



Willow Road Phase I Study Summary of CAG Meeting #10 and Public Comment Period

Date: July 21, 2011
Time: 6:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. CAG Meeting
7:30 p.m. to 8:00 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 #10 included the Public Meeting # 2 Summary, the Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2 Summary, the Alternative Evaluation Round #1 Summary, and the Introduction of Round #2 Analyses.

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 #10 meeting, follow up discussions will be held at CAG #11 on September 22, 2011. 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.

Mr. Stenzel noted the topics to be reviewed during this meeting: Public Meeting #2 Summary, Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2 Summary, and Alternatives Evaluation Round #1 Summary. The Round #2 Analyses will be introduced. These new topics will be discussed further at the CAG meeting #11 after CAG members have had an opportunity to review the information.

II. Public Meeting #2 Summary

Public Meeting #2 Summary

- Public Meeting Held on Monday, May 16, 2011 and 204 signed the attendance roster. The meeting was conducted in Open House format which included an introductory slide show, exhibits on display, project staff available to discuss work-to-date and answer questions, as well as opportunity for public to comment at meeting through court reporter or public comment forms.
- 282 comment forms were received (124 written comments, 89 e-mailed comments, and 69 court reporter comments) many of which included comments on multiple topics. Comments received are summarized by category below.
 - **Safety Categories:** child safety (94), general safety concerns (63), cut through traffic avoiding Willow Road (42), speed concerns (18), and Bicyclist Safety (4)
 - **Community Cohesion/Context Comments:** loss of community cohesion (28), context needs more emphasis (26), no change in community cohesion (3)

- **Pedestrian Safety Toolbox Comments:** Support a Pedestrian Underpass/Overpass at Willow and Clarkson Park (14), Support School Zones (6), Items Will Not Improve Pedestrian Safety (3), and Support HAWK Mid-Block Signals at Parks (1)
- **Traffic Comments:** Congestion is a Problem (72), Improvements will Increase Traffic (16), Left Turning Vehicles Cause Congestion (9), I-94 (Edens) is Cause of Willow Road Congestion (6), Recommend Reduction in Speed Limit (5), Congestion is Not a Problem Along Willow Road (4), and Narrow the Lanes to Control Speed (3)
- **Environmental Comments:** Improvement Will Worsen Pollution (15), Improvement Will Worsen Noise (10), Improvement Will Worsen Flooding (10), Existing Congestion Causes Pollution (7), Improvement Will Not Worsen Pollution (2)
- **Alternative Preferences:** Willow Road 4-Lanes with median (127), Willow Road 2-Lanes with median including the proposal sometimes referred to as the 2005 Plan (83), I-294 Interchange improvements (6), I-94 Interchange improvements (5), IL 68 (Dundee Rd) widening 6-Lanes with median (2), Lake Avenue widening 6-Lanes with median (2), and do nothing (2)

Public Meeting #2 Discussion

- A CAG Member asked why the comments had not been made available on the web site. Mr. Harmet responded that the material was being compiled and that following the format of previous meetings the public comments were being introduced at tonight's meeting to CAG and then shared with the public.
- Another CAG Member asked if there was a date when the comments would be uploaded to the web site. Mr. Harmet responded that the comments would be up-loaded on following day.
- A CAG Member asked if information pertaining to how each individual comment was categorized (by where they came from and format) would also be available. Mr. Harmet replied that this information would be posted on the web site as well.

POST MEETING COMMENT: The comments received were sorted by community and by topic. In response to CAG request, a tally of comments was posted to the web site with the Public Meeting #2 materials.

- A CAG Member asked if the comments on the alternatives were technical in nature. Mr. Harmet responded that most of the comments were statements in support of an alternative or indicating that something was a concern. Several letters require written responses, but most of the comments were statements rather than inquiries.
- A CAG Member stated that it would be beneficial if CAG Members had access to materials being discussed prior to CAG Meetings. Mr. Harmet responded that as has been mentioned previously, the process being followed is to introduce material at one meeting, give the CAG Members time to review and consider, and then further discuss the material at the next meeting.

III. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #2

TAC Meeting #2 Summary

A technical advisory meeting was held on June 2nd with village representatives, consultants and IDOT project staff. The purpose of TAC was to have technically-focused discussions on the Round #1 analysis. Written responses to all comments are included in the CAG packet and posted on project website. Key comments were highlighted and discussed:

- Round #1 conclusions are fundamentally sound
- IDOT Responded to key questions from comments received on the following subjects (elimination of Regional Alternatives, selection of Sunset Ridge Road intersection for Round #1 analysis, capacity analyses assumptions, CMAP data and forecasts, Highway Safety Manual methodology, and speed study

- Regional Alternatives were also discussed. It was explained that regional alternatives did not address project needs, travel patterns. Combinations were not analyzed since they would not address needs, travel patterns, and would result in higher costs and impacts.
- Alternatives Development and Evaluation Process – Methodology of Round #1 and #2

TAC Meeting #2 Discussion

CAG discussion regarding TAC #2 and various other topics are grouped below by category.

