

# CAG #6 MEETING SUMMARY



## Weber Road at I-55 Study CAG Meeting #6 Meeting Summary

Date: August 31, 2011  
Time: 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.  
Place: Romeoville Village Hall, 1050 W Romeo Road, Romeoville, IL  
Attendance: See Sign-In Sheet (Attached)  
Project Team: Patrick Rinos, Steve Schilke, Justin Romeo (IDOT); Allen Staron, Stacie Dovalovsky, Chad Dillavou (Clark Dietz); Clarita Lao, Sean LaDieu (Huff & Huff); Dave Palia (Planning Communities)

The purpose of CAG Meeting #6 was to update the project status, review the information from Public Information Meeting #2 (PIM #2), review the alternative evaluation process, and present the initial finding of the Fatal Flaw Screening. A summary of the meeting is as follows:

- **Introductions**

- Introductions of IDOT staff and the Project Consultant team
- Introductions of Community Advisory Group attendees
- Distribution of the meeting agenda, PIM #2, and CAG #5 meeting summaries
- Review of timetable for public involvement process

- **Public Meeting Review**

- Share reactions and comments from the second Public Information Meeting
  - Few comments, general public concurs with needs
- Reviewed Project Purpose Statement and Project needs

- **Evaluation Process**

- Introduced the objective of Alternative Screening by Fatal Flaw
  - Comparative screening to narrow range of alternatives to those with least potential impacts
- Criteria that was used in the Fatal Flaw Screening include:
  - Residential Impacts
  - Environmental Impacts
  - Business Impacts (building and access)
  - Meeting IDOT Design Criteria
- Explained how impacts were counted
  - Planning buffer was drawn around alternative representing limit of potential construction, easements, right-of-way, etc.
  - If any part of building fell within buffer, it was counted as an impact
  - A commercial building falling within the buffer was counted as "1 impact" although it may house multiple businesses
  - An access impact was counted if the building remained but its primary access was removed or adversely altered
  -

# CAG #6 MEETING SUMMARY



- **Fatal Flaw Screening**

- Alternatives (21 total) representing the ideas of the PSG, CAG, and TAG were displayed
  - Alternatives that were suggested by PSG, CAG or TAG were drawn electronically by the consultant team to capture the ideas and meet minimum design criteria (i.e., loop ramps drawn by group on aerials to fit in footprint of existing interchange were drawn to minimum required radius to meet required design speeds)
- Each alternative was reviewed and potential impacts described and discussed
- Produced a summary of alternatives to be carried forward:
  - Gave threshold numbers for business impacts that dismissed 14 and carried forward 7 alternatives
- The alternatives to be screened against Purpose and Need criterion:
  - Diamond Interchange
  - Single Point Urban Diamond Interchange
  - Diverging Diamond Interchange
  - Continuous Flow Diverging Diamond Interchange
  - Split Diamond Interchange
  - Split Diamond Interchange, variation 3
  - 2 Quadrant Partial Cloverleaf Type C at Veterans Parkway

- **Next Steps**

- Begin next round of evaluation and screening on 7 remaining alternatives
  - Purpose and Need Screening
  - Round 1 Screening
- Remove TAG #2 from project timeline; most TAG agencies attend CAG meetings
- Community Advisory Group Meeting #7 tentatively planned for fall of 2011/ spring of 2012

The next CAG meeting is not yet scheduled.

- **Comments and Discussion**

- Some concepts drawn by members of the group included exit ramps from I-55 that intersect with minor arterials in order to connect to Weber Road. No preliminary alternatives included direct connections from I-55 to side streets or minor arterials.  
*FHWA safety guidelines would not permit the construction of an intersection from a freeway off ramp onto a minor arterial street. An analysis would have to be performed and the arterial street must be improved to accommodate ramp traffic by widening the roadway and limiting access.*
- No data was presented that shows improved capacity and operations at intersections besides the interchange, especially the intersection of Weber Road and Normantown Road. Is that necessary in order to improve overall safety, capacity and operations on Weber Road?  
*At this step of the alternative evaluation process, no intersections have been studied outside of the interchange area. Beyond the interchange, the intersection improvements are assumed to be similar for all alternatives and will be studied in future rounds of analysis. It is also acknowledged that the Normantown Road interchange is a more complex intersection. The goal of information presented at CAG 6 is to screen alternatives based on Fatal Flaw Criteria.*

# CAG #6 MEETING SUMMARY

---



- For Alternative Q, when will potential noise analysis for traffic exiting onto Veterans Parkway and the use residential roadways to connect to Romeoville be considered?  
*Noise impacts will be studied as the screening and evaluation process moves forward, but will not be considered at this stage of the evaluation process.*
- If Alternative M has reduced signal timing, it will make it difficult for truck traffic to move through the interchange efficiently.  
*Alternatives moving forward must be able to operate efficiently for all vehicle types and will be examined in the following steps of the evaluation process, but not at this time.*
- All topics were displayed on poster boards and can be found on the project website Study Documents page ([www.I55atWeber.com](http://www.I55atWeber.com)) under “Study Documents”.