



PUBLIC HEARING SUMMARY

FLORENCE BRIDGE PHASE I STUDY/IL 100-106 RIVER CROSSING PROJECT

NIMROD FUNK 4H & COMMUNITY BUILDING, WINCHESTER IL

SEPTEMBER 10, 2020

Project Study Group Attendees:

Jeff Myers – Region Four Engineer, IDOT – Districts 6 & 7

Joe Schatteman – Communications, IDOT – Central Office

Sal Madonia - Program Development Engineer, IDOT – District 6

Jay Wavering – Studies and Plans Engineer, IDOT – District 6

Lori Williams – Geometrics Engineer, IDOT – District 6

Dennis O'Connell – Environmental Coordinator, IDOT – District 6

Janel Veile – Bureau of Design and Environment, IDOT – Central Office

Rick Powell – WSP USA

Tanya Adams – WSP USA

Kristin Timmons – Crawford Murphy & Tilly

Shelley Dintelman – EFK Moen

A Public Hearing was held at the Nimrod Funk 4H & Community Building in Winchester, IL from 4:00 PM to 7:00 PM. The purpose of the meeting was to present the Preferred Alternative, the Environmental Assessment document, and provide a project update for the replacement of the existing Illinois Route 100/106 Florence Bridge. The meeting was an open house format; no formal presentation was made, but a continuous presentation was presented that attendees could watch at their convenience. In addition, there was a project visualization video of approximately 4 ½ minutes that was continuously operated by a study team member and could be stopped or advanced at the request of the attendees.

A meeting handout and comment form was provided for all attendees, and IDOT and consultant team representatives were available throughout the meeting to answer questions and receive comments. There were seven display boards showing: the project timeline; existing and proposed typical sections of the roadway and bridge; Project Purpose and Need; environmental impacts; and two historic bridge coordination boards. There were also aerial maps and profiles (1" = 100' scale) representing the Preferred Alternative (4C/D).

There were 40 attendees at the meeting, representing print media, local businesses and business organizations, agriculture, government agencies, elected officials, and interested citizens. A comment deadline of September 24, 2020 was requested for comments received after the meeting via electronic or mailed delivery. The comment form requested that the commenters provide their thoughts on the

Preferred Alternative or other aspects of the study. Two (2) written comments on the provided forms were received at the meeting, and five (5) additional comments were received by the requested deadline. A summary of the received written comments is described below.

- W. Christian – Wants the project to proceed now.
- C. Ingersoll – Video is informative and easy to understand; good process.
- P. VanDeVelde – Supports the project to enable economic competitiveness and social connectivity.
- C. McCartney – Complimented the notification process for the public hearing and supports the preferred alternative.
- G. Stokvis – Supports the preferred alternative, supports the need to replace the existing bridge, favors offering the bridge to interested parties, and states his opinion that the project will improve natural habitat, will improve safety, and is reasonably cost efficient.
- Mayor N. Kurpaitis – Supports investigating whether the existing bridge can be left in place for its historic value and for use by pedestrians.
- K. Westlake/USEPA – Summarized the alternatives considered and the preferred alternative, and USEPA's prior concurrence with them. Complimented avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures for wetlands and streams, air quality, and historical and cultural resources. Complimented the Environmental Assessment for proposing installing pollinator habitat and pedestrian and bicycle accommodations.

Verbal comments received by the project study team at the Public Hearing are noted below:

- S. Madonia spoke to the restaurant owner, Doug Daniel. His property is located on both sides of IL 100/106 east of Florence Rd. Mr. Daniel indicated he was not as concerned about the property located south of the highway but more on the north side and the potential impacts to his business. He was concerned about the loss of parking and the proximity of the proposed ROW line to one of the outbuildings/sheds. S. Madonia told him the proposed right-of-way will be refined during the design phase and will be re-analyzed at that time. Florence Rd. is going shift to the east to better line up with the south leg of the intersection. During the land acquisition phase, a certified appraiser will make an appointment and offer to meet with him. S. Madonia suggested that he note some of these same concerns to them especially the parking so they can take that into account when preparing the appraisal of the taking.
- Mr. & Mrs. Havens had questions regarding how to access their property (located east of the Big Swan levee) will be maintained. J. Wavering asked how they currently accessed their property, to which they indicated via the at-grade access located at the east abutment of the existing bridge. J. Wavering informed them, that the proposed design would provide them access to their property on both sides of IL 100/106, but would have to further investigate how access would be provided south of the preferred alignment. The ideas discussed were to provide access via the existing alignment for the property north of IL 100/106 but since their existing access point would be severed by the preferred alignment, access to the remaining property south of the bridge would be a concern. The possibility of an easement was discussed on the west side of the levee "through" State ROW to access the property south of the preferred alignment. This option would have to be vetted with IDOT's Land Acquisition staff. Another option that was discussed was providing access to the area south of the preferred alignment via "Old Highway Road/Coon Lane". However, access would have to go over the levee, which would require coordination with the Big

Swan Levee District. J. Wavering informed them that we would discuss how best to provide access to their property located south of the preferred alternative and provide some options for their consideration.

They also mentioned that there was a mistake with how the property owners were labeled east of the river and provided an aerial exhibit of their property (attached). The changes were noted and will be confirmed with IDOT's Land Acquisition staff.

- Brenda Middendorf with the Pike County Economic Development Corporation had a question regarding the Pike County Boat Ramp located south of the preferred alternative. She indicated that Pike County was pursuing a grant to improve the boat ramp but did not want to apply for the grant if IDOT was going to improve/impact it. J. Wavering informed her that the preferred alternative would not impact the current boat ramp. She inquired about using the Environmental Assessment developed for this project to identify impacts associated with the County's proposed improvement. J. Wavering informed her that the EA was available on the project website at www.florencebridgestudy.com. She also inquired if IDOT's project would have any additional fill material that could be provided for the County's improvement. J. Wavering informed her that IDOT does not typically tell a Contractor where to waste or acquire materials needed to construct roadway embankments, but to approach the Contractor during construction to coordinate a potential agreement for any surplus material generated from IDOT's project.
- A representative from MECO Engineering, Kevin Garnett, asked about potential impacts to the boat ramp. Mr. Garnett indicated Pike County is wanting to improve the ramp. He asked about waste materials generated from IDOT's construction project. L. Williams informed him that this is something that would need to be worked out with the Contractor during construction and to make sure he provided written comments regarding the improvements to the boat ramp.
- An attendee questioned whether the eastbound lane needed a left turn lane to access the proposed connector road, and whether the westbound lane needed a right turn lane for the same purpose. He was concerned about the safety of a turning vehicle being stopped on the new IL 100-106 mainline while waiting for traffic to clear, and the potential for crashes. R. Powell responded that there are warrants to be met to justify turn lane additions, and that IDOT would follow up on his request to study the need for additional turn lanes.