

Alton-Godfrey Transportation Study CAG Meeting #2 Summary



Date: August 29, 2012

Time: 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

Location: Lewis and Clark Community College – Advanced Technology Center

1. The second Community Advisory Group (CAG) meeting for the Alton-Godfrey Transportation Study was held August 29, 2012. The purpose of the meeting was to:
 - Provide a summary of the Context Audit
 - Ask for comments on the Stakeholder Involvement Plan
 - Present an overview of roadway classification and the levels of access and mobility associated with different roadway types, illustrated by photos of various roadways in the study area
 - Provide a summary of the study area crash analysis and traffic model
 - Develop the study's Problem Statement

 2. The following 15 CAG members attended the meeting:
 - Mayor Tom Hoechst City of Alton
 - Mayor Mike McCormick Village of Godfrey
 - Mike Stumpf Village of Godfrey
 - Matt Asselmeier City of Alton
 - Diane Schuette Saint Anthony's Health Center
 - Martha Warford Beverly Farm
 - Monica Bristow RiverBend Growth Association
 - Gary Ayres Lewis and Clark Community College
 - Capt. Eric Decker Madison County Sheriff's Office
 - Chief David Hayes Alton Police Department
 - Chief John Sowders Godfrey Fire Protection District
 - Bob McDonald Laborers Local 218
 - Chris Norman Alton CUSD #11
 - Steven Koeller Godfrey Property Owner / Agricultural
 - John Hilgert Rock Gate Subdivision

 3. Two members asked to be removed from the CAG prior to this meeting: Moe Hand, Lifestar Ambulance manager; and Greg Love, Wenzel Acres resident.

 4. The following Project Study Group members were in attendance:
 - Jeff Keirn IDOT
 - Cindy Stafford IDOT
 - Karen Geldert IDOT
 - Frank Opfer IDOT
 - Jennifer Hunt IDOT
 - Brian Macias IDOT
 - George Ryan Piasa Collaborative (AMEC)
 - Steve Coates Piasa Collaborative (AMEC)
 - Jeff Strickland Piasa Collaborative (AMEC)
 - Jason Watters Piasa Collaborative (BLA)
-

5. CAG members were provided with the following material for their project binders: meeting agenda; hard copy of the meeting PowerPoint presentation; CAG Meeting #1 summary; and a copy of an email reply from David Walker of IDOT to an email enquiry about signal timing in the study area.
6. Context Audit Summary
 - a. CAG members were reminded that the purpose of the Context Audit is to collect information about the study area from them, with the goal of helping IDOT understand community values and develop the Problem Statement.
 - b. Responses received on each of the 20 Context Audit questions were summarized in the PowerPoint presentation, and are included in this meeting summary as an Addendum.
 - c. There were no comments from CAG members on the Context Audit summary.
7. Stakeholder Involvement Plan
 - a. At CAG Meeting #1, members had been asked to review the Stakeholder Involvement Plan and provide their comments at tonight's meeting.
 - b. There were no comments from CAG members on the Stakeholder Involvement Plan.
8. Roadway Classification and Function overview
 - a. An explanation of arterial, collector, and local roadway types was provided, along with the function of each in terms of mobility and access.
 - b. To illustrate these different roadway types, several photos were shown of roads in the study area.
 - c. There were no comments from CAG members.
9. Crash Report Summary
 - a. Crash data was gathered for 17.3 miles of road within the study area for a five year period (2006-2010). During this period there were 1,508 crashes resulting in 420 injuries and eight fatalities:
 - Rear end (582), turning (347), and angle (179) crashes were most common
 - Crash types out of normalcy for the study area include rear end crashes on Homer Adams Parkway (48%), turning crashes on Godfrey Road (33%), angle crashes on North Alby (28%), and animal crashes on Union School Road (63%)
 - b. The crash analysis took into account roadway/roadside features (i.e. sight distance, obstacles, intersections, etc), traffic volumes, accident type, weather conditions, and time of day.
 - c. The crash analysis identified most critical intersection and roadway segment crash locations.
 - d. Causes for rear end, angle, and turning crashes include congestion, not enough lanes, sight distance issues, and too many access points.
 - e. Possible countermeasures for rear end, angle, and turning crashes include adding lanes or new roadway, improving sight distance, consolidating access points, and improving signal timing.
 - f. Discussion / comments / questions
 - Q: What are angle crashes?
A: *Crashes where one vehicle strikes another at an angle, such as a "T-bone" crash.*
 - Q: Would the study team attribute the 48% of crashes on Homer Adams Parkway to signal timing issues?
A: *Signal timing could be part of the problem.*
 - Q: Would installing more roundabouts help diminish the number of angle crashes? Many area drivers ignore traffic signals and stop signs.
A: *Roundabouts are good for traffic calming, however they are not a universal remedy. There is a time and place for roundabouts as well as signal timing improvements. The goal of this study is to determine what solutions will help address the area roadway issues that we see and that you have told us you experience. Roundabouts may be part of the solution.*
 - A comment was made that Mayor Hoechst recently submitted a newspaper opinion story about texting and cell phone use.

