



Illinois Route 71 Study

From IL Route 47 in Yorkville to Orchard Road in Oswego

Meeting Minutes – CWG Meeting #2

Date: August 31, 2010
Time: 2:00pm – 4:00pm
Location: The Rec Center, 202 E. Countryside Parkway, Yorkville, IL
Subject: Review Public Meeting #1 Comments / Discuss Additional Project Issues / Determine Preferred Alternative

A meeting was held to discuss the Illinois Route 71 project for the purpose of presenting Public Meeting #1 comments and responses to the Community Working Group (CWG), soliciting input on any additional project issues from the CWG, and seeking consensus on a preferred alternative from the CWG (see attached sign-in sheet for attendees). The following handouts were distributed: Meeting Agenda, Project Issues from Previous CWG Meeting #1 handout, Purpose of Public Meeting handout, Summary of 7-29-10 Public Information Meeting for IL 71 handout (see attached for handouts). In addition, a location map, aerial displays of proposed improvements, and typical sections of proposed improvements were made available for review during the discussions.

The meeting was opened by Don Hayden of IE Consultants, Inc. The agenda was used as an outline during the discussions with all points in the agenda and handouts being presented. The following is a summary of the discussions:

1. Don Hayden started the meeting with introductions of the IDOT and consultant project study team staff in attendance. Self-introductions by CWG members in attendance followed.
2. Don Hayden discussed the project scope as outlined in the attached agenda.
3. Don Hayden provided a brief description of Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) and referred to the project Stakeholder Involvement Plan (SIP) and IDOT website for further explanation of the CSS process. Mary Terese Davison inquired if as part of the CSS process, anyone defends objections of stakeholders. Don Hayden replied that all stakeholder concerns are heard and considered during the process. Ted Fultz then described the Project Study Group (PSG) and asked if Mrs. Davison had any specific questions. He went on to say that the PSG reviews all the project comments and then determines if more engineering is required.
4. Don Hayden discussed the overall project schedule from Phase I planning through Phase III construction. (See attached agenda for project schedule.)



Illinois Department of Transportation

5. Mary Terese Davison asked about IL 47 and IL 71 and asked if both routes would be expanded. She also asked how the traffic projections are done and if the proposed IL 47 improvement was considered in the IL 71 projection. Kevin Crider replied that both have future traffic counts which warrant four lanes. Ted Fultz then stated that both routes are Strategic Regional Arterials (SRA's) and that IL 71 already meets the warrants for four lanes. The IL 47 improvement was not a factor in the IL 71 traffic projection. Mary Terese Davison then asked about quality of life issues. Jim Wywrot mentioned that these can be very subjective.

6. Don Hayden presented previous input provided for the IL 71 project:

- a. Don Hayden first reviewed the handout "Project Issues from Previous CWG Meeting #1" handout which summarized project issues brought forth by the CWG at the first meeting with them held in February 2010. Mr. Hayden proceeded to present the final Problem Statement for the project which summarized those issues raised by the CWG, as well as additional issues by the Project Study Group (PSG):

"The Transportation problem with Illinois Route 71 in Kendall County from Yorkville to Oswego is that projected vehicular traffic volumes along this Strategic Regional Arterial route will soon exceed the capacity of the existing two-lane roadway thereby increasing congestion, compromising safety, and reducing the quality of life of the adjacent communities. In order to meet the needs of the affected stakeholders, a transportation solution is needed that will increase highway capacity, reduce crashes, support local agency pedestrian and bicycle accommodation plans, support local and regional economic vitality and development, maintain reasonable access to adjacent properties, and preserve key community characteristics."

- b. Don Hayden next reviewed the "Purpose of the Public Meeting" handout reiterating the general purpose and need for the project as presented at the first Public Informational Meeting held in July 2010.
- c. The "Summary of 7-29-10 Public Information Meeting for IL 71" handout was next reviewed. A total of 86 comments were received as of the August 12, 2010 deadline via comment form mailings, tape recordings, and emails. One CWG member asked if all comments received responses. Duane Lukkari of IDOT responded that the Department sent response letters to all. Ted Fultz mentioned that everyone who attended the meeting received the results in the mail. The Department also sent the results to all property owners which is above and beyond what is required.
- d. Kevin Crider of Geotech Engineering & Testing, Inc., the prime consultant to IDOT for the IL 71 project, described the various alternatives for the project as follows:



