

Subject: Vandalia CAG Meeting Minutes	
Client: IDOT D7	
Project: US 51 EIS	Project No: I0020360
Meeting Date: September 22, 2010, 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm	Meeting Location: Mother of Dolors, Vandalia
Notes by: JKT/JTB	

**Project Team Attendees:** Sherry Phillips (IDOT), Matt Hirtzel (IDOT), Gary Welton (IDOT), Gene Beccue (IDOT), Rob Macklin (IDOT), Steve Corley (IDOT), Jerry Payonk (CDI), Stacie Dovalovsky (CDI), Antonio Acevedo (CDI), Joyce Tanzosh (CDI), Jennifer Mitchell (HDR), Linda Huff (H&H), Jamie Tunnell Bents (H&H), Jan Piland (FHWA)

See attached sign-in sheet for CAG members and public attendees

**Topics Discussed:** Review of Alternatives Developed by CAG members at the August 31, 2010, CAG meeting; Engineering Concepts; and Engineering Feasibility and Preliminary Interchange Geometry of Alternatives Developed by CAG

The meeting commenced at 6:05 p.m.

**1. Welcome (Sherry Phillips, Matt Hirtzel)**

- a. Following a brief ice breaker, the attendees (CAG members, public attendees, and project team) introduced themselves and stated what interest area they represent (CAG members only).
- b. Sherry stated the main purposes of the meeting:
  - Review engineering terms and definitions.
  - Review alternatives developed by CAG at August 31, 2010, CAG meeting.
  - Review engineering feasibility and preliminary interchange geometry examples.

**2. Engineering terms and definition (Sherry Phillips, Matt Hirtzel)**

An illustrated reader-friendly Engineering Glossary handout prepared by the project team was distributed to the CAG members. A summary of the terms and concepts explained by Sherry and Matt, and questions raised by the CAG members are summarized below.

Cross Section: 200 feet wide, four-lane divided expressway, rural or urban cross-section. 200 feet is an estimate, because when the road is elevated, the footprint is wider. Think of this cross section as an Interstate with restricted access and high speed. Narrowing the grass median width is the only way to narrow standard cross-section.

*CAG member: What about four-lane highways that do not have medians?*

*Project team: We are showing you a rural cross section. What you describe is an urban cross section, which often has no median but does have a barrier wall or barrier median, which limits access.*

*CAG member: What about 32 coming out of Effingham?*

*Project team: That is a five-lane road, not a highway. What we are developing is a highway. Access to this road is based on certain criteria. Access is not as restricted as an interstate. If the median is narrowed, it has to be about the length of a car per standards.*

*CAG member: 32 works well.*

*Project team: That is a different design. We (IDOT) are fairly limited where we can put that type of road. We can only construct those for certain lengths with center turn lane.*

Design speed: The speed the road is designed for to safely operate a vehicle is not the same as posted speed. IDOT plans to post speed for new US 51 at 65 mph, and the design speed at 70 mph.

Radius: The higher the design speed of a roadway, the larger the radius is needed to travel around the curve. IDOT has standards for minimum curve radii for vehicles to operate safely.

Interchange: For an intersection, some cars stop, either a two-way stop or four-way stop. For an interchange, some movements do not stop (free flow), and some might stop. Sherry drew illustrations of different types of interchanges, including cloverleaf and trumpet (both free flow) on a flip chart. An interchange at US 51 and I-70 would be a system-to-system interchange.

Dual marking: One road that is marked for two routes. A portion of the routes share the same road segment.

Collector-Distributor (C-D) system: Roadways parallel but separate from the interstate that allows vehicles to enter and exit in a safe manner. There is a C-D system in Peoria.

Sherry drew an example of a C-D system using I-70 and US 51 as an example. Sherry demonstrated the eight different traffic movements associated with this C-D system. Sherry stated that the length of a C-D system can vary. Sherry and Matt discussed how proper signage on the interstate (I-70) or US 51 will direct the traveling public to businesses off these roads and direct them to the correct ramps to use. A CAG member commented that there is a C-D system in Collinsville.