- Speed Study: A CAG Member asked if the Speed Study was something that is going to be done or was done. Mr. Stenzel responded that it has been completed. In response to a question from a CAG Member Mr. Harmet responded that the speed study results had been given directly to the Village of Northfield. Mr. Harmet added that the results of the Speed Study would be posted to the web site. **POST MEETING NOTE:** The Speed Study was posted to the web site as part of the Physical Inventory document dated March 15, 2011. A CAG Member asked if a summary of the speed study results could be presented. Mr. Harmet responded that a 35 mph speed limit was appropriate for the conditions on Willow Road today.
- Bicyclist Crash in Northbrook: A CAG Member asked if IDOT was aware that a woman on a bike was hit by a semi-truck on a 5-lanes section of Willow Road in Northbrook this week. He asked if IDOT had a comment regarding the safety results for Willow Road in Northfield when people keep getting hit by vehicles on a wider Willow Road in other communities. Mr. Harmet responded that crashes happen throughout the region. In terms of this project, we are looking at Willow Road and how it is performing within this study area and comparing its performance to other similar roadways. Its performance suggests that there is a need to do something and that is the objective of this process – to figure out what that is.
- Crash Data Comment: A CAG Member asked if more specifics could be given on accident data when it is posted to the web site. Mr. Harmet responded that the data comes from crash reports from the Village of Northfield. These reports contain very detailed information on the individuals involved. Mr. Harmet suggested that the Member may want to schedule a meeting with the Village as it did not seem appropriate to post this information on the web site.
- Alternatives: A CAG Member noted his frustration with the size and cost of the regional alternatives that had been examined rather than small changes that he felt could have a big impact. Mr. Harmet responded that an analysis of traffic patterns and development of the regional alternatives were aimed at determining if drivers could be attracted away from Willow Road. The findings were that the regional alternatives, regardless if considered too large a scale, did not result in any real change in travel patterns. Smaller regional improvements would thereby also not have an effect.
- CMAP Model Methodology: A CAG Member asked if the analysis of traffic patterns was done using the CMAP model. Mr. Harmet responded that this was an issue that had been previously discussed. The CMAP model has been developed based upon years of research and is state of the practice. This is how changes in travel patterns were evaluated. The CAG Member added that she did not believe that the CMAP model accurately reflected travel patterns in Northfield.
- Alternatives: A CAG Member did not understand how a regional alternative with a local alternative could not work. The Member also expressed frustration with the size and cost of the regional alternatives. She asked if the regional alternatives could be scaled back. Mr. Harmet responded that the scope of the process is to look at how the alternatives affect Willow Road rather than other communities or other roads. Combining a regional alternative that does not have an effect on Willow Road with a local alternative, is not going to improve Willow Road. It will only have more impacts and higher cost for the same benefit as the local alternative. It would not address transportation needs or take people where they want to go.
- Trip Patterns: A CAG Member disagreed that Willow Road is congested noting that she makes multiple local trips each day along the corridor, at varying times of the day to get to where she is going. She does not think

there is a problem and recommended that if people think it is a problem they should find another route to avoid Willow Road.

- Edens Congestion: A CAG member noted that she had been on Willow Road for the third consecutive day between 5:20 and 5:30 and there was not a traffic flow problem on Willow Road yet the Edens Expressway was bumper to bumper. She did not understand how IDOT could not be concerned with other roads in other communities. Mr. Harmet responded that it was not that IDOT was not concerned with other roads, but that this process is addressing the needs on Willow Road here and now. The Member added that she also did not feel there was a traffic problem on Willow Road.
- Willow Road Congestion: A CAG Member added that his anecdote was at 3:30 P.M. Willow Road was completely jammed up from Bess Hardware to Sunset Ridge Road. It took the CAG Member longer to get through Northfield than the rest of his trip from Winnetka to Northbrook.
- Traffic Congestion General Comment: A CAG Member added that the bottom line to him was that there are times of the day when traffic is horrible no matter where you are.
- Regional Alternatives: A CAG Member stated his support for some of the regional alternatives and support for IDOT studying these alternatives in a separate process. The Member added that he thought that the results of the analysis in respect to the negligible impacts of the regional alternatives on Willow Road were correct.
- Regional Alternatives: A CAG Member stated that IDOT's methodology, which looked only at the impacts of the regional alternatives on Willow Road and not the regional impacts, was faulty. For the record, he noted that the difference in alternatives was a 3 lane road vs. a 5 lane road. He asked if it was worth it to destroy the fabric of a town to move cars along Willow Road a minute or two faster when they will still get stuck on other roads.
- Village Comments: CAG Member, Stacy Sigman, Village of Northfield, noted that the Village of Northfield provided comments through their engineers KOLA and Cooper Engineering. These comments were addressed at the Technical Workshop. The Village's consultants disagree with the findings and the disposition of comments. The Village will be providing more technical backup to those findings in writing.
- Alternatives: A CAG Member asked if the construction of a 4-lane road will solve all the problems. He wanted to know if traffic would still back up at Waukegan Road and if people will be able to get on the Edens. Mr. Harmet responded that a planning process had been completed for Willow Road west of Waukegan. He added that most of the traffic on Willow Road is not going to the Edens Expressway and that this process is not about the Edens Expressway but the portion of Willow Road from Waukegan Road to I-94.
- Pedestrian Access: A CAG Member added that the intersection of Willow Road at Happ Road needs to be studied because there is no time for pedestrians to cross the road. The member wanted the focus on making roads safe for all users not just jamming through as many cars as possible. Mr. Harmet noted that in the CAG Member packet is a handout that lays out the Pedestrian Safety Toolbox from Happ Road to Waukegan Road with recommendations for enhancing safety.
- Glenview Crash Analysis: A CAG Member, in reference to an analysis of high crash intersections done by the Village of Glenview, noted that recently improved roads were safer with toolbox improvements. She also noted that a roadway improvement might not always result in safety improvements and that terminology should be used appropriately. Mr. Harmet responded that he did not believe that the Glenview analysis used the Highway Safety Manual. He added that looking at limited data from Glenview was not as useful as looking at the statewide statistics for similar types of roadways that had been used in this analysis.
- HSM: A CAG Member asked about a clarification note in the minutes from one of the last two meetings that indicated only one speed study had been used in the HSM. The member noted that the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) had many speed studies available showing the impact

