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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Project Description

The I-90/94 at I-290 Circle Interchange is located in downtown Chicago, adjacent to the west end of the central business district (see Figure A.1). The Circle Interchange is highly congested and operates in breakdown conditions for most of the day. The Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) proposes the rehabilitation of the Circle Interchange. The purposes of the proposed project are to improve safety, reduce congestion, and address the aging facility conditions.

The Circle Interchange was built in the late 1950s and early 1960s. The Circle Interchange links the Dan Ryan Expressway (I-90/94) to the south, the Kennedy Expressway (I-90/94) to the north, the Eisenhower Expressway (I-290) to the west, and Congress Parkway to the east. Local traffic reporters commonly refer to this interchange as the “Circle” because from above, the curving ramps appear to form concentric rings.

The study area for the Noise Analysis is shown on Figure A.1 of Appendix A. The study area termini are Lake Street to the north, Loomis Street to the west, Roosevelt Road to the south, and Canal Street to the east.

1.2. Existing Land Use

The Circle Interchange is located in a highly developed urban area of downtown Chicago. The surrounding land uses are a mixture of residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional uses. The residences are multi-story, multi-unit buildings that are often “zero-setback buildings” and directly overlook the freeways.

The University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) is situated in the southwest quadrant of the Circle Interchange. UIC uses within 500 feet of the Circle Interchange include indoor and outdoor recreation facilities, open space, residence halls, parking structures, and the UIC Pavilion.

The Greektown neighborhood is located in the northwest quadrant of the Circle Interchange. Greektown uses include multi-story residences, offices, restaurants, retail, and the National Hellenic Museum.

To the northeast of the Circle Interchange are multi-story residences, offices, retail, restaurants, and the Old St. Patrick’s Church. St. Patrick’s consists of a school, outdoor playground, rectory, and the Old St. Patrick’s Church that is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The southeast quadrant of the Circle Interchange is mostly light industrial, along with multi-story residences facing Congress Parkway. The Maxwell Street Market is an outdoor market held every Sunday, and is located on Des Plaines Street between Roosevelt Road and Harrison Street. Des Plaines Street is closed during the street market.
2. **NOISE BACKGROUND AND REGULATIONS**

2.1. **Noise Background**

Noise is defined as unwanted sound, which is produced by the vibration of sound pressure waves. Sound pressure levels are used to measure the intensity of sound and are described in terms of **decibels (dB)**. Decibels are a logarithmic unit, which expresses the ratio of sound pressure level to a standard reference scale. The decibel scale has an audible range of 0 to 120 and is used to show the amount of sound pressure at a given location from the general environment of specific sources.

Sound is composed of various frequencies that are measured in cycles per second or Hertz (Hz). The human ear can detect a wide range of frequencies from 20 to 20,000 Hz, but is most sensitive to sounds over a frequency range of 200 to 5,000 Hz. The human ear does not respond in a uniform manner to different frequency sounds. A sound pressure level of 70 dB will be perceived as much louder at 1,000 Hz than at 100 Hz. To account for this, various weighting methods have been developed to reflect human sensitivity to noise. The purpose of a weighting method is to de-emphasize the frequency ranges in which the human ear is less sensitive. The most commonly used measure of noise level is the **A-weighted sound level (dB(A))**. The dB(A) sound level is widely used for transportation-related noise measurements and specifications for community noise ordinances and standards. The dB(A) has been shown to be highly correlated to human response to noise.

Because of the logarithmic decibel scale, a doubling of the number of sources, such as the number of vehicles on a roadway, increases traffic sound levels by 3 dB(A). A source emitting a sound level of 60 dB(A) combined with another sound source of 60 dB(A) results in a combined sound level of 63 dB(A), not 120 dB(A). An increase of 26 percent in traffic volumes will increase traffic sound levels by 1 dB(A).

Loudness, compared to physical sound measurement, refers to how people judge a sound and varies from person to person. Studies of traffic noise have shown that an increase of 3 dB(A), such as from a doubling of traffic volumes, will be barely detectable by the human ear. A listener often judges an increase of 5 dB(A) to be readily noticeable and an increase of 10 dB(A) to be twice as loud. A change of sound level of 2 dB(A) or less will not be perceptible. Therefore, traffic volumes must at least double to result in a barely noticeable sound increase of 3 dB(A).

In addition to noise fluctuating in frequency, environmental noise will fluctuate in intensity from moment to moment. Over a period of time there will be quiet moments and peak levels resulting from noisy, identifiable sources (trucks, aircraft, etc.). Because of these fluctuations, it is common practice to average these noise level fluctuations over a specified period of time. The equivalent sound level, or $L_{eq}$, is widely accepted as a valid measure of community noise. The $L_{eq}$ is equal to the equivalent steady state noise level which, in a stated time period, would contain the same acoustical energy as the time-varying noise levels that actually occurred during the same time period. The hourly value of $L_{eq}$, based upon the peak-hour percentage of the annual average daily traffic, is referred to as $L_{eq}(h)$. Surveys have shown that $L_{eq}$ properly predicts annoyance, and this descriptor is commonly used for traffic noise measurement, prediction, and impact assessment.

2.2. **Federal Regulations**

The FHWA has established the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) to assess potential traffic noise impacts and to determine where noise abatement needs to be evaluated. The NAC are categorized by land uses, and are based on noise levels associated with the interference of speech communication. The NAC are described in Table 2.1. A traffic noise impact occurs on a project when predicted noise levels approach, meet, or exceed the NAC criteria listed in Table 2.1, or when the predicted noise levels are substantially higher than the existing noise level.
### Table 2.1

**FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC): Hourly A-Weighted Sound Level in Decibels (dB(A))**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Category</th>
<th>$L_{eq}(h)$</th>
<th>Evaluation Location</th>
<th>Description of Activity Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
<td>Lands on which serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B(1)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
<td>Residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C(1)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
<td>Active sports areas, amphitheaters, auditoriums, campgrounds, cemeteries, day care centers, hospitals, libraries, medical facilities, parks, picnic areas, places of worship, playgrounds, public meeting rooms, public or nonprofit institutional structures, radio studios, recording studios, recreational areas, Section 4(f) sites, schools, television studios, trails and trail crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>Auditoriums, day care centers, hospitals, libraries, medical facilities, places of worship, public meeting rooms, public or nonprofit institutional structures, radio studios, recording studios, schools, and television studios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E(1)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
<td>Hotels, motels, offices, restaurant/bars, and other developed lands, properties or activities not included in A-D, or F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Agriculture, airports, bus yards, emergency services, industrial, logging, maintenance facilities, manufacturing, mining, rail yards, retail facilities, shipyards, utilities (water resources, water treatment, electrical) and warehousing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Undeveloped lands that are not permitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes undeveloped lands permitted for this activity category.

Within the Circle Interchange project area, the noise-sensitive receptors are a mixture of residential, commercial, and institutional uses. The residential and institution uses fall into Activity Category B and Activity Category C, which have an outdoor NAC of 67 dB(A) (Table 2.1). Other receptors are office, hotels, and restaurants under the Activity Category E with an exterior NAC of 72 dB(A).

#### 2.3. State Regulations

This noise analysis has been performed in accordance with the IDOT policy that applies to Type I projects. The definition of a Type I project, as described by the IDOT *Highway Traffic Noise Assessment Manual*, includes the addition of through-traffic lane(s) and the addition or relocation of interchange lanes or ramps.

To assess potential traffic noise impacts, the FHWA has established the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) for various land uses and activities (Table 2.1). According to FHWA guidance and IDOT noise policy, a traffic noise impact occurs on a project when either or both of the following conditions would occur:

- The predicted build noise levels approach, meet, or exceed the applicable NAC in Table 2.1. According to IDOT, noise levels “approach” the NAC when they are within 1 dB(A) of the applicable NAC.
- The predicted build noise levels are substantially higher than the existing noise levels. According to IDOT, a substantial increase is considered to be greater than 14 dB(A), representing more than a doubling of the perceived existing noise level.

Many of the noise-sensitive receptors within the Circle Interchange project area fall under the Activity Category B and Activity Category C, which have an applicable NAC of 67 dB(A) $L_{eq}(h)$. In these areas, a predicted noise level of 66 dB(A) would “approach” the NAC and would be considered a noise impact.
3. NOISE RECEPTOR SELECTION

IDOT defines a receptor as a discrete or representative location of a common noise environment for any of the FHWA Activity Categories listed in Table 2.1. Primary consideration should be given to exterior areas where frequent human use occurs for Activity Categories A, B, C, and E.

This Noise Analysis reviewed land uses within 400 to 500 feet of the edges of the Circle Interchange project area, including the entire first block of land uses. Receptors have been identified by field investigations, aerial photographs, coordination with project engineers, and public input from the Project Working Group (PWG). Potential noise-sensitive receptors then were grouped into Common Noise Environments (CNEs). Within each CNE are representative receptors, which are noise analysis locations representing other similar receptors within the same CNE. Larger CNEs include multiple representative receptors based on distance from the Circle Interchange and shielding by buildings. In mixed-use buildings, the most sensitive land use (NAC B or C) was evaluated. The land uses around the Circle Interchange are shown in Figure A.7 in Appendix A.

The analysis point for each receptor is the area where frequent outdoor human activity occurs. For receptors with balconies, the receptor location is the balcony closest to the Circle Interchange. The worst-case representative balcony might not be the lowest floor, because of topographic features. Other outdoor uses analyzed include playgrounds, outdoor dining, parks, and courtyards. For receptors without balconies and other areas of outdoor use, the receptor location is outside the main entrance of the building.

The CNEs and representative receptors for the proposed Circle Interchange project are described in Table 3.1 below. The CNEs are shown on Figure A.2 in Appendix A, and the representative receptors are shown in Figure A.4 in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNE</th>
<th>CNE Description, Location, and Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) Activity Category</th>
<th>Worst Case Representative Receptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences West of I-90/94, north of Randolph NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 1-1: Fourth-floor balcony, eastside of building (worst-case balcony facing I-90/94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Commercial Area West of I-90/94, north of Washington NAC Activity Category E = 72 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 2-1: Haymarket Pub, outdoor dining on northside of building, facing Randolph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences West of Halsted NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 3-1: Fourth-floor balcony on eastside of building, worst-case balcony facing Halsted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Skybridge Tower, Multi-Unit Residences West of I-90/94, between Washington and Madison NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 4-1: Fifth-floor balcony on eastside of building (worst-case balcony facing I-90/94; lower levels are parking)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5A  | Greektown Neighborhood West of I-90/94, between Washington and Monroe NAC Activity Category E = 72 dB(A) | CNE 5A-1: Crown Plaza Hotel, third-floor corner balcony on southside of building (worst-case balcony, balconies face north and south)  
CNE 5A-2: Second block office building, eastside entrance onto Halsted |
<p>| 5B  | WCIU Television Studio NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A) | CNE 5B-1: TV Studio building, eastside entrance onto Halsted |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNE</th>
<th>CNE Description, Location, and Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) Activity Category</th>
<th>Worst Case Representative Receptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Greektown Neighborhood (second block) West of Halsted, at Monroe and Jackson NAC Activity Category E = 72 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 6A-1: Athena restaurant, outdoor dining along Halsted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences (second block) North of Adams, west of Halsted NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 6B-1: Residential building, entrance onto Halsted (no balconies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences (second block) South of Jackson, west of Halsted NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 6C-1: Residential building, entrance onto Halsted (no balconies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences West of I-90/94, along Jackson NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 7-1: Building north of Jackson, southside entrance onto Jackson (no balconies) CNE 7-2: 770 Lofts third-floor balcony, worst-case balcony on east side of building, overlooking I90/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>National Hellenic Museum West of I-90/94, at Van Buren NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 8-1: Museum, middle of roof-top terrace CNE 8-2: Greek temple, outdoor area south of Van Buren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Offices North of Van Buren NAC Activity Category E = 72 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 9-1: Second-block office building, SE entrance onto Green Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences (second block) North of Van Buren, east of Green NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 10-1: Fifth-floor balcony, worst-case balcony on east side of building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences (second block) 1st Floor Offices North of Van Buren, east of Peoria NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 11-1: Westside entrance onto Peoria (no balconies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12A</td>
<td>Office Area North of I-290, west of Green NAC Activity Category E = 72 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 12A-1: Rice Building, westside entrance on Green CNE 12A-2: Rice Building, eastside entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences North of I-290, west of Green NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 12B-1: 400 S Green Street, entrance onto Green CNE 12B-2: 400 S Green Street, west side recessed balconies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lexington College (second block) North of Van Buren, west of Peoria NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 13-1: Lexington College, eastside entrance onto Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>UIC College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs North of I-290 and west of Peoria NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 14-1: Building entrance onto Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Office Building North of Van Buren, west of Peoria NAC E = 72 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 15-1: Building entrance onto Van Buren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences (second block) North of Van Buren on Jackson Blvd NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 16-1: Building back entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE</td>
<td>CNE Description, Location, and Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) Activity Category</td>
<td>Worst Case Representative Receptors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17  | Multi-Unit Residences North of I-290, east of Morgan NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A) | CNE 17-1: East Building, Westside entrance onto Sangamon (no balconies)  
CNE 17-2: Outdoor courtyard, at south end of Sangamon Street  
CNE 17-3: West Building, third floor balcony facing I-290 (worst-case balcony)  
CNE 17-4: Second block residences, fourth floor balcony overlooking Van Buren  
CNE 17-5: Shielded balcony, located between multi-unit residential building and UIC CUPPA. |
| 18A | Multi-Unit Residences North of I-290, west of Morgan NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A) | CNE 18A-1: Residential building, SE corner entrance onto Tilden and Morgan (no balconies) |
| 18B | Office Buildings North of I-290, between Morgan and Aberdeen NAC Activity Category E = 72 dB(A) | CNE 18B-1: Second block office building, main entrance onto Van Buren |
| 19  | Office Buildings North of I-290, between Aberdeen and Racine NAC Activity Category E = 72 dB(A) | CNE 19-1: Architectural Studio, main entrance west side of building |
| 20A | Multi-Unit Residences North of Van Buren and west of Racine NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A) | CNE 20A-1: Residential Building, main entrance east side of building onto Racine (no individual balconies) |
| 20B | Office and Restaurant Uses North of I-290, west of Racine NAC Activity Category E = 72 dB(A) | CNE 20B-1: Ethyl's outdoor dining area on southside of building, west of Racine and north of Van Buren  
CNE 20B-2: Helix Building, main entrance east side of building onto Racine |
| 21  | Hubbard Street Dance Studio East of Racine and north of Van Buren NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A) | CNE 21-1: Dance Studio entrance onto Racine |
| 22  | Multi-Unit Residences North of I-290, east of Throop Street NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A) | CNE 22-1: East Building, 3rd floor balcony facing I-290 (worst-case balcony)  
CNE 22-2: West Building, 3rd floor balcony facing I-290 (worst-case balcony)  
CNE 22-3: Second block residences north of Jackson, 4th floor balcony facing Jackson (worst-case balcony) |
| 23  | Multi-Unit Residences North of I-290, between Throop and Loomis NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A) | CNE 23-1: Apartment building west of Throop, outdoor use area in back (no individual balconies)  
CNE 23-2: Apartment complex interior courtyard  
CNE 23-3: South block of apartment buildings, worst-case front entrance onto Van Buren |
<p>| 24  | Andrew Jackson Language Academy South of I-290, east of Loomis NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A) | CNE 24-1: Outdoor play area |
| 25  | Multi-Unit Residences South of Harrison, between Loomis and Racine NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A) | CNE 25-1: Residential backyards, facing Harrison, at ground level |
| 26  | UIC Student Services Building South of I-290, west of Racine NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A) | CNE 26-1: Entrance/courtyard at southeast corner of building, facing Racine and Harrison |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNE</th>
<th>CNE Description, Location, and Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) Activity Category</th>
<th>Worst Case Representative Receptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Offsets&lt;br&gt;South of Harrison, west of Racine&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category E = 72 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 27-1: Second block office building, main entrance southeast corner of building facing Harrison and Racine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>UIC Pavilion&lt;br&gt;South of I-290, east of Racine&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 28-1: Main Entrance, southwest corner of building facing Racine and Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>UIC Facilities&lt;br&gt;South of Harrison&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 29-1: University Hall Tower, open space area on south side of Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>UIC Performing Arts and Theater Buildings&lt;br&gt;South of I-290, west of Morgan&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 30-1: Outdoor courtyard and open area, southeast corner of buildings facing Morgan and Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>UIC Harrison Field (lawn area)&lt;br&gt;South of I-290, east of Peoria overpass&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 31-1: Approximate middle of open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>UIC Residence Halls&lt;br&gt;South of Harrison and west of Halsted&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 32-1: Outdoor courtyard facing Halsted (residence halls do not have individual balconies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>UIC Recreational Facilities&lt;br&gt;West of I-90/94, east of Halsted&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 33-1: Outdoor tennis and basketball courts&lt;br&gt;CNE 33-2: Student Recreation Facility Building, westside main entrance facing Halsted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>UIC Facilities&lt;br&gt;West of I-90/94, between Roosevelt and Polk&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 34-1: Plant Research Laboratory, outdoor plot facing South Union Avenue and Taylor&lt;br&gt;CNE 34-2: Roosevelt Road Building, southside outdoor open space facing Roosevelt&lt;br&gt;CNE 34-3: Jane Addams Hull-House, outdoor courtyard southside of house west of Halsted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Maxwell Street Market&lt;br&gt;East of I-90/94, along Des Plaines between Polk and Roosevelt&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category E = 72 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 35-1: Market outdoor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35B</td>
<td>Recording Studios&lt;br&gt;West of Des Plaines between Harrison and Polk&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category D = 52 db(A) (Interior)</td>
<td>CNE 35B-1: Westside of building, overlooking I-90/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Circuit Court of Cook County&lt;br&gt;South of Harrison, between Clinton and Jefferson&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 36-1: Courthouse northside entrance onto Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences&lt;br&gt;South of Congress Parkway, between Clinton and Jefferson&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 37-1: Second floor balcony, worst-case balcony on northside of building overlooking Congress Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Hotel&lt;br&gt;South of Congress Parkway, west of Canal&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category E = 72 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 38-1: Hotel rooftop swimming pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences&lt;br&gt;North of Congress Parkway, between Clinton and Jefferson&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 39-1: Second floor balcony, worst-case balcony on southside of building overlooking Congress Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE</td>
<td>CNE Description, Location, and Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) Activity Category</td>
<td>Worst Case Representative Receptors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences&lt;br&gt;East of I-90/94 and north of Van Buren&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 40-1: Residential building SW corner of Jackson and Des Plaines sixth-floor balcony, worst-case balcony on north side&lt;br&gt;CNE 40-2: Residential building NW corner of Van Buren and Des Plaines fifth floor balcony, worst-case on westside&lt;br&gt;CNE 40-3: Residential building NE corner of Van Buren and Des Plaines third floor balcony, worst-case on southside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Offices&lt;br&gt;North of Congress Parkway&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category E = 72 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 41-1: Office building NE corner of Clinton and Congress Parkway, entrance onto Clinton&lt;br&gt;CNE 41-2: Second block office building, entrance onto Van Buren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences&lt;br&gt;East of I-90/94, between Jackson and Adams&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 42-1: Haberdasher Square Lofts lower third floor balcony, worst-case balcony on northside&lt;br&gt;CNE 42-2: Residential highrise south of Adams fifth floor balcony, worst-case balcony on westside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Offices&lt;br&gt;East of Des Plaines&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category E = 72 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 43-1: Office building east of Des Plaines, entrance onto Des Plaines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Heritage Green Park&lt;br&gt;East of Des Plaines, north of Adams&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 44-1: Outdoor area near statue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Old St. Patrick’s Church&lt;br&gt;East of I-90/94 and north of Adams&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 45-1: Church main entrance onto Des Plaines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>St. Patrick’s Rectory&lt;br&gt;East of I-90/94 and north of Adams&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 46-1: Rectory main entrance onto Adams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>St. Patrick’s Playground&lt;br&gt;East of I-90/94 and north of Adams&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 47-1: Outdoor play area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48B</td>
<td>Archdiocese of Chicago’s Joseph Cardinal Bernardin Archives and Record Center&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category C = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 48B-1 Front door of archive building on Monroe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Presidential Towers Multi-Unit Residences&lt;br&gt;East of Des Plaines, between Monroe and Madison&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 49-1: Building westside entrance onto Des Plaines (no individual balconies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Offices&lt;br&gt;East of I-90/94&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category E = 72 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 50-1: Office building south of Washington, northside entrance onto Washington&lt;br&gt;CNE 50-2: Social Security Administration Building, westside entrance onto Des Plaines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences&lt;br&gt;East of I-90/94 and south of Randolph&lt;br&gt;NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A)</td>
<td>CNE 51-1: Fourth-Floor balcony, worst-case balcony on southside of building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE</td>
<td>CNE Description, Location, and Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) Activity Category</td>
<td>Worst Case Representative Receptors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 52  | Commercial Area East of I-90/94, between Randolph and Lake NAC Activity Category E = 72 dB(A) | CNE 52-1: Office building south of Lake, northside entrance onto Lake  
CNE 52-2: Outdoor dining area, east of Des Plaines |
| 53  | Multi-Unit Residences North of Randolph and east of Des Plaines NAC Activity Category B = 67 dB(A) | CNE 53-1: Residential balcony on 6th floor on westside of building, worst-case balcony |
4. NOISE MONITORING

4.1. Field Noise Measurement Methodology

A series of site visits were conducted by TranSystems in October 2012, November 2012, and January 2013, to identify noise-sensitive receptors and to measure the existing noise environment at representative locations within the study area. The purposes of the noise measurements are to describe the existing environment, to identify major sources of sound in the project area, and to validate the TNM computer-modeling techniques. Noise measurements were performed consistent with the FHWA Report Number FHWA-PD-96-046, Measurement of Highway-Related Noise (May, 1996).

Noise measurements were taken with a Larson Davis Model LxT, which is a Type 1 sound level meter (SLM). The response switch on the noise meter was set to "fast" and the weighting was set to "A". The $L_{eq}$ levels were recorded over 15-minute noise sampling periods. An acoustic calibrator was used to calibrate the meter before each measurement. During each noise measurement, the noise meter was tripod-mounted and the microphone located at approximately five feet (average ear height) above ground surface. No monitoring was conducted at balconies due to access issues. In locations where worst-case representative receptors are located on balconies, additional modeling was conducted at ground level for noise-monitoring validation purposes. The foam windscreen (supplied by the manufacturer) was used during all sound measurements.

4.2. Monitoring Results

The noise measurements at the Circle Interchange are summarized in Table 4.1 below and are shown on Figure A.3 in Appendix A. The field measurement data sheets are provided in Appendix C. The noise measurements in Table 4.1 have been rounded to the nearest whole decibel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor (Monitoring Location)</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>FHWA/IDOT NAC $L_{eq}$ (dB(A))</th>
<th>Measured Noise Level $L_{eq}$ (dB(A))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNE 1-1 (M15)*</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences West of I-90/94, north of Randolph</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 4-1 (M16)*</td>
<td>Skybridge Tower, Multi-Unit Residences West of I-90/94, between Washington and Madison</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 7-2 (M6)*</td>
<td>770 Lofts Multi-Unit Residences West of I-90/94, south of Jackson</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 8-2 (M5)</td>
<td>Greektown temple outdoor area south of Van Buren</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 17-2 (M4)</td>
<td>Outdoor courtyard parkland between residential buildings at south end of Sangamon Street</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 23-3 (M17)*</td>
<td>Academy Square Apartments Multi-Unit Residences North of I-290, between Throop and Loomis</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The noise measurement sites were selected at land uses adjacent to the Circle Interchange. The monitoring locations overlooked the mainlines and ramps, where traffic noise from the Circle Interchange is dominant. The measured $L_{eq}$ ranged from 65 to 80 dB(A) (Table 4.1). The highest measured noise level was 80 dB(A) at CNE 42-1, the Haberdasher Square Lofts, which is a location at the right-of-way line directly overlooking the northbound lanes of I-90/94, and site M15 CNE 1-1, the multi-family residences north of Randolph. The measured $L_{eq}$ at 14 of the 18 noise monitoring locations approached or exceeded the FHWA/IDOT noise abatement criteria (NAC). 2 of the 18 sites were located in areas later determined to be NAC Category F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor (Monitoring Location)</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>FHWA/IDOT NAC $L_{eq}$ (dB(A))</th>
<th>Measured Noise Level $L_{eq}$ (dB(A))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNE 24-1 (M18)*</td>
<td>Andrew Jackson Language Academy South of I-290, east of Loomis</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 31-1 (M3)</td>
<td>UIC Harrison Field (lawn area) South of I-290, east of Peoria overpass</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 33-1 (M2)</td>
<td>Outdoor tennis and basketball courts UIC Recreational Facilities West of I-90/94, east of Halsted</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 34-1 (M1)*</td>
<td>UIC Facilities West of I-90/94</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 35-1 (M13)</td>
<td>Maxwell Street Market East of I-90/94, along Des Plaines between Polk and Roosevelt</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 37-1 (M11)*</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences South of Congress Parkway, between Clinton and Jefferson</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 39-1 (M10)*</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences North of Congress Parkway, between Clinton and Jefferson</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 42-1 (M8)*</td>
<td>Haberdasher Square Lofts at end of Quincy Street, overlooking northbound I-90/94</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 47-1 (M9)</td>
<td>outdoor playground Old St. Patrick's Church</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 51-1 (M14)*</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences East of I-90/94 and south of Randolph</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Monitoring sites in Table 4.1 marked with asterisk (Mi)* were near the noise receptor analysis site, where public access was available.
5. NOISE ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

5.1. Traffic Noise Model (TNM)

Traffic noise levels have been predicted with the FHWA Traffic Noise Model (TNM), Version 2.5. TNM is the computer program recommended by FHWA for highway traffic noise prediction and analysis. TNM computes highway traffic noise at nearby receptors and evaluates various heights and locations of highway noise barriers.

Traffic noise levels depend primarily on the number of automobiles and trucks, speeds, and distances of receivers from the roadway. TNM also considers the effects of intervening structures, terrain, vegetation, pavement type, grades, intersections, and atmospheric conditions. The noise model does not include noises from sources other than traffic.

TNM computes traffic noise based on measurements of sound levels from thousands of vehicles operating under different conditions. This database includes vehicles cruising at various speeds, idling vehicles, acceleration, several pavement types, and up-hill grades. The two components of vehicle noise are tire/pavement noise and engine/exhaust noise. The relative contributions of each component depend on the noise frequency, vehicle type, and throttle condition.

Predicting traffic noise levels with available computer models generally is limited to distances of 500 feet from the roadway. As the distance increases, the number and scale of variables affecting noise propagation, such as terrain and meteorological conditions, increases substantially.

5.2. Traffic Volumes, Composition, and Speeds

The traffic data used in this noise analyses have been provided by IDOT and are based on actual 2012 traffic counts at the Circle Interchange. Traffic conditions have been evaluated for the weekday AM peak hour, because the AM peak hour has the highest overall traffic volumes and truck percentages in the Circle Interchange. Traffic data are provided in Appendix B.

The speed limits on the mainlines are 45 miles per hour (mph) through the Circle Interchange, although I-290 is 55 mph west of the Circle. Speeds on the system ramps range from 25 to 40 mph, and are based on advisory speeds.

The TNM noise model uses three vehicle types: automobiles, medium trucks and heavy trucks. The percentages of medium and heavy trucks were assigned to each ramp and mainline based on the IDOT traffic counts (Appendix B). Based on the IDOT counts for heavy vehicles (HV), the single-unit (SU) vehicles were assumed to be medium trucks and the multi-unit (MU) vehicles were assumed to be heavy trucks.

5.3. Project Setting and Noise Propagation Environment

The project area is a highly developed urban area of downtown Chicago. The major noise source is traffic on the mainlines and ramps of the Circle Interchange, particularly at receptors adjacent to the Circle Interchange. Other sources of transportation noise are traffic on the numerous side streets and the CTA Blue Line, which runs in the median of I-290 in the western leg of the interchange. Noise sources also include the electrical substation and other industrial uses in the southeast quadrant of the Circle Interchange.

Noise propagation is influenced by the numerous structures, retaining walls, below-grade alignments of the mainlines, and elevated ramps. Most of I-90/94 and I-290 are located in a depressed cut surrounded by
retaining walls and slopes, and are below the grade of adjacent receptors. Many of the existing retaining walls partially shield traffic noise, where they block the line-of-sight between a receptor and the roadways. The Congress Parkway is an elevated structure and is above the grade of adjacent receptors.

For noise modeling purposes, the project area is assumed to be “hard” terrain to represent the paved conditions of the developed urban area. The project area has few areas of grass lawns and minimal trees. The terrain outside the Circle Interchange right-of-way is relatively flat.

5.4. TNM Model (Validation)

The TNM model validation process verifies the accuracy of the TNM model runs used to predict the existing noise levels for the proposed project. The model validation process compares the noise monitoring results to the TNM-predicted existing traffic noise levels. Under IDOT noise policies, noise monitoring results generally should be within +/-3 dB(A) of the TNM-predicted results for the model to be considered validated.

