

Alton-Godfrey Transportation Study CAG Meeting #3 Summary



Date: November 20, 2013

Time: 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

Location: Lewis and Clark Community College – Advanced Technology Center

1. The third Community Advisory Group (CAG) meeting for the Alton-Godfrey Transportation Study was held November 20, 2013. The purpose of the meeting was to:
 - Review the Problem Statement as developed at CAG meeting #2
 - Review material presented at CAG meeting #2
 - Highway classification and function
 - Crash and traffic data
 - Introduce the corridor development process and alternatives evaluation methodology
 - Introduce the process for determining environmental impacts
 - Introduce preliminary corridors
 - Examine and discuss the preliminary corridors in a breakout session

 2. The following CAG members attended the meeting:
 - Mayor Brant Walker City of Alton
 - Dan Herkert City of Alton
 - Jim Lewis Village of Godfrey (attending for Mayor McCormick)
 - Jo Emerick Village of Godfrey (attending for Mayor McCormick)
 - Greg Caffey City of Alton
 - Matt Asselmeier City of Alton
 - Lori Ehlers Alton Square Mall
 - Diane Schuette Saint Anthony's Health Center
 - Capt. Eric Decker Madison County Sheriff's Office
 - Chief Jason Simmons Alton Police Department
 - Randy Harris Laborers Local 218 (attending for Bob McDonald)
 - Chris Norman Alton CUSD #11
 - John Hilgert Rock Gate Subdivision
 - Martin Carrow Northport Hills Resident / Business Owner
 - Matt Howard Alton Resident (attending for Todd Harpole)
 - Robert Stephan Alton Resident
 - Ayrton Womack Muny Vista Resident

 3. Approximately five members of the general public attended the meeting as observers. It was learned by the study team that the local news website Riverbender.com had posted an article erroneously stating that this CAG meeting was being held as a public informational meeting. These members of the public were informed at the sign-in table that the meeting was for invited CAG members only, but they were welcome to observe.

 4. The following Project Study Group members were in attendance:
 - Cindy Stafford IDOT
 - Frank Opfer IDOT
 - Jennifer Hunt IDOT
 - Sara Chappell IDOT
 - George Ryan Piasa Collaborative (AMEC)
 - Steve Coates Piasa Collaborative (AMEC)
-

- Ray Steege Piasa Collaborative (AMEC)
- Jeff Strickland Piasa Collaborative (AMEC)
- Jason Watters Piasa Collaborative (BLA)
- Brooks Brestal Piasa Collaborative (H&S)

5. CAG members were provided with the following new material for their project binders: meeting agenda; hard copy of the meeting PowerPoint presentation; updated study area map; CAG Meeting #1 and #2 summaries; updated CAG member roster; Context Audit Summary; and revised Stakeholder Involvement Plan.
6. The contents of the PowerPoint presentation were as follows:
 - a. Review of the Problem Statement
 - Description of project needs: lack of connectivity and capacity and safety issues
 - Statement of Project Purpose
 - b. Review material presented at CAG meeting #2
 - Road classification and function
 - Crash and traffic data in the study area
 - c. Explanation and illustration of the corridor / alternative development process
 - d. Explanation and illustration of the alternatives evaluation process
 - e. Presentation of the preliminary corridors for the study
7. CAG members were then divided into four breakout groups. Each group's assignment was to review a large exhibit of the preliminary corridors; discuss the merits or disadvantages of each corridor; and identify any additional corridors that should be considered. George Ryan was the room facilitator moving from table to table ensuring the exercise proceeded smoothly. Each group was facilitated by a study team member; was provided with a flip chart for making notes; and was given 30 minutes for this assignment. At the end of this time period each breakout group would provide an oral report to the rest of the membership in attendance. The breakout groups consisted of the following:
 - a. Table 1 (Red): Brant Walker; Lori Ehlers; Jo Emerick; Martin Carrow; Randy Harris; Jim Lewis. Facilitator: Steve Coates
 - b. Table 2 (Green): Dan Herkert; Eric Decker; Ayron Womack. Facilitator: Ray Steege.
 - c. Table 3 (Yellow): Greg Caffey; Chris Norman; John Hilgert; Matt Howard. Facilitator: Jason Watters.
 - d. Table 4 (Blue): Matt Asselmeier; Dianne Schuette; Jason Simmons; Robert Stephan. Facilitator: Brooks Brestal.
8. Reports / comments / issues identified by each breakout group:
 - a. Table 1
 - Eliminate some of the railroad at-grade crossings; provide overpasses at these crossings.
 - Need to look at some combination of corridors to deal with the needs in the study area.
 - Corridor 1E is potentially the best for multi-modal issues due to its proximity to the new Transit Center. This corridor also appears the best for potential development.
 - There are steep grades below the railroad at Big Arch Road, which could present problems when laying out alignments in that area.
 - Corridor 1W appears to be better for travel to the northern part of the study area. There needs to be an interchange at Wenzel.
 - Corridor 4N is viable if there is an overpass at the railroad crossing.
 - Corridor 7 needs to be fixed. It is a significant problem in the study area.
 - b. Table 2
 - Corridor 3: has limited improvement capability; is already four lanes with a center turn lane.
 - Corridor 1E: Provides relief for Alton High School.

