ILLINOIS ROUTE 3 CONNECTOR
CAG MEETING #8

ATTENDEES:	Curtis Francois/Gateway Motorsports Park	Scott Penny/Fairmont City Police Dept.
	Jerry Blair/EWGCOG	Annie Prothro/IDOT
	Bill Grogan/St. Clair County Transit	Cindy Stafford/IDOT
	Arlene Yates/Resident	Jennifer Hunt/IDOT
	Lauren Howell/Resident	Brian Macias/IDOT
	Joe Durako/Waste Management	Buddy Desai/CH2M
	Mark Ellison/Tank Trailer Cleaning	James Ritter/ CH2M
	Mayor John W Hamm III/Madison	Carla Mykytiuk/CH2M
	Jerome Jackson/Southern Mission Baptist Church	Sarah Archer/CH2M
		Tim Nittler/CH2M

FROM:	CH2M
MEETING DATE:	February 3, 2016
PROJECT NUMBER:	344101

On February 3, 2016, the Illinois Route 3 Connector (I3C) Project's Community Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting #8 was held at the Gateway Motorsports Park Convention Center within the project Study Area. The sign-in sheet, handouts, and a copy of the presentation used at the meeting are attached.

MEETING NOTES

The meeting agenda included the following items:

1. Study Area
2. Purpose and Need
3. Alternatives
   - No Build
   - Alternatives Carried Forward
   - Revisions to the Alternatives Carried Forward
   - Potential Preferred Alternative
4. Next Steps & Schedule
5. Questions

Introductions

Buddy Desai/CH2M welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked all attendees for coming. Buddy explained that the 8th CAG meeting was being held to provide an update on

the progress the project team had made and to solicit CAG input on revisions made to some of the alternatives carried forward.

Buddy Desai/CH2M introduced himself and asked the IDOT and CH2M members in attendance to introduce themselves. Finally, the 10 CAG members in attendance were asked to introduce themselves and state their affiliation.

Once introductions were complete, Buddy proceeded to facilitate the meeting. A brief recap of the project's previous seven CAG meetings was provided.

- Meeting #1, November 8, 2006 - Project Introduction
- Meeting #2/#3, May 10, 2007 – Purpose & Need
- Meeting #4, August 29, 2007 – Alternatives
- Project Hiatus - November 2007 to January 2013 to allow time to determine how the Mississippi River Bridge Project would impact the project area.
- Meeting #5, January 23, 2013 – Project re-initiation
- Meeting #6, October 13, 2014 – Initial Conceptual Alternatives
- Meeting #7, July 28, 2015 – Alternatives Carried Forward

The purpose of this 8th CAG meeting was to present refinements made to the four alternatives carried forward that were presented to the CAG at Meeting #7, share the impacts related to each of these revised alternatives and gather additional feedback and input from the CAG on the alternative that IDOT was considering as the Potential Preferred Alternative.

1. Study Area

Buddy reviewed the parameters of the project study area and discussed the three existing and committed projects that the project team had to take into account during the development of the conceptual alternatives:

- Construction of Mississippi River Bridge (MRB) Project
- IL Route 3 Relocation
- Planned MRB Full Build-out

2. Purpose and Need

Buddy reviewed the Purpose and Need for the project which was developed with the input of the CAG. The CAG previously expressed that a major concern for drivers in the area is the amount of time spent stopped at at-grade railroad crossings. Emergency services will also benefit from better response times by eliminating at-grade rail road crossings.. Tank Trailer Cleaning and the City of East St. Louis have previously indicated a desire to expand the commercial and industrial nature of the project area and there also was a desire to take care of the residents who still live in the area.

Based on this information, the Purpose and Need for the I3C Project is to "Improve traffic flow and network connectivity within study limits" by:

- Improving accessibility within the study area and between IL Route 3 and IL Route 203
- Eliminating reliance on circuitous local roads and short trips on Interstate System
- Improving travel time consistency

It was noted that improving connections may also enhance economic development opportunities for existing and new businesses.

