

Section 6 COMMENTS AND COORDINATION



6.0 Comments and Coordination

A scoping coordination letter describing the Springfield Project and requesting comments was forwarded to the state and federal resource agencies on September 3, 2010. The scoping letter and agency responses are in Appendix A. The Springfield Rail Improvements Project was included as part of the Tier 1 Chicago to St. Louis High-Speed Rail Draft Environmental Impact Statement Notice of Intent (NOI). The NOI was published in the Federal Register on February 14, 2011.

Since February 2011, the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT), in conjunction with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), has been conducting a Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) for the Chicago to St. Louis High-Speed Rail Project and a Tier 2 project-level evaluation for the Springfield Rail Improvements Project. A scoping coordination letter describing the project and requesting comments and upcoming scoping meeting attendance was forwarded to the state and federal resource agencies in February 2011. The agency scoping letter responses and cooperating agency responses are located in Appendix E of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. In March 2011, an initial round of public open house meetings were held within the corridor to introduce the studies to the public, explain the EIS process and timeline, and get input. After these meetings the study team spent the next several months developing alternatives. In late October and early November 2011, public hearings were held in the cities of Joliet; Bloomington; Springfield; Carlinville; and Alton. Agency and additional public coordination information may be found in Section 8.0 of the Tier 1 Final EIS.

6.1 Agency Coordination

A coordination letter describing the Springfield Rail Improvements Project was mailed to federal, state and local agencies on September 3, 2010 (see Appendix A). This letter explained the purpose of the project, the project location, potential project alternatives and requested any concerns or specific issues that should be addressed in the NEPA document.

6.1.1 Federal Agency Coordination

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Rock Island District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers responded to the September 3, 2010, coordination letter on October 8, 2010. Since the Springfield Rail Improvements Project does not involve any Corps' administered land, no further Rock Island real estate coordination is necessary. However, further coordination may be necessary for potential impacts to waters of the U.S. and/or wetlands. Also, coordination was suggested with the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Illinois Emergency Management Agency.

U.S. Department of Commerce. The Regional Director of the Chicago Regional Office of the Economic Development Administration responded on November 2, 2010. They expressed no concerns or issues that needed to be addressed regarding the high-speed rail service from Chicago to St. Louis.

U.S. Department of Interior. The Rock Island Field Office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service responded on November 9, 2010. A list of potential federally-listed threatened and endangered species was provided to assist in the assessment of suitable habitat within the project area.

6.1.2 State Agency Coordination

Illinois Department of Natural Resources. The Division of Ecosystems and Environment responded on September 10, 2010 via electronic mail that the project team should use their Eco-Cat program to identify any potential state-listed threatened and endangered species.

Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. The Acting Deputy Director responded on September 16, 2010, and had no objections to the proposed project. The potential for a NPDES permit and a permit from the Division of Public Water Supplies was mentioned as a courtesy, if warranted.

Illinois Department of Agriculture. The Acting Chief responded on September 17, 2010, stating that they have no comments towards the evaluation and selection of a high-speed railroad corridor through Springfield.

Illinois Emergency Management Agency. The Regional Coordinator responded via electronic mail on September 17, 2010, with concerns for safety from hazardous materials along the 10th Street corridor.

Illinois State Geological Survey. The Director and State Geologist provided information on coal mines and poorly drained soils within the project area. No concerns or issues with the project were noted.

Illinois Historic Preservation Agency. The Deputy State Historic Preservation Offices submitted a letter on October 4, 2010. Their concerns related to the possible adverse effects of the project on National Historic Landmarks within the project area. If any adverse effects are proposed, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the National Park Service would need to participate in the Section 106 consultation process.

6.1.3 Local Governments

The project included input from a Steering Committee composed of representatives of Springfield, Sangamon County, IDOT and Senator Durbin's office. This Committee met as needed.

IDOT Bureau of Railroads representatives served on the Steering Committee. Meetings were held to update the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) on the progress of the project. Coordination with state and federal environmental agencies is included in Appendix A.

