Appendix B Table of Contents

Agency Coordination

Appendix B-1 Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

Appendix B-2 State Historic Preservation Officer Section 106 Report Consultation

Appendix B-3 City of Geneva and Forest Preserve District of Kane County Coordination with Property Owners of Section 4(f) Resources

Appendix B-4

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District Coordination Pre-Application Meeting Minutes

Appendix B-5 Illinois Department of Natural Resource Coordination EcoCAT Tool Consultation under 17 III. Adm. Code Part 1075 Termination

Appendix B-6 US Fish and Wildlife Service Coordination Section 7 Consultation Letter Appendix B-1 Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning



Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive Suite 800 Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400 www.cmap.illinois.gov

January 12, 2016

Mr. Dave Simmons, Director Grant Development Metra 547 West Jackson Chicago IL 60661

Re: Union Pacific - West Third Mainline Track, UP-W TIP Project # 18-07-0669 - Programmer: Metra

Dear Mr. Simmons:

This project was included in the region's FY 2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and considered awarded and underway for purposes of the TIP development process. At that point in time, the project became part of the underlying transportation network evaluated in the region's air quality conformity analysis.

The current FY 2014 – 2019 TIP was accepted by the United States Department of Transportation on October 21, 2014, following approvals by the CMAP MPO Policy Committee, IDOT, IEPA and USEPA. The USDOT determined that the current 2014-2019 TIP conforms to the SIP and Clean Air Act Amendments. These findings were in accordance with 40 CFR part 51, "Criteria and Procedures for Determining Conformity to State or Federal Implementation Plans of Transportation Plans, Programs and Projects Funded or Approved Under Title 23 USC or the Federal Transit Act."

The project is included in the information analyzed for the TIP conformity analysis. Therefore, this project conforms to the existing State Implementation Plan and the transportation-related requirements of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments.

Sincerely,

Teri Dixon Senior Planner



FEB 19 2016 GRANT MANAGEMENT Appendix B-2 State Historic Preservation Officer Section 106 Report Consultation

RECEIVED

MAY 1 9 2017

U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration

May 16, 2017

REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin PRESERVATION SERVICES 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

IHPA REVIE H/AC G/b/c1 AC AR File

Dr. Rachel Leibowitz Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer Illinois Historic Preservation Agency 1 Old State Capital Plaza Springfield, IL 62701

RE: FTA Section 106 Historic Review Determination of Eligibility and Effects Concurrence Metra Union Pacific-West Line Third Mainline Western Section Track Project, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois – IHPA Log #009102416

Dear Ms. Leibowitz:

On October 20, 2016, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) submitted a Section 106 initiation and Area of Potential Effect (APE) proposal letter to the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) for the Union Pacific-West Line Third Mainline Western Section Track Project (the "Project) in DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois. The correspondence provided a proposed methodology for conducting the Section 106 field work and consultation process activities pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and the implementing regulations at 36 C.F.R. § 800. The IHPA provided correspondence to FTA, dated November 1, 2016, concurring with this methodology and FTA's proposed Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the Project.

Metra subsequently completed field surveys for all properties within the APE for the Project and prepared an eligibility and effects report titled *Section 106 Technical Report – Union Pacific West Third Mainline Project, Western Section* (the "Report"), which includes APE maps, a property survey summary table, eligibility and effects recommendations, and a full summary of the consulting party coordination. Consulting parties were contacted and briefed on the project and initial findings. Based on their feedback and the research conducted by Metra as documented in the Report, FTA has determined the following for the Project:

Within the APE, 56 resources were assessed for National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility. Of these, 53 resources were determined not eligible for listing in the NRHP. Of the remaining three resources, one is an historic district listed in the NRHP and two are recommended as eligible:

- Central Geneva Historic District, NRHP listed under Criteria A and C
- Island Park South Bridge, NRHP recommended under Criteria A and C
- Weber Farmstead, NRHP recommended under Criteria A and C

FTA Section 106 Historic Review Determination of Eligibility and Effects Concurrence, Metra Union Pacific-West Line Third Mainline Track Project, Cook County, Illinois

Based on the materials presented, FTA has determined that the project will have No Adverse Effect on any of the identified NRHP listed or eligible resources.

Pursuant to the Section 106 implementing regulations at 36 C.F.R. § 800, FTA is seeking SHPO concurrence with the above eligibility and effects determinations within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

If FTA can provide any assistance or additional information which would aid in your prompt reply, please feel free to contact Tony Greep, Community Planner, at 312-353-1646. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Kellepsookins

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator



Cc: Tony Greep, FTA Elizabeth Breiseth Brian Stepp, Metra

Enclosure: Section 106 Technical Report – Union Pacific West Third Mainline Project, Western Section

Section 106 Technical Report

Union Pacific West Third Mainline Project Western Section DuPage and Kane Counties, Illinois

Project Number: HG-4846

Prepared For: Metra

Prepared By: WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff

April 2017

Table of Contents

EXEC	UTIV	E SUMMARY	. 111
1.0	INT	RODUCTION AND DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING	1
	1.1	Project Background	1
	1.2	National Environmental Policy Act	2
	1.3	Project Description	2
2.0	SEC	TION 106 SCOPE OF WORK AND METHODOLOGY	3
	2.1	Area of Potential Effects	5
	2.2	Identification of Historic Properties.2.2.1Literature Review2.2.2Fieldwork	7
	2.3	SHPO and Consulting Parties	8
	2.4	NRHP Determinations of Eligibility	. 10
	2.5	Conclusions	. 11
3.0	HIS	FORIC CONTEXT	. 15
	3.1	Winfield Township	. 15
	3.2	City of West Chicago	16
	3.3	City of Geneva 3.3.1 The Fox River	
	3.4	 Transportation	22 24
	3.5	 Geneva Township Agricultural History 3.5.1 Farmsteads 3.5.2 Barns 3.5.3 Agricultural Outbuildings 3.5.4 Agricultural Landscape Features 	27 28 30
	3.6	Architecture3.6.1Architectural Styles3.6.2Vernacular Building Types	. 32
4.0	EFFE	ECTS ASSESSMENT 4.1.1 Central Geneva Historic District 4.1.2 Island Park South Bridge 4.1.3 Weber Farmstead	38 39

5.0	SURVEY AND RESEARCH PERSONNEL	42
6.0	BIBLIOGRAPHY	43

List of Figures

Figure 2-1 Area of Potential Effects and National Register of Historic Places
Eligibility Determinations Map6

List of Tables

Table 2-1. List of Invited Section 106 Consulting Parties	9
Table 2-2. List of Invited Tribal Governments for Section 106 Consultation	
Table 2-3. Properties Identified in the APE	11
Table 5-1. Survey and Research Personnel	

List of Appendices

APPENDIX A	AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS MAP
APPENDIX B	SURVEY DATA SUMMARY TABLE
APPENDIX C	NRHP DETERMINATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY
APPENDIX D	SHPO AND CONSULTING PARTIES COORDINATION

Executive Summary

This Section 106 Technical Report documents the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) findings of eligibility and assessment of effects for the Section 106 process for the Union Pacific West Third Mainline – Western Section Project (Project). The Eastern Section will be documented in a separate Section 106 Technical Report. The Project proposes to construct a third mainline track along the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Line through the villages of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and Geneva in Kane County, Illinois for approximately 6.4 miles.

Built resources and landscape features in the Area of Potential Effects (APE) were identified and evaluated in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended (16 USC 470 et seq.) and its enabling legislation (36 CFR 800). Because the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) may provide funding for the Project, it is a federal undertaking and is subject to compliance with the NHPA and its enabling legislation. Specifically, Section 106 of the NHPA requires FTA to take into account the effects of its undertakings on historic properties and afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and consulting parties a reasonable opportunity to comment on the undertaking.

FTA delineated the APE for this Project and provided the APE boundary and Section 106 methodology to the Illinois State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) for review and comment in a letter dated October 20, 2016. The Project architectural historians conducted research and evaluated built resources and landscape features more than 50 years of age within the APE for NRHP eligibility. Field survey and research of 56 properties in the APE was completed. This number included one NRHP-listed historic district.

The single NRHP-listed property located in the APE is the Central Geneva Historic District (survey ID 1-26). As a result of identification and evaluation efforts for this Project, two historic properties and no historic districts within the APE are recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP. The two recommended NRHP-eligible properties are the Island Park South Bridge (Survey ID 1-24) and Weber Farmstead (Survey ID 1-55).

An individual assessment of effects was completed for each of the NRHP-listed and recommended NRHP-eligible historic properties in the APE. The Project would have no adverse effect to:

- the NRHP-listed Central Geneva Historic District (survey ID 1-26),
- the recommended NRHP-eligible Island Park South Bridge (Survey ID 1-24), or
- the recommended NRHP-eligible Weber Farmstead (Survey ID 1-55).

Therefore, an overall finding of No Adverse Effect is recommended for the proposed Union Pacific West Third Mainline – Western Section Project.

1.0 Introduction and Description of Undertaking

This report documents the identification of historic properties and assessment of effects completed for the Union Pacific West Third Mainline – Western Section Project (Project). Because the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) may provide funding for the Project, it is a federal undertaking and is subject to compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended (16 USC 470 et seq.) and its implementing regulations (36 CFR 800). Specifically, Section 106 of the NHPA requires FTA to take into account the effects of its undertakings on historic properties and afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and consulting parties a reasonable opportunity to comment on the undertaking. Historic properties are defined in 36 CFR part 800.16(1)(1) as "any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion, in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)."

The Union Pacific – West (UP-W) Line extends approximately 44 miles west from the Ogilvie Transportation Center in Chicago, Illinois, to Elburn, Illinois. The UP-W Line carries a mix of passenger and freight train traffic, including an average of 60 Metra passenger trains and 60 Union Pacific (UP) freight trains per day. Over 28,000 Metra riders use the line per weekday.

The Project consists of constructing a third mainline track from Kress Road in West Chicago, IL, to approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva, IL (MP 32.00 to MP 38.41). The third mainline track would be added primarily on the south side of the existing two mainline tracks with the exception of an approximately 1.8 mile section from 0.7 miles east of the bridge at Kirk Road to the bridge at Crissey Avenue (Illinois Route 25), which would be located along the north side of the existing tracks. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within UP's existing right-of-way. Approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required to accommodate the third mainline track. Additional work includes improvements to the Fox River Bridge, railroad crossings, and the existing Geneva station, as well as a parking lot reconfiguration along the south side of the tracks.

1.1 Project Background

UP and Metra have been making improvements throughout the corridor over the course of the last several years. These incremental improvements have been divided into four phases of projects. The first three phases of projects, which are now complete, included various safety, signal, station, and switching upgrades. The fourth project, the UP-W Third Mainline, would add a third track to this existing double-track section. This is one of the final improvement projects identified by UP and Metra to improve safety and efficiency along this heavily used corridor.

1

1.2 National Environmental Policy Act

A Documented Categorical Exclusion (DCE) will be completed by FTA and Metra for the Project in order to satisfy requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). FTA is the Federal Agency responsible for final approval of the environmental document. This study and the supporting environmental documents will be governed by NEPA and corresponding Illinois regulatory requirements.

1.3 Project Description

The majority of the UP-West Third Mainline – Western Section Project will occur within the existing UP right-of-way and 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way would be required to accommodate the third mainline track. The Project is located between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. The existing UP right-of-way for this section ranges from approximately 100 to 150 feet. The third track would be added primarily on the south side of the existing two mainline tracks with the exception of an approximately 1.8 mile section from 0.7 miles east of the bridge at Kirk Road to the bridge at Crissey Avenue (Illinois Route 25), which would be located along the north side of the existing tracks. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within UP's existing right-ofway. Approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP rightof-way would also be required to accommodate the third mainline track.

The proposed third mainline track would address UP-W line rail traffic congestion issues and remove bottlenecks along the corridor. It would also help create a more fluid railroad operation, decrease commuter and freight train delays, reduce motorist wait times at grade crossings, decrease the number of idling freight trains, preserve Metra performance times, and eliminate commuter curfews for freight trains. The proposed improvements would also allow Metra to relieve high levels of congestion and better serve commuters.

Additionally, the Project includes the crossing of the Fox River. The existing structure at the crossing was constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. A new bridge span would be constructed on the existing piers and abutments that cross the Fox River to accommodate a third mainline track. Minor in-water work may occur at the existing piers, portions of which would be rehabilitated with crack sealing and structure repair of concrete. The work would include drilled shafts and caps at each of the existing abutments to accommodate the new bridge span. The existing abutments would also be extended to accommodate new retaining walls, a new deck, and the third mainline track. The existing pedestrian walkway on the east and west sides of the bridge would be maintained. The existing bicycle and pedestrian path under the bridge would remain as-is.

Improvements to railroad crossings are proposed in Geneva at Illinois Route 31 (1st Street), 3rd Street, and Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track. Minor

temporary construction easements would be required for grading purposes. The reconstruction of the crossings at 3rd Street, and Western Avenue would occur within the railroad and roadway right-of-way. The reconstruction of Illinois Route 31 under the railroad would extend approximately 300 feet from the tracks in both directions. The reconstruction of the 3rd Street and Western Avenue at-grade roadway/railroad crossings would extend approximately 150 feet south of the railroad tracks. The reconstruction of these at-grade street/railroad crossings would require temporary road closures and detours.

The existing Geneva station would remain in its current location. However, some station improvements would be necessary to accommodate the addition of a third track. The existing shelters on the south side would be removed and replaced with new shelters. The existing depot on the north side of the tracks would remain with no changes. The existing commuter parking lots on the south side of the station would be reconfigured.

The Third Street Parking Garage addition was completed in 2015, in anticipation of the parking lot reconfiguration on the south side of the tracks (Parking Lots 1, 3, and 5). When factoring in the additional Third Street Parking Garage spaces, there will be no net loss of parking spaces associated with this Project.

No additional right-of-way would be acquired for these station improvements. Temporary construction and permit easements would be acquired for improvements to Parking Lot 3.

2.0 Section 106 Scope of Work and Methodology

The UP-West Third Mainline – Western Section Project is subject to compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended (16 USC 470 et seq.) and its implementing regulations (36 CFR 800). Specifically, Section 106 of the NHPA requires that the responsible Federal agency consider the effects of its actions on historic properties, which are properties listed in or determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and provide the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment on the undertaking.

Per Section 106 requirements, the lead Federal agency, in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), develops the Area of Potential Effects (APE), identifies historic properties (i.e., NRHP-listed and NRHP-eligible) in the APE, and makes determinations of the proposed project's effect on historic properties in the APE. Section 106 regulations require the lead Federal agency consult with the SHPO and identified parties with an interest in historic resources during planning and development of the proposed project. The ACHP may participate in the consultation or may leave such involvement to the SHPO and other consulting parties. The ACHP, if participating, and SHPO are provided an opportunity to comment on the proposed project and its effects on historic properties. They participate in development of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) or Programmatic Agreement (PA) to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects, as applicable. Stipulations in a MOA or a PA must be implemented.

When a National Historic Landmark (NHL) is located within the APE and would be adversely affected by the Project, the Federal agency must also comply with Section 110(f) of the NHPA. Section 110(f) requires that the agency undertake, to the maximum extent possible, planning and actions to minimize harm to any adversely affected NHL and afford the ACHP an opportunity to comment. The ACHP regulations require that the National Park Service (NPS), an agency of the US Department of the Interior, be notified and invited to participate in the consultation involving NHLs.

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) is defined in Section 106 of the NHPA as "the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties if any such properties exist. The APE is influenced by the scale and nature of an undertaking and may be different for different kinds of effects caused by the undertaking."

Historic properties are listed in or determined eligible for listing in the NRHP by applying the NRHP Criteria for Evaluation to evaluate a property's historic significance. The Criteria state that the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and that:

- A. Are associated with events that have a made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- B. Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Above-ground resources are typically evaluated under Criteria A, B, and C; Criterion D applies primarily to archaeological resources.

If a property is determined to possess historic significance, its integrity is evaluated using the following seven Aspects of Integrity to determine if it conveys historic significance: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. If a property possesses historic significance under one or more Criteria and retains integrity to convey its significance, the property was determined eligible for the NRHP during the Section 106 process of this Project. To comply with Section 106 of the NHPA and its implementing regulations (36 CFR 800), this report documents the following:

- 1. Identification and survey of above-ground resources in the APE,
- 2. NRHP determinations of eligibility for built resources and landscape features using the NRHP Criteria for Evaluation, and
- 3. Assessments of effects to NRHP-listed and eligible historic properties.

The report does not document archaeological resources. The Project is located in suburban environment, within existing and previously disturbed railroad and roadway rights-of-way, and has little to no potential for major disturbance or damage to archaeological resources. The Project would have little potential to adversely affect significant archaeological sites.

2.1 Area of Potential Effects

The APE for above-ground resources includes the railroad right-of-way, cross streets with planned improvements, and generally one tax parcel adjacent to the railroad right-of-way and those cross streets. In some instances where the tax parcel extends well beyond the planned improvements and the area within which potential effects may occur to historic properties, the APE boundary was delineated to go through these tax parcels and no more than approximately 600 feet away from the planned improvements. In other areas, the APE was expanded more than one tax parcel to accommodate potential indirect visual effects to historic properties by the Project. The APE boundary is irregularly shaped because it follows this methodology and the tax parcel boundaries provided by DuPage and Kane Counties.

FTA provided the APE boundary and Section 106 methodology to the Illinois SHPO for review and comment in a letter dated October 20, 2016. The SHPO had no comments and concurred with the APE boundary and Section 106 methodology on November 1, 2016.

No auditory impacts are anticipated as a result of project implementation. Additional project planning analysis indicated that no significant changes to land use, traffic patterns, or property access are anticipated. A general location map depicting the APE, the Project corridor, and NRHP-listed and surveyed above-ground resources can be seen in Figure 2-1. More detailed maps are appended to this report (Appendix A).

2.2 Identification of Historic Properties

The content of this report fulfills Section 106 studies for built resources and landscape features in the APE. All work completed as part of this effort follows established state standards, requirements, and guidelines.





2.2.1 Literature Review

Architectural historians who meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards conducted research to review the published literature and to identify and obtain sources of information pertinent to the history and architecture of DuPage and Kane Counties, and specifically, West Chicago and Geneva. Architectural historians consulted and obtained relevant documentation from the following databases and repositories:

- NRHP-listed properties in the National Park Service records; and
- City directories and United States Federal Census records available through HeritageQuest Online.

The architectural historians also identified and researched a variety of sources to inform the documentation and evaluation of previously and newly surveyed properties. Current aerial imagery and property data as well as historic aerial photography and Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps aided in determining an individual property's development and past ownership. These sources included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Current property data, including year-built dates, from Assessor's Office of DuPage and Kane Counties;
- NRHP nominations acquired from the SHPO's Historic Architectural and Archaeology Resources Geographic Information System (HARGIS);
- Historical newspaper articles from the Chicago Tribune Archives;
- Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps;
- Plat maps;
- Historic aerial photographs; and
- Published histories of West Chicago and Geneva.

To supplement the information on the qualities and characteristics of specific property types in order to evaluate eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP, the architectural historians consulted the following publications:

- National Register Bulletin, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*; and
- Virginia & Lee McAlester, A Field Guide to American Houses.

The information gathered from these sources was used to develop specific historic contexts as they apply to DuPage and Kane Counties and is presented in the Historic

Context section of this report. Particular attention focused on village histories of West Chicago and Geneva, as well as Winfield Township, to gather information on surveyed properties and provide interpretive contexts in order to evaluate NRHP eligibility. These interpretive contexts focused on the development of the villages within the county and the roles of potential historic properties in local, state, and regional history, as well as their architectural significance. These sources were also used to develop individual resource histories to evaluate a resource's historical and architectural significance for evaluation of NRHP eligibility. Specifically, the aerial photographs, Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, city directories, local histories, newspaper articles, and the prior surveys of the study area were important to establishing an individual property's historic context and significance.

Section 6.0, Bibliography, provides a complete listing of sources consulted.

2.2.2 Fieldwork

Fieldwork was undertaken on March 23, 2016 and March 30, 2016 by a survey team to photograph all properties 50 years of age or older within the APE. Public records were utilized to identify all properties within the APE older than 50 years of age. The cut-off date for surveyed properties was 1966. For each property surveyed, the survey team conducted the survey of visible elevations from the public right-of-way, which included photographs and observations regarding the property's characteristics. The survey team took photographs of individual properties as well as representative viewscape and streetscape photographs. The location of each property was later verified through the Assessor GIS databases of DuPage and Kane Counties.

2.3 SHPO and Consulting Parties

As part of the historic properties identification effort, Metra consulted with FTA and the Illinois SHPO by providing the APE boundary, the locations of known NRHP-listed historic properties, and the Section 106 methodology for their review and comment on October 20, 2016. The SHPO had no comments on the APE boundary or known historic properties and concurred with the APE boundary on November 1, 2016.

Per the process outlined in the Section 106 implementing regulations, FTA, in cooperation with Metra, identified organizations with an interest in cultural resources in the Project vicinity, and invited them to participate as consulting parties during the Project study. In addition to the Illinois SHPO, the consulting parties included representatives of municipal and county governments, and cultural resources and historic preservation organizations. FTA sent nine consulting party invitation letters on December 20, 2016 (see Appendix D). The consulting parties were invited to participate in the Section 106 process, share concerns about the Project, and provide information about any known historic resources in the Project vicinity that may be affected by the Project. A list of the consulting parties who received the consulting party invitation letter and their response status is included in Table 2-1.

Invited Agency/Government	Involvement
Chicago & North Western Historical Society	Declined to Participate ¹
City of Geneva	Section 106 Consulting Party ²
City of West Chicago	Declined to Participate
DuPage County Historical Society	Declined to Participate ¹
Geneva Historic Preservation Commission	Section 106 Consulting Party
Geneva History Museum (Geneva Historical	Section 106 Consulting Party
Society)	
Landmarks Illinois	Declined to Participate
Preservation Partners of Fox Valley	Section 106 Consulting Party ³
West Chicago Historical Preservation Commission	Declined to Participate
West Chicago Historical Society	Declined to Participate ¹

Table 2-1. List of Invited Section 106 Consulting Parties

¹ No reply to the consulting party invitation letter or follow-up communication efforts was received and this agency is not being included on further Section 106 coordination efforts for this Project.

² The City of Geneva is the single point of contact for the City of Geneva organization, which includes the Geneva Historic Preservation Commission.

³ The Preservation Partners of Fox Valley was invited to participate through coordination with Landmarks Illinois. FTA confirmed the Preservation Partners of Fox Valley as a consulting party on January 19, 2017. No response was received from this organization.

FTA also identified federally recognized Indian tribes with potential interests in the Project vicinity. FTA initiated government-to-government consultation to identify the Indian tribes' interests in the Project and to participate as consulting parties in the Section 106 process. Consulting party invitation letters were sent to 11 tribal governments on December 20, 2016 (see Appendix D). A list of tribal governments who received the consulting party invitation letter and their response status are included in Table 2-2.

The Forest County Potawatomi reviewed the Project area maps and compared them with their database of recorded Potawatomi sites in Illinois. They found no issues with the Project and determined that there will be no effect on historic properties of concern to the tribe under the current Project plan. The tribe did not request to be a Section 106 consulting party.

The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma accepted the invitation to be a Section 106 consulting party. They provided preliminary comments, stating that they were unaware of any existing documentation linking a specific Miami cultural or historic site to the Project area. They also requested to be immediately consulted should any human remains or Native American cultural items falling under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) or archaeological evidence be discovered during any phase of the Project.

Invited Tribal Government	Involvement	
Citizen Potawatomi Nation	Declined to Participate ¹	
Forest County Potawatomi	Declined to Participate ²	
Ho-Chunk Nation	Declined to Participate	
Miami Tribe of Oklahoma	Section 106 Consulting Party	
Peoria Band of Indians of Oklahoma	Declined to Participate	
Potawatomi Nation – Hannahville Indian	Declined to Participate	
Community		
Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians	Declined to Participate	
Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation	Declined to Participate	
Sac and Fox Nation of Mississippi in Iowa	Declined to Participate	
Sac and Fox Nation of Missouri	Declined to Participate	
Sac and Fox Nation of Oklahoma	Declined to Participate	

Table 2-2. List of Invited Tribal Governments for Section 106 Consultation

¹ All, except one, of the tribal governments listed as "Declined to Participate" did not reply to the consulting party invitation and are not being included on further Section 106 coordination efforts for this Project.

² The Forest County Potawatomi reviewed the Project and did not indicate acceptance of the invitation to be a Section 106 consulting party.

2.4 NRHP Determinations of Eligibility

Following the identification of properties in the APE, the architectural historians evaluated each identified property for NRHP eligibility using established professional criteria and considerations set forth in *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2002). Properties that appeared to be typical or mundane examples of their type and/or have been altered by unsympathetic additions or replacement materials that altered character-defining features were not considered eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. These properties have been documented in the Survey Data Summary Table in Appendix B of the report and an individual determination of NRHP eligibility form was not completed.

Properties that were not listed in but appeared to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP were documented in formal NRHP determination of eligibility forms and included in Appendix C of this report. This included properties that appear unique and/or exhibit moderate to high architectural integrity and/or significance, warranting further investigation. These properties have been documented on a survey data form that includes an architectural description, property history and context, NRHP determination of eligibility, sources consulted, relevant photographs, and mapping. Properties were evaluated under NRHP Criteria A, B, and C for their architectural and historical significance; Criterion D was not applied as part of this assessment because the surveyed properties do not have the potential to yield significance, the historians completed integrity assessments. If the properties retained integrity, the historians determined periods of significance, and delineated historic boundaries.

2.5 Conclusions

The Project architectural historians surveyed 56 properties as part of this study. Of this number, there is one property already listed in the NRHP:

• Central Geneva Historic District, the area on both sides of West State Street and roughly bounded by North and South River Lane, South Sixth Street, South Street, and the Fox River, Geneva, NRHP-listed under Criterion A for its association with the development of the original platted settlement of Geneva and under Criterion C for its architecturally significant collection of mid-to-late-nineteenth century residential, commercial, religious, and governmental buildings united in a conservatism to form a balanced whole with the Kane County Courthouse acting as the visual anchor to the district.

Table 2-3 provides a summary of all properties identified in the APE and their NRHP eligibility recommendations. Of the 55 newly identified and evaluated properties, two historic properties in the APE, the Island Park South Bridge and Weber Farmstead, are recommended as eligible for listing in the NRHP for historic and architectural significance. The remaining 53 properties are not recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP due to a lack of architectural or historical distinction, and in some cases, significant alterations resulting in a lack of integrity.

