

4.0 Public Comments and Agency Coordination

The Illiana Corridor Tier One Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process and the Stakeholder Involvement Plan (March 2012) strive to meet state and federal requirements to integrate environmental values and public interaction into transportation improvements. These requirements include the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS), and Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT), and the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT), as joint lead agencies on the project, developed the Stakeholder Involvement Plan to meet the aforementioned requirements and to increase stakeholder awareness, interaction, and the dissemination of information regarding possible transportation improvements in the Illiana Corridor Study Area. This chapter details the work and interaction that were done to meet or exceed these requirements.

Agency coordination and stakeholder involvement are critical to the success of planning transportation improvements. The preparation of an EIS requires compliance with many local, state, and federal rules, regulations, and laws. In order to ensure compliance, coordination with resource agencies occurred regularly throughout the Tier One EIS process. This chapter describes the agency coordination and stakeholder involvement for the preparation of this Tier One EIS. In addition, this chapter presents the scoping process; the date, purpose, and participants in various stakeholder involvement activities; and discusses the components and outcomes of various agency and stakeholder involvement activities.

In order to facilitate the lead agencies interaction with other agencies and the public, a coordination plan was developed. For the Illiana Corridor project, coordination with the resource agencies consists of four main elements:

- 1) The Scoping process, described in Section 4.2.
- 2) Gathering geographic information systems (GIS) data from individual agencies to augment published data.
- 3) An aerial overview of the Study Area with resource agencies prior to the development of alternatives.
- 4) Environmental resource and regulatory agency concurrence at three points: Statement of the Purpose and Need; Alternatives for Detailed Study; and Identification of the Preferred Alternative(s).

Additionally, INDOT and the Indiana resource agencies have been invited to participate with IDOT in the NEPA/404 Merger process.

The SAFETEA-LU legislation, specifically Section 6002, requires additional public involvement opportunities for federal, state and local agencies and the public for

projects requiring an EIS. Activities undertaken to meet these requirements, including the following, are listed throughout this chapter:

- **Develop a Coordination Plan** – Section 4.0
- **Identify Participating and Cooperating Agencies** – Section 4.1
- **Development of the Project Purpose and Need** – Section 4.3
- **Development of Methodologies for Impacts Analysis** – Section 4.4
- **Development of Range of Alternatives** – Section 4.5

Additionally, the inclusion of CSS in the Illiana Corridor project further promotes a collaborative approach that involves all stakeholders and seeks to develop, build, and maintain multimodal transportation solutions that are cost-effective and fit into and reflect the project’s surroundings – its “context.” The resulting projects should improve mobility for the travelling public, while seeking to preserve and enhance the scenic, economic, historic, and natural qualities of the settings through which they pass. In order to lead the proposed project, IDOT and INDOT formed a Project Study Group (PSG), made up of multidisciplinary representatives from IDOT, INDOT, FHWA, and the project consulting team tasked with determining the ultimate project recommendations and decisions. The PSG has primary responsibility for the project development process. This group will collaborate throughout the Tier One EIS process to provide technical oversight and expertise in key areas including study process, agency procedures, standards, and technical approaches. The PSG also has primary responsibility for ensuring compliance with the Stakeholder Involvement Plan, promoting partnership with stakeholders to address identified project needs, and developing consensus among stakeholders. The Stakeholder Involvement Plan can be found in the Information Center section of the project website at www.illianacorridor.org.

IDOT and INDOT have invited stakeholders to participate in a bi-state Corridor Planning Group (CPG) and Technical Task Force (TTF) (Appendix H.) The CPG was formed to provide an overall forum for community leaders to discuss and participate in a broad range of matters concerning the Illiana Corridor project and the TTF was established to provide external subject-matter expertise during the Tier One EIS process. The CPG and TTF have met jointly eight times throughout the Tier One EIS process. Through these meetings with the CPG and TTF, along with three rounds of public meetings, two rounds of public hearings and more than 90 one-on-one and small group stakeholder meetings, the following items were accomplished:

- Problem Statement was identified
- Project Purpose and Need were established
- Transportation system performance was discussed
- Approximately 100 corridor alternatives were evaluated
- Several potential mitigation measures were identified

Illiana Corridor stakeholders include:

- Elected and appointed local, regional, state, and federal officials
- Local, regional, state, and federal environmental agencies
- Economic, historic, cultural, and transportation agencies
- Corridor business community, including farmers, professional associations, developers, small businesses, and large corporations
- Local, regional, and state environmental agencies
- Community and civic organizations
- Local, regional, and state-wide media firms (i.e., print, electronic, and broadcast representatives)
- General public with emphasis on involvement of minority and low-income populations

4.1 Cooperating and Participating Agencies

In accordance with NEPA, a cooperating agency is defined as any federal agency, other than the lead agency, that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to an environmental impact that is part of a proposed project or project alternative. In accordance with SAFETEA-LU, participating agencies are those with an interest in the project. The intent of the concept of a “participating agency” is to allow for early and timely input regarding issues of concern.

The roles and responsibilities of cooperating and participating agencies are similar, except that cooperating agencies have a higher degree of authority, responsibility and involvement in the environmental review process. Cooperating agencies are also considered participating agencies, but not all participating agencies are cooperating agencies.

Pursuant to SAFETEA-LU Section 6002, a federal agency that declines to be a participating agency must specifically state the following in its response:

- It has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the project.
- It has no expertise or information relevant to the project.
- It does not intend to submit comments on the project.

A non-federal agency must formally accept the invitation in order to be considered a participating agency. If an agency declines, its responses should state the reason for doing so. If an agency chooses not to participate, the agency may still comment on the process at public and stakeholder involvement venues. A non-federal agency that does not respond to the invitation will not be considered a participating agency.

In addition to areas of specific legal jurisdiction and expertise where federal agencies are concerned, the following are some of the roles and responsibilities of participating agencies:

- Participate in the NEPA process starting at the earliest time possible, especially regarding development of the Purpose and Need, range of alternatives, methodologies, and the level of detail for the analysis of alternatives
- Identify issues of concern regarding the project’s potential environmental and socioeconomic impact as early as possible
- Communicate issues of concern formally in the EIS scoping process
- Provide input and comment on the Purpose and Need
- Provide input and comment on the procedures used to develop alternatives and analyze impacts
- Provide input on the range of alternatives to be considered
- Provide input and comment on the sufficiency of environmental impact analyses
- A list of invited local, state and federal agencies and the status of their involvement (where confirmed) follows in Table 4-1, Table 4-2, and Table 4-3 (See Appendix H.)

Table 4-1. List of Invited Participating Local Governments

Invited Local Government	Involvement
Illinois	
Channahon Township	Declined (represented through Village of Channahon)
Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning	Participating Agency
City of Braidwood	Did Not Respond
City of Joliet	Did Not Respond
City of Wilmington	Participating Agency
Crete Township	Participating Agency
Custer Township	Did Not Respond
Florence Township	Did Not Respond
Forest Preserve District of Will County	Did Not Respond
Green Garden Township	Did Not Respond
Illinois Division of Aeronautics	Did Not Respond
Illinois State Geological Survey	Did Not Respond
Jackson Township	Did Not Respond
Kankakee Area Transportation Study	Did Not Respond
Kankakee County	Participating Agency
Kankakee River Valley Forest Preserve District	Declined
Manhattan Township	Did Not Respond

Table 4-1. List of Invited Participating Local Governments (continued)

Invited Local Government	Involvement
Manteno Township	Did Not Respond
Metra	Participating Agency
Monee Township	Participating Agency
PACE	Participating Agency
Peotone Township	Did Not Respond
Reed Township	Did Not Respond
Regional Transportation Authority	Did Not Respond
Rockville Township	Did Not Respond
Sumner Township	Did Not Respond
Village of Beecher	Did Not Respond
Village of Braceville	Did Not Respond
Village of Carbon Hill	Did Not Respond
Village of Channahon	Did Not Respond
Village of Coal City	Participating Agency
Village of Crete	Did Not Respond
Village of Diamond	Participating Agency
Village of Elwood	Did Not Respond
Village of Grant Park	Participating Agency
Village of Godley	Did Not Respond
Village of Manhattan	Participating Agency
Village of Manteno	Participating Agency
Village of Matteson	Did Not Respond
Village of Monee	Did Not Respond
Village of Peotone	Participating Agency
Village of Symerton	Did Not Respond
Village of University Park	Participating Agency
Washington Township	Participating Agency
Wesley Township	Did Not Respond
Wheatland Township	Did Not Respond
Will County	Participating Agency
Will County Governmental League	Did Not Respond
Will Township	Did Not Respond
Wilmington Township	Did Not Respond
Wilton Township	Did Not Respond

Table 4-1. List of Invited Participating Local Governments (continued)

Invited Local Government	Involvement
Indiana	
Center Township	Participating Agency
City of Crown Point	Did Not Respond
Hanover Township	Did Not Respond
Indiana Geological Survey	Declined
Indiana Transportation Association	Did Not Respond
Lake County	Did Not Respond
Northern Indiana Commuter Transportation District	Did Not Respond
Northwest Indiana Regional Bus Authority	Participating Agency
Northwest Indiana Regional Development Authority	Did Not Respond
Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission	Did Not Respond
Ross Township	Did Not Respond
Senator Dan Coats	Did Not Respond
Town of Lowell	Participating Agency
Town of Cedar Lake	Did Not Respond
Town of Merrillville	Participating Agency
Town of Schneider	Participating Agency
Town of St. John	Did Not Respond
Town of Winfield	Participating Agency
West Creek Township	Participating Agency
Winfield Township	Participating Agency
Yellowhead Township	Did Not Respond

Table 4-2. List of Invited Cooperating and Participating State and Federal Agencies

Invited State and Federal Agency	Involvement
Federal	
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	Participating Agency
Federal Aviation Administration	Cooperating and Participating Agency
Federal Railroad Administration	Participating Agency
US Army Corps of Engineers - Chicago District	Cooperating and Participating Agency
US Army Corps of Engineers - Rock Island District	Participating Agency
US Coast Guard District 8 (St. Louis)	Cooperating and Participating Agency
US Coast Guard District 9 (Cleveland)	Declined
US Department of Agriculture	Participating Agency
US Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service	Cooperating and Participating Agency
US Department of the Interior, National Park Service	Participating Agency
US Environmental Protection Agency	Cooperating and Participating Agency
Illinois	
Illinois Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Land and Water Resources	Participating Agency
Illinois Department of Natural Resources	Cooperating Agency
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency	Did Not Respond
Illinois Historic Preservation Agency	Cooperating and Participating Agency
Illinois Natural Resource Conservation Service	Did Not Respond
Indiana	
Indiana Department of Environmental Management	Participating Agency
Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historical Preservation & Archaeology	Cooperating and Participating Agency
Indiana State Department of Agriculture	Cooperating and Participating Agency

Table 4-3. List of Invited Cooperating and Participating Tribal Governments

Invited Tribal Government	Involvement
Citizen Potawatomi Nation	Did Not Respond
Forest County Potawatomi County Community, Wisconsin	Did Not Respond
Hannahville Indian Community Council	Did Not Respond
Ho-Chunk Nation	Did Not Respond
Kickapoo Tribe in Kansas	Did Not Respond
Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma	Did Not Respond
Kickapoo Traditional Tribe of Texas	Declined
Miami Tribe of Oklahoma	Section 106 Consulting Party
Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma	Did Not Respond
The Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	Did Not Respond
Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians	Did Not Respond
Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation	Did Not Respond
Sac and Fox Nation of Missouri	Did Not Respond
Sac and Fox Nation of Oklahoma	Did Not Respond
Sac and Fox Tribe of Mississippi	Did Not Respond
Shawnee Tribe	Did Not Respond
Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma	Did Not Respond

Consistent with the process outlined in the Section 106 implementing regulations, FHWA, in cooperation with IDOT and INDOT, identified organizations with an interest in Illinois and Indiana cultural resources in the project vicinity and invited them to participate as consulting parties. They will provide input on key decision points in the Section 106 process; the parties invited and the status of their involvement are shown in Table 4-4.