Buddy reminded the group that all of the alternatives carried forward discussed at today's CAG meet the project's Purpose and Need.

3. Alternatives

Buddy began the Alternatives discussion by talking briefly about the No-Build Alternative.

No-Build Alternative

In addition to the four Alternatives Carried Forward, Buddy explained that the No-Build Alternative is always maintained as a viable alternative for roadway projects subject to a study of this nature. Although "doing nothing" is always considered, the No-Build Alternative for the I3C Project does includes these conditions:

- Baseline 2040 transportation condition
- Basis for comparing the travel performance of the proposed alternatives
- Maintain the current roadways in their current condition
- Routine maintenance would continue to be conducted
- No capacity additions or major improvements to existing roadways
- Not a no-cost concept, since maintenance and repair of the existing roadways will be needed
- Assumes the construction of Relocated IL Route 3 and I-70 Full Build

Buddy moved next to an overview of the commonalities among the alternatives carried forward and told the group that this is where they will notice changes from the alternatives discussed at CAG Meeting #7.

He started with a review of the typical section for a two-way urban minor arterial roadway that will be used for the project (see slide 14 in the attached presentation deck). Buddy pointed out that it was important to note that any sidewalk or bike lane built as part of the project would require local support in the form of cost participation. If such support is not forthcoming, bike lanes and sidewalk would not be included in the final project.

Before getting into the details of each of the Alternatives Carried Forward that had been shared at CAG Meeting #7 (Alternatives A, C, E, and G), Buddy explained that as part of the NEPA/404 Merger Meeting process IDOT meets regularly with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), which has oversight, and various resource agencies (e.g. Fish and Wildlife, US Army Corps of Engineers, etc.) to review the project and provide concurrence on project milestones. At this point in the process; concurrence has been provided on the Purpose & Need, and most recently (June 24, 2015), on the Alternatives Carried Forward – which will be discussed next. The Potential Preferred Alternative is anticipated to be presented for concurrence in the summer of 2016.

Regarding the alternatives carried forward, Buddy noted that each of the alternatives features a roadway connection between IL Route 3 and IL Route 203, with a connection that utilizes existing Exchange Avenue at Collinsville Road. A Collinsville road connection was required as part of the initial funding bill.

The various ways of connecting resulted in variations of similar alternates. There were three key parts to each concept alternative:

- Connection at IL Route 203; either a North (203N) or South (203S) connection
- Connection at IL Route 3; either a North (3N) or South (3S) connection
- Connection to Collinsville Road utilizing Exchange Avenue (C1)

Next, Buddy began a review of the Alternatives Carried Forward that the CAG reviewed at the last CAG meeting. First Buddy reminded the group of the physical constraints located in the study area that any I3C alternative would need to take into consideration.

These constraints include: Gateway National Golf Links, Gateway Motorsports Park, St. Louis Auto Shredder, Tank Trailer Cleaning and the I-70 Full Build and Relocated IL Route 3 footprints.

Alternatives Carried Forward

Buddy then briefly reviewed the characteristics of each of the four alternatives carried forward:

Alternative A (with connection points 3N-203N-C1)

- Begins at the Relocated IL Route 3 intersection with Packers Avenue south of I-70
- Follows the proposed Relocated IL Route 3 alignment to the north to connection point 3N; includes building a part of the Relocated Illinois Route 3.
- Travels in a northeasterly direction crossing over:

  - The Terminal Railroad Association (TRRA) and Norfolk Southern (NS) railroads
  - The Landsdowne Ditch
  - The Cahokia Canal
  - The I-70 Full Build
- Ends at connection point 203N near Gateway National Golf Links
- Connects to Collinsville Road via Connection Point C1 using an improved Exchange Avenue

Alternative C (with connection points 3N-203S-C1)

