



# US 30 (Baseline Road) from IL 47 to IL 31 Phase I Study

Community Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting No. 3 Summary  
February 25, 2014

## CAG Meeting Summary

---

The third Community Advisory Group (CAG) meeting for the US 30 (Baseline Road) from IL 47 to IL 31 Phase I Study was held on Tuesday, February 25, 2014 at the Montgomery Village Hall – in the Community and Multi-Purpose rooms, 200 N. River Street in Montgomery, Illinois from 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM. The meeting included a PowerPoint presentation and breakout exercise to review and discuss the alternatives under consideration. CAG members received the following materials to add to their CAG binder: Meeting Agenda and Presentation Handout. Attendees were also provided a form with which to comment on the four alternatives under consideration. The forms were collected for compilation at the end of the exercise.

The meeting was attended by 9 of the CAG members. Below is a list of CAG members that were in attendance.

## CAG Member Attendance

---

### ***Fox Valley Park District***

- Jeff Palmquist

### ***Village of Montgomery***

- Jerad Chipman, Senior Planner
- Mike Pubentz, P.E., Director of Public Works
- Jeff Zoepfel, Village Administrator
- Tom Meyers, Fire Chief
- Mildred McNeal-James, Resident of Fairfield Way Subdivision, Planning & Zoning Commission

### ***Kane County***

- Jodie Wollnik, Water Department

### ***Sugar Grove Fire Protection***

- Wayne Parson

### ***Yorkville***

- Krysti Barksdale-Noble

### ***Aurora Township***

- John Shoemaker, Highway Commissioner

In addition to the nine CAG members; five additional representatives from the community were in attendance. See attached sign-in sheet for complete list of attendees.

## Presentation and Discussion

---

The presentation began with a project overview and a review of the materials presented at CAG meetings one and two.

At the last meeting (CAG Meeting #2), the group had considered a proposed rural cross-section. The majority of the group preferred an urban cross-section (with curb and gutter) over a rural cross-section (with shoulders and ditches). Following CAG Meeting #2, the Village of Montgomery reinforced the CAG's concerns by sending letters to IDOT. The concerns were investigated and potential design alternatives were coordinated with the FHWA and IDOT. As a result, three additional alternatives were developed for presentation and consideration at CAG Meeting #3. Each of the alternatives incorporate strategies to improve safety, mobility and operations and meet the project's purpose and need. In addition to the rural cross-section discussed at the previous meeting, the three additional alternatives include a rural cross-section alternative with a narrower median and two urban cross-section alternatives.

The four alternatives currently under consideration that were presented at CAG Meeting #3 include:

1. Rural cross-section with 50' depressed median and shoulders, discussed at previous CAG meeting.
2. Rural cross-section with 30' depressed median, shoulders, and high tension cable (HTC) median barrier.
3. Urban cross-section with 30' raised median and shoulders with curb and gutter.
4. Urban cross-section with 30' raised median and curb and gutter (no shoulders).

### **Alternative #1 – Rural – 50' Depressed Median with Shoulders and Ditches**

Alternative #1 is a rural cross-section consisting of two lanes in each direction separated by a 50' depressed grass median. There are 10-foot-wide shoulders on the outside and 6-foot-wide inside shoulders. It has open drainage (i.e., ditches). There is a 10-foot-wide shared use path on one side and a 5-foot-wide sidewalk on the other side. Both are located outside of the ditches near the right-of-way line. The right-of-way required to accommodate this alternative is approximately 200 feet.

### **Alternative #2 – Rural – 30' Depressed Median with HTC Barrier, Shoulders and Ditches**

Alternative #2 is a rural cross-section with a 30-foot-wide depressed median with 6-foot-wide inside shoulders and 10-foot-wide outside shoulders. It also has a high tension cable median barrier to separate the traffic. Drainage is handled by ditches and the shared use path and sidewalk are near the right-of-way line.

Approximately 180 feet of right of way is needed to accommodate this alternative. This alternative provides shoulders similar to Alternative #1, but reduces the impacts by narrowing the median, which in turn requires less right-of-way. High tension cable barrier is most commonly used on higher speed roadways with narrower medians. The two rural alternatives are appropriate for a 55 mph speed limit.

### **Alternative #3 – Urban – 30' Raised Median with Shoulders and Curb and Gutter**

Alternative #3 is an urban cross-section with a 30-foot-wide raised median with 6-foot-wide inside shoulders and 10' outside shoulders adjacent to curb and gutter. The shared use path and sidewalk are near the curb and gutter. Drainage will generally be addressed utilizing storm sewer and small swales instead of ditches.