Survey ID	Name	Address	Year Built	Property Type, Style, and/or Form	NRHP Status and Criteria	Date Evaluated
1-1	33W441	33W441 Roosevelt	1966	Warehouse, No	Recommended	2016
	Roosevelt Road	Road, Geneva		Discernible Style	Not Eligible	
1-2	0N799 Old Kirk	0N799 Old Kirk	1949	House, No	Recommended	2016
	Road	Road, West		Discernible Style	Not Eligible	
		Chicago				
1-3	0N902 Old Kirk	0N902 Old Kirk	1966	Office and	Recommended	2016
	Road	Road, West		Laboratory, No	Not Eligible	
		Chicago		Discernible Style		
1-4	33W749 Reed	33W749 Reed	1963	Machine Shop,	Recommended	2016
	Road	Road, Geneva		No Discernible	Not Eligible	
				Style		
1-5	33W859 Reed	33W859 Reed	1961	Office and	Recommended	2016
	Road	Road, Geneva		Warehouse, No	Not Eligible	
				Discernible Style		
1-6	1340 Reed Road	1340 Reed Road,	1959	Office and	Recommended	2016
		Geneva		Warehouse, No	Not Eligible	
				Discernible Style		

Survey ID	Name	Address	Year Built	Property Type, Style, and/or Form	NRHP Status and Criteria	Date Evaluated
1-7	Johnson Controls Battery Group, Inc.	300 South Glengarry Drive, Geneva	1961	Industrial Complex, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-8	Alexander House	310 Sandholm Street, Geneva	ca. 1838	House, Greek Revival	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-9	428 Chalmers Street	428 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1880	House, Gabled- Ell	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-10	420 Chalmers Street	420 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1952	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-11	402 Chalmers Street	402 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1954	House, Ranch	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-12	328 Chalmers Street	328 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1951	House, Minimal Traditional	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-13	324 Chalmers Street	324 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1937	House, Cape Cod	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-14	320 Chalmers Street	320 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1927	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-15	314 Chalmers Street	314 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1923	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-16	310 Chalmers Street	310 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1948	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-17	302 Chalmers Street	302 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1915	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-18	228 Chalmers Street	228 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1950	House, Cape Cod	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-19	224 Chalmers Street	224 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1963	House, Cape Cod	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-20	220 Chalmers Street	220 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1947	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-21	214 Chalmers Street	214 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1949	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-22	321 Crissey Avenue	321 Crissey Avenue, Geneva	1922	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-23	Geneva Waste Water Treatment Plant	602 Crissey Avenue, Geneva	1933, 1973, 2004	Sewage Treatment Plant; Service Station, Jacobean Revival	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-24	Island Park South Bridge	Fox River Trail over Fox River East Channel at Island Park, Geneva	1937	Bridge, Concrete Closed-Spandrel Deck Arch	Recommended Eligible – A, C	2016
1-25	Geneva Railroad Bridge	Bridge carrying Union Pacific	1920	Railroad Bridge, Steel Deck-Girder	Recommended Not Eligible	2016

Survey ID	Name	Address	Year Built	Property Type, Style, and/or Form	NRHP Status and Criteria	Date Evaluated
		Railroad over Fox River, Geneva				
1-26	Central Geneva Historic District	Both sides of West State Street, roughly bounded by North and South River Lane, South Sixth Street, South Street, and the Fox River, Geneva	1840- 1900	Houses, Commercial Buildings, Courthouse, City Hall, Public Library, Greek Revival, Italianate, Classical Revival, Federal Revival, Prairie School	Listed – A, C	1979
1-27	116 South Street	116 South Street, Geneva	1908	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-28	600 South 1st Street	600 South 1st Street, Geneva	1955	Commercial Building, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-29	610 South 1st Street	610 South 1st Street, Geneva	1952	Commercial Building, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-30	612 South 1st Street	612 South 1 st Street, Geneva	1955	Commercial Building, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-31	Duke & Lee's Services	609 Batavia Avenue, Geneva	1960	Auto Repair Garage, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-32	610 South 3 rd Street	610 South 3 rd Street, Geneva	1905	House, American Foursquare	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-33	509 Cheever Avenue	509 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1960	House, Split- Level	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-34	515 Cheever Avenue	515 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1958	House, Ranch	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-35	525 Cheever Avenue	525 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1953	House, Ranch	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-36	603 Cheever Avenue	603 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1951	House, Ranch	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-37	609 Cheever Avenue	609 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1961	House, Ranch	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-38	621 Cheever Avenue	621 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	ca. 1950	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-39	703 Cheever Avenue	703 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1955	House, Ranch	Recommended Not Eligible	2016

Survey ID	Name	Address	Year Built	Property Type, Style, and/or Form	NRHP Status and Criteria	Date Evaluated
1-40	709 Cheever Avenue	709 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1958	House, Ranch	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-41	721 Cheever Avenue	721 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1965	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-42	725 Cheever Avenue	725 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1949	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-43	747 Cheever Avenue	747 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1963	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-44	801 Cheever Avenue	801 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1952	House, Ranch	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-45	811 Cheever Avenue	811 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1963	House, Split- Level	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-46	Burgess-Norton Manufacturing Company	1600 South Street, Geneva	1941	Industrial Complex, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-47	2000 Gary Lane	2000 Gary Lane, Geneva	1965	Industrial Building, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-48	2080 Gary Lane	2080 Gary Lane, Geneva	1951	Industrial Building, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-49	2202 Gary Lane	2202 Gary Lane, Geneva	1963	Industrial Building, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-50	2248-2300 Gary Lane	2248-2300 Gary Lane, Geneva	1961	Industrial Building, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-51	2525 Kaneville Court	2525 Kaneville Court, Geneva	1965	Industrial Building, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-52	2571 Kaneville Court	2571 Kaneville Court, Geneva	1964	Industrial Building, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-53	2613-2633 Kaneville Court	2613-2633 Kaneville Court, Geneva	са. 1964	Industrial Building, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-54	37W248 Kaneville Road	37W248 Kaneville Road, Geneva	1953	Houses, No Discernible Style; Pole Barns	Recommended Not Eligible	2016
1-55	Weber Farmstead	1N016 Peck Road, Geneva	1929	Farmstead; House, Colonial Revival;	Recommended Eligible – A, C	2016

Survey ID	Name	Address	Year Built	Property Type, Style, and/or Form	NRHP Status and Criteria	Date Evaluated
				Outbuildings, Gambrel-roof raised barn, drive-through corncrib barn, transverse-frame barns		
1-56	Chicago & Northwestern Railway	Approximately 6.4 miles between Kress Road, West Chicago and 0.3 miles west of Peck Road, Geneva	1848- 1966	Railroad, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	2016

A table of all surveyed properties in the APE that includes additional information and photographs is presented in Appendix B. The individual findings of NRHP eligibility for properties that warranted additional investigations are in Appendix C. Maps depicting the NRHP-listed property and all identified properties in the APE are presented in Appendix A.

3.0 Historic Context

The Project's historic context focuses on the historical development of the Project corridor from West Chicago to Geneva by examining the historic patterns that have impacted the development of historical resources in DuPage and Kane Counties, specifically West Chicago and Geneva.

The following historic context presents the historical development of the Western Section Project corridor and describes the representative types of extant built resources surveyed in the APE. This context provides a background for their evaluation of NRHP eligibility by describing the area's larger patterns of development and consequently, the evolution of the built environment.

3.1 Winfield Township

Winfield Township is one of nine townships comprising DuPage County, Illinois. Early settlers, including Erastus and Jude P. Gary, arrived in the 1830s and stayed because of the rich soil and the DuPage River. These settlers clustered on the west branch of the DuPage River, founding Warrenville in southeast Winfield Township. The primarily rural community developed much of its industry along the DuPage River, constructing sawmills, factories, and gristmills there in the mid-nineteenth century. DuPage County

was divided into townships in 1849, and the citizens of Winfield Township voted on its name the next year.

Township settlement was spurred by the arrival of the Galena & Chicago Union (G&CU) Railroad and the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Aurora Branch through the area in 1849, which allowed for the transportation of goods and people between Chicago and Winfield Township. In the 1850s, three villages emerged near the railroad stations. Warrenville was established earlier in the 1830s on the west branch of the DuPage River, but more rapidly developed in the 1850s due to the railroad. Winfield Station (later Winfield) was platted in 1853 on the main line of the G&CU Railroad, three miles east of Junction, which was platted in 1855. Turner was platted in 1857, and together with Junction, became known as Turner Junction. The two towns later incorporated in 1873 as the Village of Turner (later known as West Chicago). Outside of the villages, the township remained primarily rural, as it is today.

3.2 City of West Chicago

West Chicago was the first Illinois community created as a result of the railroads. The first settlers arrived in the late 1830s, but the area remained sparsely settled until 1849 when the Galena & Chicago Union (G&CU) Railroad arrived. The G&CU was Chicago's first railroad, originally chartered in 1836 to reach the Galena lead mines. The railroad arrived in the West Chicago area in November 1849 and Elgin in February 1850, bypassing the Fox River Valley communities of St. Charles, Geneva, Batavia, and Aurora. To connect with the G&CU main line, those communities formed three branch rail lines–the St. Charles Branch Railroad in 1849 between St. Charles and West Chicago, a branch line from Geneva to the St. Charles Branch Railroad in 1850. By late 1850, three railroads and numerous trains met in present-day West Chicago, requiring the construction of water and fuel facilities for the locomotives as well as a hotel and eating house for travelers. A town quickly developed at this juncture and became known as Junction, Illinois.

In 1853, the G&CU built a second mainline running west from Junction to DeKalb, and then to Fulton, Illinois. Since the railroad's two mainlines met at Junction, the G&CU expanded its facilities there, building a three-stall roundhouse and mill for repairing rails. Consequently, many of the G&CU's new employees and their families settled in the community. Many of the town's early residents were New Englanders of English or Irish heritage. G&CU president John B. Turner owned several acres of land in what became the center of West Chicago. In 1855, he platted his acreage and recorded the community's first plat under the name of the Town of Junction. He also donated land for a Congregational church and a school. Many streets in Turner's plat had railroad-related names, including Depot, Chicago, Galena, and Fulton Streets. Two years later, Joseph McConnell and his wife, Mary, platted a second portion of town just north of Turner's plat and recorded it under the Town of Turner in honor of John B. Turner.

In the 1860s and 1870s, the community took on a more permanent character. The Chicago & North Western (C&NW) Railroad (formerly the G&CU) built a substantial brick depot and major roundhouse in the late 1860s. Several churches were also constructed during this period. The town was formally incorporated in 1873 as the Village of Turner with a population of 850 residents living in the new village boundaries. Through the late nineteenth century, the population continued to increase, eventually reaching 1,506 in 1890. Many of the new residents were German immigrants who settled in town and on farmlands in the rural areas. Town services expanded to meet population growth demands, including the Turner Public School in 1873, the Southside School in 1887, and the town hall in 1884, which housed the volunteer fire department, one-man police department, and village council chambers.

Until the late 1880s, Turner was a one-industry railroad town with nearly 40 percent of men working for the C&NW. This changed with the arrival of a new railroad, the Elgin, Joliet & Eastern (EJ&E), which was a feeder line that transferred freight one outlying Chicago community to another. The line's prosperity depended on factories being located along its right-of-way to generate freight traffic for the railroad. To attract businesses, the EJ&E offered free factory sites for any industry willing to locate along its right-of-way. As companies relocated to Turner, local developers realized this would create an increased demand for housing, retail, and services, and produced promotional literatures to advertise Turner as "Chicago's Coming Great Manufacturing Suburb."

In 1896, Turner was renamed West Chicago to help prospective industrialists visualize the town's location and to sound more metropolitan. A public water works was also established that year to provide better fire protection and attract new development. A pumping station, reservoir, and standpipe were constructed. Although the village's effort to attract industry was hindered by a national depression in the 1890s, several industrial plants opened along the EJ&E and C&NW tracks in West Chicago in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This included Belding Engineering Company, Stimmel & Hook Pump Works, Roach & Brandt Millwork, Turner Brick Company, Turner Cabinet Company, and Borden's milk condensing plant. In the late 1880s, one of Chicago's largest milk trains (a fifteen-car milk express) formed on the C&NW in West Chicago, drawing from area dairy farms and cars from three directions and as far away as Wisconsin. West Chicago was a logical location for Borden's milk plant. In 1906, West Chicago reincorporated as a city.

Through the early twentieth century, West Chicago's population continued to increase as more industry located there. New subdivisions were constructed in the city's outlying areas, connected to West Chicago and communities east and west of it, by a new electric interurban called the Aurora, Elgin & Chicago (later reorganized to the Chicago, Aurora & Elgin); the line was abandoned in 1937. The city also undertook a street improvement program in the mid-1920s. The railroad continued to be an important part of the local economy. In 1912, the C&NW built a new passenger depot, underpass, and the Wilson Street Bridge, in addition to moving and converting the 1869 depot into a freight depot. From 1918 to 1964, the West Chicago stockyards provided a stopover point for livestock being shipped east. In 1928, Route 64 and a private airport were built; the airport was paved and used in World War II by the federal government and later became known as the DuPage County Airport.

World War II brought new economic vitality to West Chicago and the population grew 17% in the 1940s. Suburban growth increased dramatically in the post-war period with annexations of existing developments and new construction, including many apartment complexes. Through the mid-twentieth century, West Chicago changed as railroad transportation declined. The mid-twentieth century saw the rise of civic groups active in community projects as well as the construction of a new public library; the formation of a park district and separate fire district; and the relocation of city offices to a new location from the 1884 Town Hall building. The city acquired the 1912 C&NW depot in the 1970s to redevelop for community purposes and worked with the Nature Conservancy to purchase a 150 acre tract of virgin prairie on the western edge of the city; it is now part of the 258 acre West Chicago Prairie County Forest Preserve run by the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County. In the 1980s, West Chicago became known as the fastest-growing industrial and manufacturing center in DuPage County.

3.3 City of Geneva

Located along the Fox River in the scenic and rich Fox River Valley, the Geneva area was originally home to the Potawatomi tribe. Two Indian trails passed through the area; the Waubonsie trail along modern day Illinois Route 31 and a second trail along State Street. During the early 1830s, the first white settlers arrived in Geneva and began trading with the Potawatomi. Among them were James and Charity Herrington of Pennsylvania, who opened a general store and tavern, and Christian Bowman Dodson and Archibald Clybourn, who opened a trading post at the mouth of Mill Creek with a general store and sawmill. Trade with the Potawatomi was short-lived, however, as the tribe was forced to move westward by white settlers.

The Herringtons are often considered Geneva's founders because they significantly contributed to the community's growth and success. James Herrington's connections to powerful Cook County politician, Colonel Richard Hamilton, resulted in the creation of Kane County and the establishment of the permanent county seat in Geneva in 1836. The name Geneva was also formally adopted at this time, at the suggestion of Hamilton's acquaintance, Dr. Charles Volney Dyer of Chicago, who was originally from New York. Previously, the community had been called Big Spring, LaFox, Herrington's Ford, and Campbell Ford. The Herrington store initially served as the county courthouse and the Kane County commissioners held their first meetings there. In 1837, the first county courthouse and jail were constructed on the north side of West State Street between North Third and North Fourth Streets. The second and present courthouse was constructed in 1892.

Through the 1830s and 1840s, Geneva's population grew rapidly due to its status as the county seat, its proximity to agricultural resources and urban markets, and its desirable location along the Fox River that facilitated agricultural and commercial enterprises. In 1837, Geneva was platted with wide streets appropriate to a commercial center and

county seat, and a second bridge and sawmill soon followed. By 1840, Geneva had three general stores, two hotels, two blacksmiths, a woodshop, and sawmill. All of its early industries were located along the Fox River where packed meat, butter, cheese, milled grains, and later glucose and flax were processed.

In the 1850s, transportation improvements substantially changed the physical, commercial, and social character and development of Geneva. In 1850, Geneva had a population of 827. That year, its first railroad service began, consisting of a two-mile branch line located on the east side of the Fox River. The branch line ran north to St. Charles and connected to the Galena & Chicago Union (G&CU) Railroad that ran in and out of West Chicago. In 1853, the G&CU Railroad's main line was extended west through Geneva, connecting it to Chicago and the West. It was the first permanent railroad line in Geneva. Three trains a day, including two passenger trains and one freight train, passed through Geneva each day.

The advent of the railroad led to the development of the town west along the rail line, away from the town's initial development centered on the Fox River. The railroad also helped to expand industry in Geneva through the second half of the nineteenth century by facilitating the shipment of goods to urban markets, like Chicago. Many of its industries relied on water power generated from the Fox River as well as area farms to provide crops to the local industries, which were delivered daily by the railroad. For example, the Bennett Bros. heavily relied on wheat farms to supply their flour mill in Geneva, requiring as much as 130,000 bushels per day to operate in the 1860s. The flour was then shipped by railroad across the country and even abroad. By 1900, several medium-sized industries were located in Geneva, including a creamery; glucose and reaper manufactories; Bennett Bros. "Geneva Belle" flour; and Howell Company's "Geneva" fluting and smoothing irons and tubular steel furniture. By 1977, there were only 19 farms in Geneva Township with a total acreage of 3,308 and the major crops were corn, soybeans, oats, and alfalfa, representing a shift from the earlier reliance on wheat, dairy, and livestock (cattle and sheep) farms.

The railroad also contributed to a changing population in Geneva in the mid-to-late nineteenth century. Prior to the mid-1850s, early Geneva settlers were primarily of New England heritage, hailing from New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and other East Coast states. In 1853, the G&CU Railroad employed many Swedish immigrants to construct the new line in Geneva. While working on the railroad, these immigrants became familiar with Geneva and returned to settle there with their families once construction was completed, becoming an important part of Geneva's industrial labor force. Through the second half of the nineteenth century, Geneva experienced an influx of Swedish immigrants; by 1900, approximately half of Geneva's population were of Swedish descent. Later immigrants to Geneva were Italian, Greek, and Irish around the turn of the century.

Geneva formally incorporated as a village in 1867 with a population nearing 1,500 residents. Local businessman, Eben Danford of Danford's Reaper and Mower Factory,

was elected the first Village president. In addition to its successful industries, Geneva had twin flax mills, four wagon shops, four blacksmith shops, eleven dry goods stores, multiple grocery and hardware stores, and numerous small businesses. The community continued to prosper through the late nineteenth century, choosing in 1887 to become a city. James Herrington III, son of Geneva's founder, was elected the city's first mayor.

During the late nineteenth century, the Geneva Improvement Association (GIA) was formed to work on various improvement projects throughout the city. This included the a beautification program, providing necessities for the needy, establishing a continuing education night school, and cleaning up the Fox River. The organization was also instrumental to the construction of a new C&NW Railroad depot in 1892.

Representatives of the GIA pressed officers of the C&NW Railroad to build a new depot to serve as a gateway to citizens attending the Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893. The new depot was constructed of dark buff brick with terra cotta trim. It was torn down in the 1960s and replaced a new passenger station.

In 1896, Geneva undertook several civic improvements. A new water plant, pumping station, and water mains were established and the entire city received electricity. Intracity and inter-city electric railways linking the Fox River Valley towns were also in operation; by 1901, the railways continuously connected the area from Aurora to Carpentersville. A community library was established in 1894 with a Carnegie library built in 1908. In 1915, the Geneva Park District dedicated Island Park, the city's first public park.

Geneva continued to grow through the twentieth century due to the establishment of additional industries and residential developments. In the early twentieth century, Geneva's first research and development facility, Riverbank Laboratories, was established in the home of Colonel George and Nelle Fabyan. During the two world wars, its research and intelligence work contributed to U.S. military successes. The establishment of the Fabyan Forest Preserve honors the legacy of the Riverbank Laboratories. By 2000, Geneva's industries included industrial electronics, railway supplies, publishing, and Burgess-Norton precision-machined parts. In 1961, Kent Shodeen began building homes in Geneva. His residential developments contributed to Geneva's continued growth through the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s that doubled its population.

Geneva's architecture is notably New England in character due to the heritage of its early settlers, which did not change until the well into the late nineteenth century. Its architecture is generally conservative, reflective of Geneva's New England settlers and European immigrants, with understated details. The city is known for its commitment to historic preservation and much of the original town is listed in the NRHP as two separate historic districts-the North Geneva Historic District and the Central Geneva Historic District—and as one local historic district.

3.3.1 The Fox River

The Fox River originates in southern Wisconsin and flows southward through Illinois in Lake, McHenry, Kane, Kendall, and La Salle Counties before joining the Illinois River near Ottawa. The waterway's average grade is 3.6 feet per mile, which made it ideal for the establishment of various industries along its banks throughout Illinois. The Fox River Valley is an abnormally hilly area in the otherwise flat Chicago area. Communities constructed dams and mills along the river, and fifteen of these dams remain today. Near its terminus, the river flows through a canyon with native plants designated as the Historic Fox Valley Canoe Trail from Yorkville to Wedron. This area includes the Fox River Dells.

The Fox River enters Kane County at the northwest corner of the county. The river flows swiftly through the county, and early sawmills and gristmills used its power in Carpentersville, Elgin, St. Charles, Geneva, Batvia and Aurora, among other communities. The Fox River had several locations naturally suited for dams throughout the county, and these locations gave way to settlements. Furthermore, the Fox River Valley was fertile ground for successful agricultural and dairy farming. Throughout the early years, the first dams were often washed out by floods and gave way to more permanent structures. These floods were often destructive, destroying buildings and bridges along the river. However, the waterway was the impetus for the formation of the primarily industrial towns along the Fox River in Kane County.

At the north end of Kane County, Carpentersville was founded because Charles and Daniel Carpenter were unable to cross the Fox River during a flood and decided to settle along its banks instead. They named the settlement Carpenters Grove, but Angelo Carpenter platted and renamed the community Carpentersville in 1851. Angelo Carpenter founded a yarn and flannel factory along the Fox River, followed by the Illinois Iron and Bolt Company and the Star Manufacturing Company. Carpentersville's industry depended on the river for water power. Farther south along the Fox River, Elgin was historically a fording site for the river and a fishing area regularly used by the Potawatomi. Settlers constructed a bridge and several mills in the area by the mid-1830s. The town grew in the mid-nineteenth century as water-powered industry grew. The Elgin Watch factory was one of the more famous industries in Elgin.

Farther south, the community of St. Charles developed around a bridge and dam built on the Fox River by 1836, and grew to include water-based industry such as a cheese factory, foundry, piano factory, glass factory, paper mill, and flouring mill. South of Geneva, whose river-based industry is discussed above (3.3), Batvia was the first part of Kane County to be settled in 1833. The town grew along the Fox River and became a manufacturing town by the late-nineteenth century. At the south end of Kane County, Aurora was founded in 1834 after Joseph and Samuel McCarty constructed a mill at a bend in the Fox River. Aurora would later be home to textile mills, grist mills, and other manufacturing industries as a major manufacturing center in the area. By the 1880s, ten towns had been founded along the Fox River in Kane County. Other communities founded successful enterprises such as brick factories, iron factories, quarries, and ice distributors. In the following decades, Chicagoans would vacation along the Fox River at resorts and private cabins. Along the river, steamboat and paddleboat excursions and clam digging were a few pastime activities. The river also provided stones for local buildings. After World War II, housing developments exploded along the Fox River Valley and population grew. Communities established parks and preserves along the banks of the river throughout the county. In the late-twentieth century, gambling boats began using the Fox River from Elgin and Aurora.

The construction of dams and factories along the Fox River in Kane County shaped the river itself over the following decades. Dam construction caused the river to widen and changed its footprint. Furthermore, suburban development along the river has caused the water quality to decrease due to increased sewage and sediment loads. Today, communities along the Fox River in Kane County are considering removing the dams in place for decades to help restore the Fox River's health.

3.4 Transportation

3.4.1 Chicago & Northwestern Railway

In 1836, the first railroad in Chicago was chartered by the State of Illinois to build tracks from the city to the lead mines at Galena in northwestern Illinois. It was called the Galena & Chicago Union (G&CU) Railroad. The first tracks were laid from the Galena Depot at Canal and Kinzie Streets in Chicago to Oak Park and River Forest in 1848. They reached Elgin by 1850 and Freeport in 1853, stopping just short of its original target destination at the Galena lead mines. Soon after, the railroad was redirected toward the Mississippi River in a direct line west out of Chicago. Also in 1853, a new station was constructed at Wells Street in Chicago.

In 1855, the G&CU Railroad laid a second track with left-hand main operation between Chicago and the Mississippi River at Fulton, Illinois, which later became a core route to the west. The left-hand operation of traffic being routed by default to the left track was a departure from the typical right-hand main operation practice in the United States. Originally, the G&CU arbitrarily placed stations on the left-hand side of their single-line trackage, particularly for inbound Chicago trains. When a second track was added, it was placed on the side away from the stations to avoid relocation of the station. As most passengers at the stations were headed to Chicago, the inbound track remained the one closest to the station platforms. Eventually, the line became known for its left-hand operations on double track mainlines, a practice that continues due to the expense of reconfiguring signals and switches to right-hand main operations.

The G&CU Railroad further expanded operations in 1862, leasing in perpetuity the Chicago Iowa & Nebraska Railroad and the Cedar Rapids & Missouri Railroad. The latter became the first railroad to reach Council Bluffs, Iowa and eventually became the mainline portion of the First Transcontinental Railroad. By this time, the G&CU Railroad operated passenger, freight, and postal service cars on the line.

In 1864, the G&CU Railroad merged with the Chicago & North Western (C&NW) Railroad, which was originally chartered by Illinois and Wisconsin in 1859. The C&NW also acquired the Peninsula Railroad in Upper Michigan at this time. After the formation of the C&NW, the company rapidly expanded through the acquisition and mergers of other lines as well as the construction of its own lines throughout the Midwest. This included the completion of an important line in the late 1860s connecting Council Bluffs, Iowa to Chicago. Between the mid-nineteenth century and early twentieth century, the C&NW acquired additional routes throughout Illinois as well as routes to Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Nebraska, and Wyoming.

Commuter service developed gradually on the C&NW Railroad through the midnineteenth century and increased in the years following the Great Chicago Fire of 1871. The fire pushed many residents west out of Chicago into the suburbs as the city rebuilt. Passenger service on the C&NW Railroad facilitated this western movement and suburban growth, allowing residents to commute into the city while living further away. The first Wells Street Station was destroyed by the fire and replaced temporarily by a wooden structure through the 1870s until the new Wells Street Station opened in 1881.

By the turn of the century, the C&NW Railroad had outgrown the Wells Street Station at the southwest corner of Wells and Kinzie Streets in Chicago as the number of commuters and intercity passengers continued to increase. A new three-story station, called the Chicago and North Western Terminal, was constructed on a site west of the original station bounded by Madison, Lake, Clinton, and Canal Streets and opened on June 4, 1911. The station featured numerous amenities, including a large main waiting room, dining room, women's rooms with writing desks and hairdressing services, smoking rooms, a barber shop, hospital rooms, and other features.

The C&NW Railroad eventually operated three commuter lines–the Northwest Line, West Line, and North Line–from the Chicago station, terminating in Harvard, Illinois; Geneva, Illinois; and Kenosha, Wisconsin, respectively. Through the early-to-midtwentieth century, the C&NW continued Chicago area commuter and passenger service, periodically making improvements to suburban depots, modernizing and adjusting operations, and introducing new commuter cars in the 1920s and again in the 1950s. The C&NW also introduced its "400" intercity trains during the 1930s, one of the few improvements made during its Depression era bankruptcy. These trains traveled 400 miles in 400 minutes between Chicago and Milwaukee. The increasing popularity of the automobile and airplane travel, however, led to declining ridership numbers during that period.

In the 1950s and 60s, the C&NW expanded its network again through the acquisition of several short railroads, including the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Omaha Railway (Omaha Road), the Litchfield and Madison Railway, the Minneapolis and St. Louis Railway, the Chicago Great Western Railway. Despite these acquisitions, the C&NW continued to struggle with declining numbers and losses through the 1960s and 70s. In 1972, it was sold to an employee-led investment group. In 1974, the Illinois Regional Transit Authority (RTA) was established and began to subsidize the region's

commuter trains. The C&NW entered a purchase-of-service agreement with the RTA; it is continued today between Metra (formed in 1984) and the Union Pacific Railroad, which purchased the C&NW Railroad in 1995.

The Chicago & North Western Terminal in Chicago underwent significant changes in the mid-1980s when the old head house was demolished in 1984 for the 42-story Citigroup Center, which was completed in 1987. It now serves as the main station entrance. In 1992, the station's passenger platforms and adjoining facilities were renovated after Metra purchased them from the C&NW. Once completed, the station was renamed the Richard B. Ogilvie Transportation Center for the former governor who championed mass transit in Illinois. The station is now Union Pacific's Metra terminus.