Table D.1 in Appendix D compares the TNM-predicted $L_{eq}$ for the existing conditions to the corresponding measured $L_{eq}$ at each noise measurement site at the Circle Interchange. The TNM-predicted $L_{eq}$ were based on the 2012 traffic counts for the interchange mainlines and ramps (see Appendix B). Monitored noise levels were within 3 dB(A) of the modeled noise levels, validating the noise model.
6. TNM RESULTS

Traffic noise levels for the Circle Interchange have been predicted with the TNM model. Table 6.1 presents the predicted traffic $L_{eq}$ levels at representative receptors along the Circle Interchange. The predicted noise levels in Table 6.1 have been based on the AM peak-hour traffic volumes and posted speed limits for the roadways and ramps of the Circle Interchange (see Appendix B: Traffic Data). Figure A.4 in Appendix A shows the receptor locations analyzed along the Circle Interchange.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNE/Receptor</th>
<th>Receptor Activity Category</th>
<th>FHWA NAC $L_{eqh}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>2012 AM Predicted $L_{eqh}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>2040 AM No-Build $L_{eqh}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>2040 AM Proposed $L_{eqh}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>Increase from Existing to Proposed $L_{eqh}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>Impact Distinction Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northwest Quadrant – Greektown</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>Outdoor dining area</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>Skybridge residences</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A-1</td>
<td>Crown Plaza Hotel</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A-2</td>
<td>Office building</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B-1</td>
<td>TV Studio</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A-1</td>
<td>Outdoor dining</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B-1</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C-1</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>770 Lofts</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>Museum rooftop terrace</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-2</td>
<td>Greek temple outdoor area</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-1</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-1</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-1</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12A-1</td>
<td>Office building, west entrance</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12A-2</td>
<td>Office building, main entrance (east side)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B-1</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences main entrance (east side)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

September 13, 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNE/Receptor</th>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Activity Category</th>
<th>FHWA NAC $L_{eqh}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>2012 AM Predicted Existing $L_{eqh}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>2040 AM No-Build $L_{eqh}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>2040 AM Proposed $L_{eqh}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>Increase from Existing to Proposed $L_{eqh}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>Impact Distinction Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12B-2</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences west balcony</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-1</td>
<td>Lexington College</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-1</td>
<td>UIC Urban Planning</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-1</td>
<td>Office building</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>Office building</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-1</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-2</td>
<td>Outdoor courtyard</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-3</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-4</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-5</td>
<td>Shielded balcony</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18A-1</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18B-1</td>
<td>Office building</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-1</td>
<td>Office building</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20A-1</td>
<td>Residential building east entrance</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20B-1</td>
<td>Outdoor dining</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20B-2</td>
<td>Office building</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-1</td>
<td>Dance Studio</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-1</td>
<td>Residential building south balcony</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-2</td>
<td>Residential building south balcony</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-3</td>
<td>Residential building south balcony</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-1</td>
<td>Residential building back courtyard</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-2</td>
<td>Apartment complex interior courtyard</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-3</td>
<td>Residential building front door</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Quadrant – UIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-1</td>
<td>Jackson Academy Playfield</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-1</td>
<td>Residential backyards</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>UIC Student Services SE entrance</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-1</td>
<td>Office building SE entrance</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE/Receptor</td>
<td>Receptor</td>
<td>Activity Category</td>
<td>FHWA NAC $L_{eqh}$ dB(A)</td>
<td>2012 AM Predicted Existing $L_{eqh}$ dB(A)</td>
<td>2040 AM No-Build $L_{eqh}$ dB(A)</td>
<td>2040 AM Proposed $L_{eqh}$ dB(A)</td>
<td>Increase from Existing to Proposed $L_{eqh}$ dB(A)</td>
<td>Impact Distinction Proposed Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-1</td>
<td>UIC Pavilion SE entrance</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-1</td>
<td>UIC University Towers open space</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>UIC Arts and Theater</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-1</td>
<td>UIC Harrison Field</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-1</td>
<td>UIC dorms courtyard</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-1</td>
<td>UIC outdoor tennis courts</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-2</td>
<td>UIC Recreation Building entrance</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-1</td>
<td>UIC Plant Lab outdoor plot</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-2</td>
<td>UIC Roosevelt Building entrance</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-3</td>
<td>UIC Hull House courtyard</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southeast Quadrant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-1</td>
<td>Maxwell Street Market</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35B-1</td>
<td>Recording Studio</td>
<td>D(2)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40/75</td>
<td>41/76</td>
<td>41/76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-1</td>
<td>Circuit Court of Cook County</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-1</td>
<td>Residential building north balcony</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-1</td>
<td>Hotel rooftop pool</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northeast Quadrant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-1</td>
<td>Residential building south balcony</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-1</td>
<td>Residential building north balcony</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-2</td>
<td>Residential building west balcony</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-3</td>
<td>Residential building south balcony</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-1</td>
<td>Office building west entrance</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-2</td>
<td>Office building south entrance</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-1</td>
<td>Haberdasher north corner balcony</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-2</td>
<td>Residential high-rise west balcony</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE/Receptor</td>
<td>Receptor</td>
<td>Activity Category</td>
<td>FHWA NAC $L_{eq}h$ dB(A)</td>
<td>2012 AM Predicted Existing $L_{eq}h$ dB(A)</td>
<td>2040 AM No-Build $L_{eq}h$ dB(A)</td>
<td>2040 AM Proposed $L_{eq}h$ dB(A)</td>
<td>Increase from Existing to Proposed $L_{eq}h$ dB(A)</td>
<td>Impact Distinction Proposed Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-1</td>
<td>Office building west entrance</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-1</td>
<td>Heritage Green Park outdoor area</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-1</td>
<td>St. Patrick’s Church east entrance</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-1</td>
<td>St. Patrick’s Rectory south entrance</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-1</td>
<td>St. Patrick’s outdoor playground</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48A-1</td>
<td>St. Patrick’s School west entrance</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48A-2</td>
<td>St. Patrick’s Center for Social Concerns north entrance</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48B-1</td>
<td>Archdiocese of Chicago’s Joseph Cardinal Bernardin Archive and Records Center</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-1</td>
<td>Presidential Towers west entrance</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1</td>
<td>Office building north entrance</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-2</td>
<td>Office building west entrance</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-1</td>
<td>Residential building south balcony</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-1</td>
<td>Office building north entrance</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-2</td>
<td>Outdoor dining facing Des Plaines</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-1</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Predicted traffic noise levels in **bold** will approach (within 1 dB(A)) or exceed FHWA NAC under the Proposed Project
2. Category D modeled noise levels shown as Interior/Exterior. Exterior noise is modeled in TNM. Interior noise is estimated by applying the Building Noise Adjustment Factors as obtained from the IDOT Highway Traffic Noise Assessment Manual Table 3-1. Receptor 35B-1 interior noise reduction is assumed to be the maximum 35 db(A) as CNE 35B has no windows.

6.1. Existing Year 2012

Traffic $L_{eq}$ levels for the year 2012 Existing Conditions have been determined with the same TNM computer-modeling techniques and assumptions as for the proposed project. The $L_{eq}$ levels for the 2012 Existing Conditions were predicted from the peak-hour traffic volumes and speed limits (see Appendix B). Predicting existing $L_{eq}$ levels provides a baseline for comparison of potential impacts, particularly at receptors without sound-level measurements. Modeling existing conditions based on peak-hour volumes is a valid technique.
to determine existing conditions at locations where existing traffic sound levels are predominantly from the adjacent roadways.

The predicted traffic $L_{eq}$ levels for the 2012 Existing Conditions are presented in Table 6.1. The higher traffic noise levels occur at CNEs located next to the right-of-way and overlooking numerous lanes of the Circle Interchange. Lower traffic noise levels occur at receptors located farther from the interchange or where shielded by existing retaining walls and/or buildings. At the majority of residential locations with outdoor balconies directly overlooking the Circle Interchange, the predicted existing traffic $L_{eq}$ levels approach or exceed the FHWA noise abatement criteria of 67 dB(A).

The predicted traffic $L_{eq}$ levels for the 2012 Existing Conditions in Table 6.1 differ from the measured $L_{eq}$ levels in Table 4.1. The predicted existing $L_{eq}$ levels have been based on peak-hour traffic volumes and posted speeds, which were different from the traffic volumes and speeds during the sound-level measurements. The measured sound levels at several locations included local traffic on side streets and non-traffic noise. Measured noise levels are only valid for the specific point in time and conditions when the noise measurements were taken.

6.2. No-Build 2040

No-Build represents future traffic conditions along the Circle Interchange without the proposed improvements. No-Build includes the current roadway alignments at the Circle Interchange, but with higher traffic volumes during the design year of 2040. No-Build describes the future traffic noise likely to occur if roadway improvements would not be undertaken by the proposed project.

Under No-Build, the predicted traffic $L_{eq}$ levels are presented in Table 6.1. Compared with the predicted 2012 Existing Conditions in Table 6.1, future traffic $L_{eq}$ levels under No-Build would increase between 0 and 1 dB(A) at all locations analyzed. This increase in future traffic $L_{eq}$ levels without the proposed project would result from the growth in traffic volumes from 2012 to 2040 on the Circle Interchange.

6.3. Proposed Build 2040

Under the proposed project, the predicted traffic $L_{eq}$ levels are presented in Table 6.1. Predicted traffic $L_{eq}$ levels that approach, meet, or exceed the FHWA NAC will result in traffic noise impacts under the proposed project. Receptors with traffic noise impacts under the proposed project are identified in Table 6.1. Under the proposed project, 30 of the 85 receptors analyzed will approach, meet, or exceed the FHWA NAC.

At most locations along the Circle Interchange, the traffic $L_{eq}$ under the proposed project will increase between 0 and 1 dB(A) compared to the predicted 2012 Existing Conditions. Higher increases between 3 and 6 dB(A) will occur at CNEs 12A, 12B, and 33, primarily because of the new elevated system ramps. The 0 to 6 dB(A) increases in traffic noise levels under the proposed project will be below the IDOT criterion for a substantial increase of greater than 14 dB(A) at all receptors along the proposed Circle Interchange project.

At CNEs 47, 48A, 48B, and 49, the traffic $L_{eq}$ under the proposed project will decrease between 0 and 1 dB(A) compared to the predicted 2012 Existing Conditions. The decrease in future traffic noise levels will occur because the I-90/94 mainlines will be shifted to the west, farther away from CNEs 47, 48A, 48B, and 49.
7. ABATEMENT ANALYSIS

The abatement analysis identifies potential noise abatement measures for areas with traffic noise impacts under the proposed Circle Interchange project. Noise abatement must be considered at the 30 receptors with traffic noise impacts predicted under 2040 Build conditions. This Noise Analysis has evaluated noise abatement under FHWA and IDOT policies for the consideration of traffic noise abatement (FHWA, 2011, and IDOT, 2011).

Any noise abatement measure must be determined to be both feasible and reasonable to be considered for implementation. Every effort should be made to achieve the noise reduction design goal of at least 8 dB(A) for at least one benefited receptor. The noise abatement measure must also be considered a prudent expenditure of public funds to be considered reasonable.

7.1. Noise Barrier Analyses

Noise barriers could reduce future traffic noise under the proposed project. The effectiveness of a noise barrier depends on its height and length, its location relative to the roadway and receiver, intervening structures, and terrain of the project site. To be effective, a noise barrier must block the "line of sight" between the highest point of a noise source and the receiver. It must be long enough to prevent sounds from passing around the ends, have no openings such as driveways, and be dense enough so that noise would not be transmitted through it.

Noise barriers usually are either walls or earth berms. Berms require a wide space, and adequate space for berms would not be available within the Circle Interchange project area because of adjacent development and limited available right-of-way. Therefore this Noise Analysis has evaluated noise walls as the means of noise abatement.

Potential noise walls have been evaluated with the TNM model under FHWA and IDOT procedures (FHWA, 2011, and IDOT, 2011). TNM modeling can determine the various noise reductions from different wall locations, heights, and lengths. Potential noise walls have been evaluated at each location, considering the site-specific topography, intervening terrain, distance between the roadway and receivers, roadway configurations, and projected future traffic volumes and speeds.

7.2. Noise Reduction Design Goal Reasonability and Feasibility

The first step in the noise barrier analysis is to determine whether a potential noise wall would achieve the noise reduction design goal and would be considered feasible. The noise reduction design goal requires at least an 8 dB(A) traffic noise reduction for at least one benefited receptor location (IDOT, 2011).

Feasibility generally addresses the engineering aspects of implementing a noise barrier. This includes considerations for safety, drainage, and utilities. Feasibility also includes whether a structure could support the load of a noise wall. A noise abatement measure must achieve the traffic noise reduction feasibility criterion of at least 5 dB(A) for at least one impacted receptor for it to be considered a feasible noise abatement measure.

This noise abatement analysis evaluated whether potential noise walls could achieve at least an 8 dB(A) reduction for receptors with traffic noise impacts under the proposed Circle Interchange project. Table 7.1 identifies the potential noise walls that would meet the 8 dB(A) noise reduction design goal. Eight CNEs have achieved noise reduction goals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNE</th>
<th>Receptor Description</th>
<th>Potential Barrier Location</th>
<th>Potential Barrier Height (feet)</th>
<th>Potential Barrier Length (feet)</th>
<th>Noise Reduction Leq dB(A)</th>
<th>Barrier Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>Multi-unit Residences</td>
<td>ROW, at top of slope Lake to Randolph</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Feasible and Reasonable: 8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal not obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>Skybridge Residences</td>
<td>ROW at top of slope Washington to Madison</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Feasible and Reasonable: 8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal not obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A-1</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>ROW at top of slope Madison to Monroe</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Feasible and Reasonable: 8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal not obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>770 Lofts</td>
<td>ROW at top of slope, Jackson to Van Buren</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>Museum rooftop terrace</td>
<td>ROW at top of slope Jackson to Van Buren</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Feasible and Reasonable: 8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal not obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-2</td>
<td>Greek temple outdoor area</td>
<td>ROW at top of slope Van Buren to Halsted</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Feasible but not Reasonable: 8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal not obtained (Feasible reduction of 5-dB(A) at impacted receptor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-1</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>ROW at top of slope Halsted to Peoria</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not Feasible and Reasonable: 8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal not obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B</td>
<td>Multi-unit Residences</td>
<td>On top of retaining wall adjacent to Ramp NW, from Peoria St to the Rice Building.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-1</td>
<td>UIC Urban Planning</td>
<td>ROW at top of slope Peoria to Morgan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Feasible and Reasonable: 8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal not obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-2</td>
<td>Outdoor courtyard</td>
<td>In front of open space, between buildings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-3</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>ROW at top of slope Peoria to Morgan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Feasible and Reasonable: 8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal not obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE</td>
<td>Receptor Description</td>
<td>Potential Barrier Location</td>
<td>Potential Barrier Height (feet)</td>
<td>Potential Barrier Length (feet)</td>
<td>Noise Reduction Leq dB(A)</td>
<td>Barrier Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18A-1</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>ROW at top of slope West of Morgan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Feasible and Reasonable: 8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal not obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-1</td>
<td>East Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>ROW at top of slope Racine to Loomis</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-2</td>
<td>West Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>ROW at top of slope Racine to Loomis</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-3</td>
<td>Multi-unit residences</td>
<td>ROW at top of slope</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-1</td>
<td>UIC outdoor tennis courts</td>
<td>ROW at top of slope South of Harrison</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-1</td>
<td>UIC Plant Lab</td>
<td>ROW Taylor to Roosevelt</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not Feasible and Reasonable: 8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal not obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-2</td>
<td>UIC Roosevelt Building</td>
<td>ROW Taylor to Roosevelt</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Feasible and Reasonable: 8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal not obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-1</td>
<td>Residential building</td>
<td>Along south edge of Congress Parkway structure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not Feasible: Congress Parkway structure would not support the load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-1</td>
<td>Residential building</td>
<td>Along north edge of Congress Parkway structure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not Feasible: Congress Parkway structure would not support the load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-1</td>
<td>Residential building</td>
<td>ROW at top of slope Van Buren to Jackson</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not Feasible and Reasonable: 8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal not obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-2</td>
<td>Residential building</td>
<td>ROW at top of slope Van Buren to Jackson</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not Feasible and Reasonable: 8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal not obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-3</td>
<td>Residential building</td>
<td>ROW at top of slope Van Buren to Jackson</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Feasible and Reasonable: 8-dB(A) Noise Reduction Goal not obtained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several potential noise walls would not be feasible for engineering reasons. Noise walls along both sides of the Congress Parkway would not be feasible because of structural concerns. Table 7.1 also identifies those wall found not feasible for engineering factors.

7.3. Economic Reasonability

For those potential noise walls found to achieve the noise reduction design goal and to be feasible (Table 7.1), the next step is to evaluate their economic reasonability. Economic reasonability is the cost-effective evaluation of the noise barrier. This considers the overall cost of the noise barrier, the number of benefited receptors, and the cost-effectiveness (cost per benefited receptor).

Key assumptions for the evaluation of economic reasonability under IDOT noise policies (IDOT, 2011) include:

- The current unit cost used by IDOT to determine the construction cost for noise barriers is $25 per square foot. The cost of right-of-way acquisition for the purpose of noise barrier construction also should be included if acquisition is needed solely for noise barrier construction.
A benefited receptor is considered any sensitive receptor that receives at least a 5 dB(A) traffic noise reduction as a result of the noise barrier, regardless of whether the receptor was identified as impacted.

In the case of multi-unit dwellings (i.e., condominiums, townhouses, apartments and duplexes), each residential unit should be counted as one receptor. A unit also can be considered benefited if the residents of that unit have access to an exterior common use area that would receive a 5 dB(A) traffic noise reduction. Second floor units can be counted as benefited receptors if the noise barrier provides at least a 5 dB(A) traffic noise reduction at the second floor elevation.

The estimated build cost of each noise abatement measure may not exceed the allowable noise abatement cost, based on a cost-per-benefited-receptor comparison. The base value for the allowable noise abatement cost is $24,000 per benefited receptor. Other reasonableness factors shall be considered to potentially adjust the allowable noise abatement base value cost of $24,000 per benefited receptor. The three reasonableness adjustment factors result in a potential maximum allowable noise abatement cost of $37,000 per benefited receptor.

If the estimated build cost of noise abatement per benefited receptor is less than the adjusted allowable noise abatement cost per benefited receptor, then the noise abatement measure achieves the cost-effective reasonableness criterion. Generally, the evaluation should provide traffic noise reductions to as many impacted receptors as possible and/or provide as much noise reduction as possible while remaining within the economic reasonability criterion.

The evaluation of economic reasonability is presented in Tables 7.2 and 7.3 for those walls found to be feasible and that would achieve the noise reduction design goal. Potential noise wall locations are depicted in Figures A.5 and A.6-1 through A.6-6.

### Table 7-2

**Circle Interchange Noise Barriers: Adjusted Allowable Cost per Benefited Receptor Calculations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNE and Receptors Analyzed</th>
<th>2040 Build Noise Level $L_{eq}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>Increase in Noise, Existing to Build $L_{eq}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>Receptor Built Before Roadway, Yes/No</th>
<th>Traffic Noise Factor</th>
<th>Noise Increase Factor</th>
<th>Receptor Built Before Roadway Factor</th>
<th>Sum of Cost Adjustments</th>
<th>Benefited Receptors at Site</th>
<th>Total Adjusted Allowable Cost per Receptor (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>770 Lofts CNE 7-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1 (Row 1, Floor 1)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 (Row 1, Floor 2)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 (Row 1, Floor 3)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1 (Row 2, Floor 1)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2 (Row 2, Floor 2)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 (Row 2, Floor 3)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1 (Row 3, Floor 1)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Circle Interchange (P-91-259-12)
#### Final Noise Analysis Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNE and Receptors Analyzed</th>
<th>2040 Build Noise Level $L_\text{eq}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>Increase in Noise, Existing to Build $L_\text{eq}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>Receptor Built Before Roadway, Yes/No</th>
<th>Traffic Noise Factor</th>
<th>Noise Increase Factor</th>
<th>Receptor Built Before Roadway Factor</th>
<th>Sum of Cost Adjustments</th>
<th>Benefited Receptors at Site</th>
<th>Total Adjusted Allowable Cost per Receptor(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-2 (Row 3, Floor 2)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3 (Row 3, Floor 3)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1 (Row 4, Floor 1)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2 (Row 4, Floor 2)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3 (Row 4, Floor 3)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1 (Row 5, Floor 1)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2 (Row 5, Floor 2)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-3 (Row 5, Floor 3)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1 (Row 6, Floor 1)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2 (Row 6, Floor 2)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-3 (Row 6, Floor 3)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-1 (Row 7, Floor 1)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2 (Row 7, Floor 2)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$25,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 400 S Green Street CNE 12B

| CNE 12B (Main door)       | 64                                       | 4                                                        | No                                   | $0                  | $0                   | $0                                  | $0                    | 67                            | $24,000                          |
| CNE 12B (Alf Investments) | 63                                       | 4                                                        | No                                   | $0                  | $0                   | $0                                  | $0                    | 1                            | $24,000                          |
| **Average**               |                                          |                                                          |                                      |                     |                      |                                     |                       |                               | **$24,000**                     |

#### Outdoor Courtyard at Sangamon Street CNE 17

| CNE 17                   | 71                                       | 1                                                        | No                                   | $1,000              | $0                   | $0                                  | $1,000                | 180                           | $25,000                          |
| **Average**              |                                          |                                                          |                                      |                     |                      |                                     |                       |                               | **$25,000**                     |

September 13, 2013
## Final Noise Analysis Study

**CNE and Receptors Analyzed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNE and Receptors Analyzed</th>
<th>2040 Build Noise Level $L_{eq}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>Increase in Noise, Existing to Build $L_{eq}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>Receptor Built Before Roadway, Yes/No</th>
<th>Traffic Noise Factor</th>
<th>Noise Increase Factor</th>
<th>Receptor Built Before Roadway Factor</th>
<th>Sum of Cost Adjustments</th>
<th>Benefited Receptors at Site</th>
<th>Total Adjusted Allowable Cost per Receptor$^{(1)}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1-2 (Row 1 Floor 2)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1-3 (Row 1 Floor 3)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2-2 (Row 2 Floor 2)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2-3 (Row 2 Floor 3)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3-2 (Row 3 Floor 2)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3-3 (Row 3 Floor 3)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4-2 (Row 4 Floor 2)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4-3 (Row 4 Floor 3)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5-2 (Row 5 Floor 2)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5-3 (Row 5 Floor 3)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6-2 (Row 6 Floor 2)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6-3 (Row 6 Floor 3)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W7-2 (Row 7 Floor 2)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W7-3 (Row 7 Floor 3)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1-2 (Row 1 Floor 2)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

$^{(1)}$ Adjustments: For Benefited Receptors at Site.
## CNE and Receptors Analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNE and Receptors Analyzed</th>
<th>2040 Build Noise Level $L_{eq}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>Increase in Noise, Existing to Build $L_{eq}$ dB(A)</th>
<th>Receptor Built Before Roadway, Yes/No</th>
<th>Traffic Noise Factor</th>
<th>Noise Increase Factor</th>
<th>Receptor Built Before Roadway Factor</th>
<th>Sum of Cost Adjustments</th>
<th>Benefited Receptors at Site</th>
<th>Total Adjusted Allowable Cost per Receptor(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E2-2 (Row 2 Floor 2)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3-2 (Row 3 Floor 2)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CNE 23 Apartments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 (23-3)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 (23-3)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4 (23-3)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5 (23-3)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 (23-3)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7 (23-3)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor courtyard (23-1)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UIC Courts CNE 33-1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old St Patrick’s</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-1 Playground</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48A-1 School</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$24,048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Sum of Adjustment Factors, added to the base value of $24,000
Table 7-3

Circle Interchange Noise Barriers: Barrier Reasonableness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-2 (770 Lofts)</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8,640</td>
<td>$216,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B (400 S Green St.)</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10,128</td>
<td>$253,200</td>
<td>68[^9]</td>
<td>$3,724</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-2 (Outdoor Courtyard)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>180[^6]</td>
<td>$58</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-1 and 22-2</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8,740</td>
<td>$218,500</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$12,853</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-1 and 23-3</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>$192,500</td>
<td>200[^7]</td>
<td>$963</td>
<td>$24,055</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined 22 and 23</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>14-23</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>$1,659</td>
<td>$24,258</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 (UIC Outdoor Courts)</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
<td>Not Reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 (Old St. Patrick's)</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>21[^8]</td>
<td>$1,857</td>
<td>$24,048</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Noise wall cost based on $25 per square foot construction cost
2. A benefited receptor is defined as receiving at least a 5 dB(A) traffic noise reduction
3. Total noise wall cost divided by total number of benefited receptors
4. Total Adjusted Allowable Cost per Receptor from Table 7.2
5. Reasonability Criterion is passed if Noise Wall Cost per Benefited Receptor is less than the Adjusted Allowable Cost per Benefited Receptor
6. Outdoor Courtyard is assumed to be the exterior common area for the residential building to the west (933 W Van Buren St Condos), which has a total of 180 residential units.
7. Outdoor Courtyard (23-1) is assumed to be the exterior common buildings for all residences within the property, which has a total of 200 residential units.
8. CNE 47, the Old St. Patrick's wall, includes 20 benefited receptors from the Francis Xavier Warde School's classrooms (CNE 48A), which receive a 5 dB(A) benefit from the wall. This is in addition to the playground's 1 benefited receptor.
9. 400 S Green St main door assumed to be the exterior common area of the building, which has 67 units. 1 ground floor office also benefited. Other store fronts in the 400 S Green St building are retail or vacant, and therefore not benefited (NAC Category F). The Rice Building defines its primary entrance as the east entrance, and is therefore not benefited.
### Table 7-4

#### Circle Interchange Noise Barriers: Cost Averaging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEs</th>
<th>Total Benefited(1) Receptors</th>
<th>Total Noise Wall Cost(2)</th>
<th>Noise Wall Cost per Benefited Receptor(3)</th>
<th>Adjusted Allowable Cost per Benefited Receptor(4)</th>
<th>Ratio of Wall Cost to Adjusted Allowable(5)</th>
<th>Cumulative Estimated Build Cost per Benefited Receptor</th>
<th>Cumulative Adjusted Allowable Cost per Benefited Receptor</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-2 (Outdoor Courtyard)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$58</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>$58</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Cost-Effective Stand Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined 22 and 23(6)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$1,659</td>
<td>$24,258</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>$933</td>
<td>$24,594</td>
<td>Cost-Effective Stand Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 (Old St. Patrick's)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>$1,857</td>
<td>$24,048</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>$980</td>
<td>$24,567</td>
<td>Cost-Effective Stand Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B (400 S Green St.)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$253,200</td>
<td>$3,724</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>$1,364</td>
<td>$24,488</td>
<td>Cost-Effective Stand Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2 (770 Lofts)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$216,000</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>$1,737</td>
<td>$24,508</td>
<td>Cost-Effective Stand Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 (UIC Outdoor Courts)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
<td>1.327</td>
<td>$1,978</td>
<td>$24,508</td>
<td>Cost-Effective Cumulative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. A benefited receptor is defined as receiving at least a 5 dB(A) traffic noise reduction
2. Noise wall cost based on $25 per square foot construction cost
3. Total noise wall cost divided by total number of benefited receptors
4. Total Adjusted Allowable Cost per Receptor from Table 7.2
5. Ratio of wall cost cannot exceed two times the adjusted allowable noise abatement cost per benefited receptor
6. CNE 22 and 23 have been combined as their locations are adjacent to each other and one continuous wall would be constructed at this location.

#### 7.4. Viewpoint Solicitation and Tally of Benefitted Noise Receptors

Per Table 7-4, there are six locations where noise walls are proposed, involving seven CNEs and 510 benefited receptors. Note that CNE 22 and 23 were combined because these locations are adjacent to each other and one combined wall could be constructed to shield both CNEs. The first solicitation of viewpoints was mailed to all benefited receptors March 21, 2013. With the exception of CNE 12B-1 (Green Street Lofts), the initial solicitation did not receive the required 33.33 percent (1/3) response rate, therefore second solicitations were sent via certified mail on May 1 and May 3, 2013.
With the second solicitation, the response threshold considers responses actually received, regardless of whether it meets the 33.33 percent level. Therefore, the tally result is based on the majority of the actual responses received.

The responses received are available in Appendix E, Public Involvement. Based on the benefitted receptors viewpoint solicitation, five of the seven noise walls will likely be implemented. The viewpoint solicitation is summarized below in Table 7-5. The locations and sizes of likely walls are shown in Appendix A, Figure A.5-2.

Table 7-5
Circle Interchange Noise Barriers: Viewpoint Solicitation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNEs</th>
<th>“YES” Votes Received</th>
<th>“NO” Votes Received</th>
<th>Percentage of responses voting “YES”</th>
<th>Wall Likely to be Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNE 7 770 Lofts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 12B Green Street Lofts</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 17 Outdoor Courtyard</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 22 1224 &amp; 1250 W. Van Buren Street</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 23 Academy Square</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 33 UIC Tennis Courts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 47 Old St. Patrick’s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5. Likelihood Statement

Based on the traffic noise analysis and noise abatement evaluation conducted, highway traffic noise abatement measures are likely to be implemented based on preliminary design. The noise barriers determined to meet the feasible and reasonable criteria are identified in Table 7-3 and 7-4. If it subsequently develops during final design that constraints not foreseen in the preliminary design or public input substantially change, the abatement measures may need to be modified or removed from the project plans. A final decision of the installation of the abatement measure(s) will be made upon completion of the project’s final design and the public involvement process.