Matt stated that economic development should be considered with regard to C-D systems. If a driver on a C-D system sees a mall along the C-D road, they might not be able to easily access it. Once a driver is on a C-D road, they must enter and exit at a ramp; there are no turns onto cross roads.

Jerry stated the reason interchanges are spaced a minimum distance of three miles apart is because weaving on to and off of the interstate at high speeds from interchange ramps poses safety concerns. C-D

roads provide an opportunity to perform the weaving operations at a lower posted speed. So a C-D system is designed to improve safety.

### 3. Review of Alternatives Developed by CAG Members (Jerry Payonk, Stacie Dovalovsky)

The project team electronically recreated the alternatives that were hand drawn on aerial photographs by the CAG during the August 31, 2010, CAG meeting. Jerry stated that the CAG members should check that all of the alternatives were accurately reproduced. The original aerial photographs with alternatives developed by the CAG are available for reference.

The project team handed out 11" x 17" color aerial photographs showing the alternatives developed by the CAG members at the August 31, 2010, CAG meeting. Five handouts were distributed, one showing all alternatives, and the other four handouts show similar alternatives grouped together in one color scheme. The groupings are as follows:

- Dual marked with I-70 alternatives (green color scheme)
- Western bypass alternatives (yellow color scheme)
- Eastern bypass and through town alternatives (blue and purple color scheme)
- Parallel with I-70 alternatives (orange color scheme)

Each of these five handouts was displayed via projector on a large screen. Jerry and Stacie reviewed each grouping. For the slide showing all alternatives, Vandalia S & U were shown along with the alternatives developed by the CAG at the August 31, 2010, meeting. The project team stated that S & U are shown for comparative purposes, and as a reminder that these alternatives are still being considered. After each group was displayed, Stacie asked the CAG members if there were any alternatives missing or if any should be modified. Stacie pointed out that the alternatives were grouped by the project team after the August 31, 2010, meeting, and asked the CAG members if they believe that any of the alternatives were in the wrong group and should be moved.

All CAG members agreed that the alternatives they created at the August 31, 2010, CAG meeting were accurately reproduced, no additional alternatives should be added, and that the alternatives appeared to be in the proper groupings.

Note: the handouts and slides presented during this segment of the meeting included the alignments only, and not preliminary interchange footprints or engineering constructability issues.

Stacie stated that if CAG members are present tonight that did not attend the last CAG meeting, those members must review, agree to, and sign the ground rules.

### 4. Review of Preliminary Interchanges and Engineering Issues of Alternatives (Jerry Payonk, Stacie Dovalovsky, Sherry Phillips, Matt Hirtzel)

Stacie discussed engineering constructability and preliminary interchange examples for the alternatives. The project team presented one preliminary interchange concept for one alternative from each of the four groups to provide an example of the engineering challenges. Engineering constructability issues identified by the project team included areas where curves are too tight and require modification. Another issue discussed in association with the interchanges was change in access to properties or side streets. After the discussion of each alternative group, the project team checked with the CAG to make sure that the

members agreed that the project team should continue developing these alternatives in light of the interchange options and modifications that are required. The interchanges as presented were preliminary and were presented to show what the interchange would look like and how it would function. Stacie reminded the group that the lines shown for the interchanges were not the entire interchange footprint, only lane lines, and the interchange footprint could be much larger. Stacie noted that environmental constraints have not yet been evaluated, and will be discussed with the CAG at a future meeting.

### Dual Marked with I-70 Alternatives

A dual marked alternative that modifies the existing US 51 and I-70 interchange on the east side of town (Exit 63), curves west and is dual marked with I-70, and then travels past the existing interchange (Exit 61) and Wal-Mart to a new trumpet type interchange then traverses southwest to join existing US 51, was shown on the screen. For a dual mark alternative, the footprint of Exit 63 would enlarge significantly. The existing diamond interchange would change to a modified cloverleaf interchange to keep traffic free flow. Jerry demonstrated the different directional travel patterns through the interchange. The modified cloverleaf would be a three-level interchange configuration. It was noted that an access modification to US 51 and US 40, south of I-70 would be needed to provide proper spacing with the eastbound to southbound exit ramp. An example of the re-routed (to the south) US 40 was shown. Also, because the north ramps would terminate so far north of I-70, access to the businesses north of I-70 would be rerouted north of the terminus of the exit ramps. Several existing businesses in the northwest quadrant would be impacted by this interchange.

