



## IL 47 Improvement Study

From Kennedy Road in Yorkville to Cross Street in Sugar Grove

### MEETING SUMMARY

#### Community Advisory Group Meeting #2

April 14, 2011

The second meeting of the IL 47 Improvement Study Community Advisory Group (CAG) was held at the Sugar Grove Public Library on Thursday, April 14<sup>th</sup>, 2011, at 6:00 P.M.

Representing IDOT's Study Team were the following individuals:

- Ted Fultz, Location & Environmental Studies Engineer (IDOT)
- Dave Alexander, Studies and Plans Unit Chief (IDOT)
- Elizabeth Jensen, Studies and Plans Unit member (IDOT)
- Mike Zorn, Consultant Project Manager (H.W. Lochner, Inc.)
- Michael Galbraith, Consultant Facilitator/Urban Planner (H.W. Lochner, Inc.)
- Natalie Mentzer, Environmental Scientist/NEPA Document Developer, (Kaskaskia Engineering Group, LLC Environmental Consultants).

Presented below is a summary of the meeting, organized by the meeting's agenda items. Elements that appeared on the flip chart are designated in *blue italics*. Items in [brackets] are materials added to augment the flip chart text.

### I. INTRODUCTIONS AND OPENING REMARKS

- Mr. Zorn and IDOT opened the meeting by welcoming the CAG members, reintroducing the returning IDOT Study Team members, and introducing the Environmental Scientist/NEPA document developer for the study.
- Michael Galbraith, of Lochner, was introduced as a substitute for Study Team member Jeff Schlotter who was unable to attend the meeting.
- CAG members were asked to reintroduce themselves and to state either the organization they represent, or their main interest in the study.
- Mr. Zorn presented the General Study Schedule to explain past and future developments, including a review of Meeting 1 and the CAG's Community Context Audit participation.
- IDOT Study Team members then proceeded to explain funding developments for the Project and reminded CAG members of the availability of Project materials on the Project Website at [www.dot.state.il.us/yorkvilletosugargrove](http://www.dot.state.il.us/yorkvilletosugargrove).
- Mr. Galbraith then reviewed the goals for the meeting as listed on the flip chart's Welcome page:



- 1) to review the results of the Community Context Audit conducted from the CAG meeting number 1
- 2) to review the Study's Problem and Purpose and Need statements that are required for the Project documentation of federally-funded, FHWA-controlled highway projects
- 3) to relate the Context Audit responses to the Problem and Purpose and Need statements and initial design considerations
- 4) to preview the next steps in the Improvement Study process.

## II. CONTEXT AUDIT RESULTS

Mr. Galbraith summarized the responses from the Community Context Audit completed by the CAG members from the first meeting. The Context Audit provides the Study Team context-related issues in the Project communities that will be considered in development of initial IL 47 improvement designs. Mr. Galbraith:

- Reviewed the results of the Context Audit questions by explaining how they were identified and grouped according to frequency and consistency of remarks under 10 categories such as Community, Culture, and Environment. Certain issues under the Categories that were identified multiple times with consistent remarks were taken as those that the CAG members felt were most important to address as the project develops.
- Summarized the Group's Audit results, including
  - identifying the most important issue, indicated by the frequency and degree of consistency of remarks, as the natural environment, especially the area water bodies. Preservation of waterways, water quality and wildlife and habitat elicited the highest number of response remarks.
  - review of all other Categories' top responses including related cross-category concerns such as the need to balance development with the traditional rural agricultural setting of the Project corridor.
- After the summary, Mr. Galbraith distributed the Study Team's completed Context Audit review record. The record included 1) a summary of the CAG members' frequent and consistent responses per each of the 10 categories and 2) a complete list of individual comments verbatim.
- After the summary, Mr. Galbraith opened the floor for questions or comments:
  - Q. How will the Audit responses be used compared to IDOT [design] study results?*
  - A. Consistency of the responses will be considered in designs. Access, for example, was noted frequently and consistently in the Audit. IDOT noted that they have criteria for safe access designs. IDOT will consider the items identified by the Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) process within the limits of current policies.*
  - Q. How will this project be coordinated with adjacent projects?*
  - A. Design for the southern portion of the IL 47 Yorkville to Sugar Grove improvements will be compatible with the Plans currently under design for IL 47 improvements immediately*



