

4.5 Land Use

Section 4.5.1 presents the methodology SEA used to determine potential effects on land use from the Proposed Action for both the planned operational changes and associated construction. A discussion of the No-Action Alternative follows in Section 4.5.2. Section 4.5.3 details the potential effects from the Proposed Action by category: land use patterns and plans, development trends, zoning regulations, prime farmland, and public lands. The potential effects on schools are addressed in Section 4.6, Socioeconomics.

The following is a summary of the analysis and findings presented in this section:

- SEA thoroughly analyzed potential effects on land use patterns and plans, development trends, zoning, public lands, and prime farmland.
- The increase in freight rail traffic on the EJ&E rail line would not be consistent with the Barrington Area County of Governments' (BACOG) plan for the rail line, which is to provide multimodal transportation, including commuter services for its residents. However, the Proposed Action would not directly change any existing land uses or prevent BACOG from managing future land uses as specified in BACOG's *Comprehensive Plan* (BACOG 1998). [Section 4.5.3.1]
- The proposed double track segments would not affect current land use patterns and would be consistent with existing land use plans and current zoning.
- Some connections would require the acquisition of open space, other protected land, or residential property, and thus would affect land use patterns and could be inconsistent with existing zoning. These connections are: Munger Alternative – Original Proposal, Munger Alternative – UP Connection, Munger Alternative – Northwest Quadrant, Proposed Matteson Connection, and Matteson Alternative – Northeast and Southwest Quadrants. [Section 4.5.4.1 - .5]
- The proposed increase in rail traffic along the EJ&E rail line due to the Proposed Action would cause increased proximity effects on public lands adjacent to the line, affecting 15 forest preserves, natural areas, and sensitive habitat areas. [Section 4.5.3.2] Increased noise and at-grade crossing delays associated with the Proposed Action would also affect 14 trails, greenways, and scenic corridors; 23 local parks; and 4 Land and Water Conservation Fund properties, all of which are adjacent to the rail line. [Sections 4.5.3.3 -.5] The Pratt's Wayne Woods Forest Preserve and the Brewster Creek Fen and Nature Preserve would be directly affected by some of the proposed Munger connection alternatives. [Section 4.5.4.7] Because of the proximity of the proposed connections and double track, 11 trails, greenways, and scenic corridors and 10 local parks would be affected. [Section 4.5.4.8 and .9] No Land and Water Conservation Fund properties would be directly encroached on by the planned construction. The Griffith, Ivanhoe, and Kirk Yard connections would be subject to the requirements of the Coastal Zone Management Act and the Indiana Lake Michigan Coastal Program. [Sections 4.5.4.10 and .11]
- Neither the Proposed Action nor any of the associated construction activities, including alternatives, would permanently affect prime farmland. [Section 4.5.4.6]

4.5.1 Methodology

This section addresses the methodology SEA used to identify potential effects on land use from the Proposed Action and associated construction. SEA's method for identifying and evaluating effects on land use focused on the following data sources and land use aspects:

- Local land use planning departments and comprehensive plans. SEA:
 - Identified land use patterns from existing and future land use plans.
 - Reviewed comprehensive plans to determine if the Proposed Action or associated construction would be consistent with local land use plans and zoning, or if it would substantially alter existing local character or land uses.
 - Evaluated potential effects on identified revitalization areas and areas of planned development.
- NRCS prime farmland database. SEA reviewed the database to determine if the Proposed Action or associated construction would affect prime farmlands.
- Federal, state, and local public lands databases. SEA identified resource rich areas, natural areas, nature and forest preserves, state and local parks, land and water reserves, national historic landmarks, and Land & Water Conservation Fund sites and evaluated these public lands for potential effects based on their location relative to the EJ&E rail line.
- Coastal management zone data. SEA identified the Coastal Management Area boundary and its relation to the proposed construction sites. If the construction sites were within a Coastal Management Area, then the Applicants initiated coordination with Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IN DNR).

SEA determined potential adverse effects due to the Proposed Action based on the physical footprint of the construction sites.

Proximity effects, such as increased noise and changes in access, were also determined for public lands. For evaluating the Proposed Action and associated construction, SEA defined land uses or zoning classifications with similar intensities as consistent with one another. For the purposes of this analysis, SEA considers the general intensity and effects on adjacent parcels from industrial and commercial land uses to be similar to the intensity and effects from transportation and utility uses. For example, construction of a new connection would be consistent with industrial or commercial land uses.

4.5.2 No-Action Alternative

Under the No-Action Alternative, the proposed connections and double track would not be constructed; nor would changes in rail operations under the Operating Plan occur. The No-Action Alternative would maintain existing land uses, and would not require the acquisition of new ROW. Current development patterns and trends would continue, and any changes would be based on market forces and local plans. Therefore, the No-Action Alternative would not affect land use, development patterns, zoning, prime farmlands, or public lands.

4.5.3 Proposed Action

4.5.3.1 Proposed Changes in Rail Line Operations

The Applicants would shift freight train traffic from CN subdivisions to the EJ&E rail line. Changes in rail operations and the expected increase in train traffic on the EJ&E rail line would require some construction or acquisition of new ROW. The Proposed Action would not directly affect prime

farmland or general development patterns. In some cases, current or future land use in specific areas could be affected.

Specifically, one of the issues frequently mentioned by the public is that the Proposed Action, specifically the proposed increase in freight rail traffic on EJ&E rail line segments, would not be consistent with their understanding of the future use of the EJ&E corridor for such things as the commuter STAR Line proposed by Metra (see Section 4.1, Rail Operations, for further reference).

The increase in train traffic on the EJ&E rail line would also contribute to proximity effects on adjacent public lands, trails, and parks. Proximity effects are typically adverse increases in ambient noise levels or delays at points of access or at-grade crossings. Noise effects are discussed in Section 4.10; delays are discussed in Section 4.3.2; and Sections 4.5.3.2 through 4.5.3.5 present discussions of proximity impacts on public lands, trails, and parks.

Although no direct effects on land uses adjacent to the CN rail lines would result from decreased train traffic volumes, minor, beneficial proximity effects would be expected on public lands adjacent to the rail lines. Beneficial proximity effects would result from decreased ambient noise levels and fewer delays at points of access or at-grade crossings.

Consistency with Existing Land Use Plans

SEA analyzed the consistency of the proposed changes in rail operations with available and approved land use plans of local municipalities, as listed in Table 3.5-1, Municipalities and Communities Along the EJ&E Rail Line, that have authority to plan for the areas adjacent to the EJ&E rail line and construction sites. None of the existing or future land use plans reviewed assumes that the EJ&E rail corridor would be removed. Region-wide transportation plans by the State of Illinois, City of Chicago, the rail industry, and Metra have been developed to upgrade and improve the Chicago region's rail transportation network to improve current freight mobility needs and plan for anticipated growth in the future; therefore, the proposed improvements are consistent with this larger region-wide transportation plan (MPC 2004). The EJ&E rail line ROW contains an active rail corridor that has been historically used for freight. The continued use of the EJ&E rail corridor under the Proposed Action would be consistent with the way the rail corridor is shown on the existing and future land use plans.

Public Lands

SEA evaluated public lands in the Study Area, including forest preserves, nature preserves, resource rich and protected areas, land and water reserves, Land and Water Conservation Fund properties, and local parks to determine potential effects of the increase in daily rail traffic along the EJ&E rail line. No state parks or state fish and wildlife areas are located within the Study Area. Section 3.5.5 presents a list of the public lands in the Study Area, including location and ownership data.