6.2 Technical Committee

A Technical Committee met as needed to discuss the project. Members of this Committee included representatives of the Steering Committee plus:

- Norfolk Southern Railroad
- Illinois Midland Railroad
- Kansas City Southern Railroad
- Union Pacific Railroad
- Canadian National Railroad
- Amtrak
- Illinois Commerce Commission

6.3 Public Involvement Activities

Public engagement has been a key element in the success of the Springfield Rail Improvements Project. The project team has worked to connect with the project's interested and impacted parties through a variety of communications and outreach tactics. The principal aim has been to educate and inform the public about the project's process, activities, and findings. To this end, a website has been maintained, newsletters distributed, email broadcasts sent out, displays circulated, and community presentations facilitated. Key stakeholders and their constituents have been directly engaged in the study through a series of stakeholder interviews and the formation of four advisory groups.

Direct engagement of the general public has also been a critical component of the project team's public involvement efforts. Two public open houses, each of which were attended by roughly 300 people, were held. These open houses provided a means to both inform the public and solicit its input at key milestones in the project. Tools to gain public input, including a project email, a telephone hotline, and the maintenance of a direct mail repository were developed.

6.3.1 Stakeholder Interviews

Stakeholders' input were sought to learn about community issues that could impact the project and to gain insights on effective public outreach and engagement activities. Seventeen key informant interviews were conducted with municipal, business, and community stakeholders in the first eight weeks of the project. These meetings introduced stakeholders to the project; obtained their initial thoughts on the project; and helped the team become aware of key issues, opportunities, and the best methods to engage constituents.

6.3.2 Stakeholder Advisory Groups

Four distinct stakeholder groups were identified and formed into corresponding advisory committees: Business, Community, Medical, and Public Officials. Fifteen representatives from the area chamber of commerce, local businesses, and professional

trade organizations came together to form the Business Advisory Group. The Community Advisory Group consists of 20 members serving on behalf of 15 neighborhood associations, a bicycle/pedestrian advocacy group, and several civic and faith-based organizations. Delegates from the region's largest health care providers participate in the Medical Advisory Group. Lastly, the Public Officials Advisory Group includes elected officials such as city aldermen, county board members, and state and federal representatives, as well as agents from the regional planning commission, park district, and mass transit district.

All four advisory groups have convened three times since the beginning of the project (February 2010, April 2010, and November 2010). Advisory group members serve as liaisons between the project team and their respective constituencies. They also provide guidance on the best ways to attain public input. Advisory group meeting summaries are made available to the public via the project website.

6.3.3 Communications, Outreach, and Engagement

As previously mentioned, a variety of tools have been employed in order to inform and educate the public.

Project Website

This includes a comprehensive project website that contains information on every aspect of the project as well as meeting summaries, a presentation calendar, and information presented at both open houses. The project website has had more than 14,000 visits since it was launched in April 2010.

Newsletters

Project newsletters are another means of communicating with the public. Three newsletters were written and distributed prior to the issuance of the Draft EIS (see Appendix E). The first newsletter served as an introduction to the project and advertised the first open house. The second newsletter reported on public input results from the first open house. The third newsletter provided an update on the project and announced the second open house. The newsletters are distributed to approximately 2,800 people and are also sent via email to a list of about 500 individuals. This same email list has received additional e-broadcasts about open houses and website updates.

Email

The project also has an email account that is checked daily and has received 50 emails to date. The nature of the email messages range from presentation requests to comments regarding the proposed alternatives. Messages are logged in a database and responded to as necessary. Additionally, the project has received 12 letters from individuals, businesses, and organizations, representing the interests of neighborhoods, property owners, professional associations, businesses, and the Mid-Illinois Medical District.

Community Presentations

Since the project's onset, 21 community presentations have been made, reaching nearly 1,000 people. Presentations have been hosted by neighborhood associations, faith-based groups, the local school district, and civic, trade, and professional organizations. By going into the community to share project information, answer questions, and obtain feedback, exposure to a wider audience of constituents has been gained than those who would normally self-select to attend project meetings.

