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1. Introduction

1.1 Project Background

The Illinois Route 31 Phase I project corridor is located in IDOT District One in McHenry County. The project begins 0.15 miles north of the intersection of Illinois Route 176 and Illinois Route 31 in Crystal Lake and extends north through the Village of Prairie Grove to Illinois Route 120 in downtown McHenry (See Figure 1-1 for a Project Location Map). The total project length is approximately 6.6 miles. Highway improvements are proposed for this section of Route 31 to accommodate existing and anticipated 2040 traffic demands. Sections of Illinois Route 31 had an AADT as high as 23,500 vehicles per day in 2009.

![Figure 1-1 – Illinois Route 31 Study Area Location Map](image)

The corridor has multiple classifications of roadway; some of which are rural and some are urban. Adjacent land use within the project study area includes agricultural, residential, commercial and
industrial properties. Agricultural lands are generally located in the central area of the project within the Village of Prairie Grove from Ames Road to Veterans Parkway. Many of these areas have been planned for new residential and commercial developments. Existing commercial developments are scattered throughout various locations within the study area including the south limits of the project near Ray Street, north of Veterans Parkway to Bull Valley Road (1.29 miles), and in downtown McHenry from Lillian Street to Illinois Route 120 (0.57 miles). At Half Mile Trail, the TC Industries steel processing plant resides on the west side of Illinois Route 31; this facility will require special considerations due to the heavy truck traffic this facility generates.

With all of the anticipated growth and development in this area, the proposed improvement is deeply rooted in the need to address future traffic demands of the communities within the region.

Due to the importance of the Illinois Route 31 roadway corridor to the central McHenry County transportation network and IDOT’s increased sensitivity to stakeholder concerns, IDOT has determined that this project should follow the general guidelines set forth in the Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) manual. CSS is a collaborative, interdisciplinary approach that involves all stakeholders to develop a facility that fits into its surroundings and preserves scenic, aesthetic, historic and environmental resources while maintaining safety and mobility. A Stakeholder Involvement Plan (SIP) is critical to the success of CSS principles on a project. The SIP, by its nature, is a work in progress and thus subject to revision anytime events warrant.

1.2 Legal Requirements

The study process for this project will meet state and federal requirements meant to integrate environmental values and public interaction into transportation improvements. The requirements include the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Context Sensitive Solutions.

1.3 National Environmental Policy Act

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) will complete an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Illinois 31 (0.15 miles north of Illinois Route 176 to Illinois Route 120) project in order to satisfy NEPA requirements. The EA schedule will combine the FHWA timeframes with an individual ¬ delete the discussion on individual 4(f). We may be able to avoid. 4(f) for Fruend Field in McHenry and will include updates under the NEPA/404 Merger process. The FHWA is the Federal Agency responsible for final approval of the environmental document. This study and the supporting environmental documents will be governed by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and state regulatory requirements. Opportunities exist for the public to provide input on the purpose and need, the alternatives and project-related environmental impacts.

The NEPA process requires federal agencies to integrate environmental values into their decision-making process by considering the environmental impacts of their proposed actions and reasonable alternatives to these actions. IDOT will assess the natural, built, and human environment to determine the extent of impacts that may arise from constructing and operating a project. Environmental factors such as air quality, wildlife, vegetation, water quality, wetlands, geology, neighborhoods, park/recreation areas, utilities, visual quality, and cultural resources will be assessed. NEPA encourages early and frequent coordination with the public and resource agencies throughout the project development process. Public comments that are received during the project are considered. Following NEPA guidelines, an EA will be prepared.

Since the mid-1990s, Illinois has had a Statewide Implementation Agreement (SIA) in place that provides for concurrent NEPA and Section 404 (Clean Water Act) processes on federally aided highway projects in Illinois. The purpose of the SIA is to ensure appropriate consideration of the concerns of the US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) as early as practical in highway project development. The intent is also to
involve these agencies at key decision points early in project development to minimize the potential for unforeseen issues arising during the NEPA or section 404 permitting processes.

State highway projects needing a standard individual permit from the Corps under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act typically are processed under the NEPA/404 SIA. The three key decision points in the NEPA process are:

1.) Project Purpose and Need
2.) Alternatives to be Carried Forward
3.) Preferred Alternative

FHWA and IDOT will seek an opportunity to present at regularly scheduled NEPA/404 meetings at these key decision points. These meetings will be in conjunction with public and agency involvement through the CSS process.

1.4 National Historic Preservation Act
Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation a reasonable opportunity to comment on such undertakings. The Section 106 process seeks to accommodate historic preservation concerns with the needs of Federal undertakings through consultation among the agency official and other parties with an interest in the effects of the undertaking on historic properties, commencing at the early stages of project planning. The goal of consultation is to identify historic properties potentially affected by the undertaking, assess its effects and seek ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties.