Table 4-4. List of Invited Section 106 Consulting Parties

Invited Agency/Government	Involvement
Illinois	
Bourbonnais Grove Historical Society	Did Not Respond
Canal Corridor Association	Declined
Channahon Township	Declined
Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning	Section 106 Consulting Party
City of Joliet	Section 106 Consulting Party
City of Wilmington	Section 106 Consulting Party
Crete Township	Did Not Respond
Custer Township	Did Not Respond
Florence Township	Section 106 Consulting Party

Table 4-4. List of Invited Section 106 Consulting Parties (continued)

Invited Agency/Government	Involvement
Forest Preserve District of Will County	Did Not Respond
Frankfort Area Historical Society	Declined
Grant Park Area Historical	Section 106 Consulting Party
Green Garden Township	Did Not Respond
Illinois Historic Preservation Agency	Section 106 Consulting Party
Illinois State Historical Society	Did Not Respond
Jackson Township	Did Not Respond
Joliet Area Historical Museum	Did Not Respond
Kankakee Area Transportation Study	Section 106 Consulting Party
Kankakee County	Section 106 Consulting Party
Kankakee County Historic Preservation Commission	Did Not Respond
Kankakee County Museum	Did Not Respond
Kankakee River Valley Forest Preserve District	Declined
Landmarks Illinois	Section 106 Consulting Party
Manhattan Township	Did Not Respond
Manhattan Township Historical Society	Did Not Respond
Manteno Area Historical Society	Did Not Respond
Manteno Township	Did Not Respond
Midewin Heritage Association	Did Not Respond
Monee Township	Section 106 Consulting Party
New Lenox Historical Society	Declined
Park Forest Historical Society	Did Not Respond
Peotone Historical Society	Declined
Peotone Township	Declined
Reed Township	Did Not Respond
Rockville Township	Did Not Respond
Sumner Township	Did Not Respond
Village of Beecher	Did Not Respond
Village of Braceville	Section 106 Consulting Party
Village of Carbon Hill	Did Not Respond
Village of Channahon	Section 106 Consulting Party
Village of Coal City	Section 106 Consulting Party
Village of Crete	Did Not Respond
Village of Diamond	Did Not Respond
Village of Elwood	Section 106 Consulting Party

Table 4-4. List of Invited Section 106 Consulting Parties (continued)

Invited Agency/Government	Involvement
Village of Grant Park	Did Not Respond
Village of Godley	Did Not Respond
Village of Manhattan	Section 106 Consulting Party
Village of Manteno	Section 106 Consulting Party
Village of Matteson	Did Not Respond
Village of Monee	Section 106 Consulting Party
Village of Peotone	Section 106 Consulting Party
Village of Symerton	Did Not Respond
Village of University Park	Did Not Respond
Washington Township	Section 106 Consulting Party
Washington Township Museum	Decline
Wesley Township	Did Not Respond
Wilmington Area Historical Society	Did Not Respond
Will County	Section 106 Consulting Party
Will County Governmental League	Did Not Respond
Will County Historic Preservation Commission	Did Not Respond
Will County Historical Society	Section 106 Consulting Party
Will Township	Section 106 Consulting Party
Wilmington Township	Did Not Respond
Wilton Township	Did Not Respond
Indiana	
Cedar Creek Township	Section 106 Consulting Party
Cedar Lake Historical Association	Section 106 Consulting Party
Center Township	Did Not Respond
City of Crown Point	Did Not Respond
Crown Point Historic Preservation Commission	Declined
Dyer Historical Society	Declined
Eagle Creek Township	Section 106 Consulting Party
Hanover Township	Did Not Respond
Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology	Did Not Respond
Indiana Historical Bureau	Declined
Indiana Historical Society	Did Not Respond
Indiana Landmarks	Section 106 Consulting Party
Lake County	Section 106 Consulting Party

Table 4-4. List of Invited Section 106 Consulting Parties (continued)

Invited Agency/Government	Involvement
Lake County Historic Preservation Coalition	Declined
Lake County Historical Society and Museum	Did Not Respond
Lake County Parks Department	Section 106 Consulting Party
Lowell Historic Preservation Commission	Section 106 Consulting Party
Lowell Main Street Association	Did Not Respond
Merrillville Ross Township Historical Society	Did Not Respond
Northwest Indiana Regional Development Authority	Did Not Respond
Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission	Did Not Respond
Ross Township	Did Not Respond
South Lake County Agricultural Historical Society	Did Not Respond
St. John Historical Society	Declined
St. John Township	Did Not Respond
Three Creeks Historical Association	Did Not Respond
Town of Lowell	Did Not Respond
Town of Cedar Lake	Did Not Respond
Town of Merrillville	Section 106 Consulting Party
Town of Schneider	Section 106 Consulting Party
Town of St. John	Did Not Respond
Town of Winfield	Did Not Respond
West Creek Township	Did Not Respond
Winfield Township	Did Not Respond
Yellowhead Township	Did Not Respond

4.2 Scoping

Scoping is an early and open process for determining the scope of a proposed action, such as the Illiana Corridor. It focuses on the identification of potential environmental impact issues and potential improvement alternatives. Scoping helps those preparing a EIS to know which issues deserve greater emphasis and which should receive less emphasis. Per the IDOT and INDOT CSS procedures, a stakeholder is anyone who could be affected by the project and has a stake in its outcome. This includes state and federal agencies, Tribes, property owners, business owners, state and local officials, special interest groups, and motorists who utilize the facility. All stakeholders are invited to participate in scoping.

Scoping on the Illiana Corridor has included comments and concerns expressed by stakeholders since the beginning of the Illiana Corridor study.

4.2.1 State and Federal Agencies

State and federal agency scoping formally began with the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS by the FHWA in the *Federal Register* on June 8, 2011 (See Appendix H). The NOI contained a brief description of the proposed project, provided the date for the scoping meeting along with contacts for further information, and introduced the CSS process.

Following the publication of the NOI, a resource agency scoping meeting was held on June 28, 2011 as part of the Illinois' NEPA/404 merger process to introduce the Illiana Corridor to federal and state resource agencies. Prior to the meeting, the Illiana Corridor Scoping Document was distributed to the cooperating/participating agencies. For agencies not receiving an advance copy of the scoping document, additional copies were included with the cooperating/participating agency invitation letters that were sent out after the meeting.

State and federal agencies and tribal and local governments invited to be Cooperating and Participating agencies as outlined in SAFETEA-LU 6002 guidelines were also invited to participate in the scoping process. All of the agencies involved had the opportunity to submit comments on the scoping document up through August 19, 2011. The meeting also provided an opportunity for upfront agency comments on both the overall Tier One EIS process and any special resource concerns. In addition to the staff from IDOT, INDOT, and FHWA, the following agencies sent representatives to this initial scoping meeting:

- USACE
- USEPA
- Illinois Department of Natural Resources (Illinois DNR)
- INHS
- Lake County Illinois Division of Transportation
- IDEM
- Indiana Department of Natural Resources (Indiana DNR)

Representatives from IDOT, INDOT, and FHWA led a discussion on the bi-state project leadership structure that has IDOT serving as the lead agency with assistance and cooperation from INDOT and the FHWA Illinois Division serving as the lead division of FHWA with cooperation from the FHWA Indiana Division. The meeting also included a discussion of the project purpose, the project history (including previous feasibility studies by Illinois and Indiana), the Study Area, and the tiered EIS process. Stakeholder outreach based on IDOT and INDOT CSS guidelines, the organization of the PSG, the CPG, and the TTF were also discussed.

Other topics covered included project schedule, potential alternatives, financial strategies, key environmental issues, and how the GIS database would be used in the development and comparative analysis of various alternatives. The presentation concluded with a discussion of key points of the proposed bi-state agency coordination program. The process for sending scoping letters to invite local, state, and federal agencies and governments to provide initial input on the potential aspects and impacts of the proposed project, along with an invitation of desired cooperating or participating agency involvement in the NEPA process was decided.

Following the formal presentation, resource agency representatives were given an opportunity to ask questions and make comments. Questions were asked concerning the location of the proposed Study Area, the width of the corridor, and how differing state policies, such as the methodologies used in the classification of streams would be coordinated. The following are summaries of the items discussed:

- **Agency Participation** – The USACE recommended that the Rock Island District should be involved in the project since Kankakee County is within that district, and suggested that they be invited to all future NEPA/404 Merger meetings. The PSG agreed to include the Rock Island District in the project development process for the Illiana Corridor.
- **Proposed Study Area** – The USEPA questioned the location of the southern Study Area boundary and whether it should be extended further south. The project team explained that expanding the corridor further south was constrained by the City of Kankakee, Illinois, and the large floodplain at the Kankakee River in Lake County.
- **Technical Study Methodologies** – IDOT and INDOT have different technical classifications and survey procedures for environmental resources. The IDEM noted that Illinois and Indiana differ in their stream and water feature descriptions such as with “classified streams.” The resource agencies inquired how the PSG will approach technical surveys and documentation for the proposed project. Joint project team/agency field reviews were proposed as necessary to confirm resource presence/quality and discuss concerns. The studies would consider all database descriptors and use the nomenclature that each state uses. Illinois and Indiana data will also be archived on separate GIS layers for data integrity and ease of reference; with the highest quality of data having priority where duplicate data sets are available.
- **Project Corridor** – The USACE asked how the 2,000-foot corridor width was determined and expressed concerns with the possible overestimation of impacts with this corridor width. The PSG explained that this width would be used to characterize the sensitive features within the corridor and not impacts. The 400 foot wide working alignment was used to tabulate potential impacts of “a transportation facility” inside the project corridor. Additionally, the project corridor does not have fixed end points, allowing flexibility to move the corridor termini north and south along highways I-55 and I-65 to avoid impacts. Therefore, characterizing the sensitive features within the project corridor is important for identifying reasonable

alternatives in addition to tabulating potential impacts for various working alignments.

- **Greenway Fragmentation** – The USEPA mentioned the potential for an east-west transportation facility to fragment greenways that serve north-south wildlife migratory routes. The Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission (NIRPC) and Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) planned open spaces and natural areas within the proposed Study Area were discussed. The project team indicated that NIRPC and CMAP 2040 planning cycles were complete and open space plans would be included in the Tier One EIS.
- Written scoping comments were also received by the following federal and state agencies and are accounted for in detail in Section 8.6 of the Stakeholder Involvement Plan and also included in Appendix H of the EIS:
- Indiana DNR Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (DHPA), August 16, 2011
- USEPA, August 26, 2011
- USACE - Chicago District, October 20, 2011
- Indiana DNR Division of Fish and Wildlife, November 10, 2011

4.2.2 Other Stakeholders

Scoping events involving CPG/TTF members, as well as the public at large were held on the following dates and are accounted for in detail in Section 8.1 through 8.5 of the Stakeholder Involvement Plan.

- June 14 – 15, 2011 - CPG/TTF Meeting #1: Project Kick-off/Scoping – concerns, goals & objectives identified.
- June 21 – 22, 2011 - Public Meeting #1: Scoping – Predominant comments included: study process and timeline, identification and consideration of existing environmental features, creating multi-modal opportunities for the Illiana Corridor.
- July 11 – 12, 2011 – CPG/TTF Meeting #2 – problem statement, project goals and environmentally sensitive areas discussed.
- Other non-federal agencies submitted written comments during scoping. These comments and responses are part of the administrative record.

After scoping, the PSG maintained ongoing coordination with local, state, and federal agencies during the Tier One EIS as outlined in meeting summaries contained throughout this chapter.

4.3 Purpose and Need

Project lead agencies are responsible for the development of a project's Purpose and Need statement. In developing the Purpose and Need, the lead agencies must provide opportunities for the involvement of participating agencies and the public and must

consider the input submitted by these stakeholders. After considering this input, the lead agencies will decide the project's Purpose and Need. Activities to develop the Illiana Corridor Purpose and Need took place during the Scoping process and via activities and comments received at CPG/TTF meetings #1 and #2 and Public Meetings #1 and #2. The Purpose and Need statement was developed based on the analysis performed for the development of the Transportation System Performance Report (TSPR) with extensive stakeholder input. The TSPR analysis included a comparison of 2010 and future 2040 baseline (no-action) transportation conditions in the region. Additional technical information can be found in the Purpose and Need document, as well as the TSPR, which is outlined in Section 4.8 of this chapter and in Appendix A. Resource agency concurrence on the Illiana Corridor Purpose and Need statement was reached during June, 2012 and is identified as:

- Improve Regional Mobility
- Alleviate Local System Congestion and Improve Local System Mobility
- Provide for Efficient Movement of Freight

In addition to the CPG/TTF and Public Meetings where the project Purpose and Need were developed and discussed, there have been several conversations between the lead agencies, PSG and state and federal agencies to obtain concurrence on the Purpose and Need. These conversations are highlighted in meeting summaries found in Table 4-6, Table 4-7, Table 4-8, Table 4-9, and Table 4-10. Written Purpose and Need comments were received from the following agencies on the following dates and can be found in Appendix I of the EIS:

- Village of Beecher, December 6, 2011
- Illinois Department of Agriculture (DOA), December 9, 2011
- Indiana DNR Division of Fish and Wildlife, December 14, 2011
- IDEM, December 15, 2011
- CMAP, December 21, 2011
- Indiana DNR-DHPA and the Indiana SHPO, December 29, 2011
- Indiana DNR Division of Fish and Wildlife, January 10, 2012
- USEPA, January 11, 2012
- IDEM, January 13, 2012
- USACE - Chicago District, January 18, 2012
- USACE - Rock Island District, January 18, 2012
- Village of Crete, February 14, 2012

4.4 Impact Methodologies

Impact Methodologies were developed for the Illiana Corridor project by the lead agencies in collaboration with the participating agencies. These Methodologies, including environmental resource identification, were initially presented to the resource agencies during scoping and are highlighted in Section 4.2.1. The following project methodologies were developed:

- **Travel Forecasting Model** – The CMAP regional travel forecasting model was used to develop the Illiana travel forecasting model. Travel Forecasting Model Technical Report (Appendix D) explains the development of the Illiana model.
- **Alternatives Development and Evaluation Planning Methodology** – The lead agencies established design standards and constraints for the Illiana Corridor project alignments and features. The Planning Framework Technical Documentation (Appendix L) describes these standards.
- **GIS Methodology** – Over fifteen participating agencies, along with other stakeholders, provided GIS data for the Illiana Corridor project. The GIS Technical Documentation (Appendix F) describes the GIS methodology used in the alternative selection.
- **Section 106 Methodology** – The lead agencies developed the Section 106 Methodology in conjunction with the IHPA and the DHPA to determine a consistent Area of Potential Effects (APE) and establish data collection protocol.

4.5 Developing Range of Alternative Corridors

The process of selecting a preferred corridor(s) includes in-depth analysis of local and regional travel needs, environmental and socio-economic impacts, and planning forecasts. Residential, commercial, recreational and protected properties were reviewed to identify a corridor that would have the minimum impacts between I-65 and I-55. Stakeholder input was sought throughout Tier One through the public comment process and at CPG/TTF Meetings, Public Meetings, and One-on-One Stakeholder Meetings to develop a range of alternative corridors. Corridors A3S2, B3, and B4, along with the No-Action Alternative, were selected for evaluation in the DEIS through the following process:

- At CPG/TTF Meeting No. 4 stakeholders generated over 80 alternative corridors.
- These alternatives were screened for fatal flaws and similar routes were consolidated. Eight representative corridors and two arterial improvements were presented at Public Meeting No. 2.
- Based on impact analysis and travel performance potential, Corridor B3 was identified as the preliminary preferred corridor at CPG/TTF Meeting No. 7 and Public Meeting No. 3.

- Subsequent stakeholder comments, followed by further analysis, generated two additional corridors, A3S2 and B4.

