

I-290 | Eisenhower Expressway

From west of Mannheim Road to Racine Avenue

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

December 2016

**Interstate 290 (I-290) Eisenhower Expressway
Cook County, Illinois**

**DRAFT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

Submitted Pursuant to 42 USC 4332 (2)(c) and 49 USC 303 by the

US Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
and
Illinois Department of Transportation

Cooperating Agencies
Federal Railroad Administration
Federal Transit Administration

12/20/2016
Date of Approval

Catherine A. Batey
For Federal Highway Administration

12/20/2016
Date of Approval

Maurice M. Addis
For Illinois Department of Transportation

For additional information concerning the project and/or this document:

Catherine A. Batey
Federal Highway Administration
3250 Executive Park Drive
Springfield, IL 62703
217-492-4600

Jose Rios
Illinois Department of Transportation
201 West Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196
847-705-4000

ABSTRACT

The Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) propose a transportation solution to improve regional and local travel, improve access to employment, improve safety for all users, improve modal connections and opportunities, and improve facility deficiencies on Interstate 290 from west of Mannheim Road on the west to Racine Avenue on the east, located in Cook County, Illinois. This Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) considers four build alternatives, along with a No Build Alternative.

The alternatives are identical in length at approximately 13 miles. There are no impacts to wetlands, High Quality Aquatic Resources, or federal or state listed species for any of the build alternatives. No displacement of residential or commercial structures would result with any of the build alternatives. There would be 0.40 acre of incremental permanent impacts to Waters of the United States, located at the Addison Creek and Des Plaines River crossings, for all build alternatives. A Section 4(f) *de minimis* finding at three public parks is proposed with the build alternatives. Alternative HOT3+ & EXP & HCT (also referred to as HOT3+), which is one High Occupancy Toll Lane and three General Purpose lanes in each direction, with provisions for Express Bus service and High Capacity Transit (Blue Line Rapid Transit or Bus Rapid Transit extension), is the Preferred Alternative.

FHWA will issue a single FEIS and Record of Decision document pursuant to Public Law 112-141, 126 Statute 405, Section 1319(b) unless FHWA determines statutory criteria or practicability consideration preclude issuance of the combined document pursuant to section 1319.

Comments on this DEIS are due by February 13, 2017 and should be sent to Mr. Jose Rios, Illinois Department of Transportation, 201 West Center Court, Schaumburg, IL 60196. Comments may also be submitted through email at: jose.rios@illinois.gov or via the I-290 Eisenhower Expressway web site at: <http://eisenhowexpressway.com>.

Table of Contents

SIGNATURE PAGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	xvii
SUMMARY.....	S-1
1.0 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION	1-1
1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND	1-1
1.2 PROJECT PURPOSE	1-2
1.3 STUDY AREA.....	1-2
1.4 PROJECT NEED.....	1-3
1.4.1 Regional and Local Travel.....	1-4
1.4.2 Access to Employment.....	1-7
1.4.3 Safety for All Users.....	1-9
1.4.4 Modal Connections and Opportunities	1-13
1.4.5 Transportation Facility Deficiencies.....	1-15
2.0 ALTERNATIVES	2-1
2.1 INTRODUCTION	2-1
2.2 INITIAL ALTERNATIVES IDENTIFICATION.....	2-2
2.2.1 Initial Range of Stakeholder Suggestions.....	2-3
2.2.2 Single Mode Alternatives Identification.....	2-3
2.3 ROUND 1 SINGLE MODE ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION.....	2-8
2.3.1 Single Mode Alternatives Definition	2-8
2.3.2 Footprint and Fatal Flaw Screening Results	2-9
2.3.3 Round 1 Evaluation Results	2-10
2.3.4 Initial Combination Mode Alternatives.....	2-16
2.4 ROUND 2 COMBINATION MODE ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION.....	2-19
2.4.1 Combination Mode Alternatives Definition	2-19
2.4.2 Round 2 Evaluation Results	2-23
2.4.3 Round 3 DEIS Alternatives.....	2-33
2.5 ROUND 3 DEIS ALTERNATIVES.....	2-33
2.5.1 Study Area Extension.....	2-33
2.5.2 Interchange Type Selection and Refinement Summary	2-35
2.5.3 Round 3 Travel Performance	2-47
2.5.4 Other Round 3 Refinements and Considerations.....	2-51