This project is considered a Federal undertaking by FHWA. This document describes coordination activities that will occur during the project development process to satisfy the Section 106 requirements.

1.5 Context Sensitive Solutions
This project is being developed using the principles of Context Sensitive Solutions per Chapter 19, Section 19-2.01(a) of the Bureau of Design and Environment (BDE) Manual.

The CSS approach will provide stakeholders with the tools and information they require to effectively participate in the study process including providing an understanding of the NEPA process, transportation planning guidelines, design guidelines, and the relationship between transportation issues (needs) and project alternatives. In other words, using the CSS process should provide all project stakeholders a mechanism to share comments or concerns about transportation objectives and project alternatives, as well as improve the ability of the project team to understand and address concerns raised. This integrated approach to problem solving and decision-making will help build community consensus and promote involvement through the study process. As identified in IDOT’s CSS policies, stakeholder involvement is critical to project success. The CSS process strives to achieve the following:

- Understand stakeholder’s key issues and concerns.
- Involve stakeholders in the decision-making process early and often.
- Establish an understanding of the stakeholder’s project role.
- Address all modes of transportation.
- Set a project schedule.
- Apply flexibility in design to address stakeholder’s concerns whenever possible.
2. Goals and Objectives

The purpose of this plan is to provide a guide for implementing stakeholder involvement for the Illinois Route 31 project. The SIP will be used as a blueprint for defining methods and tools to educate and engage all stakeholders in the decision-making process for this project. The SIP has been developed to ensure that stakeholders are provided a number of opportunities to be informed, engaged, and provide input as the project progresses.

2.1 Stakeholder Involvement Plan Goals

The goal of the SIP is to actively seek the participation of communities, agencies, individual interest groups, and the general public throughout the project development process. The SIP provides the framework for achieving consensus and communicating the decision-making process between the general public, public agencies, and governmental officials to identify transportation solutions for the project.

The SIP:

- Identifies stakeholders
- Identifies the Project Study Group (PSG).
- Identifies the roles and responsibilities of the lead agency. (Table 3-1 in Appendix A)
- Identifies agency responsibilities (Table 3-2 in Appendix A)
- Identifies Community Advisory Group (CAG), and their role and responsibilities.
- Establishes the timing and type of involvement activities with all stakeholders.
- Establishes stakeholder requirements for providing timely input to the project development

2.2 Stakeholder Identification Procedures

A stakeholder is anyone who could be affected by the project and has a stake in its outcome. This includes property owners, business owners, state and local officials, special interest groups, and motorists who utilize the facility. Stakeholders for this project may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Residents
- Business owners adjacent to the study area
- Churches and schools within the project limits
- Advocates for community and historic interests
- Special interest groups (environmental coalitions, bicycle groups, etc.)
- Elected/community officials
- Government and planning agencies
- Transportation system users
- Chambers of commerce
- Neighborhood groups
- Utilities / Telecommunications
- Others outside the study area with an interest in the project

Early coordination and/or meetings will be conducted with stakeholders within the study area as a means of identifying interested parties and stakeholders, including individuals, businesses, community leaders and organizations within each of the communities, townships, and counties. The identification of stakeholders will be done through a combination of desktop searches and input from local community leaders. It is anticipated that new stakeholders will be added to the initial stakeholder list throughout the project. All stakeholders expressing interest in the project will be added to the project mailing/emailing list, and will be able to participate in the process through various public outreach opportunities. These opportunities include, but are not limited to, the project Website, public meetings, newsletters, and press
releases (see Section 5). The project mailing/emailing list will be updated and maintained through the duration of the project.

2.3 Stakeholder Involvement Ground Rules

The SIP will be conducted based on a set of ground rules that form the basis for the respectful interaction of all parties involved in this process. These ground rules will be established tentatively with the initiation of the SIP, but must be agreed upon by the stakeholders and, therefore, may be modified based on stakeholder input.

These rules include the following:

- Input on the project from all stakeholders is duly considered in order to yield the best solutions to problems identified by the process.
- Input from all participants in the process is valued and considered.
- The list of stakeholders is subject to revisions/additions at any time as events warrant.
- All participants must keep an open mind and participate openly, honestly, and respectfully.
- All participants should work collaboratively and cooperatively to seek a consensus solution. Consensus is defined as “when a majority of the stakeholders agree on a particular issue, while the remainder of stakeholders agrees its input has been heard and duly considered and that the process as a whole was fair.”
- All participants in the process must treat each other with respect and dignity.
- The project must progress at a reasonable pace, based on the project schedule.
- Final project decisions will be made by IDOT and FHWA.
3. Joint Lead, Cooperating and Participating Agencies

3.1 Joint Lead Agencies

FHWA and IDOT will act as joint lead agencies for the preparation of the Environmental Assessment. As such, the FHWA (Division Administrator) and IDOT (Secretary of Transportation) are the ultimate decision makers for this project.

