Illinois Department of Transportation

Eastern Bypass Study

Final Results of Community Advisory Group Corridor "Drop-Keep" Exercise

At Community Advisory Group meetings 8 and 9 (held on March 22 and May 5, 2011), the CAG members participated in an exercise to systematically review the fourteen corridor locations under consideration for the Eastern Bypass and to make recommendations as to which of these should be dropped and which should be carried forward for further evaluation. This document presents the data generated during that exercise.

The process began with the CAG members being divided into eight groups, each working at an individual table. These "table groups" were provided with copies of the various study documents, maps, and other information for use in comparing the relative benefits and impacts of the fourteen corridor locations. The IDOT Study Team members also constituted a table group, bringing the total number of tables participating in the exercise to nine.

Each table group was provided with colored cards to denote which corridors their group was recommending be dropped or kept. Pink cards denoted dropped corridors; green cards denoted those that should be kept. The table groups were urged to write on the cards the reasons that led to their recommendations.

Once the cards were filled out they were posted on a large array -- in the form of a matrix -- mounted in the front of the room. The fourteen corridors were listed across the top of the matrix and the table groups constituted the rows. Spokespersons for each table then reported to the full group their table's reasons for wanting to drop or keep each corridor. After discussion, consensus* was reached on dropping eight of the fourteen corridors.

Presented on the following pages is a portrayal of the drop (pink) and keep (green) cards as they appeared on the display wall at the end of the exercise, followed by a summary of the comments made on the cards by each of the table groups.

---

* The CAG members have defined consensus as a majority of the members in agreement, with the minority agreeing that their input was duly considered.

Illinois Department of Transportation
District Four

May 13, 2011

Group Exercise Final Results

May 5, 2011 CAG Meeting

Status of the "sticky wall" at the end of the May 5 CAG Meeting

Table \ Corridor	P-1	P-2	P-3	P-4	T-5	T-6	T-7	M-8	M-9	M-10	D-11	D-12	D-13	D-14
# 1	DROP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP
# 2	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	DROP
# 3	DROP	KEEP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	DROP
# 4	DROP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	DROP
# 5	DROP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP
# 6	DROP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP
# 7	DROP	KEEP	DROP	KEEP	DROP	KEEP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP
# 8	DROP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP
# 9	DROP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	KEEP	DROP	DROP	DROP	DROP

Prepared May 13, 2011

Group Exercise Final Results

May 5, 2011 CAG Meeting

TABLE 1

Corridor	Status	Comments
P-1	DROP	North bridge, Don't like.
P-2	KEEP	Carries good traffic.
P-3	DROP	Redundant east-west portion parallels I-74, Longer = "costlier".
P-4	DROP	Residential, Dislocation, Relocation.
T-5	DROP	North bridge, Don't like.
T-6	KEEP	Mobility benefit for most communities, Germantown/Metamora access benefit.
T-7	KEEP	High traffic volumes, less miles/ < cost.
M-8	DROP	Bridge too far north.
M-9	DROP	Bridge too far north.
M-10	KEEP	Less Invasive, north/south route primarily.
D-11	DROP	Bridge too far north, Low traffic, AG impact.
D-12	DROP	Bridge too far north, Residential, Low traffic, AG impact.
D-13	DROP	Too low volumes, Good farm ground removed from production.
D-14	DROP	Serves east-west not N-S, not practical traffic flow.

CAG Members

Budde (not present 3/22; not present 5/5)
Damery
Dietrich
Fellhauer
Jacobs
Anderson

Prepared May 13, 2011

TABLE 2

Corridor	Status	Comments
P-1	DROP	High Residential relocations, Proximity effects.
P-2	DROP	High impact of residential & some business.
P-3	DROP	Residential relocations, farm land taken, too much east/west.
P-4	DROP	High proximity effects - residential, commercial & institutional.
T-5	DROP	Negative impact on River Bluff impact, Disruptive on residential, Already has economic growth.
T-6	DROP	Large impact on commercial relocations, worst in mobility, 6th worst residential impact.
T-7	DROP	High residential impacts, conflicts with economic development plans.
M-8	DROP	North Bridge, Black Partridge Park Proximity.
M-9	KEEP	Good economic development, Lower residential impact.
M-10	KEEP	Good rankings: Community growth plans, Low proximity to residental location, forest & wetlands.
D-11	DROP	North Bridge, Agricultural impacts, corridor length too long.
D-12	DROP	Encroaching cemetery and park, North bridge.
D-13	KEEP	Economic growth, Low resident impact, Low forect impact, Lowest wetland impact.
D-14	DROP	2nd highest in red impacts, 2nd highest in proximity impacts, 2nd highest in institutional impacts, follows existing roads.