In 1995, the Union Pacific Railroad acquired the C&NW Railroad, merging lines and operations. Throughout their histories, C&NW and Union Pacific had collaborated on connections to the West Coast; the merger provided Union Pacific with a connection to Chicago and helped it to compete with other railroads. Union Pacific continues to operate the C&NW lines, including its pioneer 1848 G&CU line, which also includes Metra commuter operations on the Northwest Line, West Line, and North Line.

3.4.2 Aurora Branch of the C&NW

The Aurora Branch of the C&NW consisted of a short extension along the west side of the Fox River from Geneva, IL south to Aurora, IL. The extension connected Aurora to the C&NW mainline in Geneva, IL. The Aurora Branch is part of an extension of the C&NW that branches from the mainline in Geneva north to St. Charles and south to Aurora. The St. Charles Railroad Company constructed the first 2.5-mile portion of the extension from Geneva to St. Charles in 1871. The St. Charles Railroad Company was a subset of the C&NW, and by 1872, the extension was simply referred to as the St. Charles Branch. That year, the St. Charles Branch was extended south from Geneva to Batavia. The C&NW faced economic hardship in the following decade along with the rest of the nation after the panic of 1873, and the final portion of the branch was not constructed until 1883-1884. That year, the C&NW extended their tracks south six miles from Batavia to Aurora. By 1895, the extension south of Geneva became known as the Aurora Branch of the C&NW. The branch also had a freight stop in North Aurora by 1910. A 1910 map shows the C&NW short branch complete from St. Charles south to the mainline in Geneva, and south from Geneva to Batavia and ending in Aurora. The Aurora Branch of the C&NW was abandoned in 1982, and the right of way is now used as the Fox River Trail.

3.4.3 Aurora, Elgin and Fox River Electric Company

In 1876, Bruce Rogers founded a horse car service in Elgin, IL. His company was purchased by the Elgin City Railway Company in 1889, which was quickly purchased by the Elgin City Street Railway Company the following year. The Elgin City Street Railway Company converted the service to electric streetcar operations. Throughout the 1890s, streetcar operations extended to Carpentersville and Geneva under the Carpentersville, Elgin, and Aurora Railway Company, incorporated in 1895. The two companies consolidated in 1897 as the Carpentersville, Elgin, and Aurora Railway Company.

In Aurora, horse car service began in 1882. In 1890, the Aurora Street Railway Company acquired the horse car service and converted it to electric streetcar service. In 1896 and 1897 respectively, the Aurora and Geneva Railway Company and Aurora, Yorkville, and Morris Railway Company incorporated to construct interurban lines from Aurora to Geneva and Yorkville, respectively.

By the 1890s, various trolley and interurban lines provided service along the Fox River from Carpentersville to Yorkville, connecting to local streetcars in Elgin and Aurora. Elgin and Aurora were completely connected by interurban lines after the opening of the final segment of the Aurora and Geneva Railway between Batavia and Geneva in 1900. The Pomeroy-Mandelbaum syndicate purchased the various interurban lines, including the Aurora and Geneva Railway, the Aurora Street Railway, the Carpentersville, Elgin, and Aurora Railway, and the Aurora, Yorkville and Morris Railway, consolidating the companies into the Elgin, Aurora, and Southern Traction Company in 1901. Pomeroy-Mandelbaum merged the company with the Aurora, Elgin, and Chicago Railway in 1906 and formed the Aurora, Elgin, and Chicago Railway in 1906 and formed the Third Rail Davison, extending west from the Metropolitan West Side Elevated Railroad Company out of Chicago to several towns along the Fox River.

The Fox River Division had about 150 stations between Aurora and Elgin, making the trip between the two cities around 80 minutes. The wooden trolley cars ran at slow speeds manned by two operators. The Fox River Division provided service for about fifteen years until the AE&C went bankrupt in 1919. After bankruptcy the company was re-organized into two separate companies: the Chicago, Aurora, and Elgin Railroad (CA&E), and the Aurora, Elgin, and Fox River Electric Company (AE&FRE).

The AE&FRE began business in 1924 under the ownership of the Western United Corporation as a subset of the Western United Gas & Electric Company, and continued to serve the Fox River area from Elgin to Aurora. The newly-organized company upgraded to single-operator trolley cars with modern amenities. However, despite initial success, as automobile sales rose and roads were paved, streetcar routes were closed. The route from Aurora to Yorkville was the first to close in 1925. The last routes in Elgin and Aurora were shut down in 1935. The CA&E continued to operate on the tracks between Geneva and St. Charles until 1937. The trolley service along the AE&FRE routes was replaced by buses. In 1936, National City Lines purchased all bus operations.

However, the AE&FRE retained tracks from the Illinois Central interchange at Coleman Yard north to the State Mental Hospital in Elgin. The AE&FRE conducted freight service only along the 3.5 mile track, bringing coal and other supplies to the hospital. After the hospital stopped using coal in 1971, the AE&FRE ended freight service. The remaining tracks between Coleman Yard and Illinois Route 31 are now operated as an electric railway museum by the Fox River Trolley Association.

Geneva Township retains some of its original farms and farmsteads. Each farm contains a collection of built structures and landscape features that include its natural features; spatial organization; circulation networks; boundary demarcations; vegetation; buildings, structures, or permanent objects; sites, and a setting. Farm sizes varied depending on the farm type, with livestock and cash grain farms tending to be larger.

White settlers first arrived in Geneva during the early 1830s, initially trading with the Potawatomi Native American tribe and opening a trading post, general store, and tavern. In 1836, Geneva was established as the permanent county seat of Kane County and the first county courthouse and jail were constructed there in 1837. Through the 1830s and 1840s, Geneva's population grew rapidly due to its status as the county seat, its proximity to agricultural resources and urban markets, and its desirable location along the Fox River that facilitated agricultural and commercial enterprises. The Fox River Valley was fertile ground for successful agricultural and dairy farming. In 1837, Geneva was platted with wide streets appropriate to a commercial center and county seat, and a second bridge and sawmill soon followed. By 1840, Geneva had three general stores, two hotels, two blacksmiths, a woodshop, and sawmill. All of its early industries were located along the Fox River where packed meat, butter, cheese, milled grains, and later glucose and flax were processed.

In the 1850s, transportation improvements substantially changed the physical, commercial, and social character and development of Geneva. In 1850, Geneva had a population of 827. That year, its first railroad service began, consisting of a two-mile branch line located on the east side of the Fox River. The branch line ran north to St. Charles and connected to the Galena & Chicago Union (G&CU) Railroad that ran in and out of West Chicago. In 1853, the G&CU Railroad's main line was extended west through Geneva, connecting it to Chicago and the West. It was the first permanent railroad line in Geneva. Three trains per day, including two passenger trains and one freight train, passed through Geneva each day.

The advent of the railroad led to the westward development of the town along the rail line, away from the town's initial development centered on the Fox River. The railroad also helped to expand industry in Geneva through the second half of the nineteenth century by facilitating the shipment of goods to urban markets, such as Chicago. Many of its industries relied on water power generated from the Fox River as well as area farms to provide crops to the local industries, which were delivered daily by the railroad. For example, the Bennett Bros. heavily relied on wheat farms to supply their flour mill in Geneva, requiring as much as 130,000 bushels per day to operate in the 1860s. The flour was then shipped by railroad across the country and even abroad. By 1900, several medium-sized industries were located in Geneva, including a creamery; glucose and reaper manufactories; Bennett Bros. "Geneva Belle" flour; and Howell Company's "Geneva" fluting and smoothing irons and tubular steel furniture. By 1977, there were only 19 farms in Geneva Township with a total acreage of 3,308 and the
major crops were corn, soybeans, oats, and alfalfa, representing a shift from the earlier reliance on wheat, dairy, and livestock (cattle and sheep) farms.

The following subsections discuss the history of farmsteads and types of farm structures.

3.5.1 Farmsteads

The farmstead complex served as the farm's operations headquarters, consisting of the farm buildings and work areas grouped around a farmyard accessed by a main driveway. Often protected by windbreaks or woodlots, most farmsteads developed as a tight cluster of buildings and structures that were spaced far enough apart to prevent the spread of fire, but close enough to reduce travel time between buildings. The farmhouse was typically sited away from livestock buildings and served as a work center for the farm. The farmstead's buildings were further arranged by function to reduce labor. In the Midwest, farms tended to be square to the road and hogs were housed to the east of the rest of the farmstead due to prevailing westerly winds. The buildings were typically laid out either in the same orientation to compass directions, in a courtyard arrangement, or in a free-form arrangement where the buildings follow the contour of a slope.

Within the farm, the farmstead was located either at its center at the end of a long driveway and close to the fields or close to the main public road for convenience purposes. Much consideration was also given to the arrangement of buildings within the farmstead complex and was largely dependent upon the direction the farmstead and house faced. A south or southeast-facing farmstead was the most common with a windbreak on the north and west sides while the other directions were less preferred due to prevailing winds and needed windbreaks.

Farmstead arrangements changed as agricultural technology changed and tractors replaced horses in the 1920s and 1930s. Different types of buildings were required as well as alterations to field divisions, pastures, fences, and storage facilities. In the early 1950s, emphasis shifted from the farmhouse as the work center of the farmstead to the farmhouse as a domestic refuge. Newly constructed farmhouses during this period reflected this shift with farmhouses built more distinctly separate from the agricultural outbuildings.

3.5.1.1 Farmyards

Within the farmstead, the farmyard functioned as the central common area into which the main driveway usually led. It was surfaced with dirt or gravel and patches of grass and was separate from the nearby ornamental lawns of the farmhouse. The farmyard was a work area with agricultural outbuildings for crop storage, animal husbandry, and implement storage grouped on one side and the domestic buildings grouped on the other side. The domestic areas usually extended outward from the farmhouse's back entrance and into the farmyard, which served as an outdoor work center for household chores. At the farmyard's edges were the windmill, electrical distribution pole, and elevated fuel tanks; the vegetable garden, orchard, and poultry house were also nearby.

3.5.2 Barns

As the most discernible and recognizable features of the rural landscape, barns have played an important role in the lives of rural residents. Barns were not only used as workspaces, but they provided space for dance halls, social events, and religious meetings. Various ethnic groups introduced different types of barns to the United States, but certain utilitarian features are commonly found on all buildings. Due to this ethnic influence, traditional building techniques dictated barn construction methods and forms. When Germans arrived in the United States, along with other central and Northern European immigrants, they erected log structures, while those from England already had an established frame building tradition. Most barns are rectangular in form, though circular and geometric forms emerged during the twentieth century. From the seventeenth century to the early twentieth century, barns did not drastically change; however, twentieth century barns displayed new forms, features, and materials as a result of mass production techniques and technological advances.

Agrarian culture was ingrained in early farmers. Often they constructed barns from memory, instinctively knowing what they should look like. During the nineteenth century, various ethnic groups living in rural locations in the United States began to come into contact with each other. As they shared ideas, and agrarian practice became increasingly scientific, ethnic distinction in barn design became less apparent. Early barn types were constructed using traditional building methods. Settlement era barns were typically single-pen barns of log construction. These were replaced by timber frame barns constructed of locally-felled logs hewn square with a broadax or at a nearby sawmill. These barns often sat on stone foundations and were assembled with mortise and tenon joints fastened with wooden pegs. By the end of the nineteenth century, traditional barn types were replaced by barn designs, such as plank and balloon frame barns, promoted in agricultural journals, land grant college programs, and later by the United States Department of Agriculture. Plank and balloon frame barns maximized storage capacity, used milled standard-sized sawn boards and machine-made nails, were faster to build, and required less wood than timber frame barns. Post-World War II, barn building techniques dramatically changed and traditional building techniques were superseded by the construction of pole barns and prefabricated structures, which were more cost-effective for farmers. These were commonly constructed of treated wood posts and corrugated steel, respectively, and clad in corrugated sheet metal.

In the Midwest, commonly used barn types included the English barn, the Midwest three-portal barn, transverse-frame barn, and dairy barns.

3.5.2.1 English Barns

The most widespread and enduring style in the United States, the English barn arrived in New England and the Chesapeake Bay area via settlers from England. After rising to prominence as the most popular barn type in the colonies, the style spread to the Midwest with few modifications. The English barn was constructed from the 1770s through the early 1900s. Constructed of timber framing, the rectangular plan barn often had a centered double-door entry located on the long side of the barn. The exterior of the barn was clad with vertical siding. Some early examples featured a steeped pitched gable roof. Generally, the English barn was one story in height with a hayloft for storage. Ventilation openings were often located on the gable end of the barn. In the Midwest, a gable-end shed was a common addition to the building. The English barn had a threebay configuration; the central bay contained a threshing area and the side bays provided space for grain storage. The English barn had few windows.

3.5.2.2 Midwest Three-portal Barn

Constructed throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the Midwest threeportal barn was derived from the transverse-farm barn and is one of the most common forms in the Midwest. Constructed of a transverse frame, the three-portal barn contains a central aisle and enclosed side aisles. The interior of the barn featured a central aisle and enclosed side aisles. These enclosed aisles provided space for stabling animals and for feed storage. An additional aisle to the three-portal barn was a common addition, resulting in a broken roof line. In some instances, the early gable roof on a Midwestthree portal barn was replaced with a gambrel roof. During the twentieth century, threeportal barns were constructed with a gambrel roof that spread over the building's side aisles. Traditionally, the Midwest three-portal barn had a large hay hood and large gable-ended doors.

3.5.2.3 Transverse-frame Barns

The transverse-frame barn evolved from a basic single-crib log structure and was constructed from the late nineteenth through mid-twentieth century. The single-crib barn was one square or rectangular crib of log construction with a gable roof. It was used for grain storage and stabling animals. The single-crib barn evolved into the double-crib and four-crib barns as farmers needed additional space. These barn types used the single-crib barn as a basic unit and added additional cribs to create the double-or four-crib barns. The four-crib barn had cribs at each corner with a common roof and intersecting aisles forming a cross. The transverse-frame barn evolved from the four-crib barn, but is of frame construction and has a closed-off cross aisle with stalls or cribs built along the wall. The transverse-frame barn entrances are located at each gable end so that wagons could be driven through the barn. Each side of the barn was lined by storage cribs or stables.

3.5.2.4 Dairy Barns

By the end of the nineteenth century, trends emerged that began to influence barn construction methods besides tradition. The use of dimensional lumber replaced timber. This lighter framing system allowed farmers to building larger loft spaces, enclosed by gambrel roofs. During this time, agricultural experimentation stations began to have an impact on barn designs. These stations promoted efficiency, sanitation, and construction techniques. These designs influenced many early twentieth century dairy barns. Dairy barns are often characterized by rows of small windows, gable-end doors, dormers, and roof ventilators.

A predominant dairy or livestock barn form is the Wisconsin dairy barn, which is distinguished by a narrow width to length ratio and a gambrel roof. Its name is derived from its origins in the state of Wisconsin where its design was developed by the

Agricultural Experiment Station of the University of Wisconsin. It was constructed from approximately 1890 to the 1930s. Other dairy barn forms include the English barn, basement barn, German barn, and round roof barn. The Wisconsin dairy barn was typically aligned north and south to allow for maximum lighting and located close enough to other dairy farming structures for efficient operation, but far enough away to reduce the danger of spreading fire. The dairy barn was also typically located southeast of the house, or west or southwest of the house but at a greater distance to alleviate odors at the farmhouse given prevailing wind patterns. Typically two stories, the dairy barn's primary entrance, consisting of double doors, was located in the gambrel end; sometimes, it was located on the long sides of the barns. The dairy barn also had a low main floor ceiling, two rows of stanchions, multiple closely spaced windows on the long side of the barn, a large hay mow with gambrel end hay door and hay hood, roof dormers, and roof ventilators. The gambrel roof shape was the most popular for increasing hay storage capacity in the barn's hay mow, which was sometimes divided into two areas to store hay and straw. The roof ventilators were essential to properly ventilate the dairy barn to prevent the spread of bovine tuberculosis and other diseases to humans. Farmers also frequently located silos near the dairy barns or directly attached them to the barn to easily feed cattle over the winter because the silos were used to store green crops, or silage.

Inside the dairy barn, the cows were confined to individual stalls, sometimes shared by the farm's horses. All dairy barns had a dedicated space where raw milk was handled. This space could be incorporated into the barn's original design, as an addition to the barn, or as an entirely separate building. These were called milk rooms or milk houses. Strict milk sanitation laws required the milk house to be completely separated from the stable area if it was not detached. Many dairy barns also had feed rooms where feed was chopped, ground, mixed, and stored. These were located on the main level or in the hay mow. Feed was originally prepared by hand but as cattle herds grew larger, technology improved, and labor became more expensive, farmers turned to mechanized feed handling to improve productivity and cut costs.

3.5.3 Agricultural Outbuildings

Outbuildings supported operations on the farm and were often smaller than the farmhouse and the farm's barns. They are usually devoted to a specific use, ranging from agricultural to domestic functions, and were integral in the preparation and storage of food for human consumption. The arrangement of outbuildings on farmsteads varies by location. In the Midwest, outbuildings frequently have the same alignment—to the cardinal compass points—a result of the rectangular land survey system. These buildings were often used in the preparation and storage of food.

Common agricultural outbuildings include the summer kitchen, smokehouse, privy, milk house, corncrib, and silo structures.

3.5.4 Agricultural Landscape Features

In addition to its built structures, farms also comprised numerous landscape features. These included, but were not limited to, fences, fields, pastures, stockyards, farm roads/paths, and ornamental plantings and landscaping around the farmhouse.

Fences were used to define property boundaries and subdivide farm land as well as to manage livestock by keeping them out of gardens and cultivated fields, off railroad tracks, within stockyards, and within pastures and harvested fields where they could forage. The type of fence used depended on its function and the type of livestock contained. Ornamental fences were used to enclose the farmhouse lawn, garden, or cemetery.

Fields were plots of land that were often tilled. Their size and shapes were largely influenced by topography, drainage, soil type, and farming methods. A pasture is grazed land that was either permanent by making use of untillable land, or impermanent rotational land. Nearly all fields and pastures were fenced for livestock and their number and sized largely depended upon the farm's crop rotation. Drainage systems were also sometimes employed to irrigate fields.

Beginning in the late nineteenth century, many farmers began to beautify their farmstead with ornamental plantings and lawns, particularly around the farmhouse. Landscaping helped separate the business and service areas of the farm from the public and private spaces by hiding the rougher and unattractive elements of the farm workspace and enhancing the appearance of the farmhouse. The farmhouse's service area at the back door was often screened from public view by hedges, trees, and screen plantings. Landscaping at the public entrance of the farmstead was intended to lead the visitor to the farmhouse entrance. Deciduous or evergreen trees were often planted in allées along the driveway leading to the farmyard.

From the main public road, the farm had a main driveway leading to the farmstead. The driveway typically approached the house from one side, passed by the service door at the back of the farmhouse, and led to the garage. It also sometimes included a turnaround area and parking near the main entrance of the house. Within the farm and between the farmstead buildings, narrow unimproved lanes led from the farmstead out to the farm's fields and pastures as well as between fields and pastures. These lanes sometimes developed informally through the continued use of a customary path. Lanes were used to move livestock and equipment around the farm in everyday operations and were sometimes improved by small bridges or other small structures.

3.6 Architecture

The following sections discuss the architectural styles and vernacular forms of resources in the APE.

3.6.1 Architectural Styles

3.6.1.1 Mid-to-Late Nineteenth Century Architectural Styles

The Central Geneva Historic District comprises a number or residential, commercial, religious, and governmental buildings executed in a variety of architectural styles from the mid-to-late nineteenth century. This includes the Greek Revival, Gothic Revival Italianate, Neoclassical, Federal Revival, and Prairie School styles. Vernacular forms predominantly characterize the older houses in the district and are built of local riverstone.

These architectural styles are primarily found within the historic district boundaries outside of the APE with several exceptions that are examples of the Greek Revival and Italianate styles.

Greek Revival

As the first and most prominent of several Romantic revival styles, the Greek Revival style dominated nineteenth century architecture in the United States from 1825 to 1860. After the War of 1812, Americans felt a new eagerness to artistically and culturally separate themselves from tyrannical Great Britain. Therefore, Americans were drawn to the architecture of ancient Greece, the style they felt best represented their democratic values.

While Americans experienced what they considered to be an era of suffrage and political liberation, they gravitated toward the architecture of ancient Greece. They felt that the architecture of Greece was bold and the more delicate Federal style soon fell out of favor. In addition, several events drew attention to Greece. Between 1821 and 1830, archaeological discoveries were made in Greece and later, the country entered a war for independence. This attracted the interest and the sympathy of Americans. By the time the style's popularity began to diminish after the Civil War, Greek Revival-style buildings had been constructed in every settled region of the United States.

The Greek Revival style is characterized by minimal references to Greek temples, exhibited by wide entablature moldings, cornice returns, columns and pilasters, and doors with paneled jambs and classical surrounds. In rural areas, many Greek Revival houses are vernacular house types to which the architectural style has been applied.

Italianate

The Italianate style appeared during the 1840s and remained popular throughout the county until the 1890s. The style was based on the domestic architecture of the Italian Renaissance, which emphasized the picturesque qualities of rural villas in Italy. However, Italianate style buildings are quite different in appearance than those designed during the Italian Renaissance.

During the early development of the Italianate, the style leaned toward informality, but over time adopted the balance and symmetry found in the Italian Renaissance. It is commonly found throughout the United Sates and was often applied to rural homes. Wide projecting eaves supported by ornate brackets, and tall, narrow windows characterize the Italianate style. More ornate homes feature cupolas, window hood molding, quoins at the elevation corners, and wooden front porches. Italianate homes are traditionally square or L-shaped in plan, but Italianate features were sometimes applied to the I-house type. Until the Panic of 1873, Italianate homes were constructed using brick or wood frame methods. Due to this economic downturn, builders opted for wood frame construction instead of brick.

3.6.1.2 Colonial Revival

The Colonial Revival style was a common and popular building type between 1880 and 1955, especially for residences. The style encompassed a renewed interest in the English and Dutch houses of early America, especially the Georgian and Adam styles. Early examples of the style were not typically historically accurate copies of Colonial-era houses. Instead, details from two or more architectural precedents were combined freely, resulting in an eclectic mixture of Colonial details. These houses had symmetrical facades with multi-pane, double-hung sash windows, an entry porch, and classical details. The Colonial Revival style persisted in popularity throughout the early and midtwentieth century in two manifestations. Pre-World War II Colonial Revival architecture often included pilasters and keystones, prominent fenestration surrounds and parapet walls on the gable ends. These houses represented close copies of early Colonial examples, the result of new printing methods at the turn of the century, which allowed for photographs of Colonial-era buildings to be widely disseminated in books and periodicals for the first time. Due to the economic downturn of the 1930s and changing architectural preferences, post-World War II Colonial Revival architecture was much less ornate, with simple posts and second story overhangs that referenced the Colonial period without additional classical motifs.

3.6.1.3 Jacobean Revival

The Jacobean Revival style is a subtype of the Tudor Revival style, which was the dominant style of domestic buildings in the early twentieth century, particularly in the 1920s and 1930s. It is based on the more formal English building traditions of Late Medieval times, unlike the Tudor Revival style, and characterized by parapeted gables. Front-facing gables rise in a parapet above the roof and side-gabled examples are similarly parapeted. The style is also characterized by shaped Flemish gables, flat-roofed towers, and bays with castellated parapets. Facade detailing usually consist of Gothic or Renaissance inspiration and did not incorporate the false-timbering that often characterized the Tudor Revival style. The Jacobean Revival style was commonly found in architect-designed landmarks built between 1895 and 1915. After World War I, less formal examples of the style dominated and the parapeted Jacobean Revival style persisted in scattered examples through the 1930s.

3.6.1.4 Modern-Era

Modern-era architecture became popular in the United States in the 1940s after the arrival of exiled European Bauhaus architects such as Marcel Breuer, Walter Gropius, and Mies van der Rohe. The American manifestation of the movement was less political than the Bauhaus, but still emphasized efficient design and modern materials. Early Modern-designed office towers and public buildings maximized space and windows with minimal facade decoration. The Modern house slowly became popular throughout the mid-twentieth century. While West Coast varieties were constructed before World War II, the movement became more popular after the war. The Modern house was influenced not only by the Bauhaus, but also the Prairie Style architecture of the previous decades. Some Prairie Style elements include low-pitched gables and overhanging eaves. Modern architecture emphasized harmony between the building and surrounding landscape, and utilized natural light. Basic characteristics of Modernera dwellings include clean horizontal and vertical lines, rectangular forms, low massing, lack of decoration, the use of several modern materials, and the use of glass to take advantage of natural light. These features were also applied to commercial buildings.

After World War II, Modern architects began exploring different forms such as curved surfaces made possible by new materials. Frank Lloyd Wright's Guggenheim Museum, constructed in 1956, utilized reinforced concrete to create a curved, inward-focused shell. Wright asserted that Modern architecture was not purely motivated by function, but could also portray symbolic or psychological force. Eero Saarinen, a contemporary architect and son of Eliel Saarinen, agreed with Wright and designed Modern-era structures such as the Gateway Arch in St. Louis, Missouri, for a design competition in 1948 and the Trans World Airlines Terminal at Kennedy Airport in New York City in 1962. Saarinen improved his design for the Gateway arch over the following years and construction began in 1961. He utilized a soaring parabolic form to celebrate the early pioneers' journey through the expansive, unknown western territory. When designing the Trans World Airlines Terminal, he utilized curved lines and cantilevered spaces that portray the idea of flight.

3.6.2 Vernacular Building Types

3.6.2.1 Gable-Front

During the Greek Revival era in the United States from 1825 to 1860, the gable-front house emerged as the preferred building form. Because the principal facade of the building formed a triangle beneath the gable front, the facade mimics the classical pediment of a Greek temple. In cases where the facade is fully adorned in Greek Revival ornamentation, the gable-front house is instead referred to as a "Temple-Front." The principal facade of the gable-front house is located at the gable end of the building. The rectangular plan house is often one-and-one-half stores in height. As settlers moving westward adopted the gable-front form, stylistic characteristics began to diminish.

There are several variations of gable-front houses. The gabled-ell is a gable-front house with a side extension, forming an L-shaped footprint and ranging from one to two stories in height; the ell is sometimes an addition built after the original gable-front house. This ell—or side extension—is often integral to and the same height as the gable-front section of the house. A gable-front house with a perpendicular rear portion is referred to as a T-plan house. Like the gabled-ell, the T-plan house ranges in height from one to two stories and the front and rear portions are the same height. The gabled-ell and T-plan houses in rural areas are generally unornamented, particularly later examples after the Civil War.

3.6.2.2 American Foursquare

In the early twentieth century, the American Foursquare became a popular house form in urban and rural areas. The American Foursquare is also sometimes classified as vernacular Prairie, cornbelt cube, or Midwest box for its prevalence in rural locations. The two-story American Foursquare typically had a low-pitched, hipped roof with attic dormers; wide, enclosed eaves; and a one-story, full-width porch at the facade. It was frequently distinguished by Prairie or Craftsman influenced stylistic detailing, unlike its rural counterparts, which remained relatively plain; Colonial Revival, Neoclassical, and Tudor Revival influences were also sometimes incorporated. In Chicago and the surrounding suburbs, the American Foursquare often incorporated Prairie and Craftsman-style elements and shared a similar interior floor plan with the bungalow form. The American Foursquare's boxy shape provided a maximum amount of interior space while making the most of small city lots.