The increase in rail traffic on the EJ&E rail line would contribute to proximity effects, such as increased noise, on adjacent public lands. Table 4.5-1 lists the public lands that would be affected by the Proposed Action, grouped by county. The Proposed Action would not affect public lands in Indiana.

| Table 4.5-1. Public Lands Adjacent to the EJ&E Rail Line Potentially Affected by the Proposed Action | | | | |
|---|--|----------------------------|----------------|---|
| County (State) | Name | Type of Public Land | Segment | Proposed Train Traffic Change (trains per day) |
| Lake (Illinois) | Cuba Marsh Forest Preserve | Forest preserve | EJ&E-14C | 15.0 |
| | Cuba Marsh Natural Area | Natural area | EJ&E-14C | 15.0 |
| Cook (Illinois) | Spring Creek Valley Forest Preserve | Forest preserve | EJ&E-14D | 15.0 |
| | Shoe Factory Woods Forest Preserve | Forest preserve | EJ&E-14D | 15.0 |
| | Sauk Trail Woods Forest Preserve | Forest preserve | EJ&E-5A | 24.0 |
| | Indian Hill Woods Forest Preserve | Forest preserve | EJ&E-5A | 24.0 |
| | Shoe Factory Road Prairie Nature Preserve | Nature preserve | EJ&E-14D | 15.0 |
| DuPage (Illinois) | Pratt's Wayne Woods Forest Preserve | Forest preserve | EJ&E-12 | 19.0 |
| | West Chicago Prairie Forest Preserve | Forest preserve | EJ&E-12 | 19.0 |
| | Fermilab | Natural area | EJ&E-11 | 20.9 |
| | Truitt-Hoff Nature Preserve | Nature preserve | EJ&E-12 | 19.0 |
| Will (Illinois) | Lake Renwick Forest Preserve | Forest preserve | EJ&E-9B | 23.8 |
| | Lake Renwick Heron Rookery Nature Preserve | Nature preserve | EJ&E-9B | 23.8 |
| | Lake Renwick East Land and Water Reserve | Land and water reserve | EJ&E-9B | 23.8 |
| | Des Plaines River Resource Rich Area | Resource rich area | EJ&E-8A | 23.8 |

Potentially Affected Trails, Greenways, and Scenic Corridors

SEA evaluated existing and proposed trails, greenways, and scenic corridors within the Study Area, to determine potential effects of the increase in daily rail traffic along the EJ&E rail line. Section 3.5.6 presents tables of the trails, greenways, and scenic corridors in the Study Area, including location and ownership data.

In the evaluation of the Proposed Action, SEA included proximity effects from increases in train traffic along each of the EJ&E rail line segments. Proposed facilities, including greenways and trails, are evaluated for proximity effects in Section 4.5.4.8. Table 4.5-2 lists the potentially affected existing trails, greenways, and scenic corridors, grouped by county.

Table 4.5-2. Existing Trails, Greenways, and Scenic Corridors Potentially Affected by the Proposed Action

| County (State) | Trail/Greenway/Scenic Corridor | Segment(s) | Proposed Train Traffic Change (trains per day) |
|-------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Lake (Illinois) | Cuba Marsh to Deer Grove Corridor | EJ&E-14C | 15.0 |
| | Gilmer Road Scenic Corridor | EJ&E-14B and EJ&E-14C | 15.0 |
| Cook (Illinois) | Old Plank Road Trail | EJ&E-6 | 23.0 |
| | Thorn Creek Corridor | EJ&E-6 | 23.0 |
| DuPage (Illinois) | Illinois Prairie Path-Elgin Branch | EJ&E-12 | 19.0 |
| | Margaret Pearson Interpretive Trail | EJ&E-11 | 20.9 |
| | Illinois Prairie Path-Geneva Spur | EJ&E-11 | 20.9 |
| | Illinois Prairie Path-Batavia Spur | EJ&E-11 | 20.9 |
| Will (Illinois) | Illinois Prairie Path-Aurora Branch | EJ&E-11 | 20.9 |
| | I & M Canal Trail | EJ&E-8A | 23.8 |
| Lake (Indiana) | Erie Lackawanna/ Veterans Memorial Trail | EJ&E-4 | 21.0 |
| | Little Calumet River Trail Corridor | EJ&E-4 | 21.0 |
| | Grand Calumet River/Marquette Trail Corridor | EJ&E-2 | 20.0 |
| | Marquette Corridor | EJ&E-1 | 20.0 |

Potentially Affected Local Parks

SEA considered the potential effects on local parks that are adjacent to the EJ&E rail line without any streets separating the two. In its evaluation of the Proposed Action, SEA included proximity effects from increases in train traffic along each of the EJ&E rail line segments.

The local parks adjacent to the EJ&E rail line are listed in Table 4.5-3, grouped by county.

| Table 4.5-3. Local Parks Potentially Affected by the Proposed Action | | | |
|---|---|----------------|---|
| County | Park Name | Segment | Proposed Train Traffic Change (trains per day) |
| Lake (Illinois) | Hawthorn Woods Community Park | EJ&E-14C | 15.0 |
| | Lions Park | EJ&E-14C | 15.0 |
| | Citizens Park | EJ&E-14C | 15.0 |
| | Langendorf Park | EJ&E-14C | 15.0 |
| Cook (Illinois) | Algonquin Park | EJ&E-6 | 23.0 |
| | Euclid Park | EJ&E-6 | 23.0 |
| | Petraca Park | EJ&E-5A | 24.0 |
| DuPage (Illinois) | Reed Park | EJ&E-12 | 19.0 |
| | Pioneer Park | EJ&E-11 | 20.9 |
| | Summer Lakes Park | EJ&E-11 | 20.9 |
| | Frontenac Park | EJ&E-10A | 23.8 |
| | Clearwood Park | EJ&E-10A | 23.8 |
| | Andover Park | EJ&E-10A | 23.8 |
| DuPage (Illinois) | Middlebury East Park | EJ&E-10A | 23.8 |
| | Waubensee Creek Park | EJ&E-10A | 23.8 |
| | South Spring Lake | EJ&E-10A | 23.8 |
| | Oakhurst Wetlands | EJ&E-10A | 23.8 |
| Will (Illinois) | King's Crossing | EJ&E-10E | 23.8 |
| | Future Park (Under Development) | EJ&E-10E | 23.8 |
| | Ron Rob Field | EJ&E-7B | 21.9 |
| Lake (Indiana) | Griffith Historical Park and Depot Museum | EJ&E -4 | 21.0 |
| | Tot Park-Griffith | EJ&E-4 | 21.0 |
| | Seberger Park | EJ&E-3 | 20.0 |

Potentially Affected Land and Water Conservation Fund Properties

SEA researched grants under Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act for each property. SEA considered a property to be protected by Section 6(f) if the grant was used for the portion of the property adjacent to the EJ&E rail line. Section 6(f) properties adjacent to rail line segments where train traffic is not projected to increase are not listed.

Several Section 6(f) properties within Illinois are adjacent to the EJ&E rail line where the trains are projected to increase on a daily basis. SEA did not identify any Section 6(f) properties adjacent to the EJ&E rail line in Indiana. The Proposed Action would not require the acquisition of any Section 6(f) properties, but increased train traffic on the EJ&E rail line could cause proximity effects such as changes in noise, vibration, or access to Section 6(f) properties. Increases in daily train traffic on the EJ&E rail line would adversely affect the ambient noise at these properties; Section 4.10 addresses noise and vibration effects from the Proposed Action. While these effects would not trigger provision of replacement lands, the Applicants will be required by the property owner or entity with jurisdiction over the property to maintain access to all public lands. Table 4.5-4 presents these potentially affected Section 6(f) properties.

Table 4.5-4. Land and Water Conservation Fund Properties Potentially Affected by the Proposed Action

| County (State) | Section 6(f) Property | Segment | Potential Proximity Effect |
|-------------------|---|----------|----------------------------|
| Cook (Illinois) | Spring Lake Nature Preserve | EJ&E-14D | +15.0 trains daily |
| DuPage (Illinois) | Summerlakes Park | EJ&E-11 | +20.9 trains daily |
| | West Chicago Nature Preserve | EJ&E-12 | +19.0 trains daily |
| Will (Illinois) | Lake Renwick Heron Rookery Forest and Nature Preserve | EJ&E-9B | +23.8 trains daily |

Source: National Park Service (2008a), "Project List by County and Summary Reports," *Land and Water Conservation Fund*, retrieved on March 26, 2008, <http://waso-lwcf.nrc.nps.gov/public/index.cfm>.