CAG Members

Childers (not present 3/22; not present 5/5)
Clark (not present 5/5)
Fenner
Ferrell (not present 3/22; not present 5/5)
Klotz
Maurer

TABLE 3

Corridor	Status	Comments
P-1	DROP	Less benefit of north ridge, Rte 6 interchange already there.
P-2	KEEP	Best improved travel flow, 2nd lowest ag land, supporting land use & EUC plans.
P-3	KEEP	Meets average traffic, land use, mobility, EDC criteria.
P-4	DROP	Residential impact, negative impact ICC, lacks regional plus.
T-5	DROP	Less benefit for a North bridge, Negative impacts on Washington.
T-6	DROP	Steep terrain #1, Worst traffic flow, mobility, Commercial/industrial relocations.
T-7	DROP	Congestion west of Washington, Lacks regional benefit.
M-8	DROP	Less impact/benefit of northern bridge, Negative to AG land, Low traffic volume.
M-9	DROP	Northern bridge.
M-10	KEEP	Best for 116, Best landuse/EDC, Least residential impact, least impact (neg) at Washington.
D-11	DROP	Lacks regional benefit, Northern bridge lack benefit.
D-12	DROP	Northern bridge, lacks regional benefit.
D-13	KEEP	Less Impact on Residential relocations (commercial also), only negatives: Historic sites, # of miles, Accommodate future growth, need east option.
D-14	DROP	Too much ag land, Bluff issues, Lacks regional needs.

CAG Members

Belshaw (not present 5/5)
Davis
Godar
Godke (not present 3/22; not present 5/5)
Habben
McCarty

TABLE 4

Corridor	Status	Comments
P-1	DROP	Too far west to I-74.
P-2	DROP	Too far west to I-74.
P-3	DROP	Too far west to I-74.
P-4	KEEP	Least disruptive of agriculture, leaves cycling areas intact (other areas of study zone left alone).
T-5	DROP	Negative residential impact.
T-6	DROP	Negative residential impact.
T-7	DROP	Negative residential impact.
M-8	DROP	Cemetery intersect.
M-9	DROP	River crossing.
M-10	KEEP	Low residential impact, Good N-S connection.
D-11	DROP	River crossing.
D-12	DROP	River crossing, cemetery.
D-13	KEEP	Low residential impact, true ring road.
D-14	DROP	Negative residential impact, Cuts Tri-County in two.

CAG Members

Arvin (not present 5/5)
Dunnan (not present 5/5)
Durflinger (not present 5/5)
Honnold (Alternate: Gregg Bittner)
Huser (not present 5/5)
McClellan (not present 3/22)

Group Exercise Final Results

May 5, 2011 CAG Meeting

TABLE 5

Corridor	Status	Comments
P-1	DROP	Land use impact, Community Impact, North bridge.
P-2	KEEP	Southern crossing, land use, high traffic count, best route to support recreational trail.
P-3	DROP	Takes considerable agricultural land, community impact, traffic counts go red, adds 4 miles over P2.
P-4	DROP	Least compatible with land use and economic development, not a bypass, goes thru developed area, area has good access now, doesn't benefit 116 corridor.
T-5	DROP	Has North River crossing.
T-6	KEEP	Good traffic count, supports land use plan, note- no terminus for rec trail.
T-7	KEEP	Good traffic counts, least agricultural of T's, south crossing, good mobility, least negative impacts in most areas.
M-8	DROP	N River crossing, Land Use, AG ground.
M-9	DROP	N River crossing, AG.
M-10	KEEP	Supports land use plan, south crossing, only viable east of Washington, negative agricultural impact.
D-11	DROP	North crossing, AG Ground, Not beneficial to Rt 116.
D-12	DROP	AG, N River Crossing, No 116 Benefit.
D-13	DROP	Negative agricultural impact, low traffic count, no rec trail terminus.
D-14	DROP	Ag land, No IL 116 benefits, Uses more existing routes.

CAG Members

Bachman
French
Kinsinger (not present 3/22)
Klopfenstein
Neuhauser (not present 5/5)
Quinn

TABLE 6

Corridor	Status	Comments
P-1	DROP	Wet lands, forest, Residential relocation, north bridge.
P-2	DROP	Divides Metamora/German Town, negative impact to rural residence, poor south connection.
P-3	DROP	South connection high AG affect.
P-4	KEEP	Shortest distance, good connection north and south, high traffic volume.
T-5	DROP	Wetlands.
T-6	DROP	Cuts Metamora/Germantown, cuts Washington area, steep terrain, high commercial relocations.
T-7	KEEP	Good connections, Cost, Effective routing, Uses existing roads.
M-8	DROP	Wetland, Environmental, Farmland, North Bridge.
M-9	DROP	Wetland, Farmland, North Bridge.
M-10	DROP	Residential impact, Morton connection too far east (1 person supports, 3 persons do not like).
D-11	DROP	Too far east, low traffic volume (1 person supports this, 3 persons do not support).
D-12	DROP	Wetlands, AG, Routing.
D-13	DROP	East connection, Historic sites.
D-14	DROP	East connection, Rte 24 Traffic.

