

Alton-Godfrey Transportation Study CAG Meeting #1 Summary



Date: August 8, 2012

Time: 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

Location: Lewis and Clark Community College – Advanced Technology Center

1. The first Community Advisory Group (CAG) meeting for the Alton-Godfrey Transportation Study was held August 8, 2012. The purpose of the meeting was to:
 - Provide an overview of the project, the environmental study process, and the public involvement / Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) program
 - Outline the purpose, roles, and responsibilities of CAG members
 - Ask each CAG member to complete a Context Audit form, which is designed to collect information about the study area so that IDOT gains an understanding of community resources and values.

2. Twenty-four (24) individuals, representing varied interests in the study area (government, transportation, business, emergency services, institutions, and residents) were invited by the Project Study Group (PSG) to participate in the CAG. Of this number, the following 13 attended the meeting:
 - Mayor Mike McCormick Village of Godfrey
 - Mike Stumpf Village of Godfrey
 - Matt Asselmeier City of Alton
 - Phil Roggio City of Alton
 - Rusty Ingram Alton Memorial Hospital
 - Diane Schuette Saint Anthony's Health Center
 - Martha Warford Beverly Farm
 - Joe Domer Madison County Transit (attending for Mark Steyer)
 - Capt. Eric Decker Madison County Sheriff's Office
 - Chief John Sowders Godfrey Fire Protection District
 - Steven Koeller Godfrey Property Owner / Agricultural
 - Greg Love Wenzel Road Community
 - John Hilgert Rock Gate Subdivision

3. The following Project Study Group members were in attendance:
 - Jeff Keirn IDOT
 - Cindy Stafford IDOT
 - Karen Geldert IDOT
 - Frank Opfer IDOT
 - Jennifer Hunt IDOT
 - Matt Meyer IDOT
 - Ken Sharkey IDOT
 - George Ryan Piasa Collaborative (AMEC)
 - Steve Coates Piasa Collaborative (AMEC)
 - Jeff Strickland Piasa Collaborative (AMEC)
 - Ray Steege Piasa Collaborative (AMEC)
 - Brooks Brestal Piasa Collaborative (Horner & Shifrin)
 - Dustin Riechmann Piasa Collaborative (BLA)

4. CAG members were provided with a three-ring binder that contained a meeting agenda; roster of members; 8.5x11" copies of the study area maps; NEPA and CAG process exhibits; Stakeholder Involvement Plan (SIP); list of study-related abbreviations; two copies of the Context Audit form; hard copy of the meeting PowerPoint presentation; and blank pages for note-taking. Members were told the binders are for their use for the duration of the project, and they were asked to bring their binder to each meeting so that new material can be added.
5. The meeting agenda included an orientation; introductions; a PowerPoint presentation overview of the study, the NEPA process, public involvement/CSS, and the CAG process; and a Context Audit survey.
6. The PowerPoint presentation overview featured the following:
 - a. An explanation of the scope of the project, which is to identify options that could improve transportation mobility and safety between IL Route 255 and IL Route 3 / IL Route 111 (Homer Adams Parkway). The study area limits were also given: Seminary Road on the east; Seiler Road on the north; just west of US 67/Godfrey Road on the west and IL Route 3/Homer Adams Parkway on the south (including a small area around St. Anthony's Hospital).
 - b. An overview of key activities in the study
 - Public involvement and Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS)
 - Effects of the opening IL 255 and how it will change travel patterns, land development patterns and traffic growth patterns
 - Analysis of crash history in the area and reasons for the crashes
 - Develop a project Purpose and Need
 - Investigate alternatives that address the needs in the study area
 - c. An overview of IDOT's three-phase process
 - Phase One – Location and Environmental Study
 - Phase Two – Design
 - Phase Three - Construction
 - d. An overview of NEPA and the EIS Timeline
 - e. A discussion on the issues in the study area
 - Natural environment
 - Human environment
 - Traffic
 - Safety / crash history
 - f. An overview of the CSS Process (including examples of context and CSS)
 - g. A recap of Stakeholder meetings since January and the public meeting on May 3, 2012.

General comments from stakeholders include:

- Area growth will continue with corresponding increases in traffic
- Opening of IL Route 255 is a priority
- Proposed Transit Center could be beneficial to area but lead to increased traffic volumes
- Concerns about conditions and access at specific intersections and roadways
- Concerns about safety at railroad crossings
- Minimize effects to residences
- Information provided to the team about municipal and business growth plans and employment.

General comments from the May 3rd public meeting include:

- General agreement that some transportation improvements are needed in the area
- Suggestions such as retiming signals, adding turn lanes, or improving specific intersections or roadways
- Several comments referred to IL 255 construction; differing or opposing opinions on impacts to local roadways when it opens

- Some stated concern about state's fiscal condition or that they believed the study is not needed at this time
 - h. An overview of the purpose, roles and responsibilities of CAG members
 - i. A discussion of three examples showing how CAG has worked (IL 3 Waterloo, IL 159 Collinsville and I-74 Peoria)
 - j. An overview of the Context Audit that was to be filled out by each attending CAG member
7. As part of the CSS process, the Context Audit is intended to collect information about the study area from the CAG members, with the goal of helping IDOT understand community values and develop the Problem Statement.
- a. Questions and topics addressed in the Context Audit included:
 - How existing roadways are utilized
 - Areas of historic significance
 - Aesthetically pleasing areas and areas attractive to visitors
 - Traffic congestion, safety, and signal timing issues
 - How roadway improvements may affect the area
 - b. Three of the 19 questions were in tabular form, which requested input on locations of transportation-related issues in the area (#17), and asked respondents to rank the importance to them of various transportation issues and resources in the area (#18 and 19).
 - c. After CAG members completed their forms, PSG team members tabulated responses to questions 18 and 19 in order to get an initial sense of general trends and concerns. These results were given verbally to the CAG members at the conclusion of the meeting, with a reminder that a full summary of the Context Audit would be provided at the next CAG meeting. The initial and informal results of the responses to these two questions indicated a relatively higher level of support for bicycle and pedestrian facilities, sidewalks, and economic development.
8. Open discussion:
- Steven Koeller asked when the location of a new route would be chosen and when construction could begin. George Ryan stated that the study is in the early stages of an approximately four-year Phase I process, followed by design and land acquisition. The best case would be construction in approximately six to seven years if a build alternate is chosen.
 - George Ryan gave a brief verbal description of various roadway types, such as expressways, arterials, and rural roadways. He described access, traffic volumes, and general design features typical of these facilities:
 - The primary function of an arterial is to move vehicles at faster speeds and with less interference from side roads and driveways;
 - Lower speed roadways typically focus more on access (meaning, there are more driveways and side road intersections)
9. The next CAG meeting is anticipated to take place in approximately one month. If CAG members have any questions before then, they were instructed to contact Karen Geldert.
10. The meeting concluded at approximately 8:00 pm.