

**Illinois NEPA/404 Merger Meeting
September 19, 2019**

**USEPA – Region 5
77 West Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, IL**

12th Floor – Lake Ontario Room

**Federal Highway
Administration
3250 Executive Park Drive
Springfield, IL 62703
Conference Room**

9 am – 12 noon

- Florence Bridge, District 6, Pike and Scott counties
 - Concurrence – Preferred Alternative
- Caton Farm-Bruce Road, District 1, Will County
 - Information – project update
- Quentin Road, District 1, Cook County
 - Information – status update

12:00 noon

ADJOURN

Sign-in Sheet NEPA-404 Merger Meeting September 19, 2019 District 6 - Florence Bridge, Pike and Scott counties Concurrence - Preferred Alternative			
Name	Agency	e-mail address	Participation Location
Alan Edmondson	USACE	alan.r.edmondson@usace.army.mil	Teleconference
Megan Hamilton	WSP	megan.hamilton@wsp.com	Teleconference
Pete Sambor	USCG	Peter.J.Sambor@uscg.mil	Teleconference
Jeff Kruchten	IDNR-SHPO	Jeffery.Kruchten@illinois.gov	Teleconference
Steve Ott	WSP	steve.ott@wsp.com	Teleconference
Matt Fuller	FHWA	matt.fuller@dot.gov	Chicago
William Raffensperger	IDOT	william.raffensperger@illinois.gov	Chicago
Ken Westlake	USEPA	westlake.kenneth@epa.gov	Chicago
Stasi Brown	USACE	stasi.f.brown@usace.army.mil	Chicago
Mike Sedlacek	USEPA	Sedlacek.Michael@epa.gov	Chicago
John Sherrill	IDOT	john.sherrill@illinois.gov	Chicago
Jan Piland	FHWA	janis.piland@dot.gov	Springfield
Rick Powell	WSP USA	rick.powell@wsp.com	Springfield
Denny O'Connell	IDOT	dennis.oconnell@illinois.gov	Springfield
Sal Madonia	IDOT	sal.madonia3@illinois.gov	Springfield
Heidi Thomas	FHWA	heidi.thomas@dot.gov	Springfield
Becky Roman	IDOT	elizabeth.roman@illinois.gov	Springfield
Jeffrey Evers	IL Dept of Ag	jeff.evers@illinois.gov	Springfield
Felecia Hurley	IDOT	Felecia.Hurley@illinois.gov	Springfield
Brad Koldehoff	IDOT	brad.koldehoff@illinois.gov	Springfield
Janel Veile	IDOT	janel.veile@illinois.gov	Springfield
Jay Wavering	IDOT	jay.wavering@illinois.gov	Springfield
Kristin Timmons	Crawford Murphy & Tilly	ktimmons@cmtengr.com	Springfield
Brad Hayes	IDNR	Bradley.Hayes@illinois.gov	Springfield

**IDOT District 6, Pike and Scott counties
Florence Bridge
Environmental Assessment
Concurrence – Preferred Alternative
September 19, 2019**

DECISIONS:

Concurrence on the preferred alternative was obtained from Illinois Department of Agriculture, US Army Corps of Engineers, US Coast Guard, Illinois Department of Natural Resources, US Environmental Protection Agency, and Illinois SHPO.

NEXT STEPS:

EA to be release for public review and a public hearing held in early 2020.

DISCUSSION:

On September 19, a NEPA/404 Merger Team meeting was held at the FHWA Illinois Division office in Springfield for the Illinois 100/106 River Crossing Phase I Study. The meeting included live and remote attendees who were connected via telephone and web conference. The purpose of the meeting was to seek concurrence of the project Preferred Alternative from state and federal resource agencies.

No handouts were distributed to the attendees at the meeting.