*south of this project. Design for the northern portion of the IL 47 Yorkville to Sugar Grove improvements will be compatible with existing conditions north of Cross Street.*

- Q. What CSS was done on other Studies [related to IL 47 improvements in other areas along the Corridor]?*
- A. Prior to implementation of CSS policies, IDOT met with many groups but no specific CAG or related groups.*

*IDOT noted that the Project to the south of Yorkville is included in the Fiscal Year 2012 annual program and could be included on a letting after July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011.*

- Q. What are access management policies?*
- A. Access management applies design standards to location and traffic conditions to provide safe, efficient traffic movement onto, and off of, the roadway at intersections and driveways. Access management designs will be addressed later in the Study as alternative designs are developed.*
- Q. What is the complexity of the Project on a scale of one to ten?*
- A. Project is considered average overall.*

### III. PROBLEM STATEMENT AND PURPOSE AND NEED TASK

Natalie Mentzer, of Kaskaskia Engineering Group (environmental consultants for the Project), presented the draft Problem and Purpose and Need statements. The statements were presented to explain their requirement for the Project record and to seek comments or changes from the CAG. Comments and changes are being sought to ensure that the statements accurately describe the Project objectives for addressing corridor access and mobility problems.

- Ms. Mentzer provided the topics and the objective of the presentation:  
Topics included 1) definitions for the statements, 2) review of the draft statements, and 3) group discussion to refine the drafts.  
The objective of the presentation was to develop the statements to guide future alternative [design] analyses.
- The Problem Statement is drafted by the Project Team at the beginning of a project as part of the CSS process and is developed from issues identified in the Context Audit and from other relevant studies. The draft Purpose Statement presented to the CAG:

**The transportation problems on the segment of Illinois Route 47 between Yorkville and Sugar Grove include:**

- 1. inadequate vehicular capacity to accommodate existing and future traffic volumes at an acceptable level of service;**
- 2. inadequate capacity for pedestrian and bicycle travel;**
- 3. inadequate design at several intersections; and,**
- 4. location within a floodplain.**



- The Purpose and Need Statement identifies the general problem – the purpose – and discusses the data that defines the problem – the need. It is required for the environmental process and is used for alternative design analysis. The Purpose and Need statement is re-examined by stakeholders and agency officials for comment and revisions as designs progress. The draft Purpose and Need presented to the CAG:

**The purpose of the proposed action is to provide an improved transportation facility to serve existing and proposed demand in the project corridor.**

**Specifically, the purposes of the project are to**

- 1. accommodate local and regional planning,**
- 2. provide the traffic capacity necessary to accommodate existing and projected traffic volumes at an acceptable level of service,**
- 3. correct existing geometric deficiencies,**
- 4. accommodate all appropriate users, and**
- 5. address flooding issues.**

- The following questions were raised per the draft Problem statement

*Q. If IL 47 is a Strategic Regional Arterial (SRA), why are pedestrians and bicycles considered?*

*A. IDOT is required by law and by policy to consider these [as transportation modes]. The Community has advised that this route is currently not adequate for pedestrians and bicycles and that a need for accommodation exists.*

*Q. Can the Team accurately predict bicycle and pedestrian demand?*

*A. Census data gives some indication of bicycle and pedestrian demand.*

*Q. What is the design year?*

*A. By policy, a project's design year is established as 20 years after the project is expected to be open to traffic. It is established to provide a basis for forecasting future conditions and travel demands. The design year for this project has been determined to be 2036 based on 2016 being the earliest practical year of construction.*

*Q. Will this become a "Randall Rd. corridor"? We want to avoid this at all costs. Randall Rd. does not have bike/ped links.*

*A. These meetings are intended to allow us to hear and address those types of comments. This project is linked to local land use planning, which may include bike/ped facilities.*

- The draft Problem Statement was accepted by the CAG with no further discussion and no changes.