4.5.3.2 Proposed New Constructions

Table 4.5-5 provides a summary of the proposed connections and double track improvements, listed counterclockwise around the EJ&E arc.

Table 4.5-5. Proposed Connections and Double Track Improvements

| Construction Site | Construction Alternatives | Location | Communities |
|---|--|---|--|
| Leithon Double Track | 1 Alternative | South of Allanson Road in Mundelein | Mundelein, IL |
| Diamond Lake Road to Gilmer Road Double Track | 1 Alternative | East of Diamond Lake Road in Mundelein to Gilmer Road in Long Grove | Mundelein, IL Hawthorn Woods, IL Long Grove, IL |
| Munger Connection | 5 Alternatives: 1) No-Build at Munger 2) Proposed Munger Connection 3) Munger Alternative-Original Proposal 4) Munger Alternative-UP Connection 5) Munger Alternative-Northwest Quadrant | Within Pratt's Wayne Woods Forest Preserve | Bartlett, IL Wayne, IL West Chicago, IL |
| East Siding to Walker Double Track | 1 Alternative | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> East Siding to West Wolf's Road segment (south of Liberty Street in Aurora to south of West Wolf's Crossing Road in Naperville) Normantown to Walker segment (north of 111th Street to south of Chapins Road/127th Street in Plainfield) | Aurora, IL Naperville, IL Plainfield, IL |
| Joliet Connection | 3 Alternatives: 1) No-Build at Joliet 2) Proposed Joliet Connection 3) Joliet Alternative-Original Proposal | West of South State Street/Lockport Road (IL 171) | Joliet, IL Lockport, IL |
| East Joliet to Frankfort Double Track | 1 Alternative | I-80 in Joliet to west of Wolf Road in Frankfort | Joliet, IL New Lenox, IL Frankfort, IL Mokena, IL |

| Table 4.5-5. Proposed Connections and Double Track Improvements | | | |
|--|---|---|---------------------------------|
| Construction Site | Construction Alternatives | Location | Communities |
| Matteson Connection | 4 Alternatives: 1) No-Build at Matteson 2) Proposed Matteson Connection 3) Matteson Alternative-Northeast and Southwest Quadrants 4) Matteson Alternative-Southwest Quadrant | East of Main Street | Matteson, IL Park Forest, IL |
| Griffith Connection | 2 Alternatives: 1) No-Build at Griffith 2) Proposed Griffith Connection | East of Broad Street | Griffith, IN |
| Ivanhoe Connection | 2 Alternatives: 1) No-Build at Ivanhoe 2) Proposed Ivanhoe Connection | South of 5 th Avenue (US 20) | Gary, IN |
| Kirk Yard Connection | 2 Alternatives: 1) No-Build at Kirk Yard 2) Proposed Kirk Yard Connection | Within Kirk Yard | Gary, IN |

Land Use Patterns

SEA collected data on land use patterns from municipal websites, plans, maps, agency correspondence, and site reconnaissance. SEA then compared local municipalities’ future land use plans around each construction site to existing land use and identified any planned changes. The effects on land use patterns near each of the construction sites are described below.

Leithton Double Track

As discussed in Section 3.5, Land Use, the land near the Leithton double track is used and planned for industrial, commercial, and transportation and utility uses. The land use within the existing EJ&E and CN ROW is categorized as transportation. Construction of the double track would require the Applicants to acquire approximately 0.22 acre of industrial property and 1.00 acre of vacant land. Approximately 0.35 acre of the vacant land is owned by ComEd. The ComEd property would either be acquired or an easement would be granted and the Applicants would relocate a power pole prior to construction. Because all construction would occur on vacant land and land identified for transportation and industrial uses, the proposed construction would not affect current land use patterns.

Diamond Lake Road to Gilmer Road Double Track

As discussed in Section 3.5, Land Use, the land near the Diamond Lake Road to Gilmer Road double track is used for residential and agriculture and is planned for residential uses and mixed-use development. The existing EJ&E ROW is categorized as a transportation and utility corridor. The Applicants would not acquire new ROW to construct this segment of double track. Because all construction would take place within existing EJ&E ROW, the proposed construction would not affect current land use patterns.

Munger Connection

SEA has evaluated four build alternatives in addition to the No-Build Alternative for the Munger connection. As discussed in Section 3.5, Land Use, the land around the Munger connection is used and planned for open space, recreation, and transportation and utility uses. The existing EJ&E and CN ROW are categorized as transportation and utility corridors. This construction site would be located within the boundary of the Pratt's Wayne Woods Forest Preserve, which is owned by the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County. SEA's analysis shows the following effects of the five alternatives:

- **No-Build at Munger.** Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would not affect land use patterns.
- **Proposed Munger Connection.** This alternative would occur primarily within the existing EJ&E ROW; however, the Applicants would also acquire approximately 0.80 acre of ComEd property to construct this connection, of which approximately 0.02 acre is on land designated as open space. The Applicants would need to acquire a total of 0.02 acre of open space and 1.41 acres of land designated for transportation to construct this connection. Because construction would occur on lands primarily identified for transportation and utility uses, this alternative would not affect land use patterns.
- **Munger Alternative–Original Proposal.** This alternative would occur primarily within the existing EJ&E ROW; however, the Applicants would also acquire approximately 0.69 acre of open space and use 1.72 acres of land designated for transportation to construct this connection. Because the Applicants would construct part of this connection (0.58 acre) on forest preserve property, this alternative would affect land use patterns.
- **Munger Alternative–UP Connection.** This alternative includes a new connection and a new crossover. The new crossover would be constructed within the EJ&E and UP ROWs and would not affect land use. Construction of the connection, however, would require acquisition of approximately 2.86 acres of open space land and 0.58 acres of residential land. This alternative, therefore, would affect land use patterns near the proposed connection.
- **Munger Alternative–Northwest Quadrant.** This alternative would occur within 2.42 acres of new ROW from the forest preserve and 0.76 acre of new ROW from ComEd. A total of 2.37 acres of open space land would be acquired to construct this connection. Therefore, this alternative would affect land use patterns.

East Siding to Walker Double Track

As discussed in Section 3.5, Land Use, a variety of planned land uses, including residential, commercial, industrial, utilities, and open space, surround the East Siding to West Wolf's Crossing Road segment (MP 17.2 to MP 16.1). The adjacent areas are mostly developed in a suburban development pattern. The existing EJ&E ROW is categorized as a transportation and utility corridor. The proposed double track would be constructed within existing EJ&E ROW; therefore, construction of the East Siding to West Wolf's Crossing Road double track segment would not affect land use patterns in the area.

The land surrounding the Normantown to Walker segment is more agricultural and rural than along the East Siding to West Wolfs Road segment. However, land use is transitioning from agricultural farmsteads to residential subdivisions. The existing EJ&E ROW is categorized as a transportation

and utility corridor. The proposed double track would be constructed within existing EJ&E ROW; therefore, construction of the Normantown to Walker double track segment would not affect land use patterns in the area.

Joliet Connection

The Applicants have proposed two alternatives for the Joliet connection. As discussed in Section 3.5, Land Use, the land surrounding the Joliet connection includes industrial and recreational land uses. The existing EJ&E and CN ROW are categorized as transportation and utility corridors. The effects of the three alternatives are:

- **No-Build at Joliet.** Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would not affect land use patterns.
- **Proposed Joliet Connection.** This alternative would occur primarily within the existing EJ&E ROW; however, the Applicants would also acquire approximately 1.12 acres of commercial land and 2.67 acres of vacant land (of which 2.66 acres are privately owned property). A segment of the I&M Canal Trail is adjacent to the new proposed ROW; however, the Applicants would be required to construct this alternative so that it would not affect the trail. Therefore, this alternative would affect land use, but not land use patterns. See Section 6.0 for proposed mitigation measures to protect the trail.
- **Joliet Alternative–Original Proposal.** This alternative would require the Applicants to acquire approximately 4.17 acres of commercial land to construct this connection. Because the Applicants would construct part of this connection on commercial land, this alternative would affect land use, but not land use patterns.