Items previously distributed to the attendees included:

- Preferred Alternative Report
- NEPA timeframes schedule
- List of Cooperating Agencies
- Current environmental reports and memorandums including:
 - January 2018 INHS Botanical Survey report
 - May 2018 INHS Herpetological Survey report
 - June 2017 IDOT memorandum re: historic bridge status
 - September 2018 INHS Botanical Survey Results report
 - May 2018 ISGS 3408 Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment
 - February 2018 ISAS archaeology memorandum
 - ISAS Archaeological memorandums April, May and June 2019
 - 2018 INHS Avian Survey report
 - October 2017 INHS Aquatic Survey report
 - October 2018 IDOT Historic Resources memorandum
 - June 2019 SHPO conditional Archaeological Resources concurrence memorandum
 - November 2017 INHS Wetland Determination Survey report

R. Powell (WSP USA) narrated the presentation (approximately 40 minutes), in which the project's progress was reviewed and alternatives developed were discussed in detail, including the previous recommendation of Alternative 4C (100' south of the existing IL 100/106 alignment) which was withdrawn from the February 2019 NEPA/404 Merger meeting agenda due to discovery of a sensitive archaeological resource within the alternative's footprint. Further investigation led to a recommendation of Alternative 4C/D (300' south of the existing IL 100/106 alignment) as the Preferred Alternative, which was presented for concurrence following comparison of impacts with the other alternatives.

A. Edmondson (USACE) asked IDOT's intent with the uneconomic remnant areas identified within the 4C/D footprint. J. Wavering responded that IDOT planned to temporarily fence the area during construction; the fencing would be removed after construction and the area would be left in its natural condition. A "protected area" shown in the presentation southwest of the existing IL 100/106/Florence Road intersection would be permanently fenced to protect the sensitive archaeological resource. A. Edmondson also asked if IDOT would place a covenant on the uneconomic remnant property. J. Wavering responded that IDOT had no plans to place a covenant such as would be applied to a conservation area, that IDOT had no immediate plans for the property, and it is not needed for construction of the Preferred Alternative.

W. Raffensperger asked if the existing IL 100/106 roadway would be removed in addition to removing the existing bridge. J. Wavering responded that the existing roadway would be removed east of Florence Road to the west edge of the existing bridge, and from the east edge of the existing bridge to where it meets the Alternative 4C/D alignment east of the river. From Florence Road west, the roadway would be left in place as part of the connector road. R. Powell added that the roadway portion from Old U.S. 36 west to where it meets the Alternative 4C/D alignment would be removed as well.

M. Fuller (FHWA) polled the various resource agencies on their concurrence with the project's recommended Alternatives to be Carried Forward. Verbal concurrences were received from Illinois Department of Agriculture, US Army Corps of Engineers, US Coast Guard, Illinois Department of Natural Resources, US Environmental Protection Agency, and Illinois SHPO. US Fish and Wildlife Service was not present for the poll.

Following the polling, J. Wavering and R. Powell concluded the presentation by describing the ongoing coordination and the next steps in the study process. The potential for constructing part of the alignment west of the levee on embankment (rather than on bridge structure) was discussed, pending hydraulic studies for its feasibility. It was observed that all the land east of the levee is in the mapped floodplain, but that the levee had not been breached in recent history.

Attendees were asked if there were any additional questions about the project.

W. Raffensperger asked if a reduced clearance option other than 15' could be considered. J. Wavering responded that the clearance was provided for maintenance of the levee. A. Edmondson added that Jeremy Eck of USACE St. Louis office is the Section 408 coordinator

(not in attendance), and could not directly address the question, but indicated that the USACE had developed clearances in coordination with the levee districts to address levee maintenance needs including emergency operations during flood events.

