



US 20 Galena Bypass
Citizen's Advisory Group



MEETING MINUTES

Date: April 11, 2006

Date of Meeting: April 4, 2006

Meeting Place: Happy Joes, Galena, IL

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

Subject: April 4, 2006 Citizen's Advisory
Group (C.A.G.) Meeting

PARTICIPANTS:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION/ AFFILIATION</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
Beth Baranski	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Tim Berning	C. A. G. Member	Galena
James Boho	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Mary Ellen Boho	C. A. G. Member	Galena
John J. Cox	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Charles Fach	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Bill Fawell	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Sophie Fielder	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Melvin E. Gratton	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Frank Gruber	C. A. G. Member	Chicago
Robert J. Johnson	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Chris Kirkpatrick	C. A. G. Member	Elizabeth
David R. Kriesant	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Carol Mantey	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Bill Nybo	C. A. G. Member	Galena

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION/ AFFILIATION</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
Duane Olivier	C. A. G. Member	Galena
Charles Pedersen	C. A. G. Member	Homewood
Jim Rachuy	C. A. G. Member	Stockton
Valerie Stabenow	C. A. G. Member	Freeport
Joe Mattingly	Guest	Galena
Masood Ahmad	IDOT Dist 2	Dixon
Jon McCormick	IDOT Dist 2	Dixon
Mark Nardini	IDOT Dist 2	Dixon
Cassandra Rodgers	IDOT Dist 2	Dixon
Ted Berger	IDOT Dist-2	Dixon
Joe Hoerner	Teng and Associates, Inc	Chicago
Mark Dvorak	Teng and Associates, Inc	Chicago
Robert J. Stankiewicz	Teng and Associates, Inc	Chicago

This meeting was held to approve last month's Citizen's Advisory Group (C.A.G.) Meeting Minutes, initiate an official time keeper, review the interchange configuration for Horseshoe Mound and North IL-84, discuss the format of the Public Meeting, discuss and finalize the C.A.G. Mission Statement, and confirm the final C.A.G. membership. The following is the summary of items discussed and conclusions reached:

1. Introductions / Roll Call

The meeting began with a roll call of all the C.A.G. attendees present at 6:00 p.m.

2. Implementation of Official Timekeeper

Valerie Stabenow volunteered to become the official timekeeper for the C.A.G. meetings to help keep the meetings on track. The group indicated consensus regarding this initiative.

3. Discussion / Acceptance of 3/2/2006 C.A.G. Minutes

The draft C.A.G. meeting minutes for 3/2/2006 were accepted and will be uploaded to the Public Involvement Activities page of Galena-Bypass.com. Website.

4. Level Of Service / Horseshoe Mound Interchange / North IL-84 Interchange Presentation and Discussion

A Level of Service

Teng presented the concept of Level of Service (LOS) and described its use in developing roadway design and geometry. Specifically, LOS is defined by the Highway Capacity Manual as "A *qualitative measure describing operational*

conditions within a traffic stream, based on service measures such as speed, travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort and convenience.”

Questions regarding the LOS included the following:

In the development of LOS for interchanges, the C.A.G. inquired the year for which traffic volumes were generated. IDOT responded that the traffic values were for 2028. Typically, IDOT requires that the roadway be designed for 20 years past construction and at the inception of the Phase II Project, the year 2008 was identified as the earliest possible year for construction.

The C.A.G. inquired if, in general, signalized intersections have lower LOS values than free flow intersections. IDOT and Teng replied that no general rule of thumb can be stated. Each interchange location and type is studied on a case-by-case basis before comparisons can be made.

B. Horseshoe Mound Interchange

Teng re-presented the various design configurations studied for the Horseshoe Mound Interchange location along with basis for choosing the proposed design.

In summary, three (3) interchange configurations were presented:

- ½ Diamond
- ½ Cloverleaf (parclo)
- Trumpet (proposed design)

Due to traffic capacity and functionality constraints the ½ Diamond configuration was not recommended.

Due to environmental constraints (substantial encroachment into Horseshoe Mound), the ½ Cloverleaf configuration was not feasible.