- Begins at the Relocated IL Route 3 intersection with Packers Avenue south of I-70
- Follows the proposed Relocated IL Route 3 alignment to the north to connection point 3N
- Travels in a northeasterly direction crossing over the TRRA and NS railroads and the Landsdowne Ditch; parallels the Cahokia Canal just north of Raceway Boulevard; Buddy pointed out that the minimal impacts to Gateway Motorsports Park are agreeable to the owners.
- Ends at IL Route 203 just south of the Cahokia Canal
- Connects to Collinsville Road via Connection Point C1 using an improved Exchange Avenue
- A benefit of alternative C is that it will not affect the Gateway Motorsports Park race track or Gateway Motorsports Park.
- Encroachment of the Cahokia Canal would occur; the project team is working with Metro East Sanitary District (MESD) to make sure flooding due to the proposed roadway is not an issue.

Alternative E (with connection points 3S-203N-C1)

- Begins at the Relocated IL Route 3 intersection with Packers Avenue south of I-70
- Follows the proposed Relocated IL Route 3 alignment north to connection point 3S using a shorter section of relocated Route 3 than with Alternatives A and C.
- Travels in a northeasterly direction crossing over:
  - The TRRA and NS railroads
  - The Landsdowne Ditch
  - The Cahokia Canal

- The I-70 Full Build

- Ends at connection point 203N near Gateway National Golf Links
- Connects to Collinsville Road via Connection Point C1 using an improved Exchange Avenue

Alternative G (with connection points 3S-203S-C1)

- Begins at the Relocated IL Route 3 intersection with Packers Avenue south of I-70
- Follows the proposed Relocated IL Route 3 alignment to the north to connection point 3S; similar to Alternative E, uses less of Relocated IL Route 3 than Alternatives A and C.
- Travels in a northeasterly direction crossing over:
  - The TRRA and NS railroads
  - The Landsdowne Ditch
- Parallels the Cahokia Canal just north of Raceway Boulevard
- Ends at IL Route 203 just south of the Cahokia Canal
- Connects to Collinsville Road via Connection Point C1 using an improved Exchange Avenue

Alternatives Screening

Buddy next shared the results of the extensive environmental impact screening and cost opinions for the four Alternatives Carried Forward (see slide 21). He pointed out that there are sensitive resources in the project corridor including ***Boltonia decurrens*** a threatened and endangered plant found within the corridor. In addition to numerous wetlands and floodplains throughout the corridor, there are also archeological and historical areas of concern that are not typically shared on maps to prevent people from visiting the locations.

Revisions to Alternatives Carried Forward

Buddy explained that since the last CAG meeting, the project team evaluated each of the alternatives carried forward for ways to reduce potential impacts to environmental resources of concern to the resource agencies. This evaluation resulted in a set of revisions to alternatives carried forward.

The revisions to alternatives carried forward optimize roadway alignment and avoid/minimize environmental impacts. Revisions are in ***bold italics*** and can be viewed on slides 23-33 of the attached presentation.

Alternative A (with connection points 3N-203N-C1)

- Begins at the Relocated IL Route 3 intersection with Packers Avenue south of I-70

- Follows the proposed Relocated IL Route 3 alignment to the north to connection point 3N; includes building a part of the Relocated Illinois Route 3.
- Travels in a northeasterly direction crossing over:
    - The Terminal Railroad Association (TRRA) and Norfolk Southern (NS) railroads
    - The Landsdowne Ditch
        - ***Eliminated a curve between future Relocated IL Route 3 and Landsdowne Ditch***
            - ***Improves the constructability of bridges and bridge approaches***
    - The Cahokia Canal
        - ***Cahokia Canal crossing and future I-70 Full Build shifted slightly east***
            - ***Minimizes impacts to wetlands and Boltonia decurrens populations***
    - The I-70 Full Build
- Ends at connection point 203N near Gateway National Golf Links
- ***IL Route 203 connection shifted slightly north***
    - ***Minimizes impacts to wetlands, floodplains, and Boltonia decurrens populations***
- Connects to Collinsville Road via Connection Point C1 using an improved Exchange Avenue
- ***The revisions result in a reduction in direct wetland impacts by 2.45 acres (6.0 acres to 3.55 acres) and a reduction in impact to large Boltonia decurrens populations of 1.3 acres (2.0 acres to 0.7 acres)***