7.6. Coordination with Local Government Officials for Undeveloped Lands

The Circle Interchange project study area is highly urbanized and developed. There are no large tracts of undeveloped lands. However, there are locations which have potential for redevelopment, including the Old Post Office Building which spans across the Congress Parkway and the parking lot at 765 W. Adams Street (north of CNE 07), where a 30-story high-rise building is proposed. Based on coordination with the City of Chicago, there is not an identified redevelopment plan for the Old Post Office. Additionally, the parking lot re-development at 765 W. Adams Street has not been permitted. Therefore, per Department noise policy, coordination with the property owners is not required.
The University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) has a Master Plan which shows redevelopment of some of the university property adjacent I-290 and I-90/94. Coordination with UIC has found that the Master Plan is a long range conceptual plan and there are not any near term implementation plans or implementation funding for the properties adjacent to the project area. However, there is an open grassed area bounded by I-290, Harrison Street, Peoria Street and Halsted Street, known as Harrison Field. The UIC Master Plan shows institutional buildings and classrooms at this location. Due to this, noise contours were developed and provided to UIC to promote development that will be compatible with the proposed project's noise levels. See Appendix E, Public Involvement for coordination with UIC.
8. CONSTRUCTION NOISE AND VIBRATION

8.1. Construction Noise

8.1.1. Construction Noise Impacts

Construction noise varies greatly depending on the equipment being used, the condition of the equipment, and the activities being conducted. Noise levels also depend on the time and duration of the construction activity. Noise from stationary and mobile construction equipment is primarily from the engine and exhaust. Mobile construction equipment rarely travels at high speeds where wind noise and tire noise are critical.

Trucks and machinery used for construction of the proposed project will produce noise that may affect some land uses and activities during the construction period. Residences, businesses, and public institutions along the alignment will at some time experience perceptible construction noise from implementation of the proposed project. Potential construction noise will be most noticeable at locations near construction activities, and during nighttime construction. The construction period for the proposed project is anticipated to occur from approximately November 2013 to October 2017.

Any potential construction noise impacts will be considered temporary or short-term impacts. Construction activities will include reasonable abatement measures to avoid excessive construction noise impacts.

8.1.2. Construction Noise Abatement

Any potential construction noise impacts will be considered temporary or short-term impacts. Construction activities will include reasonable abatement measures to avoid excessive construction noise impacts.

Abatement of construction noise could be accomplished by construction staging, sequencing of operations, or alternative construction methods. Typically, the construction methods to be used for a project are determined in the final engineering design. To minimize or eliminate the effect of construction noise, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Illinois Department of Transportation's Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction as Article 107.35.

Construction Staging

- Construct noise barriers, which were identified as feasible and reasonable, during the initial construction phases, to the extent reasonable and where possible, reduce construction noise.
- Install permanent or temporary noise walls, temporary stock piles, or equipment enclosures for noisy equipment, such as shields or heavy curtains.
- Route construction traffic away from sensitive receptors.
- Operate construction equipment as far from sensitive receptors as feasible.

Sequence of Operations

- Conduct louder operations during the day, and not during the night when people are more sensitive to noise.
- Conduct multiple, loud construction operations at one time. The total noise level from multiple activities will not substantially increase the noise level. However, it will reduce the total duration of that noise level.
- If construction would occur during special events at adjacent public institutions, louder construction activities could be limited during those events.
**Alternative Construction Methods**

- Evaluate alternative pile driving methods to implement when practicable, as this is a major noise contributor.
- Evaluate quieter demolition methods.
- Use special muffler systems or enclose equipment, i.e. sound curtains.

8.2. Construction Vibration

8.2.1. Construction Vibration Impacts

Vibration during construction is dependent on the equipment being used, the condition of the equipment, and the activities being conducted. Construction activities typically associated with vibration include pile driving, blasting, pavement breaking, or earth moving in close proximity to sensitive receptors. Construction vibration impacts generally would not approach levels that can damage nearby structures.

The Old St. Patrick's Church is a historic structure that is located near the Circle Interchange. Methods to minimize construction vibration are being investigated and will be included if determined to be appropriate, to ensure that it will not damage the church. A Vibration Monitoring Program will be implemented that includes the following activities:

**Vibration Monitoring Program**

- Conduct Building Condition Surveys prior to start of construction activities, as access allows and practicable
- Install Vibration Monitoring equipment to establish baseline conditions, as access allows and practicable
- Contractor to complete a Pre-Construction Condition Survey
- Provide monitoring during Construction
- Complete Post-Construction Surveys
- 23 buildings adjacent to the corridor will be monitored, as of the time of this writing.
- Vibration thresholds will be established and monitoring equipment will immediately notify the contractor and engineer if the thresholds are being approached, so the contractor can stop work and adjust their plan to avoid vibration impacts.

8.2.2. Construction Vibration Abatement

Potential abatement measures that could be considered when practicable include the following:

**Construction Staging**

- Route construction traffic away from sensitive receptors.
- Operate equipment as far from sensitive receptors as feasible.

**Sequence of Operations**

- Conduct vibration operations during the day and not during the night, when people are much more sensitive to vibration.
- Conduct vibration operations one at a time - vibration levels may be much less if generated independently.

**Alternative Construction Methods**

- Evaluate alternative pile driving methods to implement when practicable, as this is a major noise contributor.
- Evaluate demolition methods that reduce impact.
- Do not use vibratory equipment for soil stabilization or packing near sensitive receptors.
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Traffic Data
### Noise Analysis Study Traffic Input Summary - 2012 Existing Conditions

#### I-90/94 Roadway Segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Number</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No. Lanes</th>
<th>Speed (mph)</th>
<th>ADT (vph)</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour (vph)</th>
<th>Auto %</th>
<th>Medium Trucks %</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks %</th>
<th>Buses %</th>
<th>TNM peak hr per Lane vph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>I-90/94 Dan Ryan Expressway</td>
<td>south of Roosevelt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>126,500</td>
<td>6,888</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>I-90/94 Dan Ryan Expressway</td>
<td>south of Roosevelt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>157,400</td>
<td>8,130</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>I-90/94 Kennedy Expressway</td>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>96,700</td>
<td>5,411</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>I-90/94 Kennedy Expressway</td>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100,100</td>
<td>5,791</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>I-90/94 Kennedy Expressway</td>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>138,200</td>
<td>5,957</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>I-90/94 Kennedy Expressway</td>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>127,600</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### I-290 Roadway Segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Number</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No. Lanes</th>
<th>Speed (mph)</th>
<th>ADT (vph)</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour (vph)</th>
<th>Auto %</th>
<th>Medium Trucks %</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks %</th>
<th>Buses %</th>
<th>TNM peak hr per Lane vph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower Expressway</td>
<td>Loomis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>110,900</td>
<td>6,724</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower Expressway</td>
<td>Loomis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>96,900</td>
<td>5,809</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower Expressway</td>
<td>I-90/94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>2,569</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower Expressway</td>
<td>I-90/94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29,700</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>Post Office (e/o Canal Street)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35,900</td>
<td>2,745</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>Post Office (e/o Canal Street)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42,300</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Circle Interchange System Ramps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Number</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No. Lanes</th>
<th>Speed (mph)</th>
<th>ADT (vph)</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour (vph)</th>
<th>Auto %</th>
<th>Medium Trucks %</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks %</th>
<th>Buses %</th>
<th>TNM peak hr per Lane vph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>WB I-290 Eisenhower</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>EB I-290 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>WB I-290 Eisenhower</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>1,786</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>EB I-290 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>EB I-90/94 Eisenhower</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26,600</td>
<td>1,436</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>EB I-90/94 Eisenhower</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43,900</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>WN</td>
<td>WB I-90/94 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>WB I-90/94 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Access Ramps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Number</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No. Lanes</th>
<th>Speed (mph)</th>
<th>ADT (vph)</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour (vph)</th>
<th>Auto %</th>
<th>Medium Trucks %</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks %</th>
<th>Buses %</th>
<th>TNM peak hr per Lane vph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Canal Street</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>EB I-290 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>Canal Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>EB I-290 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>Racine Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>WB I-90/94 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>WB I-90/94 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Roosevelt Road</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Taylor Street</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>Taylor Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB Ramp I-90/94 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>Taylor Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>Madison Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>Washington Boulevard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Number</td>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>No. Lanes</td>
<td>Speed (mph)</td>
<td>ADT (vph)</td>
<td>AM Peak Hour (vph)</td>
<td>Auto %</td>
<td>Medium Trucks %</td>
<td>Heavy Trucks %</td>
<td>Buses %</td>
<td>TNM peak hr per Lane vph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>Randolph Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>Lake Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Jackson Boulevard</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Adams Street</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Madison Street</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Randolph Street</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>Randolph Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>Washington Boulevard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A20</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>Madison Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>Monroe Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>Adams Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>Jackson Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Lake Street</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A25</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Randolph Street</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A26</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Madison Street</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Traffic Input Summary - 2040 No Build

### Roadway Number | Direction | Roadway | Location | No. Lanes | Speed (mph) | ADT (vph) | AM Peak Hour (vph) | Auto % | Medium Trucks % | Heavy Trucks % | Buses % | TNM peak hr per Lane vph
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1 | Northbound | I-90/94 Dan Ryan Expressway | south of Roosevelt | 5 | 45 | 129,000 | 7,800 | 91 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1,560 |
2 | Southbound | I-90/94 Dan Ryan Expressway | south of Roosevelt | 5 | 45 | 163,000 | 8,650 | 92 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1,730 |
3 | Northbound | I-90/94 Kennedy Expressway | I-290 Eisenhower/Congress | 3 | 45 | 97,000 | 6,090 | 91 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 2,030 |
4 | Southbound | I-90/94 Kennedy Expressway | I-290 Eisenhower/Congress | 3 | 45 | 103,000 | 6,240 | 92 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2,080 |
5 | Northbound | I-90/94 Kennedy Expressway | Fulton | 5 | 45 | 140,000 | 6,570 | 91 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1,314 |
6 | Southbound | I-90/94 Kennedy Expressway | Fulton | 5 | 45 | 131,000 | 9,120 | 92 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1,824 |
7 | Eastbound | I-290 Eisenhower Expressway | Loomis | 4 | 55 | 114,000 | 6,920 | 95 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1,730 |
8 | Eastbound | I-290 Eisenhower Expressway | Loomis | 4 | 55 | 100,000 | 6,270 | 95 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1,568 |
9 | Eastbound | I-290 Eisenhower Expressway | I-90/94 | 3 | 45 | 33,000 | 2,610 | 98 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 870 |
10 | Eastbound | I-290 Eisenhower Expressway | I-90/94 | 3 | 45 | 31,000 | 1,780 | 96 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 593 |
11 | Eastbound | I-290 Eisenhower/Congress | Post Office (e/o Canal Street) | 4 | 45 | 37,000 | 2,820 | 98 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 705 |
12 | Eastbound | I-290 Eisenhower/Congress | Post Office (e/o Canal Street) | 4 | 45 | 44,000 | 2,190 | 96 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 548 |

### Circle Interchange System Ramps

| R1 | NW | NB I-90/94 | I-290 Eisenhower | 1 | 30 | 34,000 | 2,040 | 92 | 3 | 5 | 2,040 |
| R2 | NE | NB I-90/94 | EB I-290 Eisenhower/Congress | 1 | 30 | 4,000 | 110 | 94 | 4 | 2 | 110 |
| R3 | SW | SB I-90/94 | I-290 Eisenhower | 1 | 30 | 25,000 | 1,920 | 97 | 2 | 1 | 1,920 |
| R4 | SE | SB I-90/94 | EB I-290 Eisenhower/Congress | 1 | 25 | 5,000 | 440 | 98 | 2 | 0 | 440 |
| R5 | EN | EB I-90/94 | NB I-90/94 Kennedy | 1 | 30 | 27,000 | 1,460 | 95 | 3 | 2 | 1,460 |
| R6 | ES | EB I-90/94 | SB I-90/94 Dan Ryan | 2 | 30 | 45,000 | 2,210 | 92 | 4 | 4 | 1,105 |
| R7 | WN | WB I-90/94 | I-290 Eisenhower/Congress | 1 | 35 | 9,000 | 280 | 96 | 4 | 0 | 280 |
| R8 | WS | WB I-90/94 | I-90/94 Dan Ryan | 1 | 25 | 8,000 | 310 | 95 | 4 | 1 | 310 |
| A1 | WB | Canal Street | NB I-90/94 Eisenhower/Congress | 1 | 25 | 4,000 | 180 | 97 | 2 | 1 | 180 |
| A2 | EB | EB I-290 Eisenhower/Congress | Canal Street | 1 | 25 | 5,000 | 340 | 97 | 2 | 1 | 340 |
| A3 | EB | EB I-290 Eisenhower/Congress | Racine Avenue | 1 | 25 | 9,000 | 640 | 97 | 2 | 1 | 640 |
| A4 | WB | WB I-90/94 Eisenhower/Congress | Morgan | 1 | 25 | 5,000 | 270 | 97 | 2 | 1 | 270 |
| A5 | WB | Racine Avenue | NB I-90/94 Eisenhower/Congress | 1 | 25 | 15,000 | 800 | 97 | 2 | 1 | 800 |
| A6 | NB | Roosevelt Road | NB I-90/94 Kennedy | 1 | 25 | 6,000 | 290 | 97 | 2 | 1 | 290 |
| A7 | NB | Taylor Street | NB I-90/94 Kennedy | 1 | 25 | 11,000 | 430 | 97 | 2 | 1 | 430 |
| A8 | SB | SB I-90/94 Kennedy | Taylor Street | 1 | 25 | 8,000 | 590 | 97 | 2 | 1 | 590 |
| A9 | SB | Ramps I-290 Eisenhower/Congress | Taylor Street | 1 | 25 | 3,000 | 160 | 97 | 2 | 1 | 160 |
| A10 | NB | NB I-90/94 Dan Ryan | Madison Street | 1 | 25 | 6,000 | 560 | 97 | 2 | 1 | 560 |
| A11 | NB | NB I-90/94 Dan Ryan | Washington Boulevard | 1 | 25 | 4,000 | 430 | 97 | 2 | 1 | 430 |
## Traffic Input Summary - 2040 No Build

### Circle Interchange (I-90/94 and I-290)

#### Noise Analysis Study

Traffic Noise Model (TNM) 2040 No Build

2/24/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Number</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No. Lanes</th>
<th>Speed (mph)</th>
<th>ADT (vph)</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour (vph)</th>
<th>Auto %</th>
<th>Medium Trucks %</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks %</th>
<th>Buses %</th>
<th>TNM peak hr per Lane vph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB I-90/94</td>
<td>Dan Ryan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB I-90/94</td>
<td>Dan Ryan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Jackson Boulevard</td>
<td>NB I-90/94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Adams Street</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Madison Street</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Randolph Street</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A20</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Lake Street</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A25</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Randolph Street</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A26</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Madison Street</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Noise Analysis Study Figure B.3

### Traffic Input Summary - 2040 Proposed Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Number</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No. Lanes</th>
<th>Speed (mph)</th>
<th>ADT (vph)</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour (vph)</th>
<th>Auto %</th>
<th>Medium Trucks %</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks %</th>
<th>Buses %</th>
<th>TNM peak hr per Lane vph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-90/94 Segments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>I-90/94 Dan Ryan Expressway</td>
<td>south of Roosevelt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td>8,850</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>I-90/94 Dan Ryan Expressway</td>
<td>south of Roosevelt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>167,000</td>
<td>9,330</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>I-90/94 Kennedy Expressway</td>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>I-90/94 Kennedy Expressway</td>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>I-90/94 Kennedy Expressway</td>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>7,330</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>I-90/94 Kennedy Expressway</td>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>9,570</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-290 Segments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower Expressway</td>
<td>Loomis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>7,370</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower Expressway</td>
<td>Loomis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td>7,030</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower Expressway</td>
<td>I-90/94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower Expressway</td>
<td>I-90/94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>Post Office (e/o Canal Street)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>Post Office (e/o Canal Street)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle Interchange Ramps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>WB I-290 Eisenhower</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>EB I-290 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>WB I-290 Eisenhower</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>EB I-290 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>EB I-90/94 Eisenhower</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>EB I-90/94 Eisenhower</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>WN</td>
<td>WB I-90/94 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>WB I-90/94 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Taylor Exit (Bypass)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>Taylor Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB CD Road</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Taylor Street</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN Slip Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Ramps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Canal Street</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>EB I-290 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>Canal Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>EB I-290 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>Racine Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>WB I-90/94 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Racine Avenue</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Eisenhower/Congress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Roosevelt Road</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>Madison Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>Washington Boulevard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Number</td>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>No. Lanes</td>
<td>Speed (mph)</td>
<td>ADT (vph)</td>
<td>AM Peak Hour (vph)</td>
<td>Auto %</td>
<td>Medium Trucks %</td>
<td>Heavy Trucks %</td>
<td>Buses %</td>
<td>TNM peak hr per Lane vph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>Randolph Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Dan Ryan</td>
<td>Lake Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Jackson Boulevard</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Adams Street</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Madison Street</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Randolph Street</td>
<td>NB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>Randolph Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>Washington Boulevard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A20</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>Madison Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>Monroe Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>Adams Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>Jackson Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Lake Street</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A25</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Randolph Street</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A26</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Madison Street</td>
<td>SB I-90/94 Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Field Noise Measurements

Data Sheets
Circle Interchange Noise Analysis Worksheet

Location: #1
UIC Garage

Field Location: #1

Date: 11/16/2012
Time: 7:31 AM

Weather: Sunny, temp 50°F, no noticeable wind

Noise Meter Location:
State Plane Coordinates
1171396.4744, 1897144.4784

Sound Measurements (L<sub>eq</sub>)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;MIN&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;EQ&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;MAX&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-90/94 SB ramp to Taylor St</td>
<td>Autos</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busses</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med. Trucks</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hvy. Trucks</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.C.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90/94</td>
<td>Total (veh/hr)</td>
<td>5,634</td>
<td>4,715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:
Data stored in LxT_Data.001
# Circle Interchange Noise Analysis Worksheet

**Location:** #2  
UIC Basketball Courts  
**Field Location:** #9  
**Date:** 11/16/2012  
**Time:** 12:59 PM  
**Weather:** Sunny, temp 50° F, no noticeable wind  

**Noise Meter Location:**  
State Plane Coordinates  
1171396.4744, 1897144.4784  

## Sound Measurements (L\text{eq})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L\text{MIN}</th>
<th>L\text{EQ}</th>
<th>L\text{MAX}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Northbound (veh/hr)</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-90/94</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,103</td>
<td>3,794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments:**  
Data stored in LxT_Data.008
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location: #3</th>
<th>UIC Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Location: #10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: 11/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time: 1:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather: Sunny, temp 50º F, no noticeable wind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Meter Location:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Plane Coordinates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1170628.8391, 1897727.3603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sound Measurements (L<sub>eq</sub>)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;MIN&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;EQ&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;MAX&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Inbound (vehicles/hour)</th>
<th>Outbound (vehicles/hour)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-290 Eisenhower Expy</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,245</td>
<td>4,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Comments:

Data stored in LxT_Data.009
### Location:
384 SANGAMON ST

### Field Location:

**Date:** 11/05/2012  
**Time:** 10:34 PM  
**Weather:** Overcast, temp 40\(^\circ\) F, light wind

### Noise Meter Location:

State Plane Coordinates  
1170175.7021, 1898165.7869

### Sound Measurements (L\(_{eq}\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L(_{MIN})</th>
<th>L(_{EQ})</th>
<th>L(_{MAX})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Roadway Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sangamon</td>
<td>Autos</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med. Trucks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hvy. Trucks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.C.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Inbound (vehicles/hour) | Outbound (vehicles/hour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Outbound (vehicles/hour)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-290</td>
<td>5,966</td>
<td>4,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Morgan St Exit Ramp | n/a | 207 |

### Additional Comments:

Data stored in LxT_Data.005
**Circle Interchange Noise Analysis Worksheet**

**Location:** #5  
Greektown Monument

**Field Location:** #8

**Date:** 11/16/2012  
**Time:** 12:12 PM  
**Weather:** Sunny, temp 50°F, no noticeable wind

**Noise Meter Location:**  
State Plane Coordinates  
1171186.4966, 1898348.8849

**Sound Measurements (L_{eq})**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>L_{MIN}</th>
<th>L_{EQ}</th>
<th>L_{MAX}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NW Ramp</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Ramp</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Ramp</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Ramp</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-290</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,634 (WB)</td>
<td>1,896 (EB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90/94</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,571 (NB)</td>
<td>5,522 (SB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Van Buren (Both Directions)**

- Autos: 72
- Busses: 1
- Med. Trucks: 1
- Hvy. Trucks: 1
- M.C.: 0

**Halsted (Both Directions)**

- Autos: 240
- Busses: 3
- Med. Trucks: 15
- Hvy. Trucks: 8
- M.C.: 0

**Additional Comments:** Data stored in LxT_Data.008
## Circle Interchange Noise Analysis Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>#6 Apt. building between Van Buren &amp; Jackson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Location:</td>
<td>#7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>11/16/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>11:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather:</td>
<td>Sunny, temp 50°F, no noticeable wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Meter Location:</td>
<td>State Plane Coordinates 1171266.6066, 1898754.1185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sound Measurements (L\(_{eq}\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(L_{MIN})</th>
<th>(L_{EQ})</th>
<th>(L_{MAX})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Roadway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Southbound (veh/hr)</th>
<th>Northbound (veh/hr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-90/94</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,819</td>
<td>6,814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Comments:

Data stored in LxT_Data.006

Loud truck horn in last 5 sec of measurement did not affect \(L_{EQ}\), however \(L_{MAX}\) was likely increased.

Two vehicles passed in parking lot during reading.
### Circle Interchange Noise Analysis Worksheet

**Location:** #7  
Quincy St. West of I-90/94

**Field Location:** #6

**Date:** 11/16/2012  
**Time:** 10:31 AM

**Weather:** Sunny, temp 50º F, no noticeable wind

**Noise Meter Location:**  
State Plane Coordinates  
1171320.2398, 1899113.1106

### Sound Measurements (L<sub>eq</sub>)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;MIN&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;EQ&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;MAX&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-90/94</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,159</td>
<td>7,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Comments:

Data stored in LxT_Data.005  
4 autos passed in parking lot during reading
Circle Interchange Noise Analysis Worksheet

Location: #8
Quincy St. East of I-90/94
Haberdasher Apts

Field Location: #4

Date: 11/16/2012
Time: 9:30 AM

Weather: Sunny, temp 50º F, no noticeable wind

Noise Meter Location:
State Plane Coordinates
1171635.0880, 1899111.9318

Sound Measurements (Leq)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LMIN</th>
<th>LEQ</th>
<th>LMAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-90/94</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,580</td>
<td>7,682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:
Data stored in LxT_Data.004
## Circle Interchange Noise Analysis Worksheet

**Location:** #9  
St. Patrick Church

**Field Location:** #5

**Date:** 11/16/2012

**Time:** 10:02 AM

**Weather:** Sunny, temp 50º F, no noticeable wind

**Noise Meter Location:**  
State Plane Coordinates  
1171722.3108, 1899563.9982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound Measurements (L&lt;sub&gt;eq&lt;/sub&gt;)</th>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;MIN&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;EQ&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;MAX&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-90/94</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,206</td>
<td>6,962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments:**  
Not stored digitally
Circle Interchange Noise Analysis Worksheet

Location: #10
Tilden St

Field Location:

Date: 11/05/2012

Time: 9:00 AM

Weather: Overcast, temp 40° F, light wind

Noise Meter Location:
State Plane Coordinates
1172606.8626, 1898118.7206

Sound Measurements (L<sub>eq</sub>)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;MIN&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;EQ&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>L&lt;sub&gt;MAX&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roadway Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congress Pkwy</td>
<td>Autos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med. Trucks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hvy. Trucks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.C.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-290/Congress</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,963</td>
<td>2,587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:
LxT_Data.004
## Circle Interchange Noise Analysis Worksheet

**Location:** #11<br>Congress Pkwy

**Field Location:**

**Date:** 11/05/2012  
**Time:** 8:30 AM  
**Weather:** Overcast, temp 40º F, light wind

**Noise Meter Location:**
State Plane Coordinates  
1172639.4709, 1897883.2692

### Sound Measurements (L\(_{eq}\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L(_{MIN})</th>
<th>L(_{EQ})</th>
<th>L(_{MAX})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Roadway Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congress Pkwy (Local St)</td>
<td>Autos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med. Trucks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hvy. Trucks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.C.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I-290/Congress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,293</td>
<td>3,323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Comments:
LxT_Data.003
# Circle Interchange Noise Analysis Worksheet

**Location:** #12  
Tilden St  

**Field Location:**  

**Date:** 11/05/2012  
**Time:** 9:00 AM  
**Weather:** Overcast, temp 40°F, light wind  

**Noise Meter Location:**  
State Plane Coordinates  
1171980.2590, 1897654.9712  

## Sound Measurements (L_{eq})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L_{MIN}</th>
<th>L_{EQ}</th>
<th>L_{MAX}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Volume (vehicles/hour)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN Ramp Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Ramp Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-290 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190-94 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison St Autos</td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison St Busses</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison St Med. Trucks</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison St Hvy. Trucks</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison St M.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Plaines St Autos</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Plaines St Busses</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Plaines St Med. Trucks</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Plaines St Hvy. Trucks</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Plaines St M.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Comments:
LxT_Data.002
Loud busses idling at intersection and bus turn-around. Acceleration and braking at
intersection. Idling trucks. Majority of noise seems to be coming from sources other
than interstates.
Location: #13
Maxwell St. Market

Field Location:

Date: 11/16/2012
Time: 8:15 AM

Weather: Sunny, temp 50° F, no noticeable wind

Noise Meter Location:
State Plane Coordinates
1171978.4505, 1896340.1767

Sound Measurements (L_eq)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L_MIN</th>
<th>L_EQ</th>
<th>L_MAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Des Plaines St.</td>
<td>Autos</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med. Trucks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hvy. Trucks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.C.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I90-94</td>
<td>Total (veh/hr)</td>
<td>4,762</td>
<td>5,656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:
LxT_Data.002
Two passenger vehicles passed by monitoring equipment in parking lot.
Circle Interchange Noise Analysis Worksheet

Location: #14
Randolph St Residences East

Field Location:

Date: 01/24/2013
Time: 12:20 PM
Weather: Wind 7 MPH, Overcast, 18 °F

Noise Meter Location:
State Plane Coordinates
1171651.9467, 1900978.2347

Sound Measurements (Leq)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L_MIN</th>
<th>L_EQ</th>
<th>L_MAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roadway                  | Classification | Southbound (veh/hr) | Northbound (veh/hr) |
--------------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
I-90/94                   | Autos          | 3,412              | 6,566              |
                          | Busses         |                    |                    |
                          | Med. Trucks    |                    |                    |
                          | Hvy. Trucks    |                    |                    |
                          | M.C.           |                    |                    |

Additional Comments:
# Circle Interchange Noise Analysis Worksheet

**Location:** #15
Randolph St Residences West

**Field Location:**

**Date:** 01/24/2013

**Time:** 12:50 PM

**Weather:** Wind 7 MPH, Overcast, 18 °F

**Noise Meter Location:**
State Plane Coordinates
1171250.8686, 1901485.2252

## Sound Measurements ($L_{eq}$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$L_{MIN}$</th>
<th>$L_{EQ}$</th>
<th>$L_{MAX}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-90/94</td>
<td>Autos</td>
<td>3,286</td>
<td>6,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med. Trucks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hvy. Trucks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments:**
Circle Interchange Noise Analysis Worksheet

Not to scale

| Location: | #16 Skybridge Residences |
| Field Location: | |
| Date: | 01/24/2013 |
| Time: | 1:30 PM |
| Weather: | Wind 6 MPH, Overcast, 20 °F |

Noise Meter Location:
State Plane Coordinates
1171273.2338, 1900692.8872

Sound Measurements ($L_{eq}$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$L_{MIN}$</th>
<th>$L_{EQ}$</th>
<th>$L_{MAX}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roadway | Classification | Southbound | Northbound |
--------|----------------|------------|------------|
I-90/94 | Autos          | 3,403      | 6,387      |
|        | Busses         |            |            |
|        | Med. Trucks    |            |            |
|        | Hvy. Trucks    |            |            |
|        | M.C.           |            |            |

Additional Comments:
### Location:
#17 Academy Square Apts

### Field Location:

#### Date:
01/24/2013

#### Time:
2:40 PM

#### Weather:
Wind 3 MPH, Overcast, 21 °F

### Noise Meter Location:
State Plane Coordinates
1167640.904, 1167640.904

### Sound Measurements (Leq)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L_MIN</th>
<th>L_EQ</th>
<th>L_MAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-290</td>
<td>Autos</td>
<td>5,790</td>
<td>5,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med. Trucks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hvy. Trucks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Comments:
# Circle Interchange Noise Analysis Worksheet

**Not to scale**

---

**Location:** #18  
Andrew Jackson Language Academy

**Field Location:**

**Date:** 01/24/2013  
**Time:** 2:15 PM  
**Weather:** Wind 3 MPH, Overcast, 21 °F

**Noise Meter Location:**  
State Plane Coordinates  
1167523.1217, 1897817.536

---

## Sound Measurements ($L_{eq}$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$L_{MIN}$</th>
<th>$L_{EQ}$</th>
<th>$L_{MAX}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Roadway Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-290</td>
<td>Autos</td>
<td>5,236</td>
<td>5,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med. Trucks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hvy. Trucks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Additional Comments:

---
Appendix D
Traffic Noise Model (TNM)
Validation
1. APPENDIX D

1.1. TNM Model Validation

The model validation process verifies the accuracy of the Traffic Noise Model (TNM) predictions of the existing noise levels for the proposed project. The model validation process compares the noise monitoring results to the TNM-predicted existing traffic noise levels. Table D.1 compares the TNM-predicted $L_{eq}$ for the existing conditions to the corresponding measured $L_{eq}$ at each noise measurement site at the Circle Interchange. The locations of the noise measurement sites are shown in Figure A.3 in Appendix A.