K. Westlake at USEPA asked about the availability of the EA at the Public Hearing, and IDOT responded that it would be.

Sign-in Sheet NEPA-404 Merger Meeting September 19, 2019 District 1 - Caton Farm Bruce Road - Will County Information - project update			
Name	Agency	e-mail address	Participation Location
Matt Fuller	FHWA	matt.fuller@dot.gov	Chicago
Mary Young	Civil Tech	myoung@civiltechinc.com	Chicago
Madelaine Johnson	Civil Tech	mjohnson@civiltechinc.com	Chicago
Christina Kupkowski	Will County	ckupkowski@willcountyillinois.com	Chicago
Ken Westlake	USEPA	westlake.kenneth@epa.gov	Chicago
William Raffensperger	IDOT	william.raffensperger@illinois.gov	Chicago
Liz Pelloso	USEPA	pelloso.elizabeth@epa.gov	Chicago
John Sherrill	IDOT	john.sherrill@illinois.gov	Chicago
Stasi Brown	USACE	stasi.f.brown@usace.army.mil	Chicago
Mike Matkovic	CBBEL	mmatkovic@cbbel.com	Chicago
Joel Christell	Civil Tech	Jchristell@civiltechinc.com	Chicago
Shawn Cirton	USFWS	Shawn_Cirton@fws.gov	Teleconference
Jan Piland	FHWA	janis.piland@dot.gov	Springfield
Craig Cassem	FHWA	craig.cassem@dot.gov	Springfield
Brad Koldehoff	IDOT	brad.koldehoff@illinois.gov	Springfield
Felecia Hurley	IDOT	felecia.hurley@illinois.gov	Springfield
Jeffrey Evers	IL Dept of Ag	jeff.evers@illinois.gov	Springfield
Becky Roman	IDOT	elizabeth.roman@illinois.gov	Springfield
Janel Veile	IDOT	janel.veile@illinois.gov	Springfield

**IDOT District 1, Will County
Caton Farm-Bruce Road
Environmental Assessment
Information – project update
September 19, 2019**

DECISIONS:

None requested, none received.

NEXT STEPS:

- An Environmental Survey Request (ESR) Addendum will need to be submitted to reexamine the preferred alternative and the north-south alternatives.
- The threatened and endangered species list needs to be updated.
- Wetland delineations and impacts will need to be updated for the entire Preferred Alternative and the three north-south alternatives east of Gougar Road as part of the ESR Addendum. The 2005 wetland delineations may be used for comparison on other alternatives that were carried forward. Ms. Brown stated that wetland delineations will need to be updated again prior to obtaining a construction permit, if more than 5-years passes from the updated delineations to be completed.
- Concurrence Point #3 will be revisited once the ESR Addendum has been assessed. Areas of the corridor where there are community concerns, as well as the eastern north-south portion will be reevaluated as part of the Addendum.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Young (Civiltech) opened the meeting with a PowerPoint presentation discussing the history and developments of the project. The project was last presented on September 6, 2012 at which time concurrence was received on the Preferred Alternative. She stated the project is located in Will County north of Joliet, and covers a study area approximately 11 miles by 3 miles. The project commences at the intersection of U.S. Route 30 and Caton Farm Road and continues across the Des Plaines River Valley and ends at the intersection of IL Route 7 (159th Street) and Cedar Road. In March of 2005, Concurrence Point #1 – Project Purpose and Need was reached. In January of 2007, Concurrence Point #2 was reached with six alternatives to be carried forward, which included two different River Valley crossing locations and 6 build alternatives. The following alternatives were carried forward:

- Caton Farm – Bruce – Gougar Alignment
- Caton Farm – Bruce – Middle Alignment
- Caton Farm – Oak – Bruce – Gougar Alignment
- Caton Farm – Oak – Bruce – Middle Alignment
- Caton Farm – Oak – Gougar Alignment
- Caton Farm – Oak – Middle Alignment

In July of 2009, the Will County Board passed a resolution adopting the Caton Farm – Oak – Bruce – Middle as the locally preferred alternative.

Since Concurrence Point #3 in 2012, detailed environmental and design studies have occurred as well as coordination meetings with IDOT/FHWA, the project Transportation Corridor Committee (TCC), and the Fairmont Community. Over the past several years, local agencies have expressed the desire for the preferred alternative to be reevaluated for the north-south alignment portion east of Gougar Road due to the loss of development opportunities with the current alignment and close proximity to the newly constructed William E. Young Elementary School. The school's property is directly adjacent to the 2009 preferred alignment and construction of the new roadway would require right-of-way from the property where recreational fields are located and/or planned.

Alignment alternatives considered east of Gougar Road included changing the eastern logical terminus, using I-355 as a north to south link for the east to west portions of the alignment, and reevaluating Gougar Road and Cedar Road as north to south links. The alternative to use I-355 was eliminated because it was not believed roadway users would utilize a toll road to go such a short distance, when a non-tolled option is in close proximity. The eastern logical terminus was not changed as it would mean going back to the beginning of the project development process. It was agreed that reevaluation of the Gougar Road and Cedar Road alternatives would be undertaken.