The Alternatives to be Carried Forward Technical Memorandum (ACFTM) (Appendix C) describes in greater detail the technical analysis and Stakeholder coordination that was performed to identify Corridors A3S2, B3, and B4 for evaluation in the DEIS. Correspondence regarding the ACFTM can be found in Appendix I and resolutions of support received at the time of the release of the DEIS can be found in Table 4-5. Resource agency concurrence on the alternatives to be carried forward was achieved during June, 2012.

Table 4-5. Resolutions of Support

Date of Resolution	Stakeholder	Resolution Themes
March 12, 2012	Village of Bradley: Jerry Balthazor, Robert Redmond, Lori Gadbois, George Golwitzer, Michael Stump, Eric Cyr, Bruce Adams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corridor B3 is a single continuous corridor with efficient movement of freight and people with the highest compatibility for multi-modal uses, power distribution, and communications. • Corridor B3 appears to have best balance of performance, minimal environmental impacts, greatest financial viability, and most compatibility with community plans. • Resolution of support for B3.
March 13, 2012	Village of Aroma Park: Duane Dykstra, James Greenstreet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corridor B3 is a single continuous corridor with efficient movement of freight and people with the highest compatibility for multi-modal uses, power distribution, and communications. • Corridor B3 appears to have best balance of performance, minimal environmental impacts, greatest financial viability, and most compatibility with community plans. • Resolution of support for B3.
March 27, 2012	Kankakee County Democratic Party: John A. Willard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An east-west limited access highway through Kankakee County would promote economic development, provide temporary and permanent employment opportunities, provide sales tax revenue, and would minimize the negative effects of such a highway on residents and the environment. • Resolution of support for C4.

Table 4-5. Resolutions of Support (continued)

Date of Resolution	Stakeholder	Resolution Themes
March 28, 2012	KATS: Paul Schore, Chairman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corridor B3 reflects the goals of the City of Kankakee for the Illiana Corridor by providing a single, continuous corridor for the efficient movement of freight and people, with the highest compatibility for multi-modal uses, power distribution and communications and having the best balance of performance, minimal environmental impacts, financial feasibility and most compatibility with community plans. • Resolution of support for B3.
April 2, 2012	City of Kankakee: Mayor Nina Epstein	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corridor B3 reflects the goals of the City of Kankakee for the Illiana Corridor by providing a single, continuous corridor for the efficient movement of freight and people, with the highest compatibility for multi-modal uses, power distribution and communications and having the best balance of performance, minimal environmental impacts, financial feasibility and most compatibility with community plans. • Resolution of support for B3.
April 3, 2012	Economic Alliance of Kankakee County: Joseph France	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corridor B3 is a single continuous corridor with efficient movement of freight and people with the highest compatibility for multi-modal uses, power distribution, and communications. • Corridor B3 alternative appears to have best balance of performance, minimal environmental impacts, greatest financial viability, and most compatibility with community plans. • Resolution of support for B3.

4.6 State and Federal Meetings

State and federal coordination meetings were held throughout Tier One via regularly scheduled meetings including those listed below in Table 4-6 and Table 4-7 and pertinent materials and correspondence can be found in Appendix J.

Table 4-6. NEPA/404 Merger and Coordination Meetings

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
September 7-8, 2011 (NEPA/404 Merger)	FHWA, USEPA, USACE, IDOT, INDOT, Illinois DNR, Illinois DOA, USFWS, Village of Plainfield, Parsons Brinckerhoff, Terra Engineering, HNTB, CH2M HILL, CBBEL, V3 Companies, HR Green, Huff & Huff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USEPA recommended a joint conference be held to address USEPA comments to allow interaction and consensus among agencies. • USEPA asked how the new I-69 corridor would impact the Illiana Corridor project since it is a major north-south route with NAFTA implications. • USEPA asked about how focused outreach to intermodal facilities, and how freight railroads were incorporated into the discussion. • It was stated that a lot of communities are anxious to pick out alternatives, and were interested in how IDOT and INDOT are coordinating cross-border issues. • IDOT BDE requested the study include the new biological and cultural data generated by the ESR in the general environmental features study map and provide them with a copy.
October 14, 2011 (NEPA Coordination)	USFWS, USEPA, USACE, IDOT, Parsons Brinckerhoff, AECOM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarized travel forecasting approach and preliminary 2010 and 2040 travel performance results. • Discussed status of acceptance of cooperating/participating agency status. • Summarized CPG/TTF #5 and the TSPR. • Discussed preliminary Purpose and Need report outline, and supporting information.
November 21, 2011 (NEPA Coordination)	FHWA, USFWS, USEPA, USACE, IDOT, Parsons Brinckerhoff, AECOM, DLZ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalized scoping document. • Discussed aerial field review that took place on October 21, 2011. • Went over refinements made to the Purpose and Need report since last meeting including logical termini and supporting information.

Table 4-6. NEPA/404 Merger and Coordination Meetings (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
January 13, 2012 (NEPA/404 Merger)	Soren Hall, USACE, Ken Westlake, USEPA, Norm West, USEPA, Matt Fuller, FHWA, Jay Dumontelle, Indiana Federal Highway Administration.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USEPA stated that Tier One conclusions will be carried over to Tier Two, and that the study should be more than just about roadways. • Concern was expressed that the Illiana Corridor project was just becoming a road project. • More than just immediate needs should be addressed, and if only road concepts are examined the study team may miss out on what is to happen in 2040 and beyond. • The opportunity to preserve corridors for the future may be lost if not preserved now. • Interest was expressed in bringing sustainability to this project, even if it means not performing the study according to business as usual. • Questioned what the proper balance of north-south highways to east-west highways is. • Asked whether a short-line railroad could lead the effort to include freight rail in the corridor, to provide a “bridge” between the Class I’s. • USEPA stated that their goal is to not preclude options, but also not to dictate them. • USEPA, USACE, and USF&WS indicated that they are not yet in concurrence with the Draft Purpose and Needs report.
March 1, 2012 (NEPA/404 Merger)	FHWA, USFWS, USEPA USACE, IDOT, Illinois DNR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USEPA referenced a letter from USEPA, USACE, and USFWS that suggested appropriate points to improve the Purpose and Needs report, and help move the project forward. • USACE questioned the lack of measurable metrics for success in the Purpose and Need report statements. • USEPA, USACE, and USFWS restated their lack of concurrence with the existing Purpose and Needs report, and stated that the Illiana Corridor study may not be an appropriate candidate project for the NEPA/404 process. • USFWS questioned the sample table for environmental impacts. Specifically, the

Table 4-6. NEPA/404 Merger and Coordination Meetings (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
<p>May 25, 2012 (NEPA/404 Informational Meeting)</p>	<p>John Carr, Jason Randolph, Martha Clark Mettler, Matt Buffington, Joyce Newland, Jay DuMontelle, Nick West, Lou Haasis, Michelle Allen, Robert Tally, Robert Dirks, Karen Bobo, Chris Anderson, Chris Andrews, Matt Fuller, G. Larson, T. Savko, K. Ahrenholtz, J. Betker</p>	<p>lack of threatened and endangered species impact results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed concern about bias against arterials as an alternative, with increases of truck miles on arterials being measured as a negative. • Asked about the basis for traffic modeling and how route determinations were made to evaluate the various alternatives. • Expressed concern the crossing of Treat Island may prove to be a fatal flaw due to the impacts it would have. • Expressed concern about numbers that have changed over time in various reports, even though the changes make sense. • Mentioned that most of the communities that support the working alignment within Corridor A3S2 are not immediately affected by it. Crete and Merrillville are the only strong supporters on Corridor A3S2 that are directly affected. • Recommended that the study team funnel the incredible amount of information collected into a conclusion that is easily understandable by their group before being presented publicly. • Stated a “straight line of progression” and documentation is needed to make sure everyone understands how the conclusions of the DEIS were reached. The results should be structured so that travel performance, along with impact considerations, indicates overall performance. • Stressed the need for a shorter summary of the alternatives identification, evaluation and selection process. • Stated that it is important that correct field survey protocols be followed in wetland delineations and wildlife surveys, and that all data collection be performed within appropriate survey windows.

Table 4-6. NEPA/404 Merger and Coordination Meetings (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
June 14, 2012 (NEPA Coordination Meeting)	Steve Schilke (IDOT), Matt Fuller (FHWA), Soren Hall (USACE), Shawn Cirton (USFWS), Norm West (USEPA)	<p>Various revisions to the Purpose and Need were agreed upon including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restatement of the second Principle Need point to “alleviate local system congestion and improve local system mobility.” • Consolidate Need points under the second and third Principle Needs. • Provision of additional graphics showing the impacts to water resources. • Commitment to facilitate land use coordination with the 2,000-foot corridor(s) in Tier Two. • Other minor revisions to Purpose and Needs text.
June 15, 2012 (NEPA/404 Merger Meeting)	<p>FHWA: Matt Fuller, Jan Piland, Rachel Ocampo, Jay DuMontelle, Robert Tally, Mike Hine, Gary Martindale Jr, Betsy Tracy, Dennis Bachman; IDNR: Steve Hamer; IDOT: Steve Schilke, Pete Harmet, John Baczek, Walt Zynieuski, Kimberly Murphy, Carrie Lewis, Marty Morse, Vanessa Ruiz, Kevin Stallworth, Ojas Patel, Christian Iroume, Terry Savko; INDOT: Greg Kicinski, Laura Hilden, Jim Earl; DLZ: Kent Ahrenholtz; IDEM: Jason Randolph; USEPA: Liz Pelloso, Norm West; INDNR Fish & Wildlife: Matt Buffington; INDNR DHPA: John Carr; USACE: Paul Leffler, Cathy Chernich, Soren Hall, John Betker; USFWS: Shawn Cirton, Elizabeth McCloskey; ISTHA: Manar Nashif; Barrington: Greg Summers; CBBEL: Matt Huffman, Mike Matkovic, Pete Knysz; Civiltech: Mary Young, Joel Christell, Bob Andres, Joe Emry; Huff & Huff: Jim Novak, Evan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the presentation was to present revisions to the Draft Purpose and Need, present the Alternatives to be Carried Forward, and request concurrence on both items from the various state and federal resource agencies. • CPG#8 stakeholder concerns were discussed, a topic-by-topic addressing of comments from the May 25, 2012 NEPA/404 informational meeting was shown. • Revisions to the Alternatives to be Carried Forward process were discussed, and a request for concurrence with Alternatives to be Carried Forward (ACF) was made by M. Fuller of FHWA. • The agencies were polled for concurrence with the ACF. USEPA, USACE, and USFWS as well as Indiana DNR indicated they would like additional information; S. Hall of USACE wanted a better explanation of the alternatives selection process; S. Cirton of FWS wanted detailed exhibits of potential impact areas near the Des Plaines River, and several attendees requested a copy of the wetland, floodplain, and stream impact exhibits. • Attendees were asked if they had any objections to the three working alignments being proposed to be carried

Table 4-6. NEPA/404 Merger and Coordination Meetings (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
	Markowitz; HR Green: Ron Krall, David Johanson; AECOM: Randy Fuchs, Brian Smith, Kesti Susinskas (IDOT); Parsons Brinckerhoff: Rick Rampone, Ed Leonard, Rick Powell, Dave McGibbon, Ron Shimizu	forward, or that the list of alternatives considered to be carried forward was deficient, and none were heard. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concurrences were received from Illinois Dept. of Agriculture, Illinois Department of Natural Resources, and “no objection” from Scott Q. of Illinois EPA. There was a discussion by John Betker of USACE Rock Island district on coordinating with the Chicago district on concurrence since only one alternative (B4) impacted a tiny portion of Kankakee County over which the Rock Island district has jurisdiction. Next steps in addressing the agencies which requested additional information were briefly discussed. It was anticipated that the agencies would be able to make a decision by the end of the next week (Indiana DEM by Wednesday) once they received the requested information.

Table 4-7. State and Federal Resource Agencies

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
June 7, 2011	IDEM: Martha Clark, Jason Randolph, Kent Ahrenholtz, Greg Quartucci	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed interest in the concurrence points and dates for the NEPA 404 merger projects. • Concern about whether someone with “signing” authority would have to be present at the meetings. • Stated that they would not be able to give any opinion or concurrence until the information had been given to IDEM with specific location questions.
June 8, 2011	USEPA: Norm West, Virginia Laszewski, Ken Westlake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stated the Elgin O’Hare project was a wonderful process and said it has been nominated as a national model.
June 14, 2011	Indiana DNR: John Carr, Matt Buffington, John Baczek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed interest in the concurrence points and dates for the NEPA/404 merger projects. • Concern about whether someone with “signing” authority would have to be present at the meetings.
July 29, 2011	USFWS: Elizabeth McCloskey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USFWS identified the threatened and endangered species located within the Study Area. • USFWS indicated that non-wetland (upland) forest would likely be required to be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio. • USFWS will be a part of the TTF.
October 21, 2011	Resource Agency Aerial Field Review: Attendee names not available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed morning and afternoon aerial field review of the Illiana Corridor Study Area. • Discussed various corridor alternatives and major environmental resources.

Table 4-7. State and Federal Resource Agencies (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
January 12, 2012	USEPA: Matt Fuller, FHWA; Norm West, USEPA; Virginia Laszewski, USEPA; Ken Westlake, USEPA; Elizabeth Pelloso, USEPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stated that they do not concur with the planning Study Area and reasonable termini. • Recommended modifying the current project build needs within the Purpose and Need document. • Stated that while the USEPA has actively participated in the Illiana Corridor Tier One scoping, and consistently raised concerns in these areas, that their concerns have not yet been addressed by the distributed materials. • Recommended the Illiana Corridor project take advantage of the opportunity to plan beyond 2040 for multimodal transportation needs and open space connectivity in a sustainable way.
February 14, 2012	Illinois SHPO: Anne Haaker, Brad Koldehoff (IDOT), Emilie Eggemeyer (IDOT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are efforts to promote Route 66 and past and future plans for IL-53. • Centennial Farms Program is an honorary designation that recognizes continuous ownership and not cultural resources.
February 14, 2012	Illinois DNR: Steve Hamer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested several maps in the vicinity of the Kankakee River crossing illustrating: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General features and public land boundaries in the general area of the crossing (generally from I-55 on the west to Indian Trails Road on the east) 2. PIN numbers of affected parcels in the immediate area of the crossing. 3. Corresponding name(s) of the property owners in the same area. • Midwin-Des Plaines-Goose Lake Prairie COA is one of 32 areas in the state identified in the approved Illinois WAP.