of different speed limits. He suggested that IDOT look at all the studies not just the one from the HSM. Mr. Harmet responded that the HSM uses all of this information. Mr. Stenzel added that the purpose of a speed study is to assess speed limits not safety. The Member added that the CAG was looking at studies for various speeds and wanted to make sure all of the available data was being considered; including studies from the HSM and the NCHRP. Mr. Harmet added that in the next round of the analysis (Round 3) IDOT will be looking at modifications to the design criteria such as reduced lane widths and design speeds to determine if there is a configuration appropriate to a lower speed.

- **Speed:** A CAG Member asked if the research that the CAG had previously requested regarding accident rates at 30, 35 and 40 mph speed limits had been completed. Mr. Harmet responded that from the research there is some data from the 1980s that addressed varying speeds and crashes. He added that part of the previous discussion also addressed the difference between varying speed limits vs. a constant lower speed limit. Mr. Harmet reiterated that IDOT would be considering options as part of the Round #3 evaluation to see if there is a configuration that would be appropriate for a lower speed limit.
- **CMAQ:** A CAG Member noted that public relations firm has clients of CMAP and *Move Willow Forward*. The member asked how this potential conflict of interest was being addressed. Mr. Harmet responded that CMAP's technical tools are developed through a very open local process as well as being vetted at the Federal level. If a public relations firm is helping CMAP to promote the 2040 Plan it is far removed from the technical process.

IV. Continued CAG Discussions

A. Alternative Evaluation Round #1 Evaluation

Alternative Evaluation Round #1 Summary

A summary of the Round #1 Analysis was presented. As previously discussed, sixteen build alternatives and three corridor specific options were developed. The alternative development and evaluation process focused on how each of the alternatives affected Willow Road, addressing project needs. This is a continual process that starts with a broad level of detail, adding more specific detail as the number of alternatives is reduced.

Based on the Round #1 evaluation, the regional alternatives did not address the Willow Road project needs as well as Local Alternatives. In addition, the local Willow Road Alternatives involved fewer impacts and overall lower construction costs than Regional Alternatives.

Only local alternatives will be carried into Round #2.

Alternative Evaluation Round #1 Discussion

A CAG Member asked if the three Corridor Specific Options will be addressed in an upcoming meeting. Mr. Stenzel responded that Alternatives 17, 18, and 19 would be looked at in the context of the alternatives that move forward. Therefore, these would be examined at a later date.

V. Introduction of Evaluation Round #2

Round #2 Evaluation was presented. The Round #2 evaluation considers: Purpose & Need evaluation factors (impacts, costs, and stakeholder input), comparison of an alternative to the No-Build Alternative, and a relative comparison of alternatives to each other.

The Level of Detail increases beyond the Round #1 evaluation to provide more definition and identifying greater detail what the alternative looks like.

Tools to be used for Round #2 analyses include: Highway Safety Manual, Travel Demand Model, Highway Capacity Manual, Existing Aerial Photography, Maps and GIS, and additional site verification

Comparison criteria for Round #2 evaluations include: safety performance; LOS at intersections and segments, queue lengths, facility condition and design, flaw analyses, costs, evaluation of direct impacts to environmental resources (Wetlands & Floodplains), new right-of-way required, and potential residential and commercial displacements. Several of these items were initiated as part of the Round #1 evaluation.

Additional information regarding the safety toolbox application was discussed. Round #2 incorporates more of the tools than Round #1. Schematics were distributed that showed all of the tools used in the evaluation.

A brief overview of each alternative was presented. These are summarized briefly below.

Round #2 Analysis – No-Build Plus (Alternative 1)

The alternative includes closing the Old Willow Road at Willow Road intersection (which is recommended for all the local alternatives), cul-de-sacs at a few intersections east of Wagner Road, and traffic signal upgrades.

- The total predicted crashes is a little better than the no-build condition
- The predicted pedestrian crashes are also slightly improved over the No-Build.
- Mobility remains at LOS F
- Average daily traffic (ADT) volumes on Happ Road are predicted to decrease
- ADT on the north leg of Wagner Road is predicted to increase, which makes sense given the disconnection at Old Willow and Willow roads and the change in travel patterns back to Willow Road.

Round #2 Analysis – 2-Lane with Median (Alternative 2)

The alternative includes closing the Old Willow Road at Willow Road intersection; a continuous median, and traffic signal upgrades. Alternative 2 was studied with both a flush and curbed median. The curbed median would include landscaping. Similar to other local alternatives, there would be a 10 foot wide shared path on both sides for pedestrians and bicyclists. Since there are curbs on both the inside and outside, the lane width would be 17 feet because it must be wide enough to allow vehicles and fire trucks to pass a stalled vehicle. The extra width would be striped out and roadway would operate as one lane in each direction.

- The predicted total crashes for both the Flush and Curbed alternatives are very good compared to the No-Build Alternative.
- The predicted pedestrian crashes are good for the alternative with a curbed median.
- Mobility is still at a Level of Service F.
- The change in daily traffic volumes on the surrounding roadway network is the same as Alternative 1, with decreases on Happ Road and increases to Wagner Road north of Willow Road.

