



US 20 Galena Bypass Citizen's Advisory Group



MEETING MINUTES

Date: March 30, 2007 cc: All Participants
F/803/02.3460.01

Date of Meeting: March 1, 2007

Meeting Place: Ramada Inn, Galena, IL

Project: US 20 (FAP 301) Galena Bypass
IDOT Job No. D-92-025-04
Teng Project No. 02-3460-01

Subject: March 1, 2007 Citizen's Advisory
Group (C.A.G.) Meeting

PARTICIPANTS:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION/ AFFILIATION</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
Beth Baranski (BB)	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Tim Berning (TB)	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Jim Boho (JB)	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Ed DuPlessis (ED)	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Charles Fach (CF)	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Bill Fawell (BF)	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Bob Johnson (BJ)	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Chris Kirkpatrick (CK)	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Carol Mantey (CM)	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Joe Mattingley (JM)	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Bill Nybo (BN)	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Duane Olivier (DO)	C. A. G. Member	Galena

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION/ AFFILIATION</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
Masood Ahmad (MA)	IDOT Dist 2	Dixon
Mark Nardini (MN)	IDOT Dist 2	Dixon
Richard Maggi (RM)	IDOT Dist 2	Dixon
Cassandra Rodgers (CR)	IDOT Dist 2	Dixon
Steve Robery (SR)	IDOT Dist-2	Dixon
Mark Dvorak (MD)	Teng and Associates, Inc	Chicago
Joe Hoerner (JH)	Teng and Associates, Inc	Chicago
Joe Murphy (JTM)	Teng and Associates, Inc	Chicago
Rob Stankiewicz (RS)	Teng and Associates, Inc	Chicago

This meeting was held to review the C.A.G. Subcommittee meetings held on 10/19/06 and 2/21/07, and to discuss the “Draft Conceptual Upland Forest, Prairie and Wetland Compensation Plan (Reforestation and Prairie Mitigation Plan)”, the Phase I Noise Analysis, and the Scenic Overlook Analysis. The following is the summary of items discussed and conclusions reached:

1. Introductions/Roll Call

The meeting began with a roll call of all attendees present at 6:00 pm (see participants list above).

2. Summary/Recap of C.A.G. Subcommittee Meetings

JH and CK recapped the Subcommittee meetings held on October 19, 2006 and February 21, 2007 providing a summary describing how the Subcommittee provided input on the mitigation plan. With respect to species preferences, planting plans, ongoing maintenance, etc. JB commented that it is highly desirable that any additional required mitigation areas be found adjacent to the proposed right-of-way and/or adjacent to existing protected forested areas such as Tapley woods and that mitigation areas should be located within JoDaviess County. JB also stated for the record that the Subcommittee had put forth an extensive amount of time and effort in preparing the Compensation Plan. JH reminded the group that the Draft Compensation Plan is uploaded to the forum and is available for review.

3. Draft Conceptual Upland Forest, Prairie and Wetland Compensation Plan (Reforestation and Prairie Mitigation Plan) Presentation

CR presented the Compensation Plan. CR reiterated that parcels in the FEIS report were chosen because they are adjacent to existing forested areas. Sites adjacent to IDNR properties are favorable because management can be turned over to the IDNR. CR stated that these sites are very desirable for forest mitigation purposes, but it is not assured that IDOT will be able to acquire all the sites.

4. Draft Conceptual Upland Forest, Prairie and Wetland Compensation Plan (Reforestation and Prairie Mitigation Plan) Questions

BF asked if chestnut trees were included in the reforestation list. CK and CR explained that they are susceptible to blight and would probably not survive, requiring more moisture than is available; in addition to the fact that there may be difficulty in purchasing this species from nurseries. BB asked what is included with the cost of tree installation. CR replied that the cost includes the tree, the installation of the tree, mulch, and the protective guard placed around the tree. Maintenance for the following five years is a separate contract and cost. ED inquired if willows and walnuts are among the tree species list. CK explained that willows are low land trees that would not do well in an upland environment. While walnuts are desirable, they are still naturally reproducing. Emphasis has been given to oak trees because they are not reproducing as well on their own. ED inquired if tree harvesting was part of the plan. CR explained how the goal is to replace habitat, not harvest the trees. CM asked if these proposed parcels were totally unforested and at what density would the trees be planted. CR explained that parts of the parcels are forested already but only the unforested area of the partially forested parcel will be planted to trees and only this area is counted in the mitigation calculation. New trees will be planted at 50 trees/acre. JM asked if IDOT does not have funding for mitigation, whose responsibility it will be to obtain mitigation dollars. CR explained that mitigation costs are part of the project costs and that IDOT cannot build the road unless mitigation is part of the plan. JB briefly discussed access to Area #2 (proposed prairie site) for maintenance. TB asked if the property owners were aware the parcels will be purchased for mitigation. MN and CR explained that while specific negotiations have not yet taken place with various property owners with regard to purchasing parcels for mitigation, some preliminary discussions have taken place with property owners at prior public meetings. Also, mitigation property must be obtained from a willing seller. JH asked for a consensus that the Draft Compensation Plan be adopted contingent upon the minor refinements in process under the direction of the Subcommittee. Consensus was given by the Group and JH stated that the Final Compensation Plan will be posted on the forum at a later date.