The TNM-predicted $L_{eq}$ were based on the 2012 traffic counts for the interchange mainlines and ramps (see Appendix B). Under IDOT noise policies, noise monitoring results generally should be within +/-3 db(A) of the TNM-predicted results for the model to be considered validated. The TNM-predicted noise levels were within 3 db(A) of the corresponding measured noise levels at 17 of the 18 monitoring sites for the Circle Interchange (Table D.1). At Monitoring Site M15, the noise measurements included other noise sources such as the elevated transit line on Lake Street.
### Table D. 1
**TNM Validation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>TNM-Predicted 2012 Existing Conditions Noise Levels ( L_{eq} ) dB(A)</th>
<th>Measured Noise Level ( L_{eq} ) dB(A)</th>
<th>Difference = Predicted minus Measured ( L_{eq} ) dB(A)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>UIC Open Space: grassy area near Halsted Street Parking Structure, overlooking southbound I-90/94</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>UIC Outdoor Courts: outdoor basketball and tennis courts</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>UIC Harrison Field: open, grass field</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Outdoor Courtyard: Courtyard between residential buildings, at end of Sangamon Street</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>Greektown Monument: open-air monument</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>Residential Lofts: between I-90/94 and Halsted Street</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>Greektown Commercial: at end of Quincy Street, overlooking southbound lanes of I-90/94</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8</td>
<td>Haberdasher Square Lofts: at end of Quincy Street, overlooking northbound I-90/94</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9</td>
<td>Old St. Patrick’s Church: outdoor playground</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M10</td>
<td>Residences: multi-story residential building north of Congress Parkway</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M11</td>
<td>Residences: multi-story residential building south of Congress Parkway</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12</td>
<td>Greyhound Open Space: Open space near the bus idling facility</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M13</td>
<td>Maxell Street Market: outdoor market</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M14</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences: East of I-90/94 and south of Randolph</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M15</td>
<td>Multi-Unit Residences: West of I-90/94, north of Randolph</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Measurement included other noise sources, such as elevated transit on Lake Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M16</td>
<td>Skybridge Tower, Multi-Unit Residences: West of I-90/94, between Washington and Madison</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Location Description</td>
<td>TNM-Predicted 2012 Existing Conditions Noise Levels L&lt;sub&gt;eq&lt;/sub&gt; dB(A)</td>
<td>Measured Noise Level L&lt;sub&gt;eq&lt;/sub&gt; dB(A)</td>
<td>Difference = Predicted minus Measured L&lt;sub&gt;eq&lt;/sub&gt; dB(A)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M17</td>
<td>Academy Square Apartments: Multi-Unit Residences North of I-290, between Throop and Loomis</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M18</td>
<td>Andrew Jackson Language Academy: South of I-290, east of Loomis</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Within +/- 3 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E
Public Involvement
## Summary of Viewpoint Letter Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Total of letters sent out</th>
<th>Total # of responses per building</th>
<th># of vote responses returned either &quot;YES&quot; or &quot;NO.&quot;</th>
<th>% of votes responses returned either &quot;YES&quot; or &quot;NO.&quot; divided by Total # of responses per building</th>
<th>% of votes responses returned either &quot;YES&quot; or &quot;NO.&quot;</th>
<th>% that voted &quot;YES&quot; for only those that given back responses</th>
<th>Letters returned via &quot;Return to Sender.&quot;</th>
<th># of receipts returned from 2nd Round</th>
<th>% receipts returned from 2nd Round</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UIC Tennis Courts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 100%</td>
<td>0 1 100%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE 22 (1250 &amp; 1224 W. Van Buren)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7 59%</td>
<td>6 11 46%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11 46%</td>
<td>Academy Square Partnership has given back a &quot;NO&quot; response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] CNE 23 (Academy Square)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>200 5%</td>
<td>157 34 17%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>34 17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Outdoor Courtyard (Sangamon St.)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4 89%</td>
<td>99 57 32%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>57 32%</td>
<td>City of Chicago did not give a response back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770 Lofts</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14 18%</td>
<td>5 6 32%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Patrick's Church</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 100%</td>
<td>2 0 0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Street Lofts</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0 100%</td>
<td>1 76 95%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76 95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES:

1. (From the BDE) The goal is to obtain responses from at least one-third of the benefited receptors for each noise abatement measure (i.e., for each noise barrier being considered). If responses from one-third of the benefited receptors are not received after the first attempt, a second attempt shall be made. The desire for the proposed noise abatement can be determined after viewpoints from at least one-third of the responses have been received or after two attempts have been made to obtain the responses.

2. (From the BDE) In order for a proposed noise abatement measure to be implemented, greater than 50% of the benefited receptors responding must be in favor of the proposed abatement measures. Viewpoints will be tallied for each individual abatement measure (i.e. for each noise barrier being considered). A response from first row benefited receptors (receptors sharing a property line with the highway right-of-way) will be counted and weighted as two responses. Benefited receptors not in the first row will count as one vote. In the case of rental properties, the tenant shall count as one response and the owner shall count as one response per benefited unit. See the IDOT Highway Traffic Noise Assessment Manual for further guidance and an example viewpoint evaluation.

3. Outdoor Courtyard - City of Chicago owns the property of the outdoor courtyard, therefore they get 50% of the votes (i.e. "responses") or one vote per unit of the 933 W. Van Buren Building (This is what is currently shown).

4. CNE 22 (Academy Square) - This building is owned/managed by Academy Square Partnership, which gets 50% of the votes (i.e. "responses"). Thus, they get one vote per unit (This is what is currently shown).
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

☐ Yes
☐ No

Name:

Address:

Please Check One:  ☐ owner  ☐ tenant
Signature:

Date: 7/1/13

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Scharke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1996

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

☐ Yes
☐ No

Name: 770 Lofts LLC
Address:

Please Check One:  ☐ owner  ☐ tenant
Signature:

Date: 7/1/13

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Scharke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1996
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-596/160 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X  Yes

No

Name: Chrissy Delany
Address: 711 W. Illinois Ave.

Please Check One: X Owner Or Tenant

Signature: [Signature]

Date: 7/11/13

Comments:

I would be interested in extending the parking lot under a park.

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Planning
Attn: Steve Solka, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60173-5230

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-596/160 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X  Yes

No

Name: Allie Jones
Address: 110 W. Utah Ave. #302

Please Check One: X Owner Or Tenant

Signature: [Signature]

Date: 3/24/13

Comments:

The noise for my property is bad a noise for others.

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Planning
Attn: Steve Solka, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60173-5230

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-596/160 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X  Yes

No

Name: Margaret Trimboli
Address: 711 W. Illinois Ave.

Please Check One: X Owner Or Tenant

Signature: [Signature]

Date: 7/11/2013

Comments:

This was should extend for 2 blocks as I am the only

owner of this unit.

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Planning
Attn: Steve Solka, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60173-5230

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-596/160 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X  Yes

No

Name: Virginia Voelker
Address: 711 W. Illinois Ave. UNIT 207

Please Check One: X Owner Or Tenant

Signature: [Signature]

Date: 11/13/13

Comments:

I am opposed to this noise barrier

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Planning
Attn: Steve Solka, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60173-5230
I desire the noise barrier:

Yes [X] No

Name: Christopher Contreras
Address: 2733 South California Ave, Chicago, IL 60623
Please Check One: [X] owner Or [ ] tenant
Signature: Christopher Contreras
Title: [ ]
Date: 7/21/2013
Comments: Leave the view! Please don't ruin this project's value with a wall that blocks the views.

Thank you.

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schiltke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60195-1096

---

I desire the noise barrier:

Yes [X] No

Name: [ ]
Address: 770 West Adams Ave, 205
Chicago, IL 60661
Please Check One: [ ] owner Or [ ] tenant
Signature: [ ]
Title: [ ]
Date: [ ]
Comments: The view of the Chicago skyline - buildings included - was one of the top 3 reasons we purchased our condo at 270 W. Adams.-Chicago, IL. We hope at the city can work to ensure that the noise level is kept to a minimum.

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schiltke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60195-1096

---

I desire the noise barrier:

Yes [X] No

Name: Ryan Dohle
Address: 3901 South Homan Ave, Chicago, IL 60623
Please Check One: [X] owner Or [ ] tenant
Signature: Ryan Dohle
Title: [ ]
Date: 7/21/2013
Comments: [ ]

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schiltke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60195-1096

---
I desire the noise barrier:

Yes  
No

Name: Edward E. Kueck
Address: 1250 W. 63rd St. #39
Chicago, IL 60628

Please Check One: X owner Or tenant

Signature: Edward E. Kueck
Date: 6/17/13

Comments: It's about Time!!!

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

-----

I desire the noise barrier:

Yes

No

Name: Joseph Henderson
Address: 1520 W. Berwyn St. Apt 211
Chicago, IL 60626

Please Check One: X owner Or tenant

Signature: Joseph Henderson
Date: 7/12/13

Comments: I am changing my previous vote of YES due to strong opposition from other members of my building who live on floors 1-6, and I would love their views and sunlight blocked.

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

-----

I desire the noise barrier:

Yes

No

Name: David L. O'Connor
Address: 1550 W. 63rd St. #215
Chicago, IL 60628

Please Check One: X owner Or tenant

Signature: David L. O'Connor
Date: 7/12/13

Comments: I have a 3rd floor deck area, I have no desire to have any hard surface. With a sound barrier that is
This is a little too much.

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
I desire the noise barrier.

Yes: X

No: 

Name: Lindsey Gallagher
Address: 1250 W. Van Buren St. Apt. 207
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One: Owner Or X Tenant

Signature: Lindsey Gallagher
Title: 
Date: 7-11-13
Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schliche, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-55/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

Yes

No

Name: BRODD REESE
Address: 1250 W. Van Buren #211
CHICAGO, IL 60607

Please Check One: X owner Or tenant

Signature: BROOD REESE
Title: OWNER
Date: 7-11-12

Comments:

NO WALL, IT WILL BLOCK THE VIEW AND THE BREEZE THAT I GET AS I SIT ON MY BALCONY. I DID NOT BUY MY UNIT TO LOOK AT A WALL, ALSO THE GRASS!

ON THE WALL AND IT CONSTANTLY HAVE TO BE CLEANED, I DO NOT WANT MY VIEW TO BE OF A WALL. I HAVE PLANTS ON MY BALCONY AND I ENJOY THE SUN, BREEZE AND THE NOISE!

NO WALL, ABSOLUTELY NO WALL!!

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schille, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
 Schaumburg, IL 60195-1095

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

Yes

No

Name: PAUL GARCIA
Address: 24424 E. FR CUTS E 207
GROVE CITY, IL 60107

Please Check One: X owner Or tenant

Signature: PAUL GARCIA
Title: OWNER
Date: 2-20-13

Comments:

I am the owner of a unit that faces the highway. I have lived here for several years and have enjoyed the benefits living here. I am normally in favor of a noise wall. It is impossible to have a view of the area. I have a valley view that overlooks a valley and are surrounded by hills. My unit is 100% on Van Buren.

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schille, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60195-1095
I desire the noise barrier:  

Yes  

No

Name:  

Address:  

Please Check One: [ ] owner  [ ] tenant

Signature:  

Title:  

Date:  

Comments:

Mail to:  
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming  
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.  
201 W. Center Court  
Schaumburg, IL 60156-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form
Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-59/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

☐ Yes

☐ No

Name: [Handwritten]

Address: [Handwritten]

Please Check One: Owner or Tenant

Signature: [Handwritten]

Title: [Handwritten]

Date: [Handwritten]

Comments: [Handwritten]

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schieke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

---

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form
Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-59/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

☐ Yes

☐ No

Name: [Handwritten]

Address: [Handwritten]

Please Check One: Owner or Tenant

Signature: [Handwritten]

Title: [Handwritten]

Date: [Handwritten]

Comments: [Handwritten]

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schieke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

---

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form
Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-59/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

☐ Yes

☐ No

Name: [Handwritten]

Address: [Handwritten]

Please Check One: Owner or Tenant

Signature: [Handwritten]

Title: [Handwritten]

Date: [Handwritten]

Comments: [Handwritten]

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schieke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-55/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

Name:
A. Caruthers

Address:
1534 W. Van Buren St.
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One:  [ ] owner  [ ] tenant

Signature: A. Caruthers

Title:

Date:  7/1/13

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlika, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-55/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

Name:
Buchan Brothers

Address:
1334 W. Van Buren St.
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One:  [ ] owner  [ ] tenant

Signature: Buchan Brothers

Title:

Date:  7/1/13

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlika, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-55/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

Name:
A. Caruthers

Address:
1534 W. Van Buren St.
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One:  [ ] owner  [ ] tenant

Signature: A. Caruthers

Title:

Date:  7/10/13

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlika, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-55/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

Name:
Buchan Brothers

Address:
1334 W. Van Buren St.
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One:  [ ] owner  [ ] tenant

Signature: Buchan Brothers

Title:

Date:  7/10/13

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlika, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-60/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:  
Yes [X]  No [ ]

Name:  [ ]
Address:  [ ]
Phone:  [ ]
Owner:  [ ]
Tenant:  [ ]
Signature:  [ ]
Date:  [ ]

Comments:  [ ]

Mail to:  [ ]
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn:  Steve Schlake, P.E.
211 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60195-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-60/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:  
Yes [X]  No [ ]

Name:  [ ]
Address:  [ ]
Phone:  [ ]
Owner:  [ ]
Tenant:  [ ]
Signature:  [ ]
Date:  [ ]

Comments:  [ ]

Mail to:  [ ]
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn:  Steve Schlake, P.E.
211 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60195-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-60/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:  
Yes [X]  No [ ]

Name:  [ ]
Address:  [ ]
Phone:  [ ]
Owner:  [ ]
Tenant:  [ ]
Signature:  [ ]
Date:  [ ]

Comments:  [ ]

Mail to:  [ ]
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn:  Steve Schlake, P.E.
211 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60195-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-60/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:  
Yes [X]  No [ ]

Name:  [ ]
Address:  [ ]
Phone:  [ ]
Owner:  [ ]
Tenant:  [ ]
Signature:  [ ]
Date:  [ ]

Comments:  [ ]

Mail to:  [ ]
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn:  Steve Schlake, P.E.
211 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60195-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

☐ Yes
☐ No

Name: <signature>
Address: [redacted]

Please check one: ☒ owner  ☐ tenant

Signature: [signature]

Date: [date]

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Shulke P.E.
291 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

☐ Yes
☐ No

Name: [redacted]
Address: [redacted]

Please check one: ☐ owner  ☒ tenant

Signature: [signature]

Date: [date]

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Shulke P.E.
291 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

☐ Yes
☐ No

Name: [redacted]
Address: [redacted]

Please check one: ☒ owner  ☐ tenant

Signature: [signature]

Date: [date]

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Shulke P.E.
291 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
1-90/94 at I-290 Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

Name: Maria and Karen Glatz
Address: 1925 S. Brea, # 403

Please Check One: [ ] owner [ ] tenant

Signature: [Signature]
Title: [Title]
Date: [Date]

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schiava, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

EMERGENCY PROGRAMMING RECEIVED

DISTRICT #1

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
1-90/94 at I-290 Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

Name: Keatin Anderson
Address: 1979 S. Green Springs St. #402

Please Check One: [ ] owner [ ] tenant

Signature: [Signature]
Title: [Title]
Date: [Date]

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schiava, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
1-90/94 at I-290 Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

Name: David C. Land
Address: 481 S. Green Springs St. #307

Please Check One: [ ] owner [ ] tenant

Signature: [Signature]
Title: [Title]
Date: [Date]

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schiava, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

THE HIGHER THE WALL, THE BETTER!
I desire the noise barrier:

- Yes  
- No

Name: Michael A. Adam
Address: 1035 30th St. 60612

Please check one: Owner  Or  Tenant

Signature: [Signature]

Date: 5/13/2015

Comments: Thanks for working with us.
This is my home.

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes

No

Name: Greg Smith
Address: 400 S. Green St., Apt 3B

Please Check One: X owner Or___ tenant
Signature: ____________________________
Title: ______________________________
Date: 5/10/13

Comments:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlake, P.E.
211 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes

No

Name: Anthony Dufex
Address: 400 S. Green St., Apt 3B

Please Check One: X owner Or___ tenant
Signature: ____________________________
Title: ______________________________
Date: 5/10/13

Comments:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlake, P.E.
211 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes

No

Name: Rebecca Gray
Address: 400 S. Green St., Apt 3B

Please Check One: X owner Or___ tenant
Signature: ____________________________
Title: ______________________________
Date: 5/13/13

Comments:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlake, P.E.
211 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Benefitted Receptor Viewpoint Form
Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:
Yes
No

Name: ASHLEY L. ALLER
Address: 400 South Green St # 300
CHICAGO IL 60607
Please Check One: owner Or tenant
Signature: 
Title: Tenant
Date: 05-22-13
Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlieke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1006

Benefitted Receptor Viewpoint Form
Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:
Yes
No

Name: JENNER CUMMINGS
Address: 2133 W. Lince Ave
CHICAGO IL 60612
Please Check One: owner Or tenant
Signature: 
Title:
Date: 3-14-13
Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlieke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1006

Benefitted Receptor Viewpoint Form
Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:
Yes
No

Name: MARK T abort
Address: 2207 E. McArthur Dr. Unit 205
Los Angeles, CA 90024
Please Check One: owner Or tenant
Signature: 
Title: Tenant
Date: 05-17-2013
Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlieke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1006

Benefitted Receptor Viewpoint Form
Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:
Yes
No

Name: Thomas BUCK
Address: 5445 E. 64th St. # 205
CHICAGO IL 60637
Please Check One: owner Or tenant
Signature: 
Title: Tenant
Date: 8-20-02
Comments:

I am in support of the noise barrier. I think the additional noise reduction in the area would solve all noise issues for the residents of the community.

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlieke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1006
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-55/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes

_ No

Name: [Signature]
Address: [Signature]

Please Check One: [X] Owner [ ] Tenant

Signature: [Signature]
Title: [Signature]
Date: [Signature]

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60195-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at 1200 Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

✓ Yes
___ No

Name:__________
Address:__________

Please Check One: ___ owner Or ___ tenant

Signature:__________
Date:__________

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60173-1996

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at 1200 Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

✓ Yes
___ No

Name:__________
Address:__________

Please Check One: ___ owner Or ___ tenant

Signature:__________
Date:__________

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60173-1996

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at 1200 Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

✓ Yes
___ No

Name:__________
Address:__________

Please Check One: ___ owner Or ___ tenant

Signature:__________
Date:__________

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60173-1996
I desire the noise barrier:  

Yes  
No  

Mail to: Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming  
Attention: Steve Schilke, P.E.  
201 W. Center Court  
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1990

Mail to: Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming  
Attention: Steve Schilke, P.E.  
201 W. Center Court  
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1990

May 3, 2013

Mr. William L. Sharp  
402 South Green Street #513  
Chicago, IL 60607

RE: Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Solicitation – First Notice  
Noise Barrier Implementation  
Circle Interchange, I-90/I-290 at I-290/Congress Parkway  
I-90/I-290 – Roosevelt Road to Lake Street  
I-290 – Laramie Street to Cary Street/Old Post Office

Dear Mr. Sharp:

The Illinois Department of Transportation (Department) is currently conducting preliminary engineering and environmental studies (Phase I) for the proposed improvement of the Circle Interchange. This improvement is included in the Department’s FY 2014-2018 Proposed Multi Modal Transportation Improvement Program contingent upon plan readiness, land acquisition, and funding availability throughout future annual legislative agreements.

The project includes reconstructing the interchange and adjacent cross street bridges; improving horizontal and vertical alignments; adding ramp lanes; and auxiliary lanes on the approaches to and within the interchange complex. Additional details about the project can be found on the project website at: www.circleinterchange.org

As part of the Phase I Study for this project, traffic noise was evaluated for the proposed roadway improvements. The traffic noise analysis indicated that noise levels in your area warrant the consideration of a noise barrier to reduce traffic noise at your location. Based on the noise statement analysis, the proposed noise barrier would be a noise wall 24 feet high and 422 feet long. The wall would be located along Westbound I-290 as shown in the enclosed exhibit titled “Potential Noise Wall Location.”

The Department is requesting input regarding your desire for the noise barrier as proposed near your location. This letter has been provided to all property owners, and tenants who would ‘benefit’ from a noise barrier. A ‘benefit’ is a noticeable reduction in the noise levels, which is qualified as a noise reduction of at least five decibels.

Enclosed with this letter is a “Viewpoint Form” for you to state whether you desire the noise barrier. Please return this form in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided by May 31, 2013.
We appreciate your views and look forward to hearing from you. The Department has provided an informational sheet for you to consider during your decision-making process. Please note that the Department will consider all viewpoints expressed from "benefited" property owners and/or tenants. Based on the consideration of these viewpoints, the noise barrier may or may not be implemented with the project.

For additional information regarding traffic noise, regulations and policy, noise analysis, or noise abatement, we encourage you to access the Department's Noise Filing Module at the Department's Internet site http://www.dotil.gov. Click on the "Environmental" link and then the "Traffic Noise" link to access this information.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Paul Schneider, Project Manager, at (850) 715-8725.

Very truly yours,
John Forrman, P.E.
Acting Chief of Highways
Region C Enginee

By:
John A. Sacco, P.E.
Project and Environmental Studies Section Chief

Enclosures

Benefitted Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-290/44 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes

No

Name: X William H. Shaw
Address: 14451 SW 171st St., Unit #518

Please Check One: owner Or tenant

Signature: [Signature]
Title: tenant
Date: 5/8/13

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilika, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60195-1096

Benefitted Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-290/44 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes

No

Name: X William H. Shaw
Address: 14451 SW 171st St., Unit #518

Please Check One: owner Or tenant

Signature: [Signature]
Title: tenant
Date: 5/8/13

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilika, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60195-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Grise Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes

_ No

Name: Sue Head

Address: 12511 W. 29th St., 1st Fl.

Chicago, IL 60629

Please Check One: X owner  _ tenant

Signature:

Title:

Date:

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schiike, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Grise Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes

_ No

Name: Linda Johnson

Address: 12511 W. 29th St., 1st Fl.

Chicago, IL 60629

Please Check One: X owner  _ tenant

Signature:

Title:

Date:

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schiike, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Benefitted Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes  

_ No

Name: 
Address: 500 S. Green St., Apt. #407
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One: _ owner  Or  _ tenant

Signature: [Signature]

Title: [Title]

Date: 3/6/13

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
211 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefitted Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes  

_ No

Name: 
Address: 480 S. Green St., Apt. #407
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One: _ owner  Or  _ tenant

Signature: [Signature]

Title: [Title]

Date: 3/6/13

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
211 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefitted Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes  

_ No

Name: 
Address: 480 S. Green St., Apt. #407
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One: _ owner  Or  _ tenant

Signature: [Signature]

Title: [Title]

Date: 3/6/13

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
211 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefitted Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes  

_ No

Name: 
Address: 480 S. Green St., Apt. #407
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One: _ owner  Or  _ tenant

Signature: [Signature]

Title: [Title]

Date: 3/6/13

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
211 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Benefited Receiver Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes
__ No

Name: Jane Doe
Address: 4567 Green St. Apt. 10

Please Check One: X owner Or tenant

Signature: ____________________________
Title: ____________________________
Date: 12/10/2013

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Shihka, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

---

Benefited Receiver Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes
__ No

Name: John Smith
Address: 890 S. Green St. Apt. 10

Please Check One: X owner Or tenant

Signature: ____________________________
Title: ____________________________
Date: 5-27-13

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Shihka, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/I-94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

Yes [x] No

Name: _______ ________________________________
Address: _______ ________________________________
Please Check One: owner Or tenant
Signature: ________________________________
Title: ________________________________
Date: 5/17/12
Comments: Aint destroy our home!

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlice, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/I-94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

Yes [x] No

Name: _______ ________________________________
Address: _______ ________________________________
Please Check One: owner Or tenant
Signature: ________________________________
Title: ________________________________
Date: 5/17/12
Comments: ________________________________

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlice, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/I-94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

Yes [x] No

Name: _______ ________________________________
Address: _______ ________________________________
Please Check One: owner Or tenant
Signature: ________________________________
Title: ________________________________
Date: 5/17/12
Comments: ________________________________

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlice, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/I-94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

Yes [x] No

Name: _______ ________________________________
Address: _______ ________________________________
Please Check One: owner Or tenant
Signature: ________________________________
Title: ________________________________
Date: 5/17/12
Comments: ________________________________

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlice, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes
— No

Name: Joy Roberts
Address: 127 W. Van Buren St. Apt. 704
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One: X owner Or — tenant

Signature: ____________________________

Title: ____________________________

Date: 5/25/2013

Comments:

This noise is a considerable portion for my home. The proposed encroaching improvement, due to traffic increase in the area, will increase noise levels. The noise barrier would be a welcome improvement to the project and hopefully alleviate the noise in this affected area. To continue to have approved noise levels, the noise barrier is essential. This will benefit both the residents and visitors. A failure to include the noise barrier will likely result in noisy conditions existing away from the residents and visitors. Thank you for your consideration.

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes
— No

Name: Joy Roberts
Address: 128 W. Van Buren St. Apt. 704
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One: X owner Or — tenant

Signature: ____________________________

Title: ____________________________

Date: 5/25/2013

Comments:

The noise from the existing motorcycle Traffic Car is unbearable. I have been up every night due to the noise. We must sleep with ear plugs. We have open our windows in the summer because of the noise. In addition, there is the noise from the El Train. This adds to the disturbance. Please, please, build a noise barrier.

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes
— No

Name: Allen M. Polach
Address: 2062 W. 59th St. Apt. 109
Chicago, IL 60621

Please Check One: X owner Or — tenant

Signature: Allen M. Polach

Title: ____________________________

Date: April 15, 2015

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes
— No

Name: Ada Vanderburg & Justin Rostowetz
Address: 970 W. Van Buren St. Apt. 313
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One: X owner Or — tenant

Signature: Ada Vanderburg

Title: ____________________________

Date: 3/25/13

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

\[ \checkmark \text{Yes} \quad \text{No} \]

Name: \underline{Kristine Chavez Suarez}
Address: 136 W. Van Buren St, #711
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One: \[ \checkmark \text{owner} \quad \text{tenant} \]

Signature: \underline{Kristine Chavez Suarez}
Date: [6-30-13]

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schille, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

\[ \checkmark \text{Yes} \quad \text{No} \]

Name: \underline{John Burnmich}
Address: 2713 W. Howen St
Chicago, IL 60647

Please Check One: \[ \checkmark \text{owner} \quad \text{tenant} \]

Signature: \underline{Burnmich}
Title: [Title]
Date: [4/1/13]

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schille, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

\[ \checkmark \text{Yes} \quad \text{No} \]

Name: \underline{Thomas Schoerer}
Address: 928 W. Van Buren St, #711
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One: \[ \checkmark \text{owner} \quad \text{tenant} \]

Signature: \underline{Thomas Schoerer}
Title: [Title]
Date: [Date]

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schille, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
**Benefitted Receptor Viewpoint Form**

**Project and Environmental Studies**
**Circle Interchange**
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Name: Jeanne Antis

Address: 192 W. Washington St. 2nd Fl.
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One:  [ ] Owner  [ ] Tenant

Signature: [Signature]

Date: 8/18/13

Comments:

- Would help with noise generated by 290 tollway

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

---

**Benefitted Receptor Viewpoint Form**

**Project and Environmental Studies**
**Circle Interchange**
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Name: Tina Han Lee

Address: 713 W. Washington St. #767
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One:  [ ] Owner  [ ] Tenant

Signature: [Signature]

Title: [Title]

Date: [Date]

Comments:

The wall is only 6 ft high. This does not allow in terms of decibels, noise to our unit, and also the majority of people in our building, which are all higher than the proposed 6 ft. wall.

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form
Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-50/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway
I desire the noise barrier:

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

Name: Zachary Webb
Address: 383 W. Van Buren 6th Fl
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One: [ ] owner or [ ] tenant

Signature: [Signature]
Title: [Title]
Date: 3/26/13

Comments:
I support the noise barrier at Songwriter and I-190. This will improve conditions at my residence.