Round #2 Analysis – 2-Lane (2005 Plan) (Alternative 2A)

Alternative 2A would reconstruct Willow Road east of Three Lakes Drive to Northfield Road, which is a shorter distance than the other local alternatives considered. It would be identical to the 2005 plan as proposed, except with the addition of pedestrian refuge islands at Sunset Ridge Road and Wagner Road. This Alternative is similar to the 2-Lane option (Alternative 2) at some locations, but does not provide any improvements on west and east ends of project study area nor does it have a continuous median nor curbs on the outside of the roadway at all locations. These differences between Alt 2 and 2A have an effect on safety features. Similar to other local alternatives, there would be a 10 foot wide shared path on both sides for pedestrians and bicyclists.

- The total predicted crashes are higher than the 2-Lane alternative
- With the refuge island at Sunset Ridge Road and Wagner Road, the predicted pedestrian crashes are as good as the 2-Lane alternative.
- Mobility stays at LOS F.
- The changes in the traffic volumes on the surrounding roadway network are the same as Alternatives 1 and 2, with decreases on Happ Road and an increase on Wagner Road north of Willow Road.

Round #2 Analysis – 4-Lane with Median (Alternative 3)

This alternative would provide a continuous median throughout the project limits. Alternative 3 was studied with both an 11' flush and 8' curbed median. The 8 ft curbed median could include landscaping. Both options include a 10 foot wide shared path on both sides of the roadway.

- The curbed median alternative 3 performs much better than the flush median alternative 3 for predicted total crashes. Both perform very well for predicted pedestrian crashes.
- This alternative performs best for mobility, providing LOS D.
- This alternative best addresses the overall travel pattern, affecting traffic patterns along the surrounding roadway network. Traffic is predicted to decrease on Voltz Road, Happ Road, Wagner Road north of Willow Road, Sunset Ridge Road and Waukegan Road south of Willow Road, and Winnetka Road. Traffic is predicted to slightly increase on Willow Road west of Waukegan Road, Wagner Road south of Willow Road and Happ Road south of Willow Road.

Round #2 Analysis – Unbalanced (Alternatives 4A / 4B)

Alternative 4A: 2 lanes in the WB direction and 1 lane in the EB direction

Alternative 4B: 1 lane in the WB direction and 2 lanes in the EB direction.

Both alternatives would have flush painted medians and shared paths on both sides of the roadway.

- This alternative performs fairly well for total predicted crashes per year.
- The predicted pedestrian crash frequency is not as good as other alternatives
- Mobility is better than most alternatives, but not as good as Alternative 3.
- Alternative 4A: traffic is predicted to decrease on Happ Road, Wagner Road north of Willow Road, and Winnetka Road
- Alternative 4B: Traffic is predicted to decrease on Happ Road, Wagner Road north of Willow Road, Sunset Ridge Road south of Willow Road, and Winnetka Road. Traffic is also predicted to increase on Wagner Road south of Willow Road.

Round #2 Analysis – 2-Lane with Roundabouts (Alternative 5)

This alternative would be one lane each direction with roundabouts at Wagner Road and Sunset Ridge Road.

This alternative has impacts to properties outside of the Willow Road right-of-way. The roadway configuration is similar to Alternative 2, 2 Lane with Median, outside of the roundabout intersections.

- This alternative is the best for total predicted crashes/ overall safety performance.
- It is no better than the No-Build Alternative, and thus the worst alternative, for predicted pedestrian crashes.
- Mobility is LOS F.
- The changes in the traffic volumes on the surrounding roadway network are the same as Alternatives 1 and 2, with decreases on Happ Road and increases to Wagner Road.

Evaluation Round #2 Summary

The Round #2 Summary will be presented again at the next CAG Meeting in September for continued discussion. Comments are requested prior to the next CAG meeting. As needed, a Technical Advisory Committee meeting could be held.

A table was presented that summarized the Round 2 evaluation using colored dots to give a relative comparison between alternatives: green is the best performing; yellow is the next best performing; and red is the lowest performing relative to the other alternatives.

Based on evaluation criteria, a summary of the alternatives relative to each other was presented.

- Alternative 1 is not much better relative to the No-Build alternative.
- Alternative 2 is very good for overall safety, and a barrier median is best for pedestrian safety. However, the mobility is no better relative to the no-build alternative.
- Alternative 2A, the 2005 plan, is relatively poor performing for overall safety, and does not address mobility.

- Alternative 3 is best performing for mobility. With a curbed median, the overall safety is next best performance and best performance for pedestrian safety.
- Alternative 4 is next best for overall safety, but relatively low performance for pedestrian safety.
- Alternative 5 is the best performing for overall safety, but low performing for pedestrian safety and mobility. It also has the highest level of direct impacts.

Alternative 2 with curbed median and Alternative 3 with curbed median perform the best overall, as compared to all the other alternatives. It is recommended that these two alternatives be carried into Round 3 with more engineering and environmental detail.

There will be a modification to Alternative 3 to look at using 10 foot lanes (instead of 11' lanes) and other features, which might reduce traffic speed, increase safety, and reduce traffic volumes.

