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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Adams County Greenways & Bikeways Plan is part of an on-going effort to preserve green space and promote recreational bikeways within Adams County and Tri-State Region. In 1999 the City of Quincy adopted the Quincy Greenways & Bikeways Plan, which identified twelve (12) bikeway corridors within the jurisdictions of the City of Quincy and the Quincy Park District. These corridors included shared roadways, striped bicycle lanes and separate multi-use trails.

In addition to Adams County, City of Quincy and Quincy Park District, three (3) other entities have expressed strong interest and are participating financially with the development of this Greenways & Bikeways Master Plan. The Coalition includes: Friends of the Trails, Great River Economic Development Foundation (GREDF) and The Quincy Bicycle Club.

The planning process included several steps: 1) identification of existing natural resources such as green spaces and floodplains within Adams County; 2) identification of cultural and historic points of interest; 3) identification of major attractors and generators for biking and walking routes as well as potential safety problems; 4) development of goals, policies and objectives, including public input and one public open house; 5) development of a corridor rating system and rating of proposed segments/corridors; and 7) development of a Greenway & Bikeway Master Plan for Adams County and the Coalition. The proposed bikeway system is a combination of County roads, paved shoulders and separate multi-use trails.

The master plan recommends 14 primary corridors, many with spur routes to specific points of interest or to provide smaller sub-loops. The corridors provide access to the many rural communities within Adams County. Attractors such as Siloam Springs State Park (and adjacent Wildwood Girl Scout Camp in Brown County), Schools, Wildwood and Saukenak Scout Camps, Mississippi River, and most of the rural towns and villages, are linked.

Implementation is recommended in the form of an ongoing plan, constructing the highest priority corridors first; or as local funding/grants allow. As County roads are developed, upgraded or maintained, corridors identified in this plan should be upgraded as needed to accommodate bicycles and alternative modes of
transportation. For instance, this plan identifies some roads that need to have paved shoulders added to allow for safe usage by bicyclists and some roads that would require paving thus allowing bicyclists to avoid major highways or high traffic roads.

I PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

The plan was developed to assist Adams County in identifying and preserving potential greenways and integrating existing bike and walking paths into a regional network. As development continues to occur in the County, it is important to preserve existing natural resources where possible. Opportunities for greenways exist along the major creeks within the County, including Mill Creek, Bear Creek, and McKee Creek (see figures 1 and 2).

Most of these greenways are privately owned and would require land acquisition and/or easements if used as a separate trail route. Many of the proposed routes cross these greenways and, therefore, the greenways are points of interest for those trail routes.
The plan, in accordance with IDNR requirements, includes the following:

- Prioritization of proposed bikeway routes and implementation
- Identification of priority greenways and bikeways in the planning area that are feasible and have apparent support
- Identification of priority activities or projects within the identified greenways (trails, paved shoulders, roads needing pavement, land acquisition, etc.), some of which may be eligible for funding through the IDNR’s existing grant programs or other road funding sources
- Consideration of greenway & bikeway linkages to attractions and designations, including IDNR sites, other state sites, major existing or planned bikeways, within and near the immediate planning area, as applicable
II ANÁLÍTICO APPROACH

The planning process involved the following processes:

1) Identification of existing natural resources such as green spaces and floodplains within Adams County,

2) Identification of cultural and historic points of interest,

3) Identification of major attractors and generators for biking and walking routes as well as with potential safety problems,

4) Development of goals, policies and objectives, based in part on input by plan participants and public meeting/questionnaires,

5) Development of a corridor rating system and rating of proposed segments/corridors,

6) Summarization of planning results and recommendations in a Greenway & Bikeways Master Plan for Adams County.

��色路径/自然资源

The identification of natural resources, both woodland and floodplain, were developed by reviewing FEMA floodplain data, Adams County Geographic Information Systems (GIS) digital ortho photography, and State of Illinois Department of Natural Resources information (See Appendix A). Four (4) major linear greenways were identified within the County. First, the Mississippi River traverses along the west edge of Adams County. The river provides numerous opportunities for recreation and points of interest. Some of these include Locks and Dams 20 (at Meyer) & 21 (at Quincy); Gardner Woods, Triangle Lake, and numerous riverfront parks. Second, Bear Creek outlets to the Mississippi River at the north end of the county. The watershed for this natural greenway extends through the Ursa and Loraine area. Proposed bikeways corridors, including the north levee bikeway, cross this greenway allowing for viewing opportunities. Third, McKee Creek is located between Camp Point and Liberty and traverses along the south edge of Siloam Springs State Park. This natural greenway intersects a number of the proposed bikeway routes allowing for interpretive opportunities where connected to public land. Fourth, Mill Creek extends from the Columbus/Coatsburg area to southeast of Quincy. A portion of this riparian corridor could provide for an off road multi-use trail between State Street and southeast Quincy. A separate multi-
use trail could also traverse Mill Creek between State Street and Ellington Road. Ellington Road connects to the Cedar Creek extension via 36th Street. Therefore, an additional multi-use trail loop could be provided.

