

| | |
|--|---|
| Subject: Vandalia CAG | |
| Client: IDOT D7 | |
| Project: US 51 EIS: Pana to Irvington | Project No: |
| Meeting Date: November 9, 2010 | Meeting Location: Mother of Dolors Parish Hall |
| Notes by: Jamie Bents | |

Project Study Group Attendees: IDOT: Sherry Phillips, Matt Hirtzel, Roger Driskell, Gary Welton, Gene Beccue, Steve Corley, Rob Macklin. Consultant Team: Jerry Payonk (CDI), Joyce Tanzosh (CDI), Linda Huff (H&H), Jamie Bents (H&H), Jennifer Mitchell (HDR).

The CAG member and general public sign-in sheets are attached to these meeting minutes, as are copies of the environmental resource overview presentation and the alignments impact review presentation

Topics Discussed: Environmental and community resources review and regulations, environmental and community effects resulting from the Vandalia alignments, and drawbacks and benefits of each alignment

Action/Notes:

The meeting convened at 6:06 PM. Sherry Phillips welcomed the group. The project team introduced themselves to the CAG. Sherry reviewed the evening's agenda with the CAG:

1. Environmental Resources Overview (Linda): Describe environmental and community resources studied in NEPA and the regulations that must be followed in NEPA.
2. Resource Impacts (Jerry and Joyce): Review the environmental and community resource impacts resulting from the Vandalia alignments, as estimated by the project team.
3. Review of Exhibits
4. Discussion (Sherry and Matt) and Identification of CAG Preferences
 - a. Discussion of benefits and drawbacks of each alignment
 - b. Selection of a preferred alignment through a computerized selection program.
 - c. The CAG preferred alignment will be shown at the next Public Information Meeting (PIM) on 11/23/10, along with all the other alignments considered for the City of Vandalia.

Sherry introduced Linda who began the Environmental Resource Overview portion of the meeting.

Environmental Resource Overview (Linda Huff)

Linda presented the Environmental Resource Overview from a PowerPoint presentation. A handout of the PowerPoint presentation slides was available for CAG members to keep as a reference.

Linda explained that all federal transportation decision making must follow the NEPA process. She defined NEPA as examining social and natural impacts of Federal actions. She reviewed the social and natural resources identified in Vandalia: wetlands, floodplains, water resources, Illinois natural areas, threatened and endangered species, businesses, residences, parks/recreation areas, historic sites, cemeteries, low-income or minority populations, agricultural land, and public facilities. Linda discussed the concept of the "NEPA umbrella," and reviewed some of the regulations that fall under NEPA. She explained the concept of balancing impacts in NEPA for each alternative. There are different impacts with each alternative, and NEPA looks at the value of different resources. Linda used an example of wetland impacts versus home impacts.

Linda explained that a wetland is a transitional area between wet and dry areas. She stated there were six types of high quality wetlands identified in Vandalia: forested wetlands, seeps, floodplain forests, scrub-shrub wetland, wet meadow, and sedge meadow.

Linda stated that wetlands provide flood control and filter nutrients, improve water quality, provide wildlife habitat, and recharge and discharge groundwater supplies. She said that high quality wetlands were identified by INHS in the project area. High quality wetlands cannot be easily replaced. High quality wetlands usually contain high quality or rare plants or wildlife. High quality forested wetlands may take 100 years to regenerate if disturbed. She reviewed wetland regulations, and said that per regulations, wetland impacts should be avoided as much as possible. If impacts cannot be avoided, impacts must be minimized and wetlands must be replaced (mitigated) at a ratio determined by the regulatory agencies.

She reviewed floodplains, and the difference between transverse and longitudinal crossings of floodplains. Longitudinal floodplain crossings impact floodplains to a greater extent than transverse crossings; longitudinal impacts should be avoided when possible. Linda showed the CAG the floodplain regulations that the team will need to follow. A project may not increase the base flood elevation (BFE) by more than 1 foot, per FEMA.

