



**SPRINGFIELD RAILROAD CORRIDOR STUDY
PUBLIC OFFICIALS ADVISORY GROUP MEETING SUMMARY
FEBRUARY 19, 2010, 9:30 – 11:30 A.M.**

Overview

The first meeting of the Springfield Railroad Corridor Study Public Officials Advisory Group (POAG) was held at 9:30 am on Friday, February 19, 2010 at Hanson Professional Services Inc. Eight participants and five members of the study team attended the two-hour meeting, which served as the official launch of the study's public involvement program. The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Acquaint advisory group members with the study team;
- Explain the study's purpose, activities and timeline;
- Describe the study's public involvement program;
- Review the roles and responsibilities of advisory group members; and
- Discuss the study's upcoming community outreach activities.

Jimmie Austin, of Hanson Professional Services, opened the meeting with an introduction of the study team and a brief description of team members' responsibilities. He then invited meeting attendees to state their organizational affiliations and share their reasons for joining the POAG. A list of meeting participants is presented below.

Advisory Group Members:

| | |
|---|--|
| J. Richard Alsop III | Architect of the Capitol |
| Jim Donelan | Executive Assistance, Office of the Mayor |
| Hon. Raymond Poe | Representative, 99 th District – Illinois |
| | General Assembly |
| Judy Hines (on behalf of Hon. Aaron Schock) | Congressman, 18 th District, Illinois |
| Hon. Gail Simpson | Springfield City Council |
| Norman Sims | Springfield-Sangamon County Regional |
| | Planning Commission |
| Doris Turner | Sangamon County Board |
| Ernie Slottag | City of Springfield |

Study Team Members:

| | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Jimmie Austin (Hanson) | Leann Smart (Vector) |
| Rebecca Bennett (Vector) | Atia Thurman (Vector) |
| Kevin Seals (Hanson) | |

Corridor Study's Technical Program

After learning about POAG members' participation interests and desires, Kevin Seals, the study's environmental and public engagement lead, gave a 25-minute presentation on the

study's technical components. Copies of his PowerPoint presentation were provided to attendees, but presentation highlights included:

- An introduction to the study team and the project's key decision-makers;
- A review of the study's history, purpose and need;
- An explanation of the study's deliverables, main components, process and timeline;
- A discussion of the study team's current technical activities;
- A look at existing (2010) and projected (2020) rail traffic in Springfield; and
- An exploration of the study's next steps.

In response to Mr. Seals' presentation, POAG members offered both questions and comments. Where appropriate, study team members provided answers and feedback. The exchanges are summarized on the following pages.

| POAG Member Questions/Comments | Study Team Responses |
|--|---|
| 1. What is the Federal Railroad Administration's (FRA's) track record for accepting a recommendation from a study like this? | We will be working with the FRA continuously throughout the study process. The agency will oversee our study and will likely view our recommendation favorably provided that we follow federal guidelines. At this point, we are still working to set up a meeting with agency officials. |
| 2. We have been in contact with GE officials about the sensitivity of their medical equipment to sound vibrations. We can give you their contact information. | We will follow-up with you to get the contact information. |
| 3. With regard to the bridges, will there be drawings of overpasses and underpasses in addition to what's here [referring to traffic charts]? | We are considering the installation of over and underpasses at certain crossings. We will provide designs of what these structures may look like. Later, we'll have RDG work on possible aesthetics treatments for the structures. |
| 4. How do you justify this time line? | Our 16-month timeline is very aggressive. We are moving quickly so that our study can be completed before the expected changes in rail traffic, especially High Speed Rail (HSR). We are working closely with the city, county, state and Senator Durbin's office to stay on schedule. |
| 5. We have concerns about the validity of the train counts. First, some traffic is very seasonal, like grain, syrup, and autos. Second, I don't think anyone has a good handle on what traffic Union Pacific's (UP's) Joliet facility will generate. | We conducted our initial rail traffic counts to get a sense of existing conditions. You are right, however, that traffic is seasonal and that other considerations have to be made when validating our numbers. Regarding future traffic, we based our estimates on the railroads' projections. |