The three eastern alternatives reevaluated were:

- Caton Farm – Oak – Bruce – Gougar Alignment
- Caton Farm – Oak – Bruce – Middle Alignment
- Caton Farm – Oak – Bruce – Cedar Alignment

These alternatives were reevaluated on the basis of environmental impacts and showed comparable impacts between each of the three alternatives. The results of the alternatives reevaluation were presented to the TCC and the public. The public comments received were mixed with no clear preference. After further discussion, the TCC selected the Caton Farm – Oak – Bruce – Gougar Road Alignment as the new north-south preferred alternative due to its proximity to I-355, use of existing infrastructure, and its ability to not hinder development opportunities. Resolutions in support of the Gougar Road alternative have been passed by the County and the local agencies.

Mr. Raffensperger (IDOT) stated the EA needs to clearly state that Gougar Road was one of the alternatives carried forward to show that it meets the Purpose and Need.

Mr. Westlake (USEPA) asked if the Gougar Road portion of the alignment was evaluated for the appropriate level of service. Ms. Young (Civiltech) responded that the proposed Gougar Road alignment provides an acceptable level of service.

Ms. Pelloso (EPA) asked about the EJ impacts in the Fairmont Community. Mr. Matkovic (CBBEL) stated that the Fairmont Community is an impoverished area with which extensive

coordination has occurred through both public and individual meetings in the community. Communication is ongoing, as the preferred alternative will widen Oak Avenue, resulting in property acquisitions from about 11 residences, with 5 of these residences being vacant based on the most recent review. There are no displacements related to community centers or places of worship. A traffic signal is proposed at Green Garden and Oak Avenue with pedestrian signals to facilitate a safer walking route to the local school. Noise walls are also being evaluated to reduce noise impacts to the community. Mr. Raffensperger (IDOT) asked how community cohesion will be maintained. Ms. Kupkowski (Will County) stated that in addition to the pedestrian signals at Green Garden, boulevard options and designs to reduce speed are being considered.

Mr. Westlake (USEPA) asked if there are impacts to public lands in the section of the preferred alternative connecting Oak Avenue and Bruce Road. Mr. Matkovic (CBBEL) stated there are no impacts to public lands in this area. Mr. Westlake also inquired if there are any unresolved issues along Bruce Road west of Gougar Road. Mr. Matkovic replied there are no known fatal flaws or facilities/buildings that have been constructed along the preferred alignment.

Ms. Pelloso (USEPA) asked if stormwater management has been considered. Mr. Matkovic (CBBEL) stated that locations for basins and water storage have been evaluated and included in the proposed plan. Ms. Pelloso stated it should be verified that none of these locations impact Waters of the United States (WOUS).

An Environmental Survey Request (ESR) Addendum will need to be submitted to reexamine the preferred alternative and the north-south alternatives. Mr. Cirton (USFWS) stated a Biological Assessment (BA) for the Hines emerald dragonfly was submitted in 2012 and comments were received in 2013, but the document has not been finalized for the project. IDOT and FHWA will coordinate. It was noted that the threatened and endangered species list has been updated and a reevaluation of the project corridor will need to occur.

Ms. Brown (USACE) and Ms. Hurley (IDOT) stated that wetland delineations and impacts will need to be updated for the entire Preferred Alternative and the three north-south alternatives east of Gougar Road as part of the ESR Addendum. The 2005 wetland delineations may be used for comparison on other alternatives that were carried forward. Ms. Brown stated that wetland delineations will need to be updated again prior to obtaining a construction permit, if more than 5-years passes from the updated delineations to be completed.

Concurrence Point #3 will be revisited once the ESR Addendum has been assessed. Areas of the corridor where there are community concerns, as well as the eastern north-south portion will be reevaluated as part of the Addendum.

Ms. Veile (IDOT) stated the entire project will be reevaluated for noise concerns once the revised Preferred Alternative has been approved due to the changing cost per square foot of noise wall construction.

Mr. Raffensperger (IDOT) stated that all phases of the project need to be added to the CMAP TIP. If a FONSI is achieved, FHWA will not be able to approve it unless subsequent phases are

in the TIP.