East Joliet to Frankfort Double Track

The land along East Joliet to Frankfort double track is developed at the western end. The remainder is largely transitioning from a rural agricultural landscape to residential, commercial, and industrial uses in a suburban development pattern. The proposed double track would be constructed within existing EJ&E ROW. Therefore, construction of the East Joliet to Frankfort double track would not affect land use patterns in the area.

Matteson Connection

SEA has identified three alternatives in addition to the No-Build Alternative for the Matteson connection. As discussed in Section 3.5, Land Use, the land surrounding the Matteson connection includes residential, commercial, light industrial, and transportation uses. The existing EJ&E and CN ROW are categorized as transportation and utility corridors. The effects from the four alternatives are:

- **No-Build at Matteson.** Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would not affect land use patterns.
- **Proposed Matteson Connection.** This alternative would occur primarily outside of the existing EJ&E and CN ROW. To construct this connection, the Applicants would acquire approximately 0.13 acre of residential property, 0.47 acre of industrial property, 0.52 acre of land designated for transportation use, 8.20 acres of vacant land, and 0.44 acre of open space. The acquired parcels would be permanently incorporated into a railroad facility. Because the Applicants would acquire new ROW from residential, vacant, and open space land, this alternative would affect land use patterns.

- **Matteson Alternative–Northeast and Southwest Quadrants.** This alternative would occur primarily outside of the existing EJ&E and CN ROW. To construct this connection, the Applicants would acquire approximately 0.78 acre of residential property, 2.35 acres of commercial property, 0.50 acre of industrial property; 0.16 acre of land designated for transportation use, and 2.30 acres of vacant land. The acquired parcels would be permanently incorporated into a railroad facility. Because the Applicants would acquire new ROW from residential and vacant land, this alternative would affect land use patterns.
- **Matteson Alternative–Southwest Quadrant.** This alternative would occur primarily within the existing EJ&E and CN ROW; however, the Applicants would acquire approximately 0.18 acre of vacant land to construct this connection. The acquired parcels would be permanently incorporated into a railroad facility. Because the Applicants would acquire new ROW from land use designated as vacant land, but zoned as industrial, this alternative would not affect land use patterns.

Griffith Connection

No-Build at Griffith. Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would not affect land use patterns.

Proposed Griffith Connection. As discussed in Section 3.5, Land Use, the land surrounding the Griffith connection includes residential, commercial, light industrial, and recreational uses. The existing EJ&E and CN ROW are categorized as transportation and utility corridors.

The majority of construction would occur within the existing EJ&E and CN ROW; however, the Applicants would acquire approximately 0.10 acre of commercial land and 3.25 acres of vacant land for this connection. This parcel of vacant land is a remnant parcel between the two rail lines that is zoned for industrial uses. Because all construction would occur on land uses identified as of similar intensities, the proposed construction would not affect current land use patterns.

Ivanhoe Connection

No-Build at Ivanhoe. Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would not affect land use patterns.

Proposed Ivanhoe Connection. As discussed in Section 3.5, Land Use, the land surrounding the Ivanhoe connection includes open space and light industrial uses. The existing EJ&E and CN ROW are categorized as transportation and utility corridors.

This alternative would occur primarily outside of the existing EJ&E and CN ROW. To construct this connection, the Applicants would acquire approximately 0.30 acres of commercial land and 2.91 acres of land designated as open space but zoned as manufacturing. Because the construction would occur primarily on land designated as open space which is zoned for manufacturing, the proposed construction would be primarily consistent with current land use patterns.

Kirk Yard Connection

No-Build at Kirk Yard. Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would not affect land use patterns.

Proposed Kirk Yard Connection. As discussed in Section 3.5, Land Use, this connection would be constructed along the NS tracks in Kirk Yard. Because all construction would occur within an

existing railroad facility and no new ROW would be acquired, the proposed construction would not affect current land use patterns.

Land Use Conversions

Some of the proposed connections would require the acquisition of new ROW. Table 4.5-6 presents the acreages and land use types that would be permanently converted and incorporated into a railroad facility (transportation land use).

| Table 4.5-6. Land Use Conversion Summary | | |
|--|--|--|
| Construction Site | Existing Land Uses (If Applicable) | Acres to be Converted to Railroad Use |
| Illinois | | |
| Leithton Double Track | Industrial Vacant | 0.22 1.00 |
| Diamond Lake Road to Gilmer Road Double Track | N/A | 0.00 |
| No-Build at Munger | N/A | 0.00 |
| Proposed Munger Connection | Open Space Transportation | 0.02 1.41 |
| Munger Alternative-Original Proposal | Open Space Transportation | 0.69 1.72 |
| Munger Alternative-UP Connection | Open Space Residential | 2.86 0.58 |
| Munger Alternative-Northwest Quadrant | Open Space Transportation | 2.37 0.81 |
| East Siding to Walker Double Track | N/A | 0.00 |
| No-Build at Joliet | N/A | 0.00 |
| Proposed Joliet Connection | Commercial & Services Vacant | 1.12 2.67 |
| Joliet Alternative-Original Proposal | Commercial & Services | 4.17 |
| East Joliet to Frankfort Double Track | N/A | 0.00 |
| No-Build at Matteson | N/A | 0.00 |
| Proposed Matteson Connection | Industrial Open Space Vacant Residential Transportation | 0.47 0.44 8.20 0.13 0.52 |
| Matteson Alternative-Northeast and Southwest Quadrants | Commercial & Services Industrial Vacant Residential Transportation | 2.35 0.50 2.30 0.78 0.16 |
| Matteson Alternative-Southwest Quadrant | Vacant | 0.18 |
| Indiana | | |
| No-Build at Griffith | N/A | 0.00 |
| Griffith Connection | Commercial & Services Vacant | 0.10 3.25 |
| No-Build at Ivanhoe | N/A | 0.00 |
| Ivanhoe Connection | Commercial & Services Open Space | 0.30 2.91 |

Table 4.5-6. Land Use Conversion Summary

| Construction Site | Existing Land Uses (If Applicable) | Acres to be Converted to Railroad Use |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| No-Build at Kirk Yard | N/A | 0.00 |
| Kirk Yard Connection | Transportation | 2.42 |

Development and Development Trends

Because the EJ&E rail line has been in existence for more than 120 years, the communities in the corridor have allowed the development of properties adjacent to the rail line for uses which have adapted to a freight rail line. Areas surrounding most of the construction sites are well-established, fully developed towns and communities with small isolated parcels of undeveloped land. In the southwest portion of the Study Area, existing rural, agricultural land uses adjacent to the EJ&E rail line are developing into residential and commercial areas in a suburban development pattern. Therefore, the proposed connections would not affect development and development trends. Also, since construction of the double track would not require any new ROW, these sites would not directly affect the development trends in their respective areas. The No-Build alternatives would not affect development and development trends because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur.

Consistency with Existing Land Use Plans

Leithton Double Track

The Leithton double track would be constructed within existing railway ROW and proposed ROW, some of which is to be acquired from ComEd. The existing land use of the ComEd parcel is a transportation and utility corridor. The remaining ROW to be acquired north of the curve along the CN rail line includes existing industrial and vacant lands. The land use for the proposed Leithton double track would be consistent with the current land use plans.

Diamond Lake Road to Gilmer Road Double Track

The Diamond Lake to Gilmer Road double track construction would remain within the existing EJ&E ROW, which is designated for transportation or utility uses. Therefore, this construction within the existing railway ROW would be consistent with the current land use plans.

