV. Introduction of Round #2 Methodology

##### Presentation of Round #2 Methodology

- The kick-off for Round #2 will be at the July CAG Meeting
- Round #2 will get into more detail.
- Round #2 Considers Purpose & Need Evaluation Factors, Impacts, Costs, and Stakeholder Input
- Alternatives will be compared to No-Build Alternative as well as to each other.
- Evaluation tools to be used as part of Round #2 analysis are: Highway Safety Manual, Travel Demand Model, Highway Capacity Manual, Existing Aerial Photography, Maps and GIS, and Site verification

##### Discussion of Round #2 Methodology

- A CAG Member asked if speed would be incorporated into the analysis as the CAG had discussed. Mr. Harmet responded that 30 and 40 mph speeds would be tested.  
POST MEETING CLARIFICATION: The HSM predictive method for Urban and Suburban arterial roadway segments has only two speed settings (> 30 mph and ≤ 30 mph) that can be used to analyze vehicle-pedestrian and vehicle-bike collision types. There is no speed category for the calculation of vehicle-vehicle collisions for the segment analyses. Regarding intersection analyses, there is no speed category that can be selected in the calculation.

#### V. Recap and Next Meeting

##### Presentation

- Public Meeting #2
  - Monday, May 16, 2011
  - 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
  - Open House Format
  - New Trier High School Cafeteria, Northfield Campus
- CAG Meeting #10 – July 21, 2011
- CAG Meeting #11 – September 15, 2011

##### Discussion

- A CAG Member reminded all of the three walking tours scheduled: weekday morning, weekday evening, and a weekend morning. The Member encouraged people to attend as many of the sessions as possible.
- A CAG Member asked if the September 15<sup>th</sup> CAG Meeting date was tentative; she was concerned that the date might conflict with a school event at the beginning of the school year. Mr. Harmet agreed.
- Mr. Stenzel encouraged Members who had not yet signed up for a walking tour to do so at the table in front of the meeting room.
- Ms. Glynn noted that, at the request of Northfield, the time for the second tour had been changed to 6:00 P.M. Ms. Glynn will send out a notice next week.
- Mr. Stenzel noted that in response to questions raised at CAG Meeting #8 there was information included in the handouts regarding striping at roundabouts as well as additional cost detail.

#### VI. Public Comment Summary following Adjournment of CAG Meeting

The following comments were made during the public comment session that immediately followed CAG Meeting #9. The following reflects a summary of the comments or questions and is not meant to be verbatim. The name and residency of the speaker is listed with the comment. All consultant presentations are held to the end of the public comment section and are limited to 10 minutes.

**Comment 1 (June O'Donahue, Northfield)**

Ms. O'Donoghue noted that according to the 2010 Census the State of Illinois has lost population. She added that Cook County had lost 220,000 in population. She asked if this was taken into consideration in designing the road. She also noted that because of recent tax increases many businesses were moving to Wisconsin or Indiana and she believed the road would be getting a lot less traffic than it had in the past. She then asked if IDOT designed the 2005 Plan and if that was not designed correctly how people could be sure IDOT would design it correctly now. Mr. Harmet responded that the 2005 Plan was designed for 2012 traffic not a 2040 planning horizon as is being done now. She added that, as a financial planner, she knew that projections across a long time frame are not as accurate as projections across a shorter time period. She asked IDOT to look into this. She then asked if anyone would be upset if a school zone was removed in Winnetka at Crow Island. She added that at this location the road is narrower and has less traffic than on Willow Road. She concluded by saying that Northfield should have school zones.

**Comment 2 (Fred Gougler, Northfield)**

He commended the members of the CAG on the thoughtfulness of their work and was struck by the Level of Service for the different alternatives. He noted that we were only moving from a Level of Service F to a Level of Service E over the life of the road. It seemed to him that a lot of money was being spent for only a marginal improvement. He added that the context for the improvement, which has not been quantified, is very significant for Northfield. He asked if IDOT viewed it as a solution to move from a LOS F to a LOS E. He continued that when he drives through the area everything seems to be working at F. He asked why this road was being singled out to improve from an F to an E and asked if this was a solution or just a modest improvement. Mr. Harmet responded that the CAG was looking at a number of criteria including: safety, mobility, and facility condition so it is not about just one criterion. Other measures of mobility are also considered such as vehicle queues and delay. Mr. Gougler asked if Mr. Harmet considered it a solution. Mr. Harmet responded that the CAG needs to go through the evaluation of alternatives before he could say what a solution is.

**Comment 3 (Patrick O'Donoghue, Northfield)**

Mr. O'Donoghue asked if there had been time to look at the IDOT supplemental to the 2009 MUTCD. Mr. Harmet responded that he was not sure it had been released yet. Mr. O'Donoghue responded that it was released last week. He added that it restricts park zones on IDOT roadways; so this would be out of the question for this location. He also asked if the CAG would be adding items to its toolbox such as cameras for pedestrian crossing enforcement. He also asked about warrants for some features, such as overhead flashing pedestrian signals, which cannot be used within 300 feet of an intersection or 100 feet from any other side street. He suggested that Members search the Illinois Supplemental to the 2009 MUTCD (Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices) and view a PowerPoint presentation on the issue.