### Discussion

*CAG member: If US 51 stays on existing alignment through Vandalia, a driver heading south from Ramsey headed onto the interstate would not need access without stopping heading east or west. That is, you don't need free flow on the south leg.*

*Project team: This is true for existing condition, but for a new system, through town must be free flow.*

*CAG member: What would happen if we leave the existing interchange (Exit 63) as it is and get a variance?*

*Project team: No variances will be sought. We have to consider the standards.*

*CAG member: But it is possible we would get a variance.*

*Project team: And there is a possibility we would not. Variances can compromise safety standards. We will follow standards at this point. Variances and design exceptions are only for cases when no other reasonable alternatives that meet design standards are available. The investment in the new road should not be substandard.*

*CAG member: Effingham has the only tri-level in the area. I'm sure they don't want to compete.*

*Project team: That is probably not the case. A tri-level might not be thought of as a great thing by everyone.*

A new independent interchange on the west side of town must be three miles away the nearest interchange, per policy. An interchange three miles west of the existing US 40 and I-70 (Exit 61) interchange was shown on the screen for reference. It was agreed by the CAG that an interchange 3-miles away was undesirable.

An alternative to the independent interchange 3-miles away is to provide an interchange with US 51 while maintaining interstate access to I-40 via a C-D system. The project team showed an example of the dual-marked route with a new trumpet system interchange between I-70 and US 51 with a C-D system to the existing US 40 interchange (Exit 61). Jerry demonstrated all system and C-D traffic movements within this configuration.

*CAG member: Do you have a handout of the C-D system?*

*Project team: Not today. We did not bring any because these are preliminary. The size and location of the C-D system can vary. But we can bring a handout showing how a C-D system works to the next meeting.*

*CAG member: How far west is the trumpet from Exit 61 (I-70 and US 40 exit near the Wal-Mart)?*

*Project team: Shown here, about one mile.*

*CAG member: What about US 40?*

*Project team: US 40 would still cross I-70 at the same location, but its access to US 51 would be through the CD system. At the location where US 40 physically crosses a proposed US 51, it would remain an overpass for the dual marked I-70 alternatives.*

*CAG member: What about the Main Street overpass?*

*Project team: Main Street will not be there, and access will not be there. It will be moved a minimum of one-half mile from where it is now. The C-D system will impact local roads and have other secondary impacts. Keep in mind that we cannot show them all today.*

The project team displayed the rest of the dual-marked alternatives developed by the CAG on the screen. Stacie stated that while specific interchange designs have not been formally developed by the project team for the rest of the alternatives, they are similar to the trumpet or cloverleaf interchange. The interchange locations for the alternatives were shown with red boxes. The interchange footprints would be the about the size of the red boxes and would include flyovers similar to the modified cloverleaf at Exit 63.

The project team asked if these options represent what the CAG members drew. Do any of these options need to be removed because they now do not meet the intent of the CAG when the alternative was drawn?

*CAG member: What is the frontage road shown north of the west interchanges?*

*Project team: That is relocated US 40.*

*CAG member: I am here to collect data for some CAG members who could not attend. (It appears) the consensus (is) that (the) dual marked is probably the most popular option among the CAG members because it would impact the least amount of housing or businesses. The interchange size should be tightened up to reduce impacts. Do you have handouts?*

*Project team: The project team will not hand out figures at this time because the interchanges are preliminary – the project team can meet with the CAG members that could not attend.*

The project team asked if the CAG members understand the impacts that would occur with the dual-marked options for all dual marked alternatives.