Discussion of Round #2 Evaluation

- A CAG Member asked for the thresholds between high, medium, and low construction costs. Mr. Harmet indicated that the evaluation was based on total cost. The total cost for the No-Build Plus was \$2 Million while the other alternatives were \$14 Million or more.
- A CAG Member asked how the changes in traffic volumes were determined. Mr. Harmet that these changes were determined through the use of the travel demand model which can measure changes in travel patterns given changes in the roadway network. The analysis is based on a relative comparison of roadway volumes between the alternatives.
- A CAG member asked for an explanation of the accident data in terms of the severity of the accidents and how this changes with each alternative. Mr. Harmet explained that the analysis results in a number that represents fatal plus injury accidents. The CAG Member followed up by asking, if this is the case, how we know the roadway has been made safer if there are more serious injuries or deaths. Mr. Harmet said that IDOT would look into the analysis methodology in regard to severity of accidents and report back to the CAG. **POST MEETING NOTE:** Review of the HSM confirms that HSM provides data for Fatality + Injury crashes together and does not break down the results. A copy of the table is provided at the end of the meeting summary for reference.
- A CAG Member asked for an explanation as to how the Level of Service letter-grade is determined. Mr. Harmet explained that this analysis considered the Level of Service of all of the intersections from Waukegan to the Edens. The Member then asked if this information took into account the discussions from previous meetings concerning what class of road Willow Road fall into and whether this analysis took those revisions into account. Mr. Harmet said there had been discussions as to what class of road was appropriate for Willow Road. The Member then asked for a quantification associated with each Level of Service letter grade. Mr. Stenzel noted that in the report that will be handed out is a table that shows the delay at each intersection. For comparison, Mr. Harmet indicated that LOS F is waiting multiple signal cycles to get through a light. The CAG Member asked if the 2005 Plan could stay in the mix for further consideration so that there are more alternatives to compare. Mr. Harmet explained that the difference between 2 and 2A is that the 2005 Plan just addresses between Sunset Ridge Road and Wagner Road. The 2005 Plan did not perform that well because it did not include the features of the other alternatives. If it is modified to include these features it basically looks like Alternative 2.
- A CAG Member noted that in August 2010 the thresholds in terms of average speed did change for different levels of service. Mr. Harmet indicated that IDOT would check to see that the latest LOS criteria were used.

POST MEETING CLARIFICATION: Willow Road was analyzed as a Class II Arterial. This issue was addressed in detail as part of TAC #1 in October 2010. The average travel speed (mi/h) associated with each Level of Service for Class II roadways are shown in the table below:

LOS	Class II	Class III
	Average Travel Speed (mi / h)	Average Travel Speed (mi / h)
A	> 35 mph	> 30 mph
B	> 28 – 35 mph	> 24 – 30 mph
C	> 22 – 28 mph	> 18 – 24 mph
D	> 17 – 22 mph	> 14 – 18 mph
E	> 13 – 17 mph	> 10 – 14 mph
F	<= 13 mph	<= 10 mph

- A CAG Member stated that whether LOS F or E, they are both bad. Mr. Harmet said in Round 1, one intersection and one section were being looked at. In Round 2 all the intersections were looked at and an overall LOS D was attained. The CAG Member asked if that was also bad. Mr. Harmet said that in northeastern Illinois, D is the design standard.
- A CAG Member noted that during the development of the 2005 Plan the maximum travel time saving was 80 seconds from Sunset Ridge Road to the Edens. Mr. Harmet responded that this was part of a relative comparison of alternatives. The current analysis has taken a much more detailed approach and has looked at safety and facility conditions not just mobility. The CAG Member stated that IDOT agreed to the 2005 Plan because of safety and he could not believe that things had changed that much. Mr. Harmet explained that the tools available for the safety analysis had undergone a significant change. i.e., the introduction of the Highway Safety Manual.
- A CAG Member asked why only Sunset Ridge Road and Wagner Road were considered for the pedestrian safety analysis in the initial round of analysis. Mr. Harmet explained that the school crossings were examined in the first round and that all intersection pedestrian crossings were considered in the second round.
- A CAG Member asked about the status of the environmental analysis. Mr. Harmet explained that direct impacts were examined in Round 1 but that the detailed environmental analysis done as part of a typical Phase I Study had not been started.
- A CAG Member asked why the curbed median performs better than a flush median. Mr. Harmet explained that separating flows of traffic can have a big safety benefit, e.g., preventing head on crashes.
- A CAG Member asked if she understood correctly that the 2-Lane with curbed median was an improved version of the 2005 Plan. Mr. Harmet explained that the limits of the improvement are longer in the Alternative now that they go all the way to Waukegan Road and the Edens and includes some additional features like a continuous median.
- Two CAG Members asked if there was a way to tweak the remaining alternatives to improve their level of service. Mr. Harmet explained that attributes that could affect level of service would be examined in the next round, e.g., narrower lanes. One of the CAG Members said he was pleased with the Summary Table.
- A CAG Member noted that an improvement to provide a LOS D performance was a significant improvement. He noted that SRA Guidelines call for a consideration of a road such as Willow Road being 6 lanes or more, something that is not being considered, so that a LOS better than D may not be possible.
- A CAG Member asked if he was correct that Alternatives 2 and 3 did not address turn lanes at the intersections. Mr. Harmet responded that the side streets would remain as they are and the main road would have left turn lanes at the intersections. **POST MEETING CLARIFICATION:** Additional coordination with the Village of Northfield is required to determine final access configurations.
- A CAG Member asked if that meant that the (7) driveways along the S-curve were not taken into account. Mr. Harmet responded that this is where the level of analysis is at. The level of service may or may not go down when these driveways are considered.