- The following questions were raised per the draft Purpose and Need statement:

*Q. Has a crash analysis been conducted for the Project section and if so, will design include safety?*

*A. IDOT stated that five years of crash data examined does not indicate particular issues or locations. Improvements should address general issues of safety [throughout the Project].*

*Q. Are flooding/drainage on the road right of way considered per a 100-year flood?*



*A. Different policies apply to different design elements. The impact of a 100 year flood is considered.*

- Following further discussion of Purpose and Need issues related to flooding and drainage, point #5 was added:

**5. address pavement flooding issues**

- After further discussion of Purpose and Need, point #6 followed. Generally, comments and inquiries were related to how IDOT would handle drainage and flooding issues.

IDOT responded that they would conduct drainage analyses that consider the existing and proposed conditions.

- Based on the preceding discussion, Purpose and Need point #6 was changed to read:

**6. without exacerbating current area drainage issues.**

- Mr. Galbraith asked the CAG if they were in agreement with the Problem and Purpose and Need statements as currently formulated. The Group was not ready to endorse, requested additional time for review and comment and made the following comments:

- *Level of Service concept needs further explanation for relations to the Statements.*

IDOT stated that feedback and revision opportunities for the Statements will be part of the Project development process.

- *Review of the Problem and Purpose and Need statements should be included as part of every CAG meeting Agenda.*

**IV. INITIAL DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS**

Next, Mr. Mike Zorn, Consultant Project Manager, presented a slide show illustrating some of the initial design considerations to be evaluated for the Project. This included explanation of design criteria and standards, with discussions and suggestions following. Presentation topics included 1) definitions, 2) constraints, and 3) bicycle/pedestrian considerations. The objective of Mr. Zorn's presentation was to provide a foundation for understanding design parameters.

- Mr. Zorn provided definitions and example illustrations for Strategic Regional Arterials, Levels of Service, SRA Design Criteria, Typical Cross Sections, and Plan and Profile Drawings. These were provided to begin relating how roadway design elements can be considered and incorporated to address context audit issues and concerns.
- Next Mr. Zorn identified features of the alignment that would constrain designs and the ways they may have to be applied to locations. The constraints identified included:
  - Roadway and railroad alignments and crossings.
  - Waterways
  - Floodplains and floodways
  - Staged construction.



Examples of each type of constraint at particular locations were shown and Mr. Zorn discussed how solutions might be considered given the location and condition.

- Mr. Zorn then discussed bicycle and pedestrian considerations and provided general typical section designs that will be considered for implementation.
- Several questions regarding design considerations were raised during Mr. Zorn's presentation:

*Q. Are SRA criteria based on a speed/criteria relationship?*

*A. Different sets of criteria are established for different SRA designations and speeds.*

*Q. How does the traffic on Randall Road with an existing Average Daily Traffic (ADT), of approximately 50,000 vehicles/day compare as an example to this project?*

*A. For this project the ADT projected to the year 2036 is approximately 30,000 vehicles/day or 60% of that currently on Randall Road.*

*Q. Are offset turn lanes a consideration?*

*A. Would depend on median width and signalization plan at particular location.*

*Q. Will bridges be designed with piers or clear spans?*

*A. Designs are based on bridge type, length, and location and all practical options will be considered. Costs will be a factor in design.*

Mr. Zorn and IDOT representatives discussed how the options for bridge designs must examine the width and direction to widen the road in relation to the railroad crossing and surrounding development. Maintenance of traffic plans must allow for roadway and railroad traffic to remain open during construction.

*Q. Will construction staging be based on the County [boundaries of Kendall and Kane Cos.]?*

*A. Probably will be based on road segments.*

*Q. Will there be coordination between [Kendall and Kane] Counties?*

*A. Issue will be brought up with Project Study Group; US 30 a logical point for breaking [construction] activities.*

*Q. Could one [IDOT] District "take over" from other jurisdiction?*

*A. IDOT officials not aware of any instance where that has happened.*

*Q. Is this considered a large Project?*

*A. Yes; estimated costs are approximately \$40 million.*

*Q. At what point in the [Study] process will designs specific to this project begin to be developed.*

*A. Beginning from this point. Alternatives will be developed based on the Purpose and Need [and discussion from this meeting]. These will be presented at the next CAG meeting in approximately three to four months at which time the CAG may provide feedback and brainstorm other alternatives.*



*Q. Does IDOT always consider costs?*

*A. In developing alternatives, no. In selecting a "preferred" alternative, yes.*

#### **IV. Meeting Wrap Up**

Mr. Galbraith and Mr. Zorn addressed the final three agenda items for meeting wrap up.

