



**Potential I-55 Improvements**  
**at Airport Road and at IL 126/Essington Road**  
**Community Advisory Group Meeting #4**  
**January 31, 2012**

**Summary**

The fourth Community Advisory Group meeting for the potential I-55 improvements at Airport Road and at IL 126 was held on January 31, 2012 at the Bolingbrook Fire Station #4 at 1111 W. Boughton Road, Bolingbrook, IL from 9:30 am to 11:30 am.

To announce the January 31<sup>st</sup> meeting, e-mails were sent to all CAG members. The CAG members who did not provide an e-mail address received phone calls alerting them of the meeting. The e-mail invitation was followed up with a mailing providing the meeting information.

The following CAG members attended:

1. Kim Allen – Romeoville Resident
2. Cameron Bettin – Plainfield Park District
3. Kevin Calkins – Plainfield Resident
4. Nathan Darga – Planner, Village of Romeoville
5. Andi French – Plainfield Township Official
6. Steve Gulden – Romeoville Village Manager
7. Dr. Bernice Holloway – Romeoville Village Clerk
8. Don Hornig – Romeoville Resident
9. Randall Jessen – Plainfield Superintendent of Public Works
10. Brad Johnstone – Plainfield Resident
11. Judy Johnstone – Plainfield Resident
12. Bob Kalnicky – Romeoville Chamber of Commerce
13. Jim Klick – JRPD Board Lewis U. Airport
14. Bill Lamb – Lakelands Community, Plainfield Trustee
15. Michael Lambert – Plainfield Resident
16. Laurie McPhillips – Will Co. Board & Forest Preserve District of Will Co.
17. George M. Milton – Plainfield Resident
18. Tom Mooney – Plainfield Resident
19. Eric Olson – Romeoville Resident
20. Thomas Pawlowicz – Bolingbrook Assistant Village Engineer
21. Barb Poma – Plainfield Resident



22. Dennis Poma – Plainfield Resident
23. Jim Sanders – Plainfield Resident
24. Brian Smith – Will County Board
25. Dave Sniegowski – Property owner at IL 126 & Essington
26. John Zabrocki – Romeoville Village Engineer
27. Tom Gename – Plainfield Resident (Alternate)
28. Bob Zeck – Plainfield Resident (Alternate)

Also present at the meeting were two members of the general public and Allen Staron from Clark Dietz. Clark Dietz is conducting a Phase I study on behalf of IDOT for improvements at the Weber Road interchange with I-55. Steve Schilke and Patrick Rinoso from IDOT were present. Dave Heslinga, Mike Rechterik, Elora Ibay and Heidi Voirol represented V3 Companies at the meeting. Other team members included Mark Dwiggins from the Upchurch Group, and Clarita Lao and Rich Ray from Huff & Huff.

## **Summary of Activities**

The meeting began with a welcome and introductions of the project team members and CAG members. The Phase 1 Study Process, Project Schedule and CAG Meeting #3 were briefly reviewed as an update to the project status.

Dave Heslinga discussed the creation of the 27 initial alternatives for the project. The alternatives were developed based on prior feasibility studies, CAG member input, Village technical input, and FHWA input. Some very similar alternatives were combined into one.

Dave then outlined the evaluation process that will be applied to the initial range of alternatives. The Fatal Flaw factors were applied to the initial alternatives at this meeting. Other evaluation factors that will be applied to the range of alternatives are a Purpose and Need screening, Operational Factors evaluation and Social, Community and Environmental Factors review.

The Fatal Flaw Factors were introduced. The flaws can be broken down into two categories: Major direct impacts to land use and Interchange Access Requirements. Alternatives that had major direct impacts to either residential or business land uses were considered to have a fatal flaw. The interchange access requirements are to minimize impact to the traffic operations on I-55, it is desirable to provide for traffic movements in all directions and a two mile separation is desired in urban areas.

The 27 alternatives were reviewed. These alternates were shown on a screen and an 11"x17" handout was provided showing each possible layout. Each alternative was given a score card that listed residential and business displacements. Also listed was whether the alternative meets access spacing requirements and if it provides full access in all directions. It was stressed to CAG members that while an alternative may have a fatal flaw, parts of that layout may still be a viable option. The overall fatal flaw screening results were compiled. Alternatives that had a fatal flaw are: 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 24, 25, and 27. Alternatives to be carried forward are 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, and 26.



It was announced that the next step is a Public Meeting that will likely take place in April. Following the meeting, the Purpose and Need screening will be applied to the remaining alternatives and CAG meeting #5 will be held in June or July.