*CAG member: In order to keep the road free-flowing, a wide area will be impacted by the interchange no matter where it is located.*

*Project team: Yes, the interchanges will get much larger and other interchanges will be modified.*

*CAG member: It's not as simple as putting a stop sign there.*

*CAG member: Take off the alternative that runs along IL 185 (north of I-70) because it takes out too much housing.*

*Project team: Whoever drew that line should agree to take it off. But if you feel as a community that you don't want to keep it, then we can take it off.*

*CAG member: This is the only area in Vandalia where residential growth is occurring.*

*Project team: A CAG member drew this option to use existing roads and bridges as much as possible, which would still require reconstructing. Does anyone object to removing this alternative? Does anyone want to leave it in?*

*CAG member: Take out all dual marked alternatives except the one that uses the existing US 51 and I-70 interchange east of town. Is anyone for those other alternatives?*

*The CAG members discussed the options further.*

**The CAG reached a consensus to remove all dual marked options except the one that uses the existing interchange at Exit 63.**

*Project team: It might not be in the best interest of Vandalia to only leave one dual marked option. There are other things we have not yet considered that may compromise the viability of this option, such as geometrics or environmental constraints. Take caution that there are other things we have to evaluate.*

*CAG member: What does the alternative that would be left impact?*

*Project team: At a minimum, business and commercial impacts and the treatment lagoons.*

*CAG member: What if we wait to remove until you come back with interchange designs for all alternatives? That would be the timeline?*

*Project team: About two months.*

*CAG member: I keep asking myself, what is best for Vandalia and future growth? Should I look at this for the betterment of Vandalia or for myself? I live on the north side. But I don't want to knock out industry so people can't work. All dual marked options will be impacting someone.*

*Project team: Everyone should be considering what is best for Vandalia.*

*CAG member: The town can only grow to the west.*

The CAG members discussed these options further and reviewed all dual marked alternatives.

**The CAG confirmed that all dual marked options should be eliminated except the one that uses the existing interchange at Exit 63.**

### **Western Alternatives**

The farthest western alternative was shown on the screen. This alternative traverses west of Vandalia Lake and the airport. As originally drawn, the alternative was located through the airport runways. The project team modified the alternative originally drawn to clear the airport property and follow existing roadways until crossing I-70. The western alternatives utilize an interchange option similar to the dual mark alternatives. Instead of a trumpet interchange with I-70, US 51 would be a cloverleaf interchange with I-70 with a C-D system to US 40 (Exit 61). Jerry demonstrated the different directional travel patterns within the system. At this distance west, drivers likely wouldn't be able to see the businesses in Vandalia.

### **Discussion**

*Public attendee: I developed a drawing like this that was in the paper. This option has the least impact to the city and goes around the residential and commercial areas.*

*CAG member: How far does the road have to be from the airport?*

*Project team: We have to coordinate with the FAA to determine the distance.*

*Public attendee: North of Vera around the lake is 3.5 miles, Vandalia to Gallatin Street to Hickory Creek is 3.5 miles, 70 to Hagerstown is 3.5 miles.*

*CAG member: The way this alternative was modified, it goes right through Hagerstown.*

*Project team: This is a preliminary concept only. We would avoid Hagerstown.*

*CAG member: This is too far west and would have a negative impact on businesses. People won't use that road. The dual mark option uses I-70 through town.*

The two additional western alternatives, one that bridges the lake and one further east that uses the Exit 61, were discussed. The interchanges resulting from these alternatives would be much larger than the existing interchanges along I-70

*CAG member: is routing an alternative over a lake feasible?*

*Project team: Yes.*

*CAG member: What about time travel? These alternatives won't work for anyone. People won't come to Vandalia.*

*Project team: Does this meet the needs of the community or interest areas?*

*Public attendee: People know what destination they are going to next and do not stop when they see signs. So Vandalia won't lose existing businesses. Going around the lake will not affect one business or resident.*

*Project team: Residents will be affected.*

*CAG member: I ask this question for our kids and grandkids – how much money will be saved by bringing the option closer to town?*

*Project team: We have not developed cost. Dual marking I-70 has costs too with the complex interchanges and modifications to the interstate. Western alternatives have a longer length to build on new alignment and will impact homes and businesses, particularly farm businesses.*

*CAG member: That far west bypass is like Decatur, no one will use it. There are no industries by Decatur.*

*Project team: Does anyone want to still look at the western bypass around the airport? If there are options that are more palatable, today is the day to bring them up.*

The CAG discussed the western alternatives further.