3.6.2.3 Minimal Traditional Cape Cod

The Minimal Traditional form was a common housing form throughout the United States during and post-World War II. A prewar demand for suitable housing first arose during the Great Depression and standardized housing was developed by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) for single-family homes. The FHA standards delineated housing orientation, lot size, form, style, and room layout. Standardization assisted in meeting demands for housing as builders were able to construct large and small suburban communities quickly and efficiently across the nation. Increased automobile use, new prosperity, government and private encouragement of home ownership, a shift in standards of living, and readily available land also contributed to this development. The simplistic Minimal Traditional form typically had a rectangular plan, few architectural elements, and did not have an attached garage or carport.

The Cape Cod form is a subset of the Minimal Traditional form and was most often defined by its one-and-one-half-stories, side-gabled form, front-gabled dormers, and simple stylized door surrounds or cornices.

3.6.2.4 Ranch House

The Ranch house was a common and popular house type and style during the midtwentieth century in suburban and rural areas. First gathering nationwide attention in California, high-style Ranch houses incorporated single-story forms with long and low profiles, attached garages, overhanging eaves, and an integration of indoor and outdoor living spaces. The style's popularity grew in the post-World War II era as the nation's need for affordable housing grew exponentially and Ranch house communities were omnipresent. Many examples abandoned the innovative details of high-style examples, and the Ranch house label has grown to include single-story houses that otherwise lack a discernible style; these more modest examples are also commonly called Ramblers.

In predominately rural regions, Ranch houses are often built in small clusters or by themselves along major roads or on large farmsteads. In some cases, affordable, adaptable, and modern Ranch house frequently replaced the original farmhouses as they fell into disrepair or became too expensive to maintain; in some instances, new Ranch

houses co-existed with the original farmhouses on farmsteads. The suburban Ranch house was characterized by an emphasis on outdoor living and landscaping, which did not always translate to its rural counterparts; this may have been due to the existing relationships between the farmhouse and the outbuildings within the farm complex. The Ranch house also appealed to mid-twentieth century rural residents who were not engaged in agriculture.

3.6.2.5 Split-Level

The mid-twentieth century Split-Level house is a multi-story modification to the Ranch house. It provided a larger house on roughly the same footprint as a compact Ranch house. It shares some stylistic qualities, such as a side-gable roof, multiple exterior cladding materials, and asymmetrical windows.

4.0 Effects Assessment

This section discusses the assessment of effects to NRHP-listed and NRHP-eligible properties within the APE.

Effects assessments are based on the criteria of adverse effect as defined in 36 CFR 800.5, "Assessment of adverse effects." According to this portion of the regulations, the criteria of adverse effect are defined as follows:

An adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Consideration shall be given to all qualifying characteristics of a historic property, including those that may have been identified subsequent to the original evaluation of the property's eligibility for the National Register. Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance, or be cumulative.

Examples of adverse effects are identified in 36 CFR 800.5 and include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property
- Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation, and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the Secretary's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR 68) and applicable guidelines
- Removal of the property from its historic location
- Change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance

- Introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features
- Neglect of a property that causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization
- Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property's historic significance

To determine if any historic properties would be affected by the Project, documentation was reviewed for all NRHP-listed and eligible properties within the APE and the Project plans were reviewed. Using the criteria of adverse effect established in 36 CFR 800.5(a)(1) and guidance found in the National Register Bulletin *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, each historic property was evaluated to determine if implementation of the Project would alter any historically significant characteristics or features of each historic property by diminishing relevant aspects of that property's historic integrity.

For each historic property, a finding was made regarding the Project's potential to affect its aspects of integrity. The findings correspond to the guidelines set forth 36 CFR 800 and are supported by information on integrity in the National Register Bulletin *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. The following findings were used to assess Project effects to individual historic properties and to make an overall Project finding of effect:

- No Effect: Per 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1), an undertaking may have "No Effect" to historic properties present in the APE, and a finding of "No Effect" may be determined for an undertaking. This finding indicates that an undertaking would not alter any aspects of integrity for any historic properties. This rationale will be used to assess effects to historic properties within the APE for which there would be no direct physical impact and there would be no visual impact due to distance and intervening elements, such as topography, vegetation, and structures.
- No Adverse Effect: Per 36 CFR 800.5(b), an undertaking may be determined to have "No Adverse Effect" to historic properties if the undertaking's effects do not meet the criteria of adverse effect as described above. If project implementation would alter a specific aspect of integrity for a historic property but the effect would not alter a characteristic that qualifies that resource for inclusion in the NRHP in a manner that diminishes the significant aspect of integrity, then the finding for that aspect of integrity is "No Adverse Effect."
- Adverse Effect: An "Adverse Effect" is determined if the undertaking would alter a characteristic that qualifies that contributing resource for inclusion in the NRHP in a manner that diminishes the significant aspect(s) of integrity.

Although a portion of the Project would occur within new right-of-way and temporary and permanent easements along the existing right-of-way, no direct effects (i.e. physical impacts) to historic properties were identified. No proposed improvements are located within the boundaries of properties eligible for or listed in the NRHP.

The historic properties were also assessed for indirect effects from the Project. No auditory, vibratory, or atmospheric effects to any historic properties were identified. Project effects are limited to changes to historic properties' visual settings, an indirect effect, due to the addition of a third mainline track within the existing railroad right-of-way, minor improvements to at-grade street/rail crossings, and minor improvements to the existing structure crossing the Fox River. All changes to historic properties' settings would be minor and not adverse. Furthermore, no cumulative effects were identified. Therefore, no adverse effects were identified for any historic properties.

The following effects assessment for the NRHP-listed Central Geneva Historic District and the two recommended NRHP-eligible properties, Island Park South Bridge and Weber Farmstead, includes a detailed narrative assessment for each historic property. Although each historic property has been considered individually, per Section 106 regulations, an overall finding of No Adverse Effect is recommended for the proposed Union Pacific West Third Mainline – Western Section Project.

4.1.1 Central Geneva Historic District

Near the Central Geneva Historic District, project activity would include the addition of a third mainline track, at-grade street/rail crossing improvements along 1st Street, and improvements to the existing structure at the Fox River crossing. The third mainline track would be added south of the existing two mainline tracks within the existing UP right-of-way. Additional right-of-way is required along the south side of the existing UP right-of-way near 1st Street. The new third mainline track would be located approximately 70 feet south of the Central Geneva Historic District's south NRHP boundary, which is located concurrent with the UP's north right-of-way boundary between 1st Street and the Fox River, and approximately 165 feet south of the nearest contributing property, the Clancy House at 503 South 1st Street. On the north side of the tracks, the at-grade street/rail crossing improvements along 1st Street would include the full-depth pavement reconstruction of 1st Street within the existing roadway and railroad right-of-way to accommodate the third mainline track. The reconstruction of 1st Street under the railroad would extend approximately 300 feet from the tracks north and south along that street. Reconstruction would require temporary road closures and detours as well as minor temporary construction easements for grading purposes. The 1st Street improvements would be located just within the district's west NRHP boundary along 1st Street, south of South Street, and approximately 20 feet west of the nearest contributing property, the Clancy House at 503 South 1st Street. The improvements to the existing structure over the Fox River would include the construction of a new bridge span on the existing piers and abutments to accommodate a third mainline track; the structure was originally constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. The existing abutments would be extended to accommodate new retaining walls, a new deck, and the third mainline track. These improvements would be located

approximately 60 feet south of the district's southeast NRHP boundary and approximately 400 feet southeast of the nearest contributing property, the Clancy House at 503 South 1st Street.

No physical impacts to contributing properties within the Central Geneva Historic District would occur. Although project activity is proposed within the district's historic boundary, all project activity would occur within the existing roadway and railroad right-of-way. Further, no project activity is proposed within the legal parcels of any contributing property. Therefore, no effects to the district's integrity of location, design, workmanship, or materials would occur.

Project implementation would not adversely affect the Central Geneva Historic District's integrity of setting. Although a portion of 1st Street would be reconstructed within the district's boundaries, resulting in temporary visual and noise effects during construction, project activity would be limited to the existing roadway and traffic and would not obstruct any historically significant views between contributing buildings or to and from the district. The setting south of the district has been diminished by previous modifications not related to the Project, including new commercial buildings, parking lots, and a multi-story parking structure. Further, the district's contributing properties are primarily oriented east and west along residential streets, north and away from the Project. A dense cluster of mature deciduous and evergreen trees along the UP's north right-of-way, 1st Street, and the Fox River, as well as intervening buildings and parking lots between 1st and 6th Streets, obstruct views to the proposed Fox River crossing improvements and proposed third mainline track. No historically significant views to or from the district would be obscured, and no component of the district's setting would be adversely affected or altered. No historically significant views would be obscured by the Project and only temporary visual effects during construction to the district were identified. Based on current information, no auditory, vibratory, or atmospheric impacts were identified for this district. Therefore, project implementation would have no adverse effect to the Central Geneva Historic District's integrity of setting.

Furthermore, no project activity would alter the district's feeling as an architecturally significant collection of mid-to-late-nineteenth century residential, commercial, religious, and governmental buildings, or its association with those architectural styles or the development of the original platted settlement of Geneva. Therefore, project implementation would have no effect to the district's integrity of feeling and association.

Based on this evaluation, the UP-W Third Mainline – Western Section would have no adverse effect to the Central Geneva Historic District.

4.1.2 Island Park South Bridge

Near the Island Park South Bridge, project activity would include the addition of a third mainline track and improvements to the existing structure at the Fox River crossing. The third mainline track would be added south of the existing two mainline tracks within the existing UP right-of-way. Additional right-of-way is required along the south side of

existing UP right-of-way near the Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant on the east side of the Fox River. The improvements to the existing structure over the Fox River would include the construction of a new bridge span on the existing piers and abutments to accommodate a third mainline track; the structure was originally constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. The existing abutments would be extended to accommodate new retaining walls, a new deck, and the third mainline track. These improvements would be located approximately 65 feet southeast of the bridge's proposed south NRHP boundary.

No physical impacts to the Island Park South Bridge would occur. No project activity is proposed within the property's historic boundary and all project activity would occur within the existing railroad right-of-way. Therefore, no direct effects to the property's integrity of location, design, workmanship, or materials would occur.

Project implementation would not adversely affect the Island Park South Bridge's integrity of setting. Located along the Fox River and north of the Project, a dense cluster of mature deciduous and evergreen trees along the UP's north right-of-way and the Fox River partially obscures proximate views to the proposed Fox River crossing improvements and proposed third mainline track. The proposed Fox River crossing bridge span would be located on the south side of the existing bridge span and would be visible from some portions of the bridge, representing a minor change to its historically significant viewsheds south toward the railroad and the Fox River crossing. However, this minor change to setting would not be adverse as it would not diminish any character-defining features of the bridge. Therefore, no adverse visual effects to the property were identified. Based on current information, no auditory, vibratory, or atmospheric impacts were identified for this property. Therefore, project implementation would have no adverse effect to the Island Park South Bridge's integrity of setting.

Furthermore, no project activity would alter the property's feeling as a limestone-faced concrete, closed-spandrel, deck arch bridge embodying rustic style park architecture of the early twentieth century, or its association with that style, bridge type, or as a Public Works Administration-funded project in Geneva. Therefore, project implementation would have no effect to the property's integrity of feeling and association.

Based on this evaluation, the UP-W Third Mainline – Western Section would have no adverse effect to the Island Park South Bridge.

4.1.3 Weber Farmstead

Near the Weber Farmstead, project activity would include the addition of a third mainline track. The third mainline track would be added south of the existing two mainline tracks within the existing UP right-of-way, which is south of the Weber Farmstead and outside of its proposed NRHP boundary. The new third mainline track would be located approximately 55 feet south of the farmstead's proposed south NRHP boundary.

No physical impacts to the Weber Farmstead would occur. No project activity is proposed within the property's historic boundary and all project activity would occur within the existing railroad right-of-way. Therefore, no direct effects to the property's integrity of location, design, workmanship, or materials would occur.

Project implementation would not adversely affect the Weber Farmstead's integrity of setting. Although the farmstead has a largely unobstructed view south to the proposed third mainline track, it would represent a minor change to the property's setting and would not diminish any character-defining features of the farmstead. Furthermore, the spatial relationships of the farmstead's extant buildings with each other contributes more to conveying its historical significance than the greater setting outside of it. Therefore, no adverse visual effects to the property were identified. Based on current information, no auditory, vibratory, or atmospheric impacts were identified for this property. Therefore, project implementation would have no adverse effect to the Weber Farmstead's integrity of setting.

Furthermore, no project activity would alter the property's feeling as an extant early-tomid-twentieth century farmstead, or its association with that type, or as a former dairy or cattle farm in Geneva. Therefore, project implementation would have no effect to the property's integrity of feeling and association.

Based on this evaluation, the UP-W Third Mainline – Western Section would have no adverse effect to the Weber Farmstead.

5.0 Survey and Research Personnel

Architectural historians who meet the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (36 CFR 61) completed the field investigations and property research, and prepared the determinations of NRHP eligibility in this report.

Name	Qualification	Primary Responsibilities
WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff		
Aimee D. Paquin Architectural Historian	M.S., Historic Preservation B.A., History and American Studies 8 years of experience	Principal Investigator Report Methodology Field Investigations Property Research Determinations of NRHP Eligibility
Stephanie S. Foell Senior Supervising Architectural and Landscape Historian	M.H.P., Historic Preservation B.S., History and Psychology 20 years of experience	Technical guidance and review
Melinda Schmidt Architectural Historian	M.S., Historic Preservation B.A., History 3 years of experience	Property Research Determinations of NRHP Eligibility
Meghan Hamilton	B.S., Civil Engineering 8 years of experience	APE Map Set

Table 5-1.	Survey	and	Research	Personnel

6.0 Bibliography

- "\$1,530,000 Western United Corporation." *The Milwaukee Sentinel.* February 19, 1925. https://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1368&dat=19250219&id= nX9RAAAAIBAJ&sjid=UA8EAAAAIBAJ&pg=4189,3868006&hl=en.
- "About Winfield Township." *Winfield Township*. Accessed February 9, 2016. <u>http://www.oldplaces.org/dupage_county/winfieldhist74.htm</u>.
- Amer, Robin. "100 years of Chicago bungalows." December 30, 2013. <u>http://www.wbez.org/news/culture/100-years-chicago-bungalows-109448</u>.
- Ann Arbor Modern. "Characteristics of Modern Architecture." Accessed October 19, 2015. http://a2modern.org/2011/04/characteristics-of-modern-architecture/.
- "Aurora/Elgin/Fox River Valley." *Chicago Rail Fan.* Accessed February 9, 2016. <u>http://www.chicagorailfan.com/histaefr.html</u>.
- Buffalo as an Architectural Museum. "International Style." Accessed October 23, 2015. http://www.buffaloah.com/a/DCTNRY/i/intrntl.html.
- Chicago Architecture Foundation. "Mid-Century Modernism." Accessed October 23, 2015. <u>http://www.architecture.org/architecture-chicago/visual-dictionary/entry/mid-century-modernism/</u>.
- City of Geneva. "History of Geneva." Accessed February 1, 2016. <u>http://www.geneva.il.us/index.aspx?nid=320</u>.
- Geneva Township Assessor's Office. "Online Property Search." Accessed March 23, 2016. <u>http://www.genevatownship.com/searchmethod.asp</u>.
- Gateway Arch. "History of the Gateway Arch." Accessed February 1, 2016. <u>http://www.gatewayarch.com/about/history.aspx</u>.
- "FAQ Database." Chicago and Northwestern Historical Society. Accessed February 9, 2016. http://www.cnwhs.org/faq.pl?command=fulllist.
- "Fox River Trolley Museum." Illinois State Archives. Accessed February 9, 2016. http://www.ilsos.gov/archivalrepositories/details.do?seq_number=327.
- Hicks, Randall. "Aurora Elgin and Fox River Electric Car 306 An Illustrated History." Hicks Car Works. Accessed February 9, 2016. <u>http://hickscarworks.blogspot.com/2013/04/history-of-car306.html</u>.

Higgins, Jo Fredell. Geneva, Illinois. Chicago, IL: Arcadia Publishing, 2002.

- "History." Fox River Trolley Museum. Accessed February 9, 2016. http://www.foxtrolley.org/history.
- "Introducing the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad." Burlington Route Historical Society. Accessed February 9, 2016. <u>http://www.burlingtonroute.com/cbg.html</u>.
- Longstreth, Richard. *The Buildings of Main Street: A Guide to American Commercial Architecture.* Washington, DC: Preservation Press, National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1987.
- McAlester, Virginia and Lee Savage. A Field Guide to American Houses. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984.
- McGrath, Steph. "DuPage County." In *Encyclopedia of Chicago*. 2016. <u>http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/396.html</u>.
- Metra. "Chicago & North Western Lines History." 2015. <u>https://metrarail.com/metra/en/home/about_metra/leadership/metra_history/chicago_no</u> <u>rth_westernlineshistory.html</u>.
- Meyer, Sherry. "Geneva, IL." In *Encyclopedia of Chicago*. 2016. <u>http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/510.html</u>.
- Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT). *Historic Context Study of Minnesota Farms*, *1820-1960*. June 2005.
- Musich, Jerry. "West Chicago." In *History of DuPage County: DuPage Roots*. 2016. <u>http://www.dupagehistory.org/dupage_roots/West%20Chicago_22.htm</u>.
- National Register of Historic Places. Central Geneva Historic District, Geneva, Kane County, Illinois. National Register #79000845.
- Nationwide Environmental Title Research, LLC. "Historic Aerials." 2016. http://www.historicaerials.com.
- Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission. "Art Deco Style: 1925-1940." Accessed October 26, 2015. <u>http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/modern_movements/2391/art</u>

_deco_style/296449.

Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission. "Classical Revival Style 1895-1950." Accessed October 12, 2015. <u>http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/late_19th___early_20th_centu</u>

ry_revival_period/2390/classical_revival_style/294771.

Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission. "Colonial Revival Style: 1880-1960." Accessed November 4, 2015. http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/late_19th___early_20th_centu ry_revival_period/2390/colonial_revival_style/294769.

- Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission. "Sullivanesque Style 1890-1930." 2015. <u>http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/late_19th___early_20th_centu</u> <u>ry_movements/2392/sullivanesque_style/296420.</u>
- Pfannkuche, Craig L. "Kane County." In *Encyclopedia of Chicago*. 2016. <u>http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/685.html</u>.
- Pierson, Joe. "Chicago & North Western A Capsule History." 2004. http://www.cnwhs.org/ch_cnw.htm.
- Roth, Leland M. American Architecture A History. Boulder: Westview Press, 2000.
- Sanborn Map Company. *Geneva, Kane County, Illinois 1908-1950*. New York: Sanborn Map Company.
- Stennett, William H., Chicago and North Western Railway Company. Yesterday and Today. Chicago: Winship Company, 1910. Archive. Accessed February 9, 2016. <u>https://archive.org/details/cu31924032484572</u>.
- Teague, Jane S. "West Chicago, IL." In *Encyclopedia of Chicago*. 2016. <u>http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/1334.html</u>.
- The Old House Web. "Prairie Style House, 1900-1920." 2015. <u>http://www.oldhouseweb.com/architecture-and-design/prairie-style-house-1900-</u> <u>1920.shtml.</u>
- "The Third Rail Division." Great Third Rail. Accessed February 9, 2016. http://www.greatthirdrail.org/history/CIII.html.
- "Winfield Township History from the '1874 Atlas and History of DuPage County, Illinois.'" DuPage County Illinois the IIGenWeb Project. Accessed February 9, 2016. http://www.oldplaces.org/dupage_county/winfieldhist74.htm.



Area of Potential Effects Map





> Peck to Kress West Chicago, IL (MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41) Project No. HG-4846

> > Exhibit 1 of 8

Date: July 5, 2016







> Peck to Kress West Chicago, IL (MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41) Project No. HG-4846

> > Exhibit 2 of 8 Date: July 5, 2016





> Peck to Kress West Chicago, IL (MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41) Project No. HG-4846

> > Exhibit 3 of 8 Date: July 5, 2016





> Peck to Kress West Chicago, IL (MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41) Project No. HG-4846

> > Exhibit 4 of 8 Date: July 5, 2016





> Peck to Kress West Chicago, IL (MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41) Project No. HG-4846

> > Exhibit 5 of 8 Date: July 5, 2016





> Peck to Kress West Chicago, IL (MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41) Project No. HG-4846

> > Exhibit 6 of 8 Date: July 5, 2016





> Peck to Kress West Chicago, IL (MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41) Project No. HG-4846

> > Exhibit 7 of 8 Date: July 5, 2016





> Peck to Kress West Chicago, IL (MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41) Project No. HG-4846

> > Exhibit 8 of 8

Date: March 14, 2017



Survey Data Summary Table

Appendix B - Survey Data Summary Table

						·] · ·	-	
Survey	Name	Address	Year	Property Type,	NRHP Status	NRHP	Date	Photograph
ID			Built	Style, and/or Form		Criteria	Evaluated	

1-1	33W441 Roosevelt Road	33W441 Roosevelt Road, Geneva	1966	Warehouse, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
signific		kample of a mid-twe e, and features are t					r historical	

	1-2	0N799 Old Kirk Road	0N799 Old Kirk Road, West Chicago	1949	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
5	signific original	ance. Replacement footprint, contribute	altered example of vinyl siding and vir e to diminished inte chitectural significa	nyl windov grity of de	ws, as well as seve	eral large rear add	litions that a	alter the	

1-3	0N902 Old Kirk Road	0N902 Old Kirk Road, West Chicago	1966	Office and Laboratory, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
signific labora display	cance. CLC Lubrica tory; research did n	xample of a mid-twe ints has owned and iot reveal prior owne luences derived fro significant.	occupiec ership or a	l the building since any historically sigi	1985, using it as a nificant association	an office a ns. The bu	ind ilding	

Appendix B – Survey Data Summary Table

UP-W Third Mainline – Western Section

Survey Name	Address	Year	Property Type	NRHP Status	NRHP	Date	Photograph
ID		Built	and/or Style		Criteria	Evaluated	

1-4	33W749 Reed Road	33W749 Reed Road, Geneva	1963	Machine Shop, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
and his machin east po	y/Notes: Modest an torical significance. le shop; research di ortion is the original ry west portion was	Press Techniques d not reveal prior o one-story office and	Inc. has o wnership d one-and	owned and occupie or any historically d-one-half-story rea	ed the building sir significant associa ar shop; the large	ce 1981, us ations. The one-and-o	sing it as a building's ne-half to	

1-5	33W859 Reed Road	33W859 Reed Road, Geneva	1961	Office and Warehouse, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
and his integrit	storical significance.	nd basic example of . Infilled window ope terials. Its type, style ficance.	enings an	d replacement viny	yl siding contribute	e to diminis	hed	

1-6	1340 Reed Road	1340 Reed Road, Geneva	1959	Office and Warehouse, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
and hi	ty/Notes: Basic and storical significance. e architectural signi	Its type, style, and						

Survey Name	Address	Year	Property Type	NRHP Status	NRHP	Date	Photograph
ID		Built	and/or Style		Criteria	Evaluated	

1-7	Johnson Controls Battery Group, Inc.	300 South Glengarry Drive, Geneva	1961	Industrial Complex, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
and his firm, Jo section design	y/Notes: Modest an storical significance. ohnson Controls, res displays minor styl and is not architect and does not indica	Although associate search did not revea istic influences deri urally significant. Th	ed with the al any his ved from ne remair	e battery manufact torically significant Modern-era design der of the complex	turing division of g associations. The n tenets; however	lobal man e complex's , it is not ar	ufacturing s office n influential	

1-8	Alexander House	310 Sandholm Street, Geneva	ca. 1838	House, Greek Revival	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016
of the this pe wings workm	Integrity/Notes: See determination of eligibility form. Modest and altered example of a vernacular interpretation of the Greek Revival style applied to the gable-front form and commonly found throughout the Midwest during this period; the house lacks character-defining features of the style. Large additions to the flanking side-gable wings detract from the overall appearance and original design intent, diminishing integrity of design and workmanship. Background research did not indicate any historically significant associations with Geneva's early nineteenth century settlement period or persons significant in the past.						



1-9	428 Chalmers Street	428 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1880	House, Gabled- Ell	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
and hi contrib	ty/Notes: Modest ar storical significance bute to diminished in nacular gabled-ell ho	. Replacement vinyl tegrity of design, w	l siding, a orkmansł	luminum-sash wind hip, and materials.	dows, and enclose Its type, style, and	ed front por I features a	ch	

Survey Name	Address	Year	Property Type	NRHP Status	NRHP	Date	Photograph
ID		Built	and/or Style		Criteria	Evaluated	

1-10	420 Chalmers Street	420 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1952	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
Integrity/Notes: Basic example of a mid-twentieth century house lacking architectural and historical significance. Replacement windows and an enclosed former carport contribute to diminished integrity of design, workmanship, and materials. The building displays minor stylistic influences derived from Modern-era design tenets, such as the slightly angled rooflines and low, horizontal form; however, it is not an influential design and is not architecturally significant.								

1-11	402 Chalmers Street	402 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1954	House, Ranch	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
histo integ	rity/Notes: Modest ar rical significance. Re rity of design, workm pretations of mid-twe	placement vinyl sidi anship, and materia						

1-12	328 Chalmers Street	328 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1951	House, Minimal Traditional	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
archite and fe	Integrity/Notes: Modest and typical example of a mid-twentieth century Minimal Traditional house lacking architectural and historical significance. Although it retains its overall form and original windows, its type, style, and features are typical of Minimal Traditional houses of this period and do not indicate architectural significance.							



Survey Name

ID

1-14

320 Chalmers

Street

1-15 314 Chalmers

Address

320 Chalmers

Street, Geneva

314 Chalmers

1-13	324 Chalmers Street	324 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1937	House, Cape Cod	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	1

Property Type

and/or Style

NRHP Status

Recommended N/A

Recommended N/A

Not Eligible

NRHP

Criteria

Date

2016

2016

Evaluated

Photograph

Inte sigr rep roo design, workmanship, and materials.

1927

1923

Year

Built

Integrity/Notes: Modest and typical example of an early twentieth century house displaying minor stylistic							
influence	ces derived from the	e Tudor Revival styl	le, primar	ily in the projecting	gable-front entra	nce domina	ating the
	and its round arch						
not arc	hitecturally significa	nt. Replacement vi	nyl siding	, vinyl windows, an	d decorative shut	ters, as we	ll as a
rear ad	dition, contribute to	diminished integrity	y of desig	n, workmanship, a	nd materials.		

	Street	Street, Geneva		Discernible Style	Not Eligible		
historic	y/Notes: Modest an cal significance. Rep	blacement vinyl sidir	ng, vinyl v	vindows, and front	doorway, as well	as the addi	tion of an

House, No

attached flat-roof garage and non-historic porch, contribute to diminished integrity of design, workmanship, and materials. Its type, style, and features do not indicate architectural significance.

tegrit	y/Notes: Modest an	d altered example c	of a 1930s	s Cape Cod house	lacking architectu	ural and his	torical	
		cks the character-de						
	, ,	nd vinyl windows, no		5				
of ad	dition on the rear el	evation, and a large	e two-stor	y rear addition con	tribute to diminish	ned integrity	/ of	

House, No Discernible

Style







302 Chalmers

Street, Geneva

1-17

302 Chalmers

Street

Integrity/Notes: Modest and basic example of a mid-twentieth century Cape Code house lacking architectural and historical significance. The house displays minor stylistic influences derived from the Cape Cod and Ranch house forms, including the facade dormers, side-gable form, and facade picture window. A rear addition and large attached garage alter its original footprint. Its type, style, and features are typical of modest mid-twentieth century Cape Cod houses and do not indicate architectural significance.