2.6 CONCLUSION – ALTERNATIVES CARRIED FORWARD FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS	2-60
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION	3-1
3.1 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS	3-4
3.1.1 Population Characteristics.....	3-4
3.1.2 Corridor Economic Characteristics	3-9
3.1.3 Project Corridor Neighborhoods	3-18
3.1.4 Public Facilities and Services	3-27
3.1.5 Local Planning.....	3-32
3.1.6 Community Cohesion and Community Changes.....	3-36
3.1.7 Relocations and Right-of-Way	3-39
3.1.8 Transportation Network.....	3-46
3.1.9 Environmental Justice	3-81
3.2 CULTURAL RESOURCES	3-107
3.2.1 Consultation	3-107
3.2.2 Affected Environment.....	3-109
3.2.3 Environmental Consequences.....	3-116
3.2.4 Measures to Minimize Harm and Mitigation	3-117
3.3 AIR QUALITY	3-118
3.3.1 Affected Environment.....	3-119
3.3.2 Environmental Consequences.....	3-128
3.3.3 Measures to Minimize Harm and Mitigation	3-137
3.4 TRAFFIC NOISE.....	3-139
3.4.1 Affected Environment.....	3-139
3.4.2 Environmental Consequences.....	3-152
3.4.3 Mitigation.....	3-154
3.5 ENERGY	3-156
3.6 NATURAL RESOURCES	3-158
3.6.1 Affected Environment.....	3-158
3.6.2 Environmental Consequences.....	3-163
3.6.3 Measures to Minimize Harm and Mitigation	3-167
3.7 WATER RESOURCES AND AQUATIC HABITATS.....	3-169
3.7.1 Affected Environment.....	3-169
3.7.2 Environmental Consequences.....	3-181
3.7.3 Measures to Minimize Harm and Mitigation	3-188
3.8 GROUNDWATER	3-191
3.8.1 Affected Environment.....	3-191
3.8.2 Environmental Consequences.....	3-192
3.8.3 Measures to Minimize Harm and Mitigation	3-193

3.9 FLOODPLAINS	3-194
3.9.1 Affected Environment.....	3-194
3.9.2 Environmental Consequences.....	3-196
3.9.3 Measures to Minimize Harm and Mitigation	3-201
3.10 WETLANDS.....	3-202
3.10.1 Affected Environment.....	3-202
3.10.2 Environmental Consequences.....	3-202
3.11 SPECIAL WASTE	3-203
3.11.1 Affected Environment.....	3-204
3.11.2 Environmental Consequences.....	3-210
3.11.3 Measures to Minimize Harm and Mitigation	3-211
3.12 SPECIAL LANDS	3-213
3.12.1 Affected Environment.....	3-213
3.12.2 Environmental Consequences.....	3-222
3.12.3 Measures to Minimize Harm and Mitigation	3-231
3.13 VISUAL RESOURCES	3-232
3.13.1 Existing Conditions Visual Analysis as viewed from the Mainline ...	3-232
3.13.2 Viewsheds of the Project Corridor from Adjacent Land Uses	3-242
3.13.3 Columbus Park.....	3-254
3.13.4 Environmental Consequences.....	3-258
3.13.5 Mitigation.....	3-274
3.14 CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS	3-282
3.14.1 Transportation.....	3-282
3.14.2 Water Resources.....	3-287
3.14.3 Air Quality	3-288
3.14.4 Construction Noise and Vibration	3-289
3.14.5 Solid Waste	3-290
3.14.6 Utility Services	3-290
3.14.7 Energy.....	3-290
3.14.8 Parks and Recreational Facilities	3-291
3.15 INDIRECT AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS.....	3-292
3.15.1 Approach	3-292
3.15.2 Indirect Impacts	3-292
3.15.3 Cumulative Impacts	3-301
3.16 SHORT-TEM USE AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY	3-305
3.17 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES	3-306
3.18 PERMITS AND APPROVALS	3-308

3.19 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS AND MITIGATION	3-309
SECTION 3.0 MAP SET	
4.0 AGENCY COORDINATION AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	4-1
4.1 OUTREACH REQUIREMENTS	4-1
4.1.1 Federal and State Requirements	4-1
4.1.2 Stakeholder Involvement Plan.....	4-2
4.1.3 Project Study Group	4-2
4.2 CORRIDOR ADVISORY GROUP/TASK FORCE (CAG/TF) MEETINGS	4-3
4.3 STAKEHOLDER, COMMUNITY, AND AGENCY COORDINATION.....	4-9
4.3.1 Stakeholder Outreach.....	4-9
4.3.2 Community Coordination	4-12
4.3.3 Agency Coordination	4-14
4.4 CONCLUSION.....	4-17
5.0 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY.....	5-1
5.1 ALTERNATIVES CARRIED FORWARD.....	5-1
5.1.1 Accommodation for High Capacity Transit.....	5-4
5.1.2 Comparison Matrix of Alternatives	5-5
5.2 PERFORMANCE COMPARISON	5-12
5.3 SOCIAL/ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS COMPARISON	5-13
5.3.1 Social/Economic Impacts (including Environmental Justice).....	5-14
5.3.2 Section 4(f) Resources.....	5-17
5.3.3 Visual Resources	5-18
5.3.4 Air Quality	5-18
5.3.5 Special Waste.....	5-19
5.3.6 Natural Environment	5-19
5.3.7 Traffic Noise	5-20
5.4 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS	5-21
5.4.1 Tolling Revenues	5-21
5.4.2 Tolling and Pricing Policy and Strategies	5-21
5.4.3 Construction Staging.....	5-23
5.4.4 Construction Cost	5-23
5.5 PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE	5-24
5.5.1 Achievement of Stakeholder Goals and Objectives	5-24
5.5.2 Quantitative Comparison of Alternatives	5-30
5.5.3 Implementation Flexibility	5-33