Alternative C (with connection points 3N-203S-C1)

- Begins at the Relocated IL Route 3 intersection with Packers Avenue south of I-70
- Follows the proposed Relocated IL Route 3 alignment to the north to connection point 3N
- Travels in a northeasterly direction crossing over
    - TRRA and NS railroads
    - Landsdowne Ditch

    - ***Curve between future Relocated IL Route 3 and Landsdowne Ditch shifted east***
        - ***Improves the constructability of bridges and bridge approaches***
- Parallels the Cahokia Canal just north of Raceway Boulevard
- Ends at IL Route 203 just south of the Cahokia Canal
- Connects to Collinsville Road via Connection Point C1 using an improved Exchange Avenue
- A benefit of alternative C is that it will not affect the Gateway Motorsports Park race track.
- Encroachment of the Cahokia Canal would occur; the project team is working with Metro East Sanitary District (MESD) to make sure flooding is not an issue.
- ***No other refinements were identified that would further avoid or minimize environmental impacts or reduce costs***
- ***The revisions result in a direct wetland impacts for Alternative C now at 3.82 acres compared to 3.00 acres previously***
    - ***This increase in direct wetland impacts results from greater design detail***

Alternative E (with connection points 3S-203N-C1)

- Begins at the Relocated IL Route 3 intersection with Packers Avenue south of I-70
- Follows the proposed Relocated IL Route 3 alignment north to connection point 3S; though uses less of relocated Route 3 than Alternatives A and C.
- Travels in a northeasterly direction crossing over:
    - The TRRA and NS railroads
    - The Landsdowne Ditch
    - The Cahokia Canal
        - ***Cahokia Canal crossing and future I-70 Full Build shifted west***
            - ***Minimizes impacts to wetlands, floodplains, and Boltonia decurrens populations***
    - The I-70 Full Build
- Ends at connection point 203N near Gateway National Golf Links

- ***IL Route 203 connection and the corresponding approach shifted north***
  - ***Minimizes impacts to wetlands, floodplain, and Boltonia decurrens populations***

- Connects to Collinsville Road via Connection Point C1 using an improved Exchange Avenue
- ***The revisions result in a reduction of direct wetland impacts by 9.35 acres (13.0 acres to 3.65 acres) and reduction in impact to large Boltonia decurrens populations of 2.8 acres (3.0 acres to 0.2 acres***)

Alternative G (with connection points 3S-203S-C1)

- ***No refinements were identified for Alternative G that would further avoid or minimize environmental impacts or further optimize engineering design and constructability***

Buddy pointed out that for all of the revised alternatives; small shifts resulted in significant changes in impacts, resulting in significant benefits. A table showing the impacts of the revised alternatives was shared with the group to showcase those impacts that increased or decreased as a result of the revisions (see slide 34). In addition, Buddy used the table to show that an issue of significance had come up regarding the potential for impacts to potential Section 4(f) property in the study area that would be impacted by both Alternatives A and C. Buddy explained that 4(f) is related to one of the regulations that protects cultural resource sites.

Identification of the Potential Preferred Alternative

As part of the discussion regarding the project team's identification of the Potential Preferred Alternative, Buddy reviewed a listing of factors that differentiate alternatives, including roadway construction and maintenance, socio-economic resources (displacements and right-of way required), natural and cultural resources, cost, CAG, and public input. Although important, other elements such as special waste, noise, air quality, and traffic do not differentiate the alternatives. Buddy told the group that all of the environmental impacts will be document in the environmental document for the project, an Environmental Assessment (EA).