Illinois Department of Transportation

- No Build: this alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need for the project.
 - 3-Lanes (one thru-lane in each direction with a bi-directional left-turn lane): this alternative does not meet the Purpose and Need for the project.
 - 4-Lanes with raised median (two thru-lanes in each direction): this alternative meets the Purpose and Need for the project. Kevin mentioned that the median promotes safety, openings are required every $\frac{1}{4}$ mile, and that the local officials were consulted in regards to the sidewalk and shared-use path. It was also mentioned that the local officials need to agree to fund and maintain the sidewalk and shared-use path or they will not be constructed.
7. Following the review of previous project input and description of the alternatives developed to date, the CWG members were next divided into three groups and asked to compile a list of additional project issues. IDOT and consultant staff facilitated the discussions by answering any technical questions from the groups as they arose. The group discussions lasted approximately 30 minutes. Following the group break-out session, each group/table was asked to present their additional project issues. The following is a summary of additional project issues provided by the CWG:

Table #1 Additional Project Issues:

- ✓ Minimize ROW takes.
- ✓ Consider reducing the median width.
- ✓ Consider shifting alignment to minimize impacts on existing residential properties.
- ✓ Replace impacted trees within project limits, near same location as removal.
- ✓ List traffic calming measures that are being studied.

Table #2 Additional Project Issues:

- ✓ Provide left and right access in/out of properties (mainly for businesses).
- ✓ Concerns that U-turn will not be allowed in future.
- ✓ Is shared-use path independent project to IL 71 roadway project?
- ✓ How many actual "non-animal" crashes and how do they alone affect safety?
- ✓ Concerned that noise barriers will visually block businesses along IL 71.
- ✓ Emergency vehicles crossing the raised median (It was noted that this was a public information meeting comment which is not reflected in the summary).

Table #3 Additional Project Issues:



Illinois Department of Transportation

- ✓ Raised median (from Van Emmon to Shadow Creek lane):
 - This median is inconsistent with US 34 improvement from Oswego to Douglas Rd whereby a TWLTL is used for a section of roadway that has higher vehicular and pedestrian traffic as well as being located in an area of higher population density.
 - Consider eliminating the raised median (and change it to a flush median).
 - Reduce the median width.

Benefits of above median recommendations: better ingress/egress access to properties, lower construction cost, lower maintenance cost, less drainage runoff due to reduced area of impervious land, less land acquisition required, less trees impacted.

Further justifications for above median recommendations: crash type predominantly animal strikes for which raised medians do not prevent; subject section from Van Emmon to Shadow Creek is basically straight with a slight curve at Shadow Creek; little risk for future land development or driveways in this subject section given current size, zoning, and or covenants of the parcels.

Bristol-Kendall Fire Department (BKFD) stated to Mr. Davison (see attached agenda) that they will not cross a 6" high raised median with their vehicles due to fear of damage to the undercarriage.

Kendall County Sheriff's Department stated to Mr. Davison that they will cross a 6" high median if necessary.

- ✓ Postal delivery methods: prefer turnouts rather than mailbox clusters.
- ✓ Shared-use path and sidewalks:
 - concern for safety of bicyclists/pedestrians adjacent to IL 71 which is a major truck route – prefer off-site paths in adjacent parks/forest preserves; safety concerns are: issues related to truck traffic such as blown tires and thrown brake shoes, as well as general concern for pedestrians crossing IL 71.
 - origin-destination of potential users is unclear.
 - concern for nuisance use by snowmobiles and ATV's – and also safety particularly where paths cross driveways.
- ✓ Noise abatement.
- ✓ Roadway lighting.

8. Following the group exercise, Don Hayden sought consensus from the CWG on a preferred alternative to move forward in the IL 71 study with consideration of the purpose and need for the project as well as all stakeholder issues brought forward to date. Consensus was obtained from the CWG with no objections to move forward with the 4-Lane alternative with modifications as deemed necessary through the study process.

9. The meeting ended at approximately 4:00pm.

Agenda

Community Working Group Meeting #2
August 31, 2010

Illinois Route 71 Study From IL 47 to Orchard Road

1. Opening Statement / Introductions

IDOT Points of Contact are:

- **Ted Fultz** (Location & Env. Studies Engineer) (815) 434-8469
- **Duane Lukkari** (Studies & Plans Unit Chief) (815) 434-8565
- **Kevin Crider** (Geotech Engineering) (270) 443-1995
- **Don Hayden** (IE Consultants, Inc.) (618) 654-6738

Geotech Engineering & Testing, Inc. has been selected to provide Phase I and Phase II engineering for this project which includes the Context Sensitive Solutions approach. Geotech has hired IE Consultants to help with the CSS.

2. Proposed Scope of Work (approximately 5.41 miles)

- a. The department has identified that traffic volumes (currently average daily traffic is between 10,400 and 12,900 while it is projected to increase between 18,000 to 23,400 for design year 2035) in this corridor are near the capacity of the existing roadway and that rapid development and lack of alternate routes will continue to increase the demand on the state highway system.
- b. The proposed scope of work will be determined through engineering evaluation and public involvement.