3.2 Cooperating Agencies

Per NEPA, a cooperating agency is any federal agency that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposed project. Cooperating agencies are permitted, by request of the lead agency, to assume responsibility for developing information and preparing environmental analyses for topics about which they have special expertise.

Agencies invited to serve as cooperating agencies for this project are listed in Table 3-2 in Appendix A. The responsibilities shown in the table are in addition to those that are typical of cooperating agencies, such as the following:

- Identify, as early as possible, any issues of concern regarding the project’s potential environmental and socioeconomic impact.
- Communicate issues of concern, formally, in the EA scoping process.
- Provide input and comment on the project’s purpose and need.
- Provide input and comment on the procedures used to develop alternatives or analyze impacts.
- Provide input on the range of alternatives to be considered.
- Provide input and comment on the sufficiency of environmental analyses.

3.3 Section 106 Consulting Parties

The FHWA is responsible for involving consulting parties in findings and determinations made during the section 106 process. The section 106 regulations identify the following parties as having a consulting role in the section 106 process:

a) State Historic Preservation Officer
b) Indian Tribes and Native Hawaiian Organizations
c) Representatives of local governments
d) Applicants for Federal assistance, permits, licenses and other approvals
e) Individuals and organizations with a demonstrated interest in the undertaking

The FHWA has worked with IDOT and the SHPO to identify potential section 106 consulting parties, which are listed in Table 4-1. Individuals or organizations may request to become a consulting party for this project by contacting Scott Czaplicki by email (scott.czaplicki@illinois.gov). Consulting parties may provide input on key decision points in the section 106 process, including the project’s Area of Potential Effect, determinations of eligibility and finding of effect, and if applicable, consulting to avoid adverse effects to historic properties.

The FHWA and IDOT will utilize IDOT’s public involvement procedures under NEPA to fulfill the Section 106 public involvement requirements.

4. Project Working Groups

The project working groups for this project will consist of a Project Study Group (PSG) and a Community Advisory Group (CAG). If recommended by the stakeholders and determined necessary by the PSG, additional project working groups may be formed in the future.
4.1 Project Study Group

Per IDOT’s CSS procedures, IDOT has formed a PSG, an interdisciplinary project development team, for facilitating the Illinois Route 31 project. The PSG will make the ultimate project recommendations and decisions on this project. This group consists of a multidisciplinary team of representatives from IDOT, FHWA and the project consultant (STV Incorporated). The membership of the PSG will evolve as the understanding of the project’s context is clarified.

The PSG has primary responsibility for the project development process. This group will meet throughout the study process to provide technical oversight and expertise in key areas including study process, agency procedures and standards, and technical approaches. The PSG also has primary responsibility for ensuring compliance with the SIP.

Other responsibilities of the PSG include the following:

- Expediting the project development process.
- Identifying and resolving project development issues.
- Promoting partnership with stakeholders to address identified project needs.
- Working to develop consensus among stakeholders.

The persons listed in Table 4-1 in Appendix A will form the PSG for the IL 31 project.

4.2 Community Advisory Group

To assist in the development of the environmental and engineering studies for the Illinois Route 31 study, IDOT has proposed the establishment of a Community Advisory Group (CAG). The purpose of the CAG is to provide input on the development of the Purpose and Need statement and the alternatives to be carried forward for evaluation in the Environmental Assessment. The CAG group consists of community leaders (Mayor or Manager in the study area and the Chairpersons from McHenry County, or their designee who have authority to enter into intergovernmental agreements) and stakeholders with expertise or technical interest in Environmental, Land Use, Transportation, and Economic Development that are affected by the study. These stakeholders will focus on technical aspects of the project development process and will provide external subject-matter information and input. The CAG will represent the views of the communities and counties within the project area. The responsibilities of this group include providing input to the study process, and consensus at key project milestones (e.g., Project Purpose and Need, range of alternatives to be advanced for detailed study, and the recommended alternative.) The membership in the CAG will be by invitation. The initial invitee list is presented in Table 4-2 in Appendix A.

The meeting program will be designed to encourage timely and meaningful opportunities for input, and to encourage information sharing and collaboration between the CAG and the PSG.

4.3 Implementation

Public involvement in the planning process begins as soon as the study starts and continues throughout the project. This report serves as a guide for public involvement in Phase I of this study, but includes strategies that can be used through all project phases. Implementation of this plan requires the commitment and efforts of all involved parties. As an implementation guide, this plan links specific strategies to the study schedule and identifies the audience each strategy is intended to reach. Implementation of this plan requires the commitment and efforts of all study participants and includes actions, responsibilities, and timing. The PSG will be responsible for the overall development, implementation and coordination of Public Involvement.
4.4 Stakeholder Involvement

Any stakeholder that shows interest in the project will be added to the stakeholder list, ensuring they will receive newsletters, meeting invitations, and project updates. The project team will also be available to meet with stakeholder groups on a one-on-one basis throughout the project, if deemed necessary. In addition, stakeholders will be informed about the project website where they can access information and submit comments.