Table 6-1. Community Presentations

ORGANIZATION	DATE	APPROX. NUMBER ATTENDED
1. Regional/Urban Design Assistance Team	02/26/10	8
2. Faith Coalition for the Common Good (Steering Committee)	03/15/10	4
3. Regional Planning Commission	03/17/10	25
4. IDOT Teamsters	03/19/10	450
5. Hawthorne Place Neighborhood Association	03/24/10	28
6. Union Baptist Church	03/25/10	35
7. Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce (Board of Directors)	03/29/10	35
8. Springfield Area Transportation Study	04/01/10	25
9. Randall Court Neighborhood Association	04/06/10	9
10. Pillsbury Mills Neighborhood Association	04/07/10	10
11. Springfield Area Transportation Study Policy Committee	04/08/10	20
12. Pioneer Park Neighborhood Association	04/12/10	8
13. Harvard Park Neighborhood Association	04/14/10	55
14. Springfield School District	04/19/10	65
15. Sacred Heart Griffin High School	04/28/10	8
16. Enos Park Neighborhood Improvement Association	05/11/10	35
17. Rotary Club	05/19/10	30
18. City of Springfield Community Relations Commission	05/20/10	10
19. Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association	05/20/10	22
20. American Institute of Architects	06/02/10	14
21. Capital Area Association of Realtors	06/22/10	13

Kiosks

Four large-scale (seven foot) display kiosks that change locations about every six to eight weeks were also created. The kiosks' eight panels describe the project's purpose and background, timeline and project team, current and future rail conditions, and how to

get involved. Beginning in April 2010, the kiosks were displayed at various locations in and around the project area, including local hospitals, civic and municipal buildings, churches, and White Oaks Mall.

6.3.4 Public Open Houses Prior to Draft EIS

Two public open houses were held prior to the release of the Draft EIS to correspond with: 1) an initial discussion of the project's purpose and needs, and 2) the development of preliminary alternatives. These interactive sessions have given interested citizens and stakeholders opportunities to examine detailed project information and to share their corridor preferences and concerns. They have also provided settings for residents to meet with and ask questions.

1. April 20, 2010 Open House

The first open house was held on Tuesday, April 20, 2010, and had more than 290 people in attendance. Meeting notices in the form of letters, flyers, and posters were sent to all four stakeholder advisory groups, elected officials, and approximately 120 area churches. The first newsletter included the open house announcement, and a postcard was sent as an email-broadcast. The website's home page and Facebook page also featured event announcements. Radio advertisements ran on WMAY, WTAX, WFMB, and WUIS along with newspaper ads in The Illinois Times, Springfield Business Journal, Capital City Courier and Pure News. A press advisory was distributed to local media contacts and generated an interview on WMAY the day before the open house and an article in The State Journal-Register the day of the meeting. The four kiosks displayed open house flyers and were at Memorial Medical Center, Prairie Capital Convention Center, the city's Municipal Building, and the Lincoln Library. Additionally, door hangers were distributed to residences immediately adjacent to the three rail corridors.

At the first open house, participants learned about the project's purpose and need, technical activities and engagement process as well as shared their community values and context, concerns, and desires with the project team. To capture public input, the attendees were asked to complete a comment form and to visit a public input station where they could post their thoughts about the project for all to see. A total of 108 comment forms were completed. Respondents, 86 percent of whom were city residents, indicated that they found the open house to be well planned and worth their time. In addition, they characterized the project team as informative, helpful, and prepared.

On the comment form's two open-ended questions, respondents were able to share a wide range of perspectives. The first question asked what would make the project a success. Ninety-one people answered this question and stated in order of preference (with the last two bullets tied):

- Routing Springfield's rail (freight) traffic out of town,
- Conducting the study in a fair and neutral manner,
- Informing the community of the project's activities and findings, and
- Locating rail traffic along the city's eastern corridors.

The second open-ended query simply asked for any additional comments or questions. Fifty-four people shared their insights, with most focusing on:

- Concerns about noise and vibration impacts,
- Appreciation for the project team's community involvement efforts,
- Suggestions for keeping the public informed,
- A desire to move rail (freight) traffic out of town, and
- Concerns about public safety.

Many open house attendees not only completed comment forms, but also visited the public input station to answer questions about their project concerns, desires, and values. Because some participants had strong affiliations with the 3rd Street, 10th Street or 19th Street railroad corridors, they were encouraged to direct their responses to the corridors they cared about most. They were also given an option of answering more broadly, which involved providing responses that focused on the city as a whole.