## Cultural & Historic Resources

Cultural and Historic points of interest have been identified throughout the County. This data was assembled from the GIS system, Visitors Bureau Brochures and local knowledge. Detailed Points of Interest are described in Appendix B.

![Figure 3- Prairie Mills Windmill](Golden, Illinois)
Major Attractors & Generators

Major attractors were identified, including Cultural and Historic points of interest, cities & Villages, parks, schools, and residential areas. Generators include cities and villages around the county. These include: Quincy, Ursa, Lima, Loraine, Mendon, Coatsburg, Camp Point, Golden, LaPrairie, Clayton, Columbus, Liberty, Payson, and Plainville, among others. Other major attractors include natural resources, parks, golf courses, landmarks, and historical points of interest, among others. Figure 3 is a photograph of the Prairie Mills Windmill in Golden, Illinois.

Project Safety and Legal Issues

Safety problems were discussed with the County and the Adams County Sheriffs Department. Several significant safety problems were identified. The primary concern expressed by the County is the liability resulting from the designation of county roads as bicycle routes. There is case law on record where townships have been held liable for bicycle accidents resulting from potholes or other road related obstacles. HB-4907 declares that a person riding a bicycle is an intended and permitted user of any highway in Illinois except for a highway on which bicycle use has been specifically prohibited by law and the prohibition is indicated by appropriate signage. It provides that the new language does not create liability for any public entity for the failure to remedy any surface condition of a highway that is hazardous to a person riding a bicycle if that surface condition is not hazardous to a passenger car. Provides that, except as expressly provided by law, the new language does not impose an obligation to further improve existing highways or to maintain them to a higher standard for bicyclists. This bill and similar legislation have not been successful to date. Some type of legislation that would clearly define the liability for Adams County townships and municipalities is recommended as an action plan for Adams County officials.

Goals, Policies & Objectives

Questionnaires were distributed to key groups such as the Friends of the Trails, Quincy Bicycle Club, and interested citizens. Goals, policies and objectives were identified (Appendix C). Other previous
Greenway & Trail Plans, including the Quincy Greenways and Bikeways Plan and references such as AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities were reviewed for successful strategies.

As part of the policy review, desired design criteria was developed. Existing roadways, often with relatively inexpensive improvements, must serve as the base system to provide for the travel needs of bicyclists. Bicycle paths and lanes can augment this existing system in natural, scenic corridors, or places where access is limited. In general, separation of bicycles and pedestrian use is desired.

Planning for bicycle facilities must be conducted in conjunction with planning for other transportation needs. Often an improvement, which enhances bicycle travel, will also benefit other modes of travel. County highway improvements, through appropriate planning and design, can enhance bicycle travel (see figure 4). Plans for implementing bicycle projects must be in harmony with the community’s overall goal for transportation improvements, which in turn, should be consistent with overall community goals.

Figure 4- Paved Shoulder Needed along State Street

In general, bicycle trip purposes can be divided into two broad types - utilitarian and recreational. For a bicyclist on a utilitarian trip, the primary objective is reaching a specific destination quickly with few interruptions. The bicycle is simply the chosen mode of transportation. On the other hand, a bicyclist on a recreational trip is riding for pleasure. The destination is of less importance. Local promotion of tourism and historical/cultural points of interest may increase recreational trips in our community. For many trips, these purposes are not absolute or mutually exclusive. That is, most trips will have some utilitarian and some recreational purposes. New bicycle facilities, therefore, should be designed to accommodate the needs of the anticipated mix of bicyclists, as well as pedestrian and other alternate transportation needs, such as equestrians and horse drawn buggies.
Bicycle lanes, wide curb lanes or shared roadways may be the best way to accommodate bicycle traffic along highway corridors, depending on traffic conditions and available rights-of-way (see figures 5 and 6).

Figure 5- Existing Paved Shoulder on HWY 104 Should Be Striped As a Bike Lane

Figure 6-Typical County Road Shared Roadway

On separate bike baths, the American Association of State Highway & Transportation Officials (AASHTO) recommends a width of 10 feet, or a minimum of 8 feet paved with 2 feet stone shoulders on each side (See Figure 7). A one directional lane should be 5 feet wide. A clearance of 8 feet and a minimum design speed of 20 mph are recommended. Grades are generally recommended to be less than 5% on paved surfaces, and less than 3% for crushed stone surfaces. Signage and markings are required. Lighting between 0.5 to 2 foot candles is desirable at roadway intersections.
**Multi-Use:**

According to AASHTO, multi-use paths are generally undesirable; bicycles and pedestrians do not mix well. Wherever possible, separate bicycle and pedestrian paths should be provided. If not feasible, additional width, signage and stripping should be used to minimize conflicts. Bicycle parking facilities are an essential element, both at trip origin and trip destinations.