Munger Connection

As discussed in Section 3.5, Land Use, the Munger Connection is located within the Pratt's Wayne Woods Forest Preserve; Bartlett has designated the forest preserve as an open space/recreation land use (Village of Bartlett 2004). A discussion of the consistency of each of the five alternatives with existing land use plans follows:

- **No-Build at Munger.** Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would be consistent with the existing land use plan.
- **Proposed Munger Connection.** This alternative would occur primarily within the existing EJ&E ROW; however, the Applicants would also acquire a portion of the ComEd property to construct this connection. The existing land use of the ComEd parcel is utility (Village of Bartlett 2004). Since construction of this alternative would occur on lands identified for transportation and utility uses, this alternative would be consistent with the existing land use plan.

- **Munger Alternative–Original Proposal.** This alternative would occur primarily within the existing EJ&E ROW; however, the Applicants would also acquire 0.58 acre of forest preserve property to construct this connection. Since the Applicants would construct part of this connection in a forest preserve designated as open space and recreation land uses, this alternative would not be consistent with the existing land use plan (Village of Bartlett 2004).
- **Munger Alternative–UP Connection.** This alternative includes a new connection and a new crossover. The area of the connection would be located in unincorporated Kane County and is zoned for farmland (Kane County 2007). The area of the crossover would be in West Chicago, with the land use designated as industrial and transportation or utility use (City of West Chicago 2006). The new crossover would occur on lands identified for uses of similar intensities; however, the new connection would occur on lands designated as agricultural. Therefore, this alternative would not be consistent with the existing land use plans.
- **Munger Alternative–Northwest Quadrant.** This alternative would occur primarily within the area of new ROW that the Applicants would have to acquire from the forest preserve. Because the Applicants would construct this connection alternative in a forest preserve designated for open space and recreation land uses, this alternative would not be consistent with the existing land use plan (Village of Bartlett 2004).

East Siding to Walker Double Track

The East Siding to Walker double track would remain within the existing EJ&E ROW, which is designated as transportation or utility land use. Therefore, this construction would be consistent with the land use plans for Aurora, Naperville, and Plainfield.

Joliet Connection

As discussed in Section 3.5, Land Use, the area around the proposed Joliet connection is not designated on Joliet's or Lockport's zoning maps. As verified in the field, the land east of the connection is currently being used for industrial and commercial businesses and the land west is either vacant, industrial, or part of the I&M Canal Trail System (City of Joliet 2005). Lockport classifies I&M Canal Trail System land as parks and conservation land. Lockport's Comprehensive Plan does not specify a land use for the actual construction site at the northeast quadrant.

A discussion of the consistency of each of the three alternatives with existing land use plans follows:

- **No-Build at Joliet.** Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would be consistent with the existing land use plans.
- **Proposed Joliet Connection.** This alternative would occur primarily within the existing EJ&E ROW; however, the Applicants would also acquire approximately 1.12 acres of commercial land and 2.67 acres of vacant land to construct this connection. Because the new ROW 1) is not currently within the planning area of Joliet or Lockport; 2) is designated as commercial land by CMAP; and 3) is currently being used for industrial purposes, this alternative would be consistent with existing land use.
- **Joliet Alternative–Original Proposal.** This alternative would require the Applicants to acquire approximately 4.17 acres of commercial land. Because the new ROW is not currently within the planning area of Joliet or Lockport, and the adjacent land uses are industrial, this alternative would be consistent with existing land use.

East Joliet to Frankfort Double Track

The East Joliet to Frankfort double track construction would remain within the existing EJ&E ROW, which is designated as transportation and utility land uses. Therefore, this construction would be consistent with the Joliet, New Lenox, and Frankfort land use plans.

Matteson Connection

SEA has identified three alternatives in addition to the No-Build Alternative for the Matteson connection. As discussed in Section 3.5, Land Use, the land use surrounding the Matteson connection includes residential, commercial, industrial, and transportation uses in Matteson and Park Forest (Village of Matteson 2005b; Village of Park Forest 2005). The existing EJ&E and CN ROW are categorized as transportation and utility corridors. A discussion of the consistency of each of the four alternatives with existing land use plans follows:

- **No-Build at Matteson.** Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would be consistent with the existing land use plan.
- **Proposed Matteson Connection.** This alternative would occur primarily outside of the existing EJ&E and CN ROW. To construct this connection, the Applicants would acquire approximately 0.13 acre of residential land, 0.47 acre of industrial land, 8.20 acres of vacant land, and 0.44 acre of open space land. Because the Applicants would acquire new ROW from areas designated as residential and open space land uses, this alternative would not be consistent with existing Matteson and Park Forest land use plans.
- **Matteson Alternative–Northeast and Southwest Quadrants.** This alternative would occur primarily outside of the existing EJ&E and CN ROW. To construct this connection, the Applicants would acquire approximately 2.35 acres of commercial land, 0.50 acre of industrial land, 2.30 acres of vacant land, and 0.78 acres of residential designated land use. Since the Applicants would acquire new ROW from areas designated as several types of land use other than transportation, this alternative would not be consistent with existing Matteson land use plans.
- **Matteson Alternative–Southwest Quadrant.** This alternative would occur primarily within the existing EJ&E and CN ROW; however, the Applicants would acquire approximately 0.18 acre of land designated by the *Matteson, Illinois, Amended Zoning Map* as service intensity land use to construct this connection (Village of Matteson 2005a). Matteson defines service intensity as accepting light industrial, heavy commercial and heavy service uses (Village of Matteson 1987). Because the relative intensities of service and the transportation corridor of the EJ&E rail line are similar, this alternative would be consistent with existing Matteson land use plans.

Griffith Connection.

- **No-Build at Griffith.** Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would be consistent with the existing land use plan.
- **Proposed Griffith Connection.** The majority of construction would occur within the existing EJ&E and CN ROW; however, the Applicants would acquire approximately 0.10 acre of commercial and 3.25 acres of vacant land for this connection. This parcel of vacant land is a remnant parcel between the two rail lines that is adjacent to areas with heavy industrial land use designations (Town of Griffith 2004). Because all construction

would occur primarily on lands with identified uses of similar intensities, the proposed construction would be consistent with Griffith's current land use plan.

Ivanhoe Connection

- **No-Build at Ivanhoe.** Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would be consistent with the existing land use plan.
- **Proposed Ivanhoe Connection.** Gary is in the process of revising its future land use and zoning maps; however, this area is currently a manufacturing land use (City of Gary 2008b). The Applicants would acquire new ROW to construct the proposed connection. Because all construction would occur on lands with identified uses of similar intensities, the proposed connection would be consistent with the existing land use plan.

Kirk Yard Connection

- **No-Build at Kirk Yard.** Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would be consistent with the existing land use plan.
- **Proposed Kirk Yard Connection.** This connection would occur at Kirk Yard between two adjacent rail lines with existing transportation land uses. Therefore, proposed connection would be consistent with the existing land use plan.

Consistency with Existing Zoning Regulations

Leithton Double Track

The majority of the Leithton double track would be constructed within transportation and utility zoning, including the new ROW that would be acquired from ComEd. For the portion of the new ROW within the municipal boundaries of Mundelein, this construction would be consistent with Mundelein's current zoning (Village of Mundelein 2008).

Diamond Lake Road to Gilmer Road Double Track

The Diamond Lake Road to Gilmer Road double track construction would remain within the existing EJ&E ROW. While the rail corridor is not specifically zoned in Mundelein, Hawthorn Woods, or Long Grove, the Lake County Land Use Plan designates the entire EJ&E rail corridor as transportation land use (Lake County, Illinois 2007c). Therefore, this construction within the existing ROW would be consistent with Lake County's current zoning.

Munger Connection

As discussed in Section 3.5, Land Use, the Munger connection is located within the Pratt's Wayne Woods Forest Preserve. Bartlett has zoned the portion north of the CN rail line as public lands (forest preserve (Village of Bartlett 2006). A discussion of the consistency of each of the five alternatives with existing zoning follows:

- **No-Build at Munger.** Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would be consistent with the existing zoning.
- **Proposed Munger Connection.** This alternative would occur primarily within the existing EJ&E ROW; however, the Applicants would also acquire approximately 0.80 acre of ComEd property to construct this connection. This alternative is not within the Bartlett zoning limits; therefore, this alternative would not affect current zoning.