**The CAG reached a consensus to eliminate all western alternatives except the alternative around the lake. That alternative can be kept for further refinement and for comparative purposes.**

*Project team: So remove the two eastern bypasses but bring back the modified far west bypass?*

*Multiple CAG members: Yes.*

*Project team: What is it about the middle option that crosses the lake that you all don't like?*

*Various CAG members: We are eliminating not because it crosses the lake but because of the residences near the lake. The western bypass that crosses farthest east would impact a lot of residential areas and Wal-Mart.*

*Project team: Residential impacts have not been counted yet. The CAG should not remove based on residential impacts. Vandalia S or U only impacted six homes. Don't eliminate on resources yet, we can determine numbers at a later date.*

*CAG member: If we decide we don't like an option now, why can't we agree to remove it? We were only brainstorming possible options at the last meeting, and if we decide now that we don't like them, we should be able to change our minds and remove them.*

*Project Team: Residences must be counted for each alternative before CAG members state that alternatives could be removed because S or U only would remove 6 homes.*

### **Eastern and Through Town Alternatives**

The project team showed a cloverleaf interchange for a representative eastern alternative that crosses I-70 east of Exit 63. Jerry demonstrated the different directional travel patterns through the interchange. The eastern alternative would require eight bridges over the Kaskaskia River. The existing interchange at Exit 63 would have to close and access to US 40 would be altered. The eastern alternative would be too close to existing US 51 for a C-D system and would cut off access to Vandalia's business districts from the realigned US 51. A C-D system might work if this option was moved further to the east. There may be other challenges with the eastern alternative that have not been fully studied yet, for example, topography issues. Engineers would look at this option and likely not move it forward. However, if the CAG likes this interchange option, it can be evaluated further.

The project team displayed the remaining eastern and through town bypass alternatives. It was noted that the free-flow interchange introduced at Exit 63 with the dual mark alternatives would be the same interchange utilized for the through town alternatives. It may be possible to do an urban section for US 51 through town south of I-70, but access to Vandalia's businesses would be limited due to intersection spacing criteria.

The project team discussed an alternative developed by a CAG member that contains a sharp curve south of I-70. The intent of the curve was to avoid a meander in the Kaskaskia River. The curve is not feasible from an engineering standpoint. The curve will need to be straightened out or go through town, similar to other alternatives. In addition, the alternatives that follow existing US 51 through town with two right angles are not feasible. It is not possible to have free flow under these conditions. The project team asked the CAG if it was acceptable to eliminate the alternatives with unfeasible curvature. There are many alternatives shown in this area – are there any concepts here that the CAG feels does not make sense or are not in the best interest of Vandalia?

### **Discussion**

*CAG member: None of these options would work.*

*CAG member: These options would be on fill in the river bottom; there would be no commercial development.*

*Project team: Is there a consensus for these alternatives?*

*CAG member: The old studies by IDOT showed alternatives through town as limited access. If there was an urban cross section on the east side, what kind of access would there be?*

*Project team: Through town, there may be at-grade intersections with cross roads that would occur no closer than one-half mile. We can configure the access spacing and present at the next meeting. There would be free flow conditions at I-70; we cannot have stop control on the south side because it's not business US 51 as it is with the dual mark options.*

*CAG Member: Go with the urban cross section through town using the existing interchange, and show us what kind of exits and ramps through town would look like.*

The CAG members discussed the eastern and through town alternatives further.

The CAG reached a consensus to eliminate alternatives that require an interchange east of the existing US 51/I-70 interchange (exit 63). The CAG prefers alternatives that do not require a cloverleaf, but utilize existing Exit 63. Only keep the through town alternatives that utilize the Exit 63 interchange. At the next meeting, the project team should develop what access through town would look like.