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schliek, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

---

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form
Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-50/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway
I desire the noise barrier:

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

Name: John Smith
Address: 933 W. Van Buren AVE 6
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One: [ ] owner or [ ] tenant

Signature: [Signature]
Title: [Title]
Date: 3/26/13

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schliek, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

---

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form
Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-50/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway
I desire the noise barrier:

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

Name: Bethany Smith
Address: 933 W. Van Buren AVE 6
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One: [ ] owner or [ ] tenant

Signature: [Signature]
Title: [Title]
Date: 3/26/13

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schliek, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes

__ No

Name: Robert Kasznak
Address: 933 W. Van Buren St. Apt. 3507
Chicago, Illinois 60607

Please Check One: X owner Or__ tenant

Signature: Robert Kasznak
Title: Mr. 9 (not sure what this is)
Date: 5/4/2012

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlake, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

__ Yes

X No

Name: Jeffrey Wither
Address: 933 W. Van Buren St. Apt. 3507
Chicago, Illinois 60607

Please Check One: X owner Or__ tenant

Signature: Jeffrey Wither
Title: 
Date: 5/13/2013

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlake, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes

__ No

Name: Chester Kasznak
Address: 933 W. Van Buren St. Apt. 3507
Chicago, Illinois 60607

Please Check One: X owner Or__ tenant

Signature: Chester Kasznak
Title: 
Date: 5/4/12

Comments:

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schlake, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290 Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:
- Yes
- No

Name: 
Address: 335 3rd St, Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One: owner or tenant
Signature: 
Title: 
Date: 9/29/13

Comments: 

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

---

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form
Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290 Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:
- Yes
- No

Name: 
Address: 333 W. Van Buren St #401
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One: owner or tenant
Signature: 
Title: 
Date: 9/29/13

Comments: 

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

---

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form
Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290 Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:
- Yes
- No

Name: 
Address: 333 W. Van Buren St #401
Chicago, IL 60607

Please Check One: owner or tenant
Signature: 
Title: 
Date: 9/29/13

Comments: 

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

Name: Brian Burns
Address: 137 West 3rd St

Please check one: [X] owner     Or     [ ] tenant

Signature: __________________________
Title: Mr.
Date: 5-24-18

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Sjakic, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60195-1096

Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

Name: David Nelson
Address: 585 W. Winnetka Rd

Please check one: [ ] owner     Or     [X] tenant

Signature: __________________________
Title: Mr.
Date: 7-12-18

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Sjakic, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60195-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

☑ Yes
☐ No

Name: Padre Thomas Hurley
Address: Old St. Patrick Church
711 W. Monroe St. Chicago

Please Check One: ☑ owner Or ☐ tenant

Signature: Rev. Thomas J. Hurley
Title: Pastor
Date: 5/8/13

Comments:
I would welcome anything that would cut down and eliminate the noise of the expressway traffic!!

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Benefited Receptor Viewpoint Form

Project and Environmental Studies
Circle Interchange
I-90/94 at I-290/Congress Parkway

I desire the noise barrier:

X Yes
___ No

Name: Mark Donovan (Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services)
Address: University of Illinois at Chicago

Please Check One: X owner Or ___ tenant

Signature: [Signature]
Title: Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services - UIC
Date: 7/12/2013

Comments:
Sound/Noise barrier near UIC Tennis Courts

Mail to:
Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Programming
Attn: Steve Schilke, P.E.
201 W. Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096
Dear Cyndi,

I wanted to give you an update on the potential noise wall at Academy Square. Based on viewpoints collected, highway traffic noise abatement measures will not be implemented at your location.

Please share this information with the benefited receptors.

If you have any questions or require additional information regarding noise abatement, please contact Sam Mead, Environmental Unit Head, at (847) 705-4101.

Thanks,

Diana Decker
847.705.4663
Diana.Decker@illinois.gov
Dear Maggy,

I wanted to give you an update on the potential noise wall at 770 Lofts. Based on viewpoints collected, highway traffic noise abatement measures will not be implemented at your location.

Please share this information with the rest of the board members as well as the benefited receptors.

If you have any questions or require additional information regarding noise abatement, please contact Sam Mead, Environmental Unit Head, at (847) 705-4101.

Thanks,

Diana Decker
847.705.4663
Diana.Decker@illinois.gov
Dear David,

I wanted to give you an update on the potential noise wall at Green Street Lofts. Based on viewpoints collected, highway traffic noise abatement measures are likely to be implemented at your location based on preliminary design. However, additional detailed engineering analysis needs to be completed to verify the potential noise abatement measures are constructible from an engineering and cost perspective. As a result, the noise abatement measures may need to be modified or removed from the project plans. A final decision on the installation of abatement measures will be made upon completion of the project’s final design and continued coordination with the public.

Please share this information with the rest of the board as well as the residents.

If you have any questions or require additional information regarding noise abatement, please contact Sam Mead, Environmental Unit Head, at (847) 705-4101.

Thanks,

Diana Decker
847.705.4663
Diana.Decker@illinois.gov
Dear Andy,

I wanted to give you an update on the potential noise wall at St. Patrick’s Church and School. Based on viewpoints collected, highway traffic noise abatement measures are likely to be implemented at your location based on preliminary design. However, additional detailed engineering analysis needs to be completed to verify the potential noise abatement measures are constructible from an engineering and cost perspective. As a result, the noise abatement measures may need to be modified or removed from the project plans. A final decision on the installation of abatement measures will be made upon completion of the project’s final design and continued coordination with the public.

If you have any questions or require additional information regarding noise abatement, please contact Sam Mead, Environmental Unit Head, at (847) 705-4101.

Thanks,

Diana Decker
847.705.4663
Diana.Decker@illinois.gov
Dear Jerry,

I wanted to give you an update on the potential noise wall near the tennis courts at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Based on viewpoints collected, highway traffic noise abatement measures are likely to be implemented at your location based on preliminary design. However, additional detailed engineering analysis needs to be completed to verify the potential noise abatement measures are constructible from an engineering and cost perspective. As a result, the noise abatement measures may need to be modified or removed from the project plans. A final decision on the installation of abatement measures will be made upon completion of the project’s final design and continued coordination with the public.

If you have any questions or require additional information regarding noise abatement, please contact Sam Mead, Environmental Unit Head, at (847) 705-4101.

Thanks,

Diana Decker
847.705.4663
Diana.Decker@illinois.gov
Dear Samantha,

I wanted to give you an update on the potential noise wall at 1224 W. Van Buren. Based on viewpoints collected, highway traffic noise abatement measures are likely to be implemented at your location based on preliminary design. However, additional detailed engineering analysis needs to be completed to verify the potential noise abatement measures are constructible from an engineering and cost perspective. As a result, the noise abatement measures may need to be modified or removed from the project plans. A final decision on the installation of abatement measures will be made upon completion of the project’s final design and continued coordination with the public.

Please share this information with the benefited receptors.

If you have any questions or require additional information regarding noise abatement, please contact Sam Mead, Environmental Unit Head, at (847) 705-4101.

Thanks,

Diana Decker
847.705.4663
Diana.Decker@illinois.gov
Dear Jim,

I wanted to give you an update on the potential noise wall at outdoor courtyard on Sangamon Street. Based on viewpoints collected, highway traffic noise abatement measures are likely to be implemented at your location based on preliminary design. However, additional detailed engineering analysis needs to be completed to verify the potential noise abatement measures are constructible from an engineering and cost perspective. As a result, the noise abatement measures may need to be modified or removed from the project plans. A final decision on the installation of abatement measures will be made upon completion of the project’s final design and continued coordination with the public.

Please share this information with the residents of 933 W. Van Buren.

If you have any questions or require additional information regarding noise abatement, please contact Sam Mead, Environmental Unit Head, at (847) 705-4101.

Thanks,

Diana Decker
847.705.4663
Diana.Decker@illinois.gov
Dear Stephanie & Meghan,

I wanted to give you an update on the potential noise wall at Vanguard Lofts. Based on viewpoints collected, highway traffic noise abatement measures are likely to be implemented at your location based on preliminary design. However, additional detailed engineering analysis needs to be completed to verify the potential noise abatement measures are constructible from an engineering and cost perspective. As a result, the noise abatement measures may need to be modified or removed from the project plans. A final decision on the installation of abatement measures will be made upon completion of the project’s final design and continued coordination with the public.

Please share this information with the board member as well as the benefited receptors.

If you have any questions or require additional information regarding noise abatement, please contact Sam Mead, Environmental Unit Head, at (847) 705-4101.

Thanks,

Diana Decker
847.705.4663
Diana.Decker@illinois.gov
MEETING SUMMARY
Alderman Fioretti’s Office, Green Street Lofts, Sangamon Lofts
& West Loop Community Association

Date: April 19, 2013
Time: 1:00 p.m.
Location: UIC, 1040 W. Harrison, Room 3233

On Friday, April 19, 2013 at 1:00 pm a meeting was held between residents and representatives from Alderman Fioretti’s office, Green Street Lofts (400 S. Green Street), Sangamon Lofts (411 S. Sangamon), West Loop Community Association, and the Circle Interchange Study Team (Study Team). The purpose of this meeting was to address stakeholder concerns including the close proximity of Ramp NW to Green Street Lofts, building foundation and vibration, and noise. The Study Team provided a brief overview of the Alternatives Development Process with a focus on alternatives along outbound I-290, including how the alternative process evolved through geometric workshops and the Project Working Group (PWG) meetings. The Study team also reviewed Alternatives 7.1c and 15.4, as well as the differences in the alternatives from the concept stage developed in December 2012 versus the refined alternatives shown at the public hearing on April 3, 2013. The meeting concluded with discussions regarding potential refinement options and finished with next steps.

Introductions:
John Baczek, Project & Environmental Studies Section Chief from the Illinois Department of Transportation (Department) welcomed everyone in attendance and then the Study Team members and stakeholders introduced themselves.

Presentation
Chuck Stenzel of TranSystems facilitated the meeting and began the power point presentation. The presentation started with an overview of the Alternatives Development Process with a focus on alternatives along outbound I-290 including the development of Ramp NW (flyover) going over or under Halsted Street.

Coordination:
The question was asked:

Q. Is the Green Street Lofts engineer communicating with the Department?
A. Yes, and if there is something you need from us please let us know. The Study Team will be approaching the City of Chicago to obtain building foundation records and plans for Green Street Lofts and Sangamon Lofts. To do so, a letter granting permission is required, and both associations agreed to provide one. The Study Team needs to know the foundation design to better understand the issues with the building.
Traffic Studies:

To identify traffic patterns, an Origin Destination Study was conducted. Questions asked included:

Q. Are there illegal maneuvers at Morgan Street from outbound Congress Parkway?
A. Yes, approximately 10% of eastbound Congress Parkway traffic exits at Morgan Street.

Q. When was this study conducted?
A. August, 2012

Q. Wasn’t Congress Parkway and Wacker Drive under construction?
A. Both Wacker Drive and Congress Parkway were open, at the time of the Origin Destination study was conducted.

Criteria and constraints:

The question was asked:

Q. Why are a few of the buildings colored red?
A. These buildings are protruding into the footprint of the Expressway. For example, the Cermak Pump Station along Harrison Street and Haberdasher Lofts between Jackson and Adams protruded into the Expressway. UIC, Hellenic Museum, 770 Lofts, Green Street Lofts, etc. are all along the existing right-of-way.

Alternatives Considered:

During the project development, the Study Team went through four rounds of evaluation with numerous alternatives at each round. These alternatives were presented at each round to the PWG for their input. Subsequent rounds included new alternatives or modifications to previous alternatives. Each round added progressively more detail.

With each round, some alternatives dropped off because they didn’t meet criteria, or didn’t perform as well as other alternatives. Others kept moving forward for further analysis. In all, over 30 full alternatives and numerous variations were evaluated as part of the project.

As an example, at the beginning in Round 1, the first Alternative A.1 proposed to replace the facility in-kind. This alternative keeps the ramps in the same location with the same horizontal geometrics and did not include any flyovers. However, using the existing configuration was problematic. The horizontal alignment would continue to snake through the interchange with tight curves and slow speeds. Vertically, due to deeper beams on the structures, the profile would become steeper, thus slower and not nearly as effective.
The flyover option for the Ramp NW was introduced in Alternative A.2 to address these substandard design elements.

The majority of alternatives included a flyover over Halsted Street except Alternative A.14 in which Ramp NW was in a tunnel. It was recognized from the beginning that Ramp NW is one of the most congested ramps and had the most accidents of all the ramps. A flyover ramp would address the issues of safety and congestion.

Between Rounds 2 and 3, the PWG stated they wanted to see fewer flyovers, and provide alternatives that take Ramp NW under Halsted Street. This is when the “7 series” expanded and the “15 series” was introduced.

The following questions were asked:

Q. Alternative A.1 didn’t have a flyover?
A. That is correct, it was to basically rebuild in-kind.

There was a brief discussion of the Project Working Group meetings, the structure of the meetings, and participation. It was stated that approximately 54 different groups were invited and there was consistently 25 - 30 people in attendance in addition to observers.

Q. Was “leave as is” an option?
A. Yes, the “No-Build” alternative was considered throughout the evaluation, but does not address the purpose and need of the project.

Q. Is the intent to have all freight go through the City of Chicago? Freight is avoiding I-294 because of the tolls.
A. Currently I-294 is 28% trucks and Circle Interchange is 8% trucks. The Department is not able to restrict trucks on their facilities. The interstate system was originally built to move people, goods and services and the Circle Interchange has 33,000 trucks per day.

Q. Is the 6th lane for outbound I-290 for the future?
A. Yes, for the incorporation of a possible managed lane.

A discussion took place regarding managed lane strategies, the on-going study of I-55 and possible future managed lane studies in the Chicagoland Region. Whatever is done with the Circle Interchange, it should not preclude possible future managed lanes.

Q. How long has Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) been looking at managed lane concepts?
A. Managed lanes have been considered since the late 80’s. Within the last 5 years there is less federal funding, the gas tax is stagnant and vehicles are more fuel efficient. This results in the Department’s buying power being down. New projects have to consider new ways of moving more traffic with limited funds and right-of-way.
Q. Are managed lanes a requirement of the Federal Highway Administration?
A. No.
Q. Will there be managed lanes past Morgan Street?
A. This is currently being evaluated. There is another study on I-290 from Mannheim Road to Racine Avenue.

Comparison of 7.1C to 15.4 from December 2012:

At Project Working Group Meeting #3, the Study Team presented a side-by-side comparison of Alternatives 7.1c and 15.4 from December 2012. At that meeting it was announced that 7.1c was the recommended alternative. Both Alternatives were designed to the same project criteria known at that time such as 2 lanes on outbound I-290 from Congress Parkway and staying within the right-of-way.

For the next three months, Alternative 7.1c was refined as more details were added and some of the project criteria was adjusted. The biggest change in project criteria at this location was adding a provision for a future 3rd outbound lane, instead of just two. This allows room for a future managed lane.

Back in December, both alternatives only had provision for 5 total outbound lanes, two from Congress Parkway, two from Ramp NW and one from Ramp SW. Now, both alternatives require 6 outbound lanes (three from Congress Parkway, two from Ramp NW, and one from Ramp SW). In addition, our safety studies showed that a barrier median is needed at the Morgan Street exit so that only the adjacent ramp traffic can exit.

Prior to the public hearing in April, Alternative 15.4 was updated to include the same new details that had been applied to Alternative 7.1c since the PWG meeting in December 2012.

The following questions were asked:

Q. How tall will the flyover be crossing Halsted Street?
A. Fifteen feet of vertical clearance is required from the top of Halsted Street to the bottom of the flyover bridge. Assuming a four foot bridge depth, the top of the flyover would be approximately 19 feet above the top of Halsted Street.

Q. How wide will the flyover be?
A. The total width of the flyover will be 47 feet.

Q. What is the change to Peoria Street?
A. On the north end, Peoria Street will be raised 4 feet.
Q. Did you look at closing the Morgan Street exit ramp?
A. This was reviewed and there were a lot of concerns with closing it.

Q. Does it just benefit UIC?
A. No, there were concerns from the residents in the area, businesses, Target, and UIC.

Q. What about moving the Morgan Street ramp to Racine Avenue?
A. An exit ramp at Racine Avenue would require substantial building impacts and still not meet standards.

Q. What do you mean by substantial impacts?
A. Five buildings on Van Buren Street and Racine Avenue would need to be acquired.

Q. Would Racine Avenue be a better decision?
A. It is desirable to limit decision points in the vicinity of the Circle Interchange and it is desirable to have the first decision point as far away from the interchange as possible. However, given the number of land uses and businesses served by the Morgan Street exit, and that an exit at Racine Avenue would have substantial building and other impacts, it was determined that the exit at Morgan Street should remain. The preferred alternative includes features that will restrict some movements from accessing this ramp for safety purposes.

Q. Why does UIC want to keep the Morgan Street exit? So their opinion weighed more?
A. Actually, Morgan Street and Racine Avenue are both too close and it would be more desirable for the first exit to be located at Ashland Avenue. However, given the number of business and land uses served by the Morgan Street exit, it was determined that the exit should remain. Numerous stakeholders cited the desire to keep the Morgan Street exit.

Comparison of 7.1C to 15.4 in April 2013:

Based on the project criteria that was presented at the Public Hearing on April 3rd, a side-by-side comparison of the 7.1c and 15.4 was shown.

A cross section view of Alternative 7.1c at the east face of the Green Street Lofts building was shown. The horizontal offset is 19.9 feet from the face of the building to the back of the wall. The ramp passes the east face of the building at ground level, and continues to go down as it proceeds west to go under Peoria Street. Two retaining walls will be needed in this area near the east face of the building, one on each side of Ramp NW.

One attendee noted that the retaining walls would help with the fragility of the building foundation.

For both Alternative 7.1c and 15.4, there are retaining walls and ramp gores (the area where ramps come together) that limit driver’s sight distance. The shoulder width around the curves on the ramps is important and cannot be reduced any further so that drivers can see around the wall. This is a very important safety item.
A cross section view of Alternative 15.4 at the east face of the Green Street Lofts building was shown. The roadways for Alternative 15.4 are at the same elevation as the existing I-290 pavement, approximately 18 feet below the existing ground line. The retaining wall offset to the east face of the building is about the same as Alternative 7.1c, at 20.5 feet. While it seems like Alternative 15.4 is a reasonable plan, there are geometric and safety concerns.

Alternative 15.4 will require introducing sharp horizontal curves in both direction on I-290 and will require lowering the speed limit on I-290 to 35 miles per hour (mph). This would introduce an unexpected slow down and could increase the potential for the number and severity of crashes. The eastbound I-290 profile will have a roller coaster effect going under Halsted Street, over I-90/94, under Ramp NW, and then over Ramp EN with sight lines limited to 35 mph. Profile grades on other ramps would be steeper than existing, with Ramp SE at an 8.7% upgrade when the desired maximum is 4%. Ramp WN would exit from the left side from westbound Congress Parkway which creates a dangerous mix of slower exiting traffic with faster through traffic. While further analysis of Alternative 15.4 was warranted, it is an undesirable design because of these major safety concerns.

The following questions were asked:

Q. Where would the potential noise wall be located?
A. The wall would start at roughly the midpoint of the Rice Building and extend west to Peoria Street and the wall would generally match the alignment of the ramp.

Q. Are the shoulders 10 feet because needed for emergency services vehicles, and do you go back to them when you refine the alternative?
A. The Study Team received emergency services feedback and we have met with them twice.

Q. Is there deep tunnel access?
A. Not within the Circle Interchange project area. However, we do have 13 foot diameter water feeder mains, freight tunnels, abandoned tunnels, and CTA tunnels.

Q. Why can’t you make Alternative 15.4 work?
A. The horizontal curves are too tight and increase the potential for more crashes and severe total crashes. The vertical grades make conditions undesirable as well, for example it would be more difficult to see over the crest of a hill and see an object in your path. Another safety disadvantage of the alternative is the left handed exit for Ramp WN.

Q. If vehicles go 7 mph now, so isn’t 35 mph a step up?
A. The design needs to safely accommodate traffic throughout all hours of the day, each day of the year.

Q. Alternative 15.4 was 42 feet away and now it is 20 feet away, why?
A. The version of Alternative 15.4 shown in December was conceptual and did not include the project criteria introduced after PWG Meeting #3, specifically the provision of a future managed
Circle Interchange
Phase I Study

At the Public Hearing, an updated version of Alternative 15.4 was shown that included the newer project criteria. In December, the plans were conceptual only and now the detailed designs have been refined based on cross sections, stopping distances, vertical grades, etc. The extra detail allows for identifying concerns and determining if they can be fixed based on the constraints.

Q. Are there any other alternatives you are looking at?
A. Alternative 15.4 had concerns, but it also had merit and that’s why we continued to look at it and really focused on trying to eliminate the issues. We are investigating other options and we will be presenting three new ideas today.

Q. Was Alternative 15.4 tweaked to make it unacceptable?
A. No, the same criterion was applied to both Alternatives 15.4 and 7.1c.

Q. What about political constraints?
A. The Federal Highway Administration will likely not agree with an Interstate design with a 35 mph speed limit.

Q. At the end of the story are you going to tell us that Alternative 15.4 is just impossible and we didn’t get a voice in Morgan Street?
A. The evaluation criteria and rounds of evaluation have proven to the Study Team that Alternative 7.1c could move forward and best meets the Project’s Purpose & Need. Alternative 15.4 is still being considered and other variations of Alternative 7.1c will be presented at this meeting.

Other Options:
Alternative 7.1D

Since refinements to Alternative 15.4 are not looking promising, three new variations to Alternative 7.1c were introduced. They are not finalized at this point, and were presented to solicit feedback. The goal of these variations is to increase the offset between the Green Street Lofts building, the flyover ramp, and the retaining wall along the building. All of them have the same basic layout of Alternative 7.1c except rearrange the order the ramps come together in the westbound direction.

The first is Alternative 7.1d. It moves the flyover ramp from the right side to the left side, along the CTA right-of-way. It has the advantage of moving the flyover ramp away from the building. But it does have disadvantages. One disadvantage is the very long bridge span over Halsted and three ramps directly to the east of Halsted Street: Ramp WS, Ramp SE, and the Taylor By-pass. This raises the ramp up higher because the bridge beams would be deeper. In turn, this would affect the Peoria Street profile requiring a higher profile and ultimately could result in a complete reconstruction of the CTA’s station and platform below. This could have some significant challenges to overcome including possible service interruptions.

A cross section of 7.1d was shown and the flyover ramp is away from the building (approximately 91 feet away). However, because it crosses over Halsted at a higher elevation, it goes by Green Street Lofts at a higher elevation (over 8 feet above existing ground). Also, in order to accommodate
shoulders, bridge piers, additional barrier walls, curves in the roadways, and sight distance, the retaining wall moves closer to the building to 15 feet (instead of 20 feet with Alternatives 7.1c and 15.4).

Another disadvantage from an engineering perspective is a very large storm sewer (7 feet x 8 feet) may need to be relocated.

**Alternative 7.1E**

Since there are some drawbacks with Alternative 7.1d, a second Left Sided entry is being investigated, Alternative 7.1e.

In this scenario, the ramp crosses over I-290, then swings back over it a second time to improve the profile. This allows the flyover to cross Halsted Street at a lower profile elevation, and thus lowering the ramp near Green Street Lofts and Peoria Street. The flyover ramp is about 84 feet from the building (versus 91 feet away in the first concept). But the elevation above existing ground is about 6 feet (versus 8 feet in the first concept).

Also, in order to accommodate shoulders, bridge piers, additional barrier walls, curves in the roadways (especially the crisscross between the flyover and I-290), and sight distance, the retaining wall at the building moves even closer to 13.4 feet.

It still has the disadvantage from an engineering perspective of relocating a very large storm sewer (7 feet x 8 feet) and it would still cause Peoria Street profile to go up, possibly resulting in a complete reconstruction of the CTA’s station and platform.

Q. Does the retaining wall reflect noise?
A. Yes, near the wall, but not further out.

Q. What is the height of the noise wall?
A. Based on preliminary analysis the noise wall could be up to 22 feet. The Study Team needs to determine the geometry then run the models and determine the economic benefits.

**Alternative 7.1F**

A third alternative that would strive to avoid relocation of the very large storm sewer and minimize extensive profile changes at Peoria Street is Alternative 7.1f. This alternative involves placing the flyover ramp in the center, between I-290 on the left and Ramp SW on the right. With this option, the offset is to the flyover is reduced to 42 feet from the building. It is about 4 feet above the existing ground line.

However, to accommodate shoulders, bridge piers, additional barrier walls, curves in the roadways, and sight distance, Ramp SW moves even closer to the building, placing the retaining wall about 8 feet away.
The initial findings are that none of these new concepts increase the offset between the retaining wall and the building, but they do increase the offset to the flyover.

Q. If you go back to Alternative 7.1c, are there more refinements that can move the flyover further away?
A. Possibly, however, any change would be a few feet, but not tens of feet.

Q. Going back to Alternative 7.1c, is there precedent for a flat grade between the building and the retaining wall? This may become an appealing place for folks to congregate.
A. This area could be flattened out. If the Department maintained this area it would be a slope. The Department could enter into an agreement with the City of Chicago and they in turn could enter into an agreement with Green Street Lofts or some other entity for maintaining the area. Currently, Land Acquisition is looking into who owns this property. The Department currently has responsibility for maintenance of the slope and it is mowed twice a year at the most.

Q. With all the construction going on, how will we be affected during construction, with limited parking, impacted garbage pick-up, bus routes, closures, etc.?
A. Following selection of the preferred alternative, the Study Team will prepare staging plans. It is anticipated that work at Peoria Street will occur during summer months while student activity is low. Morgan Street would likely be a complete closure, but may stay open partially for pedestrian activity only. Halsted Street would be staged.

Q. How has the Study Team adjusted their schedule moving forward?
A. We will go back and continue to evaluate these new alternatives and seek your feedback. A second meeting with this group is planned for May 3, 2013.

Mr. Tim Stevens, Alderman Fioretti's Chief of Staff announced he needed to leave. He reiterated that the Alderman wrote the Governor and has called for another public hearing. He then thanked the Department for expanding their thoughts and coordination.

Q. Can we obtain cross sections for Sangamon?
A. Cross section information and the entire power point presentation will be provided after the meeting.

We will be investigating vibration dampening and isolation techniques for buildings close to the right-of-way. Site conditions will have a significant effect on vibrations including soil types and foundation design. It is recommended that baseline measurements will be completed with vibration monitors and monitored during construction. The Study Team will prepare a vibration study plan and share it with the group.

Q. Can you provide geotechnical data to Sangamon Lofts?
A. Yes. Would Sangamon and Green Street Lofts be willing to release permission to receive copies of permits issued on your buildings from the City?
A. Yes.
Q. How do you plan to minimize air pollution?
A. Air pollution improves with all the alternatives. Noise impacts will vary with the alternative. However, mitigation efforts will be taken.

The Department asked if there were any initial reactions to the new options of Alternatives 7.1d, e. and f, which move the flyover further away, but moves the retaining wall closer to the building. There was no initial reaction and more time was requested to review the materials. They will be discussed at the next meeting.

Q. What is the largest volume of traffic?
A. WB I-290 under 30,000, NW ramp 32,500 and SW 24,500.

Q. What is the best option for noise and visual for us?
A. Noise analysis and aesthetics will be reviewed and the Study Team will continue to find the best balance.

**Noise:**

At Green Street Lofts, our studies found the existing noise at a second floor west side loggia to be 66 dB(A) and 60 dB(A) at the east side main entrance.

Projected noise without a noise wall, if the Alternative 7.1c was constructed, would be 66 dB(A) at the same west side location and 64 dB(A) at the same east side location.

Noise is measured on a logarithmic scale. To put it in perspective, a 3 dB(A) is barely perceivable and 5 dB(A) is readily perceivable.

Q. We had issues on where you took the study.
A. We heard you and we reevaluated the study from additional locations.

Q. How can the impact be higher on one side of the building?
A. It is based on the speed of traffic, the elevation of the roadway, and distance, but we will look into what speed was used in the analysis.

Q. What is the Sangamon Court yard impact?
A. We will verify the information from the analysis.

For noise barriers to be considered, they must be both feasible and reasonable, meaning: after an impact is determined, they are constructible and achieve at least an 8 dB(A) reduction for at least one benefited receptor, and be economically reasonable.

As mentioned, the noise study is still being conducted and we don’t have the final reviews completed. At this time, it looks like we can mitigate the noise. We would like you to start thinking if you would like a noise wall and we can discuss it at our next meeting.
Next steps for the noise study would be to complete the noise study, then if indeed this location is found feasible and reasonable:

- Solicit viewpoints from each property owner and tenant by letter.
- A 33% response rate is the goal.
- Viewpoints from benefited receptors including both property owners and tenants will be tallied.
- Greater than 50% of viewpoints received must be in favor of the proposed abatement measure for it to be included in the project.

Q. How long was the field noise measurement taken?
A. The reading was for 15 minutes taken during good weather, no snow, and no rain. The field measurements were taken to validate the noise model results.

Q. Was the figure of 66 dB(A) a mean/average?
A. Yes

Q. How many benefited receptors are there?
A. For Green Street Lofts, we are counting 67 residential units plus one office for a total of 68 benefited receptors.

Q. That means the reasonable cost goes down per benefited receptor?
A. Yes

**Next Steps:**

A lot of information was reviewed and it is understood that time is needed to absorb the information.

The Study Team introduced new concepts to increase the offset between Ramp NW and the Green Street Lofts building.

The Study Team will investigate any other options to move the ramp, even though all possibilities may have been exhausted.

The Study Team will investigate strategies for vibration dampening, and will complete the noise study and get back to the group with specifics (height and placement of the wall). Then we will ask for your viewpoints.