- **Munger Alternative–Original Proposal.** This alternative would occur primarily within the existing EJ&E ROW; however, the Applicants would also acquire approximately 0.58 acre of forest preserve property to construct this connection. This alternative is not within the Bartlett zoning limits; therefore, this alternative would not affect current zoning.
- **Munger Alternative–UP Connection.** This alternative would involve a connection in unincorporated Kane County, immediately west of Wayne, and a crossover in West Chicago. The EJ&E and CN rail lines are designated as railroad corridors; however, the area around the connection in unincorporated Kane County is zoned for agricultural, industrial, and commercial uses. Because the connection would require the Applicants to acquire 3.44 acres of land, this alternative would not be consistent with Kane County zoning and may require a zoning amendment. The crossover is zoned as industrial and transportation or utility use (City of West Chicago 2007). The crossover would, however, remain within the ROW and would be consistent with West Chicago’s current zoning.
- **Munger Alternative–Northwest Quadrant.** This alternative would occur primarily within 2.37 acres of new ROW that the Applicants would have to acquire from the forest preserve and 0.81 acre of existing transportation ROW. Because the Applicants would construct this connection on land zoned as public lands (forest preserve), this alternative would not be consistent with Bartlett’s current zoning and may require a zoning amendment.

East Siding to Walker Double Track

The East Siding to Walker double track construction would remain within the existing EJ&E ROW. The existing EJ&E rail line corridor is not zoned by Aurora, Naperville, or Plainfield. Therefore, the proposed double track would not affect the current zoning in these three communities.

Joliet Connection

As discussed in Section 3.5, Land Use, the area around the proposed Joliet connection is not included on Joliet’s or Lockport’s zoning maps. As verified in the field, the land east of the CN rail line is currently being used for industrial and commercial businesses and the land west is part of the I&M Canal Trail System. Joliet has designated areas adjacent to the construction site as industrial, although the June 2005 *City of Joliet Zoning Map* does not specify a zoning type for the northeast quadrant (City of Joliet 2005). A discussion of the consistency of each of the three alternatives with existing zoning follows:

- **No-Build at Joliet.** Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would be consistent with the existing zoning.
- **Proposed Joliet Connection.** The Applicants would acquire approximately 3.79 acres of property to construct this connection. Because the new ROW is not currently zoned, this alternative would not affect zoning in the vicinity.
- **Joliet Alternative–Original Proposal.** The Applicants would acquire approximately 4.17 acres of commercial land to construct this connection. Because the new ROW is not currently zoned, this alternative would not affect zoning in the vicinity.

East Joliet to Frankfort Double Track

The East Joliet to Frankfort double track construction would remain within the existing EJ&E ROW. Neither Joliet, New Lenox, nor Frankfort designates zoning within the EJ&E railway corridor. Therefore, the proposed double track would not affect Joliet's, New Lenox's, or Frankfort's zoning.

Matteson Connection

SEA has identified three alternatives in addition to the No-Build Alternative for the Matteson connection. As discussed in Section 3.5, Land Use, the zoning surrounding the Matteson connection includes residential, commercial, industrial, and transportation uses in Matteson and Park Forest (Village of Matteson 2005a; Village of Park Forest 2005). The existing EJ&E and CN ROW are categorized as transportation and utility corridors. The effects from the four alternatives are:

- **No-Build at Matteson.** Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would be consistent with the existing zoning.
- **Proposed Matteson Connection.** This alternative would occur primarily outside of the existing EJ&E and CN ROW. To construct this connection, the Applicants would acquire approximately 0.13 acre of residential land, 0.47 acre of industrial land, 8.20 acres of vacant land, 0.44 acre of open space land, and 0.52 acre of transportation land. The acquired parcels would be permanently incorporated into a railroad facility. Because the Applicants would acquire new ROW from residential, vacant, and open space land, this alternative would not be consistent with Matteson's and Park Forest's current zoning, and may require a zoning amendment.
- **Matteson Alternative–Northeast and Southwest Quadrants.** This alternative would occur primarily outside of the existing EJ&E and CN ROW. To construct this connection, the Applicants would acquire approximately 2.35 acres of commercial land, 0.50 acre of industrial land, 2.30 acres of vacant land, 0.78 acre of residential land, and 0.16 acre of transportation land. The acquired parcels would be permanently incorporated into a railroad facility. Because the Applicants would acquire new ROW from lands that are currently zoned as industrial, this alternative would be consistent with Matteson's current zoning.
- **Matteson Alternative–Southwest Quadrant.** This alternative would occur primarily within the existing EJ&E and CN ROW; however, the Applicants would acquire approximately 0.18 acre of vacant land to construct this connection. The acquired parcels would be permanently incorporated into a railroad facility. Because the Applicants would acquire new ROW from vacant lands that are currently zoned as industrial, this alternative would be consistent with Matteson's current zoning.

Griffith Connection

- **No-Build at Griffith.** Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would be consistent with the existing zoning.
- **Proposed Griffith Connection.** The majority of construction would occur within the existing EJ&E and CN ROW; however, the Applicants would acquire approximately 0.10 acre of commercial land and 3.25 acres of vacant land for this connection. This parcel of vacant land is a remnant parcel between the two rail lines is not designated with specific zoning, but is adjacent to land zoned as industrial (Town of Griffith 2004). Because all construction would occur on lands with identified uses of similar intensities, the proposed construction would be consistent with Griffith's current zoning.

Ivanhoe Connection

- **No-Build at Ivanhoe.** Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would be consistent with the existing zoning.
- **Proposed Ivanhoe Connection.** Gary is in the process of revising its future land use and zoning maps; however, this area is currently zoned as manufacturing (City of Gary 2008b). The Applicants would acquire new ROW to construct the proposed connection. The proposed connection would be consistent if the zoning remained manufacturing, although it would interfere with any future manufacturing development if ever considered. Train activities at the connection would not be any more intense than the designated existing zoning. The proposed connection, therefore, is consistent with Gary's current zoning.

Kirk Yard Connection

- **No-Build at Kirk Yard.** Because no construction or acquisition of new ROW would occur, this alternative would be consistent with the existing zoning.
- **Proposed Kirk Yard Connection.** Because this connection would be located within Kirk Yard, it would not affect Gary's current zoning.

Prime Farmland

To determine effects on prime farmland from the proposed construction activities, SEA evaluated each construction site for the following three criteria: 1) additional ROW acquisition, 2) designated soil type, and 3) agricultural usage by planning and zoning maps. Table 4.5-7 summarizes the effects on prime farmland from the proposed construction activities.

| Table 4.5-7. Prime Farmland Effects Evaluation | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|
| Construction Site | Prime Farmland Soils? | Agricultural Usage/ Zoning? | Additional ROW Required? | Justification |
| Illinois | | | | |
| Leithton Double Track | Yes | No | Yes | Existing EJ&E ROW and new ROW is committed to transportation, industrial, and utility use. |
| Diamond Lake Road to Gilmer Road Double Track | Yes | Yes | No | No additional ROW is required; existing EJ&E ROW is committed to transportation use. |
| No-Build at Munger | Yes | No | No | No construction or ROW acquisition. |
| Proposed Munger Connection | Yes | No | Yes | Existing EJ&E ROW and new ROW is committed to transportation and utility use. |
| Munger Alternative-Original Proposal | Yes | No | Yes | Existing EJ&E ROW and new ROW is committed to open space, transportation and utility uses. |
| Munger Alternative UP Connection | Yes | Yes | Yes | Proposed connection is zoned for farmland use according to Kane County (2007) |

