



Illinois Department
of Transportation

▪ MEETING SUMMARY ▪

PROJECT: IL Route 4/15
Section 421BR-2
St. Clair County
Job No P-98-014-20
PTB 194-051

H&S PROJECT NO.: 2019400

MEETING DATE / TIME: January 17, 2024 / 6:00pm

MEETING LOCATION: Fayetteville City Hall, Fayetteville, IL

MEETING PURPOSE: Community Advisory Group (CAG) #2

ATTENDEES:



Name	Organization	Phone	Email	CAG Member
IDOT				
Tiffany Brase	IDOT – Studies & Plans	(618) 346.3715	Tiffany.Brase@illinois.gov	X
Jennifer Hunt	IDOT – Environment	(618) 346.3156	Jennifer.Hunt@illinois.gov	X
Matt Meyer	IDOT – Location Studies	(618) 346.3160	Matthew.Meyer@illinois.gov	X
Cindy Stafford	IDOT – Location Studies	(618) 346.3151	Cindy.Stafford@illinois.gov	X
Sarah Wiszkon	IDOT – Location Studies	(618) 346.3309	Sarah.Wiszkon@illinois.gov	X
CONSULTANT TEAM				
Brad Riechmann	Horner & Shifrin, Inc.	(618) 622.6827	beriechmann@hornershfrin.com	X
Bridgett Jacquot	Horner & Shifrin, Inc.	(618) 622.6831	bljacquot@hornershfrin.com	X
Theresa Goetz	Horner & Shifrin, Inc.	(618) 726.0314	tmgoetz@hornershfrin.com	X
Stephen Kehoe	Quigg Engineering, Inc.	(217) 670.0563	skehoe@quiggengineering.com	X
ATTENDEES				
Tom Bauchman	Resident - Property Owner - Fayetteville	(618) 698.0983	tom_bauchman@yahoo.com	X
Kathy Brandt	Resident - Fayetteville	(618) 677.3319	bobcase@aol.com	X
Robert Case	Owns Farmland in Fayetteville	(314) 560.6727	jgottschammer@mascoutah.com	X
Brian Funk	Villages / Elected Officials Fayetteville - Mayor	(618) 677.3343		X
Margaret Hutcheson	Resident - Fayetteville	(618) 531.6544	mmascoutah@aol.com	X
Andrew Jankowski	Commuter – Okawville Resident	(618) 301.2033	andrew.jankoski@illinois.gov	X
Darrell Muskopf	Business Owner - Muskopf Tree Farm - Fayetteville	(618) 580.3086		X
Rosemarie Parker	Business Owner	(618) 541.7233	parkerlawoffice@sbcglobal.net	X
Casey Trentman	EMS - St Libory Fire District	(618) 768.4216	rogerssuc@egyptian.net	X
John Grab	EMS - Mascoutah Rural Fire Protection District	(618) 444.1107	john.grab@usda.gov	X
Scott Dunakey	Special Interest - Heartlands Conservancy District	(618) 566.4451		X
Randy Vasquez	EMS – Fayetteville Fire Department	(618) 593.4369	fcvfc1@gmail.com	X
Melanie Brink	School District - Freeburg 70 Superintendent			X
Thomas Rude	School District - St. Libory			X
Chris Norwood	School District - Mascoutah			X



Name	Organization	Phone	Email	CAG Member
Paul Otten	Business Owner - Wenneman's Meat Market Company			X
Stephen Middendorf	Business Owner - Stripes 'N More Autobody			X
Tony Middendorf	Business Owner - Stripes 'N More Autobody			
Joe Robertson	Commuter - St. Libory			X

A copy of the presentation is included in this meeting summary. Please refer to the slide number identified throughout the summary.