1-18 228 Chalmers 228 Chalmers 1950 House, Cape Recommended N/A 2016 Not Eligible Street Street, Geneva Cod

Integrity/Notes: Modest and altered example of an early twentieth century h historical significance. It appears to originally have had a gabled-ell form that the addition of a nearly full-width, shed-roof front porch and facade dormer and vinyl windows also contribute to diminished integrity of design, workma and features do not indicate architectural significance.

Not Eligible	
house lacking architectural and hat has been significantly altered by window. Replacement wood siding anship, and materials. Its type, style,	

Integrity/Notes: Modest and basic example of a mid-twentieth century house lacking architectural and historical significance. Non-original window openings, replacement vinyl siding and windows, and large rear additions contribute to diminished integrity of design, workmanship, and materials. Its type, style, and features do not indicate architectural significance.

> House. No Discernible

Style

1915

Su ID	irvey	Name	Address	Year Built	Property Type and/or Style	NRHP Status	NRHP Criteria	Date Evaluated	Photograph
1-	16	310 Chalmers Street	310 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1948	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	

Recommended N/A

2016	
l and altered by bod siding ype, style,	



Survey Name	Address	Year	Property Type	NRHP Status	NRHP	Date	Photograph
ID		Built	and/or Style		Criteria	Evaluated	

1-19	224 Chalmers Street	224 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1963	House, Cape Cod	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016				
historio Replac	Integrity/Notes: Modest and late example of a mid-twentieth century Cape Cod house lacking architectural and historical significance. The house lacks the character-defining facade dormers of the Cape Cod form. Replacement vinyl siding and vinyl windows contribute to diminished integrity of design, workmanship, and materials. Its type, style, and features do not indicate architectural significance.										

1-20	220 Chalmers Street	220 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1947	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
histori and-or additio appea	cal significance. The ne-half-story, gable ons and replacement rance and overall f	htly altered example the house appears to a-front addition and c nt wood-shingle sidi orm, contributing to t indicate architectu	originally one-story ng and vi a lack of	v have been a Mir hipped-roof addi nyl windows have integrity of design	nimal Traditional hou ition along its rear el e significantly altered	use with a levation. d its origin	a large one- These nal	

1-21	214 Chalmers Street	214 Chalmers Street, Geneva	1949	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
historio	ty/Notes: Modest an cal significance. Its c. Replacement viny als. Its type, style, a	original rectangular I siding and window	footprint l /s further	has been altered ir diminish its integri	nto a L-shape by t ty of design, work	he addition	of a	
Surv	ey Name	Address	Year	Property Type	NRHP Status	NRHP	Date	Photograph
------	---------	---------	-------	---------------	-------------	----------	-----------	------------
ID			Built	and/or Style		Criteria	Evaluated	

Integrity/Notes: Although the Geneva Township Assessor provided a construction date of 1922, the house's hipped-roof square two-story form, tall first-story windows, and wide overhanging roof with brackets are suggestive of the Italianate style; it likely dates to the 1880s with the one-story and one-and-one-half-story additions potentially added in 1922. These additions have altered the house's overall form and original appearance. Replacement wood-shingle siding, vinyl windows, and brick chimney further contribute to diminished integrity of design, workmanship, and materials. Its type, style, and features do not indicate architectural significance. 602 Crissey 1933, 1973, 2004 Sewage Treatment Plant Recommended N/A 2016 1-23 Geneva Waste Water Treatment Plant 602 Crissey Avenue, Geneva 1973, 2004 Service Station, Jacobean Revival N/A 2016	1-22	321 Crissey Avenue	321 Crissey Avenue, Geneva	1922	House, Italianate	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
Water Treatment Plant Avenue, Geneva 1973, 2004 Treatment Plant Not Eligible Service Station, Jacobean	hipped sugges additio appeal diminis	I-roof square two-sto stive of the Italianato ons potentially addeo rance. Replacemen shed integrity of des	ory form, tall first-sto e style; it likely date d in 1922. These ad t wood-shingle sidir	bry windo s to the 1 ditions hang, vinyl v	ows, and wide overl 880s with the one- ave altered the hou windows, and brick	hanging roof with story and one-and ise's overall form chimney further c	brackets d-one-ha and origi ontribute	are lf-story nal to	
	1-23	Water Treatment		1973,	0		N/A	2016	

construction as the original infrastructure was completely replaced in 1973 and added to in 2004. The extant 1933 service station and laboratory building is a modest, altered example of the Jacobean Revival style applied to a public works building and not architecturally significant. Although significant for its association with the City of Geneva's municipally-run wastewater treatment system in the early twentieth century, the plant no longer retains integrity to convey this association or its association with 1930s wastewater treatment.



1-24	Island Park South Bridge	Fox River Trail over Fox River East Channel at Island Park, Geneva	1937	Bridge, Concrete Closed- Spandrel Deck Arch	Recommended Eligible	A, C	2016	
histori	cally significant asso	mination of eligibility ociation as a Public	Works Ad	dministration-funde	ed project in Gene	va and ur	nder	

Criterion C as a representative and intact example of a limestone-faced concrete, closed-spandrel, deck arch bridge that embodies the rustic style architecture tenets of using stone building materials and an appropriate scale for the natural landscape and setting of Island Park.



Survey	Name	Address	Year	Property Type	NRHP Status	NRHP	Date	Photograph
ID			Built	and/or Style		Criteria	Evaluated	

1-25	Geneva Railroad Bridge	Bridge carrying Union Pacific Railroad over Fox River, Geneva	1920	Railroad Bridge, Steel Deck- Girder	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
and the researce in this origina	e improvement of th ch did not indicate a location. The bridge lly designed with m	mination of eligibility the Chicago & Northy any historically signing the is a basic and type assive concrete pie to steel deck-girder b	western R ficant ass cal examp rs to acco	ailway in the early sociations. Further, ole of a steel deck-	twentieth century it is the third brid girder railroad brid	, backgrou ge to be co dge. Thoug	ind onstructed gh it was	

1-26	Central Geneva Historic District	Both sides of West State Street, roughly bounded by North and South River Lane, South Sixth Street, South Street, and the Fox River, Geneva	1840- 1900	Houses, Commercial Buildings, Courthouse, City Hall, Public Library, Greek Revival, Italianate, Classical Revival, Federal Revival, Prairie School	Listed	A, C	1979	
settlem century balanc resider courtho	ient of Geneva and residential, commond ed whole with the K ntial, the district also buse. There are five	ed under Criterion A under Criterion C for ercial, religious, and ane County Courth has commercial ar buildings in the AP t) and four noncontr						

Street, Geneva

610 South 1st

Survey Name	Address	Year	Property Type	NRHP Status	NRHP	Date	Photograph
ID		Built	and/or Style		Criteria	Evaluated	

1-27	116 South Street	116 South Street, Geneva	1908	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
and his altered workm	ty/Notes: Modest an storical significance d by a large shed-roo anship, and feeling grity of design and i	. The house's origination of side elevation add as a gable-front hou	al gable- dition wit	front form and orig	inal appearance h , diminishing its in	as been sig	gnificantly esign,	
1-28	600 South 1 st	600 South 1st	1955	Commercial	Recommended	N/A	2016	

Not Eligible

Recommended

N/A

2016

Integrity/Notes: Modest and basic example of a mid-twentieth century commercial building lacking architectural and historical significance. Research indicates it was formerly a small manufacturing facility. The building displays minor stylistic influences derived from Modern-era design tenets, such as the flat, angled roof; however, it is not an influential design and is not architecturally significant. Its type, style, and features do not indicate architectural significance.

1952

Building, No Discernible Style

Commercial

Building, No Not Eligible Street Street, Geneva Discernible Style Integrity/Notes: Modest and basic example of a mid-twentieth century commercial building lacking architectural and historical significance. The building displays minor stylistic influences derived from Modern-era design tenets, such as its overhanging flat, angled roof; however, it is not an influential design and is not architecturally significant. Its type, style, and features do not indicate architectural significance and replacement windows

diminish its integrity of materials.

610 South 1st

1-29

Street

10



and hi	storical significanc	and basic example of e. Replacement wind architectural significa	lows and					
1-31	Duke & Lee's Services	609 Batavia Avenue, Geneva	1960	Auto Repair Garage, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
from N throug	Nodern-era design h bays and garage n-era design tena	mid-twentieth century tenets. This includes and its large plate on ts to a utilitarian buil	its wide lass disp	, overhanging cro play windows. Alth	ss-gable roof that c nough an interesting	omprise g applicat	the drive- ion of	
1-32	610 South 3 rd Street	610 South 3 rd Street, Geneva	1905	House, American Foursquare	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	

612 South 1st

Street

1-30

612 South 1st

Street, Geneva

Survey Name Address NRHP Status NRHP Photograph Property Type Date Year Built and/or Style Criteria Evaluated ID

Recommended N/A

Not Eligible

2016

Commercial

Building, No

Discernible Style

1955

Integrity/Notes: Modest and basic example of an early twentieth century American Foursquare house lacking architectural or historical significance. Its overall form and appearance is common of American Foursquare houses of this period. Replacement vinyl siding and vinyl windows contribute to diminished integrity of design, workmanship, and materials. Its type, style, and features do not indicate architectural significance.







Survey ID	Name	Address	Year Built	Property Type and/or Style	NRHP Status	NRHP Criteria	Date Evaluated	Photograph
1-33	509 Cheever Avenue	509 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1960	House, Split- Level	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
and his	y/Notes: Modest an storical significance. y of design, workma ance.	Replacement vinyl	siding, v	inyl windows, and	decorative shutter	s diminish	its	

1-34	515 Cheever Avenue	515 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1958	House, Ranch	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
historio Ranch	al significance. Alth	nd typical example o hough the house inc it is a typical examp	orporates	s the low horizonta	lity and corner wir	ndows that	define	

1-35	525 Cheever Avenue	525 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1953	House, Ranch	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
and hi	storical significance ty of design, workma	nd typical example c . Replacement vinyl anship, and materia	siding, v	inyl windows, and	decorative shutte	rs diminish	its	

Survey ID	Name	Address	Year Built	Property Type and/or Style	NRHP Status	NRHP Criteria	Date Evaluated	Photograph
1-36	603 Cheever Avenue	603 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1951	House, Ranch	Recommended Not Eligible		2016	
historic	cal significance. Rep	nd altered example o placement vinyl sidir d materials. Its type,	ng, vinyl v	windows, and a fac	cade addition dimi	nish its inte	egrity of	
1-37	609 Cheever Avenue	609 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1961	House, Ranch	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
historic	cal significance. Rep	nd typical example o placement vinyl sidir /le, and features do	ng and vir	nyl windows dimini	ish its integrity of a			
1-38	621 Cheever Avenue	621 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	ca. 1950	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
archite addition appear	ectural and historical ons (facade dormers rance, contributing to	tly altered example of l significance. Repla s, one-story north rea to diminished integri rchitectural significar	acement v ar elevation ity of design	vinyl siding, vinyl wi ion wing) obscure tl	indows, and front he house's origination	door as we al form and		

Survey ID	Name	Address	Year Built	Property Type and/or Style	NRHP Status	NRHP Criteria	Date Evaluated	Photograph
1-39	703 Cheever Avenue	703 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1955	House, Ranch	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
historic	al significance. Re	and typical example c eplacement wood sid rials. Its type, style, a	ing and s	shingles and vinyl	windows diminish	its integrity		
1-40	709 Cheever Avenue	709 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1958	House, Ranch	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
historic stonew	al significance. Report on the facade	and typical example c eplacement vinyl sidiu diminish its integrity architectural significa	ng, vinyl of desigr	windows, and the	addition of non-his	toric deco	orative	
1-41	721 Cheever Avenue	721 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1965	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	

Integrity/Notes: Basic example of a mid-twentieth century house of no discernible style lacking architectural and historical significance. Replacement vinyl siding and vinyl windows on the second story and large replacement window opening on first story, which is out of proportion with the original design intent, contribute to diminished integrity of design and materials. Its type, style, and features do not indicate architectural significance.



Survey Name	Address	Year	Property Type	NRHP Status	NRHP	Date	Photograph
ID		Built	and/or Style		Criteria	Evaluated	

1-42	725 Cheever Avenue	725 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1949	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
historio chimne new fre	ty/Notes: Significant cal significance. Rec ey, shed dormer, thr ont door, stucco chir als. Its type, style, a	cent modifications to ree-over-one ribbon mney and dormer) of	o the hous windows contribute	se give it a neo-Cr) and replacement to diminished inte	aftsman-style app t materials (vinyl s egrity of design, wo	earance (fr iding, vinyl	ont porch, windows,	

1-43	747 Cheever Avenue	747 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1963	House, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
archite door o	ty/Notes: Significant ectural and historical pening, and large re e, style, and features	significance. Repla	acement v oute to din	rinyl and wood shir hinished integrity c	ngle siding, modifi	cations to t	he garage	

-

1-44	801 Cheever Avenue	801 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1952	House, Ranch	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
Ranch orname any his	houses of this era, entation. Its type, st torically significant	he house incorpora it is a typical examp yle, and features do associations. Repla	ole of the o not indic icement v	Ranch house form ate architectural s	with applied Colorignificance and re	onial Reviva	al-style not reveal	
integrit	y of design, workma	anship, and materia	IS.					and the second

Survey	Name	Address	Year	Property Type	NRHP Status	NRHP	Date	Photograph
ID			Built	and/or Style		Criteria	Evaluated	

1-45	811 Cheever Avenue	811 Cheever Avenue, Geneva	1963	House, Split- Level	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
orname wide ro did not	entation and few cha of eaves, and carpo reveal any historica	is a typical and mo aracter-defining feat ort. Its type, style, a illy significant assoc gn, workmanship, a	tures of t nd featur ciations. I	he era, such as the es do not indicate Replacement vinyl	e wide facade chir architectural signi	nney, overł ficance and	nanging d research	

1-46	Burgess-Norton Manufacturing Company	1600 South Street, Geneva	1941	Industrial Complex, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
signific 1903; tanks p mostly	ty/Notes: Modest ar cance. It is associate this plant was const prior to World War I intact with several gn, workmanship, a cance.	ed with the Burgess tructed by the Ordn I. The building's cur small additions alor	S-Norton I ance Dep rrent appo ng its sou	Manufacturing Cor partment of the U.S parance does not thwest and northe	mpany, which was S. Army to manufac convey this associa ast elevations, dim	founded cture trac ation. Th iinishing	in Geneva ir ck links for e plant is its integrity	

1-47	2000 Gary Lane	2000 Gary Lane, Geneva	1965	Industrial Building, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016		
Integrity/Notes: Modest and typical example of a mid-twentieth century industrial building lacking architectural and historical significance. The building displays minor stylistic influences derived from Modern-era design tenets through its fenestration; however, it is not an influential design and is not architecturally significant. Its									

type, style, and features do not indicate architectural significance.

AND THE SECTION

Survey ID	Name	Address	Year Built	Property Type and/or Style	NRHP Status	NRHP Criteria	Date Evaluated	Photograph
		2080 Gary Lane, Geneva altered example of				acking arch		
	storical significance. e architectural signi	Its type, style, and ficance.	features	are typical of ware	houses of this pe	iod and do	not	
1-49	2202 Gary Lane	2202 Gary Lane, Geneva	1963	Industrial Building, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
and his		altered example of Its type, style, and ficance.						
1-50	2248-2300 Gary Lane	2248-2300 Gary Lane, Geneva	1961	Industrial Building, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
and his		altered example of Its type, style, and ficance.						

Survey ID	Name	Address	Year Built	Property Type and/or Style	NRHP Status	NRHP Criteria	Date Evaluated	Photograph
1-51	2525 Kaneville Court	2525 Kaneville Court, Geneva	1965	Industrial Building, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
and his		altered example of . Its type, style, and ficance.						
1-52	2571 Kaneville Court	2571 Kaneville Court, Geneva	1964	Industrial Building, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
and his		altered example of . Its type, style, and ficance.						

1-53	2613-2633 Kaneville Court	2613-2633 Kaneville Court, Geneva	ca. 1964	Industrial Building, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
and hi	ty/Notes: Basic and storical significance e architectural signi	. Its type, style, and						

Survey	Name	Address	Year	Property Type	NRHP Status	NRHP	Date	Photograph
ID			Built	and/or Style		Criteria	Evaluated	

1-54	37W248 Kaneville Road	37W248 Kaneville Road, Geneva	1953	Houses, No Discernible Style Pole Barns	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
Towns	ty/Notes: Private pro hip Assessor. A rev ty have been substa Iso been added to o	iew of existing and antially altered and	historic a added to	erial photographs since their origina	shows that the two I 1953 construction	o houses o n. The pole	n the barns	

architectural significance and research did not reveal any historical significance.

1-55	Weber	1N016 Peck	1929	Farmstead	Recommended	A, C	2016
	Farmstead	Road, Geneva			Eligible		
				House, Colonial			
				Revival			
				Outbuildings,			
				Gambrel-roof			
				raised barn,			
				drive-through			
				corncrib barn,			
				transverse-			
				frame barns			



Integrity/Notes: See determination of eligibility form. The farmstead's extant buildings were constructed in the late 1920s and into the mid-twentieth century on a farm previously settled in 1851. None of the original 1851 dairy farm or subsequent dairy farms remains and background research did not indicate any historically significant associations with Geneva's settlement period or agricultural history, or its original owner, Samuel C. Everts. However, the farmstead continues to convey its association with cattle and dairy farming from 1929 through at least the mid-twentieth century and is a good intact example in Geneva. The farmstead's 1929 house and agricultural buildings, as well as its mid-twentieth century agricultural buildings, are largely intact and still convey their original forms and use as well as their overall layout and spatial relationships with each other. The removal of stockyards, several tree lines, and the loss of the original farm acreage do not substantially diminish its ability to convey its association as a particular type of farm or as a working farm. Therefore, the Weber Farmstead is recommended eligible under Criteria A and C.



Survey ID	Name	Address	Year Built	Property Type and/or Style	NRHP Status	NRHP Criteria	Date Evaluated	Photograph
1-56	Chicago & Northwestern Railway	Approximately 6.4 miles between Kress Road, West Chicago and 0.3 miles west of Peck Road, Geneva	1848- 1966	Railroad, No Discernible Style	Recommended Not Eligible	N/A	2016	
Integrity/Notes: Only the short segment of the Chicago & Northwestern Railway in the APE is being evaluated for NRHP eligibility. An evaluation of the greater rail line is out of the scope of this evaluation effort and should be completed in the future to determine the NRHP eligibility of the greater Chicago & Northwestern Railway. Although it was the first rail line through this area, connecting it to Chicago in the mid-nineteenth century and preceding and helping the establishment of West Chicago and Geneva, this segment of the Chicago & Northwestern Railway does not convey this association within the scope of this determination of eligibility. Further, though this segment retains its double trackage, it no longer retains integrity of design, materials, or workmanship because it has been modernized with new rails, track ballast, and modern equipment at railroad crossings.								

Appendix C

NRHP Determinations of Eligibility

NAME Alexander House					
OTHER NAME(S) N/A					
STREET ADDRESS 310 Sandholm Street		CITY Geneva			
OWNERSHIPTAX PARCEL NUMBGordon F. Cummings and Shirley A. Cummings12-11-203-002					
YEAR BUILT Ca. 1838	SOURCE Geneva Township Assessor's [Department, 2016.			
DESIGNER/BUILDER Unknown					
STYLE Greek Revival	PROPERTY TYPE Domestic				
FOUNDATION Not visible during survey	WALLS Wood; vinyl	ROOF Asphalt			

DESCRIPTIVE NOTES

The Alexander House is a modest and altered vernacular Greek Revival-style house consisting of an original one-and-one-half-story gable-front section flanked by two, one-story, side-gable wings. The side-gable wings appear to be original or nearly as old as the gable-front portion, which projects beyond the plane of the wings. The house has an irregular footprint due a one-story, shed-roof addition on the southeast wing and a one-and-a-half-story, side-gable addition on the northwest wing; both additions date to the mid-twentieth century. The foundation was not visible during survey. The house's gable-front portion and side-gable wings are clad in wood clapboard siding; the additions have vinyl siding. Greek Revival-style details are present only on the facade's gable-front portion and include simple vernacular square Doric pilasters, simple gable returns, and a pedimented door surround.

Facing northeast to Sandholm Street, the facade's gable-front portion consists of a central pedimented doorway flanked by identical six-over-six, double-hung, wood-sash windows with simple wood window surrounds. The pedimented doorway consists of square wood pilasters that support a trimmed, unornamented pediment and frame the single glass and wood paneled front door. Above the doorway, the gable has a replacement window opening with a six-over-six, double-hung, wood-sash window and decorative wood shutters. This window opening is not in proportion with the original fenestration and it interrupts the entrance pediment below. The corners of the gable-front portion are articulated by simple vernacular square Doric pilasters at the corners that support a discontinuous and unornamented wide band of trim at the cornice and simple gable returns. The flanking side-gable wings each have a single six-over-six, double-hung, wood-sash window with a simple wood surround and decorative shutters on the facade. A concrete slab porch extends across the house's gable-front portion.

The northwest and southeast side elevations of the side-gable wings have a single window with decorative shutters. The southwest rear elevation was not accessible during field survey; however, portions of the two rear additions were visible from the facade. The approximately 120

square foot, one-story, shed-roof addition is located on the southwest rear elevation of the southeast side-gable wing; it has paired windows on the southeast side elevation. The approximately 650 square foot, one-and-one-half-story, side-gable addition is located on the southwest rear elevation of the northwest side-gable wing. It projects northward and parallel to the northwest wing. The addition's northeast elevation has two, six-light, vinyl-sash basement-level windows and a single vinyl-sash window on the first story; all have decorative shutters. The addition's northwest elevation is dominated by a central brick chimney, flanked by two windows.

The house is topped by a replacement asphalt-shingle roof. An original brick interior chimney rises from the northwest wing's gable roof.

A detached three-car garage and in-ground pool are located southeast of the house. The house is set back from Sandholm Street on a property landscaped with grass and mature deciduous and evergreen trees. A row of trees line the property's southeast, west, and south boundaries and the Union Pacific West railroad line is located south and parallel to the property's south boundary.

HISTORY/DEVELOPMENT

The Alexander House at 310 Sandholm Street was constructed ca. 1838. Based on a review of plat maps and historic aerial imagery, the Greek Revival-style gable-front portion appears to be the original portion of the house. The flanking side-gable wings are either original to the house or later additions that are nearly as old as the ca. 1838 construction date given the similar window size and configuration to the gable-front portion and the brick chimney on the northwest wing. The shed-roof addition and one-and-one-half-story addition appear to date between the mid-1970s and 1990s. The detached garage appears to date between the mid-1960s and mid-1970s.

The address was identified as the Alexander House in the City of Geneva *Historic Preservation Plan* (November 17, 2008) Historic Resources List. Properties on the list were identified through a windshield survey and preliminary research that indicated they retained enough character and integrity to illustrate Geneva's history and may be eligible for designation as a local landmark upon further research and evaluation. Given the house's construction date of ca. 1838, the Alexander name is potentially associated with Julius T. Alexander, an early and prominent citizen of Geneva, who settled there in 1837. However, the 2008 preservation plan does not list a source for attaching the Alexander name to the property. Research did not definitively indicate that the house was built by Julius T. Alexander or the length of his ownership. A review of historic plat maps and Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps did not reveal the property ownership after Alexander. Research indicates the current owners, Gordon F. Cummings and Shirley A. Cummings, have owned and occupied the house since at least the 1980s.

Julius T. Alexander was born in 1814 in St. Clair County, Illinois. At the age of nineteen, he enlisted in the army and served in the Black Hawk War. Alexander then completed a three-year blacksmith apprenticeship in St. Louis, Missouri. In 1836, he established a blacksmith shop with his brother Edward Alexander in Des Plaines, Illinois, near their father's mill. In July 1837, the brothers moved to Geneva and laid claim to 135.68 acres of land on the east side of the Fox River, north and south of present-day State Street. They built their first blacksmith shop on the east side of the Fox River, north of State Street that same year. In 1842, the brothers built a second blacksmith shop south of the first, on the south side of State Street. A manufactory building was built on the property, adjacent to the blacksmith shop, in 1846. For approximately

thirty years, Alexander engaged in the blacksmith trade in Geneva. He also engaged in farming, eventually owning a grain, stock, and dairy farm that he rented to tenant farmers. Research indicates the blacksmith shop and property was sold to Johnson Updike ca. 1860, the same year the US Census lists Julius Alexander as a farmer; the 1850 US Census listed him as a blacksmith. The blacksmith shop was later demolished or destroyed by fire in the late nineteenth century. Alexander married in November 1839 and he and his wife had three sons. Active in the community, Alexander held the positions of steward, class-lender, and superintendent of the Sunday school as a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church as well as the positions of assessor, trustee, and school board member in Geneva. Alexander died in January 1889.

The Alexander House was constructed in the late 1830s during the early settlement period of Geneva by white settlers. In 1837, Geneva was platted with wide streets appropriate to a commercial center and county seat, which had been established there a year earlier in 1836. The village's status as the county seat, its location along the Fox River, and its proximity to agricultural resources and urban markets attracted early industries and more settlers, leading to its rapid development in the 1830s and 1840s. By 1840, Geneva had several sawmills, general stores, hotels, blacksmith shops, and the first county courthouse and jail. The extension of the Galena & Chicago Union (G&CU) Railroad through Geneva in 1853 further facilitated the community's growth in the 1850s.

The Alexander House is an example of a 1830s vernacular Greek Revival house with minimal ornamentation. Recognized as America's first national architectural style, the Greek Revival style dominated American domestic architecture from about 1825 to 1860. The style's popularity was driven by an increased interest in classical buildings, the end of the War of 1812, the subsequent diminished interest in British-influenced architecture, and Greece's involvement in a war for independence. The latter strongly inspired settlers who identified with the Greek ideals of democracy and many towns and villages established in the early nineteenth century have Greek names. Originating in New England, examples of the style are concentrated in the states that experienced the largest population growth in this period as settlers brought the style with them when they moved to New York, Pennsylvania, the Midwest, Kentucky, Tennessee, Louisiana, Alabama, and Georgia, among other states. It was first used on public buildings, such as the Bank of the United States (1818), with most domestic examples dating between 1830 and 1860. The popularity of the style gradually declined in urban centers along the Atlantic seaboard in the 1840s as it was replaced by the Gothic Revival and Italianate styles; it remained a dominant style in rural areas and interior states into the early 1860s. The Greek Revival style and form varies based on its location, but its typical character-defining features include gabled or hipped, low-pitched roofs; a cornice representing a classical entablature; fullwidth or entry porches supported by prominent square or rounded columns, typically of the Doric style; a front door with narrow sidelights, transom lights, and an elaborate door surround; and decorative details such as Greek key designs, egg-and-dart molding, mutules, classical capitals, and pilasters, often in lieu of free-standing columns. Vernacular examples were generally less ornamented with simple moldings and cornices and more commonly had square columns. Often, vernacular examples modestly interpreted the doorway configuration, which remained a character-defining feature of vernacular houses.

The Alexander House is an early example of a vernacular Greek Revival house in Geneva that has been substantially altered by additions and replacement materials. Although the house retains its original ca. 1838 gable-front portion and the flanking side-gable wings that appear to be original or nearly as old as the gable-front portion, its overall form and appearance has been

altered by additions to its flanking wings. The additions alter the footprint established by the original gable-front portion and wings and overall proportions when viewed from the northeast-facing facade. The house retains some of its wood windows, wood clapboard siding, and minimal Greek Revival details (corner pilasters, pedimented door surround, simple wide band of trim, and gable returns), but the addition of decorative shutters and a larger replacement window opening in the gable of the gable-front portion contribute to diminished integrity of materials and design. Further, the house lacks the more elaborate, if modest, doorway configuration of a front door with narrow sidelights and transom lights articulated by an elaborate door surround commonly applied to vernacular interpretations of the Greek Revival style.