**Comment 3 (John Raymond, 7<sup>th</sup> grader at Sunset Ridge School)**

Based on his understanding, there is a lot of money being put into this roadway which he did not approve. He sees that education has been declining through the first years of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. The money being put into the highway could be better spent on higher education. He noted that his school has cut back on field trips. Mr. Raymond added that students his age learn much better with hands-on activities. He believes the money would be better spent to support field trips for student to go, for example, to Washington D.C. to learn more about the presidents. He concluded by asking the Members to keep in mind that this money could also be spent on education.

**Comment 3 (Liz Kinnich, Northfield)**

The Illinois School Travel Plan acknowledges on the IDOT web site that "real or perceived, people's level of confidence in the safety of their community can act as a powerful barrier to walking and bicycling among students". Widening the intersection at Willow Road and Wager Road will be a decision, if made by IDOT that will be in direct opposition to the Illinois Safe Routes to Schools Program which seeks to encourage children to walk and bike to school.

**Attendance Roster - CAG Members**

**Community Advisory Group Meeting #9**

Willow Road Study: Illinois Route 43 to Interstate 94  
 April 7, 2011; 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.  
 New Trier High School, Northfield Campus, Building C, Room 234



	CAG Member	Community	Email Address	Present (Please initial)
1	William J. Baltutis	At Large	bill_baltutis@baxter.com	WJB
2	John Birkinbine	Northfield	jbirkinbine@sbcglobal.net	JJB
3	Hallie Bodman	Northfield	ahkbod@aol.com	HAB
4	Steve Bucklin	Glenview	sbucklin@glenbrooksecurity.com	SB
5	Dan de Loys	Northfield	ddeloys@comcast.net	DDL
6	Rick Filler	Glenview	rfiller@harlemirving.com	RF
7	Tensley Garris	Northbrook	tensley@northbrookchamber.org	TG
8	Ted Greene	Northfield	ted@tgreenefamily.com	TG
9	Robert Hayward	Northfield	robert.hayward@kirkland.com	RH
10	Todd Heller	Northbrook	todd@thellerlaw.com	TH
11	Steve Hirsch	Northfield	sbhirsch@hotmail.com	SH
12	Kate Katz	Northbrook	Kk2667@aol.com	KMK
13	John Kemper	Northfield	jkemper@mac.com	JK
14	Peggy Kozminski	Northfield	kozpbs@comcast.net	PK
15	Penny Lanphier	Winnetka	lanphieriv@sbcglobal.net	
16	Jeffrey G. Liss	Winnetka	JGLJGL@aol.com	JGL
17	Tom Murtha	At Large	tmurtha@cmap.illinois.gov	TM
18	Buggie O'Grady	Northfield	buggieogrady@yahoo.com	BOG
19	Don Owen	Glenview	dowen@glenview.il.us	DO
20	Jim Patterson	Glenview	jimpattersonjr@pattersoncompany.com	
21	Phoebe Raymond	Northfield	nomedad@mindspring.com	PR
22	Stacy Sigman	Northfield	ssigman@northfieldil.org	SS
23	Stephanie Stuckey	Northbrook	sstuckey@ups.com	
24	Scott Turban	Northfield	scottturban@aim.com	ST
25	Don Whiteman	Northfield	kk9h@me.com	DW

**Attendance Roster - CAG Alternates**

**Community Advisory Group Meeting #9**

Willow Road Study: Illinois Route 43 to Interstate 94  
 April 7, 2011; 6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.  
 New Trier High School, Northfield Campus, Building C, Room 234



	CAG Member	Community	Email Address	Present (Please initial)
1	Melissa Bianucci	Northfield	bianucci@comcast.net	<i>MB</i>
2	Juli Blunt	Northfield	jrb.freshideas@earthlink.net	
3	Jack Bodman	Northfield	jbod@viennabeef.com	
4	Jeff Brady	Glenview	jeffb@glenview.il.us	<i>JB</i>
5	Sydney Clark	Northfield	sclark4994@yahoo.com	
6	Pat Doherty	Northfield	dohertypat@aol.com	<i>JPD</i>
7	Nancy Firfer	Glenview	nancy.l.firfer@cm2020.org	
8	Nancy Garrity	Northbrook	ngarrity@ups.com	
9	Becky Hurley	Winnetka	hurley5@comcast.net	
10	Don Kopec	At Large	dkopec@cmap.illinois.gov	
11	Brian Kozminski	Northfield	bkozminski@lplegal.com	
12	William Lustig	Northfield	blustig@northfieldil.org	<i>W Lustig</i>
13	Kathy Miles	Glenview	gcstaff@glenviewchamber.com	
14	Brian Moran	Northfield	bmoran@femorran.com	
15	Patrick O' Donoghue	Northfield	northfieldpat@yahoo.com	<i>PO</i>
16	Sean O'Grady	Northfield	sogrady@northshore.org	
17	Anne Peterson	Northfield	apeterson70@comcast.net	
18	Kate Rekett	Northfield	kate@sutherlandhomes.com	
19	Charles Shabica	Northfield	cshabica@comcast.net	
20	Theresa Snyder	Northfield	theresasnyder14@gmail.com	