- The CAG generally agreed that the Study Team and CAG met the meeting objectives and adequately explained the Study process moving forward.
- The CAG request to include discussion and revision of the Problem and Purpose and Need Statement in future meeting agendas was identified as an action item.
- Mr. Zorn reviewed the schedule again to point out plans for the next CAG meeting in approximately three to four months at which time some preliminary alternative designs will be available for review and comment.

There being no other questions or comments, Mr. Zorn and the rest of the Study Team thanked the members for their attendance and closed the meeting, at approximately 8:10 P.M.



APPENDIX A – MEETING FLIP CHART NOTES

# IL-47 IMPROVEMENT STUDY Community Advisory Group

Meeting No. 2  
April 14, 2011

## WELCOME

### Meeting Objectives:

- 1.- Review Community Context Audit Results
- 2.- Review the Project's Problem Statement and Purpose and Need development process
- 3.- Relate Audit responses to Purpose Statement and P&N to initial design considerations.
- 4.- Preview next steps in Improvement Study process.

# Context Audit Results

Qs, after summary

Per - Design Criteria per CA  
responses  $\Rightarrow$  Consistency of responses  
related to designs  $\hat{=}$  safe access  
for example

## Problem's Purpose/Need Statements

N. Mentzer

- review draft statements  
Define Prob Stmt

Q SAR? Why ped/bike?

DOT req'd to consider ped/bike access  
 $\hat{=}$  warrants to justify

Q

based on census  $\Rightarrow$  projections  
 $\Rightarrow$  2036 design year when conditions  
& demand by residents increases

Comment: per Kane Co. - considerations in  
design "important to design for everyone"  
Plan

Q A Randall Rd. Corridor?  
perhaps best address w/ local land  
use req. agencies

$\Rightarrow$  P&N Stmt. "first filter" thru  
which Alt designs must pass.

$\Rightarrow$  draft "Purpose Statement"

provide some explanations per terms

Q "Crash analysis" - any comments on  
locations or issues

5-yr data does not indicate  
particular locs/issues

flooding / drainage only w/in roadway R/W per 100-yr flood.

5. address flooding issues  $\Rightarrow$

6. address pavement flooding issues!  
~~w/~~ ~~out~~ exacerbation ~~of~~ <sup>area</sup> current drainage  
Don't issue

Group wants further explanation of LOS per Statement before approving.

< Dave - feedback & revision opportunities will be part of Project development process.

Comment "Statement - Prob's, P&N should be part of every Agenda

# ⇒ Mile 2 Initial Design Considerations

Definitions provided  
IL47-SAR Strategic Regional Arterials

## ⇒ SRA Design Criteria

Basics provided/explained

⇒ LOS - per "letter grade system"  
A Best ————— F Grade

⇒ Other Criteria i.e. "sight distances"  
& other

TYP Sects - elements & dimensions  
interactions  
Provide graphics

per ADTs of comparisons

IL47 15-18K ⇒ 2036 projects

⇒ 4-lane per "feasible cross sections"

⇒ explanations of Plan/Profile  
dwg Δ / plans ④

Slides showing examples

Plan View

Offset LTLs?

depends on location/signals/  
demand

at RR crossing showing sag

Profile View

⇒ Constraints specific to Proj

— RR/Roadway underpasses/widths  
"look @ options" i.e. span arrangement

— Water ways ~ Rob Roy, Blackberry Crks  
RR Crk = proximity to roadway  
floodplain/floodway considerations

— Staged Const. - i.e. maintaining road  
& RR traffic as Proj built.

— Ped/Bike facilities

⇒ potential typ sect shown (5)

Q per Staging - how - could be built in a number of ways based on DOT districts \$, time, other issues w/ coordination between Groups / Districts

Q Can one D "take over" outside jurisdiction  
DOT - cannot commit to how it would be done

We are at an "early" stage -  
Proj budget est  $\approx$  \$4000K

Q @ what point in process will designs emerge - beginning from this points

Q "Always consider costs?"  
- in developing AITs No  
- in selecting "preferred" Yes

6