**Trailheads:**

Ten (10) trailheads are proposed in several key locations throughout the County. These locations are listed below:

1) **Quincy Regional Airport or 5-Points** - This trailhead should be located adjacent to existing parking at the Airport or the existing parking lot at 5-points. Public input resulted in a 5-4 vote with the Airport location receiving five votes.

2) **Camp Point/Indian Trails Golf Course** - This trailhead could be located near the Golf Course.

3) **Payson** - This trailhead could be located at or near school property.
4) **Siloam Springs State Park** - This trailhead could utilize the existing parking lot serving the “Kids Fishing Pond” just south of the park entrance (see figure 8).

5) **Golden** - This trailhead could possibly be located at the Prairie Mills Windmill.

6) **Ursa** - This trailhead could be located at the bottom road west of Ursa.

7) **Mendon** - This trailhead could be located near the Highway 336 Interchange.

8) **Lima** - This trailhead could be located at the Lima public square.

9) **Liberty** - This trailhead could be located at the Liberty Park.

10) **Loraine** – Trailhead location to be determined

These locations coupled with the already planned trailheads around the City of Quincy would serve the County.

![Figure 8- Existing Parking Lot South of Siloam Springs Entrance- Proposed Trailhead Location](image)

Some of the benefits of these proposed locations include security (located within cities, villages, publicly managed properties, or highly visible areas), existing available parking, and county distribution. The Airport and Siloam Springs sites have existing available parking. Each proposed trailhead should include at a minimum a kiosk, large trail map, brochure/small map holder, bench and access to adjacent vehicular parking to allow for park and ride opportunities. Other optional amenities could include a bicycle rack, pay phone, lighting, and landscaping.
Maps:
Maps showing the designated County routes, rules of the road and bicycle safety tips would be provided at each trailhead and made available for distribution throughout the county. The maps could also identify the route lengths and points of interest along each route.

Operation & Maintenance:
Assignment of responsibilities for control, maintenance, and policies of bicycle facilities should be established prior to construction. A central contact person, for purposes of maintenance, should be identified. Responsibilities include coordination of regular sweeping, vegetation control, lane painting and signage maintenance.

Development of Corridor Rating System

Fourteen (14) primary corridors have been identified, along with four (4) destinations (see Appendix D – Corridor Plan). Numerous county road loops were first identified, but were reduced to the 14 primary loops or corridors. Many sub-loops or corridors would still be available for use, but would not be designated as a mapped corridor.

Corridors – Fourteen (14) main corridors are currently proposed. The first three (3) corridors and corridor 14 are proposed separate multi-use trails. The corridors are as follows:

1) Cedar Creek Extended – This trail is the extension of the existing Cedar Creek Linear Park corridor identified in the Quincy Greenways and Trails plan. This corridor would extend the Cedar Creek Linear Park from 36th Street to Cannonball Road. Land and/or easement acquisition would be required for development of this corridor. Eight (8) different property owners exist along this proposed corridor north of the railroad tracks. There have been no contacts made with these property owners to date. This could be an important multi-use trail connecting Cedar Creek to the county bikeway system and would provide another separate trail for use by bicyclists, families, and skaters. This
extension would be approximately 1.6 miles in length from 36th Street to Cannonball Road.

2) **Levee Corridor** – This corridor would also be a separate multi-use trail. The levee corridor would link the Quincy Riverfront Parks to the county bikeway system to the south via the Sny Drainage District Levee and north via the Indian Grave Drainage District levee system. The levee system would provide for unique riding and interpretive opportunities through the Mississippi River floodplain areas (see figure 9). This corridor could also connect to the Hannibal, Missouri bridge thus providing an Illinois-Missouri link. There are approximately 37.2 miles of levee corridor proposed in these drainage districts.