The meeting concluded at 11:00 A.M.

Sign-in Sheet NEPA-404 Merger Meeting September 19, 2019 District 1 -Quentin Road - Cook County Information - Project Update			
Name	Agency	e-mail address	Participation Location
Matt Fuller	FHWA	matt.fuller@dot.gov	Chicago
Chris Byars	FHWA	chris.byars@dot.gov	Chicago
Tara Orbon	Cook County DOTH	tara.orbon@cookcountyil.gov	Chicago
Liz Pelloso	USEPA	pelloso.elizabeth@epa.gov	Chicago
William Raffensperger	IDOT	william.raffensperger@illinois.gov	Chicago
Zubair Haider	IDOT-BLRS	Zubair.Haider@illinois.gov	Chicago
Ken Westlake	USEPA	westlake.kenneth@epa.gov	Chicago
Jesse Vuorenmaa	TranSystems	jlvuorenmaa@transystems.com	Chicago
Alissa Kidd	TranSystems	amkidd@transystems.com	Chicago
Grace Dysico	TranSystems	gldysico@transystems.com	Chicago
Tara Fifer	CCDOTH	tara.fifer@cookcountyil.gov	Chicago
Evan Markowitz	Huff & Huff	evan.markowitz@gza.com	Chicago
Jim Novak	Huff & Huff/GZA	james.novak@gza.com	Chicago
Shirley Wolfe	CCDOTH	shirley.wolfe@cookcountyil.gov	Chicago
Adam James	CCDOTH	adam.james@cookcountyil.gov	Chicago
John Sherrill	IDOT	john.sherrill@illinois.gov	Chicago
Shawn Cirton	USFWS	Shawn_Cirton@fws.gov	Teleconference
Kathy Chernich	USACE	Kathy.G.Chernich@usace.army.mil	Teleconference
Jim Skvarla	IDOT	James.skvarla@illinois.gov	Teleconference
Jan Piland	FHWA	janis.piland@dot.gov	Springfield
Janel Veile	IDOT	janel.veile@illinois.gov	Springfield
Brad Koldehoff	IDOT	brad.koldehoff@illinois.gov	Springfield
Felecia Hurley	IDOT	felecia.hurley@illinois.gov	Springfield
Jeffrey Evers	IL Dept of Ag	jeff.evers@illinois.gov	Springfield
Brad Hayes	IDNR	Bradley.Hayes@illinois.gov	Springfield
Becky Roman	IDOT	elizabeth.roman@illinois.gov	Springfield

**IDOT District 1, Cook County
Quentin Road
Environmental Assessment
Information – project update
September 19, 2019**

DECISIONS:

No decisions were made at this meeting. This meeting was for information only.

NEXT STEPS:

Concurrence on the Preferred Alternative will likely be requested in February 2020.

DISCUSSION:

This is the sixth presentation of the project to the resource agencies through the NEPA/404 merger meeting process. The project introduction was presented at the February 2016 meeting. The project's Purpose and Need Statement was presented and received concurrence at the June 2016 meeting. The alternatives to be considered were presented over two meetings. The results from the first two rounds of the Alternative Analysis (AA) and evaluation process was presented at the September 2016 meeting while the results from the third round of the AA were presented at the February 2017 meeting. Concurrence on the two alternatives to be carried forward based on the first three rounds of the AA was received at the June 2019 meeting. The purpose of the current meeting was for information only to present the analysis that has been completed since the June NEPA/404 merger meeting presentation.

Grace Dysico of TranSystems, who is the consultant on the project, started the PowerPoint presentation. The presentation included an overview of the project and the alternatives carried forward, clarification of the resource involvements and impacts, a recap of the stakeholder outreach that had occurred since the last meeting, an overview of the results from the AA Evaluation Round 4 after a refined performance and impacts evaluation, and a discussion of the next steps.

The project study limits are from Illinois Route 62 (Dundee Road) to Lake Cook Road. Quentin Road is designated as an Other Principal Arterial within the project study limits and extends from Illinois Route 68 (Algonquin Road) in the Village of Schaumburg to Old McHenry Road in the Village of Hawthorn Woods for a total distance of 10 miles.

