

5.2.2.3 Environmental, Land Use, and Transportation Task Forces

Three task forces were created to focus on technical aspects of the project development process and to provide external subject-matter information and input with respect to environmental, land use, and transportation issues. Task force members have expertise or a particular interest in these areas (see Table 4-3 in the SIP for a list of members). They represent communities and counties in the study area, interest groups, resource agencies, transportation agencies, and individuals. Task force activities are described in subsection 5.3.2.

- **Environmental Task Force** is charged with identifying, evaluating, and making recommendations with respect to various environmental issues and concerns within the study area. This includes providing advisory input to the development of environmental impact evaluation criteria and the evaluation of environmental impacts.
- **Land Use Task Force** is charged with identifying, evaluating, and making recommendations with respect to land use and economic issues within the study area. This includes advisory input regarding land use patterns, the effects of various alternatives on land use and economic centers, and the compatibility of alternatives with the overall land use and economic development goals within the study area.
- **Transportation Task Force** provides advisory input to help identify, evaluate, and make recommendations with respect to various transportation issues within the study area. This includes advisory input for the transportation system performance evaluation, transportation system performance measures to be used to evaluate alternatives considered, and evaluation of the performance of system alternatives.

5.3 The Public and Interested Groups

The EO-WB implemented an extensive public involvement program that included every stakeholder that has interest in or is affected by the proposed transportation improvements. Many venues were provided, with the goal of establishing opportunities for stakeholders to participate, be heard, and influence the outcome of the process, for example the project's purpose and need and build alternatives to be carried forward. The EO-WB hosted or participated in meetings with the core communities most affected by the proposed improvements; stakeholder workshops comprised of community officials, staff, agency representatives, and others; meetings with transportation providers and other operating infrastructure entities in the study area; speakers bureau events with civic groups, professional societies, business groups, and communities; and information meetings with the general public.

5.3.1 Core Community Meetings

Continuous communication with the core communities – Elk Grove Village, Bensenville, Itasca, Wood Dale, Schaumburg, and Roselle – has been rigorously maintained throughout the project's development. Community officials were apprised early on of the project's intended goals. As the south bypass connection option development process matured, Franklin Park was added to the list of communities who were regularly engaged. Meetings with communities were held every couple months to update officials on current and upcoming activities and to obtain input on the development of alternatives. Officials were

asked to inform the project team of how alternatives could benefit or otherwise affect the community, or if there were aspects to the alternatives that had not yet been considered. Meetings were held with community officials in advance of stakeholder events, including public meetings. The object was to provide community representatives with a preview of what was going to be presented, to answer questions, and obtain their feedback. Table 5-4 summarizes the meetings with core community officials.

TABLE 5-4
Core Agency Meetings

| Community | Date | Topic Discussed |
|--|--------------------------------|---|
| Bensenville, Elk Grove Village, Itasca, Wood Dale, Franklin Park | August 2007; September 2007 | Overview of the study process and goals; public and stakeholder involvement; and elicit input regarding local issues. |
| Bensenville, Elk Grove Village, Itasca, Wood Dale | November 2007 | Public Information Meeting; project working group coordination plan; preview Joint Task Force Meeting and Stakeholder Workshop Number One. |
| | February 2008 | Alternatives development and evaluation process; preview objectives of upcoming project working group meetings. |
| | April 2008 | Summary of Stakeholder Workshop Number Two; project purpose and need; initial roadway system strategies. |
| | May 2008 | Comments related to project purpose and need; initial roadway and transit system strategies; preliminary transportation performance analysis. |
| Bensenville, Elk Grove Village, Itasca, Wood Dale, Franklin Park | June 2008 | Travel performance for initial roadway system strategies; preview objectives of upcoming project working group meetings. |
| Itasca | June 2008, July 2008 | Elgin O'Hare Expressway access options in Itasca. |
| Bensenville, Elk Grove Village, Itasca, Wood Dale, Franklin Park | July 2008 | Dismissal of five roadway strategies that did not satisfy purpose and need; evaluation of environmental and socioeconomic impacts; north and south legs of the O'Hare Bypass or IL 83 Freeway. |
| Franklin Park | August 2008 | Discussions of initial south bypass connection options noting their advantages; sought opinions of the options and compatibility with land use patterns. |
| Bensenville, Elk Grove Village, Itasca, Wood Dale | October 2008 | Expanded study area; recent alternatives development and evaluation efforts; analyses of projected travel patterns. |
| Roselle, Schaumburg | October 2008 | Expanded study area; introduction and overview of study; recent alternatives development and evaluation efforts; analyses of projected travel patterns. |
| Wood Dale | November 2008 | Land use and economic development consultants (The Lakota Group and TranSystems) scope of transportation improvements; improvements planned for the Thorndale corridor; coordination of projects. |
| Bensenville, Elk Grove Village, Itasca, Franklin Park | December 2008 | North and South West Bypass Connection Options; analysis findings for the potential Elgin O'Hare Expressway westerly extension past terminus at US 20. |