![Figure 9- Typical Levee Bikeway Corridor](image)

3) **Mill Creek Corridor** – Connecting Ellington Road to Herleman Road, this corridor would require easements and/or land acquisitions and would involve at least 19 property owners. This would provide another unique opportunity for a separate multi-use trail along a linear greenway. Mill Creek provides some very scenic rock outcroppings (see Figure 10). This multi-use trail would be approximately 13.54 miles in length. Points of interest would include Mill Creek and the Quincy Raceway.
4) **Century Corridor** – This Bikeway would provide the opportunity that many bicyclists strive to achieve. That is to complete a 100-mile ride. This 100-mile loop would connect Quincy, Ursa, Mendon, Golden, Clayton, Siloam Springs State Park, Liberty, and Payson utilizing county roads and highways around the perimeter of the county. A point was made to avoid high traffic roads and highways where possible, although some short segments would be required on highways. These include approximately 2 miles on Highway 61, 1.2 miles on Highway 336, 0.12 miles on U.S. Highway 24, and 0.75 miles on Highway 104. Where adequate paved shoulders do not exist on these highway segments, it is proposed that paved shoulders be added and striped with bike lanes, including signage. Highway crossings should also consider appropriate striping, signage, and/or signal lights.

5) **Ellington Road Corridor** – The Ellington Road Bikeway would connect Cannonball Road and Cedar Creek east to County Road 1600 which traverses along the west side of the airport. Then south to Highway 104, east to the Plainville Blacktop (county rd 1700), south to State Street, and State Street west to Quincy. This corridor, if looped, would be approximately 20.16 miles in length. Points of interest would include the Quincy Regional
Airport and Mill Creek. A paved shoulder or separate trail would need to be added along segments of State Street.

6) **Ursa-Mendon Corridor** – This bikeway would connect Ursa, Mendon, and Quincy. The route would connect from Ellington Road, north on 36th Street to Spring Lake Road, west to Bottom Road, north to Ursa, east to Mendon, and south on Highway 336 to U.S. Route 24, west on 24 to 1000th, then south to Ellington. Points of interest on this route would include Ursa, Mendon, and the Adams County Fairgrounds. This bikeway would be approximately 33.56 miles in length.

7) **Lima-Loraine Corridor** – This bikeway would originate from the Ursa trailhead, north on Bottom Road, east to Lima, east to Loraine on 2800th, south to Highway 336, southwest to Mendon, and west to Ursa on Highway 61. Where appropriate, paved shoulders should be added and striped for bike lanes, especially on the highway segments of this bikeway. Points of interest along this bikeway would be Ursa, Mendon, Lima, Loraine, Bear Creek, and a spur north to Nauvoo on the planned Mississippi River Trail (MRT, see figure 11). This bikeway would also provide for State bikeway connections through Hancock County. This bikeway would be approximately 37.36 miles in length.

![Figure 11- Great River Road MRT Connection](Photograph courtesy of the Nauvoo Tourism Office)

8) **Mendon-Loraine Corridor** – This bikeway would loop from Mendon on Hwy 336 to Loraine, then east on Hwy 61, then south on 1850th connecting to the Columbus-
Coatsburg Corridor. Points of interest along this loop would be Mendon, Loraine, South Fork of Bear Creek, and Byler Cemetery Prairie Savanna. This bikeway would be approximately 22.8 miles in length.

9) **Columbus-Coatsburg Corridor** – This bikeway would link Quincy, Mendon, Coatsburg, and Columbus. The bikeway would traverse north from the existing Columbus Road bike path to Ellington Road, then north on 1000th, east on Hwy 24 to Hwy 336, then north to Mendon, then north to Loraine, then east on Hwy 62, then south on 1850th, then south to Coatsburg & Columbus to Hwy 104, then west to Quincy. Points of interest include Mendon, Coatsburg, Columbus, Bear Creek, Quincy Regional Airport, and Mill Creek. This bikeway would be approximately 45.57 miles in length.

10) **Golden Corridor** – This bikeway would link Camp Point to Golden. The bikeway would traverse north out of Camp Point on 2300th, east on 2400th to Golden, south on Hwy 94 and loop back to Camp Point. Points of interest include Camp Point, Golden, Indian Trails Golf Course, Bailey Park and the Prairie Mills Windmill. This bikeway would be approximately 18.66 miles in length.

11) **Payson Corridor** – This bikeway would continue southeast from the south 48th Street extension to 1150th, then south and east to Payson, then east on 400th, north on the Plainville Blacktop (1700th) to State Street, then northwest to Quincy. Points of interest include Burton Creek Natural Area, Payson, and a spur to Plainville, Burton Cave, and Mill Creek. A spur from this bikeway would connect to Plainville and the Fall Creek Gorge. This bikeway would require 1150th to be paved, as it is currently a gravel road. This bikeway would be approximately 33.8 miles in length.