One hundred eighty-six responses were received to the first question posed at the public input station, which was, "What concerns do you have about increasing rail traffic near where you live, work, and play?" The top five areas of concern overall were:

- Compromised public safety,
- Damaging noise and vibration impacts,
- Traffic delays,
- Negative effects on the local economy, and
- Increased neighborhood division and destruction.

The second question asked people to articulate their desires for railroad corridor and neighborhood improvement. A total of 200 responses were given with the top four improvement desires being:

- Spur economic development,
- Route train (freight) traffic outside of town,
- Increase green space and recreation options along the impacted corridors/neighborhoods, and
- Improve traffic flow.

The last question addressed by open house attendees was on how to best accommodate increasing rail traffic and what values should be used in making an alternative recommendation. Respondents posted 171 comments, which revealed the most important values as:

- Doing what is best for Springfield's economy,
- Promoting public safety,
- Protecting and enhancing neighborhoods, and

- Improving traffic flow.

2. November 16, 2010 Open House

The second open house was held on Tuesday, November 16, 2010, and was attended by 309 citizens. The main purpose of this open house was to:

- Present the alternatives for accommodating increasing rail traffic;
- Share the evaluation factors in the alternative selection process; and
- Obtain public input on which alternative would best serve Springfield.

The open house was announced in the project's third newsletter and was mailed to approximately 2,800 people. Advisory group members were sent letters and an email message; flyers were mailed to elected officials; approximately 120 area churches were sent posters; and an announcement was sent to 500 people via an e-broadcast. The website and Facebook page were updated with an open house notice. Radios ads ran on WMAV, WTAX, WFMB, and WUIS. Newspaper ads were featured in The Illinois Times, Springfield Business Journal, and Capital City Courier. Flyers were made available on the project's kiosks, which were at the County Municipal Building, Springfield Art Association, Abundant Faith Christian Center, and Pilgrim Rest Missionary Baptist Church. Additionally, the Faith Coalition for the Common Good circulated an email to its 200 members; St. John's Hospital notified its 3,600 employees; and Memorial Medical Center included an announcement in its newsletter to 4,500 employees. Earned media included an article in The State Journal-Register and a radio interview with WTAX, both the day before the open house.

Attendees were encouraged to visit 12 display stations, three of which featured information on the proposed alternatives for accommodating rail traffic. The other stations featured project information; historic structures; noise and vibration; corridor redevelopment opportunities; land acquisition process; high-speed rail; non-viable alternatives; railroad safety; and public engagement. The alternative stations displayed descriptions, maps, and technical comparisons based on evaluation factors such as traffic delays, expected crash frequency, and estimated displacements. These three stations represented variations of the following alternatives:

- Double track 3rd Street;
- Shift 3rd Street rail traffic to 10th Street; and
- Shift 3rd Street and 19th Street rail traffic to 10th Street.

6.3.4.1 Comment Form Results

A total of 233 comment forms were received – 199 at the open house, 31 via the project's website, and three via mail and electronic mail.

Respondents were asked to select the alternative that they thought would best address Springfield's need to accommodate increasing rail traffic. With 220 responses to this question, approximately 47 percent of the respondents selected one of the two alternatives that involved shifting both 3rd Street and 19th Street rail traffic to 10th

Street. Forty-two percent selected one of two alternatives that involved shifting only 3rd Street to 10th Street; and the remaining respondents, 11 percent, favored one of three alternatives to double track 3rd Street.