5.5.4	Refinements to HOT 3+ Included in the Preferred Alternative	5-34
5.5.5	Conclusion	5-35
6.0	LIST OF PREPARERS	6-1
	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	6-1
	Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT)	6-1
	Consultant Team	6-2
7.0	LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATION, AND PERSONS RECEIVING	
	DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT	7-1
7.1	Federal Agencies	7-1
7.2	State Agencies	7-2
7.3	Local Agencies	7-3
7.4	Other Stakeholder Groups	7-4
7.5	Public Review Locations	7-6
8.0	REFERENCES	8-1
	INDEX	I-1

List of Figures

Figure 1-1.	I-290 Existing Configuration.....	1-2
Figure 1-2.	I-290 Study Area.....	1-3
Figure 1-3.	Existing I-290 Capacity.....	1-5
Figure 1-4.	2010 Existing Arterial Peak Period Volume to Capacity Ratios.....	1-7
Figure 1-5.	Comparison of Chicago Freeway Mainline Crash Rates.....	1-10
Figure 1-6.	Crash Comparison of I-290 Mainline Sections (2006-2008, 2011-2013).....	1-11
Figure 1-7.	Lane Drop/No Lane Drop and Left Hand/Right Hand Ramp Crash Comparison (2006-2008, 2011-2013).....	1-12
Figure 1-8.	Overall Crash Type (2006-2008, 2011-2013).....	1-13
Figure 1-9.	Rear-End Crash – Time of Day (2006-2008, 2011-2013).....	1-13
Figure 1-10.	Narrow Sidewalks with Obstructions at Harlem and Oak Park Avenues.....	1-14
Figure 1-11.	Flooding on I-290 in the Study Area.....	1-16
Figure 2-1.	Alternatives Development and Evaluation Process.....	2-1
Figure 2-2.	Transit Bus Network Assumptions.....	2-9
Figure 2-3.	Traditional Commute Travel Origins.....	2-12
Figure 2-4.	Reverse Commute Travel Origins.....	2-13
Figure 2-5.	Trip Diversions within Transit Modes.....	2-14
Figure 2-6.	Initial 10 Combination Mode Alternatives.....	2-18
Figure 2-7.	Additional Round 2 Combination Mode Alternatives.....	2-20
Figure 2-8.	Alternative Ranking Example.....	2-25
Figure 2-9.	Alternative Ranking Example (Ratio Scoring).....	2-26
Figure 2-10.	Round 2 Overall Alternatives Ranking.....	2-27
Figure 2-11.	Comparison of Rank (Ordinal) and Ratio Scoring.....	2-29
Figure 2-12.	Four Combination Mode Alternatives to be Evaluated in Round 3.....	2-30
Figure 2-13.	I-290 Phase I Study Area.....	2-34
Figure 2-14.	I-290 Study Area Sections.....	2-35
Figure 2-15.	Interchanges Evaluated.....	2-36
Figure 2-16.	25 th Avenue Proposed Interchange Concept.....	2-38
Figure 2-17.	17 th Avenue Proposed Interchange Concept.....	2-39
Figure 2-18.	9 th Avenue Proposed Interchange Concept.....	2-40
Figure 2-19.	1 st Avenue (IL 171) Proposed Interchange Concept.....	2-40
Figure 2-20.	DesPlaines Avenue Proposed Interchange Concept.....	2-42
Figure 2-21.	Harlem Avenue (IL 43) Proposed Interchange Concept.....	2-43
Figure 2-22.	Austin Boulevard Proposed Interchange Concept.....	2-44
Figure 2-23.	Austin Boulevard and Central Avenue Braided Ramp Configuration.....	2-45
Figure 2-24.	Central Avenue Proposed Interchange Concept.....	2-46
Figure 2-25.	Laramie Avenue and Cicero Avenue (IL 50) Proposed Interchange Concept.....	2-47