- A CAG Member stated that he thought, given that alternatives are being narrowed down, this would be a good time to go out onto the roadway and mark the footprint of the alternatives. **Mr. Harmet said that this would be looked at as part of Round 3.**
- A CAG Member suggested that it would be a good idea to expand the LOS analysis to the west so that the CAG could examine regional impacts. Mr. Harmet responded that the maps showed the impact of the alternatives on Willow Road and that a separate planning process had been completed for west of Waukegan Road. The CAG Member asked that if looking at a regional solution shouldn't we have an idea of how the region is performing. Mr. Harmet said the study is looking at long term solutions for Willow Road that address safety, mobility and other factors. CAG Member asked what the point of cramming cars through Northfield to end up in a bottleneck a mile from the study area.
- A CAG Member asked if it would be possible for Stacy Sigman, CAG Member and Village of Northfield City Manager, to give a summary of the points of disagreement the Village's engineers had with the last TAC meeting. Ms. Sigman said she needed additional information from the Village's engineers before she could accommodate the request.
- A CAG Member noted that in terms of construction cost only the No-Build received a green dot while all the others received a yellow dot, and he expects to see that there should be a red dot since this is a relative comparison. He asked about the difference in construction costs between the other alternatives. Mr. Harmet explained that the other alternatives were all in the range of \$14 – \$23 Million and that if a red dot were to be added it would be on Alternative 5 – 2 Lane with Roundabouts.
- A CAG Member, noting that in Alternative 3 the ADT on Willow Road to the west of Waukegan Road goes up 8 percent, wondered what the impact would be on the intersections immediately to the west of Waukegan Road noting that some of these were also high accident locations in Glenview. Mr. Harmet responded that IDOT has a program to address high accident locations no matter what other types of analysis is underway.
- A CAG Member asked if the 8 percent increase was one way or two ways. Mr. Harmet responded that it reflects a change in traffic in both directions (2-way ADT).
- A CAG Member asked in what municipality the intersection of Waukegan Road and Willow Road was located. Ms Sigman, Village of Northfield, responded that this intersection was within the Village of Northfield limits.
- A CAG Member asked what the existing lane widths are west of Sunset Ridge. Mr. Stenzel responded that most lanes are 12 feet wide.

VI. Recap and Next Meeting

- Initial Comments by August 25, 2011
- CAG Meeting #11 – Thursday, September 22, 2011
 - 6:00 P.M. to 8:30 P.M.
 - New Trier High School Northfield Campus
- Topics
 - Follow Up Discussion Evaluation Round #2
 - Introduction of Evaluation Round #3 Analysis
- Future Meeting
 - CAG Meeting #12 – November 17, 2011 (tentative)

Discussion

- A CAG Member asked if the issue of School Zones had been examined any further. Mr. Harmet responded that of the local alternatives examined only Alternative 5 – 2 Lane with Roundabouts would have been applicable for School Zones. The remaining alternatives still have signals at Sunset Ridge Road and Wagner Road so School Zones would not be applicable. However, a design speed change would be looked at in the next round for Alternative 3.
- Mr. Stenzel handed out an updated traffic analysis report that addressed comments that had been received and includes the Round #2 analysis.

DRAFT

Total Predicted Crash Frequency
 Round 2 - Willow Road Alternatives Analysis
 September 22, 2011

TOTAL CRASHES

Alt. #	Alternative Description	Total Predicted Crash Frequency (Crashes/Year)	Intersection											
			Waukegan Intersection to 3 Lakes	3 Lakes Intersection	3 Lakes to Sunset Ridge	Sunset Ridge Intersection	Sunset Ridge to Old Willow	Old Willow Intersection	Old Willow to Wagner	Wagner Intersection	Wagner to Old Willow/Northfield	Old Willow/Northfield Intersection	Old Willow/Northfield to Central/Happ	Central/Happ Intersection
	No-Build	64.8	9.6	5.3	2.4	7.6	2.8	4.7	4.8	5.4	6.2	6.3	0.9	6.9
1	No Build Plus	56.0	9.6	5.3	2.4	6.3	2.8	0.0	5.3	4.4	6.1	6.2	0.9	6.9
2	2-Lane with Flush Median	45.7	6.7	4.7	1.9	5.3	2.0	0.0	4.1	4.1	2.4	5.2	0.9	6.8
2A	2-Lane with Median (2005 Plan)	57.8	9.6	5.3	2.2	7.5	2.9	0.0	4.1	5.1	5.7	5.9	0.9	6.9
3	4-Lane with Flush Median	60.8	7.1	2.0	5.7	6.7	4.2	0.0	8.0	5.9	4.1	6.1	1.1	7.7
3A	4-Lane with Curbed Median	52.7	7.1	2.0	5.7	6.7	1.8	0.0	3.8	5.9	2.5	6.1	1.1	7.7
4A	3-Lane Unbalanced (2 WB/1 EB)	53.1	6.7	1.7	5.0	2.1	5.8	3.1	6.0	5.1	3.4	5.8	1.0	7.4
4B	3-Lane Unbalanced (1 WB/2 EB)	52.2	6.9	1.7	5.0	2.1	5.8	3.0	0.0	5.8	4.9	5.6	1.0	7.2
5	2-Lane with Roundabouts	42.7	6.7	1.6	4.7	3.3	2.1	0.0	4.2	2.6	2.3	5.5	0.9	6.8