12) **Liberty Corridor** – This bikeway would connect Liberty, Siloam Springs, and the Fishhook area. The bikeway would traverse north from Liberty on 2100th, east on 900th to 2350th, north to Kellerville Blacktop, east to Siloam Springs State Park, then west to Liberty. Points of interest include Liberty, Siloam Springs State Park, Beverly, Fishhook, and McKee Creek. This bikeway would be approximately 34.86 miles in length.
13) **Camp Point Corridor** - This bikeway would continue east from 5-Points to the Camp Point blacktop, then north through Camp Point to 2400th, west to 1850th, and then south through Coatsburg and Columbus. Points of interest would include Camp Point, Coatsburg, Columbus, Indian Trails Golf Course, and Bailey Park. This bikeway would be approximately 33.06 miles in length.

14) **Utility Greenway Corridor** - This trail could be a separate multi-use trail traversing from Lima to Bluff Hall and would follow the existing overhead power lines. This trail would be on power company property or easements. Therefore, approvals from numerous landowners would be required. This trail would be approximately 26 miles in length.

### Corridor Rating

Upon identification of the proposed corridors, we chose to rate the corridors by using a system to identify each corridor as “high”, “medium”, or “low” priority. It is assumed that property easements would become more difficult and expensive to acquire over time. A higher priority was assigned to corridors requiring easements or land acquisition. Therefore, a high priority designation does not necessarily reflect importance but identifies the need for more work to implement. A lower priority corridor may be implemented ahead of a higher priority corridor if funding and/or road improvements occur on that specific corridor. Each category was rated using a 10, 5, 0 point system. A high priority item was assigned 10, medium priority 5, and low priority 0. Therefore, the corridors yielding the greatest number of points should be considered a higher priority than lower scoring corridors. The following characteristics were included in the rating system:

1) **Acquisition Factors**

   - Type of Ownership – Three (3) types of ownership were considered – Private, Public, and Semi-Public. A corridor owned by the Public or within public right-of-way was assigned a low priority, as the possibility of the corridor experiencing a property transfer would be unlikely. Likewise, semi-public was assigned a medium priority and private ownership assigned a high priority, as privately owned land may be sold or transferred frequently.
● Number of Owners – The number of owners was considered because the more owners involved along a corridor, the more difficult it could be to acquire land and/or right-of-way. Therefore, single ownership was assigned a low priority, 2 to 4 owners – medium priority, and 5 or more owners – high priority.

● Likelihood of Corridor Loss – This considered the potential time frame within which the proposed corridor ownership could change. Within 1 year was assigned a high priority, 2 to 5 years – medium priority, and more than 5 years-low priority.

2) Physical Factors

● Corridor Length – Longer corridors can be associated with broader recreational experiences and opportunities. Long corridors would also provide connections to more communities and points of interest within the county. Therefore, long corridors of more than 25 miles were given a high priority, 5 to 25 mile corridors were given medium priority, and less than 5-mile corridors were given low priority.

● Unique Characteristics – Since few greenways (separate from streets and roads) are found within the county, potential linear parks and greenways were given a high priority. Separate bike lanes (parallel to existing streets or roads) were given a medium priority and shared pavements were given a low priority.

● Ease of Accessibility – If a corridor is currently accessible, there would be no urgent need to address accessibility. Therefore, easily accessible corridors were given a low priority, semi-accessible corridors a medium priority, and non-accessible corridors a high priority.

● Gradient/Vertical Alignment (see Appendix E) – Gradient or vertical alignment of bike routes greatly affects the corridor difficulty. Since 0% to 5% slopes are the most desirable for the average bicyclist, proposed bikeway corridors having
gradients of 0% to 5% were assigned a high priority. Corridors having gradients of 6% to 10% were assigned a medium priority and corridors having gradients exceeding 10% were assigned a low priority.

- Surface (Paved vs. Gravel) – Paved surfaces are the most desirable for bicyclists utilizing on-road bicycles, although some bicyclists using off-road bicycles may prefer a non-paved surface. For the purpose of this study, it is anticipated that most users will be on-road bicyclists. Therefore, if a proposed corridor is already paved, it was assigned a low priority. Proposed corridors that are gravel were assigned a medium priority, as the road would need to be paved before it could accommodate the majority of users.

- Curvature/Horizontal Alignment – Horizontal alignment of proposed corridors is important. Some curvature is desirable to add interest to the bikeway. However, excessive curvature can cause safety problems resulting from decreased visibility. Therefore, proposed bikeway corridors having minimal curvature or a straight alignment were assigned a medium priority and corridors with excessive curvature and low visibility were assigned a low priority.

3) Corridor Use

- Rural vs. Urban – Urban corridors (within the village, town, or city limits) would be at the most risk to be altered due to development. Rural corridors (outside of village, town, or city limits) would have a lesser risk resulting from development. Therefore, urban corridors were given a high priority and rural corridors a low priority.

