



## 8.2 Project Milestones and Associated Public Outreach Program

Following the initiation of the project and at various key points (milestones) throughout the study process, the Project Management Team made the most current information related to the study available for review and comment. This included a series of project web site updates, news releases, elected official briefings, stakeholder meetings, CAC meetings, and public meetings and/or public hearings. Through the course of the study, Project Management Team members continued to collect and analyze data related to social and environmental impacts for each of the alternatives under consideration, including spending several weeks in the field walking each of the alternatives and collecting field data. This section will provide a brief discussion of the various milestones (deliverables) associated with the project and the involvement of various stakeholders at each of these milestones. Some of the more substantive changes that were made to the project during each of the key points of the study, as a result of this public outreach program, will also be identified.

### 8.2.1 Initiation of Project

In accordance with the public notification requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, INDOT initiated this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on March 26, 2002, with the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register. This EIS was prepared to evaluate the US 31 Improvement Project from Plymouth to South Bend in Marshall and St. Joseph counties, Indiana. Public outreach activities associated with this phase of the project included opportunities to present an overview of the US 31 Improvement Project process and to solicit input from local officials and the public. The involvement of various stakeholders during this phase of the project included:

#### Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholder meetings associated with this phase of the project included those listed in Table 8.2.1 below:

Table 8.2.1 Stakeholder Meetings for Project Initiation		
DATE	ORGANIZATION/GROUP/INDIVIDUAL	MEETING TOPIC
6/9/03	Michiana Area Council of Governments (MACOG)	Project Status/Schedule Meeting
6/2/03	US 31 Coalition Members	Project Status/Schedule Meeting

#### Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting

The first CAC meeting was held on March 21, 2002. Table 8.2.2 identifies those representatives of the CAC that were invited to and those that attended the meeting.

#### Public Meeting

The first public meeting was held on March 21, 2002 at the LaVille High School in LaPaz. Approximately 250 people were in attendance at the meeting. Participants were presented with a PowerPoint presentation, given informational handouts and viewed display boards featuring maps of the project study area. Project Management Team members answered questions and addressed comments following the presentation. Approximately nine citizens provided verbal comments, including Steve Luecke, Mayor of South Bend. Approximately 20 people provided written comments.



Table 8.2.2 March 21, 2002 CAC Meeting Attendees (Project Initiation)			
NAME	ORGANIZATION	INVITED	ATTENDED
Susan Al-Abbas	St. Joseph County Engineer	X	X
Doug Anspach	Plymouth Chamber of Commerce	X	X
Gary Cook	State Representative	X	
Rhonda DeCaire	Elkhart Environmental Center	X	
Bob Deputy	Regional Area Progress Group	X	
Mark Eagan	South Bend-St. Joseph County Chamber of Commerce	X	
Terry Miller	South Bend-St. Joseph County Chamber of Commerce		X
Dennis Faulkenberg	US 31 Coalition	X	X
Neil Haeck	Marshall County Highway Department Director	X	
Eric Horvath	Elkhart City Engineer	X	
Jim LaFreeze	St. Joseph County Farm Bureau	X	X
John Leatherman	Elkhart County Council	X	
Steve Luecke	Mayor, City of South Bend	X	X
Carl Littrell	City of South Bend Engineer	X	X
Pat McMahon	South Bend Project Future	X	X
Rick McVey	LaPorte County Highway Department Director	X	
Richard Mangus	State Representative	X	
Rick Pharis	Elkhart County Engineer	X	
Larry Shafer	Elkhart Chamber of Commerce	X	X
Sandra Seanor	Michiana Area Council of Governments (MACOG)	X	X
Audry Joanes Spencer	President, South Bend Urban League	X	
Bob Warnock	Teamsters Local President	X	X
Mary Jane Thomas	LaPorte City Planner	X	
James Yaezel	Mayor, City of Plymouth	X	
Donald Abraham	INDOT – LaPorte District	X	X



## Agency Coordination

An Early Coordination Packet was issued to the following agencies and organizations on August 6, 2002:

### *Federal Agencies*

- United States Army Corp of Engineers (USACE), Detroit District – Regulatory Branch
- United States Army Corp of Engineers (USACE), South Bend Regional Office
- United States Department of Interior, National Parks Service
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Region 5
- FHWA

### *State Agencies*

- INDOT, LaPorte District
- INDOT, Division of Preliminary Engineering and Environment
- INDOT, Intermodal Transportation Division – Aeronautics Section
- Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR), Division of Fish and Wildlife
- IDNR, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology
- Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM)
- Indiana Geological Survey, Environmental Geology Section

### *Local Agencies*

- MACOG, South Bend Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
- St. Joseph County
- Marshall County
- LaPorte County
- City of Elkhart
- City of South Bend
- City of LaPorte
- City of Plymouth



## Section 106 Consulting Parties Coordination

An Early Coordination Notification Letter was submitted to the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR), Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), on July 24, 2002.

### 8.2.2 Draft Purpose and Need Statement and Identification of Preliminary Alternatives

A draft Purpose and Need Statement for the US 31 Improvement Project from Plymouth to South Bend in Marshall and St. Joseph counties, Indiana was drafted in March of 2003 and was made available for review and comment. This document identified the range of preliminary alternatives that would be included in the EIS. It also identified the purposes and needs for the project, including the underlying problems or deficiencies (i.e. congestion, safety, etc.), facts and analyses supporting the problems or deficiencies; and the context or perspective of INDOT's mission in relation to the need for the action, including the associated measurable objective specifying an outcome or result to be accomplished. Through the progress of the study, the draft Purpose and Need Statement was subsequently revised with data for the year 2030 along with other comments received and a final version is contained in this Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Public outreach activities associated with this phase of the project included the presentation of the draft Purpose and Need Statement and Preliminary Alternatives for the study and again to solicit input from local officials and the public. The involvement of various stakeholders during this phase of the project included:

#### Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting

The second CAC meeting was held on April 10, 2003. Table 8.2.3 identifies those representatives of the CAC that were invited to and those that attended the meeting.

#### Public Meeting

The second public meeting was held on April 10, 2003 at the LaVille High School. Approximately 200 people were in attendance at the meeting. Participants were presented with a PowerPoint presentation, given informational handouts and viewed display boards featuring maps of the project study area and the preliminary alternatives. Project Management Team members answered questions and addressed comments following the presentation.