FATALITIES AND INJURIES

Alt. #	Alternative Description	Total Predicted Fatality and Injury Crash Frequency (Crashes/Year)	Intersection											
			Waukegan Intersection to 3 Lakes	3 Lakes Intersection	3 Lakes to Sunset Ridge	Sunset Ridge Intersection	Sunset Ridge to Old Willow	Old Willow Intersection	Old Willow to Wagner	Wagner Intersection	Wagner to Old Willow/Northfield	Old Willow/Northfield Intersection	Old Willow/Northfield to Central/Happ	Central/Happ Intersection
	No-Build	21.8	3.4	0.5	1.9	0.7	2.8	0.8	1.6	1.3	2.0	2.2	0.3	2.5
1	No Build Plus	19.3	3.4	0.5	1.9	0.7	2.3	0.8	0.0	1.5	1.6	2.2	0.3	2.5
2	2-Lane with Flush Median	15.6	2.4	0.4	1.7	0.5	1.9	0.6	0.0	1.3	1.5	1.8	0.2	2.4
2A	2-Lane with Median (2005 Plan)	19.5	3.4	0.5	1.9	0.6	2.7	0.8	0.0	1.2	1.8	2.0	0.3	2.5
3	4-Lane with Flush Median	19.9	2.5	0.5	2.1	0.6	2.4	1.2	0.0	2.1	2.1	2.2	0.3	2.8
3A	4-Lane with Curbed Median	17.7	2.5	0.5	2.1	0.6	2.4	0.5	0.0	1.0	2.1	2.2	0.3	2.8
4A	3-Lane Unbalanced (2 WB/1 EB)	18.0	2.4	0.5	1.8	0.5	2.1	0.9	0.0	1.8	1.9	2.1	0.3	2.7
4B	3-Lane Unbalanced (1 WB/2 EB)	17.6	2.4	0.5	1.8	0.5	2.1	0.9	0.0	1.7	1.8	2.0	0.3	2.6
5	2-Lane with Roundabouts	14.5	2.4	0.4	1.7	0.5	1.2	0.7	0.0	1.3	1.0	2.0	0.3	2.4

PROPERTY DAMAGE

Alt. #	Alternative Description	Total Predicted Property Damage Crash Frequency (Crashes/Year)	Intersection											
			Waukegan Intersection to 3 Lakes	3 Lakes Intersection	3 Lakes to Sunset Ridge	Sunset Ridge Intersection	Sunset Ridge to Old Willow	Old Willow Intersection	Old Willow to Wagner	Wagner Intersection	Wagner to Old Willow/Northfield	Old Willow/Northfield Intersection	Old Willow/Northfield to Central/Happ	Central/Happ Intersection
	No-Build	43.0	6.2	1.3	3.4	1.7	4.9	2.0	3.1	3.4	3.4	4.0	0.7	4.4
1	No Build Plus	38.7	6.2	1.3	3.4	1.7	4.0	2.0	0.0	3.8	2.8	4.0	0.7	4.4
2	2-Lane with Flush Median	30.1	4.3	1.2	3.0	1.4	3.4	1.4	0.0	2.8	2.6	3.3	0.6	4.3
2A	2-Lane with Median (2005 Plan)	38.3	6.2	1.3	3.4	1.6	4.9	2.0	0.0	2.8	3.3	3.8	0.6	4.4
3	4-Lane with Flush Median	40.9	4.6	1.5	3.6	1.7	4.3	3.0	0.0	5.9	3.7	3.9	0.8	4.9
3A	4-Lane with Curbed Median	35.0	4.6	1.5	3.6	1.7	4.3	1.3	0.0	2.8	3.7	3.9	0.8	4.9
4A	3-Lane Unbalanced (2 WB/1 EB)	35.1	4.3	1.2	3.2	1.6	3.7	2.2	0.0	4.3	3.2	3.7	0.7	4.7
4B	3-Lane Unbalanced (1 WB/2 EB)	34.6	4.5	1.2	3.2	1.6	3.7	2.1	0.0	4.1	3.1	3.6	0.7	4.6
5	2-Lane with Roundabouts	28.2	4.3	1.2	3.0	1.4	2.1	1.5	0.0	2.9	1.6	3.5	0.7	4.3

Public Comment Summary following Adjournment of CAG Meeting

The following comments were made during the public comment session that immediately followed CAG Meeting #10. 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. Any consultant presentations are held to the end of the public comment section and are limited to 10 minutes.

Comment 1 (Bob Hayward, Northfield)

Mr. Hayward wanted to share several observations he had made from recent travels throughout the region. Traffic everywhere is bad and what is done to 1.2 miles of Willow Road will not matter. The solution to this problem must be regional. His recent experience on the Edens Spur, being stuck in traffic after by-passing the Waukegan Road exit, led him to wonder how many drivers exit at Waukegan Road to avoid the lane drop and cut through Northfield on their way back to the Edens. The only solution that IDOT has come up with for bad traffic is to add more lanes, e.g., Lake Cook Road. Just adding more lanes is not going to solve the problem it is only going to make it worse. Mr. Hayward has heard about cut through traffic but has not seen it. He believes that cut through traffic is a red herring and that it does not exist. He recently received a letter from a Winnetka resident saying it was their right to get through Northfield as quickly as possible to shop at Target. Mr. Hayward asked about his right to preserve his town's character, to make sure his home values do not drop, protect his children's safety, and, not waste taxpayer money on a solution that will not work. He respects a local community's right to make decisions about what happens in their town. Innovation is a good thing. IDOT works from a century old playbook that does not work. Departments of Transportation throughout the county implement innovative plans, such as the shovel ready 2005 Plan, which sits ready to be implemented today. We on the CAG should demand innovative solutions for Willow Road. IDOT's solution only takes Willow Road from an F to a D; this is still a failing grade. Finally, in addition to traffic being bad everywhere, every town presents a unique context every intersection is different. We are supposed to be involved in developing a context sensitive solution, but IDOT is denying that process. We must get back to the basics and design a road that will make Willow Road wider, safer, and better. IDOT is moving ahead with a preordained plan with no thought to a context sensitive solution. Unless IDOT begins to follow the letter and spirit of the law the process will start over.