- Traffic Count – Traffic count is a very important safety factor for bicyclists, especially on shared roadways. Since the majority of the proposed bikeway corridors will be shared roadways, traffic count was used in the priority process. Corridors having a traffic count of 25 to 1150 vehicles per day were assigned a high priority and corridors with traffic counts of 1151 to 2650 were assigned a
medium priority. Finally, corridors with traffic counts greater than 2650 were assigned a low priority.

- Speed Limit – Speed limit is another safety factor affecting bicyclists sharing roads with motor vehicles. Highways with speed limits in excess of 55 mph are less desirable for bicycle use than 55 mph and less roadways. Therefore, proposed corridors utilizing roadways with speed limits less than 55 mph were assigned a high priority and corridors utilizing roads with 55 mph speed limits were assigned a medium priority. It should be noted that Adams County roads that do not have a posted speed limit are enforced at 55 mph according to the Adams County Sheriffs Department. Corridors utilizing State and U.S. highways with posted speed limits of 65 mph were assigned a low priority.

- Connections/Proximity to Cultural/Historical Points of Interest – This category was rated as follows:
  High Priority – National Register Sites, Historic Districts, and Regional Parks or sites.
  Medium Priority – Community Parks, Neighborhood Parks, or Wildlife Areas.
  Low Priority – Minimal Points of Interest

- Connection to Existing Trails –
  Yes - High Priority
  No – Low Priority

- Public Input – A questionnaire was provided at the public input meeting for this project. Respondents were asked to rank the proposed corridors as high, medium, or low priority. If the majority of respondents ranked a corridor as high priority, it was assigned a high priority. Likewise medium and low priorities were assigned based upon the majority of respondents.
INSERT CORRIDOR RATING SYSTEM TABLE 2
4) Based upon the above described rating system, the proposed corridors rate as follows:
(high priority 60-120 points, medium priority 40-59 points, low priority 0-39 points):

- **High Priority**
  - Cedar Creek Extension
  - Mill Creek Corridor
  - Levee Trail
  - Utility Greenway

- **Medium Priority**
  - Century Corridor
  - Lima-Loraine Corridor
  - Payson Corridor
  - Ursa-Mendon Corridor
  - Golden Corridor
  - Camp Point Corridor

- **Low Priority**
  - Ellington Road Corridor
  - Mendon-Loraine Corridor
  - Liberty Corridor
  - Columbus-Coatsburg Corridor

Land/Easement acquisition for high priority corridors should be addressed within the next couple of years due to potential corridor loss to development. A lower priority bikeway may be implemented ahead of a higher priority bikeway if funding and/or road improvements occur on that specific corridor.

- **Conclusions**

Based upon the informal public survey and the rating system, the following conclusions should be considered:

1) The four (4) multi-use trail corridors are a high priority and should be addressed first, since they involve land/easement acquisition and multiple landowners.
2) County and Township officials should address liability concerns as they relate to HB 4907 and future legislation. Policy should be reviewed to allow for implementation of the bikeway corridors.
3) Detailed trailhead locations should be identified and approved. If land acquisition or easements are required, they should be obtained as soon as possible with trailhead locations for high priority corridors receiving the highest priority. Medium and low priority corridor trailhead corridors should follow.
4) Medium and low priority corridors should be developed as soon as funding is available.
**Recommendations:**

The plan recommends fourteen (14) corridors, along with spur routes to specific points of interest, to be developed as part of a 10-Year Implementation Schedule. The High Priority bikeways should proceed as soon as land easements and/or contributions can be coordinated. The medium and Low Priority Bikeways are primarily on public right-of-way and can proceed when County/State funding is allocated. Work on medium and low priority bikeways consists mainly of signage, pavement markings, completion of sidewalks (pedestrian access on existing right-of-way) and public safety improvements at intersections and highway crossings. Final trailhead locations should be identified and approved to allow for installation when the specific corridor is developed. Potential funding sources should be identified and pursued.
III. GOALS, POLICIES & OBJECTIVES

Goals, policies and objectives can be divided into six (6) planning elements:

1) Greenway/Trail Acquisition
2) Government Policies and Regulations
3) Recreation-Park District Projects
4) Resource Management
5) Economic Development – Tourism & Business Development
6) Transportation Coordination

☐ Greenway/Bikeway Acquisition

- Continue effort of voluntary land donations and conservation easements started with the Cedar Creek Linear Park effort
- Apply for funding as opportunities arise
- Budget bikeway acquisitions and development money in the County’s Capital Improvement Plan
- Use conservation easements (75 to 100 feet each side of stream) to preserve the floodplain, and promote future corridors: Mill Creek, Bear Creek and McKee Creek.