The Trumpet interchange offered functionality, safety, as well as minimal right of way and environmental impacts (none to Horseshoe Mound) and was shown to be the preferred configuration. As suggested by several C.A.G. members, the trumpet interchange design has been modified and now considers constructing the proposed realignment of existing US 20/IL 84 including the constructing the bridge that will carry existing US20/IL84 over the new US 20 freeway. Construction of a temporary bridge for the southbound to eastbound ramp is no longer necessary.

Comments regarding the Horseshoe Mound Interchange included the following:

Several C.A.G. members discussed their concern over the lighting of the interchange. In addition, some members voiced concerns over having traffic signals at any point in the future. C.A.G. members stated that the Visual Assessment Impact Report that was compiled in Phase I identified this location as a Class 1 sensitive area, and as such

outlined certain lighting design criteria. Further, the report recommends using construction materials that will help the road blend into the surrounding area.

Several C.A.G. members voiced serious concerns about implementation of a Single Point (SPUI) interchange in the future. They cited the US Route 20 Visual Impact Assessment report completed during Phase 1 and reviewed by The Phase 1 Advisory Council that states that “structures built in Class 1 areas should use materials that will blend the structures into surrounding areas. The greatest care and share of the budget should be given to creating a structure that fits within its surroundings”. Members of the C.A.G. also cited that the JoDaviess County Land Use Plan states that ridge tops, knobs and mounds should be protected from obtrusive lighting and construction. Concern was expressed that the SPUI design and traffic signals associated with it do not fit these objectives. These C.A.G. members do not believe that the SPUI would fit the character of the Horseshoe Mound Area and could potentially cause driver confusion. These reports and these issues will be considered when implementing the final interchange design and lighting specifications.

Mr. Boho asked that it be specifically documented in the meeting record that the SPUI will not be the only option considered for a future interchange. IDOT confirmed this and reiterated that the proposed trumpet design will allow for flexibility in the ultimate interchange design. No further interchange design work beyond the proposed trumpet interchange is being completed by Teng or IDOT as part of the current Phase 2 design project.

For the trumpet design, C.A.G. members asked if the ramps are designed for adequate design speed and requested the review of the WB to NB ramp entrance to ensure that the horizontal curve is not too sharp. IDOT and Teng stated that the Trumpet design is still very preliminary and that the geometry is not finalized. The minimum ramp design speed will be 40 MPH.

A C.A.G. member asked about the new profile of US 20/IL 84 around Horseshoe Mound. Teng explained that the new profile will be approximately 15 ft lower than the existing. Mr. Boho stated that this realignment will not affect the Richardson donation.

The C.A.G. asked if there is any documentation or study available that researches the impacts of a signalized vs. non-signalized intersection to local tourism. IDOT was not aware of such a study. Galena tourism signage will be discussed during future C.A.G. meetings and will be considered in the final design of the new roadway.

C. North IL-84 Interchange

Teng presented the various design configurations studied for the North IL-84 Interchange location along with basis for choosing the proposed design.

In summary, four (4) interchange configurations were presented:

- Cloverleaf
- Partial Cloverleaf (Parclo)
- SPUI (Single Point Urban Interchange)
- Diamond (proposed design, as presented in the Phase I Environmental Impact Study)

Due to increased right of way and land impacts in the south half of the interchange, as well as additional costs, the Cloverleaf configuration was not recommended.

The Parclo design was reviewed based on comments on the C.A.G. Forum. It was determined that there would be additional ROW impacts. Also, the spacing along IL 84, between the south ramp intersection and a nearby Access Road intersection, would be insufficient, creating safety and operational concerns. The Parclo configuration is not recommended.

The SPUI design offered limited benefits in reduced right of way impacts, but did not result in significant reductions in earthwork or environmental benefits at this location (compared to Horseshoe Mound). The increased costs needed for the complex bridge and retaining wall design are not justified. The SPUI configuration was not recommended.

The Diamond interchange proposed during Phase I design offers familiarity, functionality, low right of way impacts and lowest overall cost. The Diamond interchange is therefore the proposed interchange type.

Comments regarding the North IL-84 interchange included the following:

C.A.G. members commented that for consistency, it seemed logical for both interchanges to have the same design.