**Attendees:**
Tim Stevens - Alderman Fioretti’s Office
Pete Steinau - Green Street Lofts
Bernard Edelman - Green Street Lofts
Bill Sharf - Green Streets Lofts
John Gorey - Green Streets Lofts
Jennifer Powers - Green Streets Lofts
Hugh McLaughlin - Sangamon Lofts
Arthur Kurzydlo - Sangamon Lofts
J. Mohammadi - Dearborn Engineering
Martha Goldstein - West Loop Community Association
John Baczek - IDOT
Steve Schilke - IDOT
Paul Schneider - IDOT - PMC
Diana Decker - IDOT - PMC
Rick Wanner - IDOT
Chuck Stenzel - TranSystems
Matt Smith - TranSystems
Grace Dysico - TranSystems
Mark Lucas - AECOM
Mike Eichten - AECOM
Cathy Valente - Images Inc.
MEETING SUMMARY
Alderman Solis’ Office, Alderman Fioretti’s Office, Green Street Lofts, Sangamon Lofts & Peoria Parking

Date: May 3, 2013
Time: 1:00 p.m.
Location: UIC, 1040 W. Harrison, Room 3427

On Friday, May 3, 2013 at 1:00 pm a meeting was held between residents and representatives from Alderman Solis’ office, Alderman Fioretti’s office, Green Street Lofts (400 South Green Street), Sangamon Lofts (411 S. Sangamon), Peoria Park Partners, and the Circle Interchange Study Team (Study Team). The purpose of this meeting was to address stakeholder concerns including the close proximity of Ramp NW to Green Street Lofts, building foundation and vibration questions, safety, noise, visual impacts and air quality. The Study Team provided a brief overview of the alternatives studied to date with a focus on foundations and retaining walls, vibration monitoring, noise studies, aesthetics and finished with next steps.

Introductions:
Steve Schilke, Consultant Studies Unit Head, for the Illinois Department of Transportation (Department) welcomed everyone in attendance and then the Study Team members and stakeholders introduced themselves.

Presentation
Chuck Stenzel of TranSystems and Mark Lucas of AECOM facilitated the meeting and began the power point presentation.

Alternatives Development Update
The presentation began with an update on the previous alternative evaluation process. It was determined that 12 of the 34 alternatives included a flyover Ramp NW that went under Halsted Street. This includes the recent Alternatives 7.d, e, and f.

Of the 12 alternatives, Alternative 15.4 was deemed as the strongest performer. This alternative was reinvestigated since the last meeting. The Study Team also looked at the other 11 alternatives in case something has changed and one of them would be better. The finding was that none of the other 11 are worthy of additional consideration as they don’t meet the purpose and need, or don’t operate as good as other alternatives. For Alternative 15.4, the Study Team looked at changing profile grades, lowering the mainline, and re-spacing the roadways and other ideas. Unfortunately, in the end, Alternative 15.4 could not be improved upon.

At the last meeting, 3 new options were introduced, Alternatives 7.1d, e, and f. The goal of these options was to increase the offset between the Green Street Lofts building, Ramp NW, and the retaining wall along the building. All of these have the same basic layout as Alternative 7.1c except rearranging
the order the ramps come together in the westbound direction. Alternative 7.1.d moves the flyover ramp from the right side to the left side, along the CTA right-of-way.

**7.1.d** - The flyover ramp is further away from the building (approximately 91 feet away), but it is about 8 feet above existing ground level. Also, the retaining wall moves a little closer to the building to 15 feet (instead of 20 feet).

**7.1.e** - The flyover ramp is further away from the building (approximately 91 feet away), but it is about 8 feet above existing ground level. Also, the retaining wall moves a little closer to the building to 15 feet (instead of 20 feet).

**7.1.f** - The last option would place the flyover ramp in the center, between I-290 on the left and Ramp SW on the right. With this concept, the flyover ramp is about 84 feet from the building (versus 91 feet away in the first concept), and is 6 feet above ground elevation. However, the distance between the retaining wall and your building moves even closer to 13.4 feet (instead of 20 feet).

All the alternatives are similar at Sangamon Lofts. The distance between the building and retaining wall is approximately 20 feet, versus 51 feet existing. The building is 23.1 feet away with Alternative 7.1c.

There was a question at the last meeting was about the traffic volumes on the mainline and ramps near Green Street Lofts. It was explained that the projected daily traffic for the design year 2040 (which was received from CMAP) are:

- 31,000 vehicles per day (vpd) for outbound I-290
- 23,000 vpd for Ramp SW
- And 36,000 vpd for Ramp NW

Ramp NW has the most total volume but has two lanes. Another way to compare the ramp movements is lane density, or vehicles per lane. Since some movements have 2 lanes, the values differ:

- 15,500 vpd for outbound I-290 (or about 17% of traffic)
- 23,000 vpd for Ramp SW (or about 26% of the traffic)
- And 18,000 vpd for Ramp NW (or about 20% of the traffic)

The truck percentages vary between the ramps; 3% on WB I-290, 7% Ramp NW and 3% for ramp SW.

**Q.** If Alternative 15.4 is an undesirable design are you going to look at different variations and who deems it undesirable?

**A.** Design standards are set by the Federal Highway Administration. The Study Team has evaluated the alternative and has significant concerns with certain components of this alternative, with the most significant being the reduction of mainline I-290 vehicle speeds to just 35 miles per hour. This speed level is typical of ramps, not on mainline lanes.

**Q.** The Morgan Street access is limited to the NW movement only. It just doesn’t make sense to keep this open. What is the rationale behind keeping Morgan Street open and not moving it to Racine Avenue? Was the school the only entity that wanted Morgan Street to remain open?
A. Members on the Project Working Group (PWG) had mixed feelings. Members of the PWG from Greektown, UIC, and CMAP felt it's important to maintain the ramp. The Illinois State Police asked to restrict access to the ramp. Public comments from the Public Meeting were also mixed. Some residents wanted it for access to condos and businesses. Representatives from the University Village Association did not want the Morgan Street ramp closed as business and condo owners would object along with UIC students. UIC representatives stated that access is important to parking in the area and to the UIC Pavilion.

The Study Team examined moving the access to Racine Street. There were two options. Move the exit to Racine Street or line up the exit with Aberdeen Street. Both options would require the acquisition and displacement of 5 to 6 businesses. The geometrics of each alternative are not optimal. The Study Team concluded that the Morgan Street exit ramp will remain in the proposed plan.

Q. Our building (Sangamon Lofts) is 100 years old and we didn't experience foundation and settlement issues until 5 years ago when IDOT did their resurfacing project on I-290. We don't find this very comforting knowing you will be so close to the building.

A. A later portion of the presentation will discuss vibration specifications and the stringent criteria used by the City of Chicago.

Q. Why couldn't the Ramp come up to Aberdeen Street?
A. This was challenging coming up and quick curves along with impacts. It was looked at however, but geometrically was not feasible.

Foundation and Retaining Walls

It was explained that an important aspect of evaluating the various alternatives is the adjacent foundations and retaining walls. A cross section of Alternative 7.1c at the east face of the Green Street Lofts building was shown. Ramp NW is near existing ground elevation. Another exhibit with Alternative 15.4 was shown with Ramp SW in a cut section approximately 18 feet below existing ground elevation.

From a geotechnical perspective, it is the opinion of the Study Team that having Ramp NW on fill near the existing ground elevation adjacent to Green Street Lofts building is a better situation than a cut section adjacent to the building.

Preliminary feedback from geotechnical experts based on available information points to Alternative 7.1c as better addressing potential foundation issues. With the retaining wall as part of Alternative 7.1c there will be additional fill and with Alternative 15.4 fill is removed. Alternative 7.1c will provide stability to the foundation.

The design and construction of retaining walls in the City of Chicago must follow the City’s Deep Foundation Procedure and Requirements with coordination through the Office of Underground Coordination (OUC). They have very stringent requirements to obtain permits. For example, they
require hand calculations to prove computer calculations are correct; hand calculations validate computer output.

These procedures have been set up to deal with the construction of buildings next to buildings throughout the City. The Study Team is familiar with these procedures. As an example, temporary earth retention systems must be very solid, limiting movement to ¾ inches, where IDOT standard policy in open suburban areas is 2 inches.

Q. When you said fill do you mean soil?
A. Yes

Q. When you say retaining wall are you saying ramp?
A. No, it's a structural wall.

Q. So you don't anticipate driving piles? So, what happens if you get in and there is a need to drive the piles?
A. We know that it is a foregone conclusion and we don't anticipated driving piles we intend to use drilled shafts or caissons.

Q. What type of retaining wall would be installed?
A. Retaining wall types will be determined during Phase II, Final Design. But we anticipate that there will be no pile driving on the project. Drilled shafts and caissons will be used.

**Vibration Monitoring**

The Study Team is developing a Vibration Monitoring Plan that was introduced to some in attendance during a conference call earlier in the week. The plan is still being developing and it will be shared when it is complete. The plan will consist of a Pre-Construction Condition Survey to identify existing conditions, cracks, bracings, etc. Monitors will be installed. We anticipate two types: Blastmate for buildings close to the ROW, and Geosinics for those further away. Both will record data and can download information. The Blastmate has the capability to be connected to cellphones to send messages of vibrations above a pre-determined threshold. The monitoring program will be conducted before construction begins to get a baseline as well as during construction.

Vibration monitoring is proposed at 23 buildings adjacent to the corridor. The baseline measurements will be used to establish an allowable threshold. Contract specifications will be included so the contractor must stop all work if a predetermined target, such as 80% of the threshold, is hit. The monitor will immediately send a text to the construction engineer and contractor informing them if the threshold was hit.

Q. When you say action, what action will be taken if alarm goes off?
A. There will be strict specifications and if the threshold is approaching the contractor would be required to shut down. There will be no violation of this procedure.

Q. Who is monitoring on a daily basis? Who has the kill switch and who owns that responsibility?
The monitors are set at a threshold lower than the alarm alert. Construction staff, supervisors, and engineers will receive text messages regarding potential threshold. An alarm goes off and the construction will stop and the contractor must re-adjust means and methods to accomplish the work.

Q. How are the thresholds being determined?
A. I am not the vibration expert; however, I will get that information to you as thresholds are developed.

Q. Can we have input on the levels?
A. In conversations with the experts, they site U.S. Mining Standards.

Q. Who determines the thresholds?
A. The consultant team.

Q. Can our geotechnical experts have input?
A. We will share that information with you.

Q. Will we have the option to receive the alert data?
A. We can find out.

Q. When the alerts are generated we ask that the building engineers receive the alert.
A. There are reports generated at the end of the project and real time data is not available. There are codes for various buildings and alarms for the entire project and the construction team won’t be able to provide just one record.

Q. We don’t want damage, and then find out about it later. During the 4½ years will the building be monitored? Or just when you are near the building?
A. If you look at the construction staging, the cross streets are at the beginning part of the project and the vibration experts will determine if and when your building will be monitored and part of the overall plan.

Q. So when do you do the base-line monitoring? 30 days before?
A. We would like to do it now and have the ability to begin to collect data.

Q. What do you need from us?
A. No information is needed from you at this time. There will be a meeting in the future to introduce the vibration monitoring plan to other buildings in the area.

Q. Did you receive the information from the City of Chicago regarding the Green Street Lofts building?
A. The information from the City did not include anything regarding the existing foundation, only recent internal renovations and that is not what is needed. There was no information on Sangamon’s existing foundation either. Someone in the audience mentioned they may have some foundation information but not much.
Q. The vibration movement is great, however, have you thought about underpinning the buildings? The fear is that the building is going into the Ike and the Circle.
A. No, not at this time. We are setting up a program to prevent this.

Q. You own the thresholds, you set the alerts. When you resurfaced 5 years ago, was vibrations monitoring done? There was a lack of transparency between stakeholders on this. The foundation issue occurred around the time I-290 was resurfaced and there haven't been any earthquakes.
A. All work will be done by using accepted standards of the industry.

Q. So you don't know what the thresholds will be or how they are set?
A. The procedures are set; soil condition is variable, clay vs. sand, all parameters will be taken into account when setting the parameters. Monitoring the conditions today will help maintain that threshold. The alarms are set much lower than the threshold. It is not a single incident but sustained vibrations over time that causes damage.

Q. You are requested to monitor movement, settlement and vibration. You need to underpin the building. If there is a landslide, the fill is not good unless properly stabilized. You need to approach our buildings because you already damaged it. U.S. mining standards, how is that applicable to something 7 feet away. We ask you to look into this for Sangamon and Green Street Lofts.
A. Ok.

Noise

The noise study has been completed and at Green Street Lofts, our studies found there is a noise impact identified at a third floor west side loggia. The existing noise level is 67 dB(A), which exceeds the criteria of 66 dB(A). Projected noise without a noise wall, if the Alternative 7.1c was constructed, would be 68 dB(A) at the same west side third floor location and 64 dB(A) on the east side of the building. Projected noise with a noise wall will reduce the noise levels to 63 dB(A) on the west and 51 dB(A) on the east. These meet the feasibility criterion. It also passes the economically reasonable criterion.

• The calculated height of the potential wall is 24 feet.
• The result is that a noise wall can be installed if the benefited receptors vote to include one in the project.

Q. So it did raise the projected noise?
A. The noise levels presented at the last meeting were for the 2nd floor and for this study we used the 3rd floor.

Q. For the eastside of the building, will the wall provide protection for the Rice Building?
A. The potential noise wall will be approximately half way across the Rice Building and extend to Peoria Street. The wall may provide some residual protection to the Rice Building.
Q. So 24 feet from the new grass line? Is the sound different if the wall is lower?
A. A 24-foot high wall provided noise reduction for the most benefited receptors, providing at least a 5 dB(A) reduction. A lower wall, say approximately 16 feet, would still provide some noise reduction, but the 3rd floor would only achieve a 4 dB(A) reduction instead of the 5 dB(A).

Q. The windows on the second level are 17 feet of the ground
A. We are showing 24 feet because it provides the best mitigation for the most benefited receptors. You could go shorter but you need to decide what is best for you, sight vs. sound. We are going to poll the residences for a 24-foot wall.

Q. What is the offset to the west?
A. 28 feet to 31 feet.

Q. These walls, will the lights be deflected?
A. Vehicle headlights will be screened by a tall parapet wall proposed along the side of Ramp NW. Trucks headlights would be above this wall, but the point where these headlights would be directed towards the Green Street Lofts building is 500 feet away.

Q. On the south side of Green Street Lofts there are no lights and we don’t want lights. You addressed the vehicle lights.
A. We will following lighting standards.

Q. We don’t want to look like the US Cellular field and have to have black out shades - what will that look like?
A. Again, we will follow lighting standards.

Q. If cost is a big deal, is it better to replace with sound proof windows?
A. Noise monitoring is based on exterior noise levels.

Q. At our last meeting, you indicated the critical location was the 2nd floor, and today it is the 3rd floor. What happens on the 4th floor with a 24 foot wall?
A. There is a 3 dB(A) reduction. Existing 67 dB(A), Alternative 7.1c without a wall would be 68 dB(A), and with a 24-foot wall it would be 65 dB(A).

Q. So who gets to vote?
A. Residents and owners. Certified letters were sent out today. Tenants get 1 vote and the owner gets 1 vote. So if it is a rental property, the unit gets 2 votes, the owner and the tenant.

The noise study results for Sangamon Lofts were then presented. At Sangamon Lofts, for the main doorway on the west side of the building, our studies found the existing noise level is 63 dB(A), therefore an impact was not identified.

However, the adjacent courtyard was reviewed and the existing noise level was 70 dB(A), therefore an impact was identified. Projected noise levels without a noise wall, if the Alternative 7.1c was constructed, would be 71 dB(A). Projected noise with a noise wall will reduce the noise levels to 62 dB(A).
dB(A) at the courtyard. This meets the feasibility and economic reasonability criteria. A wall could be constructed if the polling indicates so. The potential wall would be 6 feet high.

The result is that a noise wall can be installed if the benefited receptors vote to include one in the project.

Q. Where does the 6 foot start?
A. At the ground level, and would span between your building and the one to the west.

Q. You wouldn’t do anything on the east side?
A. No.

Q. So you would remove the wooden fence?
A. Yes.

Q. So Sangamon Court is a benefited receptor and they only get to vote?
A. Since the courtyard was constructed as part of the west building development, the polling would be of the 180 residents of that building. Your building would not get a vote on the implementation of the wall. This is similar to the Rice Building whose occupants will not get to vote on the Green Street Lofts wall. The 180 viewpoint letters were already sent out.

The Department just sent out letters to solicit viewpoints from each property owner and tenant by certified mail. A 33% response rate is the goal. Viewpoints from benefited receptors including both property owners and tenants will be tallied. Greater than 50% of viewpoints received must be in favor of the proposed abatement measure for it to be included in the project.

Clarification on noise policy regarding the polling was provided:
First letter is sent and if 33% not returned, a second certified letter is mailed. If after the second letter is sent, and the Department still doesn’t get the desired return rate, they tally what they did receive. The Department would need greater than 50% of those tallied to move forward.

Aesthetic Treatments

Exhibits showing potential noise abatement wall types were reviewed. There was a concern expressed about changing the sloped area along the embankment near Green Street Lofts to a flat area. This flat area could be a security issue and Green Street Loft residents requested that this area be secured with a fence. A concept was shown that includes an alley around the south face of the building.

Q. Lot to the west, Peoria Park Partners, we would have a vested interest as well.
A. Yes, we will continue to work with you.

Q. Is this project going to cancel leases?
A. Yes the property will be needed during construction but the leases could be re-negotiated after construction.
Q. We would like to see a lot of green. If it is flat, could we fence it? Can it still be flat if everyone else wants a slope?
A. We would work with the city on an agreement and we would check into the second part of your question.

Q. Looks like more parking? Is that leased?
A. Opportunities will be explored as to what we can do.

Q. Regarding the alley with additional parking, in this case, the south wall would want green. Is this open for discussion?
A. Yes, these are just options to spark discussions.

Q. If you don’t put in a noise wall, how tall is the parapet wall?
A. 42 inches tall.

It was mentioned that for Halsted Street it is anticipated that there will be a canopy at the CTA station for the mid-block crossing. This will look much like the 35th and 47th Street CTA canopy. For Halsted Street, Peoria Street and Morgan Street there are also opportunities for enhancements to make these roadways more bike and pedestrian friendly.

Q. Is there opportunity for green space on Peoria Street?
A. Hardscape only due to irrigation issues.

Q. Do you have a rendering of Peoria as it relates to parking?
A. No. The portion of Peoria Street above Ramp NW would be raised by 4 feet. Moving the north, the profile will transition downward back to the street level along a 16-foot long driveway and a walkway to meet ADA requirements.

Q. What about parking near the dry cleaners?
A. There are 2 spots south of the driveway, 3 before the dry cleaners and 2 on the other side.

Q. Have you discussed this with the dry cleaners?
A. No. The City of Chicago would need to approve. These are concepts only and we are meeting with CDOT and continuing coordination.

Q. How will this new design be maintained? Who will be responsible for plowing snow? Today, no one really maintains the pedestrian bridge. Can this driveway connection to the parking lot be wide enough for two-way traffic?
A. A discussion is needed to find a balance between function or aesthetics. If you have 2 cars, one can wait. We will look at now that we know 2 cars need to pass. The Department will coordinate with CDOT/UIC and CTA about maintenance. The representative from Alderman Solis’ office mentioned they will get Street and Sanitation involved.
It was also mentioned that the curb cut would need to be approved by City of Chicago.

**Alternatives Comparison Chart**

Based on the information presented, a chart was developed to compare the various alternatives. The criteria include items that are important to Green Street Loft residents including the distance to the building, noise wall, security, vibration etc. Engineering criteria are also included for items such as meeting the project’s purpose and need, geometrics, and constructability.

From an engineering perspective, Alternative 7.1c is same or better in all categories.

**Next Steps**

The modified Alternative 7.1c, with the refinements made over the last month, is the best alternative for the project as well as addressing concerns expressed by residents from Green Street Lofts. The alternative does the best in balancing a wide range of concerns and issues. The Study Team will coordinate the vibration monitoring program as well as coordinate design plans when they are available.

This is not the end of the coordination process. It would continue throughout design and construction. The Study Team is willing to meet with residents from Sangamon and Green Street Lofts to describe the new studies that have been completed.

Q. There is great opposition to the flyover.
A. Unfortunately given the project constraints, the preferred alternative needs a flyover for Ramp NW.

Q. Green Street Lofts would like to have a meeting with its residents showing the revised setback, and updated renderings. They requested holding the meeting in their building lobby.
A. 

Q. When will you release the Environmental Assessment?
A. This project has been classified as a Categorical Exclusion. All necessary environmental analysis will be documented in the final report.

Q. When will TSL be done and can we get a copy?
A. We will look to see when we can get you the TSL.

Q. When will the hammer hit the pavement?
A. Perhaps as soon as August of 2013

Q. Will the work be 24 hours per day?
A. We will look at the operations, however, there is certain work like setting beams that require lane closures and that work will be at night. Retaining and foundation work is done during the day. Demolition due to lane closures takes place at night.

Q. How long will you be in front of the Rice Building and Green Street Lofts?
A. The number of months has not been determined yet. However, a rough estimate is work continuing for up to a year and a half.

Q. We would like a timeline and best estimate to see how we will be affected. We would also like the construction sequencing plan.
A. Construction sequencing is described in the environmental documents.

Q. Where will the contractor’s equipment be stored?
A. If the equipment is stored at the local street level, the contractor would need permits from the City.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Attendees:
Dean Argiris - Alderman Fioretti’s Office
Vince Sanchez - Alderman Solis’ Office
Bernard Edelman - Green Street Lofts
John Gorey - Green Street Lofts
Jennifer Powers - Green Street Lofts
David Lewis - Green Street Lofts
Stacey Simmons - Green Street Lofts
Hugh McLaughlin - Sangamon Lofts
Kevin Johnson - Sangamon Loft Condominium Association/Peoria Park Partners
Jon Shoemaker - Sangamon Lofts
John Baczek - IDOT
Steve Schilke - IDOT
Paul Schneider - IDOT - PMC
Diana Decker - IDOT - PMC
Rick Wanner - IDOT
Chuck Stenzel - TranSystems
Matt Smith - TranSystems
Grace Dysico - TranSystems
Tony Albert - TranSystems
Denise Castalino - AECOM
Mark Lucas - AECOM
Mike Eichten - AECOM
Cathy Valente - Images Inc.
MEETING SUMMARY

St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Church

Date: May 9, 2013
Time: 1:00 PM
Location: 711 W. Monroe Street, 3rd Floor

On Thursday, May 9, 2013 at 1:00 PM a meeting was held between representatives of Old St. Patrick's Church, the Frances Xavier Warde School, and the Circle Interchange Study Team (Study Team). The purpose of the meeting was to provide an overview of the project and address concerns of the St. Patrick's campus, including noise impacts and abatements, construction staging and scheduling, and foundation vibration.

Introductions
Steve Schilke of the Illinois Department of Transportation (Department) welcomed everyone in attendance, and then the Study Team and stakeholders introduced themselves.

Project introduction and selection of preferred alternative
An overview of the project was provided, starting with the interchange's selection as the most congested in the country and the need to reconstruct the bridges and ramps in the area around the Circle. The public involvement process to date was discussed, including four Project Working Groups with representatives from the West Loop area, a design charette, a public meeting, and a public hearing.

The constraints and challenges facing the project were discussed, explaining why the Preferred Alternative was selected. The constraint to work within the existing right-of-way and to not impact existing buildings was discussed. Traffic staging and detours during construction were also cited as important factors in the selection. The northbound collector-distributor road's design and operation was discussed as this will directly front the St. Patrick's campus.

Noise
The noise analysis process was explained, starting with the analysis of land use, selection of receptors, modeling using the Traffic Noise Model software, and model validation. The model has shown that a 6' high noise wall shielding the playground area behind the school is feasible and reasonable according to Department and federal policy.

The Department enquired if the St. Patrick's representatives had received the viewpoint letter sent to them requesting their response to the potential noise wall. The letter had not been received, but the St. Patrick's representatives present stated that the Church and school want a wall installed. The Department agreed to expedite the viewpoint letter process by emailing a letter to the Church.

Maintenance of the proposed noise wall was discussed. It was asked if the St. Patrick's campus would be willing to handle maintenance of the "back" side of the wall, primarily graffiti removal. The campus representatives agreed they would assist in these efforts. The Department would
remain responsible for all structural and highway-side maintenance, as well as any major repairs or replacement.

Exhibits showing aesthetic treatments for the proposed noise walls were viewed. The concept of all proposed treatments was to have a stone-like façade for the noise walls with vegetation growing on the vertical face. This treatment is for the highway side of the wall. The preferred treatment remains under development, but the campus representatives agreed with the aesthetic concept.

**Construction Sequencing**
The Study Team explained the overall project sequencing, starting with the I-290 corridor overhead bridges, proceeding through I-290, followed by the I-90/94 corridor including the "Kennedy Trench" adjacent to St. Patrick's. The Church expressed concern regarding the staging of the cross street bridges over I-90/94, especially Adams Street and Monroe Street. It was noted that the Kennedy Expressway cross-streets will be reconstructed in two-phases, with Van Buren and Monroe Streets being reconstructed during shut-downs, followed by Adams Street and Jackson Boulevard.

School representatives were concerned with pick-up and drop-offs of students. Currently parents pull into the alley behind the Church and wait to pick up their children, and the north and south ends of the alley are within in the project reconstruction limits. The Study Team stated that access to the alley would be maintained during the bridge closures with temporary materials at times. Other access concerns were for the Church's annual festival in the parking lot north of Monroe Street (typically held in late June every year), to be able to maintain pedestrian access to and from the festival area and the Church. The Study Team said this would be possible.

**Vibration**
The Study Team described the proposed vibration monitoring plan. Monitoring will be conducted at buildings around the Circle Interchange project, including at St. Patrick's Church. Monitoring will be conducted prior to the start of construction to establish a baseline, and during construction to ensure that vibration stays below the determined threshold. The vibration monitoring program will be similar to the one instituted for the recent Wacker Drive project.

The Church noted that though they had no current issues with foundation settlement, they had suffered damage during the construction of the adjacent lofts. The Study Team stated that drilled shafts will be used during construction in lieu of pile driving to minimize vibration to nearby buildings. The Church's representatives noted that their primary vibration concerns were for the Old St Patrick's Church building and the rectory. The Study Team requested foundation plans for the campus' buildings. The representatives stated they would likely be able to procure them.

**Discussion**
The school reiterated their concern to maintain access to their alley for student pick up during construction. Additionally they requested that if possible the alley be widened to a 2-lane one-way northbound section to accommodate additional vehicles waiting for students. The Department stated they would review that possibility.
The school expressed concern regarding the reduced distance between the Adams Street on-ramp and their alley entrance. Parents often queue on Adams Street while waiting for children, and drivers bound for the on-ramp bypassing the queue will have a reduced distance to merge into the turn lane. The Study Team will review the issue.

Meeting concluded at 2:30 p.m.

**Attendees:**
Andrew Rhodes, Old St. Patrick's Church
Joanne Gresik, Old St. Patrick's Church
Danielle Kelly, Fances Xavier Warde School
Erin Horne, Frances Xavier Warde School
Steve Schilke, IDOT
Paul Schneider, IDOT – PMC
Matt Smith, TranSystems
Brian Holman, TranSystems
Mark Lucas, AECOM
Dipal Vimawala, AECOM
A meeting was held on Tuesday, June 4, 2013, with the representatives from the National Hellenic Museum, 770 Lofts (located at 770 W. Gladys Ave.) and the Illinois Department of Transportation (Department). The purpose of the meeting was to discuss issues regarding the proposed aesthetic improvements and maintenance issues as part of the Circle Interchange project near the National Hellenic Museum and the 770 Lofts Buildings.

Parking and Green Space
Connie Moutoupalas of the National Hellenic Museum noted that her primary concern is the parking problem that exists in the Greektown neighborhood. She explained the parking agreement between the Hellenic Museum and the City of Chicago in which 77 public parking spaces are provided within 1000 feet of the museum to offset those lost during its construction. If the Hellenic Museum cannot provide these spaces, it will lose its Tax Increment Financing (TIF) grant funds. Currently, the museum is proposing to lease parking spaces from the Marks Brothers property located between Quincy Street and Jackson Boulevard. This area is the only fee simple right of way acquisition location within the project study area. It will impact 22 parking spaces. 770 Lofts also expressed their concerns over parking since there are not enough parking spaces in their parking lot for each unit in the building.

Q: Can we lease land from the Department for neighborhood parking?
A: Yes, that is a possibility.

Q: What is the process for leasing?
A: It's an open bidding process.

Q: What are the terms for leasing parking?
A: It's a 3 year commitment. After the 3 years, it's renegotiable.

Q: What is the price for the leasing?
A: It's based on fair market value for the land.

Q: Can we buy land from the Department for parking?
A: We have to talk with the Bureau of Land Acquisition.

Another option of creating a green space instead of parking was discussed. The Department would flatten the area out behind the retaining wall to create the green space and would plant trees and grass. The building would be able to use this space at no cost so long as they agree to maintain the area.
Noise Analysis
The noise analysis was performed in accordance with the Department's Highway Traffic Noise Assessment Manual. Traffic noise levels for the Circle Interchange have been predicted using a Traffic Noise Model (TNM). At 770 Lofts, our studies found there is a noise impact identified at the third floor balcony on the east side of the building facing I-90/94. The existing noise level is 72 dB(A), which exceeds the criteria of 67 dB(A) for exterior noise at a residential building. The projected noise without a noise wall would be 74 dB(A) at the same east side third floor location. A noise wall would reduce noise levels to 64 dB(A). These meet the feasibility criterion and it passes the economically reasonable criterion. The calculated height of the potential noise wall is 24 feet which maximizes the number of benefited receptors. The units with balconies facing the I-90/94 on the first three floors were identified as the benefited receptors.