A CAG member asked if all of the factors are scored and ranked numerically. Buddy said that they are not all formally weighted and ranked, but looked at holistically; taking a look at all of the numbers together. The CAG member suggested that the process is more subjective than objective and Buddy agreed, saying that the project team tries to prioritize based on input from the agencies, the CAG, and the other stakeholders. Often the project requires permits for work in certain areas. The agency issuing a 404 permit for example would push for an alternative with less wetland impacts and might not permit one with greater wetland impacts.

Next, Buddy provided a summary of CAG and public input regarding the Alternatives Carried Forward presented at CAG #7 and PIM #3:

- CAG members
    - Indicated that Alternative C (3N-203S-C1) was most favorably viewed followed by Alternative G (3S-203S-C1)
- Alternative A (3N-203N-C1) was singled out for impacts to the Gateway National Golf Links and the potential harm it would do to the economy
- Alternative E (3S-203N-C1) was by far the least favored alternative due to its environmental impacts and impacts to the golf course
- Public
    - Support for the prompt construction of the project to prevent construction traffic going across railroad tracks and merging traffic coming off the New Mississippi River Bridge

Buddy discussed the two aspects of travel time, how long it takes to get somewhere and the travel time reliability of a route, using TSA as an example since one never knows how long the security line at the airport will be. One of the benefits of the Illinois Route 3 Connector project is that reliability will be significantly improved with the elimination of at-grade railroad crossings.

Alternative C (as revised) was identified as the Potential Preferred Alternative based on the following:

- Travel performance proved to be comparable
- Social impacts were minimal
- Environmental impacts of Alternative C were less than the other Alternatives
- Stakeholder input also favored Alternative C over the other Alternatives

In consideration of all the technical analysis, stakeholder input, and impacts to the Amour Plant, the Potential Preferred Alternative for the Illinois Route 3 Connector is Alternative C (as revised)

Armour Plant Location

The potential 4(f) resource that Buddy mentioned earlier in the presentation was identified after the last CAG meeting, as a concern raised by a resource agency (Illinois Historic Preservation Agency [IHPA]) regarding the Armour Plant location in Fairmont City. Several meat packing plant buildings remain on what may be determined a property eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) based on the history of the area as a former stockyards. At one time, the Armour Plant was the largest mule/horse packing operation in the world. Buddy pointed

out that even though the buildings are in disrepair, that by law, the project team still need to consider the significance of the property and impacts of the alternatives to the property.

Currently, the Relocated IL Route 3 Project impacts the remaining Armour Plant buildings. The portion of the Illinois Route 3 Connector Project with impacts to the Armour Plant is coincident with the future Relocated IL Route 3 corridor. Relocated IL Route 3 was previously studied by IDOT with an approved Record of Decision achieved on January 22, 2001.

Buddy explained that IDOT, with assistance from Illinois State Archaeological Survey, is currently providing information to Illinois Historic Preservation Agency in order to determine the eligibility of the buildings for the NRHP. Cindy Stafford/IDOT clarified that IDOT is researching the property, but the (Illinois State Historic Preservation Officer) ISHPO makes the determination of whether it is a historic property.

Because the initial analysis indicates that the entire property boundary is likely to be eligible, avoidance/minimization alternatives were investigated resulting in modifications to Alternative C to minimize impacts.

In an effort to avoid impacts to the potential Section 4(f) resource (the Armour Plant), Buddy explained that the project team made additional revisions to Alternative C (slides 49-50), which included the ability to avoid impacts to buildings on the plant property, but not all impacts to the property itself. Alternative C originally stayed on Relocated Route 3, but the revised, minimization/avoidance version is now located north of where Relocated Route 3 is due to geometry/constructability issues. Buddy explained that without being constrained to Relocated Route 3, some other impact avoidance can be done – though there are still a lot of constraints such as the railroad tracks.

A CAG member asked if the owner of the Armour Plant had been spoken to. Buddy said that IDOT had spoken to the owners, but the project still needed to follow the Section 4(f) process. He noted that the owner stated that they are not maintaining the buildings, and intends to tear them down but that there is a significant cost to doing so. Buddy said that it is interesting that the whole property is potentially eligible for listing due to the historic activities that took place on the site.