CAG Members

Bryning
Jaeger
Lewis (not present 3/22; not present 5/5)
Mikesell (not present 5/5)
Royer
Rund (not present 3/22)

TABLE 7

Corridor	Status	Comments
P-1	DROP	North Bridge.
P-2	KEEP	Reasonable traffic count.
P-3	DROP	Too much east west.
P-4	KEEP	High traffic count.
T-5	DROP	North bridge.
T-6	KEEP	South bridge moderate impacts.
T-7	KEEP	Moderate traffic south bridge.
M-8	DROP	Northern bridge, AG land.
M-9	DROP	Northern bridge, AG land.
M-10	KEEP	Reasonable length, less populated impact (less proximity impact).
D-11	DROP	Low traffic countm AG land, Northern bridge.
D-12	DROP	AG land, Northern Bridge.
D-13	DROP	AG land.
D-14	DROP	Too far east, ag land.

CAG Members

Corcoran
Livingston (not present 3/22; on 5/5 Alternate: Richard Cridlebaugh)
Punke (not present 3/22; not present 5/5)
Schaer (not present 3/22; not present 5/5)
Schertz
Sinn

TABLE 8

Corridor	Status	Comments
P-1	DROP	North Bridge.
P-2	KEEP	Connectivity to 474, Best rating for improved traffic flow, traffic impact on McCluggage.
P-3	DROP	Poor east bound access for Washington, too much ROW.
P-4	DROP	Highest residential impact.
T-5	DROP	North bridge crossing.
T-6	KEEP	Better access to east (B/N) for Washinton.
T-7	KEEP	Better access to east (B/N) for Washinton, Scored highest most frequent.
M-8	DROP	North bridge crossing.
M-9	DROP	North bridge crossing.
M-10	KEEP	Better access to east (B/N) for Washington, E.D. opportunities both east & west for Washington.
D-11	DROP	North bridge crossing, Amount of AG land used, Too far out & distance traveled.
D-12	DROP	North bridge Crossing.
D-13	DROP	Too much AG land used, Too far out.
D-14	DROP	Follows existing roads.

CAG Members

Gee
Sorrel
Staab
Streid
VanWinkle

TABLE 9 -- IDOT Study Team Members

Corridor	Status	Comments
P-1	DROP	As compared to P-2: Land use plans, Travel flow, Relocations, ADT at River, Not as good for bikes, Higher wetlands, AG acres, Higher diagonal severance, Total ROW.
P-2	KEEP	As compared to P-1, P-4, P-3, and then T-6: Travel flow, Land use, High ADT, AG impacts, Low wetland impacts, ROW, Better for bikes, Medium residential relocations.
P-3	DROP	As compared to M-10: Residential relocations, Residential proximity effects, ROW, Forest, Steep terrain, Longer length.
P-4	DROP	As compared to P-2 or P-3: Higher residential relocations, Land use plans, EDC plans, Higher wetlands, Higher institutional relocations, Community cohesion.
T-5	DROP	As compared to T-6: Land use plans, EDC plans, Not as good for bikes, Residential Relocations, Wetlands, ROW, Lower ADT.
T-6	KEEP	As compared to T-7: Land use plans, EDC plans, Support for bikes, Residential relocations, Wetlands, Floodplain impacts, ROW, medium ADT, AG impacts.
T-7	KEEP	As compared to T-6: Land use plans, Regional mobility, Total ROW, AG impacts, Supports bikes, Medium to high ADT.
M-8	DROP	As compared to M-10: Higher residential relocations, Land use plans, EDC plans, Higher wetlands, Higher residential proximity effects, More forest, more total ROW, Lower ADT
M-9	DROP	As compared to M-10: Less support of Land Use, Less support of EDC Plans, More Wetlands, More Residential relocations, More ROW, Lower ADT.
M-10	KEEP	As compared to M-8 and/or M-9: High land use rating, EDC Plans, Good mobility, Wetlands, Low residential relocations, Low forest impacts, Low residential proximity impacts, Lower total ROW.
D-11	DROP	As compared to D-12: More AG areas, Lower ADT, Longer length, More total ROW.
D-12	DROP	As compared to D-13: Less support of Land Use, Less support of EDC Plans, More Wetlands, More Residential relocations, More forest, More ROW, Lower ADT, Longer length, More residential proximity effects.
D-13	DROP	As compared to M-10: Less support of land use, Less support of multimodal hubs, Less mobility, More residential relocations, More historic sites affected, Lower ADT, Less travel flow.
D-14	DROP	As compared to T-7: Less regional mobility, Less support for bikes, More AG land affected, More residential relocations, More floodplain acres, More institutional relocations, More total ROW, Less improved travel flow, More construction cost, Longer length, Lower ADT.

IDOT Study Team Members

Lacy, Larson, Lewis, McGinn