Comment 2 (Robert Soare, Northfield)

Mr. Soare is a 36 year resident of Northfield and a professor of mathematics at the University of Chicago. He recalled an accident that occurred April 15, 2011 that killed two people when a drunk driver crossed into the opposite lane and stuck an oncoming vehicle. He then considered two options the present Willow Road and a 4-lane road with a raised median. He discussed the time the accident took to happen and the difference that a 4-lane road with a raised median could have made. In reference to the previous speaker, who commented that no matter what is done it won't make any difference, Mr. Soare said a 4-lane road with a median would have made a difference to the people involved in the accident. It would have provided additional time for individuals to react to the changing situation. Referencing some of the changes that have occurred in Northfield over the years the speaker said that the character of Northfield does not depend on a 2 lane road or a 4 lane road it depends on the character of Northfield's institutions and people. Everyone crossed a 4 lane road to get to the meeting tonight. A 4 lane Willow Road will not disturb the character of Northfield one iota and may save lives. Further, in response to a recent newspaper article he did not agree that children playing on the fields along Willow Road would be harmed by pollution from additional truck traffic. In his opinion the road must first be made safe and passable and it is currently neither.

Comment 3 (Nancy Hagen, Northfield)

Ms. Hagen spoke about the air quality affects of traffic. She said that there are many studies that show children living next to roadways have an increased risk of developing cancer, leukemia, decreased lung capacity, asthma, and respiratory ailments. The children of Northfield are in particular danger because of the schools located along Willow Road. In California, laws have been enacted to limit the construction of schools within 500 feet of a highway corridor; calling them cancer corridors. The following states are involved in road projects

where the monitoring of air quality is being done to protect school children: Utah, Nevada, Michigan, North Carolina, Maryland, and California. The children of Northfield need protection. This is not a typical road expansion because of the three schools. We all need to be vigilant in protecting the children.

Comment 4 (Jerry Leikin, Glencoe)

Mr. Leikin is a medical toxicologist practicing in environmental illnesses. He does not represent any group involved in the meeting tonight and does not have a position on the road widening. Mr. Leikin referenced the previous speaker that mentioned studies showing a connection between air pollution and widened roads. He said that he had the studies and would be happy to submit them to the group; these studies deal with congestion and vehicle idling. The health impacts sited previously were true 20 years ago when gasoline contained benzene, which it no longer does. It is not as much of an issue as it was 20 years ago. He is a member of the emergency preparedness committee for this area, while not speaking for that committee tonight; he noted referring to the schools and business in the area that a wider road may improve emergency response. The health risk associated with traffic is due to idling and congestion not traffic flow. He referenced several instances in the past when concerns over children's health were part of a public discussion and were subsequently shown to be in error. He urged the CAG to thoroughly research the health risks to children before taking action based on these concerns.

Attendance Roster - CAG Members

Community Advisory Group Meeting #10

Willow Road Study: Illinois Route 43 to Interstate 94
 July 21, 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	WJ.B
2	John Birkinbine	Northfield	jbirkinbine@sbcglobal.net	
3	Hallie Bodman	Northfield	ahkbod@aol.com	
4	Steve Bucklin	Glenview	sbucklin@glenbrooksecurity.com	SB
5	Dan de Loys	Northfield	ddeloys@comcast.net	DdeL
6	Rick Filler	Glenview	rfiller@harlemirving.com	
7	Tensley Garris	Northbrook	tensley@northbrookchamber.org	
8	Ted Greene	Northfield	ted@tgreenefamily.com	
9	Robert Hayward	Northfield	robert.hayward@kirkland.com	
10	Todd Heller	Northbrook	todd@thellerlaw.com	
11	Steve Hirsch	Northfield	sbhirsch@hotmail.com	
12	Kate Katz	Northbrook	Kk2667@aol.com	KK
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	jjmpattersonjr@pattersoncompany.com	
21	Phoebe Raymond	Northfield	nomedad@mindspring.com	
22	Stacy Sigman	Northfield	ssigman@northfieldil.org	
23	Stephanie Stuckey	Northbrook	sstuckey@ups.com	
24	Scott Turban	Northfield	scottturban@aim.com	ST
25	Don Whiteman	Northfield	kk9h@me.com	

Attendance Roster - CAG Alternates

Community Advisory Group Meeting #10

Willow Road Study: Illinois Route 43 to Interstate 94
 July 21, 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	
2	Juli Blunt	Northfield	jrb.freshideas@earthlink.net	JB
3	Jack Bodman	Northfield	jpbod@viennabeef.com	
4	Jeff Brady	Glenview	jeffb@glenview.il.us	
5	Sydney Clark	Northfield	sclark4994@yahoo.com	
6	Pat Doherty	Northfield	dohertypat@aol.com	JD
7	Nancy Firfer	Glenview	nancy.i.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@llegal.com	BKK
12	William Lustig	Northfield	blustig@northfieldil.org	W
13	Kathy Miles	Glenview	gcstaff@glenviewchamber.com	
14	Brian Moran	Northfield	bmoran@femorran.com	
15	Patrick O' Donoghue	Northfield	northfieldpat@yahoo.com	PO
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	