4.5 Dispute Resolution

IDOT is committed to working with all agencies and stakeholders in the study process to indentify issues early and seek consensus on disagreements. IDOT is committed to building stakeholder consensus for decisions. However, if an impasse has been reached after making good faith efforts to address unresolved concerns, IDOT may proceed to the next stage of project development without achieving consensus. In the case of an unresolved dispute between the agencies, IDOT will notify stakeholders of their decision and proposed course of action.
5. Tentative Schedule of Project Development Activities and Stakeholder Involvement

This section describes the general project development process and tentative schedule, project activities, and associated stakeholder involvement activities.

5.1 Step One: Stakeholder Identification, Development of the SIP, Project Initiation

This stage of the project development process includes various agency notifications, project organizational activities, and scoping activities. These activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Assemble and organize the PSG and CAG.
- Identify potential Section 106 consulting parties and invite them to become consulting parties.
- Develop the SIP and post to the project website.
- Prepare a community context audit (PSG and project stakeholders). The context audit will identify unique community characteristics that contribute to the project’s context and will need to be considered in the project development process.
- Conduct regulatory/resource agency EA scoping activities.
- Organize and hold a CAG meeting to discuss the project process, study area, history, roles and responsibilities, and identify transportation issues/concerns and draft a project problem statement.
- Organize and hold the first public kick-off meeting to educate stakeholders on the project process and study area, history, and identify study area issues/concerns. (Public Meeting 1)

5.2 Step Two: Developing CAG Project Problem Statement and Project Purpose and Need

This stage of the project consists of the identification of transportation problems in the study area and the development of project goals and objectives. Project purpose discussions will focus on providing stakeholders with background on known traffic safety problems or congestion/operational problems, traffic forecasts, and their anticipated effects on future traffic conditions. This will help set the stage for meaningful discussions about potential solutions. This information will be used as the basis for the development of the project Purpose and Need statement. Activities in this stage include the following:

- Develop CAG project problem statement, which must be accepted by consensus of the CAG. (CAG Meeting 2)
- Development of the project Purpose and Need statement; opportunities for stakeholder review will be provided. (Public Meeting 2)
- PSG and Agency concurrence on the Purpose and Need.
- Develop Section 106 area of potential effect and coordinate with Section 106 consulting parties.

5.3 Step Three: Defining Alternatives

A range of project alternatives will be considered to address the project Purpose and Need. The alternatives development process will be iterative in nature providing progressively greater detail. Numerous opportunities will be provided for stakeholder input to the development and evaluation of alternatives. Steps in the alternatives development process include the following:

- Identification of alternative development procedures, planning and design guidelines, and alternative evaluation procedures. This information will serve as the general guidance for the alternatives development and evaluation process. (Public Meeting 2)
- Identification of initial alternatives. (CAG Meetings)
• Evaluation of the initial alternatives.
• Identification of the alternatives to be carried forward. (Public Meeting 3)
• Evaluation of the alternatives to be carried forward.
• Agency concurrence with the alternatives to be carried forward through the NEPA/404 Merger Process.
• Identify 106 properties within the project’s area of potential effect and coordinate with Section-106 consulting parties.

5.4 Step Four: Identification of the Preferred Alternative

The process will continue with the identification and concurrence of the preferred alternative and completion of the EA. Activities in this stage of the project development process include the following:

• Tentative identification of the preferred alternative based on stakeholder input.
• Agency concurrence on the Preferred Alternative.
• Preparation and approval of the EA.
• Preferred alternative refinements to address stakeholder comments received at the Public Hearing.
• Make Section-106 effect finding and coordinate with Section-106 consulting parties. If applicable, work with Section-106 consulting parties to resolve adverse effect.

5.5 Project Development Schedule and Stakeholder Involvement Activities

The tentative schedule for project development activities and stakeholder involvement activities is presented in Table 5-1 in Appendix B.
6. Public Involvement Activities

The following public involvement activities are proposed for Phase I of the IL 31 project. Unless otherwise noted, the PSG is the responsible party for activities and coordination. All activities will be approved by IDOT before proceeding. The designated point of approval at District 1 is Stephen Schilke, P.E. and Scott Czaplicki, P.E. They will coordinate internal IDOT reviews and approvals including consolidating review comments and resolution of conflicting issues. Each strategy is described, identifies a target audience, and includes an implementation schedule.

6.1 Stakeholder Activities

Stakeholders are identified as all residents of the study area, and those interested parties who are interested in and/or directly affected by the outcome of a planning process. There are two key groups of stakeholders identified in this study: those with decision making capabilities related to implementing transportation investments; and those with public standing that speak for the general public and can influence the broader spectrum of public opinion. These representatives, divided into two groups, include:

- Local, regional, state and federal elected and appointed officials and agency representatives with jurisdiction over the transportation planning process and affected environmental, historic, cultural and economic resources; and
- Corridor residents and property owners, corridor businesses, professional associations and local, regional and potentially statewide community, civic and environmental organizations. Media publication and broadcast groups – critical to informing the public and affecting public opinion are addressed later in this Section.

