



## **Meeting Notes Community Advisory Council Meeting #9**

### **Randall Road Improvements Study County Line Road to Ackman Road McHenry County**

**July 17, 2008**

This meeting was the ninth presentation of the Randall Road Improvements Study to the membership of the Community Advisory Council (CAC). The purpose of the meeting was to review the alternative packages including associated conceptual geometry, traffic operations and detailed evaluation results for the study area. The meeting took place at 9:30 a.m. at the Lake in the Hills Village Hall located at 600 Harvest Gate. The agenda for the meeting included the following:

- Introductions
- Approval of April 10, 2008 Meeting Notes
- Summary of CAC Meeting #8
- Review Alternatives
- Review Alternative Packages for Level 3. Detailed Evaluation
- Complete Aesthetics/Visual Evaluation
- Focus for CAC Meeting #10

Following are highlights of the main topics discussed at the meeting.

#### **I. Introductions**

At the meeting there was representation from Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning, City of Crystal Lake, HDR, Kane County Division of Transportation, McHenry County Division of Transportation, , and Village of Lake in the Hills. A copy of the sign-in sheet is an attachment to this document.

#### **II. Approval of April 10, 2008 Meeting Notes**

Meeting notes were sent to CAC membership via e-mail and posted on the project website. Hard copies of the notes were available at the meeting. There were no comments on the April 10, 2008 meeting notes. The meeting notes were approved as presented. The notes will remain posted on the project website.

#### **III. Summary of CAC Meeting #8**

The eighth CAC Meeting focused on the review of the conceptual geometric layout of the alternative packages. The CAC was asked to provide input on each of the alternatives presented at the meeting. The meeting also reviewed the environmental resources in the study area.

#### **IV. Review Alternative Packages for Level 3. Detailed Evaluation**

A handout presenting the Alternative Packages was distributed to the CAC membership. The handout summarized the type of improvements for each alternative and the number of access points that would be closed for each alternative. A second handout summarized the traffic operations for each of the alternatives. It was also noted that the Preferred Alternative may either be one of the alternatives or be a combination of options from the Alternatives. The CAC was reminded that the Pedestrian Options may be added onto any of the alternatives presented.

Once the alternatives and traffic operations were explained, the CAC membership was divided into two groups. The groups were led to stations containing the geometric layouts of the alternatives. The exhibits indicated the proposed right-of-way, potential acquisition of properties, and some of the environmental impacts from the proposed alternatives. CAC membership was asked to review the layouts, ask questions, and provide comments.

The following comments were provided on the Alternatives presented:

- Could you combine Alternative 1 north section with the south Section of Alternative 2? The answer was yes, any of the Alternatives could be combined together and that the delay and the level-of-service would need to be evaluated for the new alternative. The traffic operations model would have to be re-run with those options selected to determine how the traffic would operate.
- The potential relocations identified on the geometric layouts are located within 20 feet of the proposed ROW. These are in addition to the properties that are located within the proposed ROW and are considered to be relocations.
- The results of the traffic operations indicate that the alternatives presented only marginally improve the traffic delay along Randall Road when compared to existing conditions. Could there be a policy change of land use along the Corridor that would ultimately change the use of the roadway? It was noted that although the improvements would only marginally improve the operations when compared to existing, they would substantially improve operations over the No-Action Alternative. In addition, the change of land use is a separate issue that needs to be addressed through each individual city.
- McHenry County stated that Randall Road acts as an expressway that connects to I-90, Randall Road is not only a local access road, but a regional access road.
- Lake in the Hills stated that they could not support Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 due to access and economic concerns.
- Crystal Lake requested that two additional options be evaluated for the North section of Alternative 4. The options are:
  - Signalize Village as continuous green-T, add north bound left (NBL) and east bound left (EBL) movements. Signalize Alexandra, add NBL and EBL movements. Revert Angela back to a right-in/right-out, thus removing NBL and EBL movements.
  - Add NBL movements for Village and Alexandra (no signal). Angela stays signalized as shown in Alternative 4.

- Are the pedestrian movements included in the traffic operations model? The answer is no, the existing pedestrian crossings were not modeled. What are the pedestrian crossing distances, if the crossing distances remain at the current locations? McHenry County agreed to include pedestrians in the analysis.
- The pedestrian crossing options generally include providing a grade-separated overpass/underpass of Randall Road. At-grade crossings are not currently being recommended since the width of Randall Road will be relatively large and the traffic volumes and speed relatively high. Kane County suggested that at-grade pedestrian crossings be included in planning process. Although it may appear that pedestrians will chose a safe, grade-separated crossing over a congested at-grade crossing; they have found in their research this to not be true. The grade-separated crossings are generally too long and take too much time.

CAC membership was then asked to provide aesthetic/visual feedback for each of the Alternatives. The CAC membership was asked to vote on whether an alternative had high, medium, or low esthetics. The overall results of the voting are summarized below:

Single-Point Urban Interchange at Algonquin Road –Low

Grade-Separated Intersections at Algonquin Road - Low

Additional Turn Lanes at Algonquin Road - Medium

Continuous Flow Intersection at Algonquin Road – Medium

Green T Signal at Angela Lane – Medium

Traffic Signal at Angela Lane – Medium

CAC membership was then reminded of the purpose of the CAC (to be a liaison between the public, their organization, and McHenry County). There was a discussion about providing comments on behalf of your organization. McHenry County does not want any organization to be surprised about what they see. They expect that CAC membership distributes information presented at the meetings to their staff and interested public and that CAC membership bring forward any comments generated by their respective organization. McHenry County also noted that they are available upon request to meet with individuals within an organization to present the study. This does not include McHenry County presenting at a Council or Village Board meeting; that is the CAC representative responsibility.

## **V. Review Detailed Evaluation Matrix**

A handout summarizing the detailed evaluation for each alternative was presented to the CAC. The matrix contained the criteria that were used to evaluate each alternative and the results of that measurement. The matrix provided the results of each alternative from County Line Road to Ackman Road, and results for each alternative for the South section (County Line Road to Miller Road) and North section (North of Miller Road to Ackman Road). The pedestrian options results could be added to any alternative to show the cumulative impacts when adding in the pedestrian options.

## **VI. Focus for CAC Meeting #10**

The focus for CAC Meeting #10 (August 28, 2008) is to present the traffic operations model (VISSIM) for the alternatives and to discuss avoidance/minimization options to Section 4(f) resources. The meeting will also focus on the Public Informational Meeting to be held on September 23, 2008.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