Linda defined the Illinois Natural Areas Inventory (INAI) sites as special sites identified by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) for containing unique or rare plant, wildlife, or geologic features. Vandalia has an INAI site based on geology. The Vandalia Geologic Area is a unique glacial ridge formation. The project team has spoken to the IDNR biologists about this INAI site. One alignment (Vandalia U) clips the INAI site, but IDNR is not concerned with that alignment, for the INAI area includes a buffer, and the alignment is within the buffer area only. Linda reviewed the regulations for INAI. The sites should be avoided, or impacts should be minimized or resolved (mitigated) if effects cannot be minimized.

Linda defined threatened and endangered (T&E) species for the CAG. Endangered species are at risk of becoming extinct, and threatened species are vulnerable to becoming endangered. In Vandalia, there are two T&E species identified by the Illinois Natural History Survey (INHS). The Western Sand Darter was found at the Kaskaskia River near the Vandalia boat ramp, and the heart-leaved plantain was found south of Vandalia. The species and their habitat should be avoided if possible.

Section 4(f) was explained to the CAG. Section 4(f) protects publicly owned parks, recreational areas, wildlife refuges, and historic areas from being used for a Federal action. Potential 4(f) sites in Vandalia could include the statehouse, parks, and publicly owned playgrounds. All feasible and prudent actions should be taken to avoid 4(f) properties. There are different types of 4(f) impacts; a park's corner could be clipped, and that impact could be allowed as long as the impacts are worked through with the regulatory agencies. Historic properties are structures 50 years of age or older. Section 106 is a regulation that protects historic properties. Some cemeteries are protected by law, but are typically avoided in the design process.

Linda explained that transportation projects must consider Environmental Justice - the fair treatment of populations based on race, color, and income. Environmental Justice was developed from the Civil Rights Act and its analysis uses US Census data. Environmental Justice regulations state that the proposed action must not have a disproportionate effect on the special populations identified by the legislation (low-income or minority populations).

Linda reviewed agricultural lands and impact types with the CAG, farmland regulations at state level, and the Farmland Protection Act. The regulations are in place for the conservation and preservation of farmland. Prime and important farmland is defined by soil types and determined by the National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) and state soil scientists. Any effect on prime and important farmland is determined during the NEPA process. Access to farm fields, farm severances, and uneconomical remnants that can't be farmed or accessed will also be determined at the next stage of analysis, and impacts will be minimized and mitigated.

Linda reviewed groundwater and drinking water. Drinking water is a volume of water large enough to be pumped out of the ground to service a house. The State of Illinois has established setback zones and the Illinois Groundwater Protection Act to protect wells from contamination. A 200-ft radius is required around a drinking water well to protect drinking water supplies in residential areas. Illinois EPA regulates the list of what cannot be put within a setback zone. A road can be located within a setback zone and is not included in Illinois EPA's list. However, the team will work to ensure that the project will not impact wells, groundwater supplies, or drinking water.

Linda reviewed community, economic, business, and public facilities resources. The resources are not regulated, but the project team will avoid or minimize the impact to or severing of neighborhoods or affecting businesses or public facilities either directly or indirectly. Residential or business acquisitions are regulated by relocation regulations at the federal and state level.

Linda stated there are many types of environmental resources to consider, and NEPA balances effects to the resources. She asked the CAG if they had any questions regarding the environmental resources review, and no questions were asked.

Linda introduced Jerry and Joyce, who would summarize the environmental impacts for each of the remaining alignments in Vandalia.

Alternative Impacts (Jerry Payonk and Joyce Tanzosh)

Jerry stated that the project team estimated environmental resource effects for each of the six alignments: eastern bypass, western bypass, dual marked, parallel, S, and U. Jerry showed a slide of all the resources found in Vandalia. The resources are broken into three groups:

1. Resources that have a varying magnitude of effect for all alignments. The resources are defined as differentiating criteria. Differentiating criteria identified for the alignments include high quality wetlands, wetlands, floodplains, prime and important farmland, residences, and businesses.
2. Resources that show generally the same magnitude of effect for all alignments. These resources included stream crossings, INAI sites, centennial farms, severed parcels, farm outbuildings, historic sites, wells, and wastewater treatment ponds.
3. Resources that exist but are not impacted by any of the alignments. These resources included T&E species, parks, cemeteries, schools, places of worship, hospitals, police/fire stations, community center, libraries, museums, and government buildings.