The 220 responses to this question are organized in the Table 6-1:

Table 6-2. Public Response Summary - Alternative Which Best Addresses Accommodating Increasing Rail Traffic

Alternative	Number of respondents choosing the alternative	Percentage of respondents choosing the alternative
Alternative 3B: Shift 3 rd Street and 19 th Street tracks to 10 th Street corridor; fully grade separated; two new grade separations on 19 th Street corridor; Quiet zones along corridor; close six streets along 10 th Street.	53	24 percent
Alternative 3A: Shift 3 rd Street and 19 th Street tracks to 10 th Street corridor; five new grade separations on 10 th Street corridor; two new grade separations on 19 th Street corridor; Quiet zones along corridor; close four streets along 10 th Street.	50	23 percent
Alternative 2A: Shift 3 rd Street to 10 th Street; five new grade separations on 10 th Street corridor; two new grade separations on 19 th Street corridor; Quiet zones along all corridors; close four streets along 10 th Street.	50	23 percent
Alternative 2B: Shift 3 rd Street to 10 th Street; fully grade separate south of North Grand; two new grade separations on 19 th Street corridor; Quiet zones along all corridors; close six streets along 10 th Street.	43	19 percent
Alternative	Number of respondents choosing the alternative	Percentage of respondents choosing the alternative
Alternative 1B: Double Track 3 rd Street; seven new grade separations; Quiet zone along 3 rd Street corridor.	10	4 percent
Alternative 1A: Double Track 3 rd Street; no new grade separations; Quiet zone along 3 rd Street corridor.	8	4 percent
Alternative 1C: Double track 3 rd Street - seven new grade separations; five new grade separations on 10 th Street corridor; two new grade separations on 19 th Street corridor; Quiet zones along all corridors.	6	3 percent

Evaluation Factors

After selecting their top alternative, respondents were asked to choose the top three factors that they used in their decision-making. The available choices included the factors being considered in the alternative selection process. As indicated by the

comment forms, the top three factors were traffic delays, public safety, and corridor redevelopment (Table 6-3).

Table 6-3. Public Response Summary - Factors Considered in Alternative Selection

Factors considered in choosing an alternative	Total number of responses received
Traffic Delays	164
Public Safety	163
Corridor Redevelopment	101
Environmental Impacts	88
Displacements	82
Costs	76

The comment form also contained a section for respondents to add any additional comments about the alternatives or the factors used in the selection process. One hundred and sixteen, about half, of the submitted comment forms included remarks in this section.

Of those who completed this section, 40 percent used this opportunity to describe why Alternative 1, double tracking 3rd Street, was not the best choice. Citizens cited reasons that generally centered on the following:

- Negative impacts on the local economy, especially on the Medical District;
- Disruption to business operations and traffic flow in the downtown area; and
- Overall devastation to Springfield's downtown, including historical sites.

Another 16 percent of the comments revealed support for consolidating 3rd Street traffic to 10th Street (either Alternative 2 or 3) because it would create redevelopment and economic development opportunities, both along an abandoned 3rd Street and along an expanded 10th Street corridor; and it would improve traffic flow within and through the city.

There were several comments, approximately seven percent of the total provided in this section, which demonstrated concern for or opposition to consolidating rail onto the 10th Street corridor. Reasons cited include the following:

- Further division between the East Side and West Side of Springfield;
- Impacts on traffic flow and emergency medical access due to road closures; and
- Negative effects on Lanphier High School and the surrounding area.

Close to 10 percent of the comments focused on which factors to consider in the selection process. Respondents mentioned displacements, corridor redevelopment, vibration and noise, public safety, tourism, people with disabilities, a minimal number of overpasses/underpasses, and long-term planning for Springfield. The remaining comments ranged from suggestions on re-routing the rail corridor out of Springfield or completely underground, to remarks on high-speed rail.

6.3.5 Springfield Public Hearing

The Public Hearing for the Tier 2 Springfield Rail Improvements Project was held on August 15, 2012, from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the Abraham Lincoln Hotel and Conference Center in Springfield, Illinois. The Public Hearing documentation including: the Notice of Availability; local newspaper advertisements; newsletter; Springfield Public Hearing sign-in sheets; the informational boards displayed at the Hearing; and the comment disposition table for public comments received at the Public Hearing, can be found in Appendix F. The comment disposition table in Appendix F also includes responses to comments received during the Draft EIS comment period.

A total of 224 people signed in at the Springfield public hearing. Of those attending, 193 filled out a comment form. More than two-thirds of the respondents were residents, followed by frequent travelers, business owners, and non-residential adjacent property owners. Most comment form responders learned about the public hearing through “word of mouth,” closely followed by newspaper ads, and media outlets. The media outlets included, newspaper articles, particularly in the State Journal-Register in Springfield, radio, and television.