Table 4-7. State and Federal Resource Agencies (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
March 1, 2012	FHWA, USACE, USFWS, USEPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation on the Purpose and Need of the Illiana Corridor was given. • Stakeholders in attendance discussed corridor sustainability including a green corridor concept and viability to provide long-term freight movement • Stakeholders in attendance wanted to be provided measures of success.
April 9, 2012	Section 106 APE: Anne Haaker, IHPA; John Carr, DHPA; Rick Jones, Indiana DHPA; Joyce Newland, FHWA; Matt Fuller, FHWA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not think a mile on either side of the project corridor will have visual effects. • The APE should be based on potential effects, and recommended that possible effects be more clearly defined. • Stated that a windshield survey would not be effective since only inventoried data can be included in analysis. • SHPO to provide list of properties that have been previously determined eligible in various programs, going back to the 1970s. • Recommended that eligibility determinations be made only by a qualified historian, and that person's qualifications be reviewed by IDOT-BDE and IHPA.

To coordinate efforts between IDOT and INDOT, weekly meetings were held to address outstanding issues and to update all parties on progress made to date.

4.7 Public Outreach Meetings

One-on-one stakeholder meetings have been held throughout the Tier One EIS process with local officials, local businesses, and local facilities within the Study Area. These meetings were attended and conducted by members of the PSG, including members of IDOT, INDOT, and the project consultant team. Each of the meetings provided a brief history of the Illiana Corridor and an overview of the current Tier One EIS status, including progress made to date and the next steps.

The meetings provided an opportunity for the stakeholders to voice any concerns, preferences, and opinions on the current study. The meetings also allowed the PSG to

gather information from the stakeholders, including information on environmental resources, recreational resources, threatened and endangered species, local roadways, local traffic congestion or safety concerns, local opposition to the project, and local development plans. Table 4-8 provides a brief summary of these one-on-one stakeholder meetings and more information can be found in Appendix J.)