Meeting Discussion:

- Tiffany(IDOT) presented an introduction to the meeting and thanked the CAG members for coming to tonight's meeting.
- **Slide 2/3:** Brad (H&S) provided the purpose of the meeting: 1) Explain Alternative Development Process, 2) Discuss Alternatives & Impacts, 3) Discuss Potential Preferred Alternatives, 4) Group Exercise – Input on Alternatives before public meeting, 5) Next Steps.
- Introductions were made around the room.
- **Slide 4/5/6:** Brad reviewed the study area and the purpose of project which includes age of the structure and continual and rising costs of maintenance. He confirmed that the bridge is safe in the current conditions but for the reasons listed, replacement is required.
- **Slide 7:** Theresa (H&S) explained the IDOT three-phase process. The project is currently about two-thirds through Phase I which is preliminary design and environmental studies. Phase II is design plans, construction bid documents and right of way acquisition. Phase III is construction. All three phases are included in FY 2024-2029 Proposed Highway & Multimodal Improvement Program.
- **Slide 8:** Bridgett (H&S) shared the Problem Statement that was developed during CAG meeting #1 with input from the CAG. This problem statement identifies the problems with a project study area that need to be addressed.
- **Slide 9:** Bridgett summarized the important findings from the context audit that was filled out by the CAG members during CAG meeting #1. A) Closure of IL Route 4/15 is a concern to the public, B) New bridge needs to accommodate farm equipment and semi-trucks.
- **Slide 10:** Brad stated that since the last CAG meeting, Alternatives Analysis, Bike and Pedestrian Study, Environmental Survey, Drainage Studies, and Bridge Type Analysis have been completed.
- **Slide 11:** Brad reviewed the existing and proposed IL Route 4/15 Bridge Typical Sections, noting the wider lanes and shoulders on the proposed structure. Existing total bridge width is 31'9" and the proposed structure width considered in all proposed alternatives is 54'.
- **Slide 12:** Brad explained the alternative development. 14 alternatives were analyzed and 11 were eliminated because these alternatives did not meet the Problem Statement or had engineering flaws, for example: extended closure time during construction, non-policy geometry, and negative impacts to river hydraulics.
- **Slide 13:** Brad explained an alternative example North G that was eliminated due to a need to reduce the design speed limit. This speed limit adjustment and proposed geometry may cause a potential safety issue.
- **Slide 14/15:** Brad described the two reasonable alternatives, Alternative South and Alternative North.



- Questions that were asked by CAG members:
 - Will Terminal Access Rd and Emil Burgard Lane be paved? Answer: This will be determined in Phase II.
 - Are the yellow hatching property acquisitions? Answer: These are shown as possible displacements depending on the alternative selected. The apartment building counts as multiple displacements associated with the Alternative South.
 - Have property owners been alerted? Answer: Yes, property owners were sent a letter notifying them of possible displacement.
 - How many displacements are on the north side? Answer: Two.
 - Will ATV and other type vehicles be allowed on the proposed shared use bike and pedestrian path? Answer: No motorized vehicles will be allowed.
 - What side will the path be on? Answer: A proposed shared use path was investigated on both sides of the proposed alignment, however it is recommended to be place on the south due to future planned bike accommodations to the south.
 - What will be the weight load of the structure? Answer: It will be the legal limit.
 - How much distance is there between existing and proposed structures? Answer: Both alternatives looked to maintain a minimum 10 feet between the existing and proposed structures.
 - Will street signs be replaced? Answer: Yes, a sign inventory will be taken during Phase II.
 - Will the old pavement be replaced instead of just an overlay? Answer: Yes, the old pavement will be removed and replaced within the improvement limits.
 - What material will the pavement be built from? Answer: That will be determined later in Phase II.
 - Does the state already own the property? Answer: The state does already own some of the property. IDOT owns some of it and some is owned by Illinois Department of Natural Resources.
 - Will the street drainage system be replaced? Answer: A full drainage study will be completed but will not reconstruct the drainage features if not necessary. Proposed curb and gutter and sidewalk will be constructed on the west side of the bridge in Fayetteville.
 - When will bridge pier type be decided on? Answer: This will be decided during the development of the Type, Size and Location (TSL) drawings for the bridge replacement which will be prepared soon.
 - There is concern about the river when riprap was placed in the river back in 1971. Answer: Team has been coordinating with US Army Corps of Engineers and US Coast Guard through the Phase I study as part of the Hydraulic Study.
 - Will the old bridge and piers be removed? Answer: Yes, they will be removed.
 - Will pavement be recycled? Answer: This will be determined in Phase II.
- Cindy stated these reasonable alternatives are still at a high level and they may evolve as the design progresses further. These alternatives will be presented at the next Public Meeting.