Jerry and Joyce presented the impacts to differentiating criteria resulting from each alignment. A slide with a table listing impacts to the differentiating criteria by alignment was shown.

- Wetland and high quality wetland impacts shown are estimates based on aerial photographs and soil survey maps, as the State has not yet surveyed the new alignments areas for specific wetland locations. Wetland impacts were highest for the eastern bypass.
- The eastern bypass was found to have higher floodplain impacts than the other alignments. Joyce reiterated the two types of floodplain crossings (transverse and longitudinal). The eastern bypass would involve a longitudinal floodplain crossing, which is the less desirable floodplain crossing type.
- There is much acreage of prime and important farmland located within the Vandalia alignment limits. The determination of prime and important farmland is based upon soil type and agency determination. Even forested areas can be considered prime and important farmland because forested areas could be farmed if cleared.
- Residential impacts counted in the analysis are considered to be complete acquisitions, meaning the home will be completely taken for the project. Each alignment was reviewed and the location of the impacted homes was identified on aerial photograph shown on the PowerPoint presentation. The eastern bypass and parallel alignment had the most residential impacts, requiring the removal of 36 and 14 residences, respectively. The eastern bypass, approximately two dozen of the impacts are within the Vandalia city

limits. The parallel alignment impacted 14 homes. The dual mark, S, and U all impacted nine homes, and the western bypass impacted seven homes.

- Identified business impacts would constitute a complete removal of a building (or buildings) on the property. These impacts do not include secondary impacts of compromised access, loss of parking, or other impacts to businesses. The dual marked alignment and the eastern bypass impacted 5 and 17 businesses, respectively. The name and location of the impacted businesses were shown on aerial photographs on the PowerPoint presentation. The other four alignments did not result in any business impacts.

Jerry reviewed other resources that were considered, but weren't found to be differentiating by the project team. If the CAG members consider these impacts to be differentiating, they can consider these impacts when evaluating the alignments. These included:

- Number of stream crossings
- INAI sites: This was not found to be differentiating because there is clearance from IDNR to impact the buffer zone of the Vandalia Geologic Area INAI site.
- Centennial farms
- Severed parcels
- Farm outbuildings
- Historic sites: There is an old bridge on Richland Creek on east side of existing US 51. This may be acceptable to impact.
- Wells: 200' setback buffer, the next level of analysis we will have more information about wells. The state database does not contain precise well placement data, and additional analysis needs to be completed to determine exact locations and potential effects.
- Waste water treatment ponds

CAG Question: If there will be more information collected in the future, shouldn't the CAG wait to make their decision about alternatives? The wells impacted could affect groundwater.

Response: Linda: Groundwater impacts first depend upon topography. Wells down slope of the road are the wells that could be impacted. If team develops a good roadway drainage system, it can be ensured that stormwater is drained away from the well area, thus protecting the wells.

CAG Comment: Most people in north Vandalia have wells; this CAG member is concerned about water flow to wells.

Response: Jennifer Mitchell: We are showing physical well locations at this time, and the team will study groundwater flow and effects as the study progresses.

CAG Comment: I am worried about draining wells due to shallowness of existing wells in north Vandalia.

Response: The team will analyze groundwater and drinking water effects during NEPA.

CAG Comment: We need all the information about groundwater before making a decision because the different alternatives may have different impacts.

Response: Matt: The group needs to decide what alternative is best for Vandalia. The team is providing impacts for the best information available now.

CAG Comment: If the CAG can only pick one alternative, they would be concerned.

Response: Sherry: Wells within the 200-ft setback will be purchased by the state. Wells that could have secondary impacts will be studied and the project team is confident that impacts to those wells can be mitigated.

Gene: Some of the wells may be servicing homes that could be acquired as part of the project.

Jerry: When the team moves forward with alternatives to study in the DEIS, the team will study issues in extreme detail. That is what the DEIS does to determine if there are fatal flaws or impacts for that alternative.