6.2 Public Outreach Meetings

Stakeholder involvement for the IL Route 31 Study will be an ongoing process from project initiation through completion. Various meetings will be held throughout the project development process to provide outreach opportunities to all stakeholders. Additional meeting opportunities are listed below.

Small Group Meetings

Small group meetings will engage stakeholders, share information and foster discussion by addressing specific project issues, allowing for more specialized discussions and input, and aiding the general public in better understanding the project goals and objectives. Small group meetings will be ongoing throughout the project. These meetings will include the project team, local agencies and organizations, historical groups, members of the business community and various property owners. Project handouts or other appropriate meeting materials will be prepared for distribution at these meetings.

Speakers’ Bureau

A speakers’ bureau, consisting of IDOT and Consultant staff, will be assembled to present project-related information to interested local civic or service organizations, such as Rotary Clubs, Kiwanis, etc. Relevant project information will be assembled in presentation format and updated on a regular basis with available and current project information. These meetings will occur as requested.

Agency Coordination

Preparation of an EA requires compliance with many local, state and federal rules, regulations and laws. In order to ensure compliance, coordination will be carried out with resource agencies periodically throughout the EA. Initially, a general meeting will be held with local, state and federal resource agencies as part of the Scoping process. As the project progresses, meetings may be held with individual resource
agencies to discuss environmental findings and to obtain concurrence through the NEPA 404 Merger process.

**Stakeholder Workshops**

Multiple stakeholder workshops will be conducted as a means to obtain stakeholder input regarding various project issues and potential system solutions. Renderings and visualizations will be developed to illustrate concepts and issues that have been raised, developed, and evaluated. The renderings and visualizations will be dependent on the topic of discussion and format of the particular workshop.

**Public Meetings**

Public involvement for the Illinois Route 31 project also will include opportunities for broader public meetings in the form of public information meetings, stakeholder workshops, and a public hearing. These large-scale meetings will encourage public attendance and foster public awareness of project developments and alternatives that are being evaluated. These meetings also will provide a forum for general public input, including concerns and comments regarding project alternatives. Three public meetings will be held to coincide with major project milestones during the project development process. Please note that the dates shown below in parentheses are tentative and therefore subject to change.

- Public Meeting #1 (Early 2011) will serve as the project kickoff, providing information regarding the study history, process and objectives, CSS procedures, and provide an opportunity for the public to share its perspectives regarding transportation issues, project concerns, goals and objectives.
- Public Meeting/Workshop #2 (Summer 2011) will present the project purpose, and solicit input to aid in developing alternatives.
- Public Meeting #3 (Spring 2012) will present alternatives to be evaluated, as well as presenting and soliciting feedback on the evaluation methods. Workshops will be held to reach consensus on alternatives that agree with purpose and need and will be carried forward for further evaluation.

These meetings will utilize various public informational techniques such as project boards, handouts, and PowerPoint or multimedia presentations summarizing the project work and findings to date. The meetings will be advertised by postcard invitations, public notices placed in area newspapers, on the project website, and on 3rd party websites. Opportunities for the public to provide written comments (comment forms) will be available at the meetings. Translation services will be provided as they are requested.

**Public Hearing**

A public hearing for this project, anticipated in 2012, will be held. The signed EA will be available at the Public Hearing. The Public Hearing will utilize various public informational techniques such as project boards, handouts, and PowerPoint or multimedia presentations summarizing the project work and findings to date. The meetings will be advertised by postcard invitations, public notices placed in area newspapers, on the project website, and 3rd party websites. Opportunities for the public to provide written (comment forms) and verbal comments via a court reporter will be available at the hearing. Translation services will be provided.

6.3 Other Mechanisms for Public Involvement

In addition to the meeting opportunities described in the preceding section, there will be several other methods for the public to obtain information about the project. These methods (noted below) will
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provide information and opportunity for feedback regarding upcoming public meeting events, project schedule, and general project status updates within the study area.

Mailing List

To support public meeting invitations, newsletter distribution and other direct public contact, a mailing list will be developed and updated. Phone numbers and e-mail addresses will be added to the list, as available.

A mailing list will be developed that will include such recipients as landowners; federal, state, and local officials; special interest groups; resource agencies; businesses; and members of the public. The mailing list will be developed using existing resources (names and addresses of officials from other recent projects in the area), as well as other identified stakeholders. The mailing list will include government and business leaders and addresses in the immediate area. This list will be updated throughout the project through various means of communication, such as sign-in sheets and the project website.

