



## US 20 Galena Bypass Citizen's Advisory Group



1/12/2006  
GALENA MIDDLE SCHOOL

### SUMMARY OF QUESTIONS AND IDOT RESPONSES

**Question 1. Valerie Stabenow.**

Is visibility of the town from the roadway a good thing or a bad thing?

**Response 1.** During the Glacier Shadow Pass study, the tourism workgroup identified that having a view of scenic downtown Galena from the proposed freeway is a positive feature.

**Question 2. David Kriesant.**

Is it possible to maintain the higher profile over Stagecoach Trail and lower the profile along the remainder of the proposed alignment?

**Response 2.** The lower profile presented at tonight's meeting represents the optimum profile to minimize costs and to balanced earthwork. It is possible to select a final profile that lies somewhere in between the original Phase I profile and this revised profile, including maintaining the higher elevation over Stagecoach Trail. However, it should be recognized that this would result in significantly higher cost for an imperceptible increase in visibility. This is an example of an issue that could be further studied by the Citizen's Advisory Group (C. A. G.).

**Question 3. Bryan Davis (Congressman Manzullo's Office)**

Is the \$8.2M dollars provided by the SAFETEA-LU, much of which has been dedicated to the Phase II engineering for the Galena Bypass, sufficient to cover the entire Phase II engineering cost?

**Response 3.**

This should be sufficient funds to cover the Phase 2 engineering for the Galena Bypass plus some additional work at the Freeport end of the US 20 project.

**Question 4. Jon Cox**

Is Phase II fully funded?

**Response 4.**

Once the \$8.2M SAFETEA-LU funding is secured, there should be sufficient funding to complete the engineering work for the Galena Bypass. However, this does not include funds for land acquisition. Currently the Department only has a relatively small portion of the required land acquisition money that will be necessary for the Galena Bypass Project. This money will be used for early acquisition of hardship cases.

**Question 5. Bryan Davis (Congressman Manzullo's Office)**

How much additional money is needed for land acquisition?

**Response 5.**

We do not have a figure readily available this evening; however the required funds are likely in the neighborhood of several million dollars. Significant effort has been expended by the Department and by the State of Illinois including Congressman Manzullo's Office and others, to secure the funding that we currently have available. Additional effort will be required to secure the additional funds that are needed.

**Question 6. Jack Zane**

Will emergency vehicle access be provided at Buckhill Road? This could greatly reduce emergency response times onto the bypass.

**Response 6.**

This has not yet been studied; however, it has been identified as an issue that could be addressed by the Citizen's Advisory Group and through additional coordination with police, fire and emergency service agencies as part of the public involvement process during the Phase II engineering. Buckhill Road does appear to be the most likely location for some type of gated access point.

**Question 7. Chris Kirkpatrick**

Is the land acquisition process typically part of the Phase II engineering or Phase III construction.

**Response 7.** The land acquisition process will typically run concurrently with Phase II. As the engineering design is finalized, appraisals and plat preparation will begin in advance of actual property purchases. The timing of the land acquisition process is somewhat dependent upon the funding that is available. If a project is fully funded through construction, the land acquisition process will generally occur as soon as possible while the plans are being prepared (Phase II). However, in cases like the Galena Bypass, where construction funding is not available, the land acquisition process may be delayed until construction funding is secured or may occur in stages as funding becomes available.

**Question 8. Bill Tonne, JD County Zoning Board**

At the west interchange, has there been any thought of putting in frontage roads to accommodate potential commercial development?

**Response 8.** Frontage Roads were not considered during the Phase I study. Generally, the Department considers frontage roads for existing properties when alternate access needs to be provided as a result of a road project. Frontage roads are typically under local jurisdiction. If the City of Galena has development plans, the Department should be notified of them as soon as possible. Since the Phase I study has been completed and approved, the Department does not have the ability to secure additional right-of-way for frontage roads. Frontage road design and associated land acquisition would be the responsibility of the local jurisdiction. The Department would coordinate with the local jurisdiction so that any frontage road work could be incorporated into the plans. Additional costs for frontage road work would be the responsibility of the local agency.

**Question 9. Jim Rachuy**

Would construction plans be reviewed/approved before any land acquisition is initiated, or would land acquisition run concurrently with the development of the plans?

**Response 9.**

Generally the land acquisition process runs concurrently with the development of the contract plans (Phase II). In the case of the Galena Bypass, since we do not currently have construction funding, the Phase II engineering will probably progress further along before the land acquisition begins in earnest. At this time, we do have some funds available for land acquisition, and this will be used for hardship purchases which have been requested by various property owners.

**Question 10. Jim Boho**

Your presentation demonstrated how the lower profile at Stagecoach Trail reduces the time that Galena is visible from the proposed freeway from 20 to 18 seconds. What is the proposed elevation change? For example, with the higher profile you may be able to see the entire buildings, but with the lower profile you may only be able to see the roof tops. Why is it that the profile over Stagecoach Trail can not be maintained at the higher elevation? Is the whole reason cost?