3. Context Sensitive Solutions ("CSS") - Any questions?

4. Schedule

- a. The project is partially funded for construction (IL 47 to IL 126 has \$11.857 million) in the FY 2011-2016 Proposed Highway Improvement Program. Also funded, is 7.0 million for land acquisition and \$900,000 each for both Phase I and II engineering.
- b. Preliminary design (first iteration) has been completed.
- c. Public involvement began in early calendar year 2010 (see below).
- d. An official Public Hearing will be held after a favored alternative has been identified.
- e. Phase I is tentatively scheduled for completion in August 2011.
- f. Land acquisition will not begin until after Phase I is complete.

- g. Phase II Engineering is tentatively scheduled in the FY 2011-2016 Proposed Highway Improvement Program, subject to project readiness and funding availability. Phase II Engineering normally takes 18-24 months
- h. Construction is expected to take at least two construction seasons

i. **CSS schedule (tentative):**

Local Officials Meeting #1 - Held on 1-20-10 (Project Start / Identify Stakeholders)

Stakeholder Meeting (CWG) #1 – Held 2-17-10 (Context Audit / Develop Problem Statement)

Project Study Group Meeting #1 – Held 3-9-10 (Define Alternatives)

Local Official's Meeting #2 – Held 7-14-10 (Present Alternatives / Notice of Public Meeting)

Public Meeting #1 – Held 7-29-10 (Present Alternatives)

Stakeholder Meeting (CWG) #2 - August 31, 2010 (Review Public Meeting results / Review Alternatives)

Project Study Group Meeting #2 is slated for January 2011 (Select Preferred Alternative)

Local Official's Meeting #3 is slated for April 2011 (Present Preferred Alternative / Notice of Public Hearing)

Public Meeting #2 – Public Hearing is slated for early May 2011 (Present Preferred Alternative)

Finish Phase I engineering – August 2011

5. Today's agenda

- a. Review the Problem Statement. This statement came from input from our first CWG and Project Study Group (PSG) meetings.

“The Transportation problem with Illinois Route 71 in Kendall County from Yorkville to Oswego is that projected vehicular traffic volumes along this Strategic Regional Arterial route will soon exceed the capacity of the existing two-lane roadway thereby increasing congestion, compromising safety, and reducing the quality of life of the adjacent communities. In order to meet the needs of the affected stakeholders, a transportation solution is needed that will increase highway capacity, reduce crashes, support local agency pedestrian and bicycle accommodation plans, support local and regional economic vitality and development, maintain reasonable access to adjacent properties, and preserve key community characteristics.”

- b. Review the “Purpose of the Public Meeting” display. See attached sheet.
 - c. Review the Public Meeting (7/29/10) results. See summary sheet.
 - d. Review & discuss Alternatives: No build, 3 lane, or 4 lane.
6. Group Exercise: Project issues
- a. Group breakout session to discuss and list *additional* project issues.
 - b. Group consensus on a preferred Alternative. (“Consensus” is defined as the majority of the stakeholders in agreement, with the minority agreeing that their input was considered.)
7. Q&A
8. Closing



Illinois Department of Transportation

Illinois Route 71 Study

From IL Route 47 in Yorkville to Orchard Road in Oswego

Handout – Project Issues from previous CWG meeting #1

Group #1 Project Issues:

- ✓ **“Driveway access and grades”** → Group #1 elaborated that the concern is maintaining access of existing drives during construction and in the final design to IL 71 as well as ensuring that future proposed vertical approach grades to IL 71 are not too steep.
- ✓ **“Lighting”** → The group expressed a desire for lighting at sideroad intersections for safety purposes.
- ✓ **“Multi-use trail”** → The group would like to see better connectivity between existing shared-use trail systems and between subdivisions, possibly for short segments adjacent to IL 71 – but not at the expense of additional ROW.
- ✓ **“Stormwater”** → The concern is that proposed stormwater discharges be controlled so as not to adversely affect existing ditches and streams.