Matt: Tonight, the team will ask the CAG to identify their preferred alternative. If the CAG is not comfortable with one alternative, the team could look at more, and we will remove the alternatives the CAG identifies that they do not want. We do not need to leave with only one alternative in addition to alternatives S and U. Eventually the team needs to reduce alternatives.

Sherry: DEIS studies are very intensive and very expensive. The project team cannot evaluate all six alignments at this level of detail.

CAG Comment: People signed a petition against alternatives S and U, and the CAG does not feel that moving S and U forward is fair because they did not pick those alternatives.

Response: Matt: The other CAG picked those alternatives, they are approved, and they are moving forward. The team wants to move the process forward, and wants to keep the process transparent.

CAG Comment: Some CAG members don't want US 51 to be expanded through Vandalia. The CAG does want to pick an alternative that will be good for Vandalia in the future.

Response: Roger Driskell: Something to keep in mind is that the project will not be built today, and could happen 10, 20, 30, or 40 years in the future.

Question: Why is the project team rushing this decision if the project will not be built for many years?

Response: Jerry: It isn't economically feasible to look at detailed impacts for each alternative if all won't be carried forward, and that is why we need to narrow the alternatives studied.

Question: Is there a deadline to get these alternatives done?

Response: Sherry: The DEIS must be completed within four years.

Question: Will this project construction date be pushed up a lot faster? Would the project start in Vandalia?

Response: Jerry: Team will look at project phasing in DEIS.

Roger: Federal earmarks can also state where roads are built, and if an earmark is received for a portion of the project, that could determine which sections are constructed first.

Question: The project team has said before that construction could start in Vandalia as soon as ten years.

Response: Matt: This is possible, but unlikely. We cannot say for certain when or where the construction will begin.

Question: What will happen if properties are up for sale? No one knows where the alternative will go, and this already is impacting property values in Vandalia.

Response: Sherry: This is why we need to decide on an alternative so these the alignments studied are known. We need to go back to Springfield in February with any additional alternatives that will be studied in the DEIS.

CAG Comment: This member wants to wait until after February to decide which alternative(s) to select as the CAG preferred alternative.

Response: Sherry: There would be no additional data after the February meeting to review. Even if impacts change with future analyses, would that be a reason to not build that alternative?

CAG Comment: There are several alternatives this CAG member agreed with and now she believes there are too many impacts to those alternatives. She doesn't believe she has enough information to make an educated decision about the remaining alternatives.

Response: Sherry: Tonight we will have a discussion about the alternatives so the CAG can think about impacts. For example, the eastern bypass has a lot more impacts.

Jerry reviewed the resources that would not be impacted by the alignments.

Jerry reviewed operations for the alignments, including length of alignment, travel time, and use of existing roadway. Travel time and distance for the alignments was compared to the existing US 51 route. Of the six alignments, the eastern bypass demonstrates the shortest travel distance (14.1 miles) and time (13:33 min:sec), and the parallel yellow had the longest travel distance (18.8 miles) and travel time (17:18 min:sec). Only the eastern bypass had a shorter travel distance than the existing US 51. However, the travel time for existing US 51 is greater than all six alignments. The western bypass would not use any existing roadway corridor. The dual marked and eastern bypasses utilize the greatest lengths of existing roadway corridor (65% and 64%, respectively). The amount of new roadway corridor versus existing roadway corridor is not something that is specifically studied in NEPA, but is provided for the CAG's information.

Review of Exhibits

Sherry invited the CAG members to look at the 36" x 48" color exhibits of the six remaining alignments. Each alignment was displayed on an aerial photograph, and the differentiating resource criteria was shown, as well as a summary table listing the impacts associated with each alignment. Additionally, two environmental base maps were on display, one with the six alignments shown and one with no alignments shown. These base maps showed all the resources identified by the project team. A summary table listing the differentiating criteria impacts associated with each alignment was also shown.