5. Review of Phase I Noise Analysis Presentation

MD reviewed the basic principles of traffic noise as well as the results from the Phase I noise analysis. Based on FWHA and IDOT Criteria, a total of five (5) receptors are considered as “*impacted*” along the Galena Bypass. However, the impacted residences are scattered too far apart for noise wall barriers to be economically feasible. In addition, noise walls along the Galena Bypass provide no additional benefit to downtown Galena.

6. Review of Phase I Noise Analysis Questions

BF asked if the study and numbers accurately reflect existing and proposed conditions. MD confirmed that the traffic noise modeling does take into consideration the existing topography, existing and projected traffic volumes as well as the horizontal and vertical components of the proposed roadway. The Phase I noise analysis was conducted with industry recognized software approved by FHWA and IDOT. BF questioned whether an

increase in traffic would cause an increase in noise as it traveled from the Stagecoach Trail Bridge through the valley to downtown Galena. MD commented that based on sound principles, the sound decibels would not increase but decrease by 3 dBA as the distance doubles from the source. In addition, sound will further decrease due to dispersion, diffraction and absorption as the sound waves pass through and along the undulating terrain. JH and MD commented that the noise analysis was part of the Phase I process and that the results were reviewed and approved at that time. The purpose of tonight's presentation was to provide information at the request of the Group so that they had a better understanding of the noise studies that were completed as part of the Phase I Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

7. Scenic Overlook Analysis Presentation

RS presented the topic of scenic overlooks. Specifically, three locations were analyzed weighing pros and cons. Overall it was recommended not to include a scenic overlook along the US 20 Bypass due to the limited views, safety concerns, geometric constraints, right-of-way (R.O.W.)/environmental impacts, and costs.

8. Scenic Overlook Analysis Questions

BJ asked about the emergency access road and if the construction of an emergency access at Buckhill Rd. would help to alleviate the cost of a scenic overlook. SR replied that IDOT met with the fire department, police and City of Galena to review. They expressed interest in locating the emergency access at Council Hill Road rather than Buckhill Road because it offers a more favorable roadway and better access to surrounding communities and residences. IDOT is currently coordinating with the FHWA and IDOT Central Office in Springfield for approval of the emergency access concept. Upon approval, design work and further coordination with the city will be completed. BB asked if an overlook at Council Hill could be investigated. RS commented that a cursory investigation of a scenic overlook at Council Hill was explored, but it was determined that the location did not offer the scenic view sheds desired for an overlook. Most of the surrounding land is agricultural. MD reiterated that the investigation concentrated on areas south of Buckhill Road as these areas offered more scenic view sheds. JH explained how the analysis looked at getting "biggest bang for the buck" in choosing overlook locations. ED asked if an overlook can be placed right on the bypass, or if a scenic tower could be created. RS described access from other locations and how it is only feasible in certain areas due to geometric constraints and safety concerns. If the concept of a tower was something that the C.A.G. and IDOT agreed to study as a separate project, it would likely be at a location off of the US 20 Bypass freeway. JB stated that the notion of a tower is quite invasive and causes privacy conflicts, particularly with areas of the Galena Territories. Also, the entrance to a tower can produce additional noise due to acceleration and deceleration of vehicles. JM emphasized that the team had done a "good job" in thoroughly studying this issue.

9. Open Discussion/Other Items

JH opened the floor to other topics.