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
May 12, 2011	Village of Crete, Illinois: Village President, Michael Einhorn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village of Crete supports the proposed project. • Concerned stakeholders outside the Study Area may have an adverse influence on the project. • Raised concerns for potential wetland issues in Indiana.
May 12, 2011	Village of Manteno, Illinois: Mayor Nugent; Village Administrator, Bernie Thompson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village of Manteno supports the proposed project. • Raised concerns over funding and whether efforts will continue to move the project forward. • Would like to see the corridor further separated from I-80 to reduce right-of-way costs and cause fewer displacements.
May 12, 2011	Village of Peotone, Illinois: Village President, Richard Duran; Village Administrator, George Gray	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village of Peotone supports the proposed project. • A southern corridor further from I-80 may be more feasible due to environmental concerns near Cedar Lake.
May 16, 2011	Kankakee County: County Board Chairman, Mike Bossert; County Planner, Mike Lammey; County Engineer, Jim Piekarczyk; County Planning Department, Del Skimerhorn; County Planning and Economic Development, Mike Van Mill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns were raised over the influence of Private Partnership on the process. • Local roads are seeing increases in truck traffic. • Concerns over how I-80 improvements might impact the proposed project.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
May 17, 2011	Will County: Will County Executive, Larry Walsh; County Board Chairman, Jim Moustis; Majority Leader, Jim Bilotta; Minority Leader, Walter Adamic; County Board Chief of Staff, Bruce Friefeld; Planning & Policy Director, Jamy Lyne; County Engineer, Bruce Gould; County Executive Chief of Staff, Nick Palmer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the development and study process. • Concerned that funding partnering opportunities will be influenced by risk factors such as environmental resolutions, right-of-way availability, and state line considerations. • Other concerns surrounded funding, including funding for right-of-way acquisition and construction, and other pre-existing local and county funding obligations.
May 17, 2011	Village of Manhattan, Illinois: Mayor Borgo; Administrator, Marian Gibson; Development Manager, Marc Nelson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the development of the Illiana Corridor. • Concerned private funding opportunities will be influenced by risk factors such as environmental resolutions, right-of-way availability, and State line considerations. • Concerned that impacts to JADA, Midwin National Tallgrass Prairie, and soil conditions near Wilmington may limit project corridor connections.
May 23, 2011	Merrillville, Indiana: Tom Goralczyk, Howard Fink, and Shawn Petit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In support of the proposed project if it brings economic development to Merrillville and area. • Concerned of urban sprawl and how it will affect Lake County and pull from already developed areas. • Overall concern of existing traffic on US 30 for locals and through traffic.
May 25, 2011	Town of Cedar Lake, Indiana: Town Administrator, Ian Nicolini	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cedar Lake mostly supports the Illiana Corridor Project but the unincorporated areas may be more vocal against it due to potential loss of rural land. • The 2007 Corridors of the Future Plan was used as a base for the feasibility study and the locals remember this. • Hopes an interchange would be constructed at US 41. • The Town Council mostly supports the proposed project but not unanimously. • Cedar Lake is a small town and most locals want it to stay small. • Mentioned the high truck traffic on SR 2 in Lowell.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
May 26, 2011	Village of Braceville, Illinois: Mayor Homa; Village Clerk, Lois Passafiume	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports and recognizes the regional benefits the corridor will provide. • Concerned over potential impacts to the Mazonia Fish and Wildlife Area and outdoor recreational groups, and potential impacts to JADA and the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie.
May 26, 2011	Village of Coal City, Illinois: Village Administrator, Mark Fritz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the study process. • Concerned over timeliness to complete the proposed project and construct it. • Concerned over influence of intermodal facilities over the process. • Maintaining local roadways. • Concerned about western terminus and impact to Grundy County.
May 26, 2011	Village of Diamond, Illinois: Mayor Kernc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the proposed project and the study efforts. • Concerned over timeliness to complete the proposed project and construct it. • Concerned over influence of intermodal facilities over the process. • Maintaining local roadways.
May 26, 2011	City of Joliet, Illinois: Mayor Giarrante	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the proposed project. • Concerned over timeliness to complete proposed project and construct it. • Maintaining local roadways.
May 26, 2011	Will County Center for Economic Development: President and CEO, John Grueling; Transportation Coordinator, Alicia Hanlon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the Illiana Corridor and the study process. • Concerned over timeliness to complete proposed project and construct it. • Maintaining local roadways. • Feasibility of rail mode. • Concerned over the influence P3s may have on interchange locations.
May 27, 2011	Village of Beecher, Illinois: Mayor Lohmann; Village Administrator, Bob Barber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the Illiana Corridor and the study process. • Concerned over the number of project corridors considered. • Supports a “Beecher bypass” to reduce heavy truck traffic through the village. • Alignment north of Beecher may not be feasible due to environmental issues.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
May 27, 2011	Village of Elwood, Illinois: Village Administrator, Nick Narducci	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the Illiana Corridor. • Concerned with increasing volumes of truck traffic along local roadways. • Concerned over 3,500 acres of recreational facilities and the impact they may have. • Would like to promote IL-53 and access to national properties (Cemetery, Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie).
May 27, 2011	City of Wilmington, Illinois: City Administrator, Tony Graff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the Illiana Corridor and the study process. • Study should include opportunities for transit and compatibility with intermodal facilities.
May 31, 2011	Town of Lowell, Indiana: Conference call with: Town Council President, Phil Kuiper; Council Members, Greg Schook, Wilbur Cox, and Doug Nixon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly concerned with where the route might be located. • Potential developments in the area such as an ethanol plant south of Lowell, potential expansion of the Northern Indiana Commuter Transit District NICTD rail and other rail expansions. • Amount of trucks on SR 2 from the state line headed towards the Newton County landfill southeast of town was an expressed concern. • Recommended the PSG reach out to the Farm Bureau and Indiana DOA as part of the outreach program.
June 1, 2011	NIRPC: John Swanson, Bill Brown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended project team reach out to the Save the Dunes Council, Sierra Club and Hoosier Environmental Council, and suggested FHWA, Kankakee Basin, and Great Lakes Coastal Group in the study. • Expressed interest for in-depth involvement in the study. • Explained that NIRPC just completed EJ corrective action and suggested the project team consider that as part of the overall study. • Discussed that the perception of this project may be that it will hurt the future of the Gary Airport.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
June 1, 2011	Crown Point, Indiana: Mayor David Uran	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving forward he recommended the PSG work with City Engineer, Tris Miles, and his Chief of Staff, Keith Stevens. • Overall the Mayor is supportive of the Illiana Corridor and is excited about things progressing towards reality. His main focus was for it to have a positive economic impact.
June, 1, 2011	CMAP staff: Randy Blankenhorn, Kermit Wies, and Don Kopec; NIRPC staff: Steve Strains	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illiana Corridor overview and status. • Discussion of the MPO's processes related to the proposed project, including RTP and assumptions, 2040 socioeconomic forecasts, and conformity determination.
June 1, 2011	CMAP Environment & Natural Resources Committee Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illiana Corridor overview and status.
June 2, 2011	CenterPoint Properties: CEO, Mike Mullen; Senior Vice President of Infrastructure and Transportation, Eric Gilbert; Vice President of Development, Jeremy Grey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CenterPoint is willing to share data with the PSG to advance the Illiana Corridor.
July 11, 2011	Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie: Wade Spang, Bob Hommes, Jeff Tepp, Mary Honer, Bill Glass, and Renee Thakali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie is interested in improving its trail system and cleaning up hazardous waste and other buildings at the site. • Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie strictly interprets the federal law prohibiting new roads within the preserve, as well as JADA facility to be transferred (see below). • The JADA site to the north of the current Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie boundary will be transferred to Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie in the future, but no firm timeline is in place. • Several threatened and endangered species are present at Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie. • Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie is receptive to the idea of using its property for mitigation purposes.
July 21, 2011	SSA: Pete Quattrocchi and Bill Viste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSA expects to be involved through the TTF.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
August 22, 2011	Peotone, Illinois, Committee Meeting; Mayor Duran; Village Administrator, George Gray; Village Clerk, Donna Werner; Trustee, Jerome Wicker; Trustee, Christopher Forsythe; Trustee, Wade Callahan; Trustee, Richard Reichert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village supports the Illiana Corridor to address public safety and traffic concerns resultant of increasing heavy truck traffic. • Envisions the Illiana Corridor will enhance development and job opportunities in Peotone, as well as adjacent communities, and areas served by a regional type corridor. • It was recognized that the Illiana Corridor will provide improved travel for commerce and the general public between Illinois and Indiana. • The CMAP 2040 Plan and the SSA inaugural phase were commented on. • P3 and toll facilities were briefly discussed.
August 29, 2011	Village of Beecher, Illinois: Intergovernmental Committee Village President, Paul Lohmann; Village Administrator, Bob Barber; Committee Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and construction of the corridor in sections, as a cost savings/cost management option. • Funding availability for connecting road improvements, eligibility for P3. • Funding availability for rail options within the corridor, eligibility for P3. • Funding availability for applicable fire districts responsible for incidents within/along the improved corridor/facility. • Inclusion of a mitigation plan for applicable community impacts as study and planning efforts continue. • Consideration of lost revenue taxing bodies may incur as right-of-way may be acquired. • Consideration of township and/or county lines as alignment alternatives are considered to minimize adverse impacts to applicable taxing bodies.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
September 12, 2011	Village of Crete, Illinois: Mayor Einhorn; Village Administrator, Thomas, Durkin; Village Clerk, Deborah Bachert; Trustee, Daniel Bachert; Trustee, Larry Bellar; Trustee, Robert Gaines; Trustee, Larry Johnston; Trustee, Holly Milburn; Trustee, Mark Wiater; Various Village Staff; Various Public Attendees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mayor Einhorn informed the attendees that he has been involved in the current and previous study efforts. • Crete supports the Illiana Corridor to address public safety and traffic concerns resultant of increasing traffic. • Envisions the Illiana Corridor will enhance development and job opportunities. • The 2010-2040 Employment Forecast was briefly discussed. • The relationship and compatibility of the SSA was briefly discussed. • The Illiana Corridor and implementation timeline was also briefly discussed.
September 13, 2011	Ridge Property Trust: Jennifer Wagner and Doug Hayes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested if the Illiana Corridor is to be a toll road it should be placed far from I-80. • Identified a number of pipelines in the vicinity of RidgePort.
September 28, 2011	Village of Monee, Illinois, Board Meeting: Mayor Daniel Tovo; Administrator, Dave Wallace; Jay Farguhar, Bill Gray, Doug Horn, Denise Kranger, and Dave Stockton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P3 financing, as well as available funding options/opportunities. • No-Action Alternative growth projections as compared with build projections. • Previous studies and envisioned corridor alternatives. • Need for east-west corridor per stakeholder comments. • Consideration of abandoned RR south of Peotone, Illinois. • The relationship and compatibility of the SSA was briefly discussed.
October 17, 2011	(NS: Herbert Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stated that the railroads would rather serve a few large strategically placed intermodal facilities than smaller scattered facilities. • Elimination of grade crossings would be a factor in proposing a new facility. • Stated air and rail freight business do not mix well due to different focuses on types of cargo. • Follow-up message that NS was not interested in a new east-west rail line.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
October 24, 2011	UPRR: Wes Lujan, George Davis, and Gerry Bisailon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UPRR did not see a benefit from having a track alignment in the middle of a highway alignment. • UPRR would like to maximize the highway benefit to intermodal facilities. • With two north-south lines within the Study Area, the addition of an east-west line would not benefit UPRR significantly. • Any corridor further south than Arsenal Road would not benefit UPRR.
November 4, 2011	Kankakee County: County Board Chairman, Mike Bossert; County Planner, Mike Lammey; County Engineer, Jim Piekarczyk; County Planning and Economic Development, Mike Van Mill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed potential connection of alternatives to I-55 in the River Road area. • Concerns were raised over the current prohibitions against new roads in the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie. • Other connections near IL-129 were discussed.
November 21, 2011	MPO/FHWA Coordination Meeting: NIRPC: John Swanson, Bill Brown, and Kevin Garcia; FHWA: John Donovan, Matt Fuller, Dennis Bachman, and Joyce Newland; Al Chalabi Group: Suhail & Margery Al Chalabi; CMAP: Randy Blankenhorn, Don Kopec, and Kermit Wies; KATS: Mike Lammey and Delbert Skimmerhorn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of 2040 socioeconomic forecasts. • CMAP accepts using trend-market based forecasts for Illiana Corridor. They have reviewed methodology and concur. • NIRPC agrees that Illiana Corridor 2040 socioeconomic forecasts are close to their forecasts, and requests follow-up meeting to discuss. • Discuss the need for the Illiana Corridor to meet financially constrained RTP requirements.
November 22, 2011	Pace Bus: Mike Bolton, Dave Tomzik, Lorraine Snorden, and Dave Vanderzee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illiana Corridor overview and status. • Concurred with transit threshold analysis regarding lack of density for east-west fixed rail transit; however, other services would be applicable, including bus transit such as dial-a-ride, flexible bus routings, fixed-route bus, and express bus. • Pace is looking at potential east-west fixed route bus service in northern portion of Study Area.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
December 1, 2011	RVM: President and CEO of Kankakee Regional Chamber of Commerce, David Hinderliter; Managing Director of RVM Transit, Robert Hoffman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Illiana Corridor would be most useful to RVM if it were located south of the SSA. • RVM may be able to use the Illiana Corridor as a future route due to the potential for increased population and employment.
December 2, 2011	Metra Agency Coordination Meeting: David Kralik and Kristen Andersen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illiana Corridor overview and status. • Concurred with transit threshold analysis - low densities do not support east-west fixed guideway transit need. • Discussed railroad coordination. • Eastern leg of EJ&E (north of Study Area) from Joliet to Lynwood a “very long term” concept.
December 7, 2011	NIRPC Consultation Meeting: NIRPC: Steve Strains, Bill Brown, and Kevin Garcia; Al Chalabi Group: Margery and Suhail Al Chalabi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed Illiana Corridor 2040 socioeconomic forecast methodology and differences with NIRPC forecasts. • INDOT to send letter to NIRPC requesting use of Illiana Corridor 2040 socioeconomic forecasts. • Project team to provide NIRPC with township data and forecast documentation.
January 3, 2012	SSA Stakeholder Meeting: Bill Viste, Pete Quattrocchi, and Mark Thompson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inside the perimeter fence is a no go zone. • Concerned about potential new water attractants for birds which could cause aircraft hazards.
January 3, 2012	GSU: David Stone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GSU would like to be part of the CPG/TTF. • Proposed alignments A1 thru A4 would impact planned phases for 4-year campus development at GSU. GSU owns property all the way to the CN tracks west of the main campus. • Alignments to the south of campus appear to have fewer impacts to GSU.
January 6, 2012	Will County Center for Economic Development: Vice President and CEO, John Greuling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for B alternatives, but not opposed to A alternatives. • UPRR might support any alignment south of Millsdale Road.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
January 6, 2012	Will County Farm Bureau: Executive Director, Mark Schneidewind; Chairman, Tom Nugent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against corridors that cut diagonally across agricultural properties. • The concept of a multi-use corridor is generally supported. • Recommended that the preferred working alignment(s) allows for land acquisition that follows property lines as closely as possible, simultaneously considering minimal # of impacted parcels.
January 9, 2012	FPDWC: Andrew Hawkins, Larry Newton, Karen Fonte, David Robson, Tim Good, Deb Specht, Matt Novander, and Cori Crawford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request to revise maps to identify NRHP listed and eligible properties. • Concerns over corridors crossing Wauponsee Glacial Trail. • Concerns over crossing of Plum Creek Preserve. • B1 may have least impact to Midewin due to least crossing of streams running towards Midewin. • A1 – A4 Corridors impact Thorn Creek Headwaters Preserve; if shift north to avoid Preserve likely hit GSU. B1 cuts through Goodenow Grove, but the SSA does too. Staff seemed to recognize this as a potentially impacted area already due to the SSA. • A1 could help FPDWC connect two properties near IL-394 if a crossing was provided as a project element. • Poor soil structures noted near B3 in Indiana. • Wants animal and people linkage provided to any severed trails, parks, etc.
January 9, 2012	Village of Diamond, Illinois, and Grundy County Economic Development Center: Mayor Terry Kernc; Grundy County EDC, Doug Prior and Nancy Ammer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the Illiana Corridor. • Concerned about truck travel. • Prefers Corridor B3.
January 9, 2012	Village of Elwood, Illinois: Village Administrator, Nick Narducci; Public Works Director, Max Bosso	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against any direct connection of IL-53 to a B corridor. • Does not want an alignment that interferes with traffic travelling to Midewin, Alternate Route 66, etc. • Favors a southern alignment. • Against A corridors, feels B corridors serve the region better.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
January 9, 2012	Village of Manhattan, Illinois: Mayor Bill Borgo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manhattan has identified Hoff/Pauling Road all the way east to the SSA as a corridor to protect for future development. • Lincolnway has a new high school planned around Smith and Kankakee Roads. It is approximately 100 acres. • Prefers A3S1 and B3 working alignments due to low impact on residential development. • Corridor A1 might meet less resistance if it ran south of Manhattan. • Recommends Corridor A1 combining portions of A3S1 and B1 to bypass Manhattan.
January 10, 2012	Village of University Park, Illinois: Mayor Vivian Covington, Jerry Townsend, and LaFayette Linean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about impact to SSA. • Opposed to A1 and A1N2 due to impacts to planned mixed-use developments.
January 10, 2012	Village of Peotone, Illinois: Village President, Rich Duran; Village Manager, George Gray	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feels an A corridor will not meet needs of trucks travelling east-west. • Prefers Corridor B3 or B4.
January 10, 2012	Village of Beecher, Illinois: Village President, Paul Lohmann; Village Administrator, Bob Barber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about large bridges on A1 corridor. • Believes Beecher Bypass will need to be built if Illiana Corridor is south of Beecher.
January 10, 2012	Village of Crete, Illinois: Mayor Mike Einhorn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about a Beecher needing a bypass if B3 is the preferred corridor. • Thinks B1 is a very good corridor if it were not for the CenterPoint Properties. • Favors a northern alignment.
January 10, 2012	SSMMA Transportation Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the development of the Illiana Corridor. • Prefer northern routes as they are closer to SSMMA member communities.
January 11, 2012	Villages of Monee and of Manteno, Illinois: Mayor Daniel Tovo and Administrator, Dave Wallace, Monee; Mayor Tim Nugent, Manteno	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefers Corridor B3. • Concerned over potential interchange locations.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
January 11, 2012	Will County Board: Board Chairman, Jim Moustis; Public Works Committee Chairman and Majority Leader, Jim Bilotta; Chief of Staff, Bruce Friefeld; County Engineer, Bruce Gould	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Favor Corridor B3, but want to see full evaluation of all impacts and financial viability. • Concerned about environmental impacts from A corridors.
January 11, 2012	Kankakee County Board: Chairman, Mike Bossert; Highway Engineer, Mark Rogers; Planner, Mike Lammey; Kankakee County Economic Development: Mike Van Mill; Hutchison Engineering Inc: Jim Piekarczyk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Think B3 would best remove trucks from local routes and address future regional travel needs. • Concerned over traffic projections and the impact of the SSA. • Concerned about parallel routes pulling traffic from Illiana Corridor and tolls.
January 12, 2012	City of Wilmington, Illinois: Mayor Marty Orr; Administrator, Tony Graff; Village Engineer, Colby Zemaitis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cities of Wilmington and Elwood against a direct interchange at IL-53. • Support alignment near River Road, opposed to Corridor B3. • Prefer corridors removed from residential areas.
January 12, 2012	City of Braidwood, Illinois: City Manager, Rich Girot; City Planner, Jim Testin (Robert E. Hamilton Engineers)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City of Braidwood has a tremendous amount of truck traffic on IL-113, which is not a designated truck route. • Favor Corridor C4, but would be comfortable with a Corridor B3 if moved further south of Wilmington, an option that will be examined by the study team. • Discussed possible further extensions west of present termini.
January 12, 2012	Village of Coal City, Illinois: Mayor Neal Nelson; Village Manager, Matt Fritz; Trustee, Dave Togliatee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Think the A corridors relieve traffic on I-80 but do not accommodate regional travel. • Concerned about more truck traffic being drawn to IL-113. • Support for B3.
January 12, 2012	Village of Channahon, Illinois: Mayor Joe Cook; Acting Manager, Joe Pena; Engineer, Ed Dolezal; Community Development Coordinator, Mike McMahon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would support a working alignment that relieves trucks on arterial routes from I-55. • Favors a northern working alignment.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
January 12, 2012	Village of Braceville, Illinois: Mayor Jim Homa; Village Planner, Lois Passafiurne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefers Corridor B3. • Concerned over trucks coming from CenterPoint. • Think the A corridors are too close to I-80 to provide a regional travel benefit.
January 17, 2012	City of Crown Point, Indiana: Chief of Staff, Keith Stevens; City Engineer, Tris Miles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support proposed project, but Corridors A1 and A2 would be damaging to downtown Crown Point. • Concerned about diverted traffic harming businesses.
January 17, 2012	NIRPC Coordination Meeting: NIRPC: Steve Strains, Hubert Morgan, Bill Brown, Thomas VanderWoude, Kevin Garcia, and Iman Abraham FHWA: Joyce Newland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of EJ approach for Illiana Corridor. • Discussion of NIRPC's initiatives to address 2009 corrective action in regards to the Congestion Mitigation Plan and EJ populations. • Discussion of potential opportunities to work with NIRPC and their EJ stakeholders.
January 17, 2012	Town of Schneider, Indiana: Steven Wilson, Richard Ludlow, Jack Jeralds, and City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of Illiana Corridor. • Hope that if A or B corridors are opposed that Corridor C4 would be viable.
January 18, 2012	Town of St. John, Indiana: Mayor Steve Kil; Town Council President, Michael Forbes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the Illiana Corridor. • Believe proposed project should be a regional connector and a corridor to I-80/I-94. • Do not support A1, but could support A2 or a variation of A1 that uses the A2 bypass of St. John, south of US 231.
January 18, 2012	Town of Cedar Lake, Indiana: Town Administrator Ian Nicolini	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corridor A2 was identified as being the most economically beneficial corridor but has environmental issues. • Concerned water treatment basins may be too close to B3. • Indicated A2 or B3 are acceptable.
January 18, 2012	Town of Lowell, Indiana: Doug Niksch, Department of Redevelopment & Annexation, Edgar Corns, Bob Phipot, Craig Earley, and Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like the proposed project to go south of Lowell and even south of well fields because the town needs to protect its water supplies.
January 18, 2012	Town of Merrillville, Indiana: Tom Goralczyk and Howard Fink	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefers Corridor A1. • Support the corridor development.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
January 19, 2012	City of Joliet, Illinois: Mayor Tom Giarrante; City Manager, Tom Thanas; Economic Development, Jim Haller; Public Works Administrator, Jim Trizna; City Engineer, Greg Ruddy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support interchange at Baseline Road from A1. • Concerned that a B3 interchange off-set from IL-53 would block Joliet access to Illiana Corridor. • Urge a 50 foot right-of-way set aside for future piping of water from Kankakee River.
January 24, 2012	Will County Executive: County Executive, Larry Walsh; Chief of Staff, Nick Palmer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Favor Corridor B3 due to A1 impacts and diagonal property impacts of other alternatives, but will wait for further information to take a formal position. • Concerned about dangerous situation at the I-80 and IL-53 interchange.
January, 30, 2012	Village of Beecher Intergovernmental Committee: Mayor Paul Lohmann; Village Administrator, Bob Barber; Board Members; and approximately 30 representatives from various Village taxing bodies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questioned if impacts to local fire and police districts were considered as part of the Illiana Corridor funding scenarios. • A comment was made regarding a potential interchange/access at IL-1 along the proposed project. It was also stated that the IL-1 SRA Study identified a Beecher bypass should IL-1 be reconstructed as a high volume arterial. Traffic and economic benefits and impacts to the Beecher business district are being re-evaluated in regards to a potential bypass. • Impacts to local roadways that cross the proposed Illiana Corridor were also discussed regarding potential overpasses and continuity of said routes. • Environmental impacts to Lake Dalecarlia, Indiana, were discussed as applicable to the corridor alternatives.
January 31, 2012	Lake County Farm Bureau: Wayne Belden, Tom Keithley, and Nick Zandster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer corridors next to existing utility alignments such as B3. • Prefer corridors located in the northern more populated areas. • Concerned over potential property tax implications.
February 1, 2012	Northwest Indiana Forum: Kay Nelson and Mark Maasell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interested in locating utilities in the corridor. • Believe the corridor would support the region's goals.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
February 1, 2012	Will County Land Use Department: Colin Duesing, Eric Wesel, Andrew Hawkins, James Harris, Steve Lazzara, Michael Smetana, Raymond Semplinski, David Dubois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five historic Lustron homes exist throughout Will County, and will have the Will County Historic Preservation Officer review for any possible impacts. • Expressed interest about modeling a Houbolt Road connection to I-55.
February 6, 2012	CenterPoint Properties: Jeremy Grey and Eric Gilbert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed it would not be simple to route a corridor through JATA. • Asked if a combination connection to I-55 and I-80 could be considered. There is an effort to provide a direct connection from Houbolt Road to Baseline Road via a new bridge. The study team looked at a few options including a Houbolt-Baseline bridge. Terminating A1 at IL-53 will cause high impacts at Arsenal Road. Routing A1 through CenterPoint causes high impacts. If a new interchange is added to A1 at Baseline, it relieves traffic at Arsenal, but A1 remains a high cost and high impact option. • Asked about southwest to northeast alternatives. B1 was the one modeled. High impacts with any of the alternatives terminating at "1" point along I-65. • See a future need for rail; Corridor B3 is more ideal for rail than A1. • Not opposed to Corridor B3. • Think a new Houbolt-Baseline connection would be more helpful to trucking than improving the IL-53/I-80 interchange.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
February 6, 2012	Village of Crete, Illinois: Mayor Mike Einhorn; Village Administrator, Tom Durkin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked about the possibility of splitting the alignment of the Illiana Corridor at I-57 since there are different needs east and west of I-57. • Believe that east and west of the western edge of the SSA/I-57 are dramatically different and that the Illiana Corridor should run northeast of the SSA's western edge and I-57 and should run south on the west side of the SSA/I-57. • Considering potential cost of a Beecher bypass off of B3, that other corridors or combinations could prove to be as, or more cost effective.
February 10, 2012	ComEd: Joe Landise and Tyler Petersen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The large 765kv line that goes east-west from the Peotone, Illinois, area into Indiana is owned by ComEd up to the State line; in Indiana it is owned and maintained by American Electric Power. • Future substation at Beecher may have a potential conflict with the B3 alignment. • Show 38kv lines on map. • New speaker station and large sub-station were missed by the aerial photos. Stay away from impacts to corner structures because they are costly to replace. • ComEd will need to hire a consultant to design the needed adjustments. There will be a 2-year lead time from start of design to finishing adjustments. • Recommended a highway alignment setback at large interchange areas. • The Kankakee River crossing was emphasized as a critical location. • Work closely with ComEd to avoid problems with proposed tall lighting, etc.
February 17, 2012	Will County CED Board:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steve Schilke gave a presentation on the status of the Illiana Corridor • Will County CED Board members stated a preference for Corridor B3, which is generally located in the same geographic area that for many years, they have believed is the best location for the Illiana Corridor.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
February 17, 2012	CN: Patrick Waldron	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CN supports the Illinois Railway Association in its membership stance of having no interest in a heavy freight rail component within the Illiana Corridor. • CN has no other interest in the Illiana Corridor except where it crosses CN's Illinois Central mainline. • CN would prefer a grade separation for the Illiana Corridor over the railroad, where the track is not disturbed.
March 13, 2012	JADA: Dave Neal, Rick Kwasneski, and Rod Tonelli	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would consider allowing some of the remaining property (400 acres) to be used as a wetland or forest mitigation site for Illiana Corridor, if needed.
March 19, 2012	Village of Symerton, Illinois: Village President, Alan Darr Jr.; Judi Quigley, Tom Powell, Eric Wilhelm, Dwayne Haemker, Kelly Proffitt, Alan Darr Sr.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village is primarily rural and residents would prefer to keep it that way. • Pointed out the location of a gas pipeline parallel to the ComEd transmission line on the south side. • Concerned about the 2,000-foot B3 corridor which goes over all but five residences in the village's core. • Expressed interest in potential noise mitigation strategies. • Village officials stated that they want to be an active participant in the process from this point forward.
March 22, 2012	IL-53 Corridor Group: Steve Lazzara and approximately 20 other members of the IL-53 group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest expressed about how Illiana Corridor would connect to IL-53. • Study an offset interchange for Corridor B3 between IL-53 and Chicago Road. • Enhancement of the IL-53 corridor was emphasized, with focus placed on promoting tourism with Midewin and Alternate Route 66 attractions.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
March 22, 2012	Village of Manhattan, Illinois: Mayor William Borgo; Marian Gibson and Marc Nelson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Village is concerned the A3S2 alignment could disrupt Pauling-Hoff as a necessary collector. The Illiana will not accommodate all east-west travel needs, even for trucks, and another east-west collector like Pauling-Hoff will be needed and must be protected. • Asked if an encircling route could be considered around the proposed SSA location in addition to the east-west corridors. • Stated that it is unlikely that a future western extension at the “A” connection could ever take place. • Pointed out a potential FPDWC holding near Bruns Road that may impact A3S2. • Identified a Peoples Gas pumping station near Bruns/Gougar Roads that should be avoided. • Manhattan believes that when all of the environmental analysis is done, the travel performance and the socioeconomic impacts that B3 will likely emerge as the best overall corridor.
March 22, 2012	Midewin Tallgrass Prairie Alliance: Gerald Heinrich and Connie Heinrich	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questioned the NEPA process being followed in the Illiana Corridor, and suggested that other alternatives than B3 be brought into the EIS. • Opposed to the Illiana Corridor carving a corridor through Midewin.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
March 29, 2012	Village of Monee, Illinois: Village Administrator Dave Wallace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes the Illiana Corridor is a corridor of the future for the region, and an alternative should be selected that encourages future growth for the purpose of regional, not local, travel. • A northern route as close to I-80 as AS32 defeats the purpose of providing necessary future travel. • Local and county road improvements could solve many of the local travel congestion in eastern Will County, and that those local issues should not be confused with regional travel needs the Illiana Corridor could address. • Believes that technical and environmental analysis clearly identify Corridor B3 as the best option, and questions the need to carry A3S2, B4, or other corridors forward for future analysis. • Monee opposes Corridor A3S2, in part, due to its impacts on subdivisions near I-57 and north of the proposed SSA location. • Expressed concern about travel modeling and the use of growth assumptions in the CMAP 2040 plan.
March 29, 2012	Village of Crete, Illinois: Mayor Mike Einhorn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested study team to look at an alignment connecting Exchange Street, Crete-Monee Road, or other appropriate east-west route, east to US 231 in Indiana. • Provide data for the volume of trucks the team is seeing in its traffic models, and what the respective origins and destinations are for those trucks. • Refine A3S2 working alignment as it heads southeast of the proposed SSA location to avoid the Crete intermodal facility and instead “stair-stepping” the alignment versus heading straight south between Beecher and the state line. • Locate the A4 connection to US 41 in Indiana as far north as possible to improve travel performance.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
March 29, 2012	Village of Beecher, Illinois: Trustee, Greg Szymanski; Village Administrator, Bob Barber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked study team to evaluate a combination of Corridors A3S2 and B4. • Supports the corridor that is least damaging, and believes that is the B3 alternative. • If Corridor A3S2 moves forward, study possibility of running it down Ashland Avenue through the proposed SSA location footprint and connect to B3 west of Beecher. This routing would avoid the Beecher landfill and avoid diagonal property cuts. • Concerned about how Corridor B3 would provide access to and from any Beecher bypass and IL-1.
April 2, 2012	Green Garden Township Planning Commission: Don Murday, Cal Johnson, Don Minday, FIRST NAME ILLEGIBLE Greenfieldts, Tim Krygsheld, Bob Norkus, Don Schwarz, Carol Chirafisi, Lyle Healy, John Ruchaj, Cathy Ruchaj, Shirley Lawrisuk, Joanne McEldowney, and Jim McEldowney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Garden Township cooperates with the Village of Frankfort, Illinois, in community planning. • Questioned where the addition of two new alternatives came from, and what the purpose is carrying multiple alternatives forward when B3 has been identified as the best performing alternative. • Corridors B3 or B4 are seen as preferable to A3S2.
April 4, 2012	Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie: Wade Spang, Bill Glass, Bob Hommes, and Rick Short	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about corridors bisecting the area between Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie and adjacent communities. • Proximity to Illiana Corridor may provide some advantages to Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie, but that if the Illiana Corridor is too close, it may be a detriment. • Stated that any parcel acquired by Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie has the same restrictions on new highways as the original Midewin footprint. • Favor an offset in the corridor design, and an offset will be more critical on Corridor B3 than A3S2. • Noise and lighting impacts should also be considered and included in the EIS. • Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie will collect relevant planning documents and provide them for consideration in the Illiana Corridor project.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
April 5, 2012	SSA: Bill Viste, Pete Quattrocchi, Mark Thompson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways are technically viewed as compatible developments within the Airport Operations Area (AOA). • If the Illiana were to use Corridor A3S2, it would inhibit other compatible developments (FedEx, hotels, restaurants, cargo, and distribution facilities) from locating there. • Future growth of the SSA may require additional access points be created in the area of A3S2's location. • The SSA would like to leave open options for a potential future link to the proposed Crete intermodal facility. • 2,000-foot Illiana corridor should take into account a drainage design required to avoid retention ponds if it remains within the 10,000-foot FAA zone. • The 394/Beecher Bypass along Ashland Avenue has been accommodated in the SSA EIS report under cumulative impacts based on the IDOT feasibility study, and the SSA does not expect the bypass to have a negative impact on the airport.
April 5, 2012	KATS: Mike Lammey, Jim Piekarczyk, Mike Van Mill, Mike Bossert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kankakee County prefers Corridor B3, and pointed out that B4 appears to incur into the county for approximately 1 mile. • Study Corridor B3 that goes just south of the Kankakee County line.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
April 9, 2012	Town of Cedar Lake, Indiana:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stated that B3 had greater potential benefit to Lake County residents in terms of access to higher salary jobs than B4 and that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ B4 is more of a bypass than a route that serves the residents ○ Harder to develop around the B4 corridor due to lack of utilities • Indicated that the preferred corridor for Illiana Corridor will be reflected in an updated Cedar Lake comprehensive plan. • Believes the Illiana Corridor is a positive for Lake County as it adds access to regional and national trade. • Believes the Illiana Corridor will have minimal local travel time benefits. • Believes the Illiana Corridor will provide better access to higher paying jobs.
April 9, 2012	Town of Lowell, Indiana: Phillip Kuiper, Craig Earley, Robert Philpot, Donald Parker, Edgar Corns, Gerry Scheub (County Commissioner), Dick Ludlow (Schneider Town Council)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked why the law requires a 3-mile separation between interchanges with I-65. A reply was provided that guidelines exist for interchange spacing based on whether an area is urban or rural. • Asked what it would take to move the corridor further south as previously had been studied, and stated that most people would prefer the B4 route because there are fewer homes and property owners. • Expressed concern about the north/south access, wherever that may be, was the overpasses and interchanges between I-65 and Rt. 41. • Stated that he believes the road will be a huge benefit to Illinois, but not as much for Indiana with the corridor stopping immediately at I-65. • Asked where the recommendations for the routes come from, and stated that the people in the area want the route to go south. • Stated he was in favor of Corridor B4 because of interest from three major rail lines wanting to go south with a train turnaround in Schneider which crosses the CSX tracks, the ethanol plant and

