

Subject: Vandalia CAG	
Client: IDOT D7	
Project: US 51 EIS: Pana to Irvington	Project No:
Meeting Date: October 27, 2010	Meeting Location: Vandalia City Hall
Notes by: Linda Huff / Jennifer Mitchell	

**Project Study Group Attendees:** IDOT: Sherry Phillips, Matt Hirtzel, Gary Welton, Steve Corley, Rob Macklin. Consultant Team: Jerry Payonk (CDI), Stacie Dovalovsky (CDI), Linda Huff (H&H), Jennifer Mitchell (HDR)

**Topics Discussed:** Remaining alignments in Vandalia and their associated geometric footprints

**Action/Notes:**

The meeting convened at 6:10 by Jerry Payonk.

The meeting began with self-introductions. Jerry Payonk and Stacie Dovalovsky discussed guidelines for participation in the meeting. Non-CAG members were reminded that they were observers. Pen and paper were provided so members could take notes during the meeting regarding technical points of the various alternatives. Jerry also noted that in providing comment to the group, members should refrain from generalizing the comment by stating "we". The entire group may not concur and may also feel intimidated and not state their interest groups' point of view.

Jerry continued by stating the general purpose of the meeting was to discuss the refinements made to the remaining alternatives that were carried forward for further study after the October 27, 2010 CAG meeting and to potentially narrow the number of alternatives to be carried forward to environmental screening. At the October 27 meeting, the brainstormed alignments from the September 22, 2010 CAG meeting were presented in four groups of similar ideas: Dual Marked, Western Bypasses, Eastern Bypass/Through Town, and Parallel. At the conclusion of the meeting, only one alternative remained from the Dual Marked group (proposing dual marking of Interstate 70/US 51) and one alternative remained from the Western Bypass group. Two remaining groups, Parallel and Through Town/Eastern Bypass, contained multiple options.

Since the October meeting, the project team refined the geometry of interchanges and alignments to provide a clearer picture of the impacts associated with these alternatives and were seeking CAG input on alternatives to carry forward for environmental screening. For comparison purposes, four options identified to move forward for environmental screening were: Dual Marked Green, Western Bypass Yellow, Parallel S, and Parallel U. The Dual Marked and Western Bypass options were selected as they were the single alternatives remaining from one of the four original groups. Parallel S and U were carried forward as they were the alternatives previously presented to the Federal Highway Administration and NEPA agencies for further study. There were 10 alternatives that remained for consideration from the Parallel and Through Town/Eastern Bypass groups and would be discussed as part of this meeting.

Jerry presented the meeting agenda which included describing the five interchange options, the remaining alignment options, and then obtaining the CAG's input regarding the options to be carried forward. The coloring and naming of interchanges and groups was changed from the last CAG meeting. For easier reference and identification, the

interchanges were assigned a shape nomenclature and the alternatives were assigned a color nomenclature (see attachment for exhibits presented at the meeting).

The first interchange (Interchange Pentagon) is in reference to the Exit 63 and Exit 61 interchanges that work together for the Dual Marked Green alignment. On the west side of the alignment, Exit 61 is a trumpet shaped interchange with a collector-distributor (C-D) system to the existing IL 40 interchange. It was also explained that on the interchange exhibits there are blue shaded areas adjacent to the roadways. The shaded area represents a two-dimensional analysis for identification of right of way needs. The blue shading represents the preliminary limits of right of way impacts for the respective interchange.

*Question: What does impact mean?*

*Response: If a business or house is directly under the shaded area, it will likely be removed. If a building is on the fringe of the shading, there is a potential for a displacement but it may be avoided with future refinements.*

*Question: Why does the blue now impact adjacent properties in the future (at the existing Exit 61), but not now?*

*Response: The need for the C-D system changes the design requirements for the roadway alignments. Additionally, the design and safety policies in which the present interchange was built may not be the same as those we need to follow now.*

Understanding that some people may not have been present at the previous CAG meeting, the C-D system was defined.

*Question: What are the other options to eliminating the C-D system other than moving the proposed interchange west?*

*Response: Close Exit 61.*

The general response by the CAG to the option of closing Exit 61 was not favorable.