The majority of comments about all of the retained alternatives related to traveling through Springfield. The overwhelming majority of respondents support the 10th Street alternative, which would shift Union Pacific freight trains and Amtrak passenger trains from 3rd Street to 10th Street, and abandoning the 3rd Street corridor from near Ridgely Avenue to south of Iles Avenue. Several people submitted prepared letters and/or signed letters, totaling more than 30, with the same text on each one. In the letters, they “applaud IDOT’s recommendation” and believe Alternative 2A, the 10th Street corridor, is in the best interest of Springfield because it will make their community “safer, better connected, and more prosperous.”

There were several additional comments about the hearings themselves, with several respondents mentioning that they were worthwhile. Instead of commenting on the retained alternatives a few respondents mentioned the need for high-speed rail.

Of about 450 comments received from the public during the Draft EIS public comment period and the Public Hearing, only about 2 percent of commenters opposed the project and/or the preferred alternative. These comments focused on maintaining passenger rail service on 3rd Street and moving 3rd Street freight trains to 10th Street. Other comments suggested that the project is a waste of tax dollars, or the train traffic in Springfield should be moved outside of the city limits. These comments include Comment Numbers

– OC24, OC73, OC78 and OC81; and SPI1, SPI21, SPI22, and SPI 161. These comments are located in Appendix F.

6.3.6 Comments on the Tier 2 Draft EIS

The Notice of Availability for the Tier 2 Draft EIS was published in the Federal Register on June 29, 2012. The public comment period was 45 days thereafter, and closed on August 20, 2012.

Comments during this public review period of the Tier 2 Draft EIS were received from the parties listed below. Responses to these comments are organized by topic and presented in Appendix F.

Atteberry, Gregory	Hoda, Pat - HieroGraphix Production, Inc.
Barber, Charlie	Hinckley, Pam
Bland, Jeff	Steiner, Jill
Cahnman, Sam - Alderman, Ward 5	Wise, Cheryl - GIS Solutions, Inc.
Casey, Roxanne	Engelhart, Marla - Lincoln Tower Apartments
Dennison, Jeffrey	England, Kevin
Ferry, Bruce	Curtis, Ed - Memorial Health System
Fulgenzi, Jeff	Williams, Robert - Springfield Police Department
Heideman, Shelly	Isringhausen, Geoff - Isringhausen Imports, Inc.
Jordan, Leroy	Hearring, Liz
Joyce, Kathy	Anderson, Owen and Karen
McEvoy, Aaron	Fustin, Ken - Springfield Fire Department
McFarland, Scott - District 186 School Board	O'Shea, Paul - City of Springfield Office of Planning and Economic Development
Morris, Gus	Rogers, Glen D.
Myers, Steve	Schisler, Lori
Poskin, Polly - President, Harvard Park Neighborhood Assoc.	Whalen, Sharon
Raybien, Corey	Feipel, Sheila - AmeriCALL Communications
Sale, Dan - Capital Area Association of Realtors	Kriel, Jack
Traeger, Sr. Mary Jean	Mehl, Fredric and Cynthia
Vinson, Larry	Oxtoby, Caroline
Darling, Philip - MWH SR Member	Scheuermann, Cal
Decker, Ronald	Stephens, Donn
Bringuet, Dennis - Ace Sign Co.	Rogers, Glen & Betty
Peters, James - Coldwell Banker Commercial	Tucker, Gary
McNeese, Wes	Miller, Lynn
Jacobson, Jerry - Save Old Springfield	Ernst, Donald
Radwine, David - Sangamo Club	
Arnberger, Kevin - CK Dairy Dreams	
Piland, Marilyn	