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
		<p>other opportunities of land use around that corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked what kind of help from the toll road they would get for the costs of additional emergency services. <p>Stated that A3S2 would have no new business or job benefits, and that Corridors B3 and B4 have much greater potential benefits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stated that the Indiana Delegation is unanimous in its support for Corridor B4, along with not cutting off roads. • Community resident requested an auto-reply function be setup online so that people submitting inquiries know that their message went through. • Community resident asked if the project team could meet with West Creek Township officials.
<p>April 12, 2012</p>	<p>NIRPC: Geof Benson, NIRPC Steve Strains, NIRPC Bill Brown, NIRPC Steve Sostaric, NIRPC Tom Van der Woude, NIRPC Hubert Morgan, NIRPC Angie Fegaras, INDOT John Pangallo, INDOT Kesti Susinskas, IDOT Ron Shimizu, PB Joyce Newland, FHWA (by phone) Matt Fuller, FHWA (by phone) Steve Schilke, IDOT (by phone) Ed Leonard, PB (by phone) Rick Powell, PB (by phone) Randy Simes, PB (by phone)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed forthcoming April 19 meeting of the full Commission/Executive Board. • NIRPC 2040 Comprehensive Plan should be included, and there is a need to support inner core and livable communities.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
April 19, 2012	<p>NIRPC: Nancy Adams, George Adey, Roosevelt Allen, John Bayler, Geof Benson, Matt Bernacchi, Kevin Breitzke, Bob Carnahan, Tom Clouser, Anthony Copeland, Stan Dobosz, Don Ensign, Jeff Freeze, Ken Layton, Richard Ludlow, Tom McDermott, Edward Morales, Diane Noll, Brian Novak, Anthony Pampalone, Donald Parker, Jim Polarek, Bob Schaefer, David Shafer, Brian Snedecor, Greg Stinson, John Sullivan, Jim Ton, David Uran, and George Van Til. Staff present included John Swanson, David Hollenbeck, Kathy Luther, Kevin Garcia, Jody Melton, Stephen Sostaric, Steve Strains, Bob Niezgodski, Allen Hammond, Kelly Wenger, Mitch Barloga, Gabrielle Biciunas, Bill Brown, and Kathy Dubie, Greg Kicinski, INDOT, Angie Fegaras, INDOT, Kent Ahrenholtz, DLZ, Kesti Susinskas, IDOT, Ron Shimizu, PB</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed outcomes of the TSPR. • Questioned what the context is in regards to the NIRPC 2040 Comprehensive Plan.
April 23, 2012	<p>FPDWC: Andy Hawkins, Tim Good, Juli Mason, Deb Specht, Matt Novander, Larry Newton, Core Crawford, Colleen Hahn, Karen Fonte, Juanita Armstrong, Floyd Catchpole</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked why Corridor A3S2 goes north of the proposed SSA location instead of south. • Corridor A3S2 is just south of the FPDWC's current acquisition plan for Black Walnut Creek. • Corridor A3S2 would cross the planned Vincennes Trail which land acquisitions are occurring for a ½-mile extension. • The trail would run south into Kankakee County, and will need some way to cross the Illiana. • The FPDWC has updated their data on Threatened & Endangered plant species in the past year, and will distribute that information to the project team.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
April 23, 2012	SSMMA: Mayor Rich Hofeld (Village of Homewood), Ed Paesal, Mayor David Owen (Village of South Chicago Heights), Bud Fleming, Mike Scholefield	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that A3S2 will serve the traffic needs of the southland region, and be more financially viable than either Corridors B3 or B4. • Concerned that a bypass will be needed in Beecher should B3 be selected as the final corridor. • The CN intermodal facility in Harvey is projected to have as many lifts per day, with its recent expansion plans, as the BNSF intermodal facility in Elwood. • Asked if financial analysis of the three corridor alternatives would be completed before a final preferred alternative(s) is selected. • Asked if after the Tier One ROD is issued, if right-of-way can be protected. • The proposed Southeast Service Line Rail extension would terminate at a station across from Balmoral Park and would provide rail connectivity to the Corridor A3S2.
April 25, 2012	Openlands, Midewin Alliance, Sierra Club, Wetlands Initiative, Nature Conservancy: Stacy Meyers, Fran Harty, Paul Botts, Cindy Skrukruud, Lorin Schab, Nick Epstein, Joe Roth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Kankakee River is a Land Water Conservation Area and has the same protections as an Illinois nature preserve. If additional traffic were drawn to IL-53, there would be salt splash and spray issues through the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie. • The Illiana route through either the Des Plaines Conservation Area or Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie is causing great concern among environmental resource constituencies. • The DPSCA is one of the few available hunting grounds for Chicago area hunting enthusiasts, and expressed concern about how a nearby highway would affect the experience. • Indicated that the B3 crossing of the Kankakee River was likely in the least impacting location. • Openlands to provide additional GIS layers to help identify resources.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
May 7, 2012	Will County Board: Jim Moustis, Jim Bilotta, Bruce Gould	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stated that since Midewin is on a former Army base, it may not be pristine land. • Believe it is a good idea to get a consensus amongst Will County communities on a preferred route. • Corridor B3 is the best way to accommodate existing and future truck traffic, and helps divert truck traffic around Chicago. • Stated that it may be difficult to get the Corridor A3S2 through the new Wal-Mart distribution facility.
May 8, 2012	Will County Executive: Larry Walsh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commented that a lot of public input has come in surrounding Midewin – both with people wanting to route Illiana through it, and people who want to protect Midewin from Illiana. • Explained the context of the people who lost their properties to the former Joliet arsenal in the late 1930's, many of whom still have families in the area. • Expressed concern about pending quick take legislation in Illinois, and stated that it should not be used until the project is definite in funding and location, and construction is imminent. • Expressed preference that the EIS public hearing occur on or before July 19, or on or after August 1.
May 8, 2012	Will County Farm Bureau: Mark Schneidewind	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reported that a few landowners have seen surveyors on properties and wondered if they were with the Illiana Corridor project, and that the surveyors did not knock on the residence door or provide proof of the right-of-entry. • The Will County Farm Bureau is opposed to the use of “Quick-Take” and has concerns about condemnation. • The Will County Farm Bureau is working with Will County and legislators to amend the Plat Act to allow for a one-time, four-way split of an agricultural parcel in addition to any split that the Illiana Corridor project causes. • Expressed concern about farmers having difficulty accessing split parcels.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
May 8, 2012	Village of Channahon: Joe Cook, Village President; Joe Pena, Acting Administrator; Ed Dolezal, Public Works Director; Mike McMahon, Community Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquired as to what type of interchanges would be located at Bluff Road if Corridor A3S2 is selected. • Asked why some residents in a subdivision near Bluff Road received survey letters and others did not. • Village of Channahon would like to know which corridor alternative is selected as soon as possible so that they can move forward with planning activities • Asked what kind of an impact would be felt should an interchange be built at Bluff Road along Corridor A3S2. • Asked why Wilmington-Peotone Road was not chosen as the path for Corridor B3. • Should Corridor A3S2 be selected, the Village of Channahon would like to have access to the northeast corner of the interchange area. • Representatives did not see the benefit of the A3S2 corridor to their community outweighing the negative impacts it may have on the community.
May 9, 2012	CenterPoint Properties: Jeremy Grey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corridor A3S2 should be moved north at Baseline Road to avoid impacts to newly constructed Home Depot and Stepan Chemical facilities on each side of Baseline Road. • The working alignment of Corridor A3S2 should avoid a planned wetland mitigation site at the southeast portion of the CenterPoint property. • There would be advantages to Corridor A3S2 since it serves CenterPoint's two intermodal centers, but main focus is that the Illiana Corridor benefit their centers with either of the three "build" alternatives. • CenterPoint would support Corridor B3 if it is determined to be the most feasible alternative with regards to cost, environmental impacts, and travel benefits..