NRHP STATUS DATE LISTED Recommended Not Eligible N/A

NRHP CRITERIA N/A

NRHP CRITERIA CONSIDERATIONS N/A

NRHP EVALUATION/JUSTIFICATION

The Alexander House was evaluated for the NRHP under Criteria A, B, and C using guidelines set forth in the NRHP Bulletin "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation."

The Alexander House was constructed during the 1830s and 1840s, when rapid settlement and development of Geneva occurred after it was established as the county seat; however, background research did not indicate any historically significant associations with Geneva's establishment. Further, the building's lack of integrity of design and materials due to large additions that alter its original appearance and footprint diminish the building's ability to convey its association with Geneva's early nineteenth century settlement period. Therefore, the Alexander House is recommended not eligible under Criterion A.

The City of Geneva *Historic Preservation Plan* (November 17, 2008) identified the Alexander House as potentially being associated with the Alexander family. Research indicates this potential association may be with Julius T. Alexander, an early Geneva settler who initially established a blacksmith shop and later engaged in farming activities there. The house appears to be the last extant property potentially associated with Alexander since the blacksmith shop was demolished or destroyed by fire in the late nineteenth century. However, background research did not definitively confirm that the Alexander House was built by Julius T. Alexander or other members of his family, or the length of his ownership; therefore, it is not a representative example of his productive life or persons significant in the past. The Alexander House is recommended not eligible under Criterion B.

The Alexander House is a modest and altered example of an early nineteenth-century vernacular Greek Revival house with minimal ornamentation. The Greek Revival-style details are a vernacular interpretation applied to the gable-front form and commonly found throughout the Midwest during this period; the house lacks the character-defining features of the style. The building's Greek Revival-style square Doric pilasters, pedimented doorway, and simple wide trim, cornice, and gable returns are its only ornamentation and the building's form and massing appears typical of vernacular interpretations of this period. The building does not exemplify the

Greek Revival style and its features do not indicate architectural or artistic significance or the work of a master. Furthermore, large additions to the flanking side-gable wings detract from the house's overall appearance and original design intent, diminishing its integrity of design and workmanship. Although it retains its original Greek Revival features and wood clapboard siding, the addition of decorative shutters to the windows and a large non-historic replacement window opening in the gable-front portion further diminish its integrity of design and materials. Therefore, the Alexander House is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

The Alexander House was not evaluated for eligibility under Criterion D as part of this evaluation.

NRHP BOUNDARY N/A

SOURCES

City of Geneva. *Historic Preservation Plan*. November 17, 2008. <u>http://www.geneva.il.us/DocumentCenter/View/188</u>.

- Durant, Pliny A., Henry C. Bradsby, and Samuel W. Durant. *Commemorative Biographical and Historical Record of Kane County, Illinois*. Chicago, IL: Beers, Leggett & Co., 1888.
- Historic Map Works. Kane County Historical Maps and Atlases. 1871, 1872, 1892, 1904, 1928, 1954, 1966, 1978. http://www.historicmapworks.com/Browse/United_States/Illinois/Page/17/.
- Lambert, Michael A. Evolution and Preliminary Historic Significance Evaluation of the Former Mill Race Inn Property, 4 East State Street, Geneva, Illinois. Geneva Historic Preservation Commission, January 15, 2014.
- Nationwide Environmental Title Research, LLC. "Historic Aerials." 2016. http://www.historicaerials.com.
- Pierce, Henry B., Arthur Merrill, William Henry Perrin, and W. Le Bar, Jr. & Co. *The Past and Present of Kane County, Illinois*. Chicago, IL: Wm. Le Baron, Jr. & Co., 1878.
- Sanborn Map Company. *Geneva, Kane County, Illinois 1885-1951*. New York: Sanborn Map Company.



Facing northwest to the northeast-facing facade and southeast side elevation from Sandholm Street

Photo 2 – Alexander House



Facing west to northeast-facing facade from Sandholm Street

Map – Alexander House



Property Boundary

NAME Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant

OTHER NAME(S) Geneva Sewage Treatment Plant

STREET ADDRESS 602 Crissey Avenue CITY Geneva

OWNERSHIP City of Geneva TAX PARCEL NUMBER 12-10-276-001

YEAR BUILT 1933; 1973; 2002; 2004 SOURCE The Geneva Republican, October 6, 1933.

DESIGNER/BUILDER E. Roy Wells, Wells Engineering Company

STYLE See Descriptive Notes	PROPERTY TYPE Water and Power	
FOUNDATION	WALLS	ROOF
Concrete	Brick; metal	Asphalt

DESCRIPTIVE NOTES

The Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant is an active sewage treatment facility located on a triangular parcel bound by the Fox River to the west, the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Railroad tracks to the north, and Crissey Avenue to the east. Originally constructed in 1933, the majority of the plant's original infrastructure has been replaced or modified to improve the plant's treatment capacity and modernize the facility. The only remaining building from 1933 is the one-and-one-half-story, side-gable Jacobean Revival service station and laboratory building, which was altered ca. 2002 with the addition of a one-story hyphen and a two-story, gable-roof administration and laboratory building. All other structures, lagoons, and secondary facilities constructed in 1933 are no longer extant, having been replaced with modern infrastructure in 1973 and 2004. However, the plant continues to use the same activated sludge wastewater treatment process as it did originally.

The property is enclosed with a non-historic iron fence and landscaped with a grassy lawn and mature deciduous trees along the property boundaries. A paved main driveway from Crissey Avenue partially encircles the plant on its east, north, and west sides. A secondary paved driveway bisects the plant's buildings and structures on a north-south axis. Near the property's northwest corner, the main driveway forms a circle within which Juanita Park, a small landscape installation, is located. Juanita Park consists of a pond, small waterfall, and landscaped rock garden with flowers and evergreen trees.

For reference, Figure 1 provides a birds-eye aerial photograph of the existing Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant, labeled with the name of each building or structure and known construction date.

1933 Service Station and Laboratory Building

Near the property's northwest corner and immediately south of Juanita Park, the 1933 service

station and laboratory building faces northward on an east-west axis. The one-and-one-halfstory, side-gable building is a modest example of the Jacobean Revival style, which is most evident in the building's form rather than its ornamentation, applied to a public works building. The building has been substantially altered by ca. 2002 additions. It has a concrete foundation and tan-colored brick cladding. Simple limestone trim is the building's only ornamentation. The steeply pitched gable roof has replacement asphalt shingles.

The three-bay north-facing facade has identical windows in the two easternmost bays and a doorway in the westernmost bay. The replacement windows are one-over-one, double-hung, metal-sash windows with limestone sills. The top of the windows abut the roofline frieze board and gutter. The westernmost bay's doorway consists of a single wood door. A non-historic gable-roof porch is located in front of the doorway.

The nearly identical east and west side elevations have two nearly full-height, narrow window openings. Each opening has metal-sash replacement windows with a short single-light casement topped by a tall fixed light. The windows have a limestone sill and a shared limestone lintel. The parapeted gable ends project above the gable roof and are articulated by limestone molding. The east side elevation's gable terminates in a brick chimney, which slightly projects from the plane of the elevation. The building's southwest and southeast corners are articulated by slightly raised and patterned brickwork resembling quoins.

The south rear elevation has a non-historic ca. 2002 one-story, flat-roof hyphen connecting the original 1933 service station to a non-historic ca. 2002 two-story, gable-roof administration and laboratory building. Both additions have concrete foundations and brick cladding similar in color to the 1933 service station; the two-story building has vinyl siding in its gable ends. The hyphen's roof is built-up and the two-story building's roof has asphalt shingles. The hyphen has nine-light, metal-frame windows on its east and west side elevations. The two-story addition has no openings on its north or west elevations. Its east elevation has a pedestrian door and window on the first story and a two-light window on the second story. Its south elevation has a pedestrian door to the east and a large overhead garage door to the west.

Minimal replacement landscaping is located around the foundation of the service station's northfacing facade and around the two-story addition's south elevation. It consists of shrubs of various sizes and minimally landscaped flower beds.

1973 Buildings and Structures

East of the 1933 service station and laboratory building, several buildings and structures were added to the plant in 1973, replacing much of the original 1933 infrastructure. This includes the extant raw sewage pump station, blower building, one primary clarifier, three aeration tanks, and two secondary clarifiers.

The 1973 raw sewage pump station is located northeast of the 1933 service station and laboratory building. It is an irregularly shaped, one-story, flat-roof, brick-clad building. It controls wastewater pumping rates with a pumping capacity of 16.5 millions of gallons per day (MGD).

The 1973 blower building is located at northeast corner of the plant. It is a rectangular, onestory, flat-roof, brick-clad building. It removes grit through an aerated rolling grit system removal and wash tank and has pumps and blowers to push the sludge through the system. South of the blower building, and attached to it, the 1973 primary clarifier is an in-ground, rectangular, concrete tank enclosed with metal fencing. It removes heavy organic solids from the wastewater. From here, the primary effluent is sent to secondary treatment and the primary sludge is pumped to the primary anaerobic digester.

The 1973 aeration tanks are located immediately south of the 1973 primary clarifier. They are in-ground, rectangular, concrete pits enclosed with metal fencing. Three east-west walkways span the tanks. The activated sludge process occurs in the aeration basins.

The two 1973 secondary clarifiers are located south of the 1973 aeration tanks. They are round, in-ground tanks with a surface skimmer and enclosed with a metal fence. They remove the activated sludge, returning them to the aeration tanks.

1974-1994 Centrifuge Operations and Biosolids Storage Building

The centrifuge operations and biosolids storage building is located southeast of the ca. 2002 administration and laboratory building. Constructed between 1974 and 1994, it is a two-story, gable-roof building clad in standing seam metal and an asphalt-shingle roof. It is largely devoid of openings and has only a few windows and pedestrian doors on its north, south, and west elevations. The west elevation also two large overhead doors. Immediately north of the building are several wasting activated sludge holding tanks dating to the same period.

1994-1999 Primary and Secondary Anaerobic Digesters

Located at the property's southeast corner, the primary and secondary anaerobic digesters building is a one-story, brick-clad structure oriented on a north-south axis. It consists of two round structures – the digesters – connected by a flat-roof hyphen. The hyphen has doors and several windows on its west elevation.

2004 Buildings and Structures

In 2004, additional buildings and structures were added to the plant, including grit tanks, three additional aeration tanks, a second primary clarifier, a return activated sludge pumping station and secondary clarifier, a UV disinfection system and flow blending structure, an excess flow disinfection building, and garage building. These structures are utilitarian in appearance and incorporate modern materials. The primary clarifier and aeration tanks are in-ground, rectangular, concrete tanks enclosed with metal fencing.

HISTORY/DEVELOPMENT

Construction of the 1933 Wastewater Treatment Plant

In 1929, the State of Illinois created the Sanitary Water Board within the state's Department of Public Health to study, investigate, and determine ways to eliminate from state streams all pollutant materials and substances detrimental to the public health or the practical recreational use of streams. The board also had the power to order municipalities to treat sanitary sewage, direct the course of treatment, and fine any non-compliant violator. The board identified the Fox River as one of the state's most valuable rivers that should be preserved in its original beauty and protected from pollution by municipalities along it. Beginning in 1930 and 1931, the board began ordering various municipalities who did not have sewage treatment plants or had

inadequate facilities to proceed with the construction of new treatment plants in their community.

At this time, the City of Geneva's original sewage treatment plant was considered obsolete and overloaded as it only provided the partial treatment of sewage. At best, it was estimated to produce a 30% effluent, but generally less than that since the volume of sewage was twice as much as was recommended for the tank the city used. Effluent is the final liquid substance discharged into the water after treatment. Additional treatment for Geneva's sewage provided by other plants along the river was deemed inadequate to efficiently remove pollutants from the Fox River. The state also had new requirements for sewage treatment plants to provide a clear, non-putrescible effluent and chlorination of the effluent at more than 85% pure. Consequently, in January 1931 and June 1931, the state's Sanitary Water Board formally requested that the City of Geneva improve their sewage treatment system and provide an adequate sewage treatment facility to stop the pollution of the Fox River and preserve it for bathing and recreational purposes. In response, the city tasked City Engineer E. Roy Wells with providing them a report on necessary improvements to update the existing system for adequate treatment of sewage. Wells' firm, Wells Engineering Company, was later retained by the city to complete the plans for the new sewage treatment plant.

In May 1932, the new sewage treatment plant plans were completed and accepted by the city's Board of Local Improvements. The plans included the construction of a modern sewage treatment plant utilizing the activated sludge process. The activated sludge process is a biological wastewater treatment process that speeds up waste decomposition by using microorganisms to feed on organic contaminants in wastewater, producing a high-quality effluent. As the microorganisms grow, they form particles that clump together, which are allowed to settle to the bottom of the tank. This left a relatively clear liquid free of organic material and suspended solids.

State and local representatives decided to combine the plans for the new City of Geneva sewage treatment plant with prior plans and allocated funding for a small sewage treatment plant for the State Training School for Girls in Geneva. A joint facility eliminated an additional sewage plant along the river and allowed the state to provide financial aid to the construction of the city's plant. The city purchased the land commonly called the "Peninsula" on the east side of the Fox River and immediately south of the Chicago and North Western Railway (C&NW) as the site for the new plant. The total estimated cost of the proposed project was \$137,500. The state appropriated \$25,000 toward the cost of construction, as well as an annual \$1,000 for the state's share of the plant's maintenance, operation, and depreciation costs. The remainder was paid by City of Geneva property owners through a ten-year assessment plan; the assessment passed shortly after the new plant plans were approved.

Construction of the new plant began in the fall of 1932 and was completed approximately one year later. Completed on time and within budget, the plant's actual cost was approximately \$112,000 and also included several new intercepting sewers and syphon lines under the Fox River. As described in the October 6, 1933, newspaper article of *The Geneva Republican*, the plant operated so that "the sewage is treated while fresh and consequently there is no odor connected with the process. Solids are collected in a digester with a floating cover and the gases are carried to the service [station] and used in heating the building and in heating the coils in the digester. In warm weather when the heat is not required the gases will still be burned. The digested sludge is dried on a sand bed covered with a glass enclosure to protect it from rain or snow and permitting operation every month of the year. The service station is

equipped with a laboratory where tests may be made to see that the plant is operating efficiently." A 1933 historic photograph (see Photo 4) shows the original buildings and configuration of the plant. Immediately south of the service station and laboratory building was the slightly raised digester tank (current location of the service station's ca. 2002 hyphen and two-story additions) and the large one-story, gable-roof glass enclosure resembling a greenhouse. The latter had a sand bed floor for drying the digested sludge; it was removed from the plant in 1973. The property was enclosed with a tall metal fence and a gravel driveway was located along the north and west sides of the property. A smaller gravel path roughly divided the plant into two sides with Juanita Park, the service station and laboratory, digester, and glass enclosed drying beds located west of the path; east of the path were the lagoons and other in-ground treatment facilities.

The property's grounds were landscaped with a grassy lawn and mature deciduous trees. Within the circular driveway north of the service station, there was a 20-foot wide fish and wildlife pond with a waterfall and surrounding rock garden. The garden was publicly dedicated and named Juanita Park to honor Juanita Martin. Martin supervised the plant's construction for her father's construction company, an unusual occupation for women during this period. A graduate of the University of Illinois, Martin gained construction experience when she spent a summer assisting her father, E.D. Martin, in building a sewage line connecting North Aurora and Aurora. On the Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant job, she was in charge of signing contracts, hiring men, and buying materials. She also directed day laborers and handled the banking and inspections.

On October 1, 1933, Geneva's new sewage treatment plant began operations. A gathering of two hundred people, including Mayor H.C. Hanson and city council members, were there to witness the event and tour the facility. Joseph Bergeson and Ernest Dahlin, were chosen as the plant's first attendants and worked under the supervision of City Engineer E. Roy Wells for the first year to become familiar with the workings of the plant. After opening day, it was projected to take approximately two weeks to build up the bacteria to make the plant run efficiently. Shortly after it opened, staff from the state department of public welfare and state architect's office inspected the plant and were pleased with the plant and equipment.

Changes to the 1933 Wastewater Treatment Plant

Minor upgrades to the plant occurred in 1959 and 1968, including the installation of additional lagoons and other facilities that were not identifiable in contemporary newspaper articles or historic aerial imagery. In 1973, a \$1 million dollar improvement and enlargement project was undertaken to relieve the overloaded system and meet stricter requirements for sewage effluent. The contractor was Rudy Bros. of Aurora, Illinois. The plant's capacity was increased from 1.2 million gallons per day to 4 million gallons with an average daily capacity of about 2 million gallons, thus allowing for future expansion. A review of *The Geneva Republican* newspapers from this time and a comparison of historic aerial photographs was completed to identify the 1973 improvements and changes to the wastewater treatment plant site. Improvements included the addition of a primary tank, two secondary clarifier tanks, aeration tanks, raw sewage pump station, and a blower building as well as digesters rebuilt from some of the old plant. A large lagoon was also created immediately south of the site. The original 1933 greenhouse-like glass enclosure for the drying beds, which was located behind the plant's original 1933 digester, was removed at this time and the driveway into the plant from Crissey Avenue was rerouted south of its former location.

In the mid-1970s, after the plant's expansion in 1973, a lack of upkeep of Juanita Park led to the pond's deterioration. It was filled with gravel. The pond and landscaping were resurrected in 2004 when the plant was again expanded. The plant's staff volunteered their time on weekends to bring Juanita Park back to its 1933 appearance. The staff laid natural limestone from a nearby quarry, built a small waterfall, planted flowers and grasses, and added Japanese koi and goldfish to the pond. The original metal fence enclosing the property was also replaced, likely in 2004, with a modern iron fence.

Between 1974 and 2004, additional improvements were made to the Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant. This included the addition of a centrifuge operations and biosolids storage building and wasting activated sludge holding tanks immediately west of the 1973 secondary clarifiers between 1974 and 1994, which appear to have replaced the original 1933 lagoons; the addition of the primary and secondary anaerobic digesters at the site's southeast corner between 1994 and 1999; and the administration and laboratory building addition to the original 1933 service station and laboratory building between 1999 and 2002. The latter replaced the original 1933 digester that was located behind the service station and laboratory building.

Another significant upgrade was undertaken in 2004 to meet stringent Water Quality Standards (WQS) for Ammonia Nitrogen. These upgrades included significant upgrades to biosolids production and storage; increasing the daily average flow design rate from 4.0 to 5.0 MGD without increasing loading to the Fox River; designing the maximum daily flow rate of 12.5 MGD with peak flow capability of 16.5 MGD; and providing excess flow treatment capability at an additional 4.0 MGD. The facility operates twenty-four hours every day of the week and annually treats 1.61 billion gallons of water by removing 98% of pollutants. Additions to the site included a second primary clarifier, grit tanks, a return activated sludge pumping station with a secondary clarifier, three additional aeration tanks, UV disinfection system and flow blending structure, excess flow disinfection building, and a new sign along the entrance road to the plant. The 1973 lagoon south of the site was also removed at this time and filled.

History of Wastewater Management and the Activated Sludge Process in the United States

Several different urban wastewater management strategies and technologies have been implemented in the United States since 1800 to treat or dispose of sewage. As populations grew, sanitation problems increased in urban areas. Decentralized dry sewage systems and privy vaults and cesspools were commonly used, but relatively ineffective, methods for disposing of waste in the early nineteenth century. Uncontrolled and unplanned drainage often posed a public health hazard as contaminated ground soils and groundwater occasionally led to contaminated drinking water and disease outbreaks. Centralized management through the implementation of early public and private sewer systems failed as they were often constructed piecemeal and without adequate planning or engineering.

The ineffectiveness of decentralized wastewater methods, continued population growth, the construction of public water supplies and water closets, public health concerns, the sanitary reform movement, and a lack of alternative solutions gradually influenced municipalities to improve sanitation practices and move toward more centralized methods of wastewater management in the mid-to-late nineteenth century. By the end of the nineteenth century, basic techniques of urban wastewater collection were established and many major United States cities had some form of a sewer system. Separate-sewer systems that separately managed storm water and sanitary wastewater were initially favored, but they were quickly overloaded

and not adequate for meeting the demands of a rapidly growing population. This led to the growth of combined-sewer systems that used a single conduit to transport storm water and other household and industrial wastewater to a designated disposal location. The first of these systems discharged their contents directly into the nearest waterway without water treatment in the belief that the natural dilution and self-purifying capacity of the receiving waters would be sufficient to treat the combined wastewater. However, as urban populations increased, the discharges became overwhelming, exceeding the natural dilution capacities and posing a public health risk to water quality.

Consequently, wastewater treatment and water treatment to protect public health became a heavily debated and studied topic in the early twentieth century. Arguments for wastewater treatment cited the need to improve or maintain the aesthetic qualities of water bodies as advocated by the Progressive Movement in the United States; to protect the public from diseases; and to improve the efficiency of water treatment facilities by having a cleaner source of water. These arguments were supported by the passage of laws and regulations at the local and state levels with the goal of protecting water quality from developing nuisance conditions; strict enforcement of these laws by the courts further bolstered support for wastewater treatment. Early methods of wastewater and water treatment were limited during this time to four common technologies. These were dilution, land application and irrigation of farmlands (wastewater farming), filtration, and chemical precipitation. These methods were more easily applied to treating smaller and controlled wastewater flows. For more urban applications, new technologies were developed to treat wastewater and resulted in the installation of large-scale activated sludge treatment facilities throughout the United States in the early-to-mid-twentieth century.

The activated sludge process was initially developed in England in the early twentieth century with the first plants constructed in 1914. The technology was being simultaneously developed in the United States and the first full-scale installations of the activated sludge process began to appear in 1916. The first was completed in San Marcos, Texas, and experimental applications were undertaken in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and Cleveland, Ohio. In Illinois, the first installation was in Des Plaines in 1922; Chicago followed in 1927. The American installations commonly used continuous-flow operations with diffused aeration. The aeration tanks had a shorter retention span of three to six hours, compared to their British counterparts of eight to twelve hours. American installations were also much larger in size and scale as demonstrated by installations in the Midwest.

By the late 1930s, sewage treatment was only available to slightly more than half of the urban population of the United States. At that time, the US Public Health Service estimated that 95% of the urban population was served by public sewer systems, but 42% of the sewered population remained without sewage treatment of any kind. Maryland, Minnesota, Texas, Illinois, and Wisconsin offered sewage treatment to as many as 90% of the population with public sewer systems. A little over half of treated sewage underwent secondary treatment such as activated sludge (Benidickson, Jaime).

When the Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant was constructed, the activated sludge system was considered a modern system, becoming widespread in the United States in the 1940s and the conventional norm for wastewater treatment in the United States. Variations of the basic process have since been developed and are still in use. It is widely used by large cities and communities where large volumes of wastewater must be highly treated economically.

Jacobean Revival Style

The plant's original 1933 service station and laboratory building is a modest example of the Jacobean Revival style applied to a public works building in form rather than ornamentation. The Jacobean Revival style is a subtype of the Tudor Revival style, which was the dominant style of domestic buildings in the early twentieth century, particularly in the 1920s and 1930s. It is based on the more formal English building traditions of Late Medieval times, unlike the Tudor Revival style, and characterized by parapeted gables. Front-facing gables rise in a parapet above the roof and side-gabled examples are similarly parapeted. The style is also characterized by shaped Flemish gables, flat-roofed towers, and bays with castellated parapets. Facade detailing usually consist of Gothic or Renaissance inspiration and did not incorporate the false-timbering that often characterized the Tudor Revival style. The Jacobean Revival style was commonly found in architect-designed landmarks built between 1895 and 1915. After World War I, less formal examples of the style dominated and the parapeted Jacobean Revival style persisted in scattered examples through the 1930s.

The modest service station is not a high-style example, although it generally retains its Jacobean Revival stylistic character-defining features, such as the parapeted side gables, steeply pitched gable roof, and quoin-like patterned brick along the southeast and southwest building corners. However, the building has been substantially altered by the non-historic hyphen addition on the entirety of its south rear elevation, connecting it to the non-historic two-story addition. Further, all of its original multi-light, metal-sash windows have been replaced and a non-historic gable-front porch has been added to the facade's doorway.

NRHP STATUS	DATE LISTED
Recommended Not Eligible	N/A

NRHP CRITERIA N/A

NRHP CRITERIA CONSIDERATIONS N/A

NRHP EVALUATION/JUSTIFICATION

The Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant was evaluated for the NRHP under Criteria A, B, and C using guidelines set forth in the NRHP Bulletin "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation."

The Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant is associated with the City of Geneva's municipallyrun wastewater treatment system in the early twentieth century; however, it does not retain integrity of feeling, association, design, workmanship, and materials as a 1930s wastewater treatment plant to convey this significant association. The plant was the second treatment facility in the city, replacing an outdated and inadequate system. Although the plant continues to treat the city's wastewater, all of its original 1930s infrastructure has been replaced with modern equipment and technology and the plant no longer conveys its association as a 1930s wastewater treatment facility. Additionally, the plant's activated sludge process is the standard wastewater treatment in the United States and background research did not indicate any historically significant associations with that process's development or subsequent innovations. Therefore, the Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant is recommended not eligible under Criterion A. The Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant is associated with Juanita Martin, the construction supervisor who oversaw the plant's construction in 1933. As a female construction supervisor in the 1930s, Martin had an unusual occupation for a woman at that time. However, research did not indicate that she was a historically significant person and much of the construction that she oversaw has since been removed or altered. Juanita Park, the small landscaped pond and garden at the plant's northwest corner is named to honor her achievements. However, this is an honorary designation that does not indicate any historical significance and is not a representative example of her productive life. Furthermore, Juanita Park is in its original location, but no longer retains its 1933 appearance as it was infilled with gravel in the mid-1970s and restored in 2004. Background research did not indicate any associations with the lives of persons significant in the past, and therefore, the Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant is recommended not eligible under Criterion B.

The Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant has been substantially altered since its construction in 1933. Only the service station and laboratory building remain from 1933 and none of the plant's original activated sludge process components or technology are extant. This infrastructure was completely replaced in 1973 with additional structures in 2004. Research did not indicate that any of the activated sludge process components, historic or modern, were innovative. The extant 1933 service station and laboratory building is a modest and altered example of the Jacobean Revival style applied to a public works building; it does not indicate architectural or artistic significance. Furthermore, all of the building's original windows have been replaced with non-historic two-light units, giving the building a more modern appearance, and a gable-front non-historic porch, south rear elevation hyphen, and two-story addition substantially detract from the building's overall appearance and original design intent. Therefore, the Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

The Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant was not evaluated for eligibility under Criterion D as part of this evaluation.

NRHP BOUNDARY N/A

SOURCES

- Alleman, James E., and Prakasam T. B. S. "Reflections on Seven Decades of Activated Sludge History." *Journal (Water Pollution Control Federation)* 55, no. 5 (1983): 436-43. http://www.jstor.org.gatekeeper.chipublib.org/stable/25041901.
- Benidickson, Jamie. "The Culture of Flushing: A Social and Legal History of Sewage." UBC Press (2007)
- Burian, Steven J., Stephan J. Nix, Robert E. Pitt, and S. Rocky Durrans. "Urban Wastewater Management in the United States: Past, Present, and Future." *Journal of Urban Technology*, 7, no. 3 (December 2000): 33-62. <u>http://wvwv.sewerhistory.org/articles/whregion/urban_wwm_mgmt/urban_wwm_mgmt.pd</u> <u>f</u>.
- "City Engages Two Attendants for Sewer Plant." *The Geneva Republican*, August 11, 1933. <u>http://box2.nmtvault.com/Geneva/jsp/RcWebBrowseCollections.jsp</u>.