Project Website

In an effort to disseminate information to the public and to receive input and comments, a project website will be developed. This website will provide a centralized source of information, available to anyone with access to the internet. The Illinois Route 31 website will also have the capability of maintaining a history of the project. To facilitate access to project information, this website will be in addition to the IDOT website, with links between the two. Information posted on the website will include project history, study process and information, maps, photos, reports, and electronic versions of printed collateral. The website will also allow for two-way communication (comment forms), through the use of e-mail.

For consistency, the website will be updated on the same schedule as the study’s major milestones.

Website: www.ILRoute31.com

Newsletters

A common communication tool for a project is the use of newsletters. To assist with the consistent delivery of information on the progress of this project, four newsletters will be produced at key project milestones. These newsletters will not only expound upon the basic information found on the website but also update readers on the study’s progress. A project logo and communication design theme will be created for printed collateral. Newsletters are intended for staff use as well as for the public; staff use will ensure that the correct and same information is relayed in response to questions and inquiries.

Media Outreach

An effective method of informing the general public about a project and its results is through broadcast and print media. To effectively use the media, a number of media strategies will be employed to provide accurate and frequent coverage of the project and the study. Media strategies to be used during this study include message development, press releases, publication pieces, media correspondence, and one-on-one briefings with agency-designated spokespersons; these strategies will be conducted throughout the study.

The goal is to issue a number of press releases throughout the study period. Incorporating the key message, these press releases will announce public meetings, study work to date, important results, and next steps.
Public Response and Communication

Throughout this study, direct public comments will come in the form of e-mail (via a direct link from the website), standard mail, phone calls and comment forms from meetings and briefings. Indirect public comments will come through the media, non-agency sponsored meetings and third party websites. It is important to address public comments so that the public understands that its concerns and opinions are being recognized and to monitor indirect public comments, to be able to respond to potentially problematic issues such as misinformation.

Mail and e-mail responses offer the time to develop a personalized response, yet timeliness is important as well.

Phone calls and standard mail will be answered by IDOT, unless the study team is requested to complete the response. Monitoring other meeting activity, third party websites and media reports will continue throughout the study. Reports on the activity will be detailed and stored as they occur.
7. Plan Availability and Monitoring / Updates

The SIP is a dynamic document that will be available to stakeholders and updated as appropriate through the duration of the project. This section describes SIP stakeholder review opportunities and plan update procedures.

7.1 Availability of the Stakeholder Involvement Plan

The PSG will make the SIP available to stakeholders for review at Public Meetings and on the project Website. The stakeholder review period for the SIP will be 30 days from date of release. As the project proceeds forward, IDOT will update the SIP on a regular basis to reflect appropriate changes or additions. IDOT will advise stakeholders of future SIP updates and post updates on the project Website.

7.2 Modification of the Stakeholder Involvement Plan

The plan will be reviewed on a regular basis for continued effectiveness and updated as appropriate. Plan administration includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Maintaining a current list of project stakeholders
- Maintaining a detailed public involvement record (log) that includes records of all stakeholder contacts, meetings, and comments.
- Ensuring two-way communication and timely responses to stakeholders through formal and informal channels.

