



## MEETING MINUTES

Date: December 2, 2021  
Meeting: City of Washington Farm Creek Trunk Sewer Project –  
Pudik Family with Aptim and HCE Meeting  
10 a.m. at HCE and Zoom

Meeting Attendees:

Brett Pudik	<a href="mailto:bpudik@ameritech.net">bpudik@ameritech.net</a>
Case Pudik	<a href="mailto:cpudik@pudick.com">cpudik@pudick.com</a>
Troy Pudik <i>via Zoom</i>	<a href="mailto:tpudik@emrslaw.com">tpudik@emrslaw.com</a>
Christina Seibert, Aptim	<a href="mailto:christina.seibert@aptim.com">christina.seibert@aptim.com</a>
Devin Moose, Aptim <i>via Zoom</i>	<a href="mailto:devin.moose@aptim.com">devin.moose@aptim.com</a>
Dennis Carr, City of Washington <i>via Zoom</i>	<a href="mailto:dcarr@ci.washington.il.us">dcarr@ci.washington.il.us</a>
Howard Hamilton, HCE	<a href="mailto:hhamilton@hccemail.org">hhamilton@hccemail.org</a>
Kristen Hamilton, HCE	<a href="mailto:khamilton@hccemail.org">khamilton@hccemail.org</a>

1. The meeting commenced at 10 am (in person and via Zoom) with introductions per the Attendee List above.
2. The Agenda presented by Christina Seibert via email this morning was reviewed, and the meeting progressed per the Agenda (attached):
3. Howard Hamilton gave a brief overview of the project approach presented to the City.
  - Collect Data
    - HCE has City, Strand and some Austin information compiled
    - HCE has a computer model of the sewer system developed
    - Any information from this group will be valuable
  - Interview City Staff
  - Interview Homeowners
    - Walk the alignment with stakeholders – very valuable
  - Draft Report
  - Report Revisions
  - Public Hearing
  - Final Draft Report
  - Presentation to Council
  - Final Report

Howard also explained that a survey to City residents re: the project and a website to make all information available are in development.

- These tools for transparency will be promoted via City website and social media, with other options to be identified such as local newspaper
- Security of survey responses will be addressed by developer

4. Brett Pudik gave a brief history of the project from the owner perspective, including discussion of the Route B alignment.
5. Brett discussed the data provided via jump drive
  - Listed per the Agenda
  - Brett developed spreadsheets for several comparisons including cost
  - Howard said he may ask for Excel versions of some of the spreadsheets
  - Howard also stated the Wetland report will be valuable
6. Alternative alignments were discussed
  - More alignments/options may be reviewed than those presented to date
  - Howard discussed the evaluation of alignments/options is typically subjected to a first level review of cost and increase in area served, then a variety of second level priorities as presented in both the Agenda Item 7. and in HCE presentation to the City
  - Howard also noted that the City is proud to be a **growing community**, and that their Planner is working on a new Comprehensive Plan
7. Parameters for evaluation of alignments were discussed
8. Next steps were discussed:
  - a. Transparency and communication are key priorities for all stakeholders – Goat Springs LLC/Aptim will be glad to answer questions and help as needed, while HCE stressed the same – call Howard directly if you have questions.
  - b. Transparency and communication will help build consensus, which the City fully supports, and all parties agreed that the City taking this step for a third-party analysis is a good thing
  - c. Howard will review all information submitted
  - d. HCE will work with the City and the Homeowners to set a date for the walk-through in the near future
  - e. HCE will keep Goat Springs/Aptim apprised of the survey/website schedule
  - f. All communications should be copied to City/Dennis Carr



---

**City of Washington Farm Creek Trunk Sewer Replacement:  
Third Party Alternatives Analysis  
Meeting Agenda - Goat Springs, LLC / APTIM and Hamilton Consulting Engineers  
December 2, 2021**

1. Attendee Introductions
2. Overview of Meeting Objectives
  - a. Understand analysis approach and data to be used by Hamilton
  - b. Discuss concerns with proposed Route B alignment
  - c. Review data and information being provided to Hamilton by Goat Springs / APTIM team
  - d. Review potential alternative alignments developed by Goat Springs
  - e. Discuss evaluation parameters to be applied to all alternatives
  - f. Discuss next steps / opportunities for landowners to remain involved in project
3. Third Party Alternatives Analysis by Hamilton
  - a. Analysis approach / scope of work review
  - b. Data sources to be considered (existing and new)
  - c. Process / factors to be used to identify evaluation parameters (discussion of potential parameters under Agenda Item 7)
  - d. Public information and input opportunities (meetings, website, survey)
  - e. Final Report – Technical Components
  - f. Schedule
4. Concerns with Proposed Route B Alignment
  - a. Farm Creek influence and floodplain impact – Project purpose
  - b. Permanent impacts to environmental assets – US waters (Farm Creek/jurisdictional wetlands), remnant oak/hickory forest and threatened and endangered species
  - c. Scope of Permitting and Mitigation Requirements – USACE/IEPA/IDNR/ISHPO
  - d. Impact of constructability constraints posed by alignment – duration of construction and project costs/scope of contingencies
  - e. Lack of access to and from alignment – temporary (construction) and permanent (O&M)
  - f. Impact on scope and timing of STP-2/influent pumping station improvements
  - g. Assessments and surveys to be completed – Tree Assessment/Archaeological Survey
  - h. Potential for further project delays/challenges
  - i. Source of funding and funding requirements – Illinois Water Pollution Control Loan Program regulations and requirements – submittals/timing/terms of financing
  - j. Project construction and O&M costs – impact of items 4(a) – 4(i)
5. Data / Information Being Provided by Goat Springs / APTIM Team
  - a. Communications with agencies and City of Washington
  - b. Initial project design criteria presented by Strand / City of Washington
  - c. Comparison Data
    - i. Costs [FCTS – Cost Comparison Table, Project Cost Breakdown – Strand, Strand Route Comparison Table – OPCC dated July 26, 2021]
    - ii. Project Area Map – Final