Approximately 160 feet of right-of way is needed to accommodate this alternative. This alternative provides shoulders similar to Alternatives 1 and 2 but reduces the impacts by utilizing closed drainage to reduce right-of-way. The shoulders are intended to provide emergency stopping space for broken-down vehicles and emergency responders. The addition of the curb and gutter requires the posted speed limit to be lowered to 45 mph.

## Alternative #4 – Urban – 30' Raised Median with Curb and Gutter

Alternative #4 consists of a 30-foot-wide wide raised median with curb and gutter and no shoulders. The shared use path and sidewalk locations and drainage is similar to Alternative #3. This alternative requires approximately 140 feet of right-of way. This alternative does not provide a shoulder area for recovery or emergency stopping space for broken-down vehicles and emergency responders. Similar to Alternative #3, the posted speed limit would be 45 mph.

## Comments and Workshop

---

After the presentation, the group reviewed aerial exhibits showing the four different alternatives. Each person was given a Comment Form and was asked to record their comments. They were asked to consider all aspects including cost, potential impacts, and safety.

The group then reconvened to discuss the comments recorded on the forms and summarize the overall thoughts on the four alternatives. The groups' thoughts are detailed below:

### o **Alternative #1**

Generally, comments on Alternative #1 expressed the benefits of this alternatives including greater protection for pedestrians and best management practices (BMPs) for the treatment of storm water. Concerns with this alternative indicated that the speed limits for Alternative #1 were too high.

Specific comments from the comment sheets concerning Alternative #1 included:

- Appears to have same impact to unincorporated Kane County neighborhoods as Alternative #2. There doesn't seem to be a significant benefit to reducing the median from 50 to 30 feet east of Orchard Road.
- Concern that the cross-section is too wide; with too many adverse impacts upon adjacent properties.
- Of the two proposed rural cross-sections, Alternative #1 would be the preferred option.
- There was a question about the potential for a full access point between IL 47 and Bertram Road.
- Yorkville anticipates southeast corner of IL 47 and U.S. 30 will be developed commercially as a gas station with main access off of IL 47.
- Not in favor of this option; prefer urban cross-section and minimal to no impact to the landscape berms that separate the roadway from residential neighborhoods.
- This option provides greater distance from roadway to pedestrian walks making it safer.
- This option provides open drainage; which represents best management practices.
- This option seems to be lowest construction cost.

### o **Alternative #2**

Generally, those who commented on Alternative #2 felt it was a reasonable alternative to consider. It was suggested that this alternative be combined with Alternative #3, particularly from Route 31 to Orchard. Some of the CAG members felt that Alternative #2 does not fit the community and felt that curb and gutter is more appropriate. Safety concerns for Alternative #2 included the thought that the speed limits with this alternative are too high. Ultimately, it was not felt that this alternative provided additional safety benefits when compared to the other alternatives.

Specific comments from the group's comment sheets concerning Alternative #2 included:

- This option seems to have less impact to resources.
- A question concerning how Blackberry Creek overflow would be handled and if Alternative 2 would change this.
- Concern that this cross-section is too wide; too much adverse impact upon adjacent properties.
- Not a fan of the high tension cable median (HTC).
- Similar to Alternative #1, this option has the greatest impact to environment.
- Depressed median reduces emergency vehicle flexibility.
- Not in favor of this option; prefer urban cross-section and minimal to no impact to the landscape berms.
- Seems reasonable to look at Alternative 2 to mitigate some of the neighborhood impacts west of Orchard.

○ **Alternative #3**

Generally, those who commented on Alternative #3 preferred this alternative because it emphasizes safety due to its inclusion of shoulders and mitigates some impacts, including those to berms when compared to the other alternatives. Some felt that a hybrid alternative should be considered through the corridor. For example, combining with Alternative #2 from Orchard to IL 47. Representatives from Yorkville found Alternative #3 to be the best of the urban alternatives. Those who commented felt that a 45 mile per hour speed limit is acceptable. Others stressed that access to walking and biking paths is important.