Figure 2-26.	Round 3 Transit Network	2-48
Figure 2-27.	Existing Expressway and Parallel CSX and CTA Constrained Section.....	2-51
Figure 2-28.	Existing CTA Right of Way Configuration	2-52
Figure 2-29.	10-Foot ROW & CTA Right of Way Configuration	2-53
Figure 2-30.	I-290 Expressway Improvement Configuration without 10-Foot CTA ROW	2-54
Figure 2-31.	I-290 Expressway Improvement Configuration with 10-Foot CTA ROW.....	2-54
Figure 2-32.	I-290 Expressway and CTA ROW Safety Evaluation.....	2-55
Figure 2-33.	I-290 Expressway and CTA Right-of-way Proposed Configuration	2-55
Figure 2-34.	Convertible Expressway Concept – Initial and Ultimate Configuration	2-57
Figure 2-35.	Active Traffic Management Messages	2-59
Figure 2-36.	Key ITS System Elements.....	2-59
Figure 2-37.	Four Build Alternatives Advance to DEIS.....	2-61
Figure 3-1.	I-290 Study Area and Project Corridor	3-3
Figure 3-2.	I-290 Median Household Income for Project Corridor Communities (2011).....	3-10
Figure 3-3.	Poverty Levels for Project Corridor Communities (2011).....	3-11
Figure 3-4.	Existing Land Use – I-290 Study Area (Subarea 1).....	3-19
Figure 3-5.	Existing Land Use – I-290 Study Area (Subarea 2).....	3-20
Figure 3-6.	Existing Land Use – I-290 Study Area (Subarea 3).....	3-21
Figure 3-7.	Existing Land Use – I-290 Study Area (Subarea 4).....	3-22
Figure 3-8.	New and Additional Green Space Typical Section	3-38
Figure 3-9.	25 th Avenue Additional Right-of-Way Required	3-41
Figure 3-10.	1 st Avenue Additional Right-of-Way Required	3-42
Figure 3-11.	DesPlaines Avenue Additional Right-of-Way Required.....	3-43
Figure 3-12.	Circle Avenue Additional Right-of-Way Required.....	3-44
Figure 3-13.	Harlem Avenue Additional Right-of-Way Required.....	3-45
Figure 3-14.	CTA Additional Right-of-Way Required.....	3-46
Figure 3-15.	I-290 Bicycle Crossings – Reconstruction Section.....	3-52
Figure 3-16.	Projected 2040 East-West Arterial Volume Change for Alternatives versus No Build Alternative.....	3-55
Figure 3-17.	25 th Avenue Proposed Access Modifications	3-57
Figure 3-18.	1 st Avenue Proposed Access Modifications.....	3-57
Figure 3-19.	Local Cross Street Bridge Typical Sidewalk Widths.....	3-61
Figure 3-20.	25 th Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Improvements.....	3-62
Figure 3-21.	17 th Avenue Pedestrian Improvements.....	3-63
Figure 3-22.	9 th Avenue Pedestrian Improvements.....	3-64
Figure 3-23.	5 th Avenue Pedestrian Improvements.....	3-65
Figure 3-24.	1 st Avenue Interchange Pedestrian Improvements	3-66
Figure 3-25.	1 st Avenue and VanBuren Pedestrian Improvements.....	3-67

Figure 3-26.	1 st Avenue and Maybrook Drive Bike and Pedestrian Improvements	3-68
Figure 3-27.	DesPlaines Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Improvements.....	3-69
Figure 3-28.	Circle Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Improvements	3-70
Figure 3-29.	Harlem Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Improvements	3-71
Figure 3-30.	Oak Park Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Improvements	3-72
Figure 3-31.	East Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Improvements	3-73
Figure 3-32.	Ridgeland Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Improvements.....	3-73
Figure 3-33.	Lombard Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Improvements.....	3-74
Figure 3-34.	Austin Boulevard Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Improvements	3-75
Figure 3-35.	Central Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Improvements.....	3-76
Figure 3-36.	Laramie Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Improvements	3-77
Figure 3-37.	Cicero Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Improvements	3-78
Figure 3-38.	Home Avenue Pedestrian Bridge	3-79
Figure 3-39.	La Avenue Pedestrian Bridge.....	3-80
Figure 3-40.	New Shared-Use Path.....	3-81
Figure 3-41.	Environmental Justice Composite Analysis Summary by Census Block Group in the Project Corridor (Subarea 1).....	3-85
Figure 3-42.	Environmental Justice Composite Analysis Summary by Census Block Group in the Project Corridor (Subarea 2).....	3-86
Figure 3-43.	Environmental Justice Composite Analysis Summary by Census Block Group in the Project Corridor (Subarea 3).....	3-87
Figure 3-44.	Environmental Justice Composite Analysis Summary by Census Block Group in the Project Corridor (Subarea 4).....	3-88
Figure 3-45.	Origins and Job Destinations for EJ and non-EJ Communities	3-91
Figure 3-46.	GP Lane Alternative Projected East-West Arterial ADT Change and North-South Arterial Intersection Delay Change at I-290 Interchanges Compared to the No Build Alternative and EJ Communities	3-96
Figure 3-47.	HOV 2+ Alternative Projected East-West Arterial ADT Change and North-South Arterial Intersection Delay Change at I-290 Interchanges Compared to the No Build Alternative and EJ Communities	3-97
Figure 3-48.	HOT 3+ Alternative Projected East-West Arterial ADT Change and North-South Arterial Intersection Delay Change at I-290 Interchanges Compared to the No Build Alternative and EJ Communities	3-98
Figure 3-49.	HOT 3+ & TOLL Alternative Projected East-West Arterial ADT Change and North-South Arterial Intersection Delay Change at I- 290 Interchanges Compared to the No Build Alternative and EJ Communities	3-99
Figure 3-50.	Free General Purpose Lanes and HOT 3+ Lanes in HOT 3+ Alternative	3-101