- City of Geneva. "Juanita Martin (Kriegsman)." Geneva History Album, Flickr.com, June 25, 2008. <u>https://www.flickr.com/photos/cityofgeneva/4122948740/in/photostream</u>.
- City of Geneva. "Original 1933 Wastewater Plant." Geneva History Album, Flickr.com, June 28, 2007. <u>https://www.flickr.com/photos/cityofgeneva/4119679982/in/photostream/</u>.
- City of Geneva. "Wastewater Treatment Plant." Accessed July 1, 2016. http://www.geneva.il.us/index.aspx?NID=301.
- "City Still Seeking Federal Funds for New Sewage Treatment Plant." *The Geneva Republican*, October 18, 1973. <u>http://box2.nmtvault.com/Geneva/jsp/RcWebBrowseCollections.jsp</u>.
- "Council Votes Bonds for Sewage Plant; State, Feds Default." *The Geneva Republican*, February 21, 1974. <u>http://box2.nmtvault.com/Geneva/jsp/RcWebBrowseCollections.jsp</u>.
- "Here's Plant Where's Money? Geneva Sewage Plant Approved By the State." *The Geneva Republican*, November 22, 1973. http://box2.nmtvault.com/Geneva/jsp/RcWebBrowseCollections.jsp.
- Historic Map Works. Kane County Historical Maps and Atlases. 1871, 1872, 1892, 1904, 1928, 1954, 1966, 1978. http://www.historicmapworks.com/Browse/United_States/Illinois/Page/17/.
- "Indicate Funds for Sewage May Be Okayed." *The Geneva Republican*, July 12, 1973. http://box2.nmtvault.com/Geneva/jsp/RcWebBrowseCollections.jsp.

Laukaitis, John J. Geneva in Vintage Postcards. Chicago, IL: Arcadia Publishing, 2004.

- Nationwide Environmental Title Research, LLC. "Historic Aerials." 2016. http://www.historicaerials.com.
- "Plans Completed for Geneva's New Sewage Plant." *The Geneva Republican*, May 13, 1932. <u>http://box2.nmtvault.com/Geneva/jsp/RcWebBrowseCollections.jsp</u>.
- "Sewage Disposal Petition to be Filed in Court." *The Geneva Republican*, May 27, 1932. http://box2.nmtvault.com/Geneva/jsp/RcWebBrowseCollections.jsp.
- Smith, Jeff. "Reflecting History: City of Geneva (III.) staff members team up to restore a pond at the wastewater treatment plant originally established in 1933." *Treatment Plant Operator Magazine*, April 2011. <u>http://www.tpomag.com/editorial/2011/04/reflecting_history</u>.
- "Start Operation of New Sewage Disposal Plant." *The Geneva Republican*, October 6, 1933. http://box2.nmtvault.com/Geneva/jsp/RcWebBrowseCollections.jsp.
- "State Calls Attention to River Pollution." *The Geneva Republican*, February 6, 1931. http://box2.nmtvault.com/Geneva/jsp/RcWebBrowseCollections.jsp.
- Sanborn Map Company. *Geneva, Kane County, Illinois 1885-1951*. New York: Sanborn Map Company.

"Young Girl Makes Good as Boss of Plant Construction Laborers." *The Salt Lake Tribune*, November 19, 1933. <u>https://www.newspapers.com/newspage/12445482/</u>.



Figure 1 – Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant

Bing Maps birds-eye view of existing wastewater treatment facility





City of Geneva Wastewater Treatment Facility diagram of existing plant



Photo 1 – Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant

Facing southeast to 1933 service station and laboratory building (at left) with the ca. 2002 administration and laboratory building addition (at right) from Fox River Trail. Juanita Park at far left


Photo 2 - Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant

Facing south to Juanita Park (foreground) and 1933 service station and laboratory building from Fox River Trail. The centrifuge operations and biosolids storage building, added between 1974 and 1994, is visible at left in background



Photo 3 - Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant

Facing southwest to the Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant from driveway near Crissey Avenue. From left to right in the foreground, 1973 secondary clarifiers, 2004 aeration tanks, 1974 aeration tanks, and 1973 primary clarifier. From left to right in the background, 1974-1994 operations and biosolids storage building and wasting active sludge holding tanks, 2004 garage building, ca. 2002 administration and laboratory building and hyphen to the 1933 service station and laboratory building



Photo 4 - Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant

1933 historic photograph of the original plant. Juanita Park at right, foreground and service station and laboratory building, digester, and glass-enclosed drying beds at right, center. Lagoons and other in-ground treatment facilities at left.



Map – Geneva Wastewater Treatment Plant

Property Boundary

NAME Island Park South Bridge		
OTHER NAME(S) N/A		
STREET ADDRESS N/A		CITY Geneva
OWNERSHIP Geneva Park District		TAX PARCEL NUMBER N/A
YEAR BUILT 1937	SOURCE <i>The Geneva Republican</i> , March	12, 1937
DESIGNER/BUILDER Unknown		
STYLE Rustic	PROPERTY TYPE Bridge	
FOUNDATION Limestone	WALLS Limestone	ROOF N/A

DESCRIPTIVE NOTES

The Island Park South Bridge is a three-span, stone and concrete, closed-spandrel, deck arch pedestrian bridge that embodies the rustic style of park architecture prevalent during the 1930s. The bridge carries the Fox River Bike Trail over the Fox River's East Channel in Geneva, Illinois, to connect it with Island Park. The bridge is 60 feet long. Constructed entirely of concrete, it is faced with rusticated cut limestone, giving it the appearance of a stone arch bridge. The limestone is cut into several different sizes, as well as square and rectangular shapes, adding to its overall natural and rustic appearance. The three concrete arches are lined by a single row of limestones. The middle arch is slightly taller than the flanking arches. The concrete deck extends above the arches and is graded with replacement asphalt. The bridge has solid limestone-faced parapet walls with six piers on each side of the bridge. The limestone retaining walls lining the entirety of the island.

HISTORY/DEVELOPMENT

The Island Park South Bridge was built in 1937 by the City of Geneva Park District as part of an overall park improvement program primarily funded by the Public Works Administration (PWA). The new bridge was built over the Fox River at the south end of Herrington Island Park to connect a new road into the park from the sewage disposal plant located just south of the railroad bridge. The engineer and builder are unknown.

Established in June 1933, the PWA was one of the first public works agencies of the New Deal programs. Its mission was to build large-scale projects, such as dams, bridges, courthouses, hospitals, university buildings, and schools, among other buildings. PWA grant project proposals originated at the local level with the community deciding what it wanted and hiring an architect or engineer to design it. In Washington, D.C., the PWA reviewed the grant proposals and most were approved by the President of the United States. Initially, if grant funding was approved, 30 percent of the project cost came from the PWA and the remaining 70 percent was

funded by the project sponsor. The PWA would loan the 70 percent if the sponsor could not secure funding. In 1935, the shared split changed to 45 percent from the PWA and 55 percent from the sponsors as the bond markets recovered and more communities were able to sell bonds to be approved in local elections. Interest from PWA loans went into a revolving fund to provide more grants. Once projects were approved, they were executed by local contractors using local labor, providing jobs to the community.

The PWA provided \$60,000 of federal funding for Island Park improvements projects, many of which were completed in 1936 and 1937, and included the construction of the Island Park South Bridge. The local park board funded \$10,000 of the improvements. Other improvements included construction of 4,000 linear feet of cut quarry limestone retaining walls around the entire island; expansion of three acres of additional parkland from an extension of the entire shoreline around the park and infill land at the south end; installation of a new road and crushed stone sidewalks throughout the park; a renovation of the field house that included new plumbing, electrical, heating boiler, radiators, exterior porches and railing, and landscaping; the removal of tennis courts; and the relocation of playground equipment to the south end of the island. Additional landscaping throughout the park, a flag circle, and Legion patriotic memorial were also completed. All of the work was done by men from a transient camp located just south of nearby Batavia. They completed stone cutting, laying, carpentry, and all other labor required for the park improvements. The cut limestone used for these improvements was quarried in Batavia and hauled by trucks to the island.

Island Park

Herrington Island Park, later Island Park, was the City of Geneva's first official public park. In 1914, the city purchased Herrington's Island from Ralph C. Richards for \$2,250. Richards was a general claim agent with the Chicago & Northwestern Railway and a former Geneva mayor. Research did not reveal when he first obtained ownership of the island. The funding for the city's purchase of the island, construction of a bridge, and other park projects came from a special election on August 4, 1914, in which Geneva's citizens supported the issuance of \$15,000 in bonds. Three park commissioners, David Flynn, Fred Hill, and Charles Peterson, were instrumental in the creation and design of Island Park. They invited J.H. Proust, superintendent of parks for Chicago, to provide professional guidance and recommendations for the park design.

Initially named Herrington's Island after its first owner, James Herrington, the island was first called Herrington Island Park and eventually only Island Park. James Herrington was among the first white settlers of Geneva and significantly contributed to the community's growth and success in the early-to-mid-nineteenth century. The island had previously been used for various recreational activities throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Herrington Island Park informally opened as a public park on June 5, 1915. The park's north end featured an elaborate cement entrance and stairway leading from the State Street Bridge; it was constructed in 1915 prior to the park's opening and removed in 1971 when the State Street Bridge was widened. Playground equipment was also added to the north end of the park in 1915. In 1916, a wading pool and field house were added.

Originally, the Herrington Island Park Commission, and later the Geneva Park Commission oversaw park operations. It was replaced in 1953 by the Geneva Park District, which oversaw four parks at that time: Dryden, Island, McKinley, and Wheeler Parks. The district has since grown to include 50 parks, occupying over 700 acres and supporting 3,000 recreation programs

offered annually.

Island Park now features gardens, the Fox River Bike Trail, a concert pavilion, and a treehousethemed playground with a zip line. The park is accessed from Water Street on the east side of the Route 38 bridge or from the pedestrian bridge on River Lane.

Rustic Style Architecture and Concrete and Stone Arch Bridges

The rustic style of the Island Park South Bridge is derived from a nationwide trend of rustic park architecture popularized by the National Park Service (NPS) in the early twentieth century. Prior to World War II, the NPS extensively applied a rustic style to buildings, road and trail design, and road-related structures in the national parks with the intent of harmonizing these structures within their environment. Influenced by its natural setting, rustic style architecture commonly used log and stone for building materials to blend in with the natural environment as well as traditional building techniques that emphasized hand craftsmanship. The proper scaling of construction materials and completed structures with their surroundings was also important in achieving harmony with the landscape. The NPS extensively employed this philosophy of non-intrusive park design throughout its park system to minimize impacts to the natural environment in the 1920s and 1930s, though its use began to decline in the mid-to-late 1930s.

During the Depression, this rustic style of architecture also became a standard design for federal relief programs, such as the PWA, Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), and Works Progress Administration (WPA). Often, federal relief programs were completed under the direction of NPS planners who continued to implement their preferred rustic style of architecture to these projects, which were completed at the local, state, and national levels. In 1935, the NPS published a textbook of park architecture, *Park Structures and Facilities,* to define rustic style architecture, address design problems, and provide guidance to often less experienced staff and workers. The textbook became the definitive statement on rustic architecture as practiced by the NPS prior to World War II.

Bridge designs within parks were challenging as they needed to be substantial, easy to maintain, and use modern materials such as concrete. Concrete did not blend well with the natural environment, but it was both efficient and economical. This problem was resolved through the predominant use of the concrete and stone arch bridge, which was implemented throughout the national park system. These types of bridges consisted of a concrete vault one or two feet thick and twenty to thirty feet wide, spanning a waterbody or other feature. Each side of the concrete vault was faced in rustic stone to simulate a stone arch bridge, while the concrete and stone structure above the vault was then filled with earth and graded. The resulting bridge provided the desired traditional rustic stone appearance to complement its natural setting, while meeting the low maintenance and modern materials criteria preferred for projects. Although the NPS first implemented concrete and stone arch bridges in their park system, this bridge type and style appears to have been commonly used by the PWA, WPA, and CCC programs during the 1930s for small to medium-sized bridges throughout the country based on available research.

A review of available historic and aerial photographs shows the Island Park South Bridge remains relatively unaltered since its construction in 1937. A few areas of deterioration of the limestone facing is present on the arches, but the bridge is an otherwise intact example of a rustic-style stone-faced concrete arch bridge.

NRHP STATUS Recommended Eligible DATE LISTED N/A

NRHP CRITERIA A, C

NRHP CRITERIA CONSIDERATIONS N/A

NRHP EVALUATION/JUSTIFICATION

The Island Park South Bridge was evaluated for the NRHP under Criteria A, B, and C using guidelines set forth in the NRHP Bulletin "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation."

The Island Park South Bridge is associated with extensive park improvements that occurred at Island Park in 1936 and 1937 as a result of New Deal PWA federal funding and the city's continued investment in park and recreation in Geneva. These improvements occurred twenty-two years after the park was established and improved connections to the park from the south while adding to the natural, rustic quality of the park. The Island Park South Bridge is locally historically significant for its association with the PWA in Geneva, and therefore, it is recommended eligible under Criterion A.

Background research did not indicate any associations with the lives of persons significant in the past, and therefore, the Island Park South Bridge is recommended not eligible under Criterion B.

The Island Park South Bridge is recommended eligible under Criterion C. The three-span, limestone-faced concrete, closed-spandrel, deck arch pedestrian bridge embodies the rustic style of park architecture prevalent during the 1930s and commonly used for PWA projects. Although the closed-spandrel, deck arch bridge is a relatively common bridge type and the stone-facing application was a standard design of federal relief bridge projects, the Island Park South Bridge is a representative and intact example in Geneva that also incorporates the rustic style architecture tenets of using stone building materials and an appropriate scale for the natural landscape and setting of Island Park. The bridge retains its original character-defining features, materials, and overall form and appearance.

The Island Park South Bridge was not evaluated for eligibility under Criterion D as part of this evaluation.

The Island Park South Bridge retains integrity of location, setting, design, workmanship, materials, feeling and association. The bridge's period of significance is 1937, when it was constructed and associated with the PWA.

NRHP BOUNDARY

The NRHP boundary for the Island Park South Bridge is the bridge's footprint.

SOURCES

Conro, Steve. "Island Park South Bridge." Bridgehunter.com, March 5, 2012. http://bridgehunter.com/il/kane/bh51606/.

Durant, Pliny A., Henry C. Bradsby, and Samuel W. Durant. Commemorative Biographical and

Historical Record of Kane County, Illinois. Chicago, IL: Beers, Leggett & Co., 1888.

- Holth, Nathan. "South Island Park Bridge." Historicbridges.org, June 26, 2011. http://historicbridges.org/bridges/browser/?bridgebrowser=illinois/genevapark/.
- Historic Map Works. Kane County Historical Maps and Atlases. 1871, 1872, 1892, 1904, 1928, 1954, 1966, 1978. http://www.historicmapworks.com/Browse/United States/Illinois/Page/17/.

Laukaitis, John J. Geneva in Vintage Postcards. Chicago, IL: Arcadia Publishing, 2004.

Leighninger, Robert. "Public Works Administration Architecture." In *KnowLA Encyclopedia of Louisiana*, edited by David Johnson. Louisiana Endowment for the Humanities, 2010-. Article published February 1, 2011. <u>http://www.knowla.org/entry/495/</u>.

Nationwide Environmental Title Research, LLC. "Historic Aerials." 2016. http://www.historicaerials.com.

- "Thousands Spent in Improvements at Island Park." *The Geneva Republican*, March 12, 1937. http://box2.nmtvault.com/Geneva/jsp/RcWebBrowseCollections.jsp.
- Tweed, William C., Laura E. Soulliere, and Henry G. Law. *Rustic Architecture: 1916-1942*. National Park Service, Western Regional Office, Division of Cultural Resource Management, February 1977. https://www.nps.gov/parkhistory/online_books/rusticarch/introduction.htm.
- Sanborn Map Company. *Geneva, Kane County, Illinois 1885-1951*. New York: Sanborn Map Company.

Facing northeast to the west side of the bridge and the south end of Island Park



Facing southwest to the east side of the bridge



Facing east toward the Island Park South Bridge (at center) and its setting along the Fox River and the south end of Island Park





NRHP Boundary

NAME Geneva Railroad Bridge

OTHER NAME(S) Union Pacific Fox River Bridge

STREET ADDRESS N/A

CITY Geneva

OWNERSHIP Union Pacific Railroad TAX PARCEL NUMBER

YEAR BUILT	SOURCE
1920	Bridge Hunter, August 15, 2015.

DESIGNER/BUILDER Chicago & North Western Railway

STYLE Steel Deck-Girder Bridge	PROPERTY TYPE Bridge	
FOUNDATION	WALLS	roof
Stone, Concrete	N/A	N/A

DESCRIPTIVE NOTES

The Geneva Railroad Bridge is a seven-span, steel deck-girder bridge with ashlar stone abutments and wingwalls and six massive concrete piers constructed in 1920. The bridge is 486 feet long with 70-foot spans and carries the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad over the Fox River in Geneva, Illinois, southeast of downtown Geneva. A Pratt through truss pedestrian bridge added in the late-twentieth century is located under the railroad bridge.

The steel deck girders consist of plate girders with riveted connections. The steel deck girders are connected by angle-section sway bracing attached to two central I-beams below the deck. Angle beams attached to both bridge elevations support the wooden railroad ties projecting from the deck. Midway across the deck, a small wooden platform projects from both sides of the deck, supported by larger angle beams connected to the deck girders. A small sign reading "NORTH WESTERN" is located on the deck girder in the middle of the north elevation. The deck consists of two railroad tracks. A railing comprised of thin metal posts with three rows of thick wire running between the posts lines both sides of the deck.

The substructure consists of full-height rustic ashlar cut masonry abutments. The abutments are flanked by stepped, flared wingwalls of the same material. The abutments and wingwalls are remnants from the former 1880 metal lattice deck truss railroad bridge at this location. Battered concrete buttresses, added in 1920, project from the abutment under the deck, providing additional support for the deck. Each of the six concrete piers have a flared cap, two arched openings, and a battered concrete base. The piers are substantially wider than the deck. They were originally built with the intention of accommodating two additional tracks over the Fox River; therefore, the superstructure rests only on the northern half of each pier.

A steel Pratt through truss pedestrian bridge passes through the northern arch of each pier, beneath the railroad bridge deck. It is connected to the base of each pier by a pair of short angle beams connected by X-bracing. The pedestrian bridge has a wooden deck, metal railing, and

gabled metal roof.

HISTORY/DEVELOPMENT

The Geneva Railroad Bridge was constructed by the Chicago & North Western Railway (C&NW) in 1920. It is the third railroad bridge constructed across the Fox River at this location. C&NW's predecessor, the Galena & Chicago Union Railroad (G&CU), constructed the first railroad bridge across the Fox River in Geneva when the railroad expanded westward from Chicago through Geneva in 1853. An 1869 birds-eye view map of Geneva shows the original four-span railroad bridge over the river. The map does not clearly indicate the type of bridge used at the crossing, however it may have been a wooden bridge based on an 1878 *Geneva Republican* newspaper article calling for the replacement of the railroad bridge. The article claimed the bridge was rotting and unstable with creaking timbers. By 1880, the C&NW had replaced it with a new, metal lattice deck truss bridge with rustic ashlar stone piers and abutments.

After the turn of the twentieth century, the C&NW began preparing to construct a new bridge over the Fox River as part of a general improvement plan for the railroad. The C&NW submitted a report requesting authorization to construct the bridge to the Congress Commerce Committee on April 19, 1916. Congress approved the request on May 1, 1916. The new seven-span steel deck-girder bridge was constructed in 1920. The C&NW constructed the bridge on massive concrete piers twice as wide as the existing superstructure to accommodate future expansion of the bridge deck up to two railroad tracks in the future. The bridge superstructure has not been expanded since its construction.

In 1933, the C&NW raised the bridge deck twelve inches by placing cement blocks under the deck at each pier. The project raised the tracks to the height of the rest of the line to minimize the accidents that occurred at this location.

In the late-twentieth century, a pedestrian bridge was constructed below the bridge deck to provide a more efficient way for pedestrians to cross the Fox River and provide connections to the Fox River Trail and Island Park. An existing Pratt through truss was dismantled in Minnesota and transported to Geneva. It was reconstructed through the Geneva Railroad Bridge piers across the river, anchored to the base of each pier.

Geneva

Geneva was first settled in the early 1830s, and grew rapidly in the following decades due to its status as the county seat, its proximity to agricultural resources and urban markets, and its desirable location along the Fox River that facilitated agricultural and commercial enterprises. By 1840, Geneva had three general stores, two hotels, two blacksmiths, a woodshop, and sawmill. All of its early industries were located along the Fox River where packed meat, butter, cheese, milled grains, and later glucose and flax were processed.

In the 1850s, transportation improvements substantially changed the physical, commercial, and social character and development of Geneva. In 1850, Geneva had a population of 827. That year, its first railroad service began, consisting of a two-mile branch line located on the east side of the Fox River. The branch line ran north to St. Charles and connected to G&CU that ran in and out of West Chicago. In 1853, the G&CU Railroad's main line was extended west through Geneva, connecting it to Chicago and the West. It was the first permanent railroad line in Geneva. Two passenger trains and one freight train a day passed through the community by

1857. By 1892, 31 passenger and 36 freight trains passed through Geneva each day.

The advent of the railroad led to the development of the town west along the rail line, away from the town's initial development centered on the Fox River. The railroad also helped to expand industry in Geneva through the second half of the nineteenth century by facilitating the shipment of goods to urban markets. Many of its industries relied on water power generated from the Fox River as well as area farms to provide crops to the local industries, which were delivered daily by the railroad.

Geneva formally incorporated as a village in 1867 with a population nearing 1,500 residents. In addition to its successful industries, Geneva had twin flax mills, four wagon shops, four blacksmith shops, eleven dry goods stores, multiple grocery and hardware stores, and numerous small businesses. The community continued to prosper through the late nineteenth century, choosing in 1887 to become a city.

Geneva continued to grow through the twentieth century due to the establishment of additional industries and residential developments. In the early twentieth century, Geneva's first research and development facility, Riverbank Laboratories, was established in the home of Colonel George and Nelle Fabyan. During the two world wars, its research and intelligence work contributed to U.S. military successes. By 2000, Geneva's industries included industrial electronics, railway supplies, publishing, and Burgess-Norton precision-machined parts. In 1961, Kent Shodeen began building homes in Geneva. His residential developments contributed to Geneva's continued growth through the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s that doubled its population.

Chicago and Northwestern Railway

In 1836, the first railroad in Chicago was chartered by the State of Illinois to build tracks from the city to the lead mines at Galena in northwestern Illinois. It was called the G&CU Railroad. The first tracks were laid from the Galena Depot at Canal and Kinzie Streets in Chicago to Oak Park and River Forest in 1848. They reached Elgin by 1850 and Freeport in 1853, stopping just short of its original target destination at the Galena lead mines. Soon after, the railroad was redirected toward the Mississippi River in a direct line west out of Chicago.

In 1855, the G&CU Railroad laid a second track with left-hand main operation between Chicago and the Mississippi River at Fulton, Illinois, which later became a core route to the west. The G&CU Railroad further expanded operations in 1862, leasing in perpetuity the Chicago Iowa & Nebraska Railroad and the Cedar Rapids & Missouri Railroad. The latter became the first railroad to reach Council Bluffs, Iowa and eventually became the mainline portion of the First Transcontinental Railroad. By this time, the G&CU Railroad operated passenger, freight, and postal service cars on the line.

In 1864, the G&CU Railroad merged with the C&NW Railroad, which was originally chartered by Illinois and Wisconsin in 1859. The C&NW also acquired the Peninsula Railroad in Upper Michigan at this time. After the formation of the C&NW, the company rapidly expanded through the acquisition and mergers of other lines as well as the construction of its own lines throughout the Midwest. This included the completion of an important line in the late 1860s connecting Council Bluffs, Iowa to Chicago. Between the mid-nineteenth century and early twentieth century, the C&NW acquired additional routes throughout Illinois as well as routes to Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Nebraska, and Wyoming.

Commuter service developed gradually on the C&NW Railroad through the mid-nineteenth century and increased in the years following the Great Chicago Fire of 1871. The fire pushed many residents west out of Chicago into the suburbs as the city rebuilt. Passenger service on the C&NW Railroad facilitated this western movement and suburban growth, allowing residents to commute into the city while living further away.

The C&NW Railroad eventually operated three commuter lines—the Northwest Line, West Line, and North Line—from the Chicago station, terminating in Harvard, Illinois; Geneva, Illinois; and Kenosha, Wisconsin, respectively. Through the early-to-mid-twentieth century, the C&NW continued Chicago area commuter and passenger service, periodically making improvements to suburban depots, modernizing and adjusting operations, and introducing new commuter cars in the 1920s and again in the 1950s. The increasing popularity of the automobile and airplane travel, however, led to declining ridership numbers during that period.

The C&NW struggled with declining numbers and losses through the 1960s and 70s. In 1972, it was sold to an employee-led investment group. In 1974, the Illinois Regional Transit Authority (RTA) was established and began to subsidize the region's commuter trains. The C&NW entered a purchase-of-service agreement with the RTA; it is continued today between Metra (formed in 1984) and the UP Railroad, which purchased the C&NW Railroad in 1995. UP continues to operate the C&NW lines, including its pioneer 1848 G&CU line.

Steel Deck-Girder Bridges

Steel deck-girder bridges gained popularity by the turn of the twentieth century as steel makers improved their product, cutting costs and replacing iron as the material of choice. Bridge fabricators shipped all the necessary bridge parts and detailed construction instructions to the client. Once the parts arrived at their destination, assembly required construction using plates and rivets placed in pre-drilled holes. Riveted connections replaced pin and bolt connections at the turn of the twentieth century.

Typical steel deck-girder bridges are comprised of two girders, consisting of built-up steel plates or rolled steel beams, which function as the primary structural components of the bridge. The girders do not extend above the deck, allowing for width expansion. The plates are typically connected with pins or rivets along the bridge faces, and the girders are often connected by angle beams or I-beams underneath the deck. The substructure of early-twentieth century steel deck girders are typically comprised of masonry or concrete.

The C&NW constructed many steel deck-girder railroad bridges in Illinois and the Midwest around the turn of the twentieth century over rivers, streams, roadways, and railroad right-ofway. In Illinois, the C&NW constructed several steel deck-girder railroad bridges over the Fox River. Some have a concrete substructure while others have an ashlar stone substructure. The typical C&NW steel deck-girder bridges over the Fox River are approximately four spans long, with some longer bridges up to seven spans. Shorter C&NW steel deck-girder bridges in Illinois span roadways, steams, or other railroad tracks and have concrete or ashlar stone substructures. Some bridges still carry the UP Railroad while others are abandoned.

The Geneva Railroad Bridge is a large but typical example of a C&NW steel deck-girder bridge crossing the Fox River in Illinois; the girders are comprised of steel plates with riveted connections and are also connected by angle beams under the deck. The substructure is

comprised of both masonry and concrete. Changes to the bridge since construction include the replacement of deck materials such as ballasts and railroad tracks, typical of railroad maintenance, and the construction of a Pratt through truss pedestrian bridge through the bridge pier arches.