- During the discussion of forest, prairie and wetland compensation plans, JH introduced the topic of “Enhancements” that was brought up by Jim Rachuy at the 2/21 C.A.G. Subcommittee meeting. CK, CR and MA explained the concept of enhancement dollars and stressed that now would be an opportune time to begin prioritizing what enhancement projects the C.A.G. would be interested in. SR further explained that there may be two sources of “enhancement” funding available. The first is that generally for a project of this size, where extensive public involvement is a significant part of the design and construction processes, it is likely that a percentage (generally in the neighborhood of 3 to 5%) of the overall construction cost will be set aside for aesthetic enhancements beyond the normal roadway design. At this time however, since there is currently no funding for construction, we do not know the dollar amount that will be available for aesthetic enhancements. SR reiterated that the C.A.G. should be working to identify and prioritize any aesthetic enhancements that they would be interested in. A second source of enhancement funding has been made available to communities in the past. This type of enhancement funding must be sponsored by and applied for by a taxing body (City, County, and Park District) and is for non-traditional improvements, not normally part of a highway project. Such enhancement projects could include additional/special landscaping, bike paths, structures or monuments, and roadside parks. Donations, grants and local participation are also common sources of funding for enhancement/aesthetic projects. JB and MD suggested that a new topic be added to the C.A.G. forum titled “Enhancements” or “Aesthetic Features” so that the group can begin to exchange ideas on this topic. (Post Note: a forum category of “Aesthetics” currently exists on the C.A.G. Forum.)
- CR provided an update of the topic of wildlife crossings and her continued coordination with IDNR on this topic. The IDNR has concurred with the approach that IDOT has outlined in prior C.A.G. meetings which involves providing deer crossing accommodations at the Hughlett Branch, Galena River, Stagecoach Trail and Heller Pond bridges. Further, the IDNR concurred that providing an additional crossing between the Hughlett Branch and the Galena River is not advisable as it is not anticipated that a culvert of such length (approx. 400 ft.) would be used by deer. IDNR also concurred that smaller culverts located along the project would provide adequate crossings for small animals. In that they are mostly dry except for storm events, no special accommodations would be necessary.
- ED brought up topic of deer and that number of crossings looked inadequate. CR reiterated that various proposed culverts between the Hughlett Branch and the Galena River would be so long and dark that it is likely that they would not be used by deer. JH reiterated that the IDNR had concurred with IDOT’s plan. JB reiterated that the wildlife crossings were presented at October’s C.A.G. meeting. MD discussed wildlife crossings in more detail, and reiterated that after the

roadway is constructed, IDOT would review crash statistics to determine if there are any deer crossing issues.

- CM stated that she has a contact that is a lighting specialist and will verify if she wanted to be included to discuss the topic with regard to the Galena Bypass. SR described Teng's scope and the fact that lighting is not currently in the scope of the design work, and that it will be more of a focus in the next part of the Phase II design. However, IDOT would certainly be willing to begin to address the lighting issue by reviewing the commitments made as a result of the Phase I study and documenting the Group's questions and concerns. If the C.A.G. desires, time could be set aside during the next C.A.G. meeting for a guest speaker and to begin to discuss lighting. These issues would then be evaluated in detail when the lighting design work is initiated. JB recommended having the C.A.G. review lighting with the C.A.G. lighting specialist representative at the next meeting, tentatively scheduled for late April, early May.
- BF brought up the topic of fiber optic lines being incorporated into the bypass. MA stated there is a policy that fiber optics cannot be included because IDOT receives federal funds, unlike the Illinois Tollway. However, he further stated that the industry is moving towards allowing the installation of fiber optics on public access roadways.
- JM asked if the environmental studies are bound by any type of expiration date. MN explained that while an EIS does not expire, it must be re-evaluated before going on to the next phase (i.e. construction). This re-evaluation does not mean that the EIS needs to be redone, but it provides documentation of any changes from the original EIS and any corresponding changes in impacts. Any additional impacts must be justified and approved in the EIS re-evaluation document.

10. Meeting Recap/Topics and Date for Next Meeting

JH conducted a meeting recap as follows:

- The Draft Compensation Plan has been approved by the C.A.G.
- CM is to get in touch with the lighting specialist to inquire about attending and presenting/participating in the next C.A.G. meeting.
- JB is to contact Jim Rachuy to ask him to comment on the forum regarding the topic of "enhancements".
- Teng is to indicate a comment folder on the forum for "enhancements", and the Group is to begin a dialogue on the topic on the forum in advance of the next C.A.G. meeting.
- IDOT will continue to coordinate with the City of Galena with respect to the emergency access lane.
- In summary, topics for the next C.A.G. meeting include:

March 1, 2007 Meeting Minutes

March 30, 2007

Page 7

- Lighting
- Enhancement Prioritization
- The Group voted to continue to meet at the present location as opposed to meeting at the Galena Territories.
- Next C.A.G. meeting was tentatively scheduled for late April/early May, subject to confirmation.

The foregoing is the writer's understanding of the matters discussed and the conclusions reached in summary form. This will become part of the project record and is the basis upon which we will proceed.

Very truly yours,

TENG & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Joe Murphy

Joe Murphy
Landscape Designer