The Project Needs are: 1) Improve Facility Condition and Design, 2) Improve Safety, 3) Improve Mobility, and 4) Enhance System Linkage. The project Purpose and Need received concurrence at the June 2016 meeting.

The two alternatives that were carried forward from Round 3 of the AA and evaluation process were reviewed. Alternative 3C includes three 11-foot lanes with curb and gutter. Alternative 5C includes four-lanes with left turn lanes, all 11-foot lanes with curb and gutter. Concurrence for

carrying these alternatives forward was received at the June 2019 meeting.

Clarification about the impacts to the Deer Grove Nature Preserve were discussed. The Deer Grove West Nature Preserve boundary is offset 100' from the existing west right-of-way along Quentin Road. There is also a deeded Nature Preserve Buffer along the west side of Quentin Road, which encompasses manmade appurtenances such as forest preserve roadways, parking areas, and pavilions. There are other buffer areas for the access points from Dundee Road. Along Quentin Road, the boundary for the Nature Preserve Buffer is offset 120' from the existing west right-of-way. Neither Alternative 3C nor 5C will have impacts to the Nature Preserve or the Nature Preserve Buffer. On the east side of Deer Grove there is a land and water reserve area located within the forest preserve. The limits of the Environmental Survey Request (ESR) appeared to border this line or in some cases overlap it, as pointed out by Felicia Hurley from IDOT Central Office. However, the original ESR limits were established while CCDOTH was exploring multiple options for a trail crossing between the Deer Grove East and West. These options included an overpass, an underpass and an at-grade crossing. Since submitting the ESR, an at-grade crossing has been selected and the design has been refined. This design will greatly reduce the impacts on the east side of Quentin Road, staying well within the ESR limits and entirely out of the land and water reserve boundary.

Brad Hayes from the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) stated that even if the projects limits are outside of the Nature Preserve Boundary, any change that effects that hydrology of the Nature Preserve is still considered a Nature Preserve impact. Jesse Vuorenmaa of TranSystems explained that there there will be changes to a few small pocketed wetlands but nothing that would affect the Nature Preserve hydrology has been decided yet. Tara Orbon from CCDOTH also clarified that the topography along and around Quentin Road changes so dramatically within the project limits, that it is not always the case that water drains away from the roadway. Adam James, also from CCDOTH, followed up with clarification that the project will have wetland impacts, but how those relate to the Nature Preserve has not been studied yet.

Jesse Vuorenmaa continued with the presentation, explaining the results of the focus group meetings that were conducted. These meetings discussed four separate topics: water, animal/vegetation, roadway character, and safety for all user. During these meetings, it was apparent that each group had similar and overlapping concerns to those of the other groups. Many of the recommendations that came out of the process from each focus group had similar themes to those of the other groups such as the importance of considering salt run-off, splash and spray in the design and minimizing impacts to Deer Grove Forest Preserve.

Liz Pelloso from the USEPA questioned what “in-line detention” referred to in the table of focus group recommendations. Jesse Vuorenmaa explained that this meant providing oversized sewers that could be used for detention. Liz Pelloso suggested that this wording should be revised because from a water quality perspective, using in-line detention means using streams for detention. Mr. Vuorenmaa clarified that using streams for detention was definitely not the intent and that the wording would be revised.

Based on stakeholder feedback, a refined performance and impacts evaluation of Alternatives 3C

and 5C was conducted. In this refined analysis, additional environmental analysis was completed including water quality and salt splash, project specific features of each alternative were identified, and variances to standard design criteria to further reduce impacts were considered. The results of this refined Round 4 analysis were presented in a new, larger table. Mr. Vuorenmaa explained the changes that were made to this table since it was last discussed at the June NEPA/404 merger meeting.

Regarding Purpose and Need, Alternative 5C always has, and still does, fully meet the Purpose and Need. Alternative 3C had previously been shown to not fully meet the project Purpose and Need because it did not improve the mobility or system linkage along Quentin Road based on the evaluation criteria. However, based on feedback received at the June NEPA/404 merger meeting and discussions that have taken place since then, the table now shows that Alternative 3C partially improves the mobility and system linkage, and as a result, partially meets the project Purpose and Need.