Higginbotham, Michelle - Coldwell Banker
 Commercial Devonshire Realty
 Phillips, Tim
 Truax, Paul
 Bastas, Bob and Yolanda
 Terry, Sue
 Knox, Judy
 Randolph, Roger
 Manes, Jim
 Stewart, Steve
 Woomer, Anne
 Ahlers, Gaye
 Shufeldt, Warren & Gabrielle
 Hodel, Ross
 Mitchell, Harry
 Ernst, Lisa - The Real Estate Group
 Sables, Jan
 Mapes, Tim - Speaker Michael J. Madigan's
 Office
 Sale, Daniel - Capital Area Association of
 REALTORS
 Sewell, Kirk
 Dirksen , Julie A.
 Malany, Lee - Advisory Council, Rotarian
 Disaster Assistance Agency
 Krager, Don - Bank & Trust Company
 Knight-Anderson, Ruth - Near South
 Neighborhood Association
 Cavanagh, Tom - Sangamon County
 Treasurer and Capital Township Supervisor
 Chiles, Phil
 Johnson, Sharon
 Collins, Josh
 Bailey, Craig
 Koller, Carol
 Lauder, Winifred
 Van Fossan, Eloise and Donald
 Jones, Linda
 Peters, James
 Zahn, Michael D. - International Union of
 Operating Engineers Local 965
 Antonacci, Gianni and Sarah

Roulson, Lee & Sandra
 Barker, J. Michael - Springfield Electric
 Supply Company
 Stephens, Judy and Harvey
 Sumner, Martha
 Chronister, Linda
 Chronister, Grady
 Singleton, James and Mary Anne
 Simpson, Nancy & Bill
 Dimond, Richard
 Metz, Elfi
 Kelsheimer, Judith A.
 Logue, Anne
 Donels , Bill and Sue
 Rogers, Barbara
 Collins, Paula
 Morrison, Mary
 Harnish, Rick
 Cook, Emil
 Stephens, Mary Beth
 O'Brien, Thomas
 Whiston, Brian - Crawford, Murphy & Tilly
 Inc.
 Van Meter, Andy - Sangamon County Board
 Office
 Goleman, Andy - Sangamon County Board
 Office
 Fulgenzi, John - Sangamon County Board
 Office
 Sausaman, Daniel - Sangamon County
 Board Office
 Ratts, Jason - Sangamon County Board
 Office
 Forysth, Abe - Sangamon County Board
 Office
 Mendenhall, David - Sangamon County
 Board Office
 Boyster, Chris - Sangamon County Board
 Office
 Musgrave, Sarah - Sangamon County Board
 Office
 O'Neill, John - Sangamon County Board
 Office

Krell, Tim - Sangamon County Board Office
 Briggity, Kimberly - Sangamon County Board Office
 Davsko, Sue - Sangamon County Board Office
 Smith, Todd - Sangamon County Board Office
 Ridgeway, Ann
 Barnes, Sondra
 Mueller, Mark
 Levalley, John
 Reynolds, Will
 Rayburn, Corey
 Grady, Pat - Democrat Precinct Committee Person-Member of Hanson Rail Study Group/Springfield South Corridor Neighborhood Association
 Isringhausen, Jennifer - Isringhausen Imports
 Fulgenzi, Linda - Sangamon County Board Office
 Montalbano, Sam - Sangamon County Board Office
 Ruzic, Rose - Sangamon County Board Office
 Sam, Snell
 Bunch, Clyde - Sangamon County Board Office
 Good, Jim - Sangamon County Board Office
 Hall, Craig - Sangamon County Board Office
 Stumpf, Greg - Sangamon County Board Office
 Moore, Tim - Sangamon County Board Office
 Logue, Anne
 Halstead, Janet - Frank Lloyd Wright Building Conservancy
 Drum, Nicholas
 Farmer, Michael - City of Springfield Office of Planning and Economic Development
 Barker, Robert - Barker Real Estate
 McMenemy, Joe - City of Springfield
 Castir, Mike - Isringhausen Imports