*Question: Why can't you use the existing Exit 61 interchange for the US 51 interchange?*

*Response: The interchange would then be a system to system interchange and would result in a much larger footprint, having a significant impact on the adjacent businesses.*

The second interchange of Interchange Pentagon, Exit 63 was discussed next. It was pointed out that due to comments at the previous CAG meeting, the geometry was modified in an attempt to minimize impacts to the industrial park in the northwest quadrant. Specifically, the ramps were changed in the northwest quadrant to be closer to the US 51 roadway. The free-flow movements would be from US 51 to I-70 SB to WB, SB to EB and from I-70 to US 51 WB to NB and EB to NB. The I-70 to US 51 EB to SB, WB to SB, and US 51 to I-70 NB to EB, NB to WB would be intersections under traffic control (signalized or stop signs). The change is in part due to the south half of the interchange connecting with a local roadway system, Business US 51. The north half of the intersection would be a free-flow system to system connection with I-70. With the ramps crossing each other, there will likely be four levels to the interchange. It was noted by the project team that these interchange concepts have only been studied in two dimensions. The vertical impacts have not yet been evaluated.

While the ramps were moved to avoid direct impacts to the buildings, the access to the industrial park would be outside the termini of the ramps, which is significantly further north of the existing access.

- Question: A four-tier interchange, is that even financially reasonable?*
- Response: Not sure at this time. We have not been able to evaluate costs yet. Also, while this may be a large cost at this location, the entire corridor needs to be compared to other entire corridors. Not just spot locations, i.e. four lanes of new roadway could be more expensive than two lanes of new roadway with interchange.*
- Question: With this interchange, how many businesses are impacted?*
- Response: The DOT identifies an impact as a take or displacement of the business. The number of businesses is not yet determined.*
- Comment: Businesses down 40 are also impacted even though not directly by the interchange.*
- Comment: Relocating the truck access may be bad too because every mile driven by a truck is equivalent to money spent. This could affect local trucking business.*
- Question: Where would 40 come in?*
- Response: It is located south of the ramps.*
- Question: Why can't 40 be at its current location and go under the proposed ramps?*
- Response: That is not a typical application within the footprint of an interchange, but it will be investigated further.*

The third interchange (Interchange Square) would be proposed for the Western Bypass Yellow option or some of the parallel options. Interchange Square is a cloverleaf interchange with a CD system to the existing IL 40 interchange. IL 40 along the north side of I-70 would need to be realigned. Access to/from US 51 and adjacent properties would need to be located a minimum of ½ mile from the ramp termini. This interchange has been modified to provide a 90 degree crossing of I-70 and brings the interchange closer to IL 40.

- Question: Why is the CD needed?*
- Response: With a spacing of less than 3 miles between interchanges, a CD system is needed to reduce crash potential associated with interstate weaving maneuvers off of and on to interchange ramps.*

The fourth interchange configuration (Interchange Triangle) would be used for the parallel route alternatives. The interchange is a cloverleaf.

- Question: Where does the CD start for the Wal-Mart?*
- Response: The CD will start west of the US 51 interchange.*
- Question: If the US 51 interchange is three miles out, we don't need a CD?*
- Response: Correct.*
- Question: Is the three mile out still an option?*

*Response: Yes, but while it is viable, the CAG opted to eliminate the three mile interchange at a previous meeting. We will not be going back to that option.*

The fifth interchange (Interchange Circle) would be used for the through town or eastern bypass options. It is a system to system interchange with free-flow movements in all directions. The interchange is the same as was shown at previous CAG meetings.

*Question: With the re-routing of IL 40 via 8<sup>th</sup> Street and Taylor Street, will these be improved?*

*Response: Yes, the route would become the state route and would need to be improved to accommodate the traffic demand.*

*Comment: There will be impacts along the re-routed IL 40 too.*

*Comment: More traffic will travel past the school.*

Having updated everyone on the interchanges, the alignments were subsequently reviewed. The corridors carried forward are the Dual Marked Green and Western Bypass Yellow options. It was shown that Dual Marked Green uses interchange pentagon and Western Bypass Yellow uses interchange square.