Revisions to this SIP may be necessary through all phases of the project. The PSG will provide updated versions of the SIP to all agencies involved, as necessary. Cooperating agencies should notify IDOT of staffing and contact information changes in a timely manner. Plan updates will be tracked in Table 7-1 in Appendix A.
Appendix A
### Table 3-1 Lead Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Other Project Roles</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td>Lead Federal Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Joint-Lead Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3-2 Cooperating Agencies and Agency Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Cooperating Agency</th>
<th>Other Project Roles</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Natural Resources</td>
<td>Cooperating Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. EPA</td>
<td>Cooperating Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District</td>
<td>Cooperating Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Cooperating Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois EPA</td>
<td>Cooperating Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>Cooperating Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3-3 Section 106 Consulting Parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Contact Person/Title</th>
<th>E-mail &amp; Mailing Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Illinois State Historical Preservation Officer</td>
<td>Anne Haaker</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anne.haaker@illinois.gov">anne.haaker@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Illinois Historic Preservation Agency 1 Old State Capitol Plaza Springfield, IL 62701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Transportation</td>
<td>John Baczek, Section Chief</td>
<td><a href="mailto:John.Baczek@illinois.gov">John.Baczek@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IDOT District 1 201 W. Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry County</td>
<td>Ken Koehler, Chairman</td>
<td>2200 N. Seminary Ave. Woodstock, IL 60098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Prairie Grove</td>
<td>Stanley Duda, President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sduda@prairiegrove.org">sduda@prairiegrove.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3125 Barreville Road Prairie Grove, IL 60012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of McHenry</td>
<td>Susan Low, Mayor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@ci.mchenry.il.us">info@ci.mchenry.il.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>333 S. Green Street McHenry, IL 60050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Crystal Lake</td>
<td>Aaron Shepley, Mayor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:comments@crystallake.org">comments@crystallake.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4-1 Project Study Group Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Contact Person/Title</th>
<th>E-Mail &amp; Mailing Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Pete Harmet, Bureau Chief of Programming</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Pete.Harmet@illinois.gov">Pete.Harmet@illinois.gov</a> IDOT District 1 201 W. Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Transportation</td>
<td>John Baczek, Section Chief Project and Environmental Studies</td>
<td><a href="mailto:John.Baczek@illinois.gov">John.Baczek@illinois.gov</a> IDOT District 1 201 W. Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Steve Schilke, Consultant Studies Unit Head</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Steven.Schilke@illinois.gov">Steven.Schilke@illinois.gov</a> IDOT District 1 201 W. Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Scott Czaplicki, Project Coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Scott.czaplicki@Illinois.gov">Scott.czaplicki@Illinois.gov</a> IDOT District 1 201 W. Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Sam Mead, Section Chief of Environmental Studies Unit Head</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sam.Mead@illinois.gov">Sam.Mead@illinois.gov</a> IDOT District 1 201 W. Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Rick Wojcik, Hydraulics Section Chief</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rick.Wojcik@illinois.gov">Rick.Wojcik@illinois.gov</a> IDOT District 1 201 W. Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Santos Batista, Hydraulics Unit</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Santos.Batista@illinois.gov">Santos.Batista@illinois.gov</a> IDOT District 1 201 W. Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Walt Zyniewski, Bureau of Design &amp; Environment</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Walter.Zyniewski@illinois.gov">Walter.Zyniewski@illinois.gov</a> IDOT District 1 201 W. Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Transportation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Rick Wanner,</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rick.Wanner@illinois.gov">Rick.Wanner@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Transportation Bureau of Maintenance and Roadside Development Manager IDOT District 1 201 W. Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196

Illinois Department of Transportation Mike Cullian, Bureau of Land Acquisition IDOT District 1 201 W. Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196

Illinois Department of Transportation Catherine Kibble, Design Consultant Services Unit Head IDOT District 1 201 W. Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196

Illinois Department of Transportation Jim Stumpner, Bureau Chief of Maintenance IDOT District 1 201 W. Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196

Illinois Department of Transportation Steve Travia, Bureau Chief of Traffic Operations IDOT District 1 201 W. Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196

Illinois Department of Transportation Eugene Joynt Bureau of Construction IDOT District 1 201 W. Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196

Federal Highway Administration Robin Helmerichs, Transportation Engineer (Region 1) Federal Highway Administration 3250 Executive Park Drive Springfield, IL 62703

Federal Highway Administration Matt Fuller, Environmental Programs Engineer Federal Highway Administration 3250 Executive Park Drive Springfield, IL 62703

STV Incorporated Jean-Alix Peralte, Project Manager STV Incorporated 200 West Monroe Street, Suite 1650 Chicago, IL 60606

STV Incorporated John Clark, Project Engineer STV Incorporated 200 West Monroe Street, Suite 1650 Chicago, IL 60606

Huff and Huff Jim Novak, Environmental Hufnhuff.com 915 Harger Road, Suite 330 Oak Brook, IL 60523

Nancy Seeger Associates, Ltd. Nancy Seeger, Public Involvement/CSS nseeger@comcast.net 804 Forest Avenue, Apartment 3 Evanston, IL 60202