**Response 10.**

The elevation difference between the two profiles at Stagecoach Trail is a maximum of 25 ft. Due to the distance from the Stage Coach Trail crossing to the City of Galena we do not think that the quality of the view will be perceptibly diminished. This is not completely demonstrated in our simulation, but we can certainly provide additional information in order to adequately substantiate this to the Citizens Advisory Group. The issue of the profile alternatives is a topic that the Citizens Advisory Group is encouraged to discuss and evaluate in more detail. One of the primary reasons that the profile has been evaluated is to reduce costs by balancing earthwork. Reducing borrow embankment also results in a reduction of the land requirements and environmental impacts, allowing for a better fit with the surroundings.

**Question 11. Jim Boho**

Where is the 3 million cubic yards of fill material coming from, local quarries or a large borrow pit?

**Response 11.**

The referenced 3 million cubic yards of required fill would be needed with the higher of the two profiles. Our preliminary calculations indicate that the lowered profile reduces the borrow to approximately 25,000 cubic yards. This illustrates one of benefits of lowering the profile. The required fill would need to come from borrow pits.

**Question 12 Valerie Stabenow**

For a project on IL 26 in Freeport, the required borrow pit was made aesthetically pleasing and the area was sold for \$1 to the Freeport Park District. This has created a nice park area that is now a tourism feature.

**Response 12.**

The issue of location and treatment of borrow pits is open for discussion and evaluation by the CAG during the Phase 2 public involvement process.

**Question 13. Todd Lincoln**

Where does the proposed alignment cross over Stagecoach Trail?

**Response 13.**

Near the abandoned quarry approximately ½ mile east of the existing bridge carrying Stagecoach trail over the Galena River and the railroad.

**Question 14. Tom Werner**

Will the lower profile result in reduced impacts to forested areas and farmland and can you quantify this?

**Response 14.**

Based on the reduced footprint of the embankment, impacts should be reduced. We do not have these figures readily available this evening, but we can certainly provide this information to the C.A.G.

**Question 15. John Checker**

Can anyone in this room give a probability that construction of the proposed roadway will be underway by 2010?

**Response 15.**

IDOT explained the programming process, stating that projects must first move into the multi-year program, then the current fiscal year. Programming of funds is based on statewide roadway needs and with the known competing priorities, obtaining funding for construction will require continued political work. Funding to date has come primarily from Federal earmarks.

**Question 16. Jon Cox**

What is the cost estimate for right of way acquisitions?

**Response 16.**

IDOT apologized for not having a detailed estimate available, but this information will be provided to the C.A.G. in the near future. A rough, unofficial estimate would be somewhat less than \$10M.

**Question 17. Todd Lincoln**

Why is some of the money from the \$8.2M SAFETEA-LU line item going to Freeport rather than using it for Galena Bypass land acquisition?

**Response 17.** This money is earmarked for the US 20 line item, not just specifically the Galena Bypass. Some of the money has been reserved for roadway needs in the Freeport area, but the majority is identified for Phase II in Galena.

**Question 18. Jim Boho**

Can we break the right of way needs down into acreage?

**Response 18.**

We do not have an estimate available tonight, but this information will be provided to the C.A.G. in the near future.

**Question 19. Tom Brusch, Mayor of Galena**

Do we need all the construction money before we can get started?

**Response 19.**

No. One option the Department has looked into is constructing the west interchange initially because this would be a project with independent utility. This could then serve as a catalyst to maintain a funding stream for the remainder of the project.

**Question 20. Jim Boho**

At the Phase 1 Advisory Council and Work Group meetings, a liaison, Paul Biggers, was present to serve as a go-between and provide information to the groups. Will there be someone functioning in this capacity at the Phase II C.A.G. meetings?

**Response 20**

Yes, this is certainly possible. IDOT's presentation tonight attempted to make it clear that the C.A.G. itself can determine, as an independent organization, the form and frequency of all coordination with IDOT. IDOT and Teng would be happy to provide liaisons to assist the group and provide any necessary information to the C.A.G. This would represent the type of close working relationship that IDOT hopes for.

**Question 21. Name?**

Could the interchange type at the west end be looked at as well?

**Response 21**

Yes, this could be looked at. Based on potential impact and cost reductions identified by Teng, the Horseshoe Mound interchange has been assessed first.

**Question 22. Name?**

Could the roadway be constructed as a two -lane road or "super-two" rather than a four lane freeway? This could be a cost effective means of project implementation.

**Response 22**

This might be possible as an interim measure but would need to be assessed in detail. IDOT noted that the Freeport Bypass was constructed (1987) initially as a two-lane roadway with a limited number of local access points and it is currently being upgraded to a four lane freeway. It does not seem likely that local access could be maintained with an interim two-lane facility, but IDOT can assess this type of staged implementation of the freeway and coordinate the findings with the C. A. G.