

Minutes of Coordination Meeting  
Brighton to Bunker Hill Road - FAS 736  
District 6

Date: September 09, 2008

Location: Local Roads and Streets – District 6 Office

Macoupin County

Section: Section 01-00080-00-FP/Project No. RS-0736(111)

Attendance: Ms. Robin Helmerichs, P.E. FHWA  
Mr. Gary J. Galecki P.E. IDOT Central Bureau of LR&S  
Mr. Terry Fountain, P.E. IDOT District 6 LR&S  
Ms. Kim Cummins, P.E. IDOT District 6, LR&S  
Mr. Tom Reinhart, P.E. Macoupin County Highway Department  
Curt Westrich, P.E. Heneghan & Associates

1. An overview of the project was given as follows. The improvements for the project consists of approximately 9.7 miles of rural cross section consisting of two 12' HMA traffic lanes with 6' rock shoulders, replacing adjacent and crossroad culverts, replacing two bridges, horizontal and vertical realignments to meet policy/improve safety, adding 4 left turn lanes, improvements to the railroad crossing, and the purchase of ROW on about 80 parcels.
2. The construction scheduling of the proposed improvements was discussed at length. The project is currently planned for the Phase I and II engineering to be done in one phase per the Macoupin County Board's directive. IDOT said that they will review and approve the PDR for the entire project. At this time there is only \$2,000,000 set aside for this project and the most recent construction cost estimate indicated the project would cost \$20,000,000. Therefore IDOT indicated that they would not begin review of a PS&E submittal for the entire project until they know that sufficient funds are available to complete it. Macoupin County needs to have the needed funding available before IDOT will program the project. IDOT suggested that the available \$2,000,000 be used for purchasing the entire ROW needed for the project or break out a portion of the project to be constructed with these available funds. IDOT will review PS&E submittals for this smaller portion of the project provided that adequate funds will be available for programming. Terry Fountain indicated that he is willing to meet with County representatives to discuss this if desired.
3. Discussions were also held concerning the use of HBP funds with the HPP funds. These two funds can be used on the project as long as the pay items are broken out separately for the two different funds. IDOT will verify if the two bridges are eligible for HBP funds.

4. Robin Helmerichs indicated that there may be a requirement for value engineering on this project based on the estimated construction cost. *(Since this meeting she has found out that it will not be required for this project per an email sent on 9/9/08.)*
5. The realignment of the Market Street intersection near the railroad crossing adjacent to the Village of Brighton was discussed. Tom Reinhart indicated that he wanted to do a Jurisdiction Transfer of the road west of the railroad tracks from Brighton Township to Macoupin County. Tom would also like to do a jurisdictional transfer of the extension of North Market Street from Macoupin County to Brighton Township or the the City of Brighton. Macoupin County will try to get these items coordinated and the approvals required.
6. The comment concerning the contiguous sections ability to accommodate truck traffic was discussed and IDOT indicated that doing a field visit to look at these roads to determine the condition and to make a determination would be adequate. It was mentioned that no plans were available for these sections and that the proposed project would not change the truck traffic that currently exists. IDOT will look at these roads functional classifications and give further advice as to what needs to be done to address this comment.
7. The railroad crossing was discussed. Robin Helmerichs indicated that there may be some funding available for the RR Crossing if it qualifies based on past accidents.
8. The cemetery was discussed in detail.
  - It is a family cemetery and one family owns both the cemetery and the parcel of land around the cemetery. Based on the title searches done it appears that the parcel around the cemetery has dedicated ROW for the Brighton to Bunker Hill Road. However the cemetery parcel does not appear to have dedicated ROW for Brighton to Bunker Hill Road. Though no ROW dedication documents were found for the cemetery parcel it was discussed that the ROW would be there by adverse possession. The property owner was at the public meeting and was agreeable to the improvements because they did not feel there would be any adverse impacts.
  - Robin Helmerichs indicated that a signoff may be required for the cemetery and that she would verify this. *(Since this meeting she has found out that it will not be required for this project per an email sent on 9/9/08.)*.
  - The plans and x-sections in this area were reviewed. The cemetery appears to be located at the top of the hill while the area impacted by the improvements is on a steep cut bank adjacent to the roadway. This area will require some fill due to the raised profile of the road. Between 15' and 25' of ROW outside of the adjacent ROW will be needed in the cemetery property.

9. Public participation was discussed
  - The public meeting that was held on February 21, 2008. Those in attendance indicated they were in favor of the improvements and many gave input on past safety problems. Some of this input was instrumental in making additional revisions to the plans to adequately address concerns that were brought up to us at the meeting.
  - The February 21, 2008 Public Informational meeting was advertised in the newspaper but did not have individual letters sent to each property owner adjacent to the roadway improvements. Notifying the property owners is a requirement and may require registered letters.
  - It was decided to hold another public meeting before the Final PDR is submitted.
10. The 2' shoulders from Sta. 449+30 to Sta. 452+25 through Woodburn was discussed. Due to the location of houses in this area there is not adequate area for ROW to include the 6' shoulders as shown on the rest of the project. When considering that this particular area has a 30 mph speed limit IDOT indicated that they would give a design variance for this.
11. The front and back slopes adjacent to the road were discussed. The front slopes are at a 1:3 slope except for some small sections that are at a 1:2 slopes. The improvements will consist of guardrails where required due to slope steepness or depth of ditches. This will be addressed more thoroughly in the PDR.
12. IDOT verified that the environmental status of the project is currently waiting on a plant survey before this item can be completed. This plant survey should be completed by the end of September.

Respectfully Submitted,



Curtis A. Westrich, P.E.