



**Coordination Meeting – Whiteside County & Townships  
Tuesday, May 22, 2012**

Location: Whiteside County Highway Department

Time: 2:00 pm

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Attendees**

Russ Renner	Whiteside County	(815) 772-7651
Gary Bruns	Hopkins Township	(815) 499-5501
Arnold Vegter	Union Grove Township	(815) 535-5170
Randy Smith	Ustick Township	(815) 772-3579
Don Stage	Fulton Township	(815) 535-3077
Becky Marruffo	Illinois DOT	(815) 284-5902
Jennifer Williams	Illinois DOT	(815) 284-5950
Jon McCormick	Illinois DOT	(815) 284-5503
Mark Nardini	Illinois DOT	(815) 284-5460
Jon Estrem	HR Green Inc.	(319) 841-4324

**Discussion**

Following introductions, Jon McCormick began the meeting & explained the two sets of displays available. The first display was a two-piece layout at a scale of 1" = 2000' showing the corridor from Illinois Route 136 to Rock Falls on an aerial photo background with Alternatives 4 & 5 included. The display labeled the intended treatment (i.e. at-grade intersection, grade separation, close, roundabout) for each of the side roads crossed by the expressway. The second was an enlarged version (1" = 1000') of the same exhibits. One copy of this display was provided for each side of the table.

Mr. McCormick continued by providing a brief history of the project. He pointed out that a feasibility study was conducted from 2004 to 2006. Subsequently the current Environmental Impact Statement study was initiated in 2007 & is anticipated to conclude in 2014. It initially involved several broad alternatives but through the study process was honed to two. As a part of the NEPA process draft study documents were submitted to FHWA for concurrence in mid 2011. At that time it was discovered that flood plain limits had recently changed to the extent that Alternative 5 was deemed to have a significant impact on the French Creek floodplain. In an attempt to minimize that impact, the proposed alignment for the alternative was revisited. Alternative 4 was also modified slightly for the same purpose. Both sets of alignments were included in the displays.

Mr. McCormick explained that the US 30 roadway will be access controlled with a 70 mph design speed. It will be designated a freeway but will be built as an expressway, meaning there can be public road intersections. Direct commercial access is not allowed along an expressway. Field entrances and access to single family residential properties can be allowed if necessary but the goal will be to avoid these or at least minimize the number of locations. IDOT would expect to build US 30 initially as a four-lane roadway rather than two lanes initially. An analysis of operationally independent



---

sections will be part of current study. A north or south bypass would be an example of a section that might be built as part of a phased approach.

Mr. McCormick pointed out that the primary purpose of the meeting was to discuss the intended access layout for side roads & solicit associated comments or concerns. He explained that the proposed layout is a result of significant effort on the part of the project team to consider projected traffic volumes as well as the basic functionality of the side roads. Since the proposed facility is intended to be a four-lane expressway with access control, the Department's policies for spacing of public access points played a key role in determining the proposed layout. The policies require an average spacing of at least one mile as a minimum with two miles as a desirable average distance between access points which typically include a crossover in the median.

Based on the network shown, peak hour design year traffic volumes have been developed at each of the proposed intersections with US 30. Because many of the existing routes are very low volume (less than 300 ADT) and growth is expected to be slow, discontinuing some of the local roads was determined by the Department to involve reasonable levels of impacts to local users. Such road closures would be accomplished through agreements with the local agencies. Those agreements would not need to be executed until Phase II plans are prepared and/or construction is programmed & imminent. The need at this stage of the study is for documented coordination regarding the proposed access conditions. This meeting as well as any follow-up discussions & correspondence will be the primary documentation. Eventually, a road closure hearing will be held to notify area residents and other users of the changes in local access. This would occur later in Phase II.

The proposed layout provides average spacing of just over one mile, although spacing between specific side roads may be less. It involves several discontinued side roads with low projected traffic volumes throughout the corridor to achieve this. The method of closure (i.e. culdesac or hammerhead) and the locations selected for closure are elements for which the Department would like input.

There was some discussion regarding specific side roads that would involve the need to reroute plowing operations (for example, Norton Road associated with Alternative 4) or for which two townships would need to coordinate to arrange for an appropriate sharing of responsibilities (for example, Lister Road associated with Alternative 5). However, it was indicated that preference would be to wait for selection of a specific alternative to provide the requested input. Mr. McCormick indicated we cannot wait that long as the input is needed within the next month or two to proceed appropriately with the study.

The group indicated it would coordinate with the other township supervisors & provide the Department with a list of issues & concerns for both alternatives within the next month or two. To assist them on this, Russ Renner requested six additional sets of the larger scale display with all affected side roads clearly labeled. In addition, the township boundaries should be indicated. Mr. McCormick indicated he would revise the display accordingly & forward them to Mr. Renner.

Jon Estrem pointed out that Habben Road is one of the side roads intended for closure. Mr. Renner confirmed that it is under county jurisdiction. The issue of logical termini for



---

a county road was discussed, but the group was unsure as to whether the access from Habben Road to US 30 via the first side road to the north (since identified as Prairie Center Road) would meet the statutory requirements. This will be addressed with the submitted list of issues & concerns.

In response to a question, it was indicated that the Department & FHWA will utilize all the information collected throughout the study to make a joint decision regarding which alternative is to be selected. This will be accomplished as a part of the Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) process through the Project Study Group (PSG) after the next Public Hearing.

In response to another question, it was indicated that it would be IDOT's intention for the townships or perhaps in some situations the County to take jurisdiction of the new connections & discontinuous sections of existing US 30 that remain after the new alignment is constructed.

The meeting concluded at approximately 3:15 PM.