10. Traffic Model Summary

- a. Traffic models are used to examine how new roads or changes to existing roads affect surrounding roadways.
- b. The study team refined the regional traffic model developed by the East-West Gateway Council of Governments (EWGCOG) based on input from Alton and Godfrey; other known improvements such as IL Route 255 were included in the traffic model.
- c. When the study team begins developing alternatives, we will evaluate how the alternatives affect the area's transportation system.
- d. The design year for the traffic model is 2040.
- e. Discussion / comments / questions
 - Q: Will you do modeling that looks at the railroad crossings, both as at-grade crossings and as grade-separated crossings?
A: *Both of these scenarios can be modeled by our team.*

11. Problem Statement Development

- a. The study team presented a bulleted list of area transportation issues, which was developed from known data as well as feedback gained from CAG members, stakeholders, and the public; after discussing and refining this list tonight, we will collectively create one or two sentences that will become the Problem Statement (*see 12.c below*).
- b. The issues identified in the list are:
 - Congestion on street system
 - High crash rates on several roadways
 - Lack of good access / connectivity to IL Route 255
 - Concerns over numerous at-grade railroad crossings
 - Lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities
- c. Discussion / comments / questions
 - Comment: the at-grade railroad crossings divide Godfrey and affect response time for Godfrey Fire Protection District vehicles.
 - Comment: observation and general agreement from CAG members that pedestrian access, particularly on Godfrey Road, is lacking; there are elementary schools on Godfrey Road but inadequate sidewalks for pupils and parents.
 - Q: What information do you have about train volumes? You have data for roadway traffic volumes but nothing on railroad usage.
A: *We will look into acquiring existing and projected railroad traffic data. It is possible that the proposed High Speed Rail will affect rail traffic. Ground transportation costs have resulted in more shipping being done by rail; it is likely that this is a trend that will continue.*
 - Comment: Frontage roads should be considered on US Route 67 due to the multiple curb cuts and access points.
 - Comment: High school students create a good deal of traffic volume on Humbert Road.
 - Comment: There seems to be a lot of animal-type crashes in the eastern part of the study area especially on Humbert Road.
 - Comment: There is a high volume of traffic on the Clark Bridge. The potential for regional connectivity between IL Route 255 and Missouri should be considered when evaluating alternatives.
 - Comment: Many motorists commuting from areas north of Godfrey (i.e. Jerseyville) use US Route 67. For them this area is not a destination.
 - Discussion about traffic volumes on Tolle Lane and that there is a lack of good east-west connectivity in the study area.
 - Q: Does the traffic study take into account peak hour travel and weekend travel, for example?

A: The current study is a high-level look at existing and forecasted traffic volumes; it will be further refined to reflect conditions such as time of day travel.

- Comment: Access to healthcare facilities needs to be considered.
- Discussion about how the volume and type of traffic on Pierce Lane (just outside the study area) has changed over the years. The study team pointed out that many area roads were developed at a time when this area was rural and agricultural. Residential and commercial growth, changes in population, and changes in land use can all affect the character of the local road network. Many local roads are under the jurisdiction of the municipalities or Madison County and are not controlled by IDOT.

- Comment: Future development in the area needs to be considered.

Response: The current traffic model takes development into account, and will be reflected when the model is refined.

12. A draft Problem Statement, which the study team composed prior to tonight's meeting, was presented for review and discussion:

"The transportation problems in the study area relate to traffic congestion and insufficient roadway continuity and connectivity, which contributes to delays and crashes. Traffic is often delayed by trains at the numerous at-grade rail crossings. These improvements need to consider the community's desire to preserve the character of the community, to promote more pedestrian/bike facilities and to maximize the economic benefit of IL Route 255."

- a. Following any revisions tonight, the study team would would like to get consensus on the Problem Statement. Consensus is defined as the understanding that although there may not be unanimous approval of the Problem Statement itself, there is agreement that the Problem Statement was developed with with goal of addressing transportation issues in the best interests of the community and the project.

- b. Discussion / comments / questions

- Comment: Safety of the public, such as at it relates to emergency response time, needs to be included.
- Comment: Access needs and issues need to be included.
- Q: Who initiated this project? Will the Problem Statement address the concerns of those who asked for the project?

A: Jeff Keirn: IDOT was asked by several people including Senator Haine to take a look at transportation problems in the area. IDOT conducted a Feasibility Study in 2011 which showed several transportation issues exist and would warrant further study. It was deemed feasible to pursue Phase I, the preliminary engineering phase that is currently underway. We are in the early stages of this project and don't yet know what the outcome will be.

- c. The Problem Statement as revised at tonight's meeting reads as follows:

"The transportation problems in the study area relate to traffic congestion, poor or mismanaged access and insufficient roadway continuity and connectivity, which contributes to delays and crashes. Traffic is often delayed by trains at the numerous at-grade rail crossings. These improvements need to consider the community's desire to preserve the character of the community, to enhance the safety of the public, to promote more pedestrian/bike facilities and to maximize the economic benefit of IL Route 255."

13. General Discussion / Action Items / Next CAG Meeting

- a. The study team will begin working on the project Purpose and Need as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).
- b. The next CAG meeting is anticipated to take place in approximately six to eight weeks.
- c. If CAG members have any questions before then, they were instructed to contact Karen Geldert.

14. The meeting concluded at approximately 8:00 pm.