The C.A.G. voted on the proposed design of the interchanges, as presented by Teng/IDOT (Horseshoe Mound: Trumpet Interchange, North IL 84: Diamond interchange). The results for this consensus vote were 21 for “yes” and 0 for “no”. Consensus on the design of the Galena Bypass interchange design types was therefore reached by the Group. It was reiterated that the Trumpet design does leave open the possibility for multiple interchange options under the future condition and that lighting shall also be carefully considered in that design.

Several C.A.G. members indicated that they were not in favor of the SPUI as the ultimate interchange at Horseshoe Mound due to concerns over lighting, the design blending in with the surrounding area, and free flow of traffic. IDOT reiterated that no further design work pertaining to the ultimate interchange type will be completed at this time. An Interchange Design Study will be competed for the Trumpet Interchange configuration only. The design for the ultimate interchange will be completed as part

of a future contract for the design of the section of freeway located south of Horseshoe Mound.

5. Public Meeting

IDOT presented the format for the Galena Bypass Public Meeting. The meeting will be scheduled for Thursday, May 18, 2006 from 1pm to 6pm. The public meeting will be an "open house" format and there will be no formal presentation by IDOT or Teng. Representatives from both will be present to answer questions from the public

The purpose of the Public Meeting is to update the public on the status of the project. This will include informing the public on the scope of the current Phase II work, project schedule, and introduce the C.A.G. and their Mission Statement.

Exhibits will include the following:

- Displays showing Phase 1 and Phase 2 revised profile
- Summary of benefits of Phase 2 profile
- Aerial Plan sheets with proposed alignment
- Horseshoe Mound Interchange Display
- Simplified Project Schedule

The Public Meeting will be announced in the local newspaper in advance of the meeting. All those listed on the Galena –Bypass mailing list will receive an invitation by mail. This includes all affected landowners. In addition, IDOT recommended that the C.A.G. participate in the Public Meeting and suggested a designated C.A.G. table or booth and an area for C.A.G. exhibits. The exhibits could include the Mission Statement, a list of topics that have been or may be reviewed by the C.A.G., and a membership list. Jim Boho, Robert Johnson, John Cox, and Valerie Stabenow volunteered to participate during the Public Meeting. In addition, other members are welcome to contribute and participate and can indicate their interest in doing so on the CAG forum or by telephoning one of the volunteers listed above.

The C.A.G. suggested that IDOT hire a court reporter for the meeting. Normally, IDOT does not do this unless required for official Public Hearings and prefers that comments from the public be written down and placed in a Comment Box or mailed to the District Office.

C.A.G. members also suggested that their booth be located near the entrance so that the C.A.G. booth "welcomes" the attendees. In addition, the group would like to have the Comment box and comment forms located near/at their booth. IDOT and Teng agreed that it was an excellent idea for the C.A.G. to serve to welcome the attendees. In addition to overseeing the public comment forms/drop box, IDOT suggests that the C.A.G. also monitor the sign in sheets.

After further discussion it was agreed that public comments would be limited to a written format. IDOT and the C.A.G. would offer to assist the public and would be willing to write down any verbal comments that members of the public might have.

C.A.G. members requested that the Public Meeting ending time be extended to 7 PM, rather than 6 PM as originally suggested by IDOT. . Teng asked that any additional comments regarding recommended graphics for the Public Meeting be submitted to the Forum no later than Tuesday, April 18, 2006. (Extended to Tuesday April 25th).

6. Mission Statement

The C.A.G. discussed the need for a mission statement and that it should be defined before the time of the first Public Meeting. Suggestions were submitted on the web forum and IDOT crafted a draft Mission Statement for discussion from the suggestions offered. The draft statement was as follows:

The Environmental Impact Statement for Phase I Study of the Glacier Shadow Pass and its recommended Longhollow Alignment was granted approval by the Federal Highway Administration on September 22, 2005. In appreciation of the Phase I Advisory Council members who so willingly gave their time and energy to accomplish this, the Citizen's Advisory Group pledges to ensure compliance with the commitments made by IDOT to construct the Longhollow Alignment and to proactively assist both IDOT and Teng in mitigating possible negative impacts of this new roadway, during the design and construction phases of the Galena Bypass.