The Department sent out letters to solicit viewpoints from each benefited receptor, including property owners and tenants. With the first mailing, the goal is a 33% response rate. If that goal is not obtained then a second mailing occurs. At the end of the second mailing, regardless of response rate, the viewpoints of the benefited receptors are tallied, where 1 vote is assigned to the owner and 1 vote is assigned to the tenant. Greater than 50% of the viewpoints received must be in favor of the proposed noise abatement measure for it to be included in the project.

Q: Is the noise study based on the existing or the proposed traffic?
A: It is based on the proposed traffic.

Q: When will the noise wall be built?
A: Typically, after all the roadway construction is completed, all the noise barriers will be installed.

Q: Now that you have provided us with more information today on the noise wall, can we change our viewpoint letter votes?
A: Yes, you can change your viewpoint.

Aesthetics
Renderings of the proposed noise wall for 770 Lofts and the Halsted Street Bridge were shown. Galvanized steel beams will be used for all the bridges. A decorative steel woven fencing will be used near the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) station entrance/exit on Halsted Street. Various types of landscaping elements can potentially be planted including vines on the noisewall, trees, flowers and grass. The decorative “Chicago Wall”, similar to those currently installed on Lake Shore Drive, will be utilized for the barrier walls. The aesthetic plan is under development.

The Department proposed a common aesthetic theme for the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) and Greektown based on the UIC’s Flame and the Greek Olympic torch. Flowers could be selected based on the yellow/red fire-themed colors and flame designs could be incorporated into the noise wall and retaining wall designs.
Closing Remarks

Q: Are there any new entrances/exit ramps to Greektown for the proposed project?
A: All ramp locations will be the same as current. Although, the Morgan exit will only be allowed access from the NB Dan Ryan via the Ramp NW flyover.

Q: Will you include the resolution to our parking situation in your final project document?
A: Yes, in August we will finish the Phase I Plan document.

The Department will continue to coordinate with 770 Lofts and the National Hellenic Museum regarding the potential for parking or green space.

Meeting concluded at 11:00 am.

Attendees:
Connie Mourtoupalas, President of National Hellenic Museum
James Haft, 770 Lofts
Timothy McCarthy, 770 Lofts
Margaret Tinucci, 770 Lofts
Joanna Kurnyta, 770 Lofts
Andrew Burken, 770 Lofts
Steve Schilke, IDOT
Rick Wanner, IDOT
Diana Decker, IDOT – PMC
Jonathan Rualo, IDOT – PMC
MEETING SUMMARY
700/750 S. Des Plaines Street

Date:  June 14, 2013
Time:  10:00 AM
Location:  700 S. Des Plaines Street

On Friday, June 14, 2013 at 10:00 a.m., a meeting was held between the representatives of the 700/750 S. Des Plaines Street buildings and the Circle Interchange Study Team. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the noise study and vibration monitoring program for the Circle Interchange project.

**Introductions & Background:**
The Illinois Department of Transportation (Department) will host a second public hearing on Thursday, June 27th at the Crowne Plaza Hotel, 733 W. Madison Street, Chicago, from 5:00 to 8:00 p.m. The last public meeting was held on April 3rd and it was noted that Amy Van Aalst was in attendance. The Department appreciates that she was in attendance to notify them that a recording studio was in the building.

The Environmental Assessment (EA) and Noise Study will be released on Wednesday, June 19th. Hard copies of the reports will be at local public libraries and at the Department’s office in Schaumburg, IL.

**Ramp NW:**
Construction of the NW flyover ramp is expected to start in the Summer of 2014. The ramp will go over both Harrison Street and Halsted Street and then drop back down and underneath Peoria Street. Right-of-way takes with the project are minimal. Harrison Street will be reconstructed one half at a time. Harrison Street will be closed while under construction. Taylor Street will likely be staged construction.

As the Ramp NW climbs up, it will swing over the retaining wall behind the 700 S. Des Plaines building coming closer to the building in an easterly direction. At its closest point to the building, the ramp will be located 9.5 feet from the building edge, approximately 10 feet above the pavement. This is in an area of right-of-way owned by the Department that is currently paved and used as a driving aisle by the building.

At the very north end of the building, the ramp starts swinging upwards and away from the building. The Department recommends that fencing be located between the retaining wall and the ramp to prevent anyone from entering that area.

**Vibration Monitoring Program:**
A vibration monitoring program will be done for all building adjacent to the interchange. Prior to construction, the Department will set up a vibration monitor in the lowest (i.e. basement) level of the building to take base readings. A pre-condition survey will be completed and a vibration threshold will be identified. During construction if vibrations from construction reach a certain percentage of the
predetermined threshold, a notification to stop work will be sent to the contractor and Department representatives. Corrective action will then take place before construction can start up again. Additionally, data from the monitors will be examined each week or possibly more frequently to monitor vibrations. This program is set up the same way as the vibration monitoring program for the Wacker Drive reconstruction project which was considered successful. In addition to the monitoring program, construction methods will be designed to minimize vibrations including drilled shafts.

The building representatives noted that the pile sheeting at the corner of the building was installed during an earlier Dan Ryan related project to address settling issues.

The Department requested any building plans for 700/750 S. Des Plaines, as these would be helpful to set up the vibration monitoring program.

**Noise Analysis:**

The noise analysis was performed in accordance with the Department’s *Highway Traffic Noise Assessment Manual* (HTNA Manual). To assess potential traffic noise impacts, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has established the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) for various land use and activities. The 700 S. Des Plaines building is classified as Category D since there is a recording studio in the building. Unlike other NAC Categories, Category D considers indoor noise levels.

The existing outdoor noise levels were modeled at 75 decibels, compared to 76 decibels after construction in the design year (2040). An increase of 1 decibel is considered insignificant and unperceivable so there will be no noise impact outside. The HTNA Manual NAC Category D defines a property as being impacted by roadway noise if the interior noise approaches or exceeds 52 decibels. The HTNA Manual determines interior noise levels by subtracting a value from the modeled exterior noise. Because 700 S. Des Plaines is a masonry building with no windows, 35 decibels are subtracted from the 2040 outside noise of 76 decibels, resulting in an inside noise of 41 decibels. This is well below the defined 52 decibel threshold of impact for interior noise, indicating that the project will not have an impact on indoor noise.

The building representatives asked if noise testing would be completed after the Circle Interchange project was completed to verify that there is not an increase in indoor noise. The Study Team replied no. The building representatives asked if they could take their own readings and provide the data to the Department. The Department stated that they would be able to do that. However, the building is not an impacted receptor and therefore, is not eligible for noise abatement.

The Study Team asked what activities occur in the 700 S. Des Plaines Street building and the 750 S. Des Plaines Street. The building representatives replied that in the 700 S. Des Plaines Street there are automotive uses, a recording studio and entertainment events. The automotive uses will be moving to the 750 S. Des Plaines Street building in the near future. The 750 building also serves as storage.

The building’s engineering firm will be conducting their own vibration monitoring. They would like to be present when the Department’s precondition survey is conducted and the monitors are located in the building.
Next Steps:
The Department will contact the building’s engineer when the vibration monitoring program begins.

Attendees:
Stephen Murphy, Building Representative
Amy Van Aalst, Building Representative
Kristy Davis, Harley Ellis Devereaux
Paul Schneider, IDOT-PMC
Mike Eichten, AECOM
Matt Smith, TranSystems
Gina Trimarco, TranSystems
MEETING SUMMARY

Green Street Lofts

Date: June 20, 2013
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Location: Green Street Lofts, 400 S. Green Street, Chicago, IL

On Thursday, June 20, 2013 at 7:00 pm a meeting was held between residents and representatives from Green Street Lofts (400 S. Green Street) and the Circle Interchange Study Team (Study Team). The following concerns were addressed; close proximity of the ramp to Green Street Lofts, foundation and vibrations, safety, noise, air quality, and headlights. The goal of the meeting was to provide the residents with an update on the project process since the April 3rd public hearing. The agenda of the meeting progressed as follows; The study team provided an overview of the Alternatives Development Process, then Alternatives 7.1.c and 15.4 were reviewed, what they were in December 2012 versus what was shown at the public hearing in April, and why they are different. The results of the noise study were discussed, the latest information on aesthetics was provided as well. Next the proposed vibration monitoring plan was discussed in addition to a review of the project schedule.

Introductions:
Steve Schilke, Project Manager from the Illinois Department of Transportation (Department) welcomed everyone in attendance and introduced the Study Team members.

Presentation
The Department facilitated the meeting, beginning with a PowerPoint presentation. The presentation began with a summary of comments heard from the stakeholders. These included; close proximity of the ramp to our homes, foundation and vibrations, safety, noise, air quality, and headlights.

Phase I Study Process:
Phase I involves three main steps:
1) Data collection and evaluation of conditions to identify needs (This step establishes the Project’s Purpose and Need which is the basis for design). The P&N is to improve safety, improve mobility and improve the condition of the facilities and infrastructure.
2) Analysis of alternatives involves developing numerous alternatives to address the needs while also minimizing impacts.
3) Once a preferred alternative is selected, we refine it to further enhance the design and minimize impacts. Refinement is part of the public outreach process.
Project Study Team:
The Project Study Team has primary responsibility for the project development and 8 geometric workshops were held during the process. Each workshop consisted of presenting ideas, debating the advantages and disadvantages of each, and providing direction for the next steps.

- The Project Study Team consists of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), IDOT’s Project Management Consultant, Stanley Consultants, AECOM and TranSystems.

Q. Who or what is FHWA?
A. Federal Highway Administration - Springfield

Criteria and constraints:
The project had some overall primary criteria:

- Avoid right-of-way acquisition and stay in the existing footprint. This resulted in the design needing to go up because it couldn’t go out.
- Maintain all system ramps along I-290/Congress and I-90/94, and as many local ramps as feasible
- Provide geometry that is better than existing
- Reduce the number of decision points for drivers
- Provide a safer design.
- Maintain traffic as much as possible during construction to avoid detours.

There were many constraints in the project area:

- Underground: CTA tunnels, large water tunnels, abandoned water tunnels, large storm sewers, utilities – this made bridge pier placements very difficult
- Facilities protruding into the right-of-way: Cermak pump station, sewer pump stations, Haberdasher Lofts
- Buildings lining the right-of-way, including Green Street Lofts
- CTA Blue Line and bus station.

Alternative Analysis:

Over 30 alternatives were investigated.

Alternative A-3 would include a multi-level interchange with I-90/94 at the bottom on Level 1, I-290/Congress Parkway at Level 2, Free-flowing ramps over City Streets at Level 3, and free-flowing ramps for the opposite directions at Level 4, approximately 50 feet above city street level. Although alternative A-3 would be great for traffic flow, it would not be good for the adjacent community. This concept would require the acquisition of approximately 9 buildings, home to numerous residences and businesses.
Traffic safety needs warrant improvement the operations that connect these two major interstates. To accommodate all of these movements, additional lanes are proposed for ramp EN, ramp NW, and along I-90/94 to eliminate bottlenecks. At the same time, the study team looked to improve maneuvers and maintain access to local exits and entrances to the surrounding communities.

Why do we need to build flyovers:

The initial alternative considered (A-1) started with the existing facility and focused on just widening the most congested ramps and through lanes but keeping the same geometric footprint. What was found was that as lanes were added (e.g. along I-90/94) bridge openings needed widening resulting in deeper beams for the bridges. In turn, as bridge beams got deeper they needed to be raised to go over the roadways underneath, and this led to increased slopes on ramps to get them back down to where they current cross under other ramps. This led to a situation where it was not possible to keep all of the interchange movements within the current footprint defined by the cross streets of Van Buren, Des Plaines, Harrison, and Halsted.

Alternative: “Under Halsted”

It was noted that 12 of the 30 alternatives (40%) were designed with the ramp to go under Halsted. Alternative 15.4 was considered to be the best of the 12, and therefore advanced to the final round of analysis. The other 11 were not examined further because they don’t meet the purpose and need, or don’t work as well as other alternatives. At the Public Hearing on April 3, there were significant concerns from the public regarding ramps going over Halsted Street. Therefore, 15.4 was reinvestigated.

Preferred Plan- Additional Studies

The third step of a Phase I study is to identify and refine the preferred alternative, Mark Lucas presents this portion of the meeting.

In December 2012, 7.1c was announced as the recommended alternative. At that time both 15.4 and 7.1c were designed to meet the same project criteria, there were 2 lanes on outbound I-290 staying within the right-of-way.

For the next three months, Alternative 7.1c received more refinements and the project criterion was adjusted. The biggest change in project criteria at this location, was adding a provision for a future 3rd outbound lane, instead of just two. This allows the possibility for a managed lane in the future.

In December both alternatives had provision for 5 outbound lanes. Now, both require 6 outbound lanes. Alternative 7.1c was up to date, but 15.4 was not. In addition, safety studies showed that a barrier at the Morgan Street exit is necessary so only the adjacent ramp is permitted to exit. Alternative 7.1c accommodated this, but 15.4 did not.

A cross section view of 7.1c is shown at the east face of the building. The horizontal offset shows 19.9 feet to the back of the wall. The ramp passes the east face of the building at ground level, and continues
to go down to get under Peoria Street. For both 7.1c and 15.4, there are retaining walls and ramp gores (the area where ramps come together) that limit driver’s sight distance. The shoulders of the ramp cannot be reduced any further because of the drivers sight distance. This is a very important safety item.

The roadway elements for 15.4 are all near the existing roadway grade, approximately 18 feet below existing ground line. The retaining wall offset to the east face of the building is about the same as 7.1c, at 20.5 feet, because of this plan, 15.4 was examined further.

Reinvestigation of Alternative 15.4

Concerns remained while 15.4 was re-investigated:
The following primary criteria must still be met:
• Avoid right-of-way acquisition and stay in the same footprint
• Provide geometry that is better than existing
• Provide a safer design

Major concerns of alternative 15.4:
• The posted speed limit on I-290 would be 35 mph – resulting in unexpected slowdowns, increasing the potential for the number and severity of crashes.
• The EB I-290 profile is designed to go under Halsted, over the Dan Ryan, under Ramp NW, and over Ramp EN would have a “roller coaster” effect with sight lines limited to 35 mph (same crash concerns)
• Ramp WN would exit on the left side. This places slower exiting traffic in the fast lane, and drivers expecting to exit on the right have to weave over 2 or 3 lanes in a short distance after coming out from under the Post Office.
• Ramp NW would have a very steep down grade on a horizontal curve. This is not an acceptable design for a busy ramp.
• Lastly, profile grades (or roadway slopes) on other ramps would be steeper than existing even if I-90/94 was lowered by 3 feet, risking potential for flooding at this major interchange.

Overall, Alternative 15.4 is an undesirable design for safety.

Three Other Concepts

Since 15.4 couldn’t be improved, three other concepts were examined.

The goal of these concepts is to increase the offset between the Green Street Lofts building, the flyover ramp, and the retaining wall along the building. All of them have the same basic layout of 7.1c except the order in which ramps come together in the westbound direction is rearranged.

The three other concepts are; 7.1.d, e, and f. Concept D moves the flyover ramp to the left side near the CTA right-of-way but in doing so, it leads to other negatives. The flyover ramp would be even higher above Halsted and requires complete reconstruction of the CTA’s station and platform below. Concept
E is similar to D, the ramp crosses over I-290, then swings back over it a second time to improve the profile. The difference is that the retaining wall closest to Green Street Lofts moves even closer to 13.4 feet (instead of 20 feet). Concept F involves placing the flyover ramp in the center, between I-290 on the left and Ramp SW on the right. However, Ramp SW moves even closer to the building, placing the retaining wall about 8 feet away. Our findings were that none of these new concepts increased the offset between the retaining wall and the building, but they did increase the offset to the flyover.

Refinement of 7.1c

7.1c was examined to see if the offset from the Green Street Lofts building could be increased. At the meeting in March 7.1c the offset between the Green Street Lofts building and Ramp NW was 7.4 feet. At the Public Hearing it was increased to 19.9 feet by modifying the angles of how the ramps come together. By continuing to investigate how to increase the offset, we developed a modification to 7.1c that increased the offset from 20 feet to 26 feet designing more narrow shoulders. This reduction was coordinated with FHWA, and has been approved.

The offset near Sangamon Lofts was also examined. The offset in this area has remained constant at approximately 26 feet at the east face of the Green Street Lofts building, and 21 to 22 feet at the west face, given the very compact nature of this area.

Alternative 7.1c remains the preferred alternative and will be presented as so at the Public Hearing on June 27.

The following questions were asked:

Q: At the last meeting it was 28 feet, what happened?
A: 26 feet was approved by FHWA.

Q: A 4 foot shoulder?
A: A 4 foot shoulder, correct.

Q: What was the reason?
A: Safety- less than 4 foot shoulders and less than 11 foot lanes did not meet AASHTO standards.

Q: Are there studies?
A: Yes, we can show you the design exceptions documentation.

Q: The ramp will be at grade?
A: Yes, on east side it will be at 8 feet, on the west it will be below.

Q: Why did you determine that you needed a 6th lane? Why would you assume you wouldn’t want to acquire buildings, which would allow you to build a little further outside the box?
A: To minimize harm, we try to work within the right-of-way.
Discussions continue about what is desired by the Department, and what is desired by the residents. One resident expresses that it is less desirable to build an overpass, than to acquire buildings. Steve explains the importance of working within the footprint.

Q: An overpass will divide the community, for a few seconds of time savings
A: Acquisition would spread the footprint.

Discussions continue about the impact of a flyover to the community. The stakeholders are concerned about the proposed flyover and how it will affect the surrounding community.

Q: How will you protect us from accidents that occur on the flyover?
A: The parapet wall. The curves on the flyover are designed to be safe.

Q: Aren’t you just moving congestion to another location? Why are you adding lanes?
A: Lanes were added to accommodate for expansion in the future, as part of 10 year projection.

Diana explains that the lanes will be striped as the current number of lanes, each will be wider. It is explained that Oak Park will provide the opportunity for a managed lane in the future.

Q: Can you create a 3D model?
A: Yes, we have a walk-through rendering. The rendering will be shown at the public hearing.

Q: Do you have studies to show that managed lanes will be effective?
A: Yes, CMAP has data to show that managed lanes.

**Potential Enhancements of 7.1.c**

There is potential for a landscaped area between the building and the noise wall, as well as a reinforced concrete parapet wall. In addition, the parapet wall and noise wall would serve as barrier for light from headlights. The ramp would also support the ground next to the Green Street Lofts foundation. Because there are two retaining walls, the ramp would be on retained fill at the building (not on a bridge).

The retaining wall (or walls) may help with vibration. Researching is being conducted to evaluate vibration isolation barriers. These could be implemented with the construction of the retaining wall along the ramp or by placing an isolation barrier, such as a slurry wall, between the retaining wall and the building. The existing soil conditions are being evaluated as well as possibly evaluating the existing building foundation plans. Additionally, there is potential for installing vibration sensors to establish the baseline condition. Fully understanding the site conditions will assist in determining a possible solution.
Noise Study

Traffic noise based on the following factors
- Speed
- Distance from roadway to receptor
- Percentage of trucks
- Topography / Elevations

The traffic noise analysis uses the existing conditions to provide the basis for evaluation. IDOT Policy follows FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC). Traffic noise impact when predicted noise level approach, meets or exceeds the NAC of 67 dBA for residential properties. Outdoor noise only is used for residential properties, never indoor noise.

For noise barriers to be considered, they must be both feasible and reasonable, meaning:
- They are constructible
- Achieve at least an 8 dBA reduction for at least one benefited receptor
- Must be economically reasonable

The following questions were asked:

Q: How high will the wall be?
A: The greatest benefit will be provided with a 24 foot wall.

Noise Analysis Results - Green Street Lofts

At Green Street Lofts, studies found there is an noise impact of 67 dB(A) at a third floor west side loggia. Projected noise without a noise wall, if the Alternative 7.1c was constructed, would be 68 dB(A) at the same west side location and 64 dB(A) at the same east side location.

Projected noise with a noise wall will reduce the noise levels to 63 dB(A) on the west and 51 dB(A) on the east. These meet the feasibility criteria, it also passes the economically reasonable test because of the number of benefited receptors. The anticipated wall height is 24 feet.

The result is that a noise wall can be installed if the benefited receptors vote in favor of it in the project. The following question was asked:

Q: We will be able to offer input on this, correct?
A: Yes, we are soliciting your input on this.

Q: Will residents on the West side- fourth and fifth floors benefit from the noise wall?
A: There will be approximately 3 decibels of noise reduction; generally this is not discernible by the human ear.
Q: What about the East side?
A: Because of the shielding provided by the Rice building, the east side will experience between a 3 to 13 decibel benefit depending on location.

Q: What about the South side?
A: The benefit only applies to the units with the loggias, as the study is limited to exterior noise.

Potential Noise Wall Locations
On-Going Activities:
The Department solicited viewpoints from benefitted receptors (property owners and tenants). Green Street Lofts had an 85% response rate with 100% responding “Yes”. Noise walls are being considered at 5 other locations. The deadline for returning the “View Point Form” was extended to July 12, 2013. Although IDOT is still in cooperation with the city to decide the finish of the walls, it was mentioned in the meeting that the aesthetic design of public art may be used on the walls, as well as different textures of concrete.

Aesthetics
Potential Enhancements of 7.1c

A noise wall can provide a quieter atmosphere and visually block the expressway. Behind the retaining wall and potential noise wall, a flat area could be provided and include landscaping, it could be used as open area for use/outdoor activities. The noise wall would make the landscaped area much more pleasant and quieter. In addition, a taller reinforced concrete parapet wall could also be provided to enhance safety. There is also an opportunity to reconfigure parking in the area, while most parking is next to the Rice Building property, a few spaces may be possible at the end of Green Street, and coordination with the City will be needed to achieve this.

At this time in the meeting a debate began about how the green space will be insured, and maintained. There were also some residents of Green Street Lofts that voiced concerns about the homeless taking residency in the green space.

Proposed Halsted Street

Well-designed interchange projects with flyovers won’t divide communities. They must include features being added to the Circle Interchange project to enhance the community, connectivity and aesthetics. For example, Halsted Street will be transitioned to a roadway that includes features with improved community connections, visually much more interesting and appealing, better accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists, and transit enhancements.

- The proposed improvements include:
- More landscaping
• Aesthetically pleasing light poles
• Decorative Fencing and handrails
• Chicago-Style Parapet wall used elsewhere within the city, including Lake Shore Drive, marked bike lanes on each side
• Wider sidewalks, and
• A new, mid-block pedestrian crossing at the CTA station that includes a canopy and pedestrian activated traffic signals to highlight the station’s entrance and safely accommodate users.

The Circle Interchange provides an opportunity to create a gateway to Greektown and UIC, connecting the communities.

The following questions were asked:

Q: Is this the first flyover in the city?
A: Yes.

Q: Do you have any more examples of flyovers that function like this one?
A: No, we have worked with everyone to create a favorable interchange.

At this time in the meeting, a discussion begins between the study team and residents of Green Street Lofts about opposition to the flyover. The residents explain that they are not opposed to the reconstruction of the bridges and roadways, but they are opposed to the flyover. The residents expressed concerns about the flyover dividing their community. The study team outlines the efforts being made to improve and promote use of the interchange by bikes and pedestrians.

**Peoria Street**

Peoria Street is an important pedestrian-way for the community, and a gateway to the UIC campus. The proposed plan will remove the brick building currently on the bridge, thereby allowing a much wider plaza for pedestrians and bicycle users, enhancing UIC’s connection to the West Loop and Greektown area. The glass station building will be renovated to repair the leaking roof and will include a new elevator and the relocated turnstiles.

**Vibration Monitoring**

There are several major construction activities that generate vibrations that can concern residents and building owners in a construction zone.

• One of the first steps on a project such as the Circle Interchange is the demolition of bridges and pavements. On the Circle Interchange, all existing bridges and existing pavements will be demolished and replaced.
A second operation that can generate construction vibration is the construction of bridges, especially their foundations. The placement of piles, caissons, and footings involves the use of large machinery which has the potential for generating vibration.

A third operation that can generate vibration is the construction of the roadways and drainage system.

Finally, a fourth area is the construction of retaining and noise walls. Like bridges, these structures require strong foundations. The potential for vibration from construction is similar to that for bridges.

The design and ultimate construction of retaining walls in the City of Chicago require following the City’s Deep Foundation Procedure and Requirements. The Office of Underground Coordination (OUC) has very stringent requirements to obtain permits. For example, hand calculations are required to validate the computer calculations. These procedures have been set up to deal with the construction of buildings next to buildings throughout the City. Our staff is very familiar with these procedures. As an example, temporary earth retention systems must be very solid, limiting allowed movement.

Assessment of Construction Related Vibration

A Pre-Construction Condition Survey will identify existing conditions, cracks, bracings, etc.

Monitors will be installed to measure vibration. The use of two types is anticipated:

- Blastmate - for buildings close to the right-of-way
- Geosonics - for those further away from the right-of-way.

Both devices will record data and can download information. The Blastmate has the capability to be connected to cellphones to send alerts if vibrations fall above a pre-determined threshold. The monitoring program will be conducted before construction begins to get a baseline, before and during construction.

Q: Will we receive the alerts when the vibration threshold is reached?
A: No.

Q: Will there be external or internal monitoring?
A: There will be internal monitoring, in the basement, so we may focus on the foundation.

There were concerns voiced about the residents not receiving alerts from vibration monitors. The residents were assured that the alarm is a warning only.

Q: Once the baseline is established, will you share it with our engineers?
A: Yes.

Q: Will the monitoring continue throughout the four years?
A: Yes.
A brief discussion about insurance, bonds, and appropriation of funds took place, some stakeholders were concerned about plans for the budget and how the reconstruction of the Circle Interchange will affect future plans for the interchange.

**Proposed Construction Sequencing**

Reconstruction of the Circle Interchange will be a major undertaking and it will be staged over approximately 4 years.

Funding for this project is currently included in the Department’s Fiscal Year 2014-2019 Proposed Multi-Modal Transportation Improvement Program at an estimated cost of $475 Million, with $151 Million included in Fiscal Year 2014 for bridge replacement, city street work, design and construction engineering. Design will minimize travel disruptions throughout construction.

It was mentioned that the sound wall will be constructed early in Phase 2.

**Public Hearing #2**

The second public hearing is scheduled for Thursday, June 27 from 5 PM to 8 PM, at the Crowne Plaza, located at 733 West Madison. The purpose of the meeting is to present the Environmental Assessment and to review the changes since the first public hearing, in addition to the new updates on aesthetic treatments. The meeting will be an open house with opportunities to make public comments. Also, the Department’s Office of Workforce Diversity will be available to talk with attendees regarding the on-the-job training program.

David Lewis asked if the study team could address the residents input on the noise wall, and the concern of light pollution from headlights. Steve Schilke explains that the city’s ambient lighting requirements are stringent. He also explains that headlights from vehicles will not affect the building, that only high-beams from trucks could affect the first floor for approximately 100 feet.

The following questions were also asked regarding the construction process:

Q: What is the difference between the 16 foot wall and the 24 foot wall?
A: A 16 foot wall would not provide the optimal decibel reduction that a 24 foot wall would.

Q: What are the estimated peak decibel levels during construction?
A: We have not done that analysis.

Q: How will the construction affect lane closures?
A: The issue arises when the overhead structures are being done. Full lane closures must be done in order to remove the steel beams. Those closures can only be done at night.
Q: Does the traffic get re-routed?
A: No, only 15 minute lane closures are permitted. Installing the NW flyover may require a weekend closure, but that is still being decided. A detour will be required when the Ohio Street bridge is installed, a weekend detour.

Attendees:
David Lewis - Green Street Lofts
Residents - Green Street Lofts C/O David Lewis
Steve Schilke - IDOT
Paul Schneider - IDOT - PMC
Diana Decker - IDOT - PMC
Matt Smith - TranSystems
Grace Dysico - TranSystems
Mark Lucas - AECOM
Cathy Valente - Images, Inc.
Amanda Leonard - Images, Inc.
MEETING SUMMARY
770 Lofts

Date: July 2, 2013
Time: 6:30 pm
Location: 770 W. Gladys

On Tuesday, July 2, 2013 at 6:30 p.m., a meeting was held between the residents of 770 Lofts, Circle Interchange Study Team (Study Team) and the Illinois Department of Transportation (Department). The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the potential noise wall. Potential green space, parking and other aesthetic elements were also discussed.

After introductions and a brief description of the Circle Interchange project, the Department's noise policy was explained.

**Noise Policy**
The noise analysis was performed in accordance with the Department’s *Highway Traffic Noise Assessment Manual*. To assess potential traffic noise impacts, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has established the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) for various land use and activities. The study area was divided in Common Noise Environments (CNEs). Within each CNE are representative receptors, which are noise analysis locations representing other similar receptor within the same CNE. The analysis point for each receptor is the area where frequent outdoor human activity occurs, which in the case for 770 Lofts is a third floor balcony on the east side of the building facing I-90/94.