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
May 10, 2012	CMAP: Randy Blankenhorn, Executive Director, CMAP; Jill Leary, CMAP; Don Kopec, CMAP; Matt Maloney, CMAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquired as to whether the constraints of adding additional capacity to I-80 is the bridge over the quarry near the state line and residential or other developments in the area. • Asked whether Corridor A1 connection constraints were mainly in the State of Indiana. • Stated that the Illiana Corridor will need to be included in the constrained portion of the Go To 2040 Plan before potential private investors could deem the project financially viable due to the uncertainty that not being in the Plan would create. • The Illiana Corridor cannot become part of the Go To 2040 Plan until it demonstrates fiscal constraint. • CMAP requested financial information demonstrating fiscal constraint for the Illiana Corridor during Tier Two, but before the Tier Two ROD is issued. • Asked whether an interchange at IL-53 was being examined in Will County. • CMAP requested to see projections showing the population growth shifts anticipated to occur if Corridor B3 becomes the final corridor, and would like to know if growth caused by Corridor B3 will occur in existing communities. • Requested that a market analysis be done in the Illiana Corridor Study Area to determine realistic thresholds and locations for various types of projected growth because the region can only sustain a certain amount of commercial, industrial, and residential growth. • Stated that the number one goal of Go To 2040 is to promote that future growth occurs in existing communities and that existing communities include municipalities like Beecher and Peotone. • CMAP would like to see data sets for 1) financial analysis, 2) projected land use changes, and 3) economic benefits and where they will occur. • Stated that the Purpose and Need report should be reevaluated, and the project team must decide whether the purpose is to move freight or regional traffic.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
May 14, 2012	Village of Peotone: Rich Duran, President, Village of Peotone; George Gray, Administrator, Village of Peotone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about the additional cost of studying Corridor A3S2 when Corridor B3 is clearly the best balance of travel performance and environmental impacts. • Asked if the refinement mentioned in Figure A-14 of the Alternatives to be Carried Forward Technical Memorandum was made to avoid the power lines, or for another reason. • Expressed concerns about the Manteno intermodal facilities pushing traffic up Rt. 50 to Wilmington-Peotone Road, and the potential worsening of that, if there is not an interchange on Rt. 50 in addition to I-57. • Manteno has road restrictions in place on County Highway 9 that prevent trucks from directly accessing I-57 which is why trucks travel either north to Wilmington-Peotone Road or south all the way into Kankakee before they can access I-57.
May 14, 2012	Lake Dalecarlia Property Owners Association: Martha Coakley, President, Lake Dalecarlia Property Owners Association; Joe Coakley, Resident, Lake Dalecarlia; Mark Torphy, Lake Dalecarlia Property Owners Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed concern about how the Illiana Corridor would cross existing roads, and if there would be overpasses, since there are only two roads that enter and exit the community currently. • Due to their proximity to potential interchange areas at Rt. 55 and Rt. 41, they believe that they likely would not see much development specifically in Lake Dalecarlia. • Stated that they are not concerned about being directly impacted by the location of Corridor B3, but the corridor is closer than they initially realized and they are concerned about the potential noise and light impacts the Illiana Corridor might have.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
May 18, 2012	Village of University Park: Vivian Covington, Mayor; Lafayette Linear, Village Manager; Jerry Townsend, Trustee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked if the working alignment within Corridor A3S2 would be more expensive than working alignment within Corridor B3. • Stated that the working alignment within Corridor A3S2 would possibly be more advantageous to University Park by providing closer access that could help enhance the University Park industrial park. • Expressed that while there may be some benefits of the working alignment within Corridor A3S2 to their community, but that they feel there may be more negatives and that working alignment within Corridor B3 has more benefits for their community, is best for the region overall, and may be more feasible.
May 24, 2012	ISTHA: Henry Guerriero, ISTHA, Adam Lintner, ISTHA, Rocco Zuccherro, ISTHA, Kamran Khan, CDM Smith, Eugene Ryan, CDM Smith, Tom Harknett, Stantec	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parsons Brinckerhoff presented the base 2010 Illiana model to the group • Stantec presented the Illiana toll approach • Electronic toll collection penetration was discussed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Illiana Team is interested in revealed elasticity using Tollway traffic and changes in fees. Some comments that were made included – much elasticity is lost due to the fact that construction and recessionary times took place at the same time as toll increases. The group identified the correct reports that would provide the best information on elasticity for autos and trucks. This list is formalized in the data request letter being prepared. • The group then discussed violation and revenue recovery on the Tollway’s system. • Fiber optics right of way was discussed. There was a discussion on the existing system – fiber is in place at the I-57 and I-294 interchange which might inform the Illiana Expressway fiber optic plan.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversions from I-80 were discussed. CMAP and business sources are both forecasting a big growth in trucks in the region. Capacity on I-80 is limited - when a new facility allows diversion, the traffic fills up with other traffic quickly. The group recommended spot checks on I-80 diversions for reporting benefits of Illiana Expressway alternatives. • Cost per mile for Roadway Maintenance for ISTHA and IDOT were discussed • The group decided that the Illiana Consultant Team would prepare a formal letter to be transmitted to the tollway that would summarize the data requests discussed at this meeting and previously.
June 5, 2012	City of Joliet: Tom Thanas, City Manager; Jim Trizna, City Engineer; Jim Haller, Community Development Director; Greg Ruddy, Engineer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked whether the "A" connection could connect to I-80 through Houbolt Road. • Asked whether traversing the army training property is a possibility. • Stated that they do not want to see CenterPoint Properties lose developable ground due to an "A" connection to I-55 traversing the Joliet Intermodal facility, but overall that issue is more of a question for CenterPoint. • Stated that they have platted a new distribution facility or spec facility that would be located in the path of Corridor A3S2 due to the avoidance plans for Treat Island. • Stated that there must be an interchange on IL-53, or at an appropriate off-set location, otherwise Joliet will not see the benefits of Corridor B3.

Table 4-8. Local and Regional Stakeholders (continued)

Date of Meeting	Stakeholder	Comment Themes
June 5, 2012	Various Stakeholders: Representative Larry Walsh, District 86; Colleen Prieboy, Legislative Assistant for Rep. Larry Walsh; CPT Omari Robinson, Joliet Army Training Area; Bill Offerman, Elwood Mayor; Nick Narducci, Elwood Manager; Max Bosso, Elwood Public Works Director; Larry Walsh, Will County Executive; Tim Vanderheyden, Jackson Township Supervisor; Pat McGuire, 43 rd District Senator; Mark Schneidewind, Will County Farm Bureau Executive Director; Wade Spang, Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie; Paul Buss, Jackson Township Highway Commissioner; Jim Walsh, Manhattan Township Supervisor; Jim Baltas, Manhattan Township Highway Commissioner; Bill Quigley, Florence Township Supervisor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of those present stated that Midewin should be viewed as an asset. A natural area for the future that will bring jobs and millions of visitors; visitors that are looking to see things that they cannot see anywhere else. • Stated that opening up the congressional act that protects Midewin from new roads going through it would also open up every national park of its kind to potential destruction. • Asked when a list of landowners in the 400-foot working alignment would be identified. • Group discussed the timing of land acquisition and the Illinois quick-take process. • Suggested that IDOT/INDOT release a fact sheet and press release discussing the facts, process, necessity and timeframe associated with quick-take to dispel any misinformation. • Asked whether the land acquisition process would be handled by IDOT or by a private partner(s), if that occurs. • Expressed concern about the I-55/Des Plaines River Bridge near Channahon and the impact that the Illiana Corridor will have on increasing the existing overload on that structure and the I-55 facility. • IDOT was asked to provide information about bridge safety ratings to the Village of Elwood.

The CPG and TTF met for the first time on June 14 and 15, 2011. The purpose of the meeting was to “kick-off” project scoping for the Illiana Corridor. The agenda for the meeting included introductions of the PSG and other project stakeholders, an overview of the CSS process, and a discussion of the next steps in the scoping process. Project stakeholders in attendance also participated in a workshop to identify project issues and goals. Subsequent CPG/TTF meetings have been held on approximately a monthly basis and have focused on refining the proposed project goals, Purpose and Need, and proposed alternatives. Summaries of the CPG/TTF meetings are presented in Table 4-9 and can be found in Appendix J.

Table 4-9. CPG/TTF Meetings

Group/Agency	Date	Purpose	Results
CPG/TTF (Meeting No. 1)	June 14 and 15, 2011 (Illinois and Indiana)	Kick-off project scoping, introduce the PSG and other project stakeholders, present a history and overview of the corridor, present an overview of the CSS process, discuss the next steps in the scoping process, identify project issues and goals, and develop a draft stakeholder problem statement.	<p>Identified the following goals and objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate a comprehensive range of transportation system improvements that optimize mobility, capacity, accessibility, and safety in the region; in particular, maximizing congestion relief on existing facilities and providing for future capacity needs and improvement of east-west bi-state connectivity. • Minimize and mitigate community and environmental impacts. • Optimize current and future economic development opportunities. • Optimize multi-modal accommodations and intermodal connection opportunities. • Consider financial feasibility and sustainability in selecting project alternatives. • Support and enhance other major existing and planned future infrastructure projects. • Improve environmental and community assets. • Provide a transportation system that is safe and accessible for all users. • Provide a transportation system that will improve the movement of freight in the region. • Balance local economic and transportation needs in the location and design of the Illiana Corridor. • Consider innovative design concepts.