☐ Government Policies & Regulations

- Include amenities for bicyclists in all County road improvements projects that are completed on designated corridors
- Use stormwater management practice to create greenways.
- Amend the County Subdivision Ordinance to promote a connected greenway and bikeway system.
- Preserve identified greenways in new development.
- **Recreation**
  - Continue intergovernmental cooperation in acquisition and management of bikeways throughout the region
  - Provide County trailheads to promote access to the proposed corridors and points of interest
  - Promote alternative modes of transportation throughout the County and region

- **Resource Management**
  - Preserve the 100 year flood plain as greenways
  - Educate landowners about tax advantages and the benefits of greenway preservation
  - Encourage preservation of greenways through voluntary efforts on private property. Private landowners adjacent to potential greenways, should be exposed to forestry and fishery programs to create greenways, including the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP).

- **Economic Development**
  - Complete maps and brochures of bikeway system as part of tourism development.
  - Use bikeways to promote increased tourism
  - Measure key indicators of economic contributions of bikeways such as: new business, increased property values, bikeway related tourism, etc.
Transportation Coordination

- Bikeways should be an important part of the County transportation network. Adopt Greenway & Bikeway Master Plan as a part of County Highway Master Plan.
- County improvements along the proposed corridors should be planned for both pedestrian and bike traffic.
- Paved shoulders should be provided on both sides of all new roads in conjunction with major improvements.
- Sidewalks should be constructed where practical and connecting the more densely populated areas and subdivisions
**IV. IMPLEMENTATION**

Implementation is proposed over a 20-year period. The implementation schedule would be subject to available funding. A recommended timeline for implementation is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2010</td>
<td>Easement/Land Acquisition for high priority corridors and trailhead locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2020</td>
<td>Pursue funding and implementation for high and medium priority corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2027</td>
<td>Pursue funding and implementation for low priority corridors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A
Natural Resources Base Data
Appendix B
Points of Interest
POINTS OF INTEREST LINKED BY PROPOSED TRAILS

1. Siloam Springs State Park
2. Great River Road
3. Historic Architecture- Dr. Els House and the Underground Railroad
4. Culver Stockton College in Canton
5. Spirit Knob Winery in Ursa (1st Winery in Adams County)
6. 8th & Maine Freedom Plaza
7. Local Archeological Digs
8. Villa Kathrine
9. Quincy Riverfront Parks
10. Prairie Mills Windmill
11. Schools
12. Cemeteries
   a. Bartholomew IV, Lima
   b. Benville Cemetery (Hughes grave)
   c. Early Historic Cemeteries
13. Scout Camps (Wildwood & Saukenauk)
14. Meyer Ferry
15. Villages and Towns Throughout County
16. Connection to Hannibal, Missouri
17. Connection to Nauvoo, Illinois
18. Indian Trails Golf Course
19. Fall Creek
20. Sacajawea (Transitions of Western Illinois)
21. John Wood Cemetery
22. Museums
23. Illinois Veterans Home
24. Mississippi River, Mill Creek, Cedar Creek, Bear Creek, & McKee Creek
25. Bailey Park
26. Adams County Fairgrounds
27. Lock & Dam 20 & 21
28. Bayview, Memorial, & Hannibal Bridges
Appendix C
Questionnaire/Public Input
1. **CORRIDORS:**