Table 4.5-7. Prime Farmland Effects Evaluation

| Construction Site | Prime Farmland Soils? | Agricultural Usage/ Zoning? | Additional ROW Required? | Justification |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Munger Alternative-Northwest Quadrant | Yes | No | Yes | Existing EJ&E ROW and new ROW is committed to open space, transportation and utility uses. |
| East Siding to Walker Double Track | Yes | Yes | No | No additional ROW is required; existing EJ&E ROW is committed to transportation use. |
| No-Build at Joliet | No | No | No | Soils are not classified as prime farmland. |
| Proposed Joliet Connection | No | No | Yes | Soils are not classified as prime farmland. |
| Joliet Alternative-Original Proposal | No | No | Yes | Soils are not classified as prime farmland. |
| East Joliet to Frankfort Double Track | Yes | Yes | No | No additional ROW is required; existing EJ&E ROW is committed to transportation use. |
| No-Build at Matteson | Yes | No | No | No construction or ROW acquisition. |
| Proposed Matteson Connection | Yes | No | Yes | Area not zoned for agricultural use. |
| Matteson Alternative - Northeast and Southwest Quadrant | Yes | No | Yes | Area not zoned for agricultural use. |
| Matteson Alternative-Southwest Quadrant | No | No | Yes | Soils are not classified as prime farmland. |
| Indiana | | | | |
| No-Build at Griffith | Yes | No | No | No construction or ROW acquisition. |
| Griffith Connection | Yes | No | Yes | Area not zoned for agricultural use. |
| Ivanhoe Connection | No | No | Yes | Soils are not classified as prime farmland. |
| No-Build at Kirk Yard | No | No | No | Soils are not classified as prime farmland. |

Sources: USDA NRCS, 2005, Soil Survey of Lake County, Illinois, available online at http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov/Manuscripts/IL097/0/Lake_IL.pdf.

USDA NRCS, 1999, Soil Survey of Du Page County, Illinois, available online at http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov/Manuscripts/IL043/0/Du_Page_IL.pdf.

USDA NRCS, 2004, Soil Survey of Will County, Illinois, available online at http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov/Manuscripts/IL197/0/will_IL.pdf.

Village of Mundelein, February 25, 2008, *Community Development [Zoning Map]*, retrieved on March 29, 2008, http://www.mundelein.org/maps/2008_zoning_map_update_2.pdf.

Village of Hawthorn Woods, January 2006, *Village of Hawthorn Woods Zoning Map*, retrieved on March 31, 2008, <http://www.vhw.org/Images/Maps/HW%20Zoning%20Map%2010-07.pdf>.

Village of Long Grove, January 2007, *Zoning Map*, retrieved on March 29, 2008,

<http://www.longgrove.net/Planning%20and%20Zoning%20Downloadable%20Files/2007%20zoning%20map>.

pdf.

Village of Bartlett, February 2006, *Village of Bartlett, Illinois, Official Zoning Map 2006*, retrieved on March 3, 2008, <http://www.village.bartlett.il.us/assets/pdfs/zone2006.pdf>.

City of West Chicago, January 2007, *City of West Chicago 2007 Zoning Map*, retrieved on May 19, 2008, http://www.westchicago.org/Departments/AdminServices/GIS/PDFs/ZONING-E%20SIZE_2007.pdf.

Kane County, January 31, 2007, *Zoning Maps of Kane County, Illinois*, Subdivision and Zoning Division, retrieved on May 16, 2008,

http://www.co.kane.il.us/Development/Subdivision_Zoning/ZoneAtlas/pdfs/SC/SC01.pdf.

City of Aurora (2007a), *2007 Zoning Map Book*, retrieved on March 29, 2008, <http://www.aurora-il.org/communitydevelopment/landuse/zonemapbook.php>, February 6, 2007.

City of Naperville, April 2007, *City of Naperville Zoning*, retrieved on March 29, 2008,

http://www.naperville.il.us/emplibrary/zoning_7224x36.pdf.

Village of Plainfield, August 15, 2006, *Village of Plainfield, Illinois, 2006 Zoning Districts Map*, Community Development Department, GIS Division, retrieved on March 1, 2008, http://www.plainfield-il.org/village/documents/FinalZoning06_11x17.pdf.

City of Joliet, June 15, 2005, *City of Joliet Zoning Map*, City of Joliet Planning Division, retrieved on March 3, 2008, <http://www.cityofjoliet.info/For-Residents/documents/ZoningMaps.pdf>.

City of Lockport, March 31, 2007, *City of Lockport, Illinois, Official Zoning Map*, retrieved on May 17, 2008, http://www.lockport.org/comdev_planzoning.htm.

Village of New Lenox, January 23, 2007, *Village of New Lenox Zoning Map*, retrieved on February 1, 2008, <http://www.newlenox.net/maps.html>.

Village of Frankfort, March 17, 2008, *Official Zoning Map*, retrieved on April 3, 2008,

<http://www.villageoffrankfort.com/pdf/zoningmap2008-color.pdf>.

Village of Mokena, June 1, 2007, *Official Zoning Map, Village of Mokena*, retrieved on April 22, 2008, <http://www.mokena.org/DocumentView.asp?DID=6>.

Village of Matteson (2005a), *Matteson, Illinois, Amended Zoning Map*, retrieved on March 28, 2008,

<http://www.villageofmatteson.org/departments/planningdivision/pdf/Map.pdf>, February 2005.

Town of Griffith, December 2004, *Zoning District Map, Town of Griffith, Indiana*, retrieved on April 1, 2008, <http://www.griffithindiana.com/zoning.pdf>.

City of Gary, March 1, 1968, *Zoning Map*, City of Gary, Department of Planning and Development, Zoning Division.

For prime farmland to be affected the soil has to be classified as prime farmland soil, the area has to be zoned and used as agricultural land, and additional ROW has to be required. Based on the effects evaluation summarized in Table 4.5-7, the proposed construction activities would not permanently affect prime farmland. Prime farmland would be temporarily affected by the Munger Alternative – UP Connection. The construction area limits show a larger area of affected land, although only a small amount of land in this area may be permanently converted to transportation uses. Temporarily affected areas surrounding the proposed new rail connection would be returned to existing conditions use. SEA does not expect the temporary use of this land to impair the long-term agricultural productivity of any affected prime farmland areas.

Public Lands

SEA evaluated public lands in the Study Area, including forest preserves, nature preserves, resource rich and protected areas, land and water reserves, and local parks to determine potential effects of the proposed construction sites.

The No-Build alternatives would not affect public lands because construction or acquisition of new ROW would not occur.

The Pratt's Wayne Woods Forest Preserve would be directly affected by two of the Munger connection alternatives. The Applicants would acquire 0.58 acre of new ROW from the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County under the Original Proposal alternative and 2.42 acres of new ROW from the forest preserve district under the Northwest Quadrant alternative. For proposed mitigation measures, see Chapter 6.

The Brewster Creek Fen and Nature Preserve would be directly affected by the Munger Alternative – UP Connection. The Applicants would acquire 3.03 acres from the private owner to construct this connection. For proposed mitigation measures, see Chapter 6.

Affected Trails, Greenways, and Scenic Corridors

SEA evaluated existing and proposed trails, greenways, and scenic corridors in the Study Area to determine potential effects of the proposed construction activities. Section 3.5.6 presents tables showing location and ownership data for the trails, greenways, and scenic corridors in the Study Area.

In the evaluation of the proposed construction activities, SEA included direct effects from construction along each of the EJ&E rail line segments. The No-Build alternatives would not affect trails, greenways, or scenic corridors because construction or acquisition of new ROW would not occur.