Carver, Michael
 Heimlich, Charles
 Sanderson Jr., Richie
 Aiello, Joe
 Grieser, Dale
 Stratton, Nicholas
 Brissenden, Phyllis
 Corkery, Richard
 Dresch, Tim
 Hamle, Mike
 Arnold, Kenel
 Farrell, Jennifer
 Hannah, LaVerne
 Turner, A.
 Langfelder, Josh - Sangamon County Recorder
 Bilyu, Bruce
 Compton, Janet
 McConley, Donald
 Thornton, Robert
 Lewis, Tom
 Hichinon, Mona
 Pratt, Casey
 Davis, Brian
 Johnson, David
 Zahn, Timothy C.
 Freitag, Beverly
 Randall, David
 Stratton, Charlie
 Foster, Kevin
 Schackman, Bill
 Smith, Timothy B. - The Dana - Thomas House Foundation
 Butt, David - Sangamon County OEM
 Roney, Wayne
 Clark, Mechill
 Ledage, Lynn
 Jackson, Kimberly
 Tornatore, Gregory
 Mahoney, Ed - RE/MAX Professionals
 Schmit, John and Patricia
 Warren, Brad

Stone, Jim - Sangamon County Department
of Public Health
Spear, Bethany
Augspurger, Pat
Lucas , David
Mendenhall, Carole
Maier, Linda - The Real Estate Firm, Inc.
Pittman, Julie
Zang, Jean E.
Roderick, Donna
Hamende, William
Moore, Terry
Boedigheimer, Janette
Robisch, Lou
Berns, Molly
Reed, Kelly
Magmuso, Jay C.
Goulet, Joe
Pearson, Tracy
Lindsey, Christine
Watts, Mary Beth
Elston, Cassie
Rice, Fatina
Huber, Mary
Bosie, Annette
Grady, Pat - Springfield South Corridor
Neighborhood Association
Wilday, Jeffery - Downtown Springfield,
Inc.
Rahn, Douglas - Memorial Medical Center
Harnish, Zach
Logan, Wills
Maholland, Marlene
Kushak , Marilyn A. - Mid-West Family
Broadcasting
Hasara , Karen
Haines , Nancy
Brake , Teri
Barber, Nancy
Augspurger, Don
Sims, Norman - SSCRPC
Goldin, Dave

Rygh, Tom
Goodrow, Richard
Carr, Dennis
Kudlacik, Harriet
Back, William
Barshis, Jan
Roach, John
Egan, Sally
LeBeau, Jon
Warner, Timothy
Shelton, James
Hart, Robert
Israel, Robert
Ebbinghouse, Aaron
Zabaly, Nicholas
Simmons, Hillery
Lyons, Joe
Holman-Gomez, Brent
Shinners, Karen
Fisher, Andrew - Website Designer
Kriston, Ira
Olson, Layton
McCarter, Daniel
Schaaf, Kevin
Weaver, Barry
Self, Charles
Kaplan, David
Weese Young, Shirley
Thompson, Jim
Christensen, Colleen
Mier, Charles
Johnson, David
Ryckbost, Paul
Hein, Chris
Ratliff, Jerry
Woodard, Gwen
Tomzik, David
Miofsky, Christopher
LaPorte, Cinthia
Michael, Dave
Guenther, Erich

Soenson, Leland
Wedra, Art
Hutchison, Bill
Houston, J. Michael - Office of the Mayor
Dixon, Louis H.
Morrison, Mary
Morrison, Steve
Wilhite, Ann
Riffey, Darrell & Sharon
Allen, John
Groves, Linda
Schober, Albert & Barbara
Jobe, Cory M. - City of Springfield Ward 6
Stuart, Robert A. - Brown, Hay and
Stephens
Squires, Frank - Springfield Mass Transit
District
Buscher, Mike - The Real Estate Group
Musso, Todd - Capital Area Association of
Realtors
Hansen, Eric - SSRPC
Higginbotham, Todd A.
Combs, Steve - Enos Park, I.C.O.N Coalition

Wallace, Char
Russell, Lou Ann
Boer, Michael - Mid-Illinois Medical District
Isringhausen, Luke - Isringhausen
Koch, Susan - University of Illinois at
Springfield
Dorsey, Kevin J. - SIU School of Medicine
Shepherd, Michael
Sandstrom, Steward - The Greater
Springfield Chamber of Commerce
Langfelder, James - City of Springfield
Alonzo, Loretta - Illinois Association of
Realtors
Wheeland, Linda - Springfield Area
Transportation Study
Goodmen, Joseph
Brake, Gloria
Illinois Commerce Commission
United States Environmental Protection
Agency
Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
Harris, Jeff – Norfolk Southern