TABLE 5-4
Core Agency Meetings

| Community | Date | Topic Discussed |
|---|------------------------------|--|
| Bensenville, Franklin Park | January 2009 | Discussions of the south bypass connection options, including revised layout and cross-sectional views of elevated sections; review of latest impact data and discussion of evaluation criteria. |
| Bensenville, Elk Grove Village, Wood Dale | February 2009 | Briefing of systemwide travel performance, estimated costs, environmental impacts, and social impacts for roadway alternatives. |
| Elk Grove Village | March 2009 | Discussion of the Village's issues concerning several roadway alternatives that affect the community. |
| Bensenville, Elk Grove Village, Itasca, Wood Dale, Roselle, Schaumburg, Franklin Park | April 2009 | Post public meeting briefing of the build alternatives to be carried forward in the Draft EIS (i.e., Alternatives 203 and 402, and Options A and D). |
| Franklin Park, Bensenville | June 2009 | Change of administration; introduction of study process, goals and milestones; public and stakeholder involvement. |
| Franklin Park | June 2009 | Discussion with elected officials, staff and representatives from industrial properties potentially affected by south connection improvements; timing of right-of-way acquisition process afforded to property owners potentially displaced by highway projects. |
| Bensenville, Elk Grove Village, Itasca, Roselle, Schaumburg, Wood Dale, Franklin Park | June 2009, July 2009 | Overview of multimodal improvement plan; build alternatives population and employment, and travel performance; potential advance projects. |
| Franklin Park | August 5, 2009 | Potential roadway improvements to off-set traffic increases as a result of the proposed improvements; potential mitigation techniques for additional stormwater runoff. |
| Bensenville, Wood Dale, Franklin Park, Itasca, Elk Grove Village, Schaumburg, Roselle | September 2009 | Briefing of the Draft EIS including environmental, social, and economic impacts and benefits. Discussion of next steps leading to identification of a preferred alternative, and Tier Two process. |
| Des Plaines, Hanover Park | November 2009 | Discussion of Draft EIS comments. Preview of December CPG/Task Force meeting. |
| Bensenville, DuPage County, Elk Grove Village, Franklin Park | November 2009, December 2009 | Summary of Draft EIS and Public Hearing comments. Preview of the preferred alternative. Description of next steps and schedule for completing Tier One. Process, objectives, schedule, and project working groups structures and roles for Tier Two. Preview of upcoming activities. |

5.3.2 Stakeholder Workshops

The CPG and task forces were brought together regularly in a workshop format and assisted with the definition of transportation issues and problems, identification of road and transit facilities that needed improvement, criteria and methods to be used to evaluate alternatives, development of specific alternatives to be considered, and assessment of the alternative evaluation output. See Table 5-5 for the details of their involvement. The stakeholder

workshops have been a valuable forum that has helped to advance the process and build consensus amongst those affected. The workshops also served to identify local community issues that were best addressed in one-on-one meetings. The meetings focused on specific locational issues, access requirements, accommodation of transit and bike/pedestrian needs, and accommodation of changing land uses. Although not specifically invited, the public was welcome to observe.

TABLE 5-5
Stakeholder Activities

| Meeting Date | Meeting Activities |
|-------------------|---|
| October 3, 2007 | <p>CPG Meeting Number One. The meeting was attended by members of the CPG. Attendees were provided with an overview of the project and the stakeholder involvement plan, including the expected role of the CPG. A breakout session was held during which participants were divided into four groups and tasked with providing input on transportation issues and identifying concerns important to the communities. The meeting closed with a preview of upcoming events, the distribution of transportation issues questionnaire, and a request for nominees to the environmental, transportation, and land use task forces.</p> |
| December 13, 2007 | <p>Task Force Kickoff Meeting and Stakeholder Workshop. Task force members were provided with an overview of the project and the roles of the task forces. The transportation system performance analysis process and information regarding early analysis findings was also presented. Then, the attendees broke into six groups for the first workshop activity. A moderator and scribe were assigned to each group. Stakeholders reviewed a list of transportation and social issues that had been developed at previous corridor planning group meetings and public and agency coordination events. The stakeholders were asked to identify additional issues within the following categories: Freeway and Tollway System, Major Arterials and Local Roads, Transit, Freight and Bicycle/Pedestrian System, and Quality of Life/Economic Development.</p> <p>Once the groups had stated their transportation issues, attendees were given \$100 of “transportation bucks” to spend on the issues. Issues receiving the most money, and therefore the highest priority, were the need for expanded public transportation, the need for lasting solution that minimizes community impact and maximizes economic development potential, poor connectivity from I-290 to I-294 (including North Avenue), lack of access to O’Hare Airport, and travel delays along roadways with at-grade railroad crossings (e.g., Irving Park and York roads).</p> <p>The second exercise was conducted to identify potential project goals based on the issue defined in the first exercise. The groups developed 35 specific goals addressing the provision of multimodal solutions, consideration of cost-saving measures, minimizing environmental and socioeconomic impacts, and providing a comprehensive and long-lasting strategy for improving the transportation system.</p> |
| February 13, 2008 | <p>CPG Meeting Number Two. Stakeholders were provided with a project update and a summary of the stakeholder involvement plan, issues identified thus far, transportation system performance analysis and process, and upcoming milestones and events.</p> |
| February 21, 2008 | <p>Task Force Meeting Number Two. A general session was held followed by individual breakout sessions. During the general session, attendees were provided an update on the project status and a summary of stakeholder involvement activities, transportation system information and alternative performance evaluation process, stakeholder problem definition, planning framework and alternatives development and evaluation process, GIS database, and upcoming milestones and events.</p> <p><i>Transportation Task Force Session:</i> Modal strategies (or “Transportation Tool Box”) to be considered in Module One of the alternatives development process were described. Task force members were asked to determine whether and how strategies should be considered, and which transportation topics should be addressed during alternatives evaluation.</p> |

TABLE 5-5
Stakeholder Activities

| Meeting Date | Meeting Activities |
|-----------------------|--|
| | <p><i>Land Use Task Force Session:</i> Members were provided with a description of the GIS database, land use patterns, the No-Action Alternative, transit and airport network, the results of the redistribution of 2030 population and employment without the Elgin O'Hare Expressway extension and O'Hare West Bypass. Members were asked to provide input on land use constraints and opportunities in the study area, including planned land use changes and opportunities for transportation improvements to enhance such changes and comment on evaluation criteria and performance measures to compare alternatives.</p> <p><i>Environmental Task Force Session:</i> The GIS database was presented, and its mapping and analytical capabilities were described. GIS data presented include land use, water resources, designated lands, wetlands, threatened and endangered species, bike trails, historical and archaeological sites, and regulated features. It was noted that traditional field studies would not be completed for the Tier One EIS; rather, data were obtained from available resources and resource agencies. Field studies would take place in Tier Two. Subsequently, the Task Force split into two groups to identify environmental constraints on aerial base maps. The project team would use the environmental constraints identified by group members during the alternatives development process. Finally, the entire Task Force collaboratively developed environmental topics for consideration as evaluation criteria to compare in Module 3.</p> |
| March 13, 2008 | <p>Stakeholder Workshop Number Two. The purpose of the meeting was to conduct a workshop to have stakeholders help decide which strategies should be considered to address transportation issues in the area and where they should be used. After an update on the status of the project was provided, the planning charrette was introduced. The "transportation toolbox" was presented as the basis from which stakeholders could develop strategies and includes physical, operating and demand management elements. Information regarding existing and future transportation system performance and environmental and land use constraints were presented. Workshop participants were encouraged to consider this information as they identified potential improvement locations.</p> <p>Participants were divided into six teams and tasked with developing a map depicting existing system strategies and system expansion strategies to be considered, as well as demand management and operating strategies to be evaluated. The goal was to record as much information and as many ideas as possible, not to reach consensus or to develop a single recommendation.</p> <p>Each group moderator summarized the discussion in his or her group. The workshop closed with a summary of the next steps in the process and upcoming activities. The ideas collected at the meeting were used to develop the initial system strategies and potential travel performance evaluation procedures.</p> |
| April 16 and 17, 2008 | <p>CPG Meeting Number Three and Joint Task Force Meeting Number Three. The project team met with the CPG on April 16 and with the joint task force members on April 17 to apprise the group of public involvement and stakeholder activities that have occurred and of analysis findings presented in the draft TSPR, to summarize the draft purpose and need statement, to review the results of the March 2008 stakeholder workshop, and to present initial roadway system strategies. A question and answer session was held and the meetings were adjourned.</p> |
| May 22, 2008 | <p>Stakeholder Workshop Number Three. The purpose of the meeting was to hold a workshop to have stakeholders review the initial system strategies and provide input on the appropriateness of proposed improvement measures and identify environmental and social issues that may constrain improvements. The project team used stakeholder input to evaluate and screen the initial system strategies.</p> |
| June 25, 2008 | <p>Joint CPG/Task Force Meeting Number Four. The project team assembled stakeholders to update them on the status of technical work and stakeholder involvement activities, and to describe the initial roadway system strategies, the process of evaluating the strategies, and the results of the analysis that has been performed. The project team informed the stakeholders that connections to I-90 and I-294, discussed at the previous stakeholder workshop, were screened and that design would continue on the remaining alternatives. A question and answer session was held, next steps were announced, and the meeting was adjourned.</p> |

TABLE 5-5
Stakeholder Activities

| Meeting Date | Meeting Activities |
|--------------------|---|
| July 31, 2008 | Joint CPG/Task Force Meeting Number Five. The purpose of the meeting was to provide stakeholders with an update on project activities and the results of the purpose and need and environmental impact screenings of roadway system strategies. The system alternatives development process was described and next steps were announced. The project team broke the stakeholders into four groups to review and discuss the accuracy of the locations of the north and south leg connections, alternative evaluation criteria, and preliminary impact evaluation results for the north and south leg connections. The teams were encouraged to consider and provide input on the evaluation factors for the finalist alternatives. |
| November 13, 2008 | Joint CPG/Task Force Meeting Number Six. A meeting was held to update members on the refinement of alternatives, revision of the project study area, and the results of the first stage of transit alternatives screening. The public meeting held September 3 was also summarized. The group was apprised of upcoming events and then divided into four groups charged with identifying environmental and transportation issues in the expanded study area as well as potential supporting roadway improvements. |
| December 16, 2008 | Joint CPG/Task Force Meeting Number Seven. A meeting was held to provide members with an update on public involvement and technical activities that have occurred, to apprise the group that the study area has been further expanded based on stakeholder input and logical termini evaluation and that the Purpose and Need and TSPR would be amended to reflect the expanded study area, and present the finalist roadway alternatives evaluation, including tie-ins to I-90 and I-294. |
| February 19, 2009 | Joint CPG/Task Force Meeting Number Eight. A meeting was held to provide members an update on technical activities, including reevaluation of purpose and need to assess whether it changed based on the expanded study area. The finalist roadway alternatives were described. Members were given a preview of upcoming technical work and the public information meeting to be held in March. |
| April 23, 2009 | Stakeholder Workshop Number Four. The project team assembled stakeholders to update them on the status of technical work and stakeholder involvement activities. This included a summary of the March 2009 Public Information Meeting. The project team described the two remaining roadway alternatives (Alternatives 203 and 402), transit elements, and Options A and D that have been carried forward for consideration in the Draft EIS. A question and answer session was held, next steps were announced, and a brief group exercise was held to discuss innovative financing options and to identify "advance projects." Pieces of the overall build alternative that have independent utility and could potentially be accelerated. |
| July 8, 2009 | Joint CPG/Task Force Meeting Number Nine. A meeting was held to update members on refinements to multimodal improvements, including community, bicycle/pedestrian, transit, and roadway improvements. The build alternatives evaluation of population and employment forecasts and travel performance, and potential advance projects under consideration were presented. |
| September 10, 2009 | Joint CPG/Task Force Meeting Number Ten. A meeting was held to provide an update to members on activities that have occurred since the last Joint CPG/Task Force meeting. Attendees were informed that the Draft EIS was signed and the public comment period was about to commence. The sections of the Draft EIS were described. Future technical work was described and the October 8, 2009 Public Hearing was previewed. |
| December 9, 2009 | Joint CPG/Task Force Meeting Number Eleven. The project team met with the CPG/Task Force to present a project status update. A summary of the October 8, 2009 Public Hearing was provided along with a description of the Draft EIS comments received from agencies, municipalities, and members of the public. The project team presented Alternative 203 with Option D as the Preferred Alternative and described the transit and bicycle/pedestrian features accompanying the proposed roadway improvements. The meeting concluded with a description of the next steps, specifically the conclusion of Tier One and the commencement of Tier Two. |

5.3.3 Meetings with Other Agencies

Thirty meetings were held with other agencies important to the development of alternatives and the analysis used to evaluate them (see Table 5-6). The RTA and its family of transit providers met regularly with the project team to assist in developing and screening transit improvements for the study area. The MWRDGC considered the effects of alternative transportation strategies upon facilities that it owns and operates, and provided guidance to the team to address those matters. The proximity of the project improvements to O'Hare Airport requires the consideration of airspace constraints. The team consulted the FAA regarding airspace issues, and prepared documentation that evaluated every potential airspace envelope for existing and proposed aircraft operating areas that might be affected by a proposal from the EO-WB. The project team has coordinated regularly with the OMP and freight rail operators in the study area to ensure that project alternatives are compatible with existing and planned facilities.

TABLE 5-6
Meetings with Other Agencies

| Date | Participants | Topics Discussed |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| July 19, 2007 | CMAP | Introduction of project team; traffic model development and travel demand forecasts; data needed from CMAP; next steps. |
| August 23, 2007 | CMAP | Travel modeling methodology; model development process; requests for CMAP, IDOT, and ISTHA traffic data. |
| October 18, 2007 | Pace, RTA, CTA, Metra, CMAP | Introduction of the project and study process; transit-related issues; obtain information regarding facilities/services and transit-related planning documents; identification of planned development activities to be considered in the No-Action Alternative; identification of improvements to include in the build alternatives. |
| October 24, 2007 | ISTHA | Introduction of project and study process; acquisition of information regarding existing facilities and planned improvements for consideration as No-Action Alternative; coordination with ISTHA's congestion pricing study; stakeholder and public involvement activities; and ISTHA's involvement in the project. |
| December 7, 2007 | Chicago DOA | Summary of Public Information Meeting Number One; agency invitation letters (CPG membership, Task Force membership nominations, upcoming Joint Task Force Meeting Number One, participating agency invitations); interim projects. |
| December 19, 2007 | FAA | Overview of EO-WB travel demand modeling; stakeholder concerns as project team conducts travel forecasts for the study area; CMAP's airport trip generation process document, including 2018 forecast assumptions and 2030 forecast assumptions; EO-WB baseline travel forecasts and assumptions, including study area socioeconomic data redistribution and airport socioeconomic assumptions. |
| December 20, 2007 | DuPage County, CMAP | Socioeconomic data input from DuPage County and CMAP used to develop a population and employment scenario for the 2030 No-Action Alternative. |
| January 15, 2008 | CMAP | Details of the 2030 preliminary baseline CMAP model run; development of the final 2030 baseline (No-Action Alternative) traffic forecasts. |
| January 28, 2008 | Pace, RTA, CTA, Metra, CMAP | Transit alternatives to be included in the No-Action Alternative; overall alternatives development and evaluation process; request for Pace capacity data; upcoming meetings. |

TABLE 5-6
Meetings with Other Agencies

| Date | Participants | Topics Discussed |
|------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| February 1, 2008 | OMP | Status of ongoing work (TSPR, purpose and need, scoping); preview of alternatives development and evaluation process (modules, preferred alternative selection process); objectives of upcoming project working group meetings; updates to stakeholder involvement plan; questions and answers. |
| February 5, 2008 | ISTHA | Project status; alternatives development and evaluation process; objective of upcoming project working group meetings; status and objective of the congestion pricing study. |
| April 16, 2008 | OMP | Status of ongoing work; preview and schedule of draft purpose and need statement; summary of Stakeholder Workshop Number Two (presentation of 13 roadway strategies developed in response to roadway, transit, bicycle/pedestrian and TDM strategies suggested by stakeholders; identification of measures to be used to evaluate alternatives); traffic associated with O'Hare Airport; adequacy of initial system strategies and process for screening alternatives; potential locations of the STAR Line. |
| May 6, 2008 | Pace, RTA, CTA, Metra, CMAP | Obtain feedback regarding initial transit system strategies before upcoming stakeholder meeting. |
| May 20, 2008 | OMP | Status of ongoing work; comments on purpose and need and next steps; initial roadway and transit system strategies to be presented at upcoming CPG and task force meetings; results from transportation performance analysis of initial roadway strategies; status of OMP work; projected air traffic numbers; next steps and upcoming meetings. |
| May 21, 2008 | ISTHA | Comments on purpose and need statement and next development steps; initial system strategies, including a preview of the initial transit system strategies and the initial roadway system strategy transportation performance, evaluation and screening procedures, and a preview of corridor typical sections; topics and objectives of upcoming Project Working Group meetings, including Stakeholder Workshop Number Three, Joint CPG/Task Force Meeting, and Public Information Meeting Number Two. |
| June 16, 2008 | OMP | Status of ongoing work; screening of initial roadway system strategies based on travel performance findings and ability to satisfy purpose and need; next steps in alternatives development and evaluation; objectives of upcoming Joint CPG/Task Force and Stakeholder Meetings. |
| July 29, 2008 | OMP | Status of ongoing work; preview of recent alternatives development and evaluation activities and findings (dismissal of five roadway strategies because they did not satisfy purpose and need; evaluation of environmental and socioeconomic impacts to identify alternatives with disproportionate adverse effects); review of south and north connection options and effect on OMP property and air space; update on status of OMP property acquisition; objectives of upcoming stakeholder meetings (recommendation to dismiss three roadway alternatives with disproportionately higher socioeconomic impacts). |

TABLE 5-6
Meetings with Other Agencies

| Date | Participants | Topics Discussed |
|--------------------|--|---|
| August 5, 2008 | Canadian Pacific Railroad | Introduction of the project, study area, proposed multimodal transportation solution, and regional significance of the project; impacts of south alignment improvements on the use of Bensenville Yard and potential mitigation measures; suggested alignment locations for south alignment option to limit impact to existing and future uses of the property; agreements between OMP and CPRR; utilities on the property. |
| August 13, 2008 | Pace, RTA, CTA, Metra, CMAP, DuPage County | Alternatives screening process and resulting finalist roadway alternatives; proposed transit alternatives analysis process; current transit alternatives. |
| September 22, 2008 | FAA, TSA | Alternatives development and screening process; key features of the roadway alternatives; proposed improvements' relationship to the Airport Outer Area, the new 9L-27R runway, aviation fuel line easements, and other airspace issues; requirements for the FAA 7460 submittal and review process. |
| October 17, 2008 | Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago | Potential conflict of improvements with storage reservoirs; potential detention storage regulations. |
| October 21, 2008 | Pace, RTA, CTA, Metra, CMAP | Screen transit alternatives analysis measures and results; expanded study area and proposed transit improvements in the new study area; next steps in screening process; upcoming meetings. |
| December 4, 2008 | OMP | Drainage improvements related to OMP; Bensenville flood control project; adequacy of drainage facilities for proposed improvements; future evaluation of drainage options to minimize base floodplain influence spreading into the proposed interchange at York Road/O'Hare West Bypass/Elgin O'Hare Expressway. |
| December 10, 2008 | Canadian Pacific Railroad | Impacts of the south alignment options on freight rail operations and regional freight movement; options for constructing the improvements in the yard. |
| January 21, 2009 | Pace, RTA, CTA, Metra, CMAP | Presented transit screen two analysis and results. Transit corridors having regional significance were retained in plan. Participants dismissed light-rail from Thorndale corridor in favor of diesel motor limits. Ultimately, BRT was chosen to be the initial improvement in the corridor. |
| February 12, 2009 | OMP | Letter to request copies of the <i>Proposed Conditions Willow Creek Relocation Plan</i> . |
| February 17, 2009 | OMP | Brief of roadway and transit alternatives to be presented at the public meeting in March 2009. |
| March 23, 2009 | Pace, RTA, CTA, Metra, CMAP | Brief of the finalist transit corridors. Additional detail provided for station, park 'n' ride, and transit center locations. Transit providers suggested a few adjustments to proposal. Discussion also included cost factors to be considered in development of transit cost estimate. |
| April 20, 2009 | ISTHA | Briefing of the build alternatives to be carried forward in the Draft EIS (i.e., Alternatives 203 and 402 and Options A and D). |

TABLE 5-6
Meetings with Other Agencies

| Date | Participants | Topics Discussed |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| April 22, 2009 | OMP | Briefing of the build alternatives to be carried forward in the Draft EIS (i.e., Alternatives 203 and 402 and Options A and D). |
| July 14, 2009 | OMP | Interchange form at Taft Road and Irving Park Road; widening of Franklin Avenue/Green Street UPRR bridge for purposes of EO-WB (OMP design provisions to expand the bridge without need for shoofly); Cargo Access Road and Irving Park Road intersection; possible locations for compensatory storage in the vicinity of southwest corner of O'Hare Airport. |
| July 20, 2009 | OMP | Irving Park Road/Taft Road and access to nearby properties; discussions of eliminating Cargo Access Road intersection with Irving Park Road. |
| August 4, 2009 | Pace, RTA, CTA, Metra, CMAP | Summarized elements of the build alternatives, including transit. Additional analysis resulted in refinements of the transit plan was shared with the group to secure their consensus. Input suggested that details in the location of the western terminal be deferred until the vision for the west terminal has been advanced. Next steps in the process were outlined stating the dates for the release of the Draft EIS and Public Hearing. |
| September 9, 2009 | OMP | Briefing of the Draft EIS including environmental, social, and economic impacts and benefits. Discussion of next steps leading to identification of a preferred alternative, and Tier Two process. |
| October 2, 2009 | OMP, FAA | Coordination meeting with the FAA concerning flight procedures for aerial flight photos in O'Hare air space. |
| October 12, 2009 | OMP | Coordination with the OMP concerning the reconstruction of the UP Green Street bridge by the OMP. IDOT seeks to alter the bridge length to accommodate EO-WB traffic effects, and would reimburse the OMP for added costs. |

Direct connection of proposed improvements to tollway facilities owned and operated by ISTHA required regular contact with staff to determine solutions that would be compatible with its existing facility operations and future improvement plans.

DuPage County's interest in the study area precedes the EO-WB study with a vision study of transportation and economic development proposals for the area. DuPage County has assisted in the process by participating in the development of the No-Action Alternative, assisting in configuring specific transit proposals and providing technical assistance in the development of the population and employment forecasts related to the No-Action Alternative.

5.3.4 Speakers Bureau

The speakers bureau was developed as a venue for putting the project message and information before the public. Fifteen speaking events occurred, many of which were an extension of the project working groups, with group members requesting that the project team speak to other community organizations, such as community councils, business organizations, civic organizations, and others. Requests for speakers also came directly through the project Web page. This venue has been important to the project team in gaining a

broader perspective on local issues, and it has given participants an opportunity to delve into the proposed project improvements and how they affect them. Similar information was presented at each event and included project history and regulatory framework, status of the alternatives development and evaluation process, and past and upcoming public and agency involvement activities. See Table 5-7 for a list of the speaker bureau events.

TABLE 5-7
Speakers Bureau Meetings

| Date | Event |
|-------------------|---|
| October 23, 2007 | DuPage Mayors and Managers Council Meeting |
| May 22, 2008 | Northwest Municipal Conference |
| July 24, 2008 | American Public Works Association |
| October 10, 2008 | O'Hare Noise Compatibility Commission |
| October 23, 2008 | Franklin Park Economic Development Committee Meeting |
| November 10, 2008 | Schaumburg Economic and Business Development Group Meeting |
| November 18, 2008 | Illinois Association of Highway Engineers Monthly Dinner |
| November 19, 2008 | DuPage Mayors and Managers Council Meeting |
| January 5, 2009 | Village of Roselle Board Meeting |
| March 19, 2009 | Institute of Transportation Engineers, Illinois Division Meeting |
| March 26, 2009 | American Society of Civil Engineers Meeting |
| April 9, 2009 | Chicagoland Chamber of Commerce Air Cargo Logistics |
| June 22, 2009 | Village of Roselle Board Meeting |
| August 24, 2009 | West O'Hare Corridor Implementation Team (WOCIT) Meeting |
| September 2, 2009 | Illinois Road and Transportation Builders Association (IRTBA) Meeting |

5.3.5 Public Information Meetings

Three public information meetings and one public hearing have been held to present project activities to interested citizens and solicit public input. The meetings were open-house format, beginning with a brief PowerPoint presentation summarizing project activities to date. Personnel from IDOT and its consultants were present to discuss comments from the public. Participants were given two options for submitting comments: (1) forms were available to write and submit comments, and (2) a court reporter was available to record oral comments for the project record. The meetings were publicized through advertisements in newspapers, on various municipality Web sites, and in a newsletter mailed to public officials, communities, organizations, and citizens. Accommodations at the meeting locations were provided to the media covering the events. Meeting summaries were prepared for each meeting and included a description of the meeting, publicity materials, handouts, exhibits, photographs of the meeting, sign-in sheets, and comment and response forms.

5.3.5.1 Public Information Meeting Number One

Public Information Meeting Number One was held November 14, 2007. The meeting was well attended, with almost 400 individuals present. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an introduction and overview of the study objectives, process, and schedule. The public was invited to review aerial exhibits of the study area and to identify transportation issues, sensitive community features, and sensitive environmental features on the exhibits.

Comments were accepted through December 5, 2007. Thirty-one written comments were received, and the court reporter transcribed several oral comments. Transportation issues, sensitive community features, sensitive environmental features and other notations recorded on the aerial exhibits were compiled and documented. Some recommended locations for transportation improvements; others expressed interest in improving non-roadway transportation facilities, or voiced concern regarding schedule and compatibility with the OMP. Many emphasized the importance of minimizing impacts to environmental and socioeconomic resources.

5.3.5.2 Public Information Meeting Number Two

Public Information Meeting Number Two was held September 3, 2008, and roughly 250 people attended. The meeting offered information, such as initial roadway and transit alternatives, the project purpose and need, mapped environmental and socioeconomic data, potential location options for connecting alternatives with an IL 83 improvement to I-90, and options for connecting the north bypass to I-90 and the south bypass to I-294. Other information pertaining to study objectives, process, and schedule was also displayed. Public comments were accepted through September 19, 2008. Forty-five written comments were received. Comments included suggestions or choices for transportation improvements, requests for transit improvements, support for environmentally friendly measures such as reducing traffic and paved area and including landscaping in the design, support for a comprehensive improvement program rather than a compromised alternative that does not address the purpose, concern regarding displacement of area businesses and residents, interest in cost and funding sources, concern regarding losses in community tax base, suggestions for sign changes, support for bicycle and pedestrian accommodations, request that the bypass be on airport property, concern regarding noise and community cohesion impacts, and concern regarding whether those entering O'Hare Airport on the west side will have access to the entire airport.

5.3.5.3 Public Information Meeting Number Three

Public Information Meeting Number Three was held March 11, 2009, and was attended by well over 650 people. The meeting presented the roadway and transit alternatives that remain under consideration, including the proposed extension of the Elgin O'Hare Expressway; the potential O'Hare West Bypass north connection to I-90 (by IL 83 Freeway or a new freeway east of Elmhurst Road/York Road); and the four potential O'Hare West Bypass south connection options to I-294. Nearly 37,000 comments were received. Over 36,500 comment cards were received as a result of Elk Grove Village's community outreach effort supporting Alternative 203 and opposing expansion of IL 83. Nearly 200 comment letters supporting Option D were received through Bensenville's community outreach effort. Fifteen comments (two typewritten, 13 oral) were submitted through the court reporter, and more than 80 written comments were submitted supporting particular alternatives, and expressing concern

about traffic operations, and other impacts to communities, including residential and commercial displacements and the resulting tax base losses.

5.3.5.4 Public Hearing

A Public Hearing was held on October 8, 2009, and was attended by roughly 175 people. The build alternatives under consideration in the Draft EIS were presented including the extension of the Elgin O'Hare Expressway, two alignment alternatives for the O'Hare West Bypass north connection to I-90, and two alignment alternatives for the O'Hare West Bypass south connection to I-294. Copies of the Draft EIS were available for attendees to review. A comment box was provided for people to submit handwritten comments. A court reporter was also present to take oral comments. Comments received at the public hearing and throughout the Draft EIS public comment period are described in Section 5.4.

5.3.6 Newsletters

Seven newsletters have been distributed to area residents and interested parties throughout the study (see Table 5-8). They have reported study progress, major decisions, and milestones, and provided answers to frequently asked questions. An eighth newsletter will be distributed after this Final EIS is signed. It will announce the identification of the Preferred Alternative, publicize the completion of this Final EIS, notify readers that the Tier One NEPA process will conclude with the completion of a ROD, and introduce Tier Two.

TABLE 5-8
Newsletters

| Issue | Date | Topics |
|-------|----------------|---|
| 1 | Fall 2007 | Project introduction; message from IDOT; introduction to project Web site; description of the tiering process for environmental studies; public participation opportunities; next steps; public meeting announcement. |
| 2 | Winter 2008 | Request for public input; description of the stakeholder involvement plan; introduction to CPG; next steps; frequently asked questions; description of project's purpose and need; request for public input; project description. |
| 3 | Summer 2008 | What's not working?; request for public input; next steps; presentation of roadway improvement alternatives; public meeting announcement; presentation of transit improvement strategies; frequently asked questions. |
| 4 | Fall 2008 | Summary of comments on initial alternatives; background and description of expanded study area; update on roadway alternatives evaluation; finalist alternative evaluation criteria; frequently asked questions; transit alternatives update; next steps. |
| 5 | May 2009 | Roadway alternatives recap; public meeting summary and comments heard; announcement and description of the alternatives to be carried forward for consideration; transit alternatives screening results; next steps. |
| 6 | June 2009 | Surveys to begin on Elgin O'Hare – West Bypass Corridors. |
| 7 | September 2009 | Draft EIS available for public comment; environmental and social benefits and impacts of the build alternatives; travel performance benefits; build alternatives considered in detail; next steps. |

5.3.7 Web Site

The project Web site (www.elginohare-westbypass.org) provides information that can be accessed at the convenience of the user. The site began service on September 7, 2007, and is updated regularly. General project information and topic-specific details are provided. Materials are available for viewing or downloading, including project documents and reports such as the project purpose and need, meeting materials and minutes, and public involvement materials, such as newsletters and press releases. The alternatives under the various stages of development and screening are posted for public review and comment, including the alternatives carried forward. A page is also provided for those who wish to submit comments. Responses to comments are provided and become part of the project record. The page has received over 700 hits since it began service.

5.3.8 Mailing List

A project mailing list was developed using available information including names and addresses of officials from other recent projects in the area, and Internet searches. The list is updated regularly with attendance lists from public meeting, speaker bureau events, and so on. The list is comprehensive including government and business leaders, area residents, and special interest groups. It is used as a distribution list for newsletters, meeting and workshop invitations, and project documents. The mailing list has about 2,000 entries.

5.4 Draft EIS Comments

The Notice of Availability for the Draft EIS was published in the Federal Register on September 11, 2009. The comment period closed on October 26, 2009. During that time, 74 comments were received from regulatory/resource agencies, municipalities, and other stakeholders. Overall, agency representatives indicated that the build alternatives' environmental and social impacts are comparable and identified actions to be taken in Tier Two. No comments required reconsideration of the range of alternatives or the technical analyses contained in the document. Nine letters or resolutions were submitted by local governmental entities in the study area, four of which were resolutions passed in favor of Alternative 203 and/or Option D; one expressed a preference for Alternative 402. Others focused on issues important to the communities in the next phase of the project such as noise abatement, stormwater management, and preserving transit as a part of the solution. Fifty-seven comments were received from the public at-large, and most (41) supported Alternative 203 and/or Option D. Other comments included requests for specific information or clarification of the proposed concept.

The following section is a summary of substantive comments from agencies and municipalities. Copies of all comments and complete responses to substantive comments are contained in Appendix D.

5.4.1 Resource/Regulatory Agency Comments

5.4.1.1 USEPA

The USEPA noted that the project team provided an abundance of opportunities for stakeholders to be engaged in the process and was able to identify a manageable number of