Ken Westlake from USEPA asked whether any Level of Service (LOS) improvements between the two continuing alternatives had been studied. He stated that looking at travel delays may be a useful way to evaluate the two remaining alternatives against their ability to improve mobility.

Bill Raffensperger from IDOT Bureau of Local Roads asked how difficult it would be to measure air quality between Alternative 3C and 5C. Jim Novak from Huff & Huff explained that there is not an effective way to measure the difference. He explained that COSIM is not sensitive enough to pick up the changes between the alternatives and that no other physical way to measure the air quality had been determined. However, since idling plays a significant role in air pollution, Alternative 5C has a greater ability to improve air quality than Alternative 3C because it better addresses mobility along Quentin Road by providing both additional travel lanes and channelization to move vehicles more quickly and efficiently through the corridor.

A section which analyzed pollutant loads within the watershed was added to the Round 4 table at the request of the stakeholders. This analysis looked at the levels of chlorides, metals, and total suspended solids for each of the two remaining alternatives as compared to the existing conditions. Chloride levels for Watershed 1, which is the Arlington Heights Branch of Salt Creek, had a net increase of +1 mg/L for Alternative 3C and +3 mg/L for Alternative 5C. For Watershed 2, which is the Unnamed Tributary to Buffalo Creek, chloride levels had a net increase of +22 mg/L for Alternative 3C and +56 mg/L for Alternative 5C. All of the chloride levels, for each alternative in both watersheds, were under the regulatory requirements for aquatic life. For metals, the increase in copper, lead, and zinc was analyzed. The analysis found that the net change in any of these metals from existing to Alternative 3C or Alternative 5C was so small that if best management practices (BMPs) are implemented, either of the build alternatives may result in no net changes to these pollutants. Finally, the level of total suspended solids was analyzed. The results of this analysis found that for Watershed 1, Alternative 3C would have a net increase from existing conditions of +6 mg/L and Alternative 5C would have a net increase of +13 mg/L.

For Watershed 2, neither of the alternatives would have any net increase in total suspended solids. Similar to the results of the metals, if best management practices are implemented, it can be said that none of the build alternatives would result in any net change to the total suspended solids.

Tara Orbon walked through the next steps in the project. The goal is for CCDOTH to make a final decision on the Preferred Alternative. Once the decision on the Preferred Alternative is made, the completion of the final Alternative Analysis document will follow. Concurrence on the Preferred Alternative will then be sought at a future NEPA/404 Merger meeting. The preliminary EA will then be prepared and then the Final EA will be made ready for public review and comment. The final EA and Errata/FONSI will follow.

Following conclusion of the presentation, the floor was opened to questions.

Bill Raffensperger questioned why Alternative 3C was recommended to move forward since it does not fully meet the Purpose and Need. The concern is that the EA document would not make it through the IDOT Central Office's Legal Sufficiency review if the recommendation was to move forward with this alternative. There is also a chance that the project would need to go back through the entire NEPA/404 Merger meeting process if Alternative 3C is selected. Tara Orbon acknowledged the concerns from IDOT Bureau of Local Roads. CCDOTH is recommending to move forward with Alternative 3C and 5C as part of their commitment to a fair and transparent process for the environmental stakeholder group who have been strong supporters of Alternative 3C. Matt Fuller from FHWA said that as long as the Preferred Alternative improves the existing conditions and the County is okay with selecting an improvement that only partially meets the Purpose and Need, there should not be any issues with the NEPA process if either alternative is selected.

Bill Raffensperger asked what design year was being used and stated that 2050 projects should now be used. Grace Dysico stated that 2040 CMAP projections are being used since a sensitivity analysis was performed which showed that while the 2040 and 2050 projected volumes are slightly different, the relative differences in volumes between Alternative 3C and 5C are the same. Zubair Haider from IDOT District One Bureau of Local Roads questioned whether the lower volumes from 2050 should actually be used since using those volumes might be better for Alternative 3C. Adam James clarified that while the 2050 volumes are lower than the 2040 volumes, there is not a significant enough difference between the two to affect the results of the analysis.

This concluded the formal presentation.