Cindy Stafford/IDOT said that the owners of the Armour Plant had been hoping that IDOT would take their properties down. This however, is not a factor for the agency and the building still need to be avoided.

A CAG member said that the CAG and Project Team took advantage of Relocated Illinois Route 3, and now that is still going through buildings, but Revised Alternative 3 will be close to that roadway. He was concerned that taxpayers would now be paying for two roads in virtually the same place now. Buddy responded that

the Relocated Illinois Route 3 environmental document will have to be reevaluated and that the outcome of this reevaluation would likely be that Relocated Illinois Route 3 will now join Revised Alternative C. He said that without Relocated Illinois Route 3, the Illinois Route 3 Connector alternatives would have looked different; now they will be subject to Illinois Route 3 Connector.

Buddy asked if anyone is opposed to the Revised Alternative 3 alignment. Chief Penny/Fairmont City said that he would need to take this to his board and be ready for considerable opposition to the alternative given that the abandoned buildings would not be razed as part of the roadway project. He said that Fairmont City had hoped the project would remove these buildings that are eyesores and pose a safety hazard. Buddy said that he understands the city's viewpoint.

Curtis Francois/Gateway Motorsports Park asked if the owner can tear the buildings down now. Buddy said "yes" and that then we wouldn't have the impact.

Chief Penny said that he was upset that the buildings were not going to be taken down but that he was ok with the alignment. He said that he had never heard of this as historic or any issue regarding the Armour Plant property.

Group Discussion on Potential Preferred Alternative

After sharing the impacts for the Revised Alternative C (slide 51), Buddy asked the group to take 10-15 minutes to review the Potential Preferred Alternative. Each CAG member was provided an impact table for Revised Alternative C and a map of Environmental Resources Impacts to review. Buddy asked the group to consider the evaluation factors and to provide feedback on the study team's decision on the Potential Preferred Alternative.

After the CAG members reconvened, Buddy asked if they had any thoughts or comments to share. A CAG member asked if there would be a road on both sides of the Cahokia Canal. Buddy said yes; the roadway on the north side would be the I-70 Full Build and would be a freeway. On the south side of the Cahokia Canal would be the Illinois Route 3 Connector, an arterial roadway.

A CAG member asked if I-70 will be elevated. James Ritter/CH2M said that near the canal, I-70 would be elevated.

Buddy said that the I-70 Project is long term and that the Illinois Route 3 Connector may be built first. He said that originally it was part of the New Mississippi River Bridge Project – so that when the I-70 full-build is built, it won't affect the new bridge. Cindy Stafford/IDOT added that the realigned I-70 would be built when and if there is a need for 8-lanes across the river. This would result in a parallel bridge to the current new bridge.

Next, Buddy reviewed the Environmental Resources Impacts map for Revised Alternative C. He mentioned that resource agencies had expressed concern about

environmental impacts associated with Alternatives E and G. Buddy asked for CAG member opinions of the alternatives so that they could be documented. CAG member Curtis Francois/Gateway Motorsports Park confirmed that the race track is pleased with Revised Alternative C. CAG member Mark Ellison/Tank Trailer Cleaning said that he agrees with Chief Penny; that the revisions to Alternative C to avoid the Armour Plant buildings is a waste of public funds, would not benefit growth in this area, and even the owner of the Armour Plant property does not want the buildings. Buddy acknowledged his concerns, but said that the regulations are clear and IDOT has to follow them.

Merger Meetings

After the discussion about the Potential Preferred Alternative, Buddy briefly touched on the NEPA/404 Merger process and the merger meetings that had been held to date (see slide 54). At the June 2015 merger meeting, the agencies provided concurrence on the Alternatives to be Carried Forward. (Note: the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency did not concur; however, their concurrence is not required to proceed with the study). Concurrence on the Potential Preferred Alternative is anticipated in June 2016.