Discussion and CAG Preferred Alignment Selection (Sherry Phillips and Matt Hirtzel)

Sherry and Matt each stood at an easel, and reviewed each alignment with the CAG. They asked the CAG to provide drawbacks and benefits for each alignment. A summary of comments received is below, and a table of the written comments developed is included at the end of this section.

Western bypass

Drawbacks

- Too far west
- Have to get off the Interstate system far from the Wal-Mart interchange (Exit 61). People will miss the Wal-Mart. Interstate traffic has to get off before they see the businesses. Concerned that Exit 61 will miss interstate traffic. Too confusing and too far west to get off interstate before businesses are in view.
- Secondary business impacts
- Has the largest amount of new road built

Benefits

- Avoids northern neighborhoods and residential areas as much as possible
- Avoids business acquisitions/takes
- Avoids schools
- Provides western interchange for future growth, which is the only direction Vandalia can grow
- Because the western bypass is so far west, traffic could still use existing US 51 and patronize businesses and the historic district
- Increased noise would be away from residential areas north of I-70

CAG Question: Would the inclusion of a collector-distributor (C-D) road be set in stone or can things be changed? If the C-D road were removed that would be the perfect option.

Response: Sherry: I cannot answer that. If CD road were removed, would need to ask for an additional interchange, and that may not be allowed. Could close Exit 61 and get a new interchange.

CAG Question: Can we look at the option of closing the existing Wal-Mart interchange and building the new US 51 interchange as a replacement instead?

Response: Sherry: Yes, could look at that option. IDOT did not look at closing Wal-Mart interchange, because it assumed Vandalia would want to keep that interchange open.

CAG Comment: Do not close Wal-Mart interchange. The project team should research both options. A frontage road could take place of a C-D system and be a cheaper option.

Response: Sherry: What would be the advantage of closing the interchange and building a replacement interchange further west to economic development?

CAG Comment: This would be an advantage for the city because they would need to run utilities out to that new western interchange anyway.

Response: Sherry: If the western bypass is selected to move forward, the team will look at that issue in-depth and look at other alternatives, but any results would likely be a year from now.

CAG Question: Why are we waiting to study the impacts of traffic noise? The residential areas north of Vandalia already experience noise impacts from I-70. This information would help this CAG member make a decision.

Response: Linda: In modeling noise impacts, we look at the profile of the proposed road and homes. The impacts can be mitigated if levels are too high. Homes and other physical impacts are better indicators of impact at this time. Noise is not information that would likely help to make a decision.

CAG Question: How much road has to be built? If you do the dual marking alternative, you have to build no new road. CAG keeps telling IDOT that they don't need to build the tri-level interchange with the dual marked alternatives, but their comments don't get very far.

Response: Sherry: Large new interchanges would need to be constructed with the dual marked alternative, they are inclusive of the alternative and satisfy the current design standards.

Dual Marked

Benefits

- Less new road to be built, less cost
- Enhances business by increasing drive by traffic and visibility
Less impact on housing, wells, and septic tanks

Drawbacks

- Existing interchange needs to be reconstructed –would have complicated interchanges due to the need for free flow conditions
- Secondary impacts to businesses at Exit 63 – Drivers can see businesses but can't get to them very easily
- Impacts to corrections center, the city's largest employer – removes some of the parking lotsThe alternative would involve re-routing 40/185 past the schools

The project team pointed out that the western bypass has the least impact on housing. The CAG had a short discussion about businesses, and if the dual marked alternative would be a drawback or a benefit for businesses. One CAG member said the interchange doesn't need to be the "monstrosity" it is proposed to be. Sherry said that if the alignment moves forward it would include the large interchanges to achieve free-flow conditions, which is the current design policy as discussed. CAG member says there is a way to engineer the interchanges to avoid businesses. Sherry said to bring the designs to the project team; the team has studied design of the interchanges and has determined the large interchanges are needed.

Another CAG member says that the alternative must have free flowing interchanges or else speeds will be down to 20 mph, and that is why the interchanges are large.

Parallel

Benefits

- Does not re-route traffic by schools
- Avoids some of the northern residential areas
- Avoids the Exit 63 large interchange footprint. Because there is no need to reroute 40, there would be no secondary impacts to Exit 63 businesses as with dual marking

Drawbacks

- Fourteen residences impacted, higher impact than most alternatives
- C-D system.