Figure 3-51. Tolled General Purpose Lanes and HOT 3+ Lanes in HOT 3+ & TOLL Alternative	3-101
Figure 3-52. Off-System Improvements.....	3-105
Figure 3-53. MSAT Analysis Area	3-133
Figure 3-54. Potential Solar Garden Areas – Village of Oak Park.....	3-157
Figure 3-55. Addison Creek, north of I-290.....	3-166
Figure 3-56. Des Plaines River, north of I-290.....	3-167
Figure 3-57. Watersheds in the Project Corridor	3-170
Figure 3-58. Proposed Frontage Road Storm Sewer Location.....	3-200
Figure 3-59. Proposed Frontage Road and Local Drainage Detail.....	3-200
Figure 3-60. Existing Parks and Recreation Facilities	3-214
Figure 3-61. Veterans Park and the Dog Park – Proposed Access Improvements at Circle Avenue and I-290	3-225
Figure 3-62. Park District of Forest Park – Roos Property	3-227
Figure 3-63. Columbus Park - West Side Trail Connection and Enhancements.....	3-229
Figure 3-64. Columbus Park – East Side Enhancements	3-230
Figure 3-65. I-88 Terminus of Study Area	3-232
Figure 3-66. Western Portion of Study Area	3-233
Figure 3-67. Mainline Roadway Views.....	3-233
Figure 3-68. Mainline Roadway View – Retaining and Noise Barriers.....	3-234
Figure 3-69. View at Mannheim Road/I-290 Interchange	3-234
Figure 3-70. View at 25 th Avenue/I-290 Interchange.....	3-235
Figure 3-71. View Proximate to South 21 st Avenue.....	3-235
Figure 3-72. Roadway View at 17 th Avenue	3-236
Figure 3-73. View Northeast of 1 st Avenue	3-236
Figure 3-74. Mainline View Near I-290/1 st Avenue Interchange.....	3-237
Figure 3-75. CTA Facilities near Circle Avenue	3-238
Figure 3-76. I-290 View at Harlem Avenue.....	3-238
Figure 3-77. Eastbound I-290 View east of South Oak Park Avenue.....	3-238
Figure 3-78. I-290 Eastbound east of South Central Avenue	3-239
Figure 3-79. Viewshed with CTA Trains	3-240
Figure 3-80. I-290 Eastbound near South Damen Avenue	3-241
Figure 3-81. I-290 Mainline View east of South Central Park Boulevard	3-241
Figure 3-82. I-290 Eastbound west of South Pulaski Road.....	3-241
Figure 3-83. Eastbound Mainline View West of South Paulina Street	3-242
Figure 3-84. Eastbound I-290 Mainline View.....	3-242
Figure 3-85. View at Hillside Avenue/Jackson Boulevard.....	3-243
Figure 3-86. View from Frontage Road east of Hillside Drive	3-243
Figure 3-87. Southwest View Proximate to Hillside Drive	3-243
Figure 3-88. View Looking East near Harrison Street	3-244
Figure 3-89. I-290 Mainline near Cernan Drive	3-245
Figure 3-90. View along Harrison Street	3-245
Figure 3-91. View of Bataan Drive near 23 rd Avenue.....	3-246

Figure 3-92.	North Frontage Road along Harrison Street	3-246
Figure 3-93.	View Looking East near 1 st Avenue.....	3-247
Figure 3-94.	View to I-290 from Garfield Street.....	3-248
Figure 3-95.	Northeast View to I-290 from Garfield Street	3-248
Figure 3-96.	I-290 at Lehmer Street and Ferdinand Avenue.....	3-249
Figure 3-97.	View along Harrison Street near Kenilworth Avenue.....	3-249
Figure 3-98.	View Proximate to Home Avenue at Harrison Street.....	3-250
Figure 3-99.	Views along Harrison Street.....	3-250
Figure 3-100.	View along Flournoy Street	3-251
Figure 3-101.	View along West Lexington Street	3-252
Figure 3-102.	I-290 View Proximate to South Kenneth Avenue.....	3-252
Figure 3-103.	View of Westbound I-290 from West Flournoy Street.....	3-252
Figure 3-104.	View of West Harrison Street	3-253
Figure 3-105.	View along West Flournoy Street	3-253
Figure 3-106.	View from West Flournoy Street at Kilpatrick Avenue.....	3-254
Figure 3-107.	View at I-290 Off-Ramps at Austin Boulevard	3-255
Figure 3-108.	View at Columbus Park Trail.....	3-255
Figure 3-109.	Columbus Park Trail on South Edge of Columbus Park.....	3-256
Figure 3-110.	Southeast Edge of Columbus Park with Trail.....	3-256
Figure 3-111.	Southeast Edge of Columbus Park	3-257
Figure 3-112.	View from Ballfields at Southeast Edge of Columbus Park.....	3-257
Figure 3-113.	Simulation of Cross Street Overpass from I-290 Mainline	3-259
Figure 3-114.	Simulation of Cross Street Overpass from I-290 Mainline with Noise Barriers	3-260
Figure 3-115.	Close-up Simulation of Cross Street Overpass from I-290 Mainline	3-260
Figure 3-116.	Close-up Simulation of Cross Street Overpass Detail from I-290 Mainline.....	3-261
Figure 3-117.	Frontage Road Community Level Space	3-263
Figure 3-118.	25 th Avenue	3-264
Figure 3-119.	Harlem Avenue Interchange	3-265
Figure 3-120.	Austin Avenue Interchange.....	3-266
Figure 3-121.	Home Avenue Pedestrian Bridge	3-267
Figure 3-122.	Oak Park Signature Bridge Concept.....	3-267
Figure 3-123.	Noise Barrier Visualization – Village of Westchester	3-270
Figure 3-124.	Noise Barrier Visualization – Village of Oak Park	3-271
Figure 3-125.	Noise Barrier Visualization – City of Chicago	3-271
Figure 3-126.	Typical Cross Street Section View with CTA Station	3-273
Figure 3-127.	Typical Cross Street Section View without CTA Station.....	3-273
Figure 3-128.	CTA Blue Line Head Station Concept.....	3-274
Figure 3-129.	Home Avenue Pedestrian Crossing	3-276
Figure 3-130.	Home Avenue Pedestrian Bridge Concept.....	3-277
Figure 3-131.	Ridgeland Avenue Schematic Landscape Plan.....	3-277
Figure 3-132.	Concept Design - Ridgeland Avenue Overpass	3-278