- **Slide 16:** Bridgett discussed the difference between the North and South alternatives using the screening summary.
- CAG members asked about closures, and Tiffany stated that will be determined in Phase II whether it be flagger maintenance of traffic or weekend closure for the connections on each side of IL Route 4/15. Bridgett assured the community that if there is a closure, it will be coordinated with the community especially because of the Emergency Management Services, school bus routes, and mail services.
- **Slide 17:** Stephen discussed both potential alternatives allowed for bridge construction adjacent to existing with minimal traffic impacts and that minimal closures may be needed to make east and west final connections. This would be determined later through a Transportation Management Plan.
- CAG members stated they preferred alternative North because of fewer displacements, less tree removal, and less wetland impacts. They do not want to lose more people in their community. From review of the two main options, the CAG members came to a consensus to prefer the North Alternative.
- Cindy stated the results from this CAG meeting will be shared at a Public Meeting. Information shared today and the CAG consensus on a preferred alternative will be presented and will allow for the general public to provide comment. Information about the public meeting will be shared through press releases, CAG members report, flyers, post card mailers, changeable message boards, and emails.
- CAG Member stated there will be a solar farm project east of the IL Route 4/15 river bridge. It was confirmed after the meeting with National Grid Renewables that this solar farm will be located on IL 4/15 east of the horizontal curve east of Bee Hollow Rd. There will be one proposed on the north side and one on the south side of IL Route 4/15, about 150 acres total. This is a private developer, not an Ameren project. The solar project will tie into Ameren's system. IDOT team members and H&S did not know about this, appreciated the information, and stated that is the reason these CAG meetings are so important.
- CAG Member asked if this project funding is confirmed. Tiffany confirmed construction of the project is identified within the FY 2024-2029 Proposed Highway & Multimodal Improvement Program. Cindy stated this is a 100-year-old bridge and bridge projects tend to have a higher priority. The only funding guaranteed is the funding in the yearly budget. A project won't go to construction unless the funding is authorized. Other items for the project have also been identified in the FY 2024-2029 5-year plan include engineering for PH II, utility relocation, ROW acquisition, and construction.
- A CAG Member stated he was frustrated that the project team did not show the eleven eliminated alternatives. Brad stated that he had all other eleven alternatives loaded on his computer and that he could show them and discuss how they were analyzed and dropped from further consideration. Most CAG Members stayed for the additional presentation.
 - Culverts – The use of Culverts to replace the first overflow structure was investigated, The alt did not meet hydraulics requirements which could negatively impact future drainage patterns during flood events in the region. The alternative was not carried forward for additional study.
 - North A – First of 3 adjacent north alternatives considered North A,B,C. East and west tie in used two curves in opposite directions directly back to back(reverse curve), path on north side of structure, with short tie in that met existing curve on east. This was eliminated due to the east tie in reverse curves near another curve resulting in undesirable geometry. In addition, this design may cause a potential



increase for crashes near Bee Hollow Road which has had a fatal crash within the studied period.