#### Agency Coordination

The Draft Purpose and Need Statement and Preliminary Alternatives were submitted to the agencies on February 20, 2003. A Resource Agency Meeting and Project Tour were conducted on May 15, 2003. Table 8.2.4 identifies those agencies that were invited to and those that attended the meeting and tour. At this agency meeting, a representative of the USFWS suggested that a new preliminary freeway alternative should be developed that would be located east of existing US 31 and terminate at the existing Ironwood Road and US 20 interchange. As a result of this comment, Preliminary Alternative K was developed by the Project Management Team and added to the range of alternatives being studied. Also at this agency meeting, a representative of IDNR suggested that a preliminary freeway alternative should be developed that would more closely follow existing US 31 throughout the length of the study area. As a result of this comment, Preliminary Alternative J was developed by the Project Management Team and added to the range of alternatives being studied.



Table 8.2.3 April 10, 2003 CAC Meeting Attendees (Draft Purpose and Need Statement and Alternatives)			
NAME	ORGANIZATION	INVITED	ATTENDED
Susan Al-Abbas	St. Joseph County Engineer	X	X
Doug Anspach	Plymouth Chamber of Commerce	X	X
Gary Cook	State Representative	X	
Rhonda DeCaire	Elkhart Environmental Center	X	
Bob Deputy	Regional Area Progress Group	X	
Mark Eagan	South Bend-St. Joseph County Chamber of Commerce	X	
Dennis Faulkenberg	US 31 Coalition	X	X
Neil Haeck	Marshall County Highway Department Director	X	
Eric Horvath	Elkhart City Engineer	X	
Jim LaFreeze	St. Joseph County Farm Bureau	X	
John Leatherman	Elkhart County Council	X	X
Steve Luecke	Mayor, City of South Bend	X	X
Carl Littrell	City of South Bend Engineer	X	X
Pat McMahon	South Bend Project Future	X	X
Rick McVey	LaPorte County Highway Department Director	X	
Richard Mangus	State Representative	X	
Rick Pharis	Elkhart County Engineer	X	
Larry Shafer	Elkhart Chamber of Commerce	X	X
Sandra Seanor	MACOG	X	X
Audry Joanes Spencer	President, South Bend Urban League	X	X
Mary Jane Thomas	LaPorte City Planner	X	
James Yaezel	Mayor, City of Plymouth	X	
Donald Abraham	INDOT – LaPorte District	X	X
Burne Miller	City of Elkhart		X
Chris Kubik	Ice, Miller		X
Robert Florz	Marshall County Farm Bureau		X
Terry Miller	St. Joseph County Chamber of Commerce		X
Richard Monhart	St. Joseph County Farm Bureau		X



Table 8.2.4 May 15, 2003, Agency Meeting and Project Tour (Draft Purpose and Need Statement and Alternatives)

NAME	AGENCY	INVITED	ATTENDED
Christine Baynes	INDOT – Project Manager	X	X
William Proud	INDOT – LaPorte District Director	X	
James Juricic	INDOT – Environmental Assessment Section	X	
Jim Keefer	INDOT – Aeronautics Section	X	
Tarlochan Bansi	INDOT – Consultant Services Section		X
Steve Sperry	INDOT – Environmental Assessment Section		X
Donald Abraham	INDOT – LaPorte District Development Engineer		X
Robert Dirks	FHWA		X
John Baxter	FHWA	X	
Les Weigum	USACE, Detroit District	X	
Charlie Simon	USACE, Detroit District		X
Goldfarb Eugene	US Department of Housing and Urban Development	X	
Virginia Laszewski	USEPA, Region 5		X
Ken Westlake	USEPA, Region 5	X	
Elizabeth McCloskey	USFWS	X	X
Scott Pruitt	USFWS	X	
Lori Kaplan	IDEM	X	
Jason Randolph	IDEM, Section 401		X
John Goss	IDNR, State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)	X	
Christine Kiefer	IDNR, Division of Fish and Wildlife	X	
Keith Poole	IDNR, Fish and Wildlife		X
Hank Huffman	IDNR, Heritage Program		X
William Schenk	US Department of Interior, National Parks Service	X	
Edwin Hartke	Indiana Geological Survey, Environmental Geology Section	X	
Jane Hardisty	USDA, NRCS	X	



## Section 106 Consulting Parties Coordination

An Early Coordination Notification Letter was submitted to the following consulting parties on May 21, 2003:

- IDNR, SHPO
- Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana
- Marshall County Historical Society/Museum
- South Bend City Council
- Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County
- St. Joseph County Commissioners
- INDOT, LaPorte District
- IDNR, Division of Fish and Wildlife
- St. Joseph County Engineering Department
- Marshall County Commissioners
- Town of Lakeville
- Lakeville Historian
- Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma
- Wythougan Valley Preservation Council, Inc.

A Consulting Party Meeting regarding Area of Potential Effects was held on June 6, 2003. Table 8.2.5 identifies those consulting parties that were invited to and those that attended the meeting.

Table 8.2.5 June 6, 2003 Consulting Party Meeting (Area of Potential Effects)		
CONSULTING PARTY	INVITED	ATTENDED
IDNR, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO))	X	X
Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana	X	X
Marshall County Historical Society/Museum	X	
South Bend City Council	X	
Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County	X	X



Table 8.2.5 June 6, 2003 Consulting Party Meeting (Area of Potential Effects) (Continued)

CONSULTING PARTY	INVITED	ATTENDED
St. Joseph County Commissioners	X	
INDOT – LaPorte District	X	X
IDNR, Division of Fish and Wildlife	X	
St. Joseph County Engineering	X	
Marshall County Commissioners	X	
Town of Lakeville	X	X
Lakeville Historian		X
City of Mishawaka	X	
Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	X	
Wythougan Valley Preservation Council, Inc.		

### 8.2.3 Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report

The Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report for the US 31 Improvement Project from Plymouth to South Bend in Marshall and St. Joseph counties, Indiana, was made available for review and comment on August 19, 2003. In this report, the number of preliminary alternatives under consideration was screened to four preliminary freeway alternatives (Alternatives C, E, F and G) and the No-Build Alternative. In the months following the publication of the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report, there were numerous meetings with local elected officials in St. Joseph, Marshall and Elkhart counties, LaPaz, Plymouth, South Bend, Bremen and other communities, local business groups located within the study area, state and federal agencies and with local residents at a Public Meeting. Many comments and concerns were expressed during the course of these meetings and also expressed via e-mail from the project web site related to the impacts associated with each of the four alternatives. These concerns ranged from residential and business relocations, wetland impacts, impacts on historic properties and many other issues along the alternatives. The number of comments and the amount of interest received from the local communities and residents was very encouraging.