*Project team: We are hesitant to get rid of the eastern options. When we previously met with the north side residents, they were adamant about going east.*

*The CAG members confirmed that the eastern alternatives were not desired.*

### **Parallel to I-70 Alternatives**

The project team discussed that these alternatives are not dual-marked with I-70, but rather new routes that run parallel to I-70. It is not possible to have an interchange at I-70 with a parallel US 51 due to spacing and curve radius. The intention of the alternatives as originally drawn by the CAG cannot be met. Many of the lines drawn on the paper do not translate to a feasible corridor. The project team reconfigured the parallel alternatives to show where the alternatives would have to be located to make an interchange with I-70 feasible. The alternatives are no longer parallel with I-70, but located about one mile to the north. The project team showed an example of what an interchange with I-70 would look like based on the reconfigured alternatives. The interchange option is a cloverleaf for US 51 with a C-D system to US 40. The movements of the interchange and rerouted US 40 were illustrated.

### **Discussion**

*CAG member: Why does the reconfigured alternative loop so far to the west?*

*Project team: So the alignment can get across I-70 at 90-degrees to reduce skew and potential safety problems.*

*CAG member: These routes are somewhat similar to the dual marked routes we've already eliminated.*

*CAG member: What type of exit would be required when new US 51 diverges southeast from existing US 51?*

*Project team: This would probably be a spur like in Moweaqua or Patoka where Old US 51 was rerouted.*

*CAG member: If there are that many engineering issues, we should get rid of it.*

*Project team: The reconfigured alternative would work.*

*CAG member: It seems like the other alternatives that were discussed were higher priority.*

*A CAG member requested that the project team illustrate traffic flow through the reworked parallel alternative to the Wal-Mart. The CAG members discussed different options of these alternatives, and compared these to the dual-marked options.*

*CAG member: Why would a driver travel a mile east or west when you are trying to travel south?*

*Project team: This has been a question for other alternatives as well and something that must be considered.*

The CAG discussed the parallel alternatives further. A consensus was reached that the parallel alternatives were not favored, but the feasible parallel alternative as provided by the Project Team should be included for comparison.

**The project team will reconfigure parallel alternatives to be feasible from an engineering perspective for review at the next meeting. The preliminary interchange designs will also be prepared for CAG review.**

## **5. Conclusions (Sherry Phillips, Matt Hirtzel, Jerry Payonk, Stacie Dovalovsky)**

Jerry asked if the CAG is comfortable with the project team refining the alternatives and moving forward with only the alternatives selected by the CAG tonight. Is the CAG satisfied with the alternatives? Should anything else be considered?

The CAG members confirmed that they are satisfied with the alternatives selected tonight for further evaluation.

Jerry asked if another meeting was required to discuss anything presented tonight. Is everything clear?

The CAG members confirmed that no additional meeting to cover this material was required.

The project team stated that preliminary interchanges for all alternatives would be presented at the next meeting. In addition, environmental considerations would be discussed.

The official meeting period ended (8:00 p.m.).

The project team created an image in PowerPoint showing only the alternatives selected by the CAG for further review; the image was projected on the screen. Several CAG members stayed to review and confirm that the alternatives shown were accurate based on the night's discussion.

One CAG member stated that he was unhappy that several of the parallel alternatives that traverse the north side of Vandalia west of existing US 51 remain. He stated that this area is where the residential growth is occurring in Vandalia. If these homes are taken, then the tax revenue is lost and will never be replaced.

Sherry stated that she understands, however, the CAG did not come to a clear consensus that parallel alternatives should be eliminated tonight. The project team will quantify impacts for the remaining alternatives. Sherry understands there are homes on the north side, but there are homes on the south side and near the through town alternatives and those will be considered as well.