Specific comments from the group's comment sheets concerning Alternative #3 included:

- Concerns about storm water runoff; and where water will go before development comes.
- Having a shoulder allows for traffic to flow in the event that a lane was blocked.
- The shoulders provide benefit.
- Concerns regarding the impact to Blackberry Creek overflow.
- From a safety perspective, this alternative seems best.
- This option provides greater distance from roadway to pedestrian walks.
- Paved shoulders seem safer for police and for easier speed traffic enforcement.
- Lower speed limits always are a plus due to the number of homes in area.
- This option provides greater separation between the roadway and new soccer fields, which is a benefit.
- The curb and gutter provides protection for bike path and sidewalk users, and the shoulder provides safety for vehicles.
- Suggest removing north sidewalk and allow a shared walk/bike path on the south side, then tree/shrub impacts can be reduced on north side.
- This option appears to have fewest displacements and least impact to environment.
- Some CAG members asked if this Alternative would provide for future full access between IL 47 and Bertram Road; particularly for full access on US 30 to parcels on the south side.
- Like the urban cross-section, but don't like that it still impacts the berm/ landscape areas.
- Providing a shoulder is a good idea.
- This appears to be the best option in terms of public safety and visual appearance.

- This option seems like a good compromise.
- Questions regarding how this option impacts detention.
- Question as to whether there is any way to use a curb and gutter in the more congested area and as you go west, transition to a rural cross-section.
- This option seems to provide improved vehicular safety.
- Safety concerns about the bicycle path and sidewalk and high travel speeds as children will be using shared path for cycling, parents will be walking strollers.
- There were suggestions that a shoulder for police, fire, and ambulances is a necessity.
- Least impact to environment (floodplain, agriculture).

○ **Alternative #4**

Generally, those who commented on Alternative #4 preferred this alternative because it reduces overall impacts in the project area, including minimizing impacts to landscaping within the Village of Montgomery. It was suggested that Alternative #4 be combined with Alternative #3 outside the landscaped area. It was also suggested that impacts to berms would be reduced if the sidewalk was dropped while maintaining a multiuse path. The lack of maneuverability and resultant safety impacts was considered the main detractor of this alternative. The potential use of “Michigan Turns” was suggested as a means of providing emergency vehicles locations to turn.

Specific comments from the group’s comment sheets concerning Alternative #4 included:

- The Village of Montgomery prefers to preserve as many trees as possible and would like to see a cross section similar to that being constructed on U.S. 30 east of this project.
- Unsafe for pedestrian traffic due to lack of shoulder.
- Safety concern due to lack of maneuverability if a lane is blocked.
- Don’t like the lack of pull-off locations (compared to Alternative #3 which provides shoulder). Is there an option to include periodic pull-offs?
- A CAG member preferred this alternative as it is similar to the section of US 30 east of IL 31 currently under construction.
- This option minimizes impact to adjacent neighborhoods.
- This alternative might improve pedestrian/ bicycle access by opening up additional routes through neighborhoods on south side of roadway.
- The urban cross-section without shoulders does not fit well with future growth.
- The lack of emergency vehicle pull-off area is problematic.
- This is preferred by some CAG members and one suggested it is similar to the section currently being constructed on U.S. 30 between Briarcliff and Goodwin.
- Suggest that the 5-foot sidewalk be eliminated and the 10-foot shared use path be placed on the south side from the IL 47 to Lakewood Creek/Griffin, and then cross to the north side from Lakewood Creek/Griffin to Orchard Road.
- This option because has least impact upon adjacent properties.
- This option improves path user safety.
- This appears to be the best design for reducing impacts to landscaping along U.S.30 west of Orchard Road to Gordon Road.
- The urban cross-section minimizes impact.

After the completion of the Comment Forms, the group held a brief discussion to summarize the overall thoughts of the group on the four alternatives. Overall comments or requests regarding all of the alternatives included:

- Review the need for sidewalk.
- Review topography to select best side for multi-use path.
- Review possibility of creating hybrid alternative that uses segments from each; including “flipping” path at major intersections; minimize impact to berm where possible.
- Consider varying the design elements in appropriate segments of this project; using flexibility for various areas/ road segments rather than an “all or nothing” approach.
- Any alternative should consider future pedestrian bridge over U.S. 30 at ComEd right-of-way, which is documented in the Village of Montgomery’s Comprehensive Plan.
- All alternatives should add signal at Lakewood Creek Drive.

Ultimately, the majority of the group expressed a preference for Alternative #3, Urban – 30’ Raised Median with Shoulders and Curb & Gutter when taking safety and potential impacts into consideration.

A General Understanding of Agreement to eliminate Alternatives, #1 and #2 and to carry forward Alternatives #3 and #4 was achieved.

## **Next Steps**

---

The meeting concluded with a discussion of next steps in the process. This includes refining the alternatives to carry forward and conducting the second public information meeting. After the public meeting, the 4<sup>th</sup> CAG meeting will be held to get the group’s input on the preferred alternative. The final determination on the preferred alternative will be made by IDOT and the Federal Highway Administration, after considering all input. After the preferred alternative is selected, more detailed studies will be performed and a public hearing will be held.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12 PM.