The Project Study Team continued to collect and analyze data related to social and environmental impacts for each of the four alternatives and had a team of environmental scientists that spent several weeks in the field walking each of the four alternatives collecting field data. In response to the many comments received and in an attempt to minimize the impacts associated with the four alternatives, some modifications to each of the remaining alternatives were made. These modifications and resulting Alternatives Cs, Es and G-C were announced and presented in December 2003. Public outreach activities associated with this phase of the project included the presentation of the Preliminary Alternative Analysis and Screening Report, presentation of the modifications made to those alternatives recommended for further analysis in the screening report and to again solicit input from local officials and the public. The involvement of various stakeholders during this phase of the project included:

#### News Release

The first news release was distributed on August 19, 2003 and announced the completion and publication of the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report. The second news release was distributed on December 17,



2003 and announced modifications made to the remaining four preliminary alternatives that were carried forward in the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report. These modifications were aimed at minimizing both social and environmental impacts associated with each of the preliminary alternatives.

## Elected Officials Briefing

The first project status briefing was held on August 19, 2003 and provided information related to the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report. The second project status briefing was held on December 17, 2003 and presented additional information related to the modifications made to the remaining four preliminary alternatives that were carried forward in the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report. These modifications were aimed at minimizing both social and environmental impacts associated with each of the preliminary alternatives.

## Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholder meetings associated with this phase of the project included those listed in Table 8.2.6. Following the publication of the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report, the Whispering Hills Subdivision Task Force, consisting of a group of individuals involved with the subdivision's neighborhood association, suggested modifications to Preliminary Alternative E. These modifications were very similar to those suggested in comments made by a representative of Historic Landmarks of Indiana at a consulting parties meeting, that would later be further developed by the Project Management Team into Preliminary Alternative Es.

DATE	ORGANIZATION/GROUP/INDIVIDUAL	MEETING TOPIC
12/02/03	Marshall County Economic Advisory Committee	Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report
11/13/03	Town of LaPaz	Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report
10/17/03	Elkhart County Chamber of Commerce	Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report
9/30/03	St. Joseph and Marshall Counties Emergency Service Personnel and School Systems	Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report
9/29/03	Jeannine and Richard Machowiak	Impacts to Personal Property
9/29/03	Robert and Charlotte Wolfe	Impacts to Personal Property
9/10/03	St. Joseph County Chamber of Commerce Legislative Affairs Committee	Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report
9/9/03	South Gateway Business Group	Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report
9/9/03	South Bend City and Chamber Officials and Local Developer	Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report



### Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting

The third CAC meeting was held on September 4, 2003. Table 8.2.7 identifies those representatives of the CAC that were invited to and those that attended the meeting.

Table 8.2.7 September 4, 2003 CAC Meeting Attendees (Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report)			
NAME	ORGANIZATION	INVITED	ATTENDED
Susan Al-Abbas	St. Joseph County Engineer	X	
Doug Anspach	Plymouth Chamber of Commerce	X	X
Gary Cook	State Representative	X	
Rhonda DeCaire	Elkhart Environmental Center	X	X
Bob Deputy	Regional Area Progress Group	X	
Mark Eagan	South Bend-St. Joseph County Chamber of Commerce	X	
Dennis Faulkenberg	US 31 Coalition	X	
Neil Haeck	Marshall County Highway Department Director	X	
Eric Horvath	Elkhart City Engineer	X	
Jim La Free	St. Joseph County Farm Bureau	X	X
John Leatherman	Elkhart County Council	X	
Steve Luecke	Mayor, City of South Bend	X	
Carl Littrell	City of South Bend Engineer	X	X
Pat McMahon	South Bend Project Future	X	
Rick McVey	LaPorte County Highway Department Director	X	
Richard Mangus	State Representative	X	X
Rick Pharis	Elkhart County Engineer	X	X
Larry Shafer	Elkhart Chamber of Commerce	X	X
Sandra Seanor	MACOG	X	
Audry Joanes Spencer	President, South Bend Urban League	X	
Mary Jane Thomas	LaPorte City Planner	X	
James Yaezel	Mayor, City of Plymouth	X	
Donald Abraham	INDOT – LaPorte District	X	
Burne Miller	City of Elkhart		



Table 8.2.7 September 4, 2003 CAC Meeting Attendees (Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report) (Continued)

NAME	ORGANIZATION	INVITED	ATTENDED
Chris Kubik	Ice Miller		
Robert Flora	Marshall County Farm Bureau		
Terry Miller	St. Joseph County Chamber of Commerce	X	X
Richard Monhart	St. Joseph County Farm Bureau		
Mike Hay	St. Joseph County Isaak Walton League	X	
Becky Parker	South Bend/Mishawaka Audubon Society	X	X
Richard Smith	Marshall County Farm Bureau	X	X

## Public Meeting

The third public meeting was held on September 4, 2003 at the Old Lakeville School Project - Newton Center. Approximately 500 people were in attendance at the meeting. Participants were presented with a PowerPoint presentation, given informational handouts and viewed display boards featuring maps of the preliminary alternatives. Project Management Team members answered questions and addressed comments prior to and after the presentation. Participants were provided a comment period following the presentation. Approximately 20 citizens provided verbal comments.

## Agency Coordination

The Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report was submitted to the agencies on August 19, 2003. A Resource Agency Meeting was conducted on September 30, 2003. Table 8.2.8 identifies those agencies that were invited to and those that attended the meeting. At this meeting, several agency representatives expressed concerns related to impacts to the natural environment, particularly wetland impacts, for each of the four preliminary alternatives. Project Management Team response to these concerns included modifications to each of the alternatives that involved shifts in the alignment of the alternatives aimed at avoidance and minimization of impacts to the natural environment, particularly wetlands, while not increasing impacts to other resources. These modifications generally resulted in the reduction of impacts to wetlands and residential and business relocations as detailed in Section 3.2, Modifications of Alternatives Recommended for Further Analysis.

Table 8.2.8 September 30, 2003 Agency Meeting (Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report)

NAME	AGENCY	INVITED	ATTENDED
Christine Baynes	INDOT – Project Manager	X	X
William Proud	INDOT – LaPorte District Director	X	
James Juricic	INDOT – Environmental Assessment Section	X	
Jim Keefer	INDOT – Aeronautics Section	X	X



Table 8.2.8 September 30, 2003 Agency Meeting (Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report) (Continued)			
NAME	AGENCY	INVITED	ATTENDED
Martin Blake	INDOT – Aeronautics Section		X
Tarlochan Bansi	INDOT – Consultant Services Section	X	
Steve Sperry	INDOT – Environmental Assessment Section		X
Donald Abraham	INDOT – LaPorte District Development Engineer	X	X
Janice Osadczyk	INDOT – Environment, Planning & Engineering	X	
Brad Steckler	INDOT – Engineering Assessment Section	X	
Rickie Clark, Jr.	INDOT – Hearings Section	X	
Steven Smith	INDOT – Long-Range Transportation Planning Section	X	
Vaneeta Kumar	INDOT – Planning/Intermodal Transportation	X	
Nick Batta	INDOT – Engineering Assessment Section		X
Roy Nunnally	INDOT – Long-Range Transportation Planning Section		X
Robert Dirks	FHWA		
John Baxter	FHWA		
Matt Fuller	FHWA	X	X
Kate Quinn	FHWA	X	
Susan Al-Abbas	St. Joseph County Engineer	X	X
Sandra Seanor	MACOG	X	
Dennis Schafer	County Council Member – St. Joseph County		X
Les Weigum	USACE, Detroit District	X	
Charlie Simon	USACE, Detroit District	X	X
John Ritchey	USACE, South Bend	X	X
Goldfarb Eugene	US Department of Housing and Urban Development		
Virginia Laszewski	USEPA, Region 5	X	X
Ken Westlake	USEPA, Region 5	X	
Julie Guenther	USEPA, Region 5		X
Elizabeth McCloskey	USFWS	X	X
Scott Pruitt	USFWS	X	
Lori Kaplan	IDEM	X	



Table 8.2.8 September 30, 2003 Agency Meeting (Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening Report) (Continued)			
NAME	AGENCY	INVITED	ATTENDED
Jason Randolph	IDEM, Section 401		X
Ryan Cassidy	IDEM	X	X
John Goss	IDNR, State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)	X	
Christine Kiefer	IDNR, Division of Fish and Wildlife	X	
Keith Poole	IDNR, Fish and Wildlife		
Hank Huffman	IDNR, Heritage Program		
William Schenk	US Department of Interior, National Parks Service	X	
Edwin Hartke	Indiana Geological Survey, Environmental Geology Section	X	
Jane Hardisty	USDA, NRCS	X	
Deborah Knepp	USDA, NRCS		X

### Section 106 Consulting Parties Coordination

The Historic Property Report was submitted to SHPO on August 20, 2003. A Consulting Party Meeting regarding eligible and listed National Register (NR) properties was held on September 4, 2003. Table 8.2.9 identifies those consulting parties that were invited to and those that attended the meeting. At this meeting, consulting parties expressed concerns related to potential Section 4(f) issues with two historically significant sites that impact three of the four preliminary alternatives under consideration. These sites are located along existing US 31, in an area just south of the US 31 and Kern Road intersection. The first site, the Ullery/Farneman House, is a Local Historic Landmark that is Potentially Eligible (PE) for the NR and is located on the west side of US 31. The second site, the Southlawn Cemetery, is located directly east of and across US 31 from the Ullery/Farneman House. Comments provided at this meeting by a representative of Historic Landmarks of Indiana suggested modifications to Preliminary Alternative E, very similar to those comments made by the Whispering Hills Subdivision Task Force, that would later be further developed by the Project Management Team into Preliminary Alternative Es. Preliminary Alternative Es eliminated the potential Section 4(f) issues related to the two historically significant sites and also reduced impacts to residential and business relocations, as further discussed in Section 3.2, Modifications of Alternatives Recommended for Further Analysis.

Table 8.2.9 September 4, 2003 Consulting Party Meeting (Eligible and listed NR properties)		
CONSULTING PARTY	INVITED	ATTENDED
IDNR, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO))	X	
Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana	X	X
Marshall County Historical Society/Museum	X	
South Bend City Council	X	



CONSULTING PARTY	INVITED	ATTENDED
Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County	X	X
St. Joseph County Commissioners	X	
INDOT – LaPorte District	X	X
IDNR, Division of Fish and Wildlife	X	
St. Joseph County Engineering	X	X
Marshall County Commissioners	X	
Town of Lakeville	X	
Lakeville Historian	X	
City of Mishawaka	X	
Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	X	
Wythougan Valley Preservation Council, Inc.		

### 8.2.4 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

The DEIS for the US 31 Improvement Project from Plymouth to South Bend in Marshall and St. Joseph counties, Indiana, was approved by INDOT and FHWA on February 13, 2004 and was made available for review and comment on February 27, 2004. This report contained an analysis of the remaining preliminary alternatives related to their socio-economic and environmental impacts and ability to satisfy the purpose and need of the project. Based on this analysis, Alternatives Cs, Es, G-C and the No-Build Alternative were identified as the alternatives selected for detailed study. Public outreach activities associated with this phase of the project included the presentation of the DEIS and to again solicit input from local officials and the public. The involvement of various stakeholders during this phase of the project included:

#### News Release

The third news release was distributed on February 27, 2004 and announced the development and availability of the DEIS for the proposed improvements to US 31.

#### Elected Officials Briefing

The third project status briefing was held on February 27, 2004 and presented information related to the availability of the DEIS for the proposed improvements to US 31.

#### Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholder meetings associated with this phase of the project included those listed in Table 8.2.10. The preliminary alternatives studied in detail in the DEIS were on common alignment throughout the length of Marshall County, with the exception of a small segment just south of the Marshall and St. Joseph County line. This meant that the location



of the preferred alternative, to be determined at a later time in the study, was essentially determined in Marshall County in the DEIS. Local officials in Marshall County and Plymouth expressed concerns with the local access plan associated with the preliminary alternatives within the county and met with the Project Management Team on two occasions to discuss these access issues. These issues focused on interchange, overpass/underpass and cul-de-sac locations. Through the course of discussions at these meetings, Marshall County and INDOT officials were able to modify the Marshall County local access plan and produce a plan that was in the best interest of both parties. The most significant change related to the revised Marshall County local access plan involved the elimination of a proposed interchange at West 5A Road and the addition of an interchange at 7th Road. This change in local access is consistent with the Marshall County Comprehensive Plan and Plymouth Comprehensive Plan. No interchange had been proposed at the 7th Road location initially as no intersecting roadway currently exists at 7th Road and US 31. Due to the lack of a connecting roadway at the 7th Road interchange location, Marshall County officials made a written commitment to complete a 7th Road extension project that would begin at Michigan Road (old US 31) and extend eastward to the western limits of the proposed US 31 interchange at 7th Road. It would then begin on the east side of the proposed 7th Road interchange and continue eastward to 7th Road. This commitment included funding associated with preliminary engineering, environmental studies, right-of-way acquisition and construction costs.

It is anticipated that Marshall County will utilize Federal funding for the construction of the 7th Road Extension Project, which will require the associated environmental evaluation to follow the NEPA process. It should be noted that while the US 31 and 7th Road interchange, including the US 31 Bridge over 7th Road and the associated interchange ramps, is identified as a part of this EIS, the timing of the construction of the interchange is directly related to the timing of the construction of the 7th Road Extension Project. Construction of the interchange ramps that will provide access to and from US 31 at 7th Road will not be completed by INDOT prior to the completion of the 7th Road Extension NEPA process and the construction of the 7th Road Extension Project by the county.

Table 8.2.10 Stakeholder Meetings for the DEIS		
DATE	ORGANIZATION/GROUP/INDIVIDUAL	MEETING TOPIC
8/24/04	City of South Bend Officials	DEIS Alternatives and access to South Bend
7/15/04	St. Joseph County Economic Development Symposium	Display of DEIS Alternatives
7/14/04	City of South Bend Officials	DEIS Alternatives and access to South Bend
7/1/04	Marshall County and City of Plymouth Officials	Access for Marshall County as detailed in the DEIS
4/14/04	Residents/Businesses Opposed to Alternative Es	DEIS
4/14/04	Whispering Hills Subdivision Task Force	DEIS
4/14/04	MACOG	DEIS
3/18/04	Marshall County and City of Plymouth Officials	Access for Marshall County as detailed in the DEIS

Following publication of the DEIS, City of South Bend officials expressed concerns with Preliminary Alternative Es related to the proposed facility being an elevated roadway, constructed on retaining walls, from Kern Road northward to the US 31/US 20 interchange. Along with this, they were also concerned with local access to the subdivisions on the east and west sides of the alternative between Kern Road and the US 31/US 20 interchange. Local officials in South Bend met with the Project Management Team on two occasions to discuss these concerns and potential modifications to the alternative to address these concerns. Through the course of discussions at these



meetings, modifications were made to the alternative as well as the local access plan that was in the best interests of both the City of South Bend and INDOT. These modifications included revising the alternative between Kern Road and the US 31/US 20 interchange to be an “at grade” facility and not an elevated roadway, constructed on retaining walls. A revised local access plan was developed to improve north-south connectivity between Kern Road and Ireland Road, just north of US 20, that included two separate grade separated crossings of US 20, one on the west side of US 31 at Scott Street and the other on the east side of US 31 at Fellows Street. East-west connectivity across US 31 was improved with the addition of grade-separated crossings at Johnson Road and Jackson Road and the extension of Main Street southward, under the proposed US 31, to existing US 31 near Kern Road.

### Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting

The fourth CAC meeting was held on March 18, 2004. Table 8.2.11 identifies those representatives of the CAC that were invited to and those that attended the meeting.

Table 8.2.11 March 18, 2004 CAC Meeting Attendees (DEIS)			
NAME	ORGANIZATION	INVITED	ATTENDED
Susan Al-Abbas	St. Joseph County Engineer	X	
Doug Anspach	Plymouth Chamber of Commerce	X	
Gary Cook	State Representative	X	
Rhonda DeCaire	Elkhart Environmental Center	X	
Bob Deputy	Regional Area Progress Group	X	
Mark Eagan	South Bend-St. Joseph County Chamber of Commerce	X	
Dennis Faulkenberg	US 31 Coalition	X	X
Neil Haeck	Marshall County Highway Department Director	X	X
Eric Horvath	Elkhart City Engineer	X	
Jim La Free	St. Joseph County Farm Bureau	X	
John Leatherman	Elkhart County Council	X	
Steve Luecke	Mayor, City of South Bend	X	
Carl Littrell	City of South Bend Engineer	X	X
Pat McMahon	South Bend Project Future	X	
Rick McVey	LaPorte County Highway Department Director	X	
Richard Mangus	State Representative	X	
Rick Pharis	Elkhart County Engineer	X	
Larry Shafer	Elkhart Chamber of Commerce	X	X
Sandra Seanor	MACOG	X	X
Audry Joanes Spencer	President, South Bend Urban League	X	
Mary Jane Thomas	LaPorte City Planner	X	
James Yaezel	Mayor, City of Plymouth	X	
Donald Abraham	INDOT – LaPorte District	X	X



Table 8.2.11 March 18, 2004 CAC Meeting Attendees (DEIS) (Continued)

NAME	ORGANIZATION	INVITED	ATTENDED
Burne Miller	City of Elkhart		
Chris Kubik	Ice Miller		X
Robert Flora	Marshall County Farm Bureau		
Terry Miller	St. Joseph County Chamber of Commerce		X
Richard Monhart	St. Joseph County Farm Bureau		
Mike Hay	St. Joseph County Isaak Walton League	X	
Becky Parker	South Bend/Mishawaka Audubon Society	X	
Richard Smith	Marshall County Farm Bureau	X	
Bob Warnock	Teamsters Local President	X	
Steve Heim	City of Culver		
Dennis Schafer	St. Joseph County Council		
Kyle Hannon	Elkhart County Chamber of Commerce		
Larry Shoemaker	Whispering Hills Subdivision Neighborhood Assn.	X	X
Corey Hull	MACOG		X
Benjamin Marshall	(Unidentified)		X
Clifford Allen	Marshall County Commissioner		X

## Public Hearing

The DEIS was made available for review and comment on February 27, 2004. The formal comment period began March 5, 2004 with the *Federal Register* notice of the availability of the DEIS. The public comment period extended 52 days (regulations require a minimum 45 day comment period) and concluded on April 26, 2004. The DEIS was made available for downloading, viewing and/or printing on the project web site. Copies of the DEIS were made available for review at locations within the study area (libraries, city/county offices, INDOT offices, etc.) and these locations were identified on the project web site. In addition, a copy of the DEIS was sent to individuals, agencies and organizations listed in Appendix B of the FEIS.

A Public Hearing to discuss the findings of the DEIS for the US 31 – Plymouth to South Bend Study was held on Thursday, March 18, 2004. INDOT published an official public notice of the public hearing that identified the date, time, location and format of the hearing, as well as the methods and deadline for making a comment. Notification letters were sent to approximately 1,500 individuals that had either signed-up at a previous meeting, signed-up through the project web site or the project toll free hotline. Notification of the hearing via e-mail was sent to those individuals that had signed-up through the project web site. Details related to the hearing were also provided on the project web site.

The public hearing was held in order to provide citizens an opportunity to learn about the project and also to offer all interested persons an opportunity to comment on the project. INDOT held two separate sessions as a part of this Public Hearing. Session One of the March 18<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing was held at the Old Lakeville School Project



– Newton Center, located at 601 N. Michigan Street in Lakeville. Doors opened to the public at 1:00 pm with the formal presentation beginning at 2:00 pm and a public comment session, which extended to 4:30 pm. Approximately 450 people were in attendance at Session One. Session Two of the March 18<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing was held at the LaVille Jr.-Sr. High School, located at 69969 US 31 South, in Lakeville. Doors opened to the public at 6:00 pm with the formal presentation beginning at 7:00 pm and a public comment session, which extended to 9:30 pm. Approximately 550 people were in attendance at Session Two.

Each session of the public hearing featured an “Open House” area, a formal presentation, and a public comment session. The format, information presented, and display materials were identical at each session. Project officials from INDOT and FHWA were on hand to listen to comments and discuss concerns. Project area maps, displays and handouts were available for public inspection during both sessions. Upon arrival, attendees were asked to sign in and were briefed on the meeting format. Attendees were then free to view the exhibits at their own pace and ask questions of study team representatives (including FHWA and INDOT personnel) on a one-on-one basis. Additional information available at the hearing included paper copies of the DEIS Executive Summary and relocation assistance information and a CD version of the DEIS.

In the hearing presentations, study team members explained the significance of the hearing, reviewed the information presented in the DEIS, and explained how to make an official comment. Meeting participants could comment for the official hearing record either in writing or by participating in a public statement session. Comment forms were available at both hearings. An audio recorder was available to take comments for the official record. In addition to submitting written comments at the hearing, attendees were informed that they could mail written comments, provide comments through the project web site or provide comments on the project toll free hotline. Attendees were also informed that the deadline for making a comment was Monday, April 26, 2004.

The public hearing received extensive coverage in the local newspapers and television stations and attendance at the two sessions totaled approximately 1000 people. The US 31 – Plymouth to South Bend DEIS Public Comment Period ended on Monday, April 26, 2004. INDOT received over 2,300 comment letters during the DEIS Public Comment Period. All comments submitted during this comment period have been reviewed, evaluated and substantive comments are addressed in Appendix L of this FEIS. Copies of the sign-in sheets and comments made during the two public hearing sessions are included in the official transcript to the public hearing.

Several public comments following the public hearing suggested the investigation of the combination of Alternative Es and G-C north of Roosevelt Road. In response to this request and similar requests made by the resource agencies, a “hybrid” alternative, Alternative G-Es was developed. Alternative G-Es was a hybrid alternative consisting of a combination of the southern portion of Preliminary Alternative G-C and the northern portion of Preliminary Alternative Es. Additional analysis indicated that the hybrid alternative resulted in a reduction of wetland impacts, and avoidance of many high quality wetland complexes west of existing US 31 a reduction in forest impacts, a good traffic performer, an alternative that utilized more of the existing US 31 corridor, and relocation impacts and cost estimates that were consistent with the other alternatives being studied in the DEIS. Therefore, the range of reasonable alternatives in the decision-making process was expanded to include Alternative G-Es, along with the No-Build Alternative and Alternatives Cs, Es and G-C.

## Agency Coordination

The DEIS was submitted to the agencies on February 13, 2004. A Resource Agency Meeting was conducted on July 14, 2004. Table 8.2.12 identifies those agencies that were invited to and those that attended the meeting. Comments received from various agencies during the DEIS Public Comment Period suggested further modifications to the alternatives that would further minimize impacts to the natural environment and would maximize the use of the



existing US 31 corridor. Modifications were made to all of the remaining alternatives in isolated areas that reduced wetland impacts, minimized fragmentation of both wetlands and forests, while not significantly increasing residential and business impacts.

Agency comments received from IDNR requested a review of potential modifications to Alternative G-C north of Roosevelt Road to avoid impacts to natural resources. In response to this request and similar requests made by the public, a “hybrid” alternative, Alternative G-Es was developed. As discussed above, Alternative G-Es was a hybrid alternative consisting of a combination of the southern portion of Preliminary Alternative G-C and the northern portion of Preliminary Alternative Es. Additional analysis indicated that the hybrid alternative resulted in a reduction of wetland impacts and avoidance of many high quality wetland complexes west of existing US 31, a reduction in forest impacts, was a good traffic performer, was an alternative that utilized more of the existing US 31 corridor and had relocation impacts and cost estimates that were consistent with the other alternatives being studied in the DEIS. Therefore, the range of reasonable alternatives in the decision-making process was expanded to include

Table 8.2.12 July 14, 2004, Agency Meeting (DEIS)			
NAME	AGENCY	INVITED	ATTENDED
Christine Baynes	INDOT – Project Manager	X	X
William Proud	INDOT – LaPorte District Director	X	
James Juricic	INDOT – Environmental Assessment Section	X	
Jim Keefer	INDOT – Aeronautics Section	X	X
Martin Blake	INDOT – Aeronautics Section		
Tarlochan Bansi	INDOT – Consultant Services Section	X	
Steve Sperry	INDOT – Environmental Assessment Section		X
Donald Abraham	INDOT – LaPorte District Development Engineer	X	
Janice Osadczyk	INDOT – Environment, Planning & Engineering	X	
Brad Steckler	INDOT – Engineering Assessment Section	X	
Rickie Clark, Jr.	INDOT – Hearings Section	X	
Steven Smith	INDOT – Long-Range Transportation Planning Section	X	
Vaneeta Kumar	INDOT – Planning/Intermodal Transportation	X	
Nick Batta	INDOT – Engineering Assessment Section		X
Roy Nunnally	INDOT – Long-Range Transportation Planning Section		
Robert Dirks	FHWA		
John Baxter	FHWA		
Matt Fuller	FHWA	X	X
Kate Quinn	FHWA	X	
Susan Al-Abbas	St. Joseph County Engineer	X	



Table 8.2.12 July 14, 2004, Agency Meeting (DEIS) Continued			
NAME	AGENCY	INVITED	ATTENDED
Sandra Seanor	MACOG	X	
Dennis Schafer	County Council Member – St. Joseph County		
Les Weigum	USACE, Detroit District	X	
Charlie Simon	USACE, Detroit District	X	X
John Ritchey	USACE, South Bend	X	X
Goldfarb Eugene	US Department of Housing and Urban Development		
Virginia Laszewski	USEPA, Region 5	X	X
Ken Westlake	USEPA, Region 5	X	X
Julie Guenther	USEPA, Region 5		
Wendy Melgin	USEPA, Watersheds and Wetlands		X
Elizabeth McCloskey	USFWS	X	X
Scott Pruitt	USFWS	X	
Lori Kaplan	IDEM	X	
Jason Randolph	IDEM, Section 401		
Ryan Cassidy	IDEM	X	X
Liz Elverson	IDEM		X
John Goss	IDNR, State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)	X	
Karie Brudis	IDNR, Division of Historic Properties		X
Christine Kiefer	IDNR, Division of Fish and Wildlife	X	
Keith Poole	IDNR, Fish and Wildlife		
Hank Huffman	IDNR, Heritage Program		
Jon Eggen	IDNR		X
William Schenk	US Department of Interior, National Parks Service	X	
Edwin Hartke	Indiana Geological Survey, Environmental Geology Section	X	
Jane Hardisty	USDA, NRCS	X	
Deborah Knepp	USDA, NRCS		



Alternative G-Es, along with the No-Build Alternative and Alternatives Cs, Es and G-C. Alternative G-Es was presented to the agencies at the July 14, 2004, agency meeting.

Agency comments from the USEPA and the USACE, Detroit District, requested a review of options not fully considered in the DEIS. They identified, in particular, the re-evaluation of modifications to Alternative G that would terminate at the existing US 20 and Ironwood Road interchange. This request was also made in a September 30, 2003, agency meeting and subsequently addressed in the DEIS in Section 3.2.4, Alternative G – Ironwood Road Connection. The US 20 and Ironwood Road interchange was the north terminus of Preliminary Alternative K that was previously eliminated from further consideration during the initial Preliminary Alternatives Analysis and Screening due to its failure to meet the purpose and need of the project. In response to these comments, INDOT and FHWA reconsidered Alternative G – Ironwood Road Connection.

Additional information related to the re-evaluation of the alternative was collected and analyzed. This included an investigation of additional major roadway improvements to existing roadway facilities that would be required to make the alternative meet the purpose and need of the project, potential impacts to historic properties and sites, potential socio-economic impacts (commercial and residential relocations, costs, etc.), and potential environmental impacts (wetlands, forests, farmlands, etc.).

The impacts of Alternative G – Ironwood Road Connection were compared to the impacts of the alternatives studied in detail in the DEIS (Alternatives Cs, Es and G-C) and to the hybrid Alternative G-E as discussed above. It was found that while the wetland and forest impacts associated with Alternative G – Ironwood Road Connection were slightly less than those of the alternatives studied in the DEIS, they were still higher than the wetland and forest impacts associated with the hybrid Alternative G-E. Alternative G – Ironwood Road Connection had a much higher associated total costs, residential relocations, potential historic impacts including a Section 4(f) issue and farmland impacts. Based on these considerations, as well as data contained in the DEIS, FHWA and INDOT concluded that Alternative G – Ironwood Road Connection was not a reasonable alternative.

Representatives of the project team performed mist netting for bats in July 2004. Also, a Wetland Jurisdictional Field Review was conducted from October 4, 2004 - October 6, 2004. This consisted of a week being spent in the field during which wetland delineations made by the project team members and potential wetland and stream impacts associated with Preferred Alternative G-Es were reviewed and verified with representatives of USACE, Detroit District and IDEM.

## Section 106 Consulting Parties Coordination

The Findings of Effects Report was submitted to SHPO on February 25, 2004. A Consulting Party Meeting regarding revised alternatives and potential effects upon historic properties was held on March 19, 2004. Table 8.2.13 identifies those consulting parties that were invited to and those that attended the meeting.

Table 8.2.13 March 19, 2004 Consulting Party Meeting (Revised Alternatives and Potential Effects Upon Historic Properties)		
CONSULTING PARTY	INVITED	ATTENDED
IDNR, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO))	X	X
Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana	X	X
Marshall County Historical Society/Museum	X	X



Table 8.2.13 March 19, 2004 Consulting Party Meeting (Revised Alternatives and Potential Effects Upon Historic Properties) (Continued)

CONSULTING PARTY	INVITED	ATTENDED
South Bend City Council	X	
Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County	X	X
St. Joseph County Commissioners	X	
INDOT – LaPorte District	X	X
IDNR, Division of Fish and Wildlife	X	
St. Joseph County Engineering	X	
Marshall County Commissioners	X	X
Town of Lakeville	X	
Lakeville Historian	X	X
City of Mishawaka	X	
Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	X	
Wythougan Valley Preservation Council, Inc.	X	X

### 8.2.5 Preferred Alternative Mitigation Package (PAMP)

The Preferred Alternative Mitigation Package (PAMP) for the US 31 Improvement Project from Plymouth to South Bend in Marshall and St. Joseph counties, Indiana, was drafted in March of 2003, and was made available for review and comment. The purpose of this document was to identify Alternative G-Es as the Preferred Alternative for this EIS. It also identified potential mitigation measures for the Preferred Alternative G-Es. Public outreach activities associated with this phase of the project included the presentation of the PAMP to the resource agencies and to solicit their input. The PAMP was also made available for public viewing, review and comment on the project web site as well as at various local public locations. The involvement of various stakeholders during this phase of the project included:

#### News Release

The fourth news release was distributed on September 23, 2004, and announced that Alternative G-Es had been identified as the Preferred Alternative for the proposed improvements to US 31. A subsequent announcement was made on the project web site on October 29, 2004, to inform the public of the availability of the PAMP for viewing/ downloading or review on the web site.

#### Elected Officials Briefing

The fourth press briefing was held on September 23, 2004, and presented information related to Alternative G-Es being identified as the Preferred Alternative for the proposed improvements to US 31.



## Agency Coordination

The PAMP was submitted to the agencies on October 29, 2004. A Resource Agency Meeting was conducted on December 3, 2004. Table 8.2.14 identifies those agencies that were invited to and those that attended the meeting.

NAME	AGENCY	INVITED	ATTENDED
Christine Baynes	INDOT – Project Manager	X	X
William Proud	INDOT – LaPorte District Director	X	
James Juricic	INDOT – Environmental Assessment Section		
Jim Keefer	INDOT – Aeronautics Section	X	
Martin Blake	INDOT – Aeronautics Section		
Tarlochan Bansi	INDOT – Consultant Services Section	X	
Steve Sperry	INDOT – Environmental Assessment Section	X	
Donald Abraham	INDOT – LaPorte District Development Engineer	X	
Janice Osadczuk	INDOT – Environment, Planning & Engineering	X	(Via Phone)
Brad Steckler	INDOT – Engineering Assessment Section	X	
Rickie Clark, Jr.	INDOT – Hearings Section	X	
Steven Smith	INDOT – Long-Range Transportation Planning Section	X	
Vaneeta Kumar	INDOT – Planning/Intermodal Transportation	X	
Nick Batta	INDOT – Engineering Assessment Section		X
Roy Nunnally	INDOT – Long-Range Transportation Planning Section		X
Robert Buskirk	INDOT – Environmental Assessment Section		X
Lyle Sadler	INDOT – Environmental Assessment Section	X	
Robert Dirks	FHWA		
John Baxter	FHWA		
Matt Fuller	FHWA	X	X
Kate Quinn	FHWA	X	
Susan Al-Abbas	St. Joseph County Engineer		
Sandra Seanor	MACOG	X	
Dennis Schafer	County Council Member – St. Joseph County		
Les Weigum	USACE, Detroit District	X	



Table 8.2.14 December 3, 2004 Agency Meeting (PAMP) (Continued)

NAME	AGENCY	INVITED	ATTENDED
Charlie Simon	USACE, Detroit District	X	
John Ritchey	USACE, South Bend	X	
Goldfarb Eugene	US Department of Housing and Urban Development		
Virginia Laszewski	USEPA, Region 5	X	X
Ken Westlake	USEPA, Region 5	X	
Julie Guenther	USEPA, Region 5		
Wendy Melgin	USEPA, Watersheds and Wetlands		
Cathy Garra	USEPA		X
Elizabeth McCloskey	USFWS	X	X
Scott Pruitt	USFWS	X	
Lori Kaplan	IDEM	X	
Jason Randolph	IDEM, Section 401		
Ryan Cassidy	IDEM		
Liz Elverson	IDEM	X	X
Andrew Pelloso	IDEM		X
David Parry	IDEM	X	
John Goss	IDNR, State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)	X	
Karie Brudis	IDNR, Division of Historic Properties	X	
Christine Kiefer	IDNR, Division of Fish and Wildlife	X	
Keith Poole	IDNR, Fish and Wildlife		
Hank Huffman	IDNR, Heritage Program		
Jon Eggen	IDNR		
William Schenk	US Department of Interior, National Parks Service		
Nick Chevance	US Department of Interior, National Parks Service	X	
Edwin Hartke	Indiana Geological Survey, Environmental Geology Section		
Nancy Hasenmueller	Indiana Geological Survey, Environmental Geology Section	X	
Jane Hardisty	USDA, NRCS	X	
Deborah Knepp	USDA, NRCS		X
Troy Manges	St. Joseph County Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD)		X



## Section 106 Consulting Parties Coordination

The FHWA submitted the 800.11(e) documentation on November 5, 2004, to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and invited ACHP participation. ACHP declined to participate by not responding within 15 days of notice. A Consulting Party Meeting regarding findings of effects and possible mitigation was held on November 5, 2004. Table 8.2.15 identifies those consulting parties that were invited to and those that attended the meeting. The FHWA and SHPO began consultation on the development of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the project on December 20, 2004. The MOA was submitted to the consulting parties for concurrence on March 7, 2006. The MOA was signed by SHPO on March 16, 2006; by INDOT on March 23, 2006; and FHWA on March 29, 2006.

Table 8.2.15 November 5, 2005 Consulting Party Meeting (Findings of Effects and Possible Mitigation)		
CONSULTING PARTY	INVITED	ATTENDED
IDNR, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO))	X	X
Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana	X	X
Marshall County Historical Society/Museum	X	
South Bend City Council	X	
Historic Preservation Commission of South Bend and St. Joseph County	X	X
St. Joseph County Commissioners	X	
INDOT – LaPorte District	X	
IDNR, Division of Fish and Wildlife	X	
St. Joseph County Engineering	X	
Marshall County Commissioners	X	
Town of Lakeville	X	X
Lakeville Historian	X	X
City of Mishawaka	X	
Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	X	
Wythougan Valley Preservation Council, Inc.	X	



## 8.2.6 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)

The FEIS was prepared to respond to all substantive public and agency comments on the DEIS that were received during the DEIS Public Comment Period. It incorporates the DEIS (essentially in its entirety) with changes made as appropriate throughout the document to reflect the selection of Alternative G-Es as the Preferred Alternative and the basis for the decision, modifications to the project, updated information on the affected environment, avoidance and minimization measures utilized throughout the project to minimize impacts, changes in the assessment of impacts, mitigation and enhancement measures, wetland and floodplain findings, the results of coordination, comments received on the DEIS and responses to these comments, final Section 4(f) and other findings, Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), etc.

The FEIS has been made available for downloading, viewing and/or printing on the project web site. Copies of the FEIS were made available for review at locations within the study area (libraries, city/county offices, INDOT offices, etc.) and these locations were identified on the project web site. In addition, a copy of the FEIS was sent to individuals, agencies and organizations listed in Appendix B.

## 8.2.7 Record of Decision (ROD)

Following the FEIS review period, the Record of Decision (ROD) will be developed. The ROD will again discuss the reasons for the project decision, summarize any mitigation measures that will be incorporated in the project and document any required Section 4(f) approval. It will briefly describe each alternative and explain the balancing of values (impacts) which formed the basis for the decision, including the influence of lands protected by Section 4(f) were a factor in the selection of the preferred alternative. All substantive comments received on the FEIS will be identified and given appropriate responses.