Table 4-9. CPG/TTF Meetings (continued)

Group/Agency	Date	Purpose	Results
CPG/TTF (Meeting No. 2)	July 11 and 12, 2011 (Illinois and Indiana)	Review and further develop the problem statement and project goals, discuss the technical analysis approach, discuss the next steps in the process, and conduct a workshop to identify environmentally sensitive areas and opportunities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refined goals and objectives identified in Meeting No. 1. • Clarified the issues and concerns surrounding the draft problem statement. • Commented on project goals, including revising the goal statement to read, 'Improve a safe and accessible transportation system for all.'
CPG/TTF (Meeting No. 3)	August 11, 2011	Review of problem statement, develop draft Purpose and Need framework, outline alternatives development process, and distribute alternatives toolbox.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed and revised the problem statement. • Began development of the Purpose and Need statement. • Reviewed the technical analysis findings. • Began the development of alternatives by reviewing relevant transportation modes in the corridor, and potential for using the corridor for multi-purpose/multi-modal travel. • Assessed funding options.

Table 4-9. CPG/TTF Meetings (continued)

Group/Agency	Date	Purpose	Results
CPG/TTF (Meeting No. 4)	September 19, 2011	Present draft Purpose and Need statement, detail the initial alternatives development process, seek input on potential corridor alternatives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed and provided input on the draft Purpose and Need statement. • Developed a total of nearly 60 alternatives during workshop breakout session. • The developed alternatives generally included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A north, central, and southern east-west route, interchanges with I-55 (River Road, IL-129, Goodfarm Road) and I-65 (near I-65 in Merrillville, Indiana, near SR 2 between the towns of Cedar Lake, Indiana, and Lowell, Indiana) - Opportunities to parallel/utilize I-57 as a portion of the route. - Extension of commuter rail service. - Use of ComEd right-of-way. - Avoidance of environmental constraints, municipal borders, and major population areas. - Connection to the proposed SSA. - Build as a tollway with truck only lanes/freight corridor. - Extend the corridor west (to Morris, Illinois) and east (to Michigan City, Indiana). - Connect to I-80 vs. I-55 on the west end of the corridor.
CPG/TTF (Meeting No. 5)	October 25, 2011	Review the TSPR, review the draft Purpose and Need statement, evaluate the initial alternatives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed points of the draft Purpose and Need statement in detail. • Reviewed initial alternatives (developed from stakeholder alternatives).

Table 4-9. CPG/TTF Meetings (continued)

Group/Agency	Date	Purpose	Results
CPG/TTF (Meeting No. 6)	December 6, 2011	Refine Purpose and Need statement, review initial alternatives evaluation and screening, refine alternatives to best address transportation needs and deficiencies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refined Purpose and Need statement. • Refined and narrowed initial alternatives for further study down to eight corridors.
CPG/TTF (Meeting No. 7)	February 8, 2012	CPG Meeting No. 6 and Public Meeting No. 2 recap, second round of alternatives evaluations and screening process presented, preliminary preferred alternative recommendation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corridor B3 identified as the preliminary preferred corridor for further study. • Public Meeting No. 3 scheduled for February 22 and 23, 2012.
CPG/TTF (Meeting No. 8)	June 6, 2012	Recap input received from CPG #7 and Public Meeting Round 3. Discuss details of further studies on A3S2, B3 and B4 Corridors. Outline EIS and corridor location findings, including impacts, travel performance, meeting Purpose and Need and costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corridors A3S2, B3, and B4 will be included in the DEIS to be released Summer 2012 with a Public Hearing and comment period to follow.
Travel Forecast Modeling Workshop (held in conjunction with CPG/TTF Meeting #8)	June 6, 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning context and modeling requirements presented. • Illiana travel model main components presented. • CMAP model updates. • Zone system, highway network refinements presented. • National and local system assignments. • Truck travel. • Population and employment growth. • No-tell scenarios presented. • Travel performance results presented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall travel performance of Corridors A3S2, B3, and B4.

Following the initial CPG and TTF project kick-off/scoping meeting, where transportation deficiencies were identified and goals and objectives were identified, the first public meetings were held on June 21 and 22, 2011. The purposes of the public meetings were to review these items and collect input on the project including comments, suggestions, issues, and concerns from the public.

The second round of public meetings were held in mid-December 2011 to update the public on the progress to date and to inform them on what the next steps in the process would be. The meetings were also held to solicit public input on the Purpose and Need, and on the proposed solutions to the transportation problems that were identified from stakeholder and public input.

A third round of public meetings was held in February 2012 to present to the public the preliminary preferred corridor and solicit input on the alternatives evaluation process.

Upon request, a public meeting was held on March 21, 2012 for the City of Wilmington, Illinois. A review of the process and an update of project activities were presented. The meeting focused on the corridor location refinements specific to the Wilmington area. Summaries of public meetings and open houses are presented in Table 4-10 and in Appendix K.

Table 4-10. Public Meetings and Hearings

Date of Meeting	Purpose	Number of Participants	Comment Themes
June 21, 2011 (Illinois Public Meeting No. 1)	Project kickoff, review study history, process, and objectives, CSS procedures, and provide an opportunity for the public to share its perspectives regarding transportation issues, project concerns, and objectives.	71	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study process and timeline. • Identifying and taking existing environmental features into consideration. • Creating multi-modal opportunities within the Illiana Corridor.
June 22, 2011 (Indiana Public Meeting No. 1)	Project kickoff, review study history, process, and objectives, CSS procedures, and provide an opportunity for the public to share its perspectives regarding transportation issues, project concerns, and objectives.	140	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand for a new facility. • Study process and communications. • Farmland/agricultural preservation. • Project costs (both direct and indirect). • Corridor location and route configuration.

Table 4-10. Public Meetings and Hearings (continued)

Date of Meeting	Purpose	Number of Participants	Comment Themes
December 13, 2011 (Indiana Public Meeting No. 2)	Review the study process and schedule, describe how the Purpose and Need for the project was developed, show what the local communities had developed as possible solutions to the transportation problems, and the evaluation of those solutions, and what the next steps are.	126	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestions or preferences for alternatives, including the submittal of three alternative maps. • Concerns over potential impacts to communities and existing transportation routes. • Comments on the No-Action Alternative.
December 14, 2011 (Illinois Public Meeting No. 2)	Review the study process and schedule, describe how the Purpose and Need for the project was developed, show what the local communities had developed as possible solutions to the transportation problems, and the evaluation of those solutions, and what the next steps are.	118	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestions or preferences for alternatives, including the submittal of one alternative map. • Concerns over potential impacts to communities and existing transportation routes. • Consideration of transit and tolling options during the alternatives evaluation process.

Table 4-10. Public Meetings and Hearings (continued)

Date of Meeting	Purpose	Number of Participants	Comment Themes
February 22, 2012 (Indiana Public Meeting No. 3)	Review alternatives evaluation and refinement process for current alternatives with the public, introduce the preliminary preferred alternative, and seek further corridor alternatives input.	487	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property impacts. • Land acquisition information and process questions. • Preference for the Illiana Corridor to be located further north or south than Corridor B3. • A desire for more detailed information and maps concerning the preferred corridor. • Alternatives suggested for further consideration included the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Corridor A2, - Constructing the corridor along the high-tension power lines, and - A combination of B-3 on the west and A4, and C4. • Some stakeholders expressed opposition to the following corridors: A1, A3, and A3S1.
February 23, 2012 (Illinois Public Meeting No. 3)	Review alternatives evaluation and refinement process for current alternatives with the public, introduce the preliminary preferred alternative, and seek further corridor alternatives input.	245	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Schedule. • Additional Community planning with proposed route. • Property impacts. • Land acquisition information and process questions. • Preference for the Illiana Corridor to be located further north or south than Corridor B3.

Table 4-10. Public Meetings and Hearings (continued)

Date of Meeting	Purpose	Number of Participants	Comment Themes
March 21, 2012 Open House – City of Wilmington, Illinois	Presentation and open house were held at request of City of Wilmington. Public Meeting No. 3 presentation and exhibits were shown. Review of study process and alternatives refinements specific to Wilmington area.	323	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinements to Corridor B3 were suggested. • Details of the engineering/design characteristics of Corridor B3 were requested. • Concerns over community impacts.

4.8 Other Activities

In addition to the scoping and stakeholder meetings, and public involvement efforts described above, numerous other means of communicating and coordinating with the public have been utilized. These include the following items:

- **Mailing List** – The mailing list was developed to support public meeting invitations, newsletter distribution, and other direct public contact. The mailing list includes contact information for federal, state, and local officials; special interest groups; resource agencies; business and community leaders; and members of the public.
- **Newsletters/Fact Sheets** – Newsletters provide updates on the Illiana Corridor progress and are circulated at key project milestones to assist with the consistent delivery of project information and progress (Table 4-11).
- **Public Website** – The public website disseminates information to the public and also provides an opportunity for visitors to provide input and comments. The website provides a central source of project information. Information posted on the website includes project history, study process and information, maps, photos, reports, and electronic versions of printed material. (www.IllianaCorridor.org)
- **Media Outreach** – Press releases, media briefings, publication pieces, media correspondence, and one-on-one briefings with agency-designated spokespersons are all utilized to inform the general public about the proposed project and its progress.
- **Public Response and Communication** – Both direct (e-mail, mail, phone calls, and comment forms submitted at meetings and briefings) and indirect (comments received from the media, non-agency meetings, and third party websites) public comments are addressed to ensure the public that its concerns and opinions are being recognized. Through May 18, 2012, there have been 684 comments recorded in the comment response management system implemented to provide a centralized, secure, and electronically accessible repository for comments received and comment responses.

- The monitoring of third-party meetings, activities, websites, and media reports related to the project will continue throughout the Illiana Corridor and reports on these activities will be detailed and stored as they occur.

Table 4-11. Fact Sheets and Newsletters

Title and Date	Content
May 2011 (Fact Sheet Issue #1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed the history of the Illiana Corridor project, and how it dates back to the 1909 Plan of Chicago by Daniel Burnham and Edward Bennett. • Identified the Illiana Corridor Study Area. • Outlined that feasibility studies for a potential Illiana expressway were completed in 2009 by Indiana and 2010 by Illinois, and that a MOU was signed on June 9, 2010 by the Governors of Illinois and Indiana which formalized a partnership between the two states for planning a potential new transportation linkage. • Explained that legislation was enacted in both states to allow a P3, which allows private sector financing for constructing or operating a transportation facility. • Outlined that the IDOT is managing consulting contracts and the overall study, and that the INDOT is financially participating in the study and will provide Indiana leadership. • Stated that the IDOT and INDOT will act as joint lead agencies with the FHWA for preparation of the EIS, and that Parsons Brinckerhoff will conduct the Illiana Corridor Study as the consultant team. • Highlighted that the Illiana Corridor Study Tier One EIS was initiated in April 2011 and will be completed within 24 months, and that Tier One and Tier Two EIS work is all that currently funded. • Explained that CSS will be used on the project, and that public involvement is a key component of this approach and is strongly encouraged during the study.

Table 4-11. Fact Sheets and Newsletters (continued)

Title and Date	Content
June 2011 (Newsletter Issue #1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informed recipients of public meetings to be held in Matteson, Illinois on June 21, 2011 and in Crown Point, Indiana on June 22, 2011. • Explained that the Illiana Corridor Study will follow the NEPA process, and will use a two-tiered approach. • Identified the Illiana Corridor Study Area. • Explained the purpose and functionality of the CPG and the TTF. • Informed recipients about how to obtain additional information regarding the Illiana Corridor project, and how to stay informed going forward. • Outlined the next steps in the Tier One study timeline.
November 2011 (TSPR Fact Sheet)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defined the Illiana Corridor Study Area. • Explained the model characteristics used to perform traffic analysis within the Illiana Corridor. • Outlined the key findings of the TSPR. • Identified the key transportation needs of the Illiana Corridor Study Area as defined by the project's Purpose and Need. • Summarized stakeholder input and engagement, and how it was considered within the TSPR. • Explained the next steps in the Illiana Corridor Study process.
December 2011 (Fact Sheet Issue #2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented initial alternatives developed from a CPG/TTF workshop, and explained the process that was used to develop the various alternatives. • Explained that additional corridors are being studied, and that all corridors are being evaluated with a computerized regional traffic forecast based on the model used by MPOs. • Outlined the next steps in the study process including identifying environmental and building impacts, traffic counts, congestion impacts, and economic impacts. • Presented preliminary impact summary ratings, and preliminary travel benefit summary ratings for each of the eight alternatives.

Table 4-11. Fact Sheets and Newsletters (continued)

Title and Date	Content
December 2011 (Newsletter Issue #2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarized that the consideration of prime agricultural land and natural resources; the incorporation of trails and other modes of transportation; maintaining sensitivity to nearby communities; streamlining and accelerating the study process; and mitigating environmental impacts were comments supported by multiple stakeholders. • Outlined the next steps in the Tier One study timeline. • Informed recipients that the IDOT and the INDOT welcome input on the initial stakeholder alternatives at public meetings to be held on December 13-14, 2011. • Explained that the Illiana study team completed the TSPR, which examines the existing transportation conditions, needs and deficiencies in the Study Area. • Highlighted that the draft Purpose and Need document has identified Improved Regional Mobility, Addressing Local System Deficiencies, and Providing for Efficient Movement of Truck and Freight Demand as the three major transportation needs within the Illiana Corridor Study Area. • Explained the process of developing and studying various alternative suggestions, and identified more than 80 corridor alternatives came from stakeholders.
February 2012 (Newsletter Issue #3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarized the process that produced more than 80 corridor alternatives, and eight major corridors for further study. After analyzing all of the alternatives, the Illiana Corridor study team presented a preliminary recommendation to move forward with Corridor B3. • Explained the decision-making process and criteria used that led to Corridor B3 being selected as a preliminary recommendation. • Outlined the next steps in the Tier One study timeline. • Summarized analysis of alternative alignments within the northern, middle and southern portions of the Study Area.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK