

Eastern Bypass Study Community Advisory Group

Eastern Bypass Study

From Interstate 74 to Illinois Route 6
Peoria, Tazewell and Woodford Counties
Job No. P-94-021-07; Catalog No. 033514-00P

MEETING SUMMARY

Community Advisory Group Meeting #12 June 18, 2015

The twelfth meeting of the Community Advisory Group (CAG) for the Eastern Bypass Study was held at the Countryside Banquet Facility, in Washington, IL on Thursday, June 18, 2015, at 6:00 p.m.

Representing IDOT's Study Team for the Eastern Bypass Project were the following individuals:

- Maureen Addis (IDOT)
- Mike Lewis (IDOT)
- Tom Lacy (IDOT)
- Greg Larson (IDOT)
- Shannon Russell (IDOT)
- Jeff Schlotter (H.W. Lochner, Inc.)
- George Ghareeb (TERRA Engineering, Ltd.)
- Eric Therkildsen (TERRA Engineering, Ltd.)
- Alexis Zgoda (TERRA Engineering, Ltd.)
- Dennis Jennings (Technology of Participation)
- Judy Weddle (Technology of Participation)

Presented below is a summary of the meeting, organized by the agenda items.

AGENDA ITEM 1 – Introduction

The meeting began at 6:00 p.m. with Jeff Schlotter (IDOT Study Team) welcoming the CAG and re-introducing the IDOT Study Team members present at the meeting. He then explained the agenda for the meeting, stating that the goals are: to put the study in perspective; explain what has taken place since the previous CAG meeting; present the IDOT Study Team's recommendations on the

final corridors; have an open ended discussion on these and any other study matters; and, present information about the final steps in the Tier 1 study.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – Review of the study’s objectives and parameters

Mr. Schlotter stated that because it’s been quite some time since the CAG last met, and because there are some new members, the IDOT Study Team thought it would be useful to refresh everyone’s memory about the study’s objectives and parameters.

He proceeded by giving a very brief overview of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), stating that one of the main purposes of NEPA is to establish a process for understanding a project’s expected benefits and impacts. One of the main purposes of NEPA is informed decision-making about where a project should be built, with what design, and whether it should be built at all.

Mr. Schlotter also mentioned that a very important part of NEPA – and an important IDOT policy – is to engage with the public early in the study and to continue that engagement throughout the process. He then reminded the CAG members that so far the Eastern Bypass Study has had: a public kickoff meeting; held two public information meetings; three informational newsletters; meetings with local governments; an ongoing website; and the current Community Advisory Group.

He then explained how the proposed project transitioned from a Corridor Study to a Tiered Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, describing first the typical, non-tiered EIS steps, and then a tiered process, explaining that Tier 1 examines bigger questions at a general level of detail and Tier 2 generates impact information at a much finer level of detail. He then explained the reasons behind IDOT’s decision to use a tiered EIS process for the Eastern Bypass Study, stating that: (1) the study process could continue immediately rather than pause to await funding for a full, non-tiered NEPA process; (2) state and federal agencies would provide formal reviews of the proposed project at corridor level; (3) there would be a formal Record of Decision about the preferred corridor location; and, (4) the degree of uncertainty about where the project could be build would be reduced sooner.

Mr. Schlotter then asked if there were any questions about this background information. There being none, he moved on to the next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – Update on study activities and procedures

Mr. Schlotter explained that when conducting an EIS under NEPA, one of the key first steps is to hold a formal “scoping meeting” with local, state, and federal agencies. He described the reason such meetings are held and the highlights of the one held for the Eastern Bypass Study. Those included agreement among the agencies that the methods and level of detail used in the previous Corridor Study would be adequate for the Tier 1 level of analysis and that the stakeholder involvement plan in place was likewise adequate for the Tier 1 process.

Mr. Schlotter then explained that under NEPA, state and federal agencies often need to reach formal “concurrence” on key study findings over the course of the study process, and that on the

current study those concurrence points include the project's Purpose and Need, Alternatives to Carry Forward, and Preferred Alternative. He noted that the current study has achieved concurrence on Purpose and Need and Alternatives to Carry forward. He then described some of the key aspects of both findings, particularly how the proposed project's Purpose and Need analysis had been updated to differentiate between primary and secondary purposes, and how those had been re-examined and how the alternatives had been re-screened using the updated information.

Mr. Schlotter then asked if there were any questions.

Pete Fenner (Peoria Audubon Society) commented about the primary purpose of the project, noting the bridge over the Illinois River and an interchange on I-74 near Morton might be all that is needed to achieve the project's stated purpose.

Keith Bachman (Community Impacts) said he felt there had been no discussion of a project solution that would be less than a full bypass until it was just mentioned in Mr. Schlotter's presentation.

Mr. Schlotter explained that under federal review, alternative concepts such as mass transit and transportation systems management are studied as a matter of routine consideration, even though they proved to not be viable solutions for this project, and that studying these concepts was not necessary during the earlier corridor study. He further stated that the goal of the current Tier 1 Study is to identify the best general location or corridor for further examining the details of the project in Tier 2 and that Tier 2 does not necessarily rule out solutions that would be less than a full bypass concept.

Mr. Fenner asked: If the bridge is built, does it have to be connected to a completely new highway?

Mr. Schlotter responded by explaining that in Tier 1 IDOT is examining alternatives for connecting I-74 to IL 6; in Tier 2, smaller individual projects can be explored.

Mike Lewis (IDOT Study Team) reiterated Mr. Schlotter's point and responded to Mr. Bachman regarding reducing the scope of the project to a smaller level of improvements. Mr. Lewis stated that this had not been presented to the CAG yet because it was done more recently as a part of the Tier 1 process. It was further noted that IDOT could conduct a more concise Environmental Assessment process (as opposed to a larger Environmental Impact Statement) in Tier 2 for smaller individual projects that could possibly have a more limited scope of work. There could be, for example, an independent project established to build a new bridge over the Illinois River and an interchange or a just a section of new road.

Greg Larson (IDOT Study Team) added that, in keeping with federal regulations, IDOT cannot propose projects that do not have what is known as "logical termini," explaining that IDOT would need to establish that any smaller improvements (other than connecting I-74 directly to IL 6 with a new highway) could stand alone as useful projects and not require other improvements to make them useful.

There being no other questions, Mr. Schlotter moved on to the next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – Corridor drop-keep review

Mr. Schlotter explained that the IDOT Study Team felt it was important to remind the CAG members about how the IDOT Study Team and the CAG worked together to drop ten of the original fourteen corridors. He then presented the information about this “drop-keep” process, explaining that this was the same information presented to federal and state agencies in seeking their formal concurrence on the four corridors to be retained for further study.

Mr. Schlotter then proceeded to explain the following items: 1) the master benefits-impacts matrix and how that, along with projected traffic volumes, guided the IDOT Study Team/CAG decision-making; 2) the 500-foot wide representative bands that were developed to allow impact data to be generated for comparing corridors; 3) the “drop-keep” process that was used, based on notes placed on a “sticky wall”; and, 4) the three drop-keep iterations required and the outcome of each.

After stepping through the decisions on each corridor to drop and keep, Mr. Schlotter presented the four corridors that remained and that were approved for more detailed study by the federal and state agencies: P2,T6, M10, and D13.

Mr. Schlotter then proceeded to the next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – Explanation of initial Draft EIS

Mr. Schlotter described how all the information developed and decisions made over the course of the Tier 1 study is being documented in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which has a formal draft version and a formal final version. He explained that the chapters of the document include: Study Overview; The Purpose of the Proposed Project; Alternatives for Meeting the Project Purpose; Expected Benefits and Impacts of the Corridor Alternatives; Recommendation for the Project’s Preferred Alternative; Government, Agency, and Public Involvement; Next Steps; List of Preparers, Document Mailing List, and Related Items; and, References Cited.

Mr. Schlotter then explained that this document is being developed in what is known as a “reader-friendly” format, which is intended to be more easily understood by members of the general public. He stressed the importance of incorporating technical information by reference instead of embedding it in the main body of the document when using this reader-friendly format.

Mr. Schlotter concluded this brief agenda item by reminding the CAG members that topics contained in the first four chapters of the Draft EIS have been approved by the Federal Highway Administration, and that the key final decision yet remaining is IDOT’s recommendation to the FHWA about which corridor or corridors should be designated as the preferred alternative for the Tier 1 study.

Mr. Schlotter proceeded to the next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM 6 – Explanation of the recommended corridor alternatives

Mr. Schlotter presented information on what IDOT will be proposing as its preferred corridor for the Tier 1 study.

He began by reminding the CAG members that IDOT's goal has always been to identify the one best corridor, and that in attempting to achieve that goal the IDOT Study Team has looked at each of the four remaining corridors very closely, comparing the full array of expected impacts and benefits.

Mr. Schlotter explained that the first step in establishing the recommendation was IDOT's decision to drop Corridor D13. He described the factors that led to that decision, which included: the low traffic volumes D13 is predicted to carry; agricultural impacts; scoring lowest on most of the benefit categories; and, the fact that D13 is a mixture of high and low impacts across the other impact categories.

He summarized the decision by explaining that this corridor wouldn't provide enough return on investment to justify keeping it for future study, compared to the other three remaining corridors.

With respect to the other three corridors, Mr. Schlotter explained, with the aid of a colored-coded graphic, that each of the three remaining corridors represents a mixture of benefits and impacts, with P2 showing relatively high benefits and low agricultural impacts but also higher residential impacts. He further explained that M10 has fewer benefits, but lower impacts, and that T6 has very few extremes of either benefits or impacts.

Mr. Schlotter then explained that this mixture of benefits and impacts, and particularly the benefits that P2 would bring, led the IDOT Study Team to conclude that each of these three should be carried forward to the Tier 2 level of analysis. At that time, more precise and extensive impact data will be generated, which will allow ultimate decisions to be made about the proposed project's best location.

Mr. Schlotter emphasized that in the case of relocation impacts, IDOT understands that each residential relocation is a potentially major disruption to the individuals and families who would need to relocate, and that IDOT does not make these kinds of decisions lightly. The IDOT Study Team wants to carry P2 forward, even though it would require a higher number of relocations, so a more precise look at how the actual roadway might be configured can be assessed. Factors such as the connection to US 24 and the layout of local roads in this area, steep terrain in the Farmdale Road area, interchange configurations and access all need further detail to get a clearer picture of how the three remaining corridors compare in terms of impacts.

Mr. Schlotter stated that as much as the IDOT Study Team would have liked to carry only one or two corridors forward, the Team members agreed it is necessary to carry all three -- P2, T6 and M10 -- into the Tier 2 study. He continued by explaining that the combined footprint of these three corridors will become, in effect, the study area for the Tier 2 NEPA phase and the area within which actual roadway locations will be drawn. These locations will not be called corridors but will instead be called alignments and will be much narrower in width than the corridors. Many different

alignments will be developed as the Tier 2 study proceeds. At least three of the alignments will roughly follow the bands that have been developed for each of the three corridors.

Mr. Schlotter then stated that the IDOT Study Team would like to get the CAG members' reactions to this decision, and in particular, the views of any CAG member who may have a different perspective about the relative importance of the impacts and benefits the IDOT Study Team used to make its recommendations.

Mr. Schlotter further stated that the IDOT Study Team wanted to ask the CAG members two questions: what would they like IDOT to know at this stage of the study; and, what more do the CAG members need to know as they discuss this project with members of their respective communities in the months between now and the public hearing next year.

Mr. Schlotter then announced a 15-minute break, stating that a group discussion focusing on those questions will take place after the break.

Before the break, Mr. Schlotter responded a question about the previous agenda item:

Dr. Jim Dunnan (Controlled Growth) asked: Is the dropping of D13 IDOT's final recommendation? If so, will there be no call for formal consensus from the CAG? If IDOT is not asking the CAG for consensus, will the CAG be on record as having endorsed this recommendation?

Mr. Schlotter confirmed that IDOT could neither justify keeping D13 nor could it justify dropping any of the other three, and, as a result, formal consensus is not needed and will not be asked for. He also stated that the CAG will not be on record as having formally endorsed IDOT's recommendation.

— BREAK —

AGENDA ITEM 7 – Discussion of the recommended corridor alternatives

In response to questions asked during the break about the study's schedule, Mr. Schlotter next presented the information originally intended for the first half of agenda item 8. In summarizing the Tier 1 study's timeline graphic, he described how the study is currently in the final stages of the CAG meeting process and how the IDOT Study Team has begun the task of preparing the Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). He explained that the next major step will be to present the IDOT Study Team's recommendation for the preferred corridors to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and other state and federal agencies for their concurrence. Once this concurrence is achieved, the DEIS will be completed and signed by the FHWA, at which time it becomes approved for public release. This begins a formal comment period, during which a public hearing will be held to receive comments on this document's findings. Once all comments are received and reviewed, the Final EIS will be written, incorporating any changes as a result of the comments and summarizing all comments made. Once the Final EIS is approved by the FHWA, a formal Record of Decision will be written and published in the *Federal Register*. Once that step is

accomplished, the Tier 1 study is considered completed with respect to NEPA requirements. Mr. Schlotter explained that the IDOT Study Team is currently expecting the Record of Decision to be published in mid-2017.

Mr. Schlotter then explained what would happen in the Tier 2 study, noting that it could either 1) produce another Draft and Final EIS for the whole project at a greater level of detail, including one final route location and design concept; or, 2) be divided into smaller individual projects. He further explained that after the Tier 2 NEPA phase is completed, the project could proceed to the final design phase, then the right-of-way acquisition phase, and then to project construction. He emphasized there is currently no funding beyond the current Tier 1 EIS phase.

Having discussed the schedule, Mr. Schlotter then opened the floor for general discussion. The following comments, questions, and responses were made:

Pete Streid (Agriculture) asked when in the study one final corridor will be selected.

Mr. Schlotter explained that instead of taking one corridor into Tier 2, the recommendation to the FHWA will be to take the remaining study area – the combination of P2, T6, and M10 – into Tier 2.

Randall Jacobs (Property Impacts) said P2 and T6 will be close to Westlake Subdivision and hopes steps would be taken to keep the lake from becoming contaminated during construction and operation of the facility. He stated he would like to see the subdivision protected from noise, air, and other contaminants, as well. As a representative for the Property Impacts group, he feels this should be the case for all other subdivisions in the corridors.

Mr. Schlotter noted that in Tier 2 more detailed study will be conducted and will include noise impacts, air quality, and other ways the project could affect area properties.

Jim Gee (City of Washington) asked if 1) IDOT now feels the CAG has completed its role on this study and 2) who will make the final corridor decision.

Mr. Schlotter said while tonight's meeting will be the last formal meeting of the CAG, IDOT encourages the CAG members to attend the study's public hearing next year to provide their insights regarding the corridors and the study process, as well as to hear what input the general public provides. CAG members are also encouraged to continue to stay in touch with the IDOT Study Team and to provide input to IDOT or ask questions of the IDOT Study Team if questions arise from the general public. It is expected there will be a CAG for Tier 2 and the current CAG members would be offered the opportunity to participate in that group. Mr. Schlotter also noted the study still has more work to be done. The combined study area of Corridors P2, T6, and M10 is the recommended study area IDOT will present to the FHWA, but this recommendation still needs to be approved by the FHWA and other regulatory agencies. During the coming months, IDOT will welcome any additional input CAG members would like to provide.

Steve Van Winkle (City of Peoria) asked if the same study area shown (Corridors P2, T6, and M10) will be used for Tier 2, or if any revisions will be made.

Mr. Schlotter responded that the FHWA could make changes, but the area presented tonight will likely remain the study area to carry into Tier 2. He cautioned that no decisions can be considered absolutely final until the FHWA signs the Tier 1 Final EIS and the Record of Decision is published in the *Federal Register*.

Dr. Dunnan commented that he feels there are reasons to keep D13 included for further analysis, stating that its cost/benefit ratio is good in light of the approximately \$620 million that would be spent to build the project. He also noted that Corridors P2 and T6 have the highest expected costs and the most residential relocations. An east-west division could occur in Washington with Corridors P2 and T6. A north-south division already exists with the Washington Bypass, and another division could hurt the city. He also said the interchanges on I-74 for P2 and T6 are too far west if coming from Bloomington. A traveler would just continue on existing roads once they were that far into the area and wouldn't use the new bypass. If the new bypass were further out in the D13 area, a traveler would be more likely to use it to bypass the more congested areas in cities.

Mr. Schlotter explained the decision to drop D13 reflects the weights or relative values IDOT places on the benefit and impact categories, with a relatively high value placed on the amount of traffic the corridors are expected to attract. Because D13 is anticipated to carry less traffic than the other corridors, IDOT sees this as a negative. The IDOT IDOT Study Team does, however, want to hear the CAG's values on these categories so that IDOT can present them to the FHWA and the regulatory agencies for their consideration. Mr. Schlotter added that the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission's traffic model was used to estimate future traffic volumes and to compare traffic between corridors.

Shelli McClellan (Property Impacts) commented that she was disappointed D13 is being dropped, stating that the two corridors she has supported, D13 being one of them, will now both be dropped from consideration. She felt D13 has the least impact on lives and should still be considered. She said she currently experiences no difficulties getting to Peoria or travelling north-south to the Morton area, so there is really no problem with travel in the area. She does not support the three corridors going forward, nor the way the decision to do so was made, stating that the decision should not just be made by a few people around a table without input from the public. Also, she said she agrees with Dr. Dunnan's comments regarding D13.

Greg Sinn (Tazewell County) commented that this selection is going to be a touchy decision. The answer needs to be a road that will be used and that will open up the area to development.

Mr. Van Winkle reminded the group about the long history of the project, referring to the time when it was called the Ring Road. He stated that back then it was considered to be the foundation for a new highway being planned to connect Peoria directly to Chicago. The Ring Road was needed in order to distribute the traffic from that new, cross-country route. He further stated that the current Eastern Bypass project will be needed if the Peoria-to-Chicago highway is ever again pursued.

Mr. Fenner said the current corridors seem to avoid direct impact on the high quality wildlife habitat that exists in the region, adding that the corridors that would have had an impact were eliminated earlier in the study. He did note, however, that Corridor P2 is very near the Farmdale Recreation Area and that while Northwood Park (near Morton) would be avoided, Corridor T6 comes close to it. He noted that at the Illinois River, a new crossing could offer access for viewing and possibly access to the river for recreational use. He said these considerations should continue to be a part of the study, as it moves forward.

Mr. Bachman commented that this road is a “want” instead of a need, and that when the current study began, he assumed the need for the road would be discussed rather than the “want” for it. He added that before any investment is made, the determination should be made as to whether it is truly needed, or simply wanted. He said some feel the Eastern Bypass is “preferred” in order to create more economic development. But, he noted, the existing farmland is already an economic generator. He concluded by saying the highway would be an expense, not an investment.

Mr. Schlotter responded by saying that Mr. Bachman’s comments are directly related to the larger topic of Cumulative Impacts and Indirect Effects. These types of impacts, he explained, are an important consideration in the selection of an alternative. Cumulative impacts look at the effects, or “stresses,” on a particular environmental resource over time, regardless of the source of those stresses. He said that on the current project, one valuable resource that has been stressed for many years is agricultural land, due to conversion of this valuable resource to other land uses. NEPA requires resources such as this – ones that have been subjected to ongoing stresses – be examined to see how the proposed project would add to that impact. With respect to Indirect Effects, this examines how the project might affect resources that are farther removed in distance or time from the direct “footprint” of the project. Mr. Schlotter noted that if the project triggers development into farmland where such growth has not been planned, that could be an additional stress on agricultural resources. The main point is that impacts to agricultural lands are, for these reasons, particularly important. These topics will be included in detail in the study’s Draft EIS.

Mr. Streid asked where Tier 2 ends on the schedule shown in the handout materials that were distributed to the CAG members at the beginning of the meeting.

Mr. Schlotter explained that the handout materials only show Tier 1, and Tier 2 does not appear on the schedule. He further explained that Tier 2 would take approximately four more years to complete, after the Tier 1 tasks shown on the schedule are completed. Mr. Schlotter then noted that another two to three years would be needed to develop design plans, and then approximately two more years would be needed for land acquisition. Once these milestones are accomplished, construction of the project could begin. Mr. Schlotter emphasized that the timeframe he just mentioned represents the fastest possible schedule and would require all funding be in place and all required environmental permits obtained. He reiterated that none of these phases beyond the current Tier 1 study are funded.

Ken Maurer (Community Impacts) asked what part of the project would be built first.

Maureen Addis (IDOT Study Team) responded, saying the project would almost certainly be funded in segments, explaining that the Tier 2 study would include identifying what segments could be built for what costs. The Illinois River crossing and a connection at I-74 are, she said, logical locations to check for places to start construction. She emphasized that such a determination for the project would be very far in the future, however.

Mr. Bachman asked if Phase II (design plans) is funded yet.

Mr. Schlotter and Ms. Addis reiterated that no funding is currently in place other than for the current, Tier 1 phase.

Paul Corcoran (Property Impacts) asked if the construction could start at I-74.

Ms. Addis responded, saying it would depend on available funding and on which segments would be expected to be the most used. Eric Therkildsen (IDOT Study Team) added that each proposed segment would need to be able to function on its own, without requiring any other improvements to be built – a requirement called “independent utility.”

Mr. Bachman asked if the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission has identified their preferred corridor.

Mr. Schlotter said the Commission has not expressed a preference. Mr. Van Winkle, who holds a seat on the Tri-County Planning Commission, added that the Commission supports the concept of the eastern bypass but it has not gone on record as supporting any particular corridor. Mr. Schlotter added that the Eastern Bypass, as a concept, is listed in the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission’s Long Range Transportation Plan.

Mr. Gee asked if IDOT would seek consensus from the CAG tonight on IDOT’s recommendation.

Mr. Schlotter responded by saying that after thoroughly considering all the benefit and impact factors, the IDOT Study Team members decided they were not comfortable keeping D13 or dropping any of the remaining three corridors, and that this will be their recommendation to the FHWA for approval to move forward to Tier 2. He added that one of the objectives of tonight’s meeting was to have a discussion with the CAG members about this decision. He reminded the CAG that one of the Group’s agreed-upon ground rules is that this is an advisory group to IDOT. He assured the CAG that they have provided IDOT with excellent comments, throughout the study, which helped the IDOT Study Team make all the corridor drop-keep decisions.

Mr. Schlotter added that materials will be mailed to all the CAG members that include tonight’s meeting summary and a questionnaire to fill out regarding the CAG members’ views on these corridors and the study process overall.

Mr. Schlotter then asked if there were any more questions or comments. There being none, he turned to the second half of the final agenda item (the first having been presented earlier).

AGENDA ITEM 8 – Next steps and concluding remarks

Having already mentioned the package the CAG members could expect in the mail, Mr. Schlotter concluded this final CAG meeting by thanking the CAG members for their dedication, hard work, and patience over a period that extended much longer than was originally expected.

Mike Lewis added that this group has been remarkable in the contribution it has made to the study, noting that many similar groups that IDOT works with throughout Illinois do not show as much attention and dedication as this group has consistently shown. Mr. Lewis noted that this is a very special group and one that is very appreciated by IDOT.

There being no additional questions or comments, Mr. Schlotter adjourned the meeting, at approximately 8:40 p.m.

ATTACHMENT

**Transcription of Flip Chart Notes from
June 18, 2015 CAG Meeting #12**

Flipchart notes

CAG Meeting #12

June 18, 2015

Eastern Bypass Project

The following is a transcription of the flip chart notes taken at the June 18, 2015 CAG meeting. Editing has been limited to words, phrases, or punctuation added for clarity. Other than minor edits like punctuation, the revisions are noted in brackets.

Easel #1

- When narrow to one corridor? [Response:] “Study area” for tier 2 determined w/ 3 corridors.
- [Need to share this:] West Lake subdivision / lake [should be] protected from contamination & noise impacts – [Response:] federal law requires attention to these.
- CAG or who decides on single corridor – [Response:] Tier 2 / when funded – CAG will be needed. Study Group / IDOT et al will decide - & it is these 3 corridors [that will be recommended for Tier 2 study].
- Same corridors going into Tier 2? [Response:] Yes, pretty likely – [Nothing is final until] Final EIS signed is final.
- D13 – Struggle: cost benefit analysis / impacts concerns in Washington of – some does not make sense / P2 / T6 “picking & choosing” IDOTs Value [has been placed] on traffic volumes
- One of the options I supported was eliminated tonight. Just build the bridge/spot builds – Bothers me that D13 dropped when it has least impact on lives – do not support 3 going forward nor the way it was decided.
- I support road that will be [well] used and open up area (Washington/county) to traffic
- [Potential re-emergence of] Heart of Illinois [Highway – Peoria to Chicago] would change factors going into this study. (Post Meeting Note: The Heart of Illinois Highway is not currently being reconsidered by IDOT.)
- Not a huge impact on [important wildlife] habitat (Farmdale – area not first choice – N. Woods park in Morton – high quality areas. River is unique feature [of the area] – bridge could provide access road for viewing – launch canoe / Bike path – [all this enables] birds, etc. [viewing] – Good thing – bridge / recreation also
- “Need” would be the first thing discussed. It is a “want.” Reasonable people do this! Frustration of mine – push behind it is preferred economic development /

land taken / agriculture is economic factor – compounds expenses in the future
[Response:] [IDOT is] charged with looking at cumulative effects

- Timeline where is Tier 2 study done? – Don't know. When to start (4-5 years)
- Do they just fund segments [Response:] – build – River crossing is logical first step. 75-80% [of funds IDOT has available goes to] maintain what we have. /Constructable segments depends on \$ available
- Tri-county picked a favorite corridor? [Response:] No formal selection/choice – want to see built as people want.
- You want consensus from CAG to move forward? What do you want from us?

Easel #2

- P2/P6 WESTLAKE PROTECTION FROM NOISE AND OTHER POLLUTION
- P2 FROM EAST COMING FROM BLMGTON I-74 [FROM BLOOMINGTON ON I-74], DON'T KNOW WHY [MOTORISTS] WOULD ACCESS THAT ROUTE [P2]
- P2 EAST WEST DIVIDE NOW IN ADDITION TO THE CURRENT NORTH/SOUTH DIVISION
- LIVE IN T6 – TOOK CORRIDOR D13 THAT W/O INPUT FROM CAG (TROUBLESOME) HAS LEAST IMPACT ON LIVES
- NEEDS TO BE ROAD THAT WILL BE USED AND THAT WILL OPEN UP ACCESS TO AREA
- HEART OF ILLINOIS ROAD REEMERGENCE COULD EFFECT CHANGE IN THIS PROJECT (Post Meeting Note: The Heart of Illinois Highway is not currently being reconsidered by IDOT.)
- FARMDALE HABITAT [IS] A HIGH QUALITY HABITAT IMPACT AREA; NORTHWOODS PARK OTHER AREA IS HIGH QUALITY HABITAT / RIVER MOST VALUABLE / ACCESS TO RIVER FOR VIEWING FOR WILDLIFE
- DETERMINE IF EBP [EASTERN BYPASS] IS A WANT RATHER THAN A NEED / COMES AS A FRUSTRATION / VIEW THAT THIS EBP IS DRIVEN BY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / TAKING AGRICULTURAL LAND OUT OF PRODUCTION IS A LOSS OF INVESTMENT / [RESPONSE: IDOT IS CHARGED WITH LOOKING AT] CUMULATIVE EFFECTS
- WHERE IS TIER 2 PROCESS DONE ON THIS T/L [TIMELINE]?
- WHAT DO YOU DO FIRST IF FUNDED? [RESPONSE:] CONSTRUCTABLE, USEABLE SEGMENTS / INDEPENDENT UTILITY / NO CURRENT CAPITAL BUDGET

- **HAS TRI-COUNTY PICKED THEIR SELECTION [RESPONSE:] NEVER SELECTED A PREFERRED CORRIDOR / SUPPORTIVE OF ONE PEOPLE SUPPORT**