4. Next Steps

Buddy explained that the project would be moving forward on three fronts; engineering, environmental, and public involvement;

He mentioned that the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) is close to being completed and will be reviewed internally first and then by FHWA. The EA will document the alternatives refinement, public involvement, and decision making processes, and will also include a more detailed analysis of the impacts.

Engineering efforts will include advancing design on the Potential Preferred Alternative.

Upcoming public involvement activities include a Public Hearing later this year after the EA has been made available for public review. Buddy said that future CAG meeting will focus on design of the Preferred Alternative, will likely be shorter and might be more of an open house format.

Cindy Stafford/IDOT told the group that the project could be wrapped up in about a year. CAG member Chief Penny/Fairmont City asked if there was a timeline for when shovels would hit the ground. Buddy said that funding for construction has not been identified. Cindy clarified by saying that the next phase (Phase 2) including land acquisition activities and construction planning takes about 18 to 24 months and for the Illinois Route 3 Connector Project, it may take additional time due to railroad involvement. Cindy said that because construction money is not currently available, the project team cannot provide a concrete timeline. She also mentioned that regarding the Armour property, it could be 20 years before IDOT gets around to

removing the buildings. Buddy said that a change to the Armour Plant buildings or land could result in reverting to the Alternative C alignment.

5. Questions

Buddy invited questions/discussion at the conclusion of CAG meeting #8. As a result, no questions were offered.

Buddy Desai concluded the meeting by thanking everyone for their time and encouraging anyone with questions or concerns about the project to contact him or Annie at any time.

5. Post Meeting Discussion and Follow Up

At the end of the meeting Chief Penny/Fairmont City asked IDOT to provide all communication between the Department and the IHPA regarding the Armour Plant property. Cindy Stafford/IDOT said that she may need to work with the Department's FOIA department to honor his request.

There were also three questions that were raised related to the Armour Plant and the Section 4(f) and Section 106 processes. The questions, and responses are provided below.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. Since IDOT is using federal funds and will need federal permits (404 permits, etc) for this project, IDOT is legally required to comply with the Section 106 process.

- *Question 1 – If the building is determined to be eligible for the NRHP, does the Property Owner still have the ability to demolition the building utilizing his or her own resources?*
    - *Response – Yes, the private owner can remove the building even if it is determined to be eligible for the register.*
- *Question 2 - Is the property owner is permitted to remove the building under the conditions described in Question 1, would the property owner still be eligible for any public funding assistance that might be available to do so? (Basically, if the building is determined eligible for the register, does that make the property owner ineligible to receive public funding programs that might have helped with the demo cost)?*
    - *Response – Probably. This is because, if state or federal funds are used to remove the building, the removal would then have to be coordinated with the Illinois Historical Preservation Agency (IHPA) and/or the State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO).*

      Please note: If private funds are used for the demolition of an identified eligible property, it is recommended that property owner contact the SHPO to insure no state laws are overlooked.

- *Question 3 - Does the property owner solely have the ability to officially request that the buildings be added to the national register, or can some other group, such as a Preserve the Armour Building Group, make that request without the property owner's consent?*
    - *Response – Properties can be **determined eligible** for the NRHP without landowner involvement, **but they cannot be listed** on the NRHP without landowner involvement. Please note that in terms of the Section 106 process, listed or determined eligible, mean the same thing and, therefore, carry the same restrictions for IDOT/FHWA.*

Illinois Route 3 Connector Project
Community Advisory Group
Meeting #8

Wednesday, February 3, 2016
Gateway Motorsports Park

Name	Affiliation
Mayor Tom W Hemmer	City of Madison
Jerry Blair	EWGCOG
Bill Grogan	St. Clair County Transit
Mark Ellison	Tonk Trailer Cleaning
Scott Penny	Fairmont City
Arlene Yates	Concerned Citizens of East St. Louis Caseyville
Lauren Howell	" "
Joe Drake	Waste Management
Curtis Francois	Gateway MSP
Jerome Jackson	Southern Mission Bapt. Ch.