

INTRODUCTION

Public Information Meeting No. 2 for the Quentin Road Phase I Project was held on Tuesday November 15, 2016 at the Holiday Inn Express Chicago-Palatine/N Arlington Heights, Palatine, Illinois from 4:00 P.M. to 7:00 P.M. The purpose of the public meeting was to present the project's purpose and need statement, introduce the alternative analysis results, and gather input and information.

NOTIFICATIONS

Prior to the public meeting, display ads were published in the Daily Herald to announce the public meeting and provide details. The public meeting notice was published on October 28 and November 9, 2016, 18 days and six days before the public meeting, respectively. The public meeting notice was shared with the Village of Palatine and shown on the village's website. Invitation letters were mailed to elected officials and representatives of public agencies. Invitation letters were also sent to over 250 property owners along the project corridor. Lastly, two changeable message signs - one near the intersection of Quentin Road and Dundee Road and one near the intersection of Quentin Road and Lake Cook Road – were placed from November 9 to November 15, announcing the public meeting.

DAY OF MEETING

Attendees were greeted at a registration table and provided a project brochure. The public meeting included an 18 minute looping audio/video presentation that provided an overview of the project and introduced the information in the main room. After viewing the presentation, attendees were directed to the main room which had exhibits on display providing further information about the project. Exhibits presenting the Purpose and Need as well as exhibits presenting the alternative analysis from evaluation rounds 1 and 2 were on display for comment. Additionally on display were typical sections of the alternatives that were considered and exhibits showing the potential bike path crossing alternatives near Camp Reinberg at the Deer Grove Forest Preserve entrance. The project brochure provided a summary of the items in the presentation and on display.

A total of 150 people signed in at the public meeting including: a representative from the office of Cook County Commissioner Greg Goslin; Daily Herald Reporter, Doug Graham; Palatine Village Engineer, Mike Danecki; Palatine Public Works Director, Matt Barry; Palatine District I Village Councilman, Tim Millar; Palatine Superintendent of Parks & Planning, Ed Tynczuk; Deer Park Village Engineer Lee Fell; Kildeer Chief Village Officer, Michael Talbett; and Lake County Division of Transportation Director, Paula Trigg.

METHODS FOR MAKING COMMENTS AND PROVIDING INPUT

A formal comment area was provided at the public meeting where written comments could be made on comment forms. After the meeting, comments were received through email and regular mail. The official public meeting record only included comments received by December 2, 2016.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED

General

About two-thirds of the comments who indicated support for widening Quentin Road supported a four or five lane roadway, while about one-third supported a two or three lane roadway. This level of support is similar to support seen after the December 2015 public meeting and the earlier public meeting in 2009. Responses from residents who live within the project limits continue to favor a four or five lane roadway. In addition, responses from those living within the surrounding communities also continue to support a four or five lane roadway; about four times as often as those favoring a two or three lane roadway.

Quentin Road Phase I – Dundee Road to Lake Cook Road
Summary of Public Information Meeting No. 2 held on November 15, 2016
December 22, 2016

Comment Breakdown

A total of 148 comments were received and were comprised of the following: 67 comments submitted by email, 57 written comments submitted at the public meeting, and 24 comments submitted by regular mail. Of the 148 comments, 57 were received from those who did not attend the public meeting.

The 148 comments were provided by 143 people. Four people provided both a written comment and comment through email while one person provided a comment through email and regular mail.

The comments were reviewed and grouped geographically based on the commenter's address. Five groups were created:

- Residents of Dunhaven Woods (Dunhaven Woods)
- Residents outside of Dunhaven Woods within the project limits (Within Project Limits)
- Residents of Palatine, Deer Park and Inverness outside the project limits (Palatine/Deer Park/Inverness)
- Residents outside of Palatine, Deer Park and Inverness (Other)
- Commenters whose residence is unknown (Unknown)

Comment Type	Total	Dunhaven Woods	Within Project Limits	Palatine/Deer Park/Inverness	Other	Unknown
Written	57	9	6	19	14	9
Email	63	8	5	17	18	15
Mail	23	2	4	11	1	5
Total	143	19	15	47	33	29

Note: Those who provided both written comment and through email or regular mail have been tabulated as written comment while the person who provided comment through email and regular mail has been tabulated as through email.

Roadway Alternatives

Nearly all comments received expressed an opinion on a preferred roadway alternative. Over one-half of these comments favored a four or five lane roadway alternative, while just over one-quarter favored a two or three lane roadway alternative. Support for a four or five lane roadway verse a two or three lane roadway was strongest from both those living within the project limits (59% preferred) and from those living in surrounding communities (79% preferred).

Alternative	Total	Dunhaven Woods	Within Project Limits	Palatine/Deer Park/Inverness	Other	Unknown
Support 2/3 Lanes	34	2	7	7	13	5
Support 4/5 Lanes	65	12	1	27	6	19
Oppose all Alternatives that include Hicks/Ela	9	0	0	3	3	3
Support any Alternative	13	3	0	4	2	4
Oppose all Alternatives	4	0	0	0	4	0
Total	125	17	8	41	28	31

Deer Grove Forest Preserve Bike Path Crossing

About one-third of all comments received addressed an opinion of the Deer Grove Forest Preserve bike path crossing alternative. Forty percent of these comments supported an at-grade crossing, thirty-eight percent supported an underpass, and twenty-two percent supported an overpass. Of those supporting an underpass, they indicated that this was their preferred crossing alternative because it would improve safety and traffic flow along the project corridor.

After consideration of the three alternatives (at-grade crossing, underpass, overpass), an at-grade crossing with a new signalized intersection has been recommended as the likely preferred alternative. Construction of the underpass alternative would require a much larger footprint than an at-grade crossing and would require removal of many mature trees. The large footprint would also affect the use of the recently renovated Camp Reinberg.

Crossing Type	Total	Dunhaven Woods	Within Project Limits	Palatine/Deer Park/Inverness	Other	Unknown
At-Grade	19	1	3	8	3	4
Underpass	18	1	1	12	1	3
Overpass	10	1	0	7	2	0
Total	47	3	4	27	6	7

Other Comments

A number of other comments received mentioned the need to address the following: protecting the environment, adding a separated bike/pedestrian path along the east side of the roadway, and reducing the speed limit within the project corridor.

Comment	Total	Dunhaven Woods	Within Project Limits	Palatine/Deer Park/Inverness	Other	Unknown
Bike/Pedestrian Path	33	0	4	13	6	10
Protect Environment	22	2	2	5	11	2
Reduce Speed Limit	6	3	1	1	1	0