CAG Question: One CAG member is confused about why the C-D system is needed. Another CAG member says that it's needed to provide access to businesses. CAG member says the CAG is concerned about the impacts of the C-D system

Response: Sherry: C-D systems are common in cities, but they may be a surprise to drivers through Vandalia.

S

Benefits

No benefits were given by the CAG.

Drawbacks

- Affects residences.
- C-D system.

Sherry stated that this alternative won't impact more residences than the eastern bypass and the parallel alternatives. Perhaps this drawback should be rephrased as "neighborhood impacts."

CAG member: This alternative could affect residences through wells, septic tanks, and noise

Sherry stated that this alternative has a shorter C-D system than other alternatives with C-D systems

CAG Question: *Isn't this alternative going to the next level regardless?*

Response: *Matt: Can still select an alternative and can have discussion.*

U

Benefits

No benefits were given by the CAG.

Drawbacks

- Affects residences.
- C-D system.
- Both S and U affect northern neighborhoods, and U bisects northern neighborhoods more than S

Eastern Bypass

Benefits

- Less new roadway
- The state already owns property at the corrections center – this would mean less acquisition would be needed, less cost
- Brings people downtown
- No C-D system

Drawbacks

- Most impacts on residences
- Has “funky interchange” at Exit 63
- No room for expansion
- Most wetland impacts

CAG Comment: This is the alternative to choose but it needs to be tweaked. We can't go south through town, and you don't need to take all those houses out. It's already wide enough for four lanes.

Response: IDOT: Other variations of that alternative were studied at the last CAG meeting. This alternative shown was the alternative selected by the CAG.

CAG Comments: Can't this version be tweaked? Why was that old alternative taken out?

Response: Jerry: The alternative referred to had eight crossings of the Kaskaskia River.

Following discussion of benefits and drawbacks of the six remaining alignments, Sherry led the CAG in a discussion to aid the CAG in selecting their preferred alignment.

IDOT Question: What surprises you about these options?

CAG Response:

- *The magnitude of the interchange at I-70 to keep traffic free flowing.*
- *Impacts to schools by the rerouting of 40.*
- *Also, thought there would be greater travel time differential among alternatives, but there wasn't.*

IDOT Question: What concerns you?

CAG Response: Could put a road through the northern neighborhoods. There doesn't seem to be one good option – businesses are just as important as northern residences. Any option would require giving up a critical part of our community.

CAG Question: We aren't giving anything up with the dual marked alternative, are we?

IDOT Response: Yes, residences and businesses are impacted with the dual marked alternative. But, is it OK to take businesses or residences? What is important to Vandalia? The CAG needs to consider direct impacts versus indirect impacts of an alternative.

IDOT Question: We are discussing businesses as they are today. If project is not completed now, how will the area be in the future?

CAG Response: This is also true of the northern neighborhoods – the number of residents could be totally different in the future than today.

IDOT Question: Show of hands: who has discussed options with interest groups they are representing? About half of the CAG members present raised their hand.

IDOT Question: This CAG has been meeting for about four months. Has your voice been heard during this time?

CAG Response: Yes, whether IDOT wants to listen or not. Once the public meeting is held and impacts are shown, there will be many people against alternatives in their backyard and there may be future petitions against the project.

IDOT Question: US 51 could be proposed to stay on existing alignment, and then the NEPA document would likely not be approved because it would not meet the purpose and need of the project. Is that what Vandalia wants?

CAG Response: The CAG doesn't have enough information to decide on one alternative.

IDOT Comment: The team can say that the CAG doesn't like any of the alternatives developed.

CAG Response: The decision will be made by those higher than anyone in this room.

IDOT Question: Think about the purpose and need of this project – why are we building this road?

CAG Response: There are many caveats of this project that the CAG was not aware of initially.

IDOT Comment: The purpose and need for this project is about regional connectivity and continuity.

CAG Comment: You are creating chaos for Vandalia if the alternative goes west. I-70 has been here for 50 years and city hasn't built much along it during that time.