A series of site visits were conducted to measure the existing noise environment. The purposes of the noise measurements are to describe the existing environment, to identify major sources of sound, and to validate the Traffic Noise Model (TNM) computer-modeling results. The noise levels were recorded over 15-minute sampling periods. Traffic noise levels depend primarily on the number of vehicles (car and trucks), speeds, and distance from the roadway. The TNM also considers the effects of intervening structures, terrain, vegetation, pavement types, grades, intersections, and atmospheric conditions.

**TNM Results**
Traffic noise levels for the Circle Interchange were predicted with the TNM model. At 770 Lofts, our studies found there is a noise impact identified at the third floor balcony on the east side of the building facing I-90/94. The existing noise level is 72 dB(A), which exceeds the criteria of 67 dB(A) for Activity Level B – exterior residential. The projected noise without a noise wall would be 74 dB(A) at the same east side third floor location. A noise wall would reduce noise levels to 64 dB(A). These meet the feasibility criterion and it passes the economically reasonable criterion. The calculated height of the potential noise wall is 24 feet which maximizes the number of benefited receptors. A noise wall height less than 18 feet does not meet policy and
therefore cannot be considered. Renderings from the second and fourth floors were viewed. The noise wall could be installed on top of the proposed retaining wall or in the embankment.

Solicit Viewpoints
The Department sent out letters to solicit viewpoints from each benefited receptor, including property owners and tenants. With the first mailing, the goal is a 33% response rate. If that goal is not obtained then a second mailing occurs. At the end of the second mailing, regardless of response rate, the viewpoints of the benefited receptors are tallied, where 1 vote is assigned to the owner and 1 vote is assigned to the tenant. Greater than 50% of the viewpoints received must be in favor of the proposed noise abatement measure for it to be included in the project. Since the Department developed an Environmental Assessment and subsequent public hearing for this project, the deadline to return viewpoints has been extended to the end of the public comment period which is July 12, 2013. The viewpoints will be tallied after the extended deadline to determine if the potential noise walls will likely be installed.

Potential Parking, Green Space & Aesthetic Elements
The potential for parking and green space was discussed. The residents of 770 Lofts and the owner of the adjacent parking lot are undecided on whether they desire additional parking or green space. Land for additional parking would be leased based on fair market value for the land. The Department would permit the use of land as a green space at no cost so long as the building agreed to maintenance of the green space. The Department could construct the proposed retaining wall to accommodate either parking or green space, backfill behind the retaining wall to a level grade even with the existing parking lot, and landscape with trees.

If the viewpoints were not in favor of a noise wall, the Department stated there are a couple of different aesthetic treatments for the access control fencing on top of the retaining wall. These treatments could include a ‘green wall’ which consists of standard chain link fencing with vines or precast concrete panels. Pictures of the ‘green wall’ were shown and renderings from the public hearing were also viewed.

Next Steps
Viewpoint forms for the potential noise wall are due on July 12, 2013. The Department is currently have appraisals completed and should have approximate cost for leasing land for parking next week. The Department will continue to coordinate with the residents of 770 Lofts and the owner of the adjacent parking lot regarding their desire for parking or green space.

Attendees
Residents of 770 Lofts
Grace Dysico – TranSystems
John Baczek – IDOT
Rick Wanner – IDOT
Diana Decker – IDOT-PMC
On Monday, July 8, 2013 at 6:30 p.m. a meeting was held between residents and representatives from Sangamon Lofts (915 W. Van Buren Street) and the Circle Interchange Study Team (Study Team).

The goal of the meeting was to provide the residents with an update on the project. The agenda of the meeting progressed as follows; introductions, project status, building vibration monitoring program, noise study status, and a review of the overall project schedule.

Introductions:
Steve Schilke, Project Manager from the Illinois Department of Transportation (Department) welcomed everyone in attendance and introduced the Study Team members.

Presentation
Chuck Stenzel from TranSystems facilitated the meeting and conducted the power point presentation.

Preferred Alternative near 915 W. Van Buren Street (Sangamon Lofts):
Near the Sangamon Lofts building, the outbound lanes of I-290 will total five lanes along the expressway: Two from outbound I-290, one from Ramp SW, and two from Ramp NW. In addition, there is the exit ramp to Morgan Street. Note that only traffic from Ramp NW will be allowed to exit to Morgan Street.

The Morgan Street Exit Ramp will be closer to the building because today there are only four lanes and proposed there are five, plus the provision of a possible future managed lane along the inside shoulder. The ramp convergence area also plays a part of the pavement coming closer to your building.

The existing edge of roadway is about 51 feet away from the southeast corner of the building. With the preferred alternative it will be reduced to 27 feet. At the southwest corner of the building, the roadway moves from 36 feet away today to 25 feet with the preferred alternative. A retaining wall will be constructed next to the ramp. It will be designed to account for the pressures from the building side of the wall, so that the wall does not move or rotate. A landscaping area can be provided between the building and the retaining wall.

Racine Avenue Exit:
The Study Team examined if the Morgan Street exit could be eliminated and the off ramp shifted west to Racine Avenue. A ramp to Racine Avenue concept was presented. The plan showed the need for the acquisition and displacement of businesses, including closing off access to other businesses near Tilden Street because the street would have to be closed. The new exit ramp would meet Racine
Avenue immediately next to the Racine Avenue/Van Buren Street intersection which is too close and would make right hand turns on Racine Avenue impossible. Van Buren would need to be converted to one way. For these reasons, the Morgan Street exit ramp remains as part of the preferred alternative.

**Vibration Monitoring:**
A vibration monitoring program has been established for the project. Vibration could be introduced by demolition activities, bridge construction, roadway construction, and retaining wall installation. Approximately 29 buildings that front the interchange will be part of the vibration monitoring program including Sangamon Lofts.

Baseline building conditions surveys will be performed prior to construction and vibration thresholds, based on standards from the Bureau of Mines, will be set and discussed with property owners. Monitors will be installed in each building to monitor vibrations during construction.

The design and construction of retaining walls must meet Chicago’s Deep Foundation Procedure and Requirements from the Office of Underground Coordination (OUC). They have very stringent requirements to obtain permits. For example, they require hand calculations to validate your computer calculations. These procedures have been set up to deal with the construction of buildings next to buildings throughout the City.

Pre-Construction Condition Surveys will be completed to identify existing conditions, cracks, bracings, etc. Vibration monitoring at Sangamon Lofts is underway. The monitoring program will be completed before construction begins to get a baseline and will be conducted again during construction. If vibrations reach a predetermined threshold during construction, there will be immediate action taken to stop the activity causing that vibration. Contractors will then be required to adjust their means and methods to stay below the vibration threshold. These procedures will be controlled by contract special provisions that will be included into the contract documents. Similar efforts were part of the recent Wacker Drive Reconstruction Project.

**Noise Analysis**
Traffic noise is based on the following factors:
- Speed
- Distance from roadway to receptor
- Percentage of trucks
- Topography / Elevations

The traffic noise analysis uses the existing conditions to provide the basis for evaluation. Department Policy follows FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC). Traffic noise impacts occur when predicted noise levels approach, meet or exceed the NAC of 67 dBA for residential properties. Outdoor noise only is evaluated and considered for residential properties.

The results of the noise analysis near Sangamon Lofts were presented.
At Sangamon Lofts, the existing noise level at the main door on the west side of the building, facing the courtyard is 63 dB(A). It is below the 67dB(A) Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) criteria and an impact was NOT identified.

The courtyard was also analyzed and an impact was identified as the existing noise level was 70 dB(A), exceeding the NAC of 67 dB(A).

- Projected noise without a noise wall, if the Preferred Plan was constructed, would be 71 dB(A) at the courtyard.
- Projected noise with a noise wall will reduce the noise levels to 62 dB(A). This meets the feasibility criteria. It also passes the economically reasonable test as we used 180 benefited receptors from the neighboring building, with which the courtyard was developed.
- The anticipated wall height would be 6 feet spanning the width of the courtyard.

The result is that a noise wall can be installed if the benefited receptors vote to include one in the project. Viewpoint letters are to be returned by July 12, 2013. At this time, viewpoints are coming in in-favor of the wall.

**Overall Project Schedule**
The Department employs a 3-Phase process to plan, design and construct their projects.

Phase I involves the preliminary engineering and environmental studies. Most of the public involvement occurs in this phase as the project footprint and changes are defined.

Phase II involves the preparation of detailed design plans and specifications for the contractor to follow. These are packaged as bid documents and advertised for a contract letting.

Phase III is the actual construction of the project. The project will be constructed by the lowest responsive bidder. The Department will oversee the construction to make sure it is getting built in accordance with the plans and specifications.

**Question/Answers:**
The following questions were asked:

Q: Can we get a copy of the power point presentation from today’s meeting?
A: Yes, the Department will provide a copy of the presentation to Hugh McLaughlin.

Q: Is the retaining wall next to our building a good thing for us?
A: Preliminary analysis says that having this wall would create a better condition than today.

Q: Why can’t the Department fix our problems now before construction begins?
A: The Department cannot do work on private property. It is the goal of the Department is to avoid all impacts to buildings near the construction area.

Q: Why is this project a priority?
A: The bridges of the interchange and the surrounding cross roads are nearing the end of their useful life. The interchange was identified as the number one freight bottleneck in the nation and it is expected that the reconstruction of the Circle Interchange will ease congestion, move people and freight more efficiently, and reduce emissions from idling vehicles.

Q: Why doesn't the Department fix the Dan Ryan instead?
A: The Circle Interchange was determined to be the reason for delays that stretch back beyond 31st Street on the northbound Dan Ryan. Adding the 4th through lane in the interchange and the two lane exit ramp for Ramp NW will significantly improve mobility.

Q: Will the Department provide real time vibration monitoring data during construction?
A: Vibration monitoring data will not be made available during construction.

Q: Mr. Kyrzydlo from Dearborn Engineering stated that their geotechnical analysis of the building concluded that any nearby construction will cause damage to the building.
A: It is the goal of the Department is to avoid all impacts to buildings near the construction area. The vibration monitoring proposed for the project was successfully used for construction of Wacker Drive.

Q: What insurance requirements are established for the contractor in case the building falls in? Can Sangamon Lofts be added as an additional insured?
A: It was agreed at the meeting that the Department would follow up with an answer to this question.

The Department’s Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction provides insurance level requirements for contractors. For Commercial General Liability, the Department requires:
1) General Aggregate Limit $2,000,000
2) Products-Completed Operations Aggregate Limit $2,000,000
3) Each Occurrence Limit $1,000,000

Higher minimum limits and additional coverage are typically secured by contractors of major construction projects like the Circle Interchange.

Q: What is the construction schedule?
A: Morgan Street will begin in the fall of 2013. Peoria Street will begin in the spring of 2014. Construction of Ramp NW and the retaining walls will begin in 2014 and continue into 2015. Construction of I-290 is targeted for 2015.

Q: How long can we expect construction to occur outside our building?
A: Morgan Street construction will begin later this year and be completed in the Spring of 2014. Construction of the retaining wall and the exit ramp to Morgan Street will be completed with construction of Ramp NW during 2015.

Q: What if vibration thresholds are not exceeded but there is still settlement in the building foundation?
A: Settlement will be monitored during construction.

Q: What are you doing for air quality?
A: Existing, 2040 No-Build and 2040 Build conditions were analyzed and it was determined that air quality will improve by 1/3 with moving vehicles because of the project, combined with greater fuel efficiency.

Q: About the noise analysis, why wasn’t our outdoor balcony on the east side of the building considered?
A: The Department agreed to follow up with this resident after the meeting.

[Subsequent to the meeting, the Department viewed the balcony behind the building. There is a brick wall along the right-of-way that provides a barrier to the balcony. The wall is approximately 11 feet above ground level. The balcony is about 6 feet above ground level. The Department analyzed noise conditions at this location and found the existing noise level of 58 db(A) in the existing conditions, increasing 1 db(A) to 59 db(A) in the proposed condition. This is below the Noise Abatement Criteria for an impact at a residential receptor (66 db(A)). Therefore no noise wall needs to be evaluated at this location.]

The removal of trees along the right-of-way may negatively affect the perceived noise levels, but this change cannot be mitigated by the Department’s noise policy.

Q: What kind of pavement will be used?
A: This is determined during the design phase. Concrete pavement is assumed.

Q: What will be done if the vibration thresholds are exceeded during construction and the required work cannot be completed with less vibration?
A: This scenario is not anticipated. If it does arise, the Department will investigate options with the contractor.

Q: What construction activities will be completed at night?
A: Certain construction work must be completed at night like the removal of the cross street bridges and the setting of new beams. These activities require closure of mainline lanes and this is restricted to overnight hours.

Q: What can be done to limit noise from work near the CTA station? If construction activities will require track closures, past experience indicates we will have to deal with air horns during overnight hours to announce arrival and departure of trains.
A: The Department will coordinate with CTA to determine if air horn noise can be minimized, recognizing that it is part of their safety procedure and may not be flexible in changing their procedure.
**Attendees:**
From Sangamon Lofts:

Robert Meyer  
Carmen Basile  
P. Branson  
Daniel Valdes  
David Given  
Justin Miller  
Chris Rentner  
Hugh McLaughlin  
Jon Shoemaker  
Katie Shoemaker  
Carole Chadock  
Rashod Johnson  
Ama Addas  
Gil Ruman  
Anne Brodley  
Hedy Gallagher  
Chris Gallaher

Steve Schilke – IDOT  
John Baczek - IDOT  
Paul Schneider - IDOT - PMC  
Diana Decker - IDOT - PMC  
Matt Smith - TranSystems  
Chuck Stenzel - TranSystems  
Mark Lucas - AECOM
MEETING SUMMARY

1224 W. Van Buren

Date: July 9, 2013
Time: 11:00 am
Location: 1224 W. Van Buren

On Tuesday, July 9, 2013 at 11:00 a.m., a meeting was held between the property manager of 1224 W. Van Buren, Circle Interchange Study Team (Study Team) and the Illinois Department of Transportation (Department). The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the potential noise wall.

After introductions and a brief description of the Circle Interchange project, the Department’s noise policy was explained.

Noise Policy
The noise analysis was performed in accordance with the Department’s Highway Traffic Noise Assessment Manual. To assess potential traffic noise impacts, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has established the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) for various land use and activities. The study area was divided in Common Noise Environments (CNEs). Within each CNE are representative receptors, which are noise analysis locations representing other similar receptor within the same CNE. The analysis point for each receptor is the area where frequent outdoor human activity occurs, which in the case for 1224 W. Van Buren is a third floor balcony facing I-290.

A series of site visits were conducted to measure the existing noise environment. The purposes of the noise measurements are to describe the existing environment, to identify major sources of sound, and to validate the Traffic Noise Model (TNM) computer-modeling results. The noise levels were recorded over 15-minute sampling periods. Traffic noise levels depend primarily on the number of vehicles (car and trucks), speeds, and distance from the roadway. The TNM also considers the effects of intervening structures, terrain, vegetation, pavement types, grades, intersections, and atmospheric conditions.

TNM Results
Traffic noise levels for the Circle Interchange were predicted with the TNM model. At 1224 W. Van Buren, our studies found there is a noise impact identified at the third floor balcony facing I-290. The existing noise level is 75 dB(A), which exceeds the criteria of 67 dB(A) for Activity Level B – exterior residential. The projected noise without a noise wall would be 76 dB(A) at the same third floor location. A noise wall would reduce noise levels to 68 dB(A). These meet the feasibility criterion and it passes the economically reasonable criterion. The calculated height of the potential noise wall is 23 feet which maximizes the number of benefited receptors.
Solicit Viewpoints
The Department sent out letters to solicit viewpoints from each benefited receptor, including property owners and tenants. With the first mailing, the goal is a 33% response rate. If that goal is not obtained then a second mailing occurs. At the end of the second mailing, regardless of response rate, the viewpoints of the benefited receptors are tallied, where 1 vote is assigned to the owner and 1 vote is assigned to the tenant. Greater than 50% of the viewpoints received must be in favor of the proposed noise abatement measure for it to be included in the project. Since the Department developed an Environmental Assessment and subsequent public hearing for this project, the deadline to return viewpoints has been extended to the end of the public comment period which is July 12, 2013. The viewpoints will be tallied after the extended deadline to determine if the potential noise walls will likely be installed.

Next Steps
Viewpoint forms for the potential noise wall are due on July 12, 2013.

Attendees
Samantha Ahto – 1224 W. Van Buren
Grace Dysico – TranSystems
Steve Schilke - IDOT
Diana Decker – IDOT-PMC
MEETING SUMMARY
Van Buren Lofts

Date: July 10, 2013
Time: 7:00 pm
Location: 1250 W. Van Buren

On Wednesday, July 10, 2013 at 7:00 p.m., a meeting was held between the board members of Van Buren Lofts, Circle Interchange Study Team (Study Team) and the Illinois Department of Transportation (Department). The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the potential noise wall.

After introductions and a brief description of the Circle Interchange project, the Department's noise policy was explained.

**Noise Policy**
The noise analysis was performed in accordance with the Department's *Highway Traffic Noise Assessment Manual*. To assess potential traffic noise impacts, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has established the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) for various land use and activities. The study area was divided in Common Noise Environments (CNEs). Within each CNE are representative receptors, which are noise analysis locations representing other similar receptor within the same CNE. The analysis point for each receptor is the area where frequent outdoor human activity occurs, which in the case for Van Buren Lofts is a third floor balcony facing I-290.

A series of site visits were conducted to measure the existing noise environment. The purposes of the noise measurements are to describe the existing environment, to identify major sources of sound, and to validate the Traffic Noise Model (TNM) computer-modeling results. The noise levels were recorded over 15-minute sampling periods. Traffic noise levels depend primarily on the number of vehicles (car and trucks), speeds, and distance from the roadway. The TNM also considers the effects of intervening structures, terrain, vegetation, pavement types, grades, intersections, and atmospheric conditions.

**TNM Results**
Traffic noise levels for the Circle Interchange were predicted with the TNM model. At Van Buren Lofts, our studies found there is a noise impact identified at the third floor balcony facing I-290. The existing noise level is 75 dB(A), which exceeds the criteria of 67 dB(A) for Activity Level B – exterior residential. The projected noise without a noise wall would be 76 dB(A) at the same third floor location. A noise wall would reduce noise levels to 66 dB(A). These meet the feasibility criterion and it passes the economically reasonable criterion. The calculated height of the potential noise wall is 23 feet which maximizes the number of benefited receptors.
Solicit Viewpoints
The Department sent out letters to solicit viewpoints from each benefited receptor, including property owners and tenants. With the first mailing, the goal is a 33% response rate. If that goal is not obtained then a second mailing occurs. At the end of the second mailing, regardless of response rate, the viewpoints of the benefited receptors are tallied, where 1 vote is assigned to the owner and 1 vote is assigned to the tenant. Greater than 50% of the viewpoints received must be in favor of the proposed noise abatement measure for it to be included in the project. Since the Department developed an Environmental Assessment and subsequent public hearing for this project, the deadline to return viewpoints has been extended to the end of the public comment period which is July 12, 2013. The viewpoints will be tallied after the extended deadline to determine if the potential noise walls will likely be installed.

Next Steps
Viewpoint forms for the potential noise wall are due on July 12, 2013.

Attendees
Elizabeth Forman - Van Buren Lofts
William Orpet - Van Buren Lofts
Meghan Kennedy - Van Buren Lofts
Grace Dysico – TranSystems
Paul Schneider – IDOT-PMC
On Thursday, July 11, 2013 at 7:00 PM a meeting was held between residents of 933 W. Van Buren Street and the Circle Interchange Study Team (Study Team). The purpose of the meeting was to provide an overview of the project and address concerns of the residents, including noise impacts and abatement, construction staging and scheduling, and foundation vibration.

**Introductions**
Steve Schilke of the Illinois Department of Transportation (Department) welcomed everyone in attendance, and then the Study Team introduced themselves.

**Project introduction and selection of preferred alternative**
An overview of the project was provided by the Department, starting with the interchange's selection as the most congested in the country for freight mobility and the need to reconstruct the bridges and ramps in the area around the Circle Interchange. The constraints and challenges facing the project were discussed, explaining why the Preferred Alternative was selected. The constraints of keeping the project footprint within the existing right-of-way and to not impact existing buildings was discussed.

**Noise**
Chuck Stenzel of TranSystems discussed IDOT noise policy and procedure, including the analysis of areas of frequent outdoor use and that potential noise barriers must be considered both feasible and reasonable. After a barrier is found feasible and reasonable then benefitted residents have a chance to vote on whether or not to construct the barrier.

In the case of 933 Van Buren, noise was evaluated at balconies. However, because the lowest levels of balconies are near the top of the FHWA’s maximum height for noise wall guidelines (25 feet), no noise reduction benefits could be provided. Therefore, the common-use courtyard east of the building was evaluated for noise impacts. A 6’ high noise wall between 933 Van Buren and the building to the east was found to be both feasible and reasonable.

Several residents of 933 Van Buren expressed skepticism at the usefulness of a noise wall shielding the courtyard. It was asked if any non-standard techniques to shield their building from highway noise had been considered, especially the south side of the building. It was replied that State and Federal policies limit noise abatement to standard techniques. Some of the options suggested by the residents, such as ‘capping’ the expressway or extending large curved noise walls over traffic were noted as being overly expensive to build and maintain.
Staging
In response to resident questions, the Department explained the proposed construction staging of the Circle Interchange in greater detail. It was explained that the Morgan Street bridge will be the very first contract of the broader Circle Interchange project, with closure and demolition starting in the fall of 2013. It was noted that contractors will be required to maintain access to the resident’s garage throughout the project.

The Department further elaborated that Peoria Street will not be closed for construction until Morgan Street is reopened, and that Halsted Street will be stage-constructed and access will be available across it at all times. A run-down of the overall project staging and scheduling was given, indicating that Ramp NW and the I-290 corridor will follow the three bridges over I-290, finishing with two years of construction along I-90/94.

Vibration
The Department described the vibration monitoring program that will be in place during the Circle Interchange project. Baseline monitoring will be conducted at buildings surrounding the project area, including 933 Van Buren. Building management confirmed that monitors had already been installed in the basement. During construction, monitors will be capable of sending out electronic alerts to engineers and contractors. If a specified level of vibration is exceeded, the contractor will be required to halt work and adjust his means and methods.

Morgan Street Exit
Residents noted that convenient access from the Morgan Street exit is a benefit of living in the building, and were unhappy to learn that in the final project condition access to that ramp will only be possible from northbound I-90/94. There were additional concerns about the need to close the ramp during construction. The Department noted that construction staging required the temporary closure of the ramp, primarily for relocation of a water main riser shaft.

Residents were also concerned about the relocation of the exit ramp closer to their building. The Department stated that it may actually be beneficial for the building, as the new retaining wall will not have the sloughing problems that have been observed with other steep slopes against buildings along the I-290 corridor.

Other Resident Concerns
- Worry that project benefits may be negated by moving traffic to other chokepoints – eg, the Hillside Strangler – or increased traffic volumes.
  - Department stated that 2040 traffic models still show significant travel time benefits after traffic increases.
- Will vibrations increase post-construction since the roadway will be closer?
  - Department stated that roadway vibrations are greatly affected by pavement quality, and the project will replace the current rough pavement with new pavement.
- Will the Ramp NW flyover provide an unpleasant pedestrian experience on Halsted?
  - The Department stated that lighting will provided underneath Ramp NW, and that the flyover will be a quarter of the width of the Congress Street Viaduct over Des Plaines etc., so there should not be a ‘tunnel’ effect.
- Will snow removal be improved in final conditions, especially on Morgan and Peoria Streets?
Department explained it is only responsible for snow removal on the highways. UIC, the City, local buildings, and other entities share responsibility for snow removal along Peoria and Morgan Streets.

- Will traffic increase on local streets (especially Van Buren Street) from traffic detouring around the project area during construction?
  - The Department noted that Van Buren Street will not be an official detour, but that it is likely that some drivers will start using local streets as an alternative to the highway during construction.

- Is there anything that can be done for noise-proofing the interior residential spaces along the south side of the building?
  - The Department stated that state and federal noise guidelines expressly disallow the analysis or soundproofing of interior residential uses. However, they will use their connections with the O'Hare Residential Sound Insulation Program to see if what options residents have for soundproofing of their own initiative.

The meeting concluded around 9:00 PM.

**Attendees:**
From 933 Van Buren:

- E.A. Maksym
- Ronald Naraciso
- H Bavaj
- Ilya Bunmoviett
- John Doody
- Norman Loyd
- Avril Hector
- Kate Cosgrove Stephens
- Kara Johnson
- B. Reeves
- G. Caldwell
- J. Roberts
- Stacy Bebel
- Ted Nebel
- Drew Browning
- Annette Barbier
- Colleen Ralph
- Brian Ralph

- Steve Schilke – IDOT
- Paul Schneider - IDOT - PMC
- Chuck Stenzel - TranSystems
- Brian Holman - TranSystems
Project and Environmental Studies  
I-90/94 at I-290  
Circle Interchange  
Cook

July 30, 2013

Mr. Mark Donovan  
Associate Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services  
2801 University Hall, MC 102  
601 S. Morgan Street  
Chicago, IL 60607

Dear Mr. Donovan:

The Illinois Department of Transportation (Department) is nearing completion of preliminary engineering and environmental studies (Phase I) for the proposed improvement of I-90/94 @ I-290 (Circle Interchange). This improvement is included in the Department’s FY 2014-2019 Proposed Multi-Modal Transportation Improvement Program. Our current engineering efforts are targeted to enable a contract letting this fall contingent upon plan readiness, land acquisition, and funding availability through our future annual legislative appropriations.

As part of the environmental studies for this proposed project, projected future traffic noise levels were evaluated for lands near the proposed roadway improvement. For your information, this study area includes undeveloped land that is planned for future development in a comprehensive land use plan. For developed lands, a traffic noise study has been completed for this project and will be included in the Project Report which will be transmitted to you in the near future.

Attached for your information is an exhibit showing the predicted design year (2040) build traffic noise levels for these undeveloped lands identified along the project corridor. We hope this information will be useful to you in planning and permitting future development in your area. Although noise abatement is not warranted, we recommend that you carefully consider the future predicted noise levels to avoid potential issues of public concern over incompatible noise levels.

To help with your future planning and discernment regarding permitting decisions, we encourage you to obtain the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) publication titled *Entering the Quiet Zone: Noise Compatible Land Use Planning* from their website at [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/noise_compatible_planning/federal_approach/land_use/quietzone.pdf](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/noise_compatible_planning/federal_approach/land_use/quietzone.pdf).
For additional information regarding traffic noise, regulations and policy, noise analyses or noise abatement, visit the Department's website at: http://www.dot.il.gov/desenv/noise.html.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Paul Schneider, Project Manager, at (847) 705-4725.

Very truly yours,

John Fortmann, P.E.
Deputy Director of Highways,
Region One Engineer

By: [Signature]
John A. Baczek, P.E.
Project and Environmental Studies Section Chief

Enclosures

bcc: PROJECT ENGINEER (scan and send signed letter to Consultant for inclusion in project report)
Project and Environmental Studies
I-90/94 at I-290
Circle Interchange
Cook

September 5, 2013

Ms. Luann Hamilton
Deputy Commissioner
CDOT Division of Project Development
30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1100
Chicago, IL 60602

Dear Ms. Hamilton:

The Illinois Department of Transportation (Department) is nearing completion of preliminary engineering and environmental studies (Phase I) for the proposed improvement of I-90/94 @ I-290 (Circle Interchange). This improvement is included in the Department's FY 2014-2019 Proposed Multi-Modal Transportation Improvement Program. Our current engineering efforts are targeted to enable a contract letting this fall contingent upon plan readiness, land acquisition, and funding availability through our future annual legislative appropriations.

As part of the environmental studies for this proposed project, projected future traffic noise levels were evaluated for lands near the proposed roadway improvement. For your information, this study area includes undeveloped land that is planned for future development in a comprehensive land use plan. For developed lands, a traffic noise study has been completed for this project and will be included in the Project Report which will be transmitted to you in the near future.

Attached for your information is an exhibit showing the predicted design year (2040) build traffic noise levels for 765 W. Adams Street. We hope this information will be useful to you in planning and permitting future development in your area. Although noise abatement is not warranted, we recommend that you carefully consider the future predicted noise levels to avoid potential issues of public concern over incompatible noise levels.

To help with your future planning and discernment regarding permitting decisions, we encourage you to obtain the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) publication titled Entering the Quiet Zone: Noise Compatible Land Use Planning from their website at http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/noise_compatible_planning/federal_approach/land_use/quitezon.pdf.
Ms. Luann Hamilton
September 5, 2013
Page 2

For additional information regarding traffic noise, regulations and policy, noise analyses or noise abatement, visit the Department’s website at: http://www.dot.il.gov/desenv/noise.html.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Sam Mead, Environmental Unit Head, at (847) 705-4101.

Very truly yours,

John Fortmann, P.E.
Deputy Director of Highways,
Region One Engineer

By: [Signature]
John A. Baczek, P.E.
Project and Environmental Studies Section Chief

Enclosures
NOTES:
1. Noise levels shown are in "A"-weighted decibels (db(A))
2. Noise contours modeled 5' above ground level, for the "2040 Build" conditions of the Circle Interchange.
3. Noise is modeled using the FHWA's Traffic Noise Model Version 2.5.
4. The noise model only includes noise from freeways and ramps, and does not include local street or other sources.
5. FHWA NAC (Noise Abatement Criteria) Levels:
   Activity Category C 67 dB(A)
   Activity Category E 72 dB(A)