



**IL 100-106 River Crossing Project Phase I Study**  
**Citizens Advisory Group - Meeting #3 Summary**  
**March 8, 2018**

A meeting of the Citizens Advisory Group was held on March 8, 2017 at the Nimrod Funk Community Building in Winchester, IL. The agenda for the meeting included the following items.

- Project Timeline
- Study Area and Preliminary Alternatives
- Review of Environmental Resources
- Review Range of Alternatives Considered
- Identify Alternatives Proposed to be Carried Forward
- Refined Alternatives to be Carried Forward
- Features, Costs and Impacts
- Public Meeting #2 Comment Review
- Next Steps

Handouts at the meeting included:

- Matrix spreadsheets of alternatives with costs, travel benefits, and environmental impacts itemized under each alternative.
  - One matrix included the eleven build alternatives as presented to the CAG #2 meeting in April 2017, based on initial environmental impacts, design features and costs based on initial design and environmental screening of available databases.
  - The other matrix included the four recommended Alternatives to be Carried Forward (4A, 4C, 4C/D and 5B) with updated environmental impacts, design features and costs based on refined design and environmental screening of available databases, but also including updated environmental surveys which were available as of March 2018 for wetlands, mussels, and federally-listed threatened plant species Decurrent False Aster.
- Comment forms, similar to those provided for Public Meeting #2 in December 2017, asking members to state their preference for each of the four build alternatives as well as providing a space for detailed comments.

After introductions conducted by J. Wavering, R. Powell and K. Timmons conducted a PowerPoint presentation, after which the attendees were invited to review maps showing environmental resources and video flyover simulations of the four alternatives proposed to be carried forward for further study.

Meeting attendees were also invited to make written comments on the alternatives, either by submitting at the meeting or sending to IDOT District 6 by March 22, 2018.

Comments and questions during and after the presentation included the following:

- A CAG member asked IDOT to include the yearly operational cost of the existing bridge in the description of Alternative 1, the No-Build Alternative.
- One of the trucking companies hauling for the quarry would rather take a right turn from Illinois 100-106 to access the quarry than a left.
- CAG members asked about the process of the resource agencies in prioritizing the alternatives by environmental impacts. J. Wavering replied that all the impacts are considered, and the resource agency representatives discuss the various impacts as a group, with each agency presenting impacts in their area of expertise. R. Powell added that sometimes a slight increase in impacts in one resource are acceptable if greater reductions in impacts to another resource are achieved. All impacts are subject to mitigation requirements requested by the various agencies.
- A CAG member indicated there could be potential Native American burial mounds in the vicinity of the northwest connector of Alternative 4A.
- Some CAG members indicated concerns about Florence's loss of tax revenue if "Ed Moodie's" restaurant/bar is impacted by Alternative 4A.
- Some CAG members cited archaeological resources as well as farm and residence impacts in opposing Alternative 5B.
- A CAG member favored the T-intersection connection to Florence Road of Alternative 4 C/D.
- A CAG member favored adding a local interchange at I-72 and County Highway 14 in addition to replacing the Illinois River bridge.
- CAG members favoring Alternative 5B cited the shorter bridge length, better location for river navigation, and less disruption of traffic during construction as compared to other alternatives.
- A CAG member asked that the existing bridge not be shut down during construction citing disruption and economic impacts to businesses, residents and emergency services. Also, impacts to existing residences were cited as a reason to not favor Alternative 5B.
- A CAG member cited an alignment just south of the current bridge as being most beneficial, less disruptive to normal traffic flow, and have less impact on farmland and natural areas as compared to other alternatives.

A total of 16 completed comment forms and one email comment were collected, including those submitted at the meeting and those sent afterward to IDOT District 6 by the March 22 deadline. The comments indicated the following preferences as shown on Table 1 below.

**Table 1. CAG #3 Alternative Preference**

	Alternative 4A	Alternative 4C	Alternative 4C/D	Alternative 5B
1 <sup>st</sup> preference	2	7	6	2
2 <sup>nd</sup> preference	4	7	0	0
3 <sup>rd</sup> preference	2	0	4	3
4 <sup>th</sup> preference	3	0	0	5
Not marked or "0"	6	3	7	7

See Appendix A for the written comments as received, including alternative preference and additional comments.

Project Study Group members attending CAG Meeting #3 included the following.

**IDOT:** Jeff Myers, Sal Madonia, Jay Wavering, Jon Kelley, Lori Williams, Joe Schatterman

**WSP:** Rick Powell, Meghan Hamilton, Tanya Adams

**CMT:** Kristin Timmons