It was generally agreed that the draft Mission Statement was too long and should be shortened. However, it was also agreed that it was important to identify the tremendous amount of work and history during the Phase I. After further discussions, the following Mission Statement was crafted:

The Environmental Impact Statement for the Phase I Study of the Glacier Shadow Pass and its recommended Longhollow Alignment was granted approval by the Federal Highway Administration on September 22, 2005. In appreciation of the Phase I Advisory Council members who gave their time and energy to accomplish this, the Galena Bypass Citizen's Advisory Group has adopted the following Mission Statement:

The Citizen's Advisory Group will work to ensure compliance with the commitments made by IDOT to construct the Longhollow Alignment, and to proactively assist IDOT and other stakeholders to mitigate impacts of the new roadway during the design and construction phases of the Galena Bypass.

A consensus vote was called by the C.A.G. The results for this consensus vote were 13 for "yes" and 7 for "no" with 1 "absentee yes" vote. Consensus on the Mission Statement was therefore reached. It was agreed that the revisions discussed would be published on the C.A.G. Web Forum. Comments on the Mission Statement for the record could be posted on the Forum up to Tuesday, April 18, 2006. (Extended to April 25, 2006).

7. Membership Confirmation

The C.A.G. briefly discussed the admittance of Joe Mattingly as a full C.A.G. member. Mr. Mattingly has attended multiple meetings in the past and was unable to attend last months meeting due to a family emergency. The C.A.G. chairs recommended that Mr. Mattingly be included in the group. The C.A.G. voted on including Joe into the group. The results for this consensus vote were 20 for “yes” and 0 for “no”. Consensus for membership confirmation for Joe Mattingly was therefore reached.

It was also noted that Andy Lewis, from the City of Galena, will serve as a liaison to the C.A.G. and will be updated on CAG activates via e-mail by Robert Johnson. Mr. Johnson was instrumental in getting a commitment from Mr. Lewis to be involved.

8. Open Discussion

A few C.A.G. members were concerned about the escalated cost of the project compared to estimate in the Phase I report. It was suggested that the profile issue be re-opened to further investigate the increase of profile slopes and the “Super 2” concept as possible methods to reduce costs.

IDOT responded that the Phase I construction cost for the Galena Bypass has not increased. Rather, the revised profile has saved an additional \$30 million in earthwork costs. It should be noted that the Phase cost estimate is a preliminary estimate based on preliminary engineering information available at the time. Revised cost estimates will be conducted as part of the Phase II design process and it is likely, as additional details become known, that the cost estimate will be different than the Phase I estimate

IDOT further stated that it would be highly unlikely for FHWA to accept roadway grades greater than the 4% policy maximum, based on safety considerations alone. Steeper grades would also increase noise and air pollution from trucks and require the construction of truck climbing lanes. It was also noted that plans for proposed US 20 improvements west of the Galena Bypass to the Iowa border are being prepared with roadway slopes less than or equal to the 4% maximum.

The C.A.G. Co-Chairmen also discussed the issue of opening issues that have already been voted upon and closed. Since a consensus was already reached on this issue at a previous meeting, it was decided that a re-vote would not be considered. However, C.A.G. members could voice their concerns. At this time Carol Mantey and Charles Fach voiced opposition to the proposed profile, indicated a desire for a more rolling profile to better fit the terrain, and expressed concern that the high bridges would be unattractive. In addition, Joe Mattingly noted his disagreement with the proposed profile.

9. Meeting Recap / Next Meeting

Teng provided a meeting recap and discussed the possible next discussed the next C.A.G. meeting date to fall sometime in late July or early August, 2006. Topics will be identified

through the Forum at a later date. Teng and IDOT will coordinate with the Co-Chairmen and a subsequent announcement will be made on the C.A.G. Web Forum.

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. IDOT recommends that the C.A.G. not wait until the next C.A.G. meeting to approve these minutes and will therefore make an attempt to get concurrence via the C.A.G. Forum as follows:

The Draft Meeting Minutes will be posted on the Forum, for review by the C.A.G. members. Comments will be accepted until April 28, 2006. Any comments will be addressed through the Forum and revised minutes will be subsequently posted as Final Minutes. Concurrence on the final minutes will be assumed unless additional comments are received within 10 days of posting of the Final Minutes.

Very truly yours,

TENG & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Mark Dvorak

Mark Dvorak, P.E.
Project Engineer