*Question: How close can a road be to the airport?*

*Response: We are verifying that. Proposed US 51 for the western bypass alternative is aligned on the existing roadway west of the airport.*

Parallel alternative groups were reviewed first. Two of the parallel alignments would use Interchange Square and the other two would use Interchange Triangle. The alignment south of I-70 is the same for all alignments. The difference between alignments is in the north half. The alignments either pass along the edge of the industrial park or are located between the industrial park and the residential neighborhoods. Alignments S and U fit in the parallel group and utilize the Triangle Interchange. S and U are being carried forward from prior study, but with modifications to meet the design criteria studied in more detail as a result of this refined analysis. The alignment changes to meet horizontal curve requirements and intersecting the interstate at a 90 degree were shown. It was also pointed out that S has alignment pieces similar to the other parallel alignments suggested by the CAG.

*Comment: Don't see drivers from the north wanting to drive straight west.*

*Response: These are options presented by the CAG and we need options for comparison.*

Each color alternative and corresponding interchange in the parallel group was reviewed.

*Question: If the I-40 ramps were eliminated, could the 51 interchange be moved eastward?*

*Response: Yes, but the business access would be restricted to ½ mile beyond the ramp termini.*

*Question: Is this being built under different criteria than US 51 south of Bloomington?*

*Response: Yes, the standard is 1 mile.*

After discussion of the alternatives, the next step was a group exercise to identify the parallel alternative(s) to move forward. The group was provided two colored stickers to place on the alternative(s) that they felt best met the needs of the community and their interest groups.

Results of this exercise are as follows:

Option	# of Stickers
Parallel Yellow	23
Parallel Red	7
Parallel Orange	1
Parallel Green	0

Following the exercise, the CAG was queried to determine if it was acceptable to move forward with just the Parallel Yellow option and not include the Parallel Red option. No one spoke in favor of moving the Parallel Red option forward.

The Through Town and Eastern Bypass options were then reviewed. All options utilize the Interchange Circle. The south end of the Through Town alignments travels adjacent to two cemeteries. It is understood that the CAG's intent is to avoid the cemeteries. The CAG concurred with this assumption. Therefore, the south end of the Through Town alignments was modified to minimize impacts to the cemeteries.

For the Through Town options, US 51 south of I-70 would be a four-lane roadway with controlled or limited access. Preliminary proposed access locations were shown.

Three alignment options existed for the north end of the alignments. The three options presented were the existing US 51 alignment, routing US 51 just east of the State Farm, and routing US 51 east of the State Farm following the extension of US 51 from the curve near Co Rd 975 E south of Ramsey. Both the Eastern Bypass alignments and the Through Town alignments have these same three north end options.

The south end is the same alignment for each eastern bypass in that proposed US 51 would move east of town and align with the south leg of existing US 51 at the 51/40 tee intersection. Proposed US 51 would go over the railroad and touch down south of the existing 51/40 intersection. IL 40 would need to have a new connection to US 51.

A group exercise was held to identify the through town and eastern bypass alternative(s) to move forward. Each person was again given two stickers to again place on the exhibits that they felt best met the needs of the community and their interest group.

Results of this exercise are as follows:

Option	# of Stickers
Eastern Bypass Green	21
Through Town Red	4
Eastern Bypass Purple	2
Through Town Orange	0
Eastern Bypass Pink	0
Through Town Yellow	0

Following the exercise, the CAG was queried to determine if it was acceptable to move forward with just the Eastern Bypass Green option and not include the Through Town Red or Eastern Bypass Purple options. The CAG concurred that the project team could move forward with only the Eastern Bypass Green option.

*Question: You may still have to tweak these?*

*Response: Yes.*

A general discussion followed regarding business impacts. It was asked how economic impact was evaluated and if it included revenue? Linda Huff indicated that it will take into consideration the revenue, employees, etc; however, this detail is contained in the DEIS. The next round of analysis will tally the number of businesses taken, and employment information as available will be considered.

The next meeting will have all the environmental impacts tallied for each alignment. The CAG will then help evaluate and determine which alternatives to further eliminate and recommend those to carry forward for further study.

The next meeting will be on Tuesday November 9, 2010.

The CAG asked for hard copies of the alignments and the environmental impact summaries at the next meeting. It was concurred by the project team to provide hard copies to the CAG.

Discussion followed regarding the public meeting. It was determined that the meeting following November 9<sup>th</sup> would be a public information meeting. The meeting will be on Tuesday, November 23, 2010. The format will be open house, likely from 3:00 PM to 7:00 PM, to allow for question and answer by the public.