# Attendance Roster – Vandalia CAG Members



## Community Advisory Group Meeting # 3

September 22, 2010 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM – Mother of Dolores Parish - Vandalia

CAG Member	Representing	E-Mail Address	Present (Please initial)
Walt Barenfanger	Environmental	Kaskas123@aol.com	
Charles Barenfanger	Local Business	cbarenfa@illwestern.com	CB
Harold Baumann	Homeowners within Corp Limits	HGB821@att.net	HGB
Dean Black	Municipal	Deb1941@gmail.com	DB
Janet Bright	Homeowners – North Side	rbright@swetland.net	JB
Ernie Chappel	Historic District	echappel@thefnb.com	
Andy Craig		craigexc@starband.net	
Ken Cripe	Agriculture / Farmers		
Don Dolly	Homeowners – North Side	BearingPlus@Gmail.com	DRD
Randy Edwards		rudjana@sbcglobal.net	RE
Joe Ellison		bonjoe1@earthlink.net	
Larry Emerick	Historic District	<a href="mailto:larry3365@yahoo.com">larry3365@yahoo.com</a>	LE
Mike Gidcrimb	Carlyle Road Area – Woodyard	no email - Steve will contact	
JoAnn Sasse Givens	Economic Development	<a href="mailto:econdev@vandaliaillinois.com">econdev@vandaliaillinois.com</a>	
Mayor Gottman	Municipal & Emergency Services	mayor@vandaliaillinois.com	
Dennis Graumenz	Route 185	<a href="mailto:dgraumenz@yahoo.com">dgraumenz@yahoo.com</a>	DKG
Dave Hall	Religious / Ministerial Alliance	<a href="mailto:dave6402@gmail.com">dave6402@gmail.com</a>	DH
Matt Hall	Vandalia School Board		

# Attendance Roster – Vandalia CAG Members



## Community Advisory Group Meeting # 3

September 22, 2010 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM – Mother of Dolores Parish - Vandalia

CAG Member	Representing	E-Mail Address	Present (Please initial)
Greg Hubler	Homeowners within Corp Limits		<i>GH</i>
Steve Knebel	Carlyle Rd Area – Woodyard & Emerg. Services & Cnty Repres.	<a href="mailto:slknebel@sbcglobal.net">slknebel@sbcglobal.net</a>	<i>SK</i>
Ron Lange	Carlyle Road Area - Woodyard	618-846-2002	
Keith Manley	Existing 51 Residents	<a href="mailto:janet_manley@hotmail.com">janet_manley@hotmail.com</a>	<i>KM</i>
James Marlen	Agriculture / Farmers	<a href="mailto:wingmead@rocketmail.com">wingmead@rocketmail.com</a>	
Ron Marshall	Agriculture / Farmers	<a href="mailto:manager@fayettefb.com">manager@fayettefb.com</a>	<i>RM</i>
Mark Miller	Vandalia Park District	900 N Locust St. 618-283-1029	
Kevin Satterthwaite		<a href="mailto:pineridge@pineridgehomes.net">pineridge@pineridgehomes.net</a>	<i>KLS</i>
Greg Schal	Carlyle Road Area - Woodyard		
Byron Sikma	Agriculture / Farmers	<a href="mailto:bsikma@southcentralfs.com">bsikma@southcentralfs.com</a>	<i>BS</i>
Russ Stunkel	Vandalia Correctional Center	618-292-9187	
Dale Timmerman	Historic District	<a href="mailto:dale@timco.us">dale@timco.us</a>	
Kathy Trexler	Homeowners - North Side	<a href="mailto:katrexler@newwavecomm.net">katrexler@newwavecomm.net</a>	<i>KT</i>
Jim Weaver	Carlyle Road Area - Woodyard		
Mike Wehrle	Agriculture / Farmers	<a href="mailto:wehrleprop@yahoo.com">wehrleprop@yahoo.com</a>	<i>MW</i>
Rich Well	School District 203	<a href="mailto:rwell@fayette.k12.il.us">rwell@fayette.k12.il.us</a>	<i>RW</i>
Raymond Wosley	Carlyle Road Area - Woodyard		
Anita Wuertz	Vandalia Park District / Airport	<a href="mailto:awuertz@sbcglobal.net">awuertz@sbcglobal.net</a>	<i>AW</i>
William York		<a href="mailto:wyork@icompass.us">wyork@icompass.us</a>	

NON-CAGT MEMBERS:  
PLEASE SIGN IN HERE

NAME

ADDRESS

PHONE

GARY PROBST	192 RIVERSIDE	6189180034
JOE ELLISON	<sup>2080 ILLINOIS</sup> VANDALIA	283-3732