Figure 3-133. Overpass Planter Boxes.....	3-279
Figure 3-134. Noise Barrier Visualization Base Design Character.....	3-280
Figure 3-135. Columbus Park Trail Connection.....	3-281
Figure 3-136. Primary Off-System Improvements.....	3-283
Figure 3-137. Construction Staging.....	3-285
Figure 3-138. Change in Population – Build vs. No Build Due to Highway Improvements.....	3-295
Figure 3-139. Change in Employment – Build vs. No Build Due to Highway Improvements.....	3-296
Figure 3-140. Change in Population – Build vs. No Build Due to Transit Improvements.....	3-297
Figure 3-141. Change in Employment – Build vs. No Build Due to Transit Improvements.....	3-298
Figure 4-1. Project Working Group Structure.....	4-2
Figure 5-1. Four Build Alternatives Evaluated in Round 3.....	5-3
Figure 5-2. Convertible Expressway Section – Initial and Ultimate Configuration.....	5-5

List of Tables

Table 1-1.	Regional 2040 Jobs Accessible by Auto from Study Area	1-8
Table 1-2.	Regional 2040 Jobs Accessible by Transit from Study Area.....	1-9
Table 2-1.	Summary of Pre-Screening Findings.....	2-4
Table 2-2.	Transit Modes Evaluated in Round 1.....	2-6
Table 2-3.	Expressway Modes Evaluated in Round 1	2-7
Table 2-4.	Arterial Improvements Evaluated in Round 1	2-8
Table 2-5.	Round 1 Evaluation Summary	2-11
Table 2-6.	Performance Comparison of Blue Line Extensions.....	2-15
Table 2-7.	Single Mode Performance Ratings.....	2-16
Table 2-8.	Combination Mode Alternatives Descriptions	2-21
Table 2-9.	Round 3 Travel Performance Comparison (Showing Change from 2040 No Build).....	2-49
Table 3-1.	Population Changes in Project Corridor Communities 1950-2012	3-5
Table 3-2.	Project Corridor Population, 2010	3-5
Table 3-3.	Project Corridor Race and Ethnicity Characteristics, 2010.....	3-6
Table 3-4.	Population by Race and Ethnicity for Project Corridor Communities	3-7
Table 3-5.	Age Characteristics of Project Corridor Communities	3-8
Table 3-6.	Project Corridor Community Unemployment Percentages 2000 – 2014	3-11
Table 3-7.	Housing Characteristics of Project Corridor Communities	3-12
Table 3-8.	Auto Ownership Characteristics of Project Corridor Communities.....	3-13
Table 3-9.	Travel Time to Work Characteristics of Project Corridor Communities	3-14
Table 3-10.	Employment by Major Industries for Project Corridor Communities	3-16
Table 3-11.	Alternatives Daily Vehicle Hours of Travel Savings and Annual Productivity Benefits Change vs. No Build Alternative.....	3-17
Table 3-12.	Public Facilities/Services in the Project Corridor.....	3-28
Table 3-13.	School Districts Serving Project Corridor Communities	3-29
Table 3-14.	Major Hospitals / Medical Centers in the Project Corridor.....	3-30
Table 3-15.	New Right-of-Way Required for the Reconstruction of the I-290 Expressway	3-40
Table 3-16.	Project Corridor Lane Miles by Functional Class and Direction.....	3-47
Table 3-17.	Class I and Class II Truck Routes in Project Corridor	3-48
Table 3-18.	Projected 2040 I-290 Average Daily Traffic (ADT).....	3-53
Table 3-19.	Daily 2040 Study Area Arterial Travel Performance	3-54
Table 3-20.	Projected Daily 2040 I-290 Study Area Truck Performance.....	3-58
Table 3-21.	Job Accessibility Travel Time Comparison between No Build and Build Alternatives (Average of Six Job Destinations).....	3-92