Table 4-2 Citizens Advisory Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Contact Person&gt;Title</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Other Project Role(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McHenry County</td>
<td>Ken Koehler / County Board Chairman</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Phase I Study – Illinois Route 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry County</td>
<td>Dennis Sandquist/ Department of Planning and Development Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Crystal Lake</td>
<td>Gary Mayerhofer/ City Manager Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Crystal Lake</td>
<td>Victor Ramirez/ Public Works Director Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Crystal Lake</td>
<td>Michelle Rentzsch/ City Planner Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Crystal Lake</td>
<td>Erik Morimoto/ City Engineer Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of McHenry</td>
<td>Susan Low/Mayor Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of McHenry</td>
<td>Jon Schmitt/Public Works Director Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of McHenry</td>
<td>Christopher Black /City administrator Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of McHenry</td>
<td>Peter Merkel /Director of Parks and Recreation Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of McHenry</td>
<td>Ryan Schwalenberg /Director of Construction &amp; Neighborhood Services Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Prairie Grove</td>
<td>Stanley Duda /Village President Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Prairie Grove</td>
<td>Kimberly Minor /Public Works Director Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Prairie Grove</td>
<td>Jeannine Smith /Village Administrator Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Metropolitan Agency For Planning</td>
<td>Don Kopec Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad</td>
<td>Richard Ellison/ Public Projects Coordinator Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Department of Natural Resources</td>
<td>Steve Hamer/ Transportation Review Program Manager Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Authority (RTA)</td>
<td>Stephen Schlickman / Director Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Thomas J Ross / Executive Director Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Historical Preservation Agency</td>
<td>Robert Coomer/Director Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry County Division of Transportation</td>
<td>Joseph Korpalski/ County Engineer Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metra</td>
<td>Lynnette Ciavarella Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicagoland Bicycle</td>
<td>Rob Sadowsky/ Director Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation</td>
<td>League of Illinois Bicyclists</td>
<td>Ed Barsotti/ Director</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District #47</td>
<td>Dr. Donn Mendoza/ Superintendent</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District #155</td>
<td>Dr. Jill Hawk/ Superintendent</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District #156</td>
<td>Dr. Teresa Lane/ Superintendent</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District #15</td>
<td>Dr. R. Alan Hoffman/ Superintendent</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District #46</td>
<td>Dr. Lynette Zimmer/ Superintendent</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District #156/#15</td>
<td>Dennis Ryan / Director of Transportation</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry County Transportation Commission</td>
<td>Dallas Larson/ Chairman</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry County Board</td>
<td>Tina Hill/ County Board Member</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry County Economic Dev. Corp.</td>
<td>Pam Cumpata/ President</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. House of Representatives</td>
<td>Mark Kirk</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>Richard Durbin</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>Roland Burris</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Senate</td>
<td>Jeffrey Schoenberg</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois House of Representatives</td>
<td>Elizabeth Coulson</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS Industries Inc.</td>
<td>Dick Deain</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry Township Highway Commissioner</td>
<td>Leon H. Van Every</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunda Township Highway Commissioner</td>
<td>Don Kopsell</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7-1 SIP History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Revision Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>Stakeholder Involvement Plan – IL Route 31.docx</td>
<td>Version 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
A typical highway improvement project is developed in three (3) distinct phases as follows:

**Phase I**
- Public Meeting (May 2011)
  - Establish Problem Statement, Identify Deficiencies
- Analyze traffic congestion
- Solicit input on deficiencies

**Phase II**
- Develop Purpose and Need
- Identify Possible Alternatives
- Solicit input on alternatives
- Present evaluation criteria

**Phase III**
- Present Preferred Alternative
- Solicit issues and concerns
- Share Problem Statement
- Present project Purpose & Need
- Present Preliminary Alternatives
- Present evaluation criteria
- Solicit input on alternatives

**Public Involvement**
- **Spring 2011**: Public Meeting (June 2011)
  - Overview of study process
  - Solicit issues and concerns
  - Solicit input on deficiencies
- **Fall 2011**: Public Meeting (Dec. 2011)
  - Share Problem Statement
  - Present project Purpose & Need
  - Present Preliminary Alternatives
  - Present evaluation criteria
  - Solicit input on alternatives
- **Summer 2012**: Preferred Alternative
- **Winter 2012**: Public Hearing (Winter 2012)
  - Present Preferred Alternative
  - Public review and input
- **Summer 2013**: Environmental and Engineering Report
Appendix C
## Glossary, Acronyms, and Abbreviations

**Alternative**
One of a number of specific transportation improvement proposals, alignments, options, design choices, etc. In a study. Following detailed analysis, one improvement alternative is chosen for implementation.

**Community Advisory Group (CAG)**
A group of residents, community leaders, and public officials representing the population of the study areas who assist in formulating transportation planning goals and objectives, evaluating alternative plans, selecting recommended courses of action, and setting priorities. They represent community interests and contribute valuable information to project sponsors about the location, design, and implementation of proposed transportation improvements.

**Consensus**
When a majority agrees upon a particular issue, while the dissenting remainder agrees that their input has been heard and duly considered and that the process as a whole was fair.

**Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS)**
Balance between mobility, community needs and the environment while developing transportation projects. This is achieved through involving stakeholders early and continuously, addressing all modes of transportation, applying flexibility in the design, and incorporating aesthetics to the overall project.

**Environmental Assessment (EA)**
A document prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for federally-funded transportation projects that do not fall under any categorical exclusion category and do not appear to be sufficient magnitude to require an EIS

**National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)**
The federal law that requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), Environmental Assessment (EA), or Categorical Exclusion (CE).

**Project Study Group (PSG)**
A group of professionals representing specific technical or scientific disciplines who are brought together for a designated period of time to perform detailed analysis of subjects that require various environmental, engineering and project development expertise. (i.e. IDOT, FHWA, and consultant team)

### Acronyms
- **ADT** Average Daily Traffic
- **BDE** Bureau of Design and Environment
- **CA** Cooperating Agencies
- **CMAP** Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
- **CAG** Community Advisory Group
- **CSS** Context Sensitive Solutions
- **EA** Environmental Assessment
- **FHWA** Federal Highway Administration
- **IDNR** Illinois Department of Natural Resources
- **IDOT** Illinois Department of Transportation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronyms</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IEPA</td>
<td>Illinois Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSG</td>
<td>Project Study Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>Stakeholder Involvement Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>