Group #2 Project Issues:

- ✓ **“Will this project draw more traffic?”** → Group #2 listed a concern that improving the route through adding lanes will attract more traffic from alternative routes and thus, exacerbate any safety and noise-related issues associated with increased traffic.
- ✓ **“Encourage people to get out of cars and use trails”** → In general, Group #2 is in favor of multi-modalism for the IL 71 project. It was mentioned that there were other modes of transportation that can be used for people to get to work.
- ✓ **“Left turn lanes at all intersecting roads”** → The group’s concern is the safety of left-turning traffic at intersections.
- ✓ **“Difficult to see private drives in vicinity of Morgan Creek”** → The group is concerned about the existing sight distances at this location.
- ✓ **“Traffic calming measures”** → The group would like to see calming measures implemented because they are concerned that adding lanes to the roadway will encourage speeding and become a safety issue. It was mentioned that there are opportunities to do things regarding this item. Anything that could be done would be beneficial.
- ✓ **“Sound barriers”** → The concern is that increased traffic, particularly truck traffic, will cause noise pollution to residences abutting the roadway.

IMPROVEMENT OF ILLINOIS ROUTE 71

PURPOSE OF THE PUBLIC MEETING

- Gather information about transportation issues and concerns from members of the community and users of the roadway.
- Identify possible improvements and solutions that could become part of the proposal.
- Locate important resources or features that should be considered as the study continues.
- Answer questions about the project.
- Receive public comments.

NEED FOR THE IMPROVEMENT

- The existing roadway is at or near capacity.
- Crash data indicates congestion.
- Regional growth creates demand.
- Existing features may not be adequate for expected traffic.

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Study three alternatives: No build, 3-lane, and 4-lane.
- Reconstruct IL 71 to a 4-lane urban cross section, plus a 22' raised median, and concrete curb and gutter.
- Intersection signal improvements at IL 47, IL 126, Country Hills Drive, and Van Emmon / Reservation Roads.

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

- Following the public meeting, IDOT will consider the comments received in developing the final project design. Please submit comments by August 12, 2010.
- A Public Hearing will be held in the spring of 2011 to present the proposed design and the Phase I preliminary engineering study is scheduled for completion in August of 2011.
- The south section of the project (IL 47 to IL 126) is funded at \$11.857 million dollars in the Fiscal Year 2011-2016 Proposed Highway Improvement Program. The remaining portion of the project will be monitored and considered for inclusion in future programs. Total cost is estimated at \$38.2 million and \$7.0 million for Land Acquisition.

Summary of 7-29-10 Public Information Meeting for IL 71

<u>The comments included the following:</u>	<u>No. Comments</u>
Requested a noise barrier or a noise study	25
Requested a right turn lane for WB IL 71 to NB IL 47	10
Requested traffic signals at Village View, Raintree, or Country Hills	9
Concerned that their property values will decline	7
Concerned about landscaping (trees, flowers, bricks, berm, etc.)	7
Concerned about the road being closer to home / safety concerns	6
Requested to move the centerline / or widen other side of the road	5
Requested a portion of the exhibits	4
Requested that the speed limit be lowered to 40 mph	4
In favor of the shared use path	4
Stated that they want the path moved to other side or eliminated	4
Requested that IDOT refine/reduce the proposed right-of-way	4
Concerned about nearby drainage	3
Does not feel that IL 71 warrants four lanes	3
Stated that they do not want additional signals from IL 47 to IL 126	3
Requested that the 22' raised median be reduced in width	3
Requested that IDOT utilize rubberized asphalt for less noise	3
Stated that sidewalks are not fiscally responsible	2
Stated that they do not want a noise wall	2
Requested traffic signals at Van Emmon Road	2
Favor grass in the median areas if possible	2
Does not like the raised median / prefers a flush median	2
Concerned about the road being too close to their well	2
Requested a left turn lane for their subdivision or house	2
Stated that it will be more difficult getting out of their driveway	1
Stated that it would be easier getting in/out of their driveway	1
Concerned about the safety for the COMED bike path crossing	1
Glad to find out that signals will be installed at Van Emmon	1
Would like IDOT to disregard the 3 lane alternate	1
Requested that IDOT limit left turns out of developments	1
Favors a reduced speed limit	1
Favors any interim projects – such as the Van Emmon signal project	1
Concerned about the utility adjustments	1
Concerned about additional air pollution	1
Stated that travel on IL 71 would be improved	1
Requested that more property owners get on the stakeholder list	1
Concerned that concrete curb and median is less safe	1
Favor the 22' wide raised median	1
Requested driveway access to their property	1
Asked if sidewalk and a path are both needed	1
Asked if residents could review the tree removal & style of wall?	1

A total of 49 written comments and one tape recorded message were received as of the August 12, 2010 comment deadline. It should be noted that some individuals submitted multiple comments.

Total number of individuals registered at the Public Meeting 86

Breakdown of individuals who attended the Public Meeting:

Village of Oswego (includes consultant)	1
Village of Yorkville	2
Kendall County	1
Property Owners representing themselves	70
Representing someone else's interests	3
Construction Company	1
Newspapers	1
Developers or Property Management	5
Oswegoland Park District	2