- North B – presented earlier in the meeting as recommended alternative North. Preferred smooth east tie-in best of the 3 adjacent north alternatives.
- North C – Similar to North A with path now on south side of structure, uses reverse curves west and east ends, tie in east met existing curve. This was eliminated due to the east tie-in reverse curves near another curve resulting in undesirable geometry. In addition, this design may cause a potential increase for crashes near Bee Hollow Road which has had a fatal crash within the studied period.
- North D – Adjacent North Alt where reuse of existing overflow structure was the goal. Resulted in a curve on first overflow structure, not preferred by IDOT due to complexity of construction. Geometry was not within IDOT policy without lowering design speeds. Lowering design speeds was later studied as Alt G, This option is not within IDOT policy and therefore was eliminated.
- North E - Curved longer overflow structure not preferred by IDOT due to increased maintenance requirements. Alternative removed the second overflow structure and proposed rerouting drainage channel to the first overflow structure for one combined structure. This is not desirable due to the change in existing drainage patterns which can create additional problems. Eliminated due to impacting existing drainage patterns, complicated construction, additional wetland and ROW impacts.
- North F – Curve on river structure, first overflow structure replaced on an angle causing impacts with the existing overflow structure during construction and impacts to maintenance of traffic but allows for widening on second overflow structure. This option was eliminated due to cost being similar to replacing all structures. It also has one of the highest impacts to the traveling public of options considered due to the lengthy road closure time anticipated. Also, IDOT does not prefer curves on structures due to complication of construction and future maintenance requirements.
- North G – Replace river structure and west overflow structure. Connect into existing IL Route 4/15 before east overflow structure. Not recommended due to the low design speed required to meet IDOT geometric policies. Also, the cost of replacing just one structure with this option is close to the cost of replacing all three structures proposed with the preferred alternatives. Noted proposed typical section will appear rural and invite rural section speed expectations.
- North H – Combine River and first overflow structures. Eliminated due to possibly displacing additional houses, access issues, changes existing drainage patterns which can in turn cause drainage problems,
- South A – First of 3 adjacent south Alternatives studied: South A, B, C. River structure south of existing, path on south side of structure, smooth tie in west and short tie in east. This was eliminated due to the east tie-in reverse curves near another curve resulting in undesirable geometry. In addition, this design may cause a potential increase for crashes near Bee Hollow Road which has had a fatal crash within the studied period.
- South B – Adjacent South alignment, All structures replaced, alignment on the south side of existing structure. Presented earlier in the meeting as alternative South. The east end tie-in is smooth and best of the 3 adjacent south alternatives.



- South C – Adjacent South alignment on south side of existing, path on south side of structure, short tie in east. This was eliminated due to the east tie-in reverse curves near another curve resulting in undesirable geometry. In addition, this design may cause a potential increase for crashes near Bee Hollow Road which has had a fatal crash within the studied period.
- Accelerated Bridge Construction alternative (ABC) 1a – Construct on existing alignment requires one travel lane to be closed during construction - greater traffic impacts to stay on alignment since IL Route 4/15 would need to be closed to traffic or limited to one lane each direction throughout the construction. Does not meet problem statement due to these increase impacts to the public along with greater cost for one bridge compared to the other alternatives which replace three structures and then IDOT still must maintain two older existing bridges. Therefore, it did not make fiscal sense and eliminated.
- ABC 1b - Slight offset North – greater traffic impacts to stay on existing alignment since traffic would need to be closed or limited to one lane each direction throughout the construction. Does not meet problem statement due to these increase impacts to the public along with greater cost for two bridges and then IDOT still must maintain an older existing bridge did not make fiscal sense. Not able to provide a reverse curve to tie back into the existing alignment before the 1st overflow structure so ended up replacing the river crossing structure and the first overflow structure.
- **Slide 19:** Next steps are Public Information Meeting, complete project report and request approval for Phase 1.
 - Questions asked by CAG Members.
 - Who can come to the public meeting? Answer: General public similar to the first Public Meeting.

After the meeting a CAG Member from the fire station stated that Fayetteville needs to maintain access 24/7 no matter which alternative A or B is chosen. Conditions are already tight for truck lengths with access to the existing alignment when pulling in or out.

Attachments:

- Power Point presentation slides used during the meeting
- Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Action Items:

- Design Team to distribute meeting minutes for attendee's record.
- Setup Public Information Meeting.

End of Meeting Minutes

Contact Theresa Goetz at tmgoetz@hornersshifin.com for any additions or corrections to these minutes within seven calendar days of the distribution date or they will be considered final.