



I fail to see why there is such dramatic negative response to the EJ&E proposal when the roads in and around Barrington are maintained in a minimalist, and in my opinion, sub-par way, apparently in accordance to the BACOG's website's published policy. Why not add additional barriers to traversing through the area so no one who doesn't belong here can, or will be willing to, make the effort to come through? Or maybe this additional insult to already overburdened, poorly maintained, and underdeveloped roads will be just what we need to finally discuss what's really happening here. The fact is that just this week it took me 15 minutes to go west on Route 22 from Route 59 to...well, some back road. I bailed out. I'd planned to go to Lake Barrington for dinner off of Pepper Road but didn't even make it to Good Shepherd before I turned around. If I'd been going to Good Shepherd, as everyone seems to be whining about, I'd never have made it, and there is no crossing to blame in that area. The traffic "flow" is nonexistent.

I live in Lake Barrington, and I travel for work all over NW Illinois. Any time I have to go through Barrington, it's terrible. Route 59 is in a pathetic situation as it is, even if there were no train crossings to compound the situation. Whether or not the EJ&E plan goes through, we should consider a Route 59 bypass to go over or under the entire area with local access for those who want or need to utilize the local business. That could reduce the constant traffic congestion which currently makes it difficult to get in or out of driveways all through the area, by taking the through traffic out of the mix. Regardless of whether or not the BACOG wants the traffic to be coming through, there are few other options due to neighborhoods, rivers, and other natural barriers. The desire of the BACOG to make the local infrastructure inhospitable for through traffic leaves us all suffering. The maps and navigation systems that people use to plan their travels show Route 59 as a clearly viable thoroughfare; they don't say Route 59 goes where you want to go, but you shouldn't take it because there are very few right turn lanes, virtually no suicide lanes, it's mostly one lane of constantly stopping traffic each way, and it's the plan of the BACOG to make you unwelcome to use it. Most residents here have no idea that this is an intentional choice by our elected officials. When I showed a group of my neighbors this policy, they were, as I am, FURIOUS.

It seems that the development of the area was not done with much foresight in terms of traffic impact planning. A contingency for developing roads could have been a contractual obligation of developers, or a requirement before new zoning was improved, had our village planners been thinking ahead. Let someone else foot the bill as a cost of "improving and developing" the land for our use, rather than letting it be a 100% taxpayer supported, too little too late, venture. Now the fat cat developers have moved on and we are stuck with the problems.

The argument regarding Good Shepherd's location in reference to the train lines rings hollow to me. Most of us knew where these facilities were when we bought our homes or began our work and decided it was an acceptable situation. I was listening to the 50-year residents of Barrington grieving about Good Shepherd's location; how many of them were involved with its inception and location choice? It might have been more expensive to put it closer into town, and on the other side of the EJ&E line when it was built; but to use their argument, aren't human lives worth it? I grew up in the SW suburb of Western

Springs, half a block from the Burlington Northern Line. The closest hospital was in LaGrange, just down the street on the other side of the tracks. Had there been a freight train and an emergency, we might have had to go to Hinsdale Hospital or another location. We knew that ahead of time and were aware that could happen. It reminds me of the complaints that residents of areas near O'Hare have about the traffic at O'Hare. That airport was there LONG before most of those people lived and worked there. Its very presence was an indication that some traffic was there and more could always come. How is this rail line any different?

I also suspect that with the increasing costs of fuel and transporting goods and people, rail transit may surge in popularity. Having traveled in Europe, I found rail travel much more convenient than considering a car. I believe that it might have a surge in popularity here, too, so arguing about EJ&E may just be putting off something that is inevitable.

Rather than having each little, relatively powerless municipality try to negotiate on its own, let's see what we can do if a group like BACOG uses its banded power to negotiate with EJ&E about compromises such as viaducts and bypasses so that as a part of the contingency of purchase they improve crossings making increased train travel less of a barrier for local residents. The so-called increase in pollution is just from a different source. I'd rather have a few more trains hauling more goods efficiently than many, many trucks hauling less. Sound protection walls could be negotiated to reduce the noise impact on local residents. If EJ&E is willing to fund these, and give right of way for future commuter travel on the line, I think that having this deal go through is a very wise idea for the future.