Public input is one of several factors (such as gradient/slope, traffic count, speed limit, visibility, etc.) that will be used to prioritize the proposed corridors. Please help us prioritize the corridors by ranking each corridor H (High Priority), M (Medium Priority) or L (Low Priority). The highest priority corridor would be ranked first for implementation; low priority corridor may be developed in later years. Implementation of the corridors will be subject to final approval by the County Board and available funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>Rank (H, M, or L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cedar Creek Extension</td>
<td>Multi-use Corridor – Along Cedar Creek 36th Street to Cannonball Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Levee Corridor</td>
<td>Multi-use Corridor - Drainage District Levees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mill Creek Corridor</td>
<td>Multi-use Corridor – Along Mill Creek Ellington Road to Herleman Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Century Corridor</td>
<td>This 100-mile loop would connect Quincy, Ursa, Mendon, Golden, Clayton, Siloam Springs State Park, Liberty, and Payson utilizing county roads and highways around the perimeter of the county.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ellington Road Corridor</td>
<td>Cannonball Road and Cedar Creek east to County Road 1600, which traverses along the west side of the airport. Then south to Highway 104, east to the Plainville Blacktop (county rd 1700), south to State Street, and State Street west to Quincy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ursa-Mendon Corridor</td>
<td>Ellington Road, north on 36th Street to Spring Lake Road, west to Bottom Road, north to Ursa, east to Mendon, and south on Highway 336 to U.S. Route 24, west on 24 to 1000th, then south to Ellington.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Lima-Loraine Corridor</td>
<td>This Corridor would originate from the Ursa Trailhead, north on Bottom Road, east to Lima, east to Loraine on 2800th, south to Highway 336, southwest to Mendon, and west to Ursa on Highway 61.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Mendon-Loraine Corridor</td>
<td>This Corridor would traverse from Mendon on Hwy 336 to Loraine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Columbus-Coatsburg Corridor</td>
<td>The Corridor would traverse north from the existing Columbus Road bike path to Ellington Road, then north on 1000th, east on Hwy 24 to Hwy 336, then north to Mendon, then east to 1850th, then south to Coatsburg &amp; Columbus to Hwy 104, then west to Quincy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Golden Corridor</td>
<td>The Corridor would traverse north out of Camp Point on 2300th, east on 2400th to Golden, south on Hwy 94 and loop back to Camp Point.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Payson Corridor</td>
<td>This Corridor would continue southeast from the south 48th Street extension to 1150th, then south and east to Payson, then east on 400th, north on the Plainville Blacktop (1700th to State Street, then northwest to Quincy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Liberty Corridor</td>
<td>The Corridor would traverse north from Liberty on 2100th, east on 900th to 2350th, north to Kellerville Blacktop, east to Siloam Springs State Park, then west to Liberty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If not completed at the public meeting, please mail or deliver your comments to:
Klingner & Associates P.C.
616 N. 24th St.
Quincy, IL 62301
email: dcd@mail.klingner.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Corridor Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Camp Point Corridor</td>
<td>This Corridor would continue east from 5-Points to the Camp Point blacktop, then north through Camp Point to 2400th, west to 1850th, and then south through Coatsburg and Columbus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Utility Greenway Corridor</td>
<td>This Corridor could be a separate multi-use Corridor traversing from Lima to Bluff Hall and would follow the existing overhead power lines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list any other corridors you suggest should be included in the master plan, and any changes or modifications to the fourteen (14) proposed corridors.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. GOALS:

Name your top five (5) suggested goals for this planning project (i.e., habitat preservation; budget right-of-way acquisition and development in County Capital Improvement Plans; community connections; opportunity for exercise and fitness; enhance property values; use storm water management practices to create greenways, modify subdivision ordinances to require sidewalks, establish a system which promotes and encourages non-auto travel; modify regulatory ordinance to encourage greenway development; public safety; improve quality of life; new opportunities for tourism; recreation; points of interest signage; etc.)

A.
B.
C.
D.
E.

3. USE:

Please circle High Priority (H), Medium Priority (M) or Low Priority (L) based on your opinion.

A) H M L Multi-use corridors (separated from roadways) are desired
B) H M L Shared roadway corridors are desired
C) H M L Where bike/walking paths are separated from streets and roadways, paved surfaces are desired. (Paved vs. crushed stone)
D) H M L Where adequate pavement widths are available, bike paths should be designated by pavement striping and signage
E) H M L Paved shoulders with striped bike lanes should be added where feasible
4. **TRAILHEADS:**

Please check your preferred location for a centralized Trailhead:

( ) Quincy Regional Airport     ( ) 5-Points

Please rank the ten (10) proposed Trailhead locations (1 being the highest priority location and 10 being the lowest priority location)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>Rank (1 - 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quincy Regional Airport/5-Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siloam Springs State Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loraine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **COMMENTS:**

Please provide other comments/suggestions:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(Optional) Please list the following information:

Name (Print) _____________________________________________________________
Address ________________________________________________________________
Phone Number __________________________________________________________

☐ Please check this box if you would volunteer to help implement the bikeway plan.
Appendix D
Trail Plan
Appendix E
Trail Slope Analysis
SLOPE ANALYSIS PLAN

Adams County Trails

- Channel 1 - Watershed 1: (2020 HLA)
- Channel 2 - Watershed 2: (2020 HLA)
- Channel 3 - Watershed 3: (2020 HLA)
- Channel 4 - Watershed 4: (2020 HLA)
- Channel 5 - Watershed 5: (2020 HLA)
- Channel 6 - Watershed 6: (2020 HLA)
- Channel 7 - Watershed 7: (2020 HLA)
- Channel 8 - Watershed 8: (2020 HLA)
- Channel 9 - Watershed 9: (2020 HLA)
- Channel 10 - Watershed 10: (2020 HLA)
- Channel 11 - Watershed 11: (2020 HLA)
- Channel 12 - Watershed 12: (2020 HLA)
- Channel 13 - Watershed 13: (2020 HLA)
- Channel 14 - Watershed 14: (2020 HLA)
- Watershed Boundaries

Shingle Rights:
- 0 - 10
- 11 - 25,000
- No Data

Scale:
- 2 0 2 4 Miles
Appendix F
Existing Trail Connections