Table 3-22.	Estimated Toll Cost per Build Alternative (Wolf Road to Ashland Avenue)	3-100
Table 3-23.	NRHP-Listed and Previously Determined NRHP-Eligible Historic Properties in the APE	3-110
Table 3-24.	NRHP-Eligible Historic Properties in the APE.....	3-113
Table 3-25.	National Ambient Air Quality Standards.....	3-120
Table 3-26.	Summary of Air Quality Monitored Near Study Area.....	3-122
Table 3-27.	Project Area Attainment Status.....	3-124
Table 3-28.	2040 Regional Emission Burdens (Annual).....	3-129
Table 3-29.	2040 GHG Emission Burdens (Annual)	3-130
Table 3-30.	Construction GHG Emissions (Annual)*	3-131
Table 3-31.	2040 MSAT Emission Burdens (Annual)	3-134
Table 3-32.	Noise Abatement Criteria	3-140
Table 3-33.	Noise Level Summary	3-144
Table 3-34.	Traffic Noise Impacts Summary by Build Alternative	3-153
Table 3-35.	Land Cover within the Project Corridor	3-158
Table 3-36.	Tree Data by Municipality	3-160
Table 3-37.	Federally Listed Threatened and Endangered Species within Cook County	3-162
Table 3-38.	State Listed Threatened and Endangered Species within Cook County	3-163
Table 3-39.	Potentially Impacted Trees by Origin and Municipality.....	3-164
Table 3-40.	Use Support and Impairment Summary for Project Corridor Water Bodies.....	3-179
Table 3-41.	Streams Crossed by the Proposed Project in the Existing and Build Condition.....	3-182
Table 3-42.	Watersheds Receiving Project Corridor Stormwater.....	3-184
Table 3-43.	Incremental Chloride Contribution Analysis.....	3-187
Table 3-44.	Designated 100-Year Floodplains within the Project Corridor	3-194
Table 3-45.	Proposed 100-Year Floodplain Impact Summary	3-197
Table 3-46.	Proposed 100-Year Floodplain and Regulatory Floodway Encroachment Summary.....	3-197
Table 3-47.	Proposed 100-Year Floodway Impact Summary	3-199
Table 3-48.	Summary of PESA Project Sites in Environmental Regulatory Databases.....	3-210
Table 3-49.	Existing Parks in the I-290 Project Corridor	3-215
Table 3-50.	Summary of Parkland Use – Village of Forest Park.....	3-228
Table 3-51.	Impacts to Visual Resources within and from outside the Project Corridor	3-258
Table 3-52.	Comparison of I-290 Study Area 2040 No Build and Build Forecasts...	3-299
Table 3-53.	Summary of Environmental Commitments.....	3-310
Table 4-1.	Corridor Advisory Group/Task Force Meetings	4-3
Table 4-2.	Summary of Outreach Methods (as of September 2016).....	4-9

Table 4-3.	Public Meetings	4-10
Table 5-1.	Comparison Matrix of Alternatives.....	5-6
Table 5-2.	Transportation Performance Comparison.....	5-13
Table 5-3.	Social/Economic Impact Comparison	5-14
Table 5-4.	Section 4(f) Resources Impact Comparison.....	5-17
Table 5-5.	Visual Resources Impact Comparison	5-18
Table 5-6.	Air Quality Impact Comparison	5-19
Table 5-7.	Special Waste Impact Comparison.....	5-20
Table 5-8.	Natural Environment Impact Comparison	5-20
Table 5-9.	Traffic Noise Impact Summary Table	5-21
Table 5-10.	Estimate of Implementation Cost Summary for Build Alternatives.....	5-24
Table 5-11.	Rank and Ratio Scoring Comparison of Build Alternatives	5-33

List of Appendices

The following appendices are included in electronic format only on the disc provided with this document.

APPENDIX A	CRASH ANALYSIS OVERVIEW 2011 - 2013
APPENDIX B	FORECASTING METHODOLOGY REPORTS
APPENDIX C	ALTERNATIVES IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION
APPENDIX D	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE METHODOLOGY TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM
APPENDIX E	SECTION 106 MATERIALS AND CORRESPONDENCE
APPENDIX F	TRAFFIC NOISE ABATEMENT ANALYSIS
APPENDIX G	NATURAL RESOURCE REVIEW
APPENDIX H	WATER QUALITY DATA
APPENDIX I	COLUMBUS PARK CORRESPONDENCE
APPENDIX J	NOISE BARRIER VISUALIZATIONS
APPENDIX K	NEPA/404 MATERIAL AND CORRESPONDENCE
APPENDIX L	I-290 COST ESTIMATING PROCEDURES
APPENDIX M	INVEST EVALUATION