| POAG Member Questions/Comments | Study Team Responses |
|--|---|
| 6. On the timing for the crossings, did you just consider the time it takes for the train to clear the crossing or did you count from when the signal starts and ends? | We began counting when the crossing arm came down and finished when the arm went back up. |
| 7. We don't really have any control over the freight schedule, do we? Can we ask the railroads about their scheduling? | You are correct that we don't control the railroads or their schedules. We can always inquire about their plans, but we can't direct them. |
| 8. The railroads won't even tell you when they are going to come through. | One reason why they are hesitant to share their schedules has to do with security measures since 9/11. To get our information, we had to sit along the tracks and count. |
| 9. Another issue you have is all three tracks running trains at different speeds. They run slower on 19 th Street. | You are correct. The trains do run at different speeds. Along the 19 th Street corridor, the trains run slower, but they are also longer. |
| 10. Looking at the slide on 2020 passenger traffic for UP at Jefferson, why is the delay time shorter than for 2010? | The 2020 slide assumes that the introduction of HSR passenger service will decrease passenger train delays. |
| 11. So, the changes in delay times are likely the result of track upgrades? Currently, trains often have to slow down because of poor track conditions. Will upgrades make a big difference? | You are right that track conditions matter. However, the train count that we performed and the projections that we made only took into consideration existing track conditions. |
| 12. Aren't delays also determined by train speed? | You are correct. |
| 13. With regard to the train counts, when we looked, we ended up with higher numbers than you did. We counted in the summer and there is more auto and agriculture traffic throughout the summer. Trying to set a baseline is tough. What we found was not what we were hearing from IDOT (Illinois Department of Transportation). | As we proceed through our study, we will take more factors and variables into account. |

| POAG Member Questions/Comments | Study Team Responses |
|--|---|
| 15. Several issues are important to stress here. First, we were concerned that the earlier study didn't deal with community externalities and only focused on cost benefit analyses. Second, this study needs to address consistency and inconsistency with various plans (plans for the City, medical district, capitol complex, and bikes and greenways). Third, Metro Sanitary District is considering a plan to separate storm sewers from the sanitary system. This would affect the Old Town Branch Sewer and a railroad corridor. | Our study will work closely with the Regional Planning Commission and others to ensure that we are taking all of these issues and plans into consideration. |
| 16. Also, you'll have to consider some risk issues that arise as a result of additional freight traffic running along the corridors. These risks include possible derailment, spills and contamination. | These are the kind of issues that we'll hear more about as we get other agencies involved in the study. |
| 17. Kudos on your sound vibration guys, they are the best. | Thank you for the compliment. |

Corridor Study's Public Engagement Program

Rebecca Bennett, of Vector Communications, facilitated the portion of the presentation on the study's public engagement program. As the manager of public engagement, she covered the following topics:

- Vector's public engagement principles;
- The study's public engagement goals and target audiences;
- Internal and external stakeholder relations;
- Community and media relations;
- Advisory groups' roles, responsibilities and structure;
- Outreach activities in March and April; and
- How to contact the study team.

Following Ms. Bennett's presentation, POAG members put forth comments and questions, which she and other members of the study team addressed. The exchanges are summarized on the next page.

| POAG Member Questions/Comments | Study Team Responses |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|
|--------------------------------|----------------------|

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. One of the things that the City can offer is to put study information, presentations and video materials on the public access channel. | This is great. We will follow-up with you about raising the study's visibility in the community. |
| 2. If you have information that you could put in board members' packets, they can help you pass information along to their constituents. | This is a great way of getting the word out. |

Next Steps

The next POAG meeting will be held on Friday, April 16, 2010 from 9:30 am until 11:30 am at Hanson Professional Services Inc. More details about this meeting will be provided closer to the meeting date.