CAG Comment: Need to look ahead and things will be different in future.

CAG Question: Do you think that taking the alternative west is a must for growth for Vandalia in the future?

CAG Comment: Town will grow to west in the future. The western bypass does not take the road through the residential areas, either.

CAG Comment: I want to share my opinion. Convince me that I'm making the right decision for the future. It seems chaotic to discuss flyovers and connecting roads in this little town and if we have the C-D system people will miss Wal-Mart if they are daydreaming.

IDOT Response: This project will follow an expressway standard. We need to take all these alternatives to the public in two weeks. We invite the CAG members to come to the meeting and help explain things we have talked about during the four months of CAG meetings.

CAG Comment: We should tell the public that there are too many factors in choosing an alternative, it's not very simple.

CAG Comment: Instead of voting on alignments, I would prefer if the CAG can discuss this and come to a consensus on the best alignment. We should discuss this and come to a determination as a group. But I don't think we can do that at this point.

CAG Comment: The CAG does not have enough information to make a decision.

CAG Comment: We can't do expensive studies on all alternatives.

CAG Comment: If we are looking 40 years down the line, is Vandalia locked into the decision made tonight?

IDOT Response: Roger: IDOT will decide on the Preferred Alternative and place a corridor protection for the alignment so alignment is on plat. If a development goes in, IDOT has the option to buy property or not. When road is built, IDOT must decide if it goes through the property or determine if realignment should be studied.

CAG Comment: Is there a possibility of changing the alignment in the future?

IDOT Response: Roger: The alignment could be changed in the future if nothing has been built in 40 years. If part of it is built, IDOT is committed.

Sherry: Projects usually aren't reopened, but it could happen. We cannot say for certain now if this study will be reopened in the future, this is dependent on many variables.

CAG Comment: We should collect input from the public and then vote on options instead of voting tonight.

IDOT Response: If the CAG wants one alternative and public wants another, we need to come back to the CAG to discuss. All the alternatives will be shown at the November PIM, and the CAG preferred alternative will be noted. The public will be able to see all alternatives.

IDOT Question: Sherry: if you had to pick an alternative tonight, would you be comfortable? (About half of the CAG indicated they were comfortable voting). Can we go ahead and vote? The vote will be more for project team information only so we know which way you are leaning. We will not indicate which alignment the CAG preferred at the PIM. We will hold another CAG meeting in January to discuss the comments received from the PIM.

CAG Comment: In order to avoid a petition, you should go to public first and then CAG will vote on an alternative.

IDOT Comment: Matt: If we receive 500 public comments preferring an eastern bypass and 13 CAG members want the dual marked alternative, IDOT will not carry forward the dual marked. The public's comments should be reflecting what the CAG is deciding.

Alignment Selection (Jennifer Mitchell)

Jennifer led the CAG members in an interactive survey in which each person received an electronic responder, or clicker. Attendees were presented with multiple-choice questions through a slideshow. Each person responded to the question by pressing a button on the clicker that corresponded to their desired answer. Following each question, a chart showing how the group answered was displayed for the audience to provide immediate feedback. Two CAG members left early, and they left their selection with two proxies from the project team, who cast the absent CAG members' selections.

The CAG started by answering several test questions to get used to the selection system and the technology, and then indicated their alignment preference:

Of the four options, which option best meets the needs of the community of Vandalia?

- *Dual marked 13%*
- *Western bypass 73%*
- *Parallel 13%*
- *Eastern bypass 0%*

Of note, Alignments S and U were not listed in the preference survey, as they have already been identified as corridors to move forward by the FHWA.

Sherry asked the CAG to raise their hands if they wanted US 51 built to four lanes. Nine people of the 13 CAG members who were still present raised their hands (two members had left by that time).

Closing Comments (Sherry Phillips)

The PIM will be held on 11/23/10, at Mother of Dolors from 3 to 7 pm. The project team encouraged the CAG members to attend the meeting and discuss the project and their alignment selection process with the public. The project team will meet with the CAG in January 2011.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 PM.