## Comments and Questions

CAG members posed questions and comments during the discussions of the alternatives and during the Open Meeting portion of the meeting. The following is a list of those comments/questions:

### During the presentation of the Initial Range of Alternatives

- Consider what is the best option for the community. We do not need to create congested roads especially when train crossings are in the area.
- Some plans have fatal flaws, can we rework them? *Reply: Yes, some of the alternatives can be revised but in some cases the fatal flaw cannot be overcome.*
- Can we combine some of the alternatives? *Reply: Yes, some of the alternatives can be revised or merged with other options.*
- Two-mile separation is important, look at the interchanges at Cass Avenue and Lemont Road along I-55.
- Can you explain the spacing requirement on Alternative 2? *Reply: The interchange access requirements list a two mile separation as desired in urban areas. An interchange at Lockport/Airport and one at 143<sup>rd</sup> Street would only provide 1 mile of separation.*
- On Alternative 1, can you show where the housing impact is? This alternative has a fatal flaw, but the Airport interchange works, can we keep that or is that dropped too? *Reply: The housing impact occurs south of 143<sup>rd</sup> Street, east of I-55. Due to the housing impacts this alternative was dropped.*
- Alternative 2 does not solve the traffic issues at 135<sup>th</sup> Street
- Alternative 3 should not dump more traffic onto Essington Road.
- This one has negative impacts to the agricultural area on the west side between Lockport Road and 143<sup>rd</sup> Street.
- Spacing requirements were discussed on Alternative 4.
- Alternative 4 does not provide a westbound path onto Renwick Road to bypass downtown Plainfield. Plainfield needs westbound access. Isn't Renwick Road a better option than 143<sup>rd</sup> Street? Why would we plan a new road rather than using an existing road? *Reply: Renwick Road is within 1 mile of US Route 30 and therefore does not meet the spacing requirements.*
- A representative from Bolingbrook discussed possible improvements in the area.
- Alternative 4 should add another lane to I-55 from US Route 30 to Renwick Road so there would be no left turn lanes. There should be a full cloverleaf interchange at US Route 30. *Reply: The US Route 30 interchange is already a full access interchange.*
- On Alternative 8, would the old frontage road between Lockport Road and 143<sup>rd</sup> Street remain? *Reply: Yes.*



- Is there a reason that the 143<sup>rd</sup> Street connection is shown differently in Alternative 1 and Alternative 8? *Reply: No, the final proposed layout for the 143<sup>rd</sup> Street Connection has not been determined. The various options were shown throughout the alternatives.*
- On Alternative 9, would there be southbound access at Kings Road? What is the spacing from there to IL 126? Would the IL 126 partial interchange remain? *Reply: Yes, there would be a new southbound entrance from Kings Road to I-55. The spacing from the Kings Road access to the IL 126 access would be approximately 1 mile. The IL 126 partial interchange would remain.*
- On Alternative 10, the Lakelands traffic is better off connecting their north/south entrance to Lakelands Club with a connection to Essington Road. 135<sup>th</sup> Street will have to be widened.
- On Alternative 16, is the distance between the Airport Road and IL 126 interchanges enough? *Reply: The spacing would be approximately 1 mile.*
- On Alternative 17, would the noise, traffic and environment be considered? *Reply: Environmental impacts will be considered during the screening process.*
- Doesn't Alternative 18 run into a lot of wetlands? *Reply: Environmental impacts will be considered during the screening process.*

## During the Open Meeting

- An interchange at Airport Road combined with Alternative 23 would be a good idea.
- Are Plainfield, Bolingbrook and Plainfield considering their Comprehensive Plans in relation to this study? Have they considered it in terms of economic development? *Reply: The question was deferred to the Villages.*
- Based on the projected traffic data provided at the last CAG meeting, an alternative that does not meet northbound on and southbound off of I-55 does not meet the purpose of this study.
- A lot of the alternatives put traffic on Essington Road. Has anyone considered the three schools that are on Essington Road? *Reply: The impact to local traffic on the roadway network will be evaluated once the alternatives are narrowed down further.*
- It is interesting that one major fatal flaw was not discussed – Money. *Reply: Funding and constructions costs are evaluated further once the alternatives have been narrowed down.*
- Are there a lot of cost savings realized by avoiding the residential and business displacements? *Reply: There are cost as well as time savings in avoiding residential and business displacements.*
- Can IDOT add a fourth lane to I-55 between possible interchanges at US Route 30 & IL 126 and IL 126 & Airport Road? *Reply: IDOT does not have plans at this time to widen to add a fourth lane.*
- Is there any update on the Weber Road Phase 1 study? *Reply: An update to the Weber Road Study was provided by representatives from Clark Dietz.*