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

List of Acronyms

ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
ACM	asbestos containing materials
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ADT	average daily traffic
AQI	Air Quality Index
ATM	Active Traffic Management
AUL	Activity and Use Limitations
AWG	Advisory Working Group
BDE	Bureau of Design and Environment
BMP	Best Management Practices
BOL	Bureau of Land
BRC	Belt Railway Company of Chicago
BRT	bus rapid transit
CAAA	Clean Air Act Amendment
CAG	Corridor Advisory Group
CAWS	Chicago Area Waterway System
CBD	Central Business District
CCDD	Clean Construction and Demolition Debris
CDOT	Chicago Department of Transportation
CER	Cost Estimate Review
CERCLIS	Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information System (superseded by the Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS))
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CMAP	Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
CN	Canadian National Railway
CNE	Common Noise Environments
CO	carbon monoxide
CO _{2e}	carbon dioxide equivalents
COSIM	Carbon Monoxide Screen for Intersection Modeling
CSO	combined sewer overflow
CSS	Context Sensitive Solutions
CSX	CSX Transportation, Inc.
CTA	Chicago Transit Authority
CWS	community water supply
dB(A)	Decibel (A-weighted)
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
DMS	dynamic message signs
DRSCW	DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup
EcoCAT	Ecological Compliance Assessment Tool

EDP	existing drainage plan
EJ	environmental justice
ERNS	Emergency Response Notification System
ESA	Endangered Species Act
EXP	Express Bus
FAST	Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FMGP	Former Manufactured Gas Plan
GHG	greenhouse gas
GIS	Geographic information system
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HAA	Highway Authority Agreement
HCT	high capacity transit
HEI	Health Effects Institute
HOT	high occupancy toll
HOV	high occupancy vehicle
HRT	heavy rail transit
HSM	Highway Safety Manual
HUC	Hydrologic Unit Code
ICE	Infrastructure Carbon Estimator
IDNR	Illinois Department of Natural Resources
IDOA	Illinois Department of Agriculture
IDOT	Illinois Department of Transportation
IEMA	Illinois Emergency Management Agency
IEPA	Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
IHB	Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad
IHPA	Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
ILCS	Illinois Compiled Statutes
INHS	Illinois Natural History Survey
INVEST	Infrastructure Voluntary Evaluation Sustainability Tool
ISAS	Illinois State Archaeological Survey
ISATe	Enhanced Interchange Safety Analysis
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act
ITS	intelligent transportation system
LBP	Lead-based paint
LDPEP	Lower Des Plaines Ecosystem Partnership
LOS	Level of Service
LUST	Leaking Underground Storage Tank
LWCF	Land and Water Conservation Fund
MABAS	Mutual Aid Box Alarm System

MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MSAT	Mobile Source Air Toxics
MTP	metropolitan transportation plan
MWRDGC	Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAC	Noise Abatement Criteria
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NFPA	National Fire Protection Association
NHL	National Historic Landmark
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NO ₂	Nitrogen Dioxide
NO _x	nitrogen oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPS	National Park Service
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
O ₃	Ozone
OPWG	Oak Park Working Group
ORC	Office of Resource Conservation
OSFM	Office of the Illinois State Fire Marshall
OSLAD	Open Space Land Acquisition and Development
OWJ	Official with Jurisdiction
P3	public private partnership
PESA	Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment
PIN	Property Identification Numbers
PM	Particulate Matter
PSG	Project Study Group
PSI	preliminary site investigation
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RCRIS	Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System
REC	Recognized Environmental Condition
ROD	Record of Decision
RTA	Regional Transportation Authority
SCWN	Salt Creek Watershed Network
SELDM	Stochastic Empirical Loading and Dilution Model
SEMS	Superfund Enterprise Management System
SHAP	Stream Habitat Assessment Procedure
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SIP	Stakeholder Involvement Plan
SIP	state implementation plan
SO ₂	Sulfur Dioxide
SOV	single occupant vehicles
SPUI	Single Point Urban Interchange

SRP	Voluntary Site Remediation Program
STIP	Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
TF	Task Force
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
TMDL	total maximum daily loads
TNM	Traffic Noise Model
TRI	Toxic Release Inventory
TSS	suspended solids
TWG	Transit Working Group
UPDREP	Upper Des Plaines River Ecosystem Partnership
USACE	US Army Corps of Engineers
USC	United States Code
USCG	US Coast Guard
USDA	US Department of Agriculture
USDOT	United States Department of Transportation
USEPA	US Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	US Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	US Geological Survey
UST	underground storage tank
v/c	volume to capacity ratio
VHT	Vehicle Hours Traveled
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VOC	volatile organic chemical
Vpd	vehicles per day
VPPP	Value Pricing Pilot Program
WOUS	Waters of the United States
WSEL	water surface elevation
WWTP	wastewater treatment plant
YOE	Year of Expenditure