Existing and proposed trails, greenways, or scenic corridors were evaluated only for potential effects from construction activities. Table 4.5-8 lists the affected existing and proposed trails, greenways, and scenic corridors, grouped by county.

| Table 4.5-8. Trails, Greenways, and Scenic Corridors Affected by Proposed Construction | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|---|--|
| County (State) | Trail/Greenway/Scenic Corridor | Segment(s) | Proposed Train Traffic Change (trains per day) | Proximity to Proposed Construction Site |
| Lake (Illinois) | EJ&E Corridor (Proposed Greenway) | EJ&E-14C | 15.0 | Adjacent; would parallel the Leighton double track and the Diamond Lake Road to Gilmer Road double track |
| | IL 53 Corridor Bike Trail (Proposed I-355 Extension) | EJ&E-14B and EJ&E-14C | 15.0 | Would intersect the Diamond Lake Road to Gilmer Road double track |
| | Gilmer Road Scenic Corridor | EJ&E-14B and EJ&E-14C | 15.0 | Eastern boundary of the Diamond Lake Road to Gilmer Road double track |
| Cook (Illinois) | Old Plank Road Trail | EJ&E-6 | 23.0 | Adjacent to the Matteson connection |
| DuPage (Illinois) | EJ&E Corridor (Proposed Greenway) | EJ&E-13B, 12, 11 and 10A | Ranges from 17.0 to 23.8 | Adjacent; would parallel the EJ&E rail line through the Munger connection |
| | 75 th Street and Oswego Road bikeway corridors (proposed greenway) | EJ&E-10A | 23.8 | Would intersect the East Siding to Walker double track; Oswego heads west and 75 th heads east from the same intersection |
| Will (Illinois) | EJ&E Corridor (Proposed Greenway) | EJ&E-10B, 10C, 10D, 10E and 9A | 23.8 | Adjacent; would parallel the East Siding to Walker double track |
| | Lincoln Highway Corridor (Proposed Greenway) | EJ&E-10E | 23.8 | Would parallel the East Siding to Walker double track (Normantown - Walker segment) |
| | I & M Canal Trail | EJ&E-8A | 23.8 | Adjacent; west of the Joliet connection |
| | Wabash Corridor (Proposed Greenway) | EJ&E-7B | 21.9 | Would intersect the East Joliet to Frankfort double track |
| Lake (Indiana) | Erie Lackawanna/Veterans Memorial Trail | EJ&E-4 | 21.0 | Adjacent, west of the Griffith connection |

The Old Plank, I&M Canal, and Erie Lackawanna trails would experience only proximity effects. No construction would occur on these existing trails because they are adjacent to, and outside of, the construction sites. The proposed construction activities would not affect the use of existing trails.

The proposed construction activities would not prevent the development of the proposed trails and greenways because the EJ&E and CN rail lines were already in existence when the trails and greenways were proposed. However, the Applicants must notify and coordinate with the trail proponents of any new construction that intersects proposed trails.

In the event of new development, Hawthorn Woods expects a minimum donation of 50 additional feet of ROW along its scenic corridors to construct berms and install natural landscape elements (Village of Hawthorn Woods 2004). Therefore, the Applicants shall coordinate with Hawthorn Woods regarding its scenic corridor requirements and may be required to limit the construction of double track to 50 feet east of the existing Gilmer Road scenic corridor ROW.

For proposed mitigation measures for all affected trails, greenways, and scenic corridors, see Chapter 6.

Affected Local Parks

SEA considered the potential effects on local parks that are adjacent to the EJ&E rail line without any streets separating the two. To evaluate the proposed construction of the connections, SEA identified parks adjacent to the construction sites.

The No-Build alternatives would not affect parks because construction or acquisition of new ROW would not occur.

SEA considers local parks to be potentially affected by the Proposed Action if their boundaries back directly up to the existing EJ&E or CN ROW in an area of proposed construction. The local parks adjacent to the EJ&E rail line that are considered to be potentially affected have been identified along with their relative distance from the rail line and are listed in Table 4.5-9, grouped by county. See Chapter 6 for proposed mitigation measures.

| Table 4.5-9. Local Parks Potentially Affected by Proposed Construction | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|---|--|
| County | Park Name | Segment | Proposed Train Traffic Change (trains per day) | Proximity to Proposed Construction Site |
| DuPage (Illinois) | Frontenac Park | EJ&E-10A | 23.8 | Adjacent; east of the East Siding double track |
| | Clearwood Park | EJ&E-10A | 23.8 | 220 feet west of the East Siding double track |
| | Andover Park | EJ&E-10A | 23.8 | Adjacent; west of the East Siding double track |
| | Middlebury East Park | EJ&E-10A | 23.8 | Adjacent; west of the East Siding double track |
| | Waubonsee Creek Park | EJ&E-10A | 23.8 | Adjacent; west of the East Siding double track |
| | South Spring Lake | EJ&E-10A | 23.8 | Adjacent; east of the East Siding double track |
| | Oakhurst Wetlands | EJ&E-10A | 23.8 | Adjacent; west of the East Siding double track |
| Will (Illinois) | King's Crossing | EJ&E-10E | 23.8 | 260 feet east of the East Siding double track (Normantown to Walker segment) |
| | Future Park (Under Development) | EJ&E-10E | 23.8 | 300 feet east of the East Siding double track (Normantown to Walker segment) |
| | Ron Rob Field | EJ&E-7B | 21.9 | Adjacent; south of the East Joliet double track |
| Lake (Indiana) | Griffith Historical Park and Depot Museum | EJ&E-4 | 21.0 | Adjacent; west of the Griffith connection |

Affected Land and Water Conservation Fund Properties

The No-Action alternatives would not affect Section 6(f) properties because construction or acquisition of new ROW would not occur.

No Section 6(f) properties are adjacent to any of the construction alternatives. Therefore, the construction alternatives would not affect any Section 6(f) properties.

Affected Coastal Zone Management Areas

As discussed in Section 3.5.5.8, Indiana has implemented a coastal zone management program for areas along Lake Michigan; however, Illinois has not. Three proposed connections (Griffith, Ivanhoe and Kirk Yard) would be located within Indiana's Lake Michigan Coastal Program (LMCP) boundary.

The No-Action alternatives would not affect the Indiana coastal zone management area because construction or acquisition of new ROW would not occur.

The Griffith, Ivanhoe, and Kirk Yard connections are subject to two of the three LMCP components: the Indiana Coastal Nonpoint Pollution Control Plan and Federal consistency requirements (INDNR 2004a). All three connections would need to be constructed within the nonpoint pollution control plan boundary. Section 4.12, Water Resources, discusses nonpoint pollution and the LMCP requirements.

4.5.4 Conclusions

SEA acknowledges that the following properties would experience proximity effects under the Proposed Action: 15 public lands; 14 existing or proposed trails, greenways and scenic corridors; 23 local parks; and 4 Land and Water Conservation Fund properties. The direct land use affects from the Proposed Leighton, Munger, Joliet, Matteson, Griffith, Ivanhoe, and Kirk Yard Connections would include the acquisition of 1.52 acres of commercial property, 0.69 acre of industrial property, 3.38 acres of open space, 15.11 acres of vacant land, 0.13 acres of residential property, and 4.35 acres of land designated for transportation uses. The respective Munger, Joliet, and Matteson alternatives that would convert the most acreage to railroad use would be the Munger Alternative – UP Connection (3.44 acres), the Joliet Alternative – Original Proposal (4.17 acres), and the Proposed Matteson Connection (9.76 acres). The Proposed Matteson Connection and the Matteson Alternative – Northeast and Southwest Quadrants are not consistent with land use patterns, land use, and zoning, therefore, may require a zoning amendment if constructed. The Proposed Joliet Connection would affect land use, including the I&M Canal Trail, but not the land use patterns in this area because most of the land use is for industrial and commercial uses. The three connections in Indiana would be subject to Federal consistency requirements under the Coastal Zone Management Act, because they are within the specified coastal management zone boundary. SEA is recommending mitigation measures (see Chapter 6) for public lands, coastal management zones, and construction sites. Based on SEA's review of new ROW required, prime farmland effects, and public land and trail effects, the alternatives with the fewest effects are: the Proposed Munger Connection (no effects on land use patterns, least amount of new ROW required), Joliet Alternative – Original Proposal (no effects on I & M Canal Trail, but slightly more new ROW required), and Matteson Alternative – Southwest Quadrant (no land use effects and least amount of new ROW required).

This page intentionally left blank.