- iii. Trunk Sewer Route Comparison Matrix – July 21, 2021
  - iv. Trunk Sewer Route Comparison Table – August 1, 2021
- d. Preliminary Analysis
- i. Select Practicable Alternatives [Practicable Alternatives Analysis – January 26, 2021, Select Figures – January 22, 2021, References, Route D-1 Profile]
  - ii. All Route Evaluation Matrix – January 31, 2021
  - iii. Routes Appendix – January 30, 2021
  - iv. Select Trunk Sewer Route Comparison Matrix – Practicable Alternatives – January 22, 2021
- e. Route B
- i. Cost Data
    - Quality Assessment – October 26, 2021 [Additional Trenchless & Tree Removal Pricing Category Detail, Forest Detail, Costs per Strand Drawings, Costs per Strand Original, and Costs with Tree BMPs & Strand Drawings]
    - Strand’s Project Cost Breakdown – October 2019
    - Strand’s Route Comparison OPCC – July 26, 2021
  - ii. Environmental Data
    - Forest [Forest vs. Open Access Corridors/ROW, Environmental Documents]
    - Illinois Forestry Association Board of Directors letter dated August 5, 2021
    - Forest Best Management Practices – Illinois Forestry Association – October 21, 2021
    - Wetlands – See separate Wetlands folder
  - iii. Route Data
    - Data & Cost Analysis – October 26, 2021
    - Data Sheet (rev. October 26, 2021)
  - iv. Strand Profile Drawings and Scope of Work
    - Pre-Final Drawings dated January 29, 2021
    - Markup of March 31, 2016 Scope of Work Letter with miscellaneous public meeting minutes
- f. Route E-3
- i. Cost Data
    - Forest Detail – October 26, 2021
    - Costs per Strand July 26, 2021 OPCC (rev. by Goat Springs, LLC – October 26, 2021)
    - Strand’s Project Cost Breakdown – October 2019
    - Strand’s Route Comparison OPCC – July 26, 2021
  - ii. Profile – Route E-3
  - iii. Route Data
    - Data & Cost Analysis – October 26, 2021
    - Data Sheet (rev. October 26, 2021)

- g. Route L-1
    - i. Cost Data
      - Forest Detail – October 26, 2021
      - Costs per Strand format & minimum trenchless (rev. by Goat Springs, LLC – October 26, 2021)
      - Costs per Strand format & tree BMPs (rev. by Goat Springs, LLC – October 26, 2021)
    - ii. Topo and Profile – Route L-1
    - iii. Route Data
      - Data & Cost Analysis – October 26, 2021
      - Route Sheet – June 23, 2021
      - Data Sheet (rev. October 26, 2021)
    - iv. Route L-1 Hybrid Routes
      - Route L-3 Topo & Profile
      - Route L-2 Map-Data-Cost June 23, 2021
      - Route L-3 Map-Data-Cost June 23, 2021
  - h. Wetlands Documents and USACE Correspondence
  - i. Archaeological Study
6. Alternative Alignments Identified by Goat Springs
- a. Route locations
  - b. Factors impacting location of alternative routes
    - i. Farm Creek crossings
    - ii. Wetland and floodplain areas
    - iii. Forested areas
    - iv. Open access corridors
    - v. Permitting and agency approvals
    - vi. Permanent impacts to landowner property (environmental assets, use)
    - vii. Access – Temporary construction and permanent (O&M)
    - viii. Cost (initial and life-cycle)
    - ix. Consistency with municipal, county, and related agency planning objectives
7. Potential Parameters to be Applied to Evaluate Alternatives
- a. Design
    - i. Number of Farm Creek crossings and percent of route through floodplains
    - ii. Percent of route through remnant woodland/forest/timber property
    - iii. Percent of route through jurisdictional wetlands
    - iv. Manholes (number, depth)
    - v. Tributary sewers (number of extensions, impact of extensions, trenchless construction, Farm Creek and RR crossings)
    - vi. Number of RR crossings

- vii. Topography/Elevation constraints (trenchless vs. open cut/linear access)
- viii. Need for influent pumping station replacement (initially vs. deferred)
  
- b. Constructability
  - i. Percent of route through open access corridors vs. forested areas
  - ii. Number of Farm Creek encounters (installation of pipe/access)
  - iii. Approvals and/or permits required
  - iv. Access – existing ROW/easements granted to City
  - v. Mitigation and restoration of disturbed areas
  - vi. Duration of construction
  - vii. Project cost contingency(ies)
  
- c. Environmental
  - i. Wetlands
  - ii. Farm Creek and floodplains (I&I, sewer overflow)
  - iii. Forested areas
  
- d. Restoration / mitigation
  - i. Trees
  - ii. Wetlands
  - iii. Existing use disturbance
  
- e. Operations and maintenance
  - i. Accessibility - particularly during / after storm events
  - ii. Maintenance of Farm Creek crossings
  - iii. Existing trunk sewer decommissioning
  
- f. Costing
  - i. Construction
  - ii. Post-construction mitigation / land recovery
  - iii. Operations and maintenance
  
- g. Other
  - i. Potential for landowner delay/challenge – analysis of each landowner parcel for the route
    - Scope of permanent impacts of trunk sewer improvements to use of property
    - Existing sanitary sewer easements/public ROW
    - Synergistic opportunities for abandonment of easements, improvements to tributary crossings, future use of sanitary sewer for property development
  
- 8. Next Steps for Landowner Involvement
  - a. Opportunity(ies) and participants
  - b. Timing