- Corridor 1E: Mr. Womack asked Mr. Herkert why this area should be opened for development; Mr. Herkert replied that the City is more interested in re-development rather than new development.
 - Corridor 4S: a center turn lane could be added, otherwise options are limited; the traffic crash rate is high; there are access issues from side streets.
 - Corridor 1W: must be paired with an east-west route.
 - Corridor 2E: existing infrastructure – positive; terrain and safety – negative.
 - Table 2 believes that Corridor 4N with Corridor 1E is more beneficial than Corridor 5
- c. Table 3
- Corridor 5: there are a lot of obstacles; a variation in the alignment was proposed, in which the eastern end of the corridor was realigned to the west and south of Alton High School and then intersecting with Humbert Road just south of the high school.
 - Corridor 4: addresses Lewis and Clark CC and IL Route 255.
 - Corridors 2E and 2W: there is a potential problem at Humbert and North Alby but it is worthy of further study
 - Extending Buckmaster Lane north to Corridor 1E is worth investigating.
 - Corridor 7: should be expanded to the east.
 - Connect Corridor 1W to 2W behind Alton Square Mall.
 - Corridor 5: only go from Humbert to North Alby.
 - Connect the new train station to Alton Square Mall (bike or ped).
- d. Table 4
- Connect Corridor 1W to Corridor 2.
 - Bike / ped connections are needed between the planned Multi-Modal Transportation Center and Alton Square Mall.
 - Expand Corridor 7 and make it the #1 priority.
 - The east-west issue seems to be overstated.
9. The study team will review these suggestions and comments and take them into account as corridor studies proceed..
10. General questions and comments:
- a. Has the study team performed a survey of Lewis and Clark students to determine their travel patterns?
A: This would best be accomplished by an Origin and Destination (O&D) traffic study, which hasn't been done yet but the study team will consider it. We will have to determine if we need to supplement existing traffic data.
 - b. When is the next public informational meeting?
A: We anticipate a public meeting sometime within the next year. We have to do screening of the corridors and run traffic models. We will hold another CAG meeting prior to the next public meeting.
11. General Discussion / Action Items / Next CAG Meeting
- a. The study team thanked the CAG members for their time, input and participation in the study and as members of the CAG.
 - b. If CAG members have any questions before then, they were instructed to contact Karen Geldert.
 - c. Cindy Stafford asked the CAG group if there was consensus that the corridors shown with possible slight modifications were the corridors that will be studied. The CAG group in general agreed that there was consensus in moving forward with studying the corridors shown.
12. The meeting concluded at approximately 8:00 pm.