NRHP STATUSDATE LISTEDRecommended Not EligibleN/A

NRHP CRITERIA N/A

NRHP CRITERIA CONSIDERATIONS N/A

NRHP EVALUATION/JUSTIFICATION

The Geneva Railroad Bridge was evaluated for the NRHP under Criteria A, B, and C using guidelines set forth in the NRHP Bulletin "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation."

The Geneva Railroad Bridge was constructed during a time of growth in Geneva and the improvement of the C&NW Railroad system. However, background research did not indicate any historically significant associations with Geneva's growth or the growth of the C&NW. Although it is located at the site of the first railroad line to pass through Geneva, the original bridge, and subsequent bridge constructed by the C&NW, are no longer extant. Background research did not indicate any significant contributions to the broad patterns of United States history or any historically significant associations with the lives of persons significant in the past, and therefore, the Geneva Railroad Bridge is recommended not eligible under Criterion A or B.

The Geneva Railroad Bridge is a basic and typical example of an early twentieth century steel deck-girder railroad bridge, a common bridge type constructed throughout Illinois in the earlytwentieth century. The replacement of deck materials is typical of railroad maintenance and does not detract from the bridge's original appearance, form, or materials. However, the latetwentieth century addition of the Pratt through truss pedestrian bridge along the bridge piers alters the bridge's original appearance, form, and design intent. Although the bridge's massive piers designed for additional future tracks are unusual and the bridge retains its original character-defining features as a steel deck-girder railroad bridge, the bridge is not an innovative or significant example of this bridge type. The bridge does not represent an innovative application of bridge building technology or embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, style, or method of construction, and does not represent the work of a master. Therefore, the Geneva Railroad Bridge is recommended not eligible under Criterion C.

The Geneva Railroad Bridge was not evaluated for eligibility under Criterion D as part of this evaluation.

NRHP BOUNDARY N/A

SOURCES

Bridge Hunter. "UP- Fox River Bridge (Geneva)." August 15, 2015. Accessed June 27 2016. Available at <u>http://bridgehunter.com/il/kane/bh41897/</u>.

- "Geneva, Kane County, Illinois, 1869." *History Map.* Accessed June 27, 2016. Available at <u>http://www.history-map.com/picture/002/pictures/Illinois-Geneva.jpg</u>.
- "Gossip By Mattie." *The Geneva Republican*, July 6, 1878. Accessed June 26, 2016. Available at <u>http://box2.nmtvault.com/Geneva/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=1878+-</u> +1879%2fgn000000%2f20120724%2f00000013&collection_filter=true.
- Great Third Rail. "The Third Rail Division." Accessed February 9, 2016. http://www.greatthirdrail.org/history/CIII.html.
- Hoth, Nathan. "Geneva Railroad Bridge." *Historic Bridges*. Accessed June 27, 2016. Available at http://historicbridges.org/bridges/browser/?bridgebrowser=illinois/genevarr/.
- "Map showing the location of the Galena & Chicago Union Railroad with its branches & connections in Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa and Minnesota." New York: G.W. & C.B. Colton & Co., 1862. Accessed June 27, 2016. Available at <u>https://www.loc.gov/item/98688665/</u>.
- "North Western Ry. Bridge Being Raised 12 Inches." *The Geneva Republican,* August 11, 1933. Accessed July 1, 2016. Available at <u>http://box2.nmtvault.com/Geneva/jsp/RcWebImageViewer.jsp?doc_id=1930+-</u> +1939%2fgn000000%2f20121130%2f00001116&collection_filter=true.
- Parsons Brinckerhoff and Engineering and Industrial Heritage. A Context for Common Historic Bridge Types. Prepared for the National Cooperative Highway Research Program. October 2005.
- Solzman, David M. "Fox River." *Encyclopedia of Chicago*. Accessed February 9, 2016. <u>http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/481.html</u>.
- Stage Fright Productions. "The History of the Fox River in Geneva, Illinois." Accessed June 27, 2016. Available at <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nsa_tpf1Glo</u>.
- Stennett, William H., "Yesterday and Today: A history of the Chicago and North Western Railway System." Chicago: Winship Company, 1910. Archive.org. Accessed February 9, 2016. <u>https://archive.org/details/cu31924032484572</u>.

Superintendent of Documents. Catalogue of the Public Documents of the Sixty-Fourth Congress and of All Departments of the Government of the United States for the period from July 1, 1915 to June 30, 1917. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1922. Accessed June 27, 2016. Available at <u>https://books.google.com/books?id=yeFHAQAAMAAJ&dq=Geneva+Railaroad+bridge+C</u> <u>hicago+and+NOrth+Western+Railway&source=gbs_navlinks</u>.



Facing northwest to the south elevation from the east side of the Fox River

Photo 2 - Geneva Railroad Bridge



Facing southwest to the north elevation from South Island Park Bridge on the east side of the Fox River



Facing west through the Pratt through truss pedestrian bridge addition



Map – Geneva Railroad Bridge

Property Boundary

NAME Weber Farmstead		
OTHER NAME(S) Everts' Crossing, Lovett Farm		
STREET ADDRESS 1N016 Peck Road		CITY Geneva
OWNERSHIP Michael and Libby Burcham		TAX PARCEL NUMBER 12-06-400-013
YEAR BUILT 1929	SOURCE Geneva Township Assessor's Department, 2016.	
DESIGNER/BUILDER Unknown		
STYLE Colonial Revival	PROPERTY TYPE Agricultural	
FOUNDATION Concrete	WALLS Brick; wood; metal	ROOF Asphalt

DESCRIPTIVE NOTES

The Weber Farmstead is a formerly active early twentieth century farmstead located on five acres at the northwest corner of Peck and Keslinger Roads. The buildings are located on the southern portion of the property, near the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Railroad tracks, with small agricultural fields to the north and west. The agricultural buildings are sited west and away from the house, which is located at the southeast corner of the property. The agricultural buildings are reached by a long unpaved driveway that curves south and west of the house, and terminates in a gravel farmyard around which the agricultural buildings are located. Former agricultural fields associated with the original farm, and now part of the City of Geneva's Prairie Green Preserve, surround the farmstead to the north and west.

The farmstead's extant buildings consist of a two-story, side-gable Colonial Revival house constructed in 1929 and seven agricultural buildings that date from 1929 through the mid-twentieth century. The agricultural buildings include a ca. 1929 two-story gambrel-roof raised barn with an attached concrete silo; two ca. 1929 transverse-frame barns; a ca. 1929 small gable-roof barn; a mid-twentieth century drive-through corncrib barn; a mid-twentieth century pole barn; and one non-historic pole barn. A freestanding metal grain bin is also present on the property, on the south side of the driveway between the house and agricultural outbuildings.

1929 Colonial Revival House

The modest two-story, side-gable Colonial Revival house faces east to Peck Road on a northsouth axis. It has a concrete foundation, red and brown brick cladding, and an asphalt-shingle roof. The side gables each terminate in an exterior brick chimney. All windows are replacement eight-over-eight, double-hung, vinyl-sashes, unless otherwise specified. The three-bay, symmetrical facade has a central elaborate doorway consisting of multi-pane glass and woodpaneled front door topped by a four-light transom. The front door surround consists of fluted pilasters topped by a broken triangular pediment. The doorway is reached by three concrete steps. A window flanks each side of the door in the outer bays of the first story; they each have a brick sill and lintel. The second story has a single window with a brick sill in each bay; the middle window is slightly smaller and more square. The top of the windows abut a simple frieze board. An original moulded copper gutter that alludes to a cornice extends across the roofline, above the frieze, and connects to original copper downspouts located at the far south and north ends of the facade.

The nearly identical north and south side elevations comprise two bays of windows with brick sills and lintels at each story. The north side elevation's westernmost first-story bay has a smaller window than the others present on the side elevations and basement-level windows are present on the south side elevation only. Two narrow rectangular louvered vents are present in the gables. The gables each terminate in a brick chimney that is articulated with decorative detailed brickwork.

The three-bay west rear elevation has a central partial-width porch leading to the single door in the middle bay. The porch has a concrete foundation and steps, a wood deck, wooden railings and posts, and a flat roof. Two windows with brick sills and lintels flank each side of the central entrance in the outer bays of the first story; the northernmost bay has a smaller window with a smaller upper sash and eight-light lower sash. The second story has a round-arch window with multiple lights in the central bay; it has a brick round-arch lintel and brick sill that rests on the first-story porch. The outer bays of the second story each contain a window with a brick sill; the top of the windows abut the frieze board that extends across the roofline. An original copper gutter system appears to be present on this elevation, similar to the one on the facade.

The house has several manicured shrubs at the facade's foundation and flower beds and low shrubs along the west rear elevation's foundation. The property has a landscaped grass lawn. Mature deciduous trees to the east, south, and southwest, as well as a double row of evergreen trees to the north, of the house form the property's only tree lines. They create an incomplete circle around the house, blocking views to and from the house toward Peck Road, the UP-W Railroad, and the agricultural buildings. Two perpendicular sidewalks south and west of the house lead to the driveway and agricultural buildings from the west rear elevation entry. An unpaved driveway is located east of the house and curves south and west of the house toward the agricultural outbuildings.

1929 Gambrel-Roof Raised Barn

The two-story, gambrel-roof raised barn is located on the south side of the farmyard. It sits on a concrete foundation and its walls are clad in original wood siding on the north elevation and replacement standing seam metal on the remaining elevations. Its gambrel roof is topped by asphalt shingles and five evenly spaced lightning rods on the central ridge. Oriented on an east-west axis, the barn's rectangular footprint is 50-feet wide by 90-feet long. The raised barn comprises a full basement and a three-bay upper level reached by an earthen ramp to the central threshing floor. Its three-bay form, barn doors on the broad sides, and gambrel ends are similar to the English barn form. The concrete, grass, and wood ramp is present on the barn's north elevation, which has an off-center entrance with sliding wood doors flanked to the west by a small six-light wood window on the upper level. The basement level has two six-light wood windows east of the ramp and three of the same windows west of the ramp.

The barn's east side elevation has central double doors on the lower level and a single oneover-one window in the gambrel. The south rear elevation has one door and five openings on the lower level and two openings on the upper level; all openings are infilled with standing seam metal. The west side elevation is largely devoid of openings and has a single opening in the gambrel. At its south end, a one-story, gable-roof hyphen clad in standing seam metal connects the barn to the adjacent two-story, round concrete silo with a conical roof.

1929 Gable-Roof Barn

Located southeast of the gambrel-roof raised barn, a one-story, gable-roof barn is oriented on an east-west axis. It sits on a concrete foundation and its walls are clad in wood siding on the east elevation and standing seam metal on the remaining elevations. The roof is topped by asphalt shingles. The east elevation has two sets of wood double doors and a two-over-two, wood window in the gable. The west elevation has two openings on the first story and one opening in the gable; all are infilled with standing seam metal. The north and south side elevations have no openings.

1929 Transverse-Frame Barns

Northeast of the raised barn and along the east side of the gravel farmyard, the two transverseframe barns are oriented on an east-west axis and parallel to each other. To the south, the smaller one-story, gable-roof transverse-frame barn is clad in wood siding and has an asphaltshingle roof. The east and west elevations have central double wood sliding doors. The east elevation also has an infilled opening in the gable. The north and south side elevations have no openings. Directly north and parallel to this barn is a slightly larger one-and-one-half-story, gable-roof transverse-frame barn. It has a concrete foundation and its walls are clad in a mix of standing seam metal and wood siding. The roof is topped by asphalt shingles. The west elevation has central double wood sliding doors. The north elevation has a single infilled opening and the east and south elevations have no openings.

A rectangular concrete pad is located directly southeast of these two barns.

Ca. 1963 Corncrib Barn

North of the raised barn and the gravel farmyard, the one-and-one-half-story, gable-roof drivethrough corncrib barn sits on a concrete foundation with wood-clad walls and asphalt-shingle roofing. The barn is oriented on a north-south axis. Its north and south elevations contain large double doors on the first story and a small rectangular opening in the gable. Its identical east and west elevations have no window or door openings. A gabled cupola surmounts the roof ridgeline.

Pole Barns

The two pole barns are located northwest of the gambrel-roof raised barn along the west side of the farmyard. They are oriented on an east-west axis. To the north, the larger non-historic pole barn is a one-and-one-half-story, aluminum-clad, gable-roof Morton Building. Two large sliding doors are located on the east elevation and at the west end of the north elevation. The south elevation has a single pedestrian door at the east end and the west elevation has no openings. Directly south and parallel to this barn is a smaller ca. 1963 one-story, aluminum-clad, gable-roof pole barn. It has double doors on its east and south elevations and no openings on its remaining elevations.

Setting

The farmstead generally retains its layout and relationship between buildings and landscape features. However, its greater setting has been substantially altered by the division of its original farmland, the construction of large non-historic buildings to the east and south, and the intersection improvement of Peck and Keslinger Roads to the southeast, which is now an elevated intersection above the UP railroad. The intersection improvement required substantial additional right-of-way from the Weber Farmstead property, resulting in the loss of much of the house's front yard, including six sugar maple trees, and the rerouting of the driveway to intersect with Peck Road 1,000 feet north of the house.

HISTORY/DEVELOPMENT

The 5-acre Weber Farmstead and the formerly associated 78.5-acre surrounding agricultural fields were originally settled as the 83.5-acre dairy and cattle farm of Samuel C. Everts in 1851. None of the buildings associated with Everts remain and research indicates the original uprightand-wing farmhouse and barns were replaced in 1929 by either Gust Nelson or William W. Lovett. Gust Nelson owned the property until at least 1928, but research did not conclusively indicate when William W. Lovett assumed ownership; he first appears in the 1930 US Census as a stock farmer in Geneva. The Geneva Township Assessor dates the extant Colonial Revival house to 1929 and the gambrel-roof raised barn, gable-roof barn, and two transverse-frame barns were likely also constructed at this time. A review of historical aerial photographs shows the drive-through corncrib barn and smaller pole barn were added between 1952 and 1963 and that the area directly south and west of the raised barn was originally a stockyard. A second stockyard appears to also have been located behind the southernmost transverse-frame barn. By 1996, the larger Morton Building pole barn and grain bin were added to the property and the stockyards were no longer extant. Most of the farmstead's original acreage and fields were sold in 1999 to form the Prairie Green Preserve, while the five acres immediately surrounding the farmstead were retained. Additional changes to the property occurred in 2000-2001 when the easternmost portion of the farmstead, primarily the front yard of the house, was taken for required additional right-of-way for the new elevated intersection of Peck and Keslinger Roads. This resulted in the removal of six large sugar maple trees, as well as other mature deciduous and evergreen trees, and the realignment of the driveway parallel to the house and Peck Road to access Peck Road 1,000 feet north of the house. The new right-of-way now extends to approximately 150 feet from the house's facade.

Ownership History

The land of the present Weber Farmstead was originally settled in 1851 by Samuel C. Everts, though none of the buildings associated with him remain. Samuel C. Everts was born in Washington, Massachusetts, in 1805 to native New Englander parents. Everts moved to Lenox, Massachusetts, when he was eighteen years old and married Ruth Barrett. The Everts lived on a farm in Lenox until 1834 when the family moved to East Otto in western New York where he engaged in dairy farming. In 1851, Everts moved his family to Kane County, Illinois, where he purchased the 83.5-acre Sitterly farm in Geneva Township, which was renamed to indicate Everts as the new owner; this property is the subject of this determination of eligibility. Here he also engaged in dairy farming and the raising of livestock. Everts held the offices of Township Assessor and Road Commissioner, the latter of which he held for twenty-four years. Everts also helped to organize the Congregational Church in Geneva where he served as deacon and Sunday school superintendent. Married three times, Everts had seven children. His eldest son, Louis Humphrey Everts, was a Civil War veteran and pioneer map, atlas, and county history publisher and entrepreneur. Between 1867 and 1902, the younger Everts produced numerous

county atlases and histories of Illinois, Iowa, New Jersey, Philadelphia, and New York with various partners. As a result, his father's Geneva Township dairy farm was prominently featured with an illustration in the 1871 and 1872 Kane County atlas maps. Referred to as Everts' Crossing, the illustration shows the farm's original upright-and-wing farmhouse, gable-roof barn, extensive landscaping, agricultural fields, and livestock. Everts also included his father's biography and portrait in the *History of Cattaraugus Co., New York*, published by L.H. Everts in 1879.

The elder Everts died in 1888 and by 1892, Jerome B. Ellis owned the farm. The 1892 plat map shows the 83.5-acre property with a house near Peck Road, surrounded by trees, and two outbuildings further west of it. Ellis came with his parents to Geneva in 1856 when he was seventeen and assisted his father with the home farm. At the age of twenty-one, he left home and spent several years out of state. He returned home when his father became ill, taking charge of the home farm that he inherited upon his father's death in 1865. He continued general farming but also became involved in breeding pure-blood Jersey cattle, Plymouth Rock poultry, and blooded Berkshire hogs. In 1891, he sold the home farm, but retained and continued living at the old homestead. He likely purchased Everts' Crossing (now Weber Farmstead) around this time, which he owned until at least 1898.

By 1904, Gust Nelson owned the farm. Listed as a dairy farmer in the 1910 US Census, the Nelson family consisted of Gust, his wife Mary, and five children. Additional census research indicates that one or more of Nelson's sons may have taken over farm operations in the 1920s, though their father continued to own the property until at least 1928 as indicated on plat maps. Research did not reveal any additional information about the Nelson family. By 1930, William W. Lovett owned the farm and was listed in the 1930 US census as a stock farmer. Given that Nelson and Lovett engaged in dairy and stock farming, respectively, it is very possible that either one of them demolished buildings associated with earlier occupants and constructed the present Weber Farmstead in 1929 since research did not reveal when Lovett assumed ownership of the property. Lovett owned and lived on the property until at least November 1965 when a warranty deed conveyed joint tenancy to Clarence and Doreen Weber. The Webers purchased the farm in 1967.

They grew 13 acres of sweet corn while Clarence continued his job at the Geneva Post Office as well as farming 300 acres of other people's land. In 1999, the Webers sold 77 acres of farmland to the City of Geneva as part of the local government's plan to create the 540-acre Prairie Green Preserve, a preserved area of wetland and open space. The Webers retained the farmstead and the five acres surrounding it. In 2000-2001, a major intersection improvement of Peck and Keslinger Roads was undertaken by Kane County. It included a four-way bridge with turn lanes and traffic signals over the UP railroad. The new elevated intersection required substantial additional right-of-way from the Weber Farmstead property, resulting in the loss of much of the house's front yard, including six sugar maple trees, and the rerouting of the driveway to intersect with Peck Road 1,000 feet north of the house. In 2011, the Webers sold the property to current owners, Michael and Libby Burcham.

Geneva Agricultural History

White settlers first arrived in Geneva during the early 1830s, initially trading with the Potawatomi Native American tribe and opening a trading post, general store, and tavern. In 1836, Geneva was established as the permanent county seat of Kane County and the first county courthouse and jail were constructed there in 1837. Through the 1830s and 1840s, Geneva's population

grew rapidly due to its status as the county seat, its proximity to agricultural resources and urban markets, and its desirable location along the Fox River that facilitated agricultural and commercial enterprises. The Fox River Valley was fertile ground for successful agricultural and dairy farming. In 1837, Geneva was platted with wide streets appropriate to a commercial center and county seat, and a second bridge and sawmill soon followed. By 1840, Geneva had three general stores, two hotels, two blacksmiths, a woodshop, and sawmill. All of its early industries were located along the Fox River where packed meat, butter, cheese, milled grains, and later glucose and flax were processed.

In the 1850s, transportation improvements substantially changed the physical, commercial, and social character and development of Geneva. In 1850, Geneva had a population of 827. That year, its first railroad service began, consisting of a two-mile branch line located on the east side of the Fox River. The branch line ran north to St. Charles and connected to the Galena & Chicago Union (G&CU) Railroad that ran in and out of West Chicago. In 1853, the G&CU Railroad's main line was extended west through Geneva, connecting it to Chicago and the West. It was the first permanent railroad line in Geneva. Three trains per day, including two passenger trains and one freight train, passed through the community by 1857. By 1892, 31 passenger and 36 freight trains passed through Geneva each day.

The advent of the railroad led to the westward development of the town along the rail line, away from the town's initial development centered on the Fox River. The railroad also helped to expand industry in Geneva through the second half of the nineteenth century by facilitating the shipment of goods to urban markets, such as Chicago. Many of its industries relied on water power generated from the Fox River as well as area farms to provide crops to the local industries, which were delivered daily by the railroad. For example, the Bennett Bros, heavily relied on wheat farms to supply their flour mill in Geneva, requiring as much as 130,000 bushels per day to operate in the 1860s. The flour was then shipped by railroad across the country and even abroad. By 1900, several medium-sized industries were located in Geneva, including a creamery; glucose and reaper manufactories; Bennett Bros. "Geneva Belle" flour; and Howell Company's "Geneva" fluting and smoothing irons and tubular steel furniture. By 1977, there were only 19 farms in Geneva Township with a total acreage of 3,308 and the major crops were corn, soybeans, oats, and alfalfa, representing a shift from the earlier reliance on wheat, dairy, and livestock (cattle and sheep) farms. In the greater Kane County area, between 1945 and 2012, the number of farms decreased from 2,029 to 590 and farm acreage decreased from 298,489 acres to 168,541 acres.

Just outside of the City of Geneva limits, the Geneva Park District maintains the Peck Farm Interpretation Center, which retains its original farmhouse, barn, and silo that are now used as a museum, multimedia orientation room, and observatory, respectively. The former 131 acres of farmland is used for recreational activities. The Peck Farm is not listed in the NRHP, but the City of Geneva has recommended its designation as a local landmark in the city's Preservation Plan (2008). Immediately southwest of the Peck Farm Interpretation Center is the Bork Bros. Soil Service, the County Poor Farm, which is listed as Undetermined on the Illinois SHPO HARGIS website. The land west of the City limits is currently zoned rural residential (2017 Zoning Map) and was previously identified in the 2003 land-use plan as single-family residential. Newer subdivisions are located north, south, and east of Peck Farm.

Other well-known farms that are open to the public in the area are the Windy Acres Farm (Geneva), Rustic Road Farm (Elburn), Heritage Prairie Farm (Elburn), and Pushing the Envelope Farm (Geneva). All are active farms that may raise cattle, but none operate

commercial dairy activities. Three miles west of Geneva is the NRHP-listed Garfield Farm and Inn Museum at LaFox, IL and south of Geneva is the Stearns-Wadsworth House of Lake Run Farm in Batavia, IL. Research did not reveal any farms or farmsteads in the vicinity that are listed in or were previously determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. As one of the few remaining intact farms or farmsteads in the area, and in the context of these examples, the Weber Farmstead is a good example of a farmstead with a high level of integrity.

Farmstead Building Types and Styles

The farmstead complex served as the farm's operations headquarters, consisting of the farm buildings and work areas grouped around a farmyard accessed by a main driveway. Often protected by windbreaks or woodlots, most farmsteads developed as a tight cluster of buildings and structures that were spaced far enough apart to prevent the spread of fire, but close enough to reduce time and effort to move between buildings. The farmhouse was typically sited away from livestock buildings and served as a work center for the farm. The farmstead's buildings were further arranged by function to reduce labor. In the Midwest, farms tended to be square to the road and hogs were housed to the east of the rest of the farmstead due to prevailing westerly winds. The buildings were typically laid out either in the same orientation to compass directions, in a courtyard arrangement, or in a free-form arrangement where the buildings follow the contour of a slope. The Weber Farmstead's buildings are located in a cluster near the south portion of the property in a relatively straight line east to west with the majority of the buildings oriented east-west.

The Weber Farmstead house is a modest example of pre-World War II Colonial Revival architecture, which more closely copied early Colonial-era houses than later examples. The Colonial Revival style was a common and popular building type between 1880 and 1955, especially for residences. The style encompassed a renewed interest in the English and Dutch houses of early America, especially the Georgian and Adam styles. Early examples of the style were not typically historically accurate copies of Colonial-era houses. Instead, details from two or more architectural precedents were combined freely, resulting in an eclectic mixture of Colonial details. These houses had symmetrical facades with multi-pane, double-hung sash windows, an entry porch, and classical details. The Colonial Revival style persisted in popularity throughout the early and mid-twentieth century in two manifestations. Pre-World War II Colonial Revival architecture often included pilasters and keystones, prominent fenestration surrounds and parapet walls on the gable ends. These houses represented close copies of early Colonial examples, the result of new printing methods at the turn of the century, which allowed for photographs of Colonial-era buildings to be widely disseminated in books and periodicals for the first time. Due to the economic downturn of the 1930s and changing architectural preferences. post-World War II Colonial Revival architecture was much less ornate, with simple posts and second story overhangs that referenced the Colonial period without additional classical motifs. The modest Weber Farmstead house retains its overall form and appearance as well as Colonial Revival stylistic character-defining features, such as the central articulated doorway with fluted pilasters and a broken triangular pediment; the transom window above the front door: the symmetrical facade; and parapet-like side gables. Changes to the property since it was constructed consist of the replacement of all its original windows and the addition of a newer porch to the west rear elevation.

The presence of the raised barn and corncrib barn, as well as the former stockyards and Lovett family ownership, indicates it was likely a general farm that produced crops and engaged in the raising of cattle, and potentially dairy farming, to a certain degree. All are basic examples typical

of their period of construction with varying degrees of alterations and replacement materials. The gambrel-roof raised barn was likely a dairy or beef cattle barn, used to house and feed the animals. Beef cattle barns were built from the 1860s through the 1950s; after 1910, many had attached silos. Raised barns, like the Weber Farmstead barn, were most commonly associated with beef cattle or dairy farming. The barn was similar to the English barn form with its three bays, doors on the broad sides, and gable ends, except raised on a full basement. Raised barns were typically not built into a hill, though they were accessed by a bridge or ramp. The common interior arrangement housed the cattle in the basement and stored feed on the first floor. They frequently had gambrel roofs to accommodate extra hay storage within the barn. The Weber Farmstead raised barn is a basic and altered example of the raised barn form associated with cattle raising. The barn retains character-defining features, such as the exposed basement level, gambrel roof, earthen ramp to the upper level entrance, and attached silo, although it has been altered by replacement standing seam metal cladding on the majority of its elevations and infilled original openings along its south elevation. Research did not indicate the presence of a milkhouse on the property.

Silos were built in two forms, vertical (or tower) and horizontal. The first modern silos were pit silos, which were constructed in the mid-to-late 1870s, and characterized by a fully or partly excavated hole that was horizontal in form and lined with straw, stone, or another material. Covered silos were first constructed in North America during the early 1880s. The first vertical silos were square structures built of wood or stone. During the late 1880s, the upright and tower silos emerged. The round and circular versions still used today developed during the late 1890s. The circular silo form was preferred because it allowed for greater corn storage, eliminated air space, and reduced spoilage. Silos are often located adjacent to the barn or at the gable end of the building. The earliest silos had gable roofs, until the low dome or hemispherical roof emerged. During the early twentieth century, silos constructed from poured concrete and surrounded by a ladder of metal rings became popular. The farmstead's silo attached to the raised barn is a typical example of an early twentieth century concrete silo.

The small one-story, gable-roof barn located southeast of the raised barn may have formerly been used as a garage or machine shed given the pair of double wood doors on its east elevation near the driveway. It appears to be a basic example of a gable-roof barn. The farmstead's two transverse-frame barns similarly are typical examples of their forms and altered by replacement materials and infilled openings. The transverse-frame barn evolved from a basic single-crib log structure and was constructed from the late nineteenth through mid-twentieth century. The single-crib barn was one square or rectangular crib of log construction with a gable roof. It was used for grain storage and stabling animals. The single-crib barn evolved into the double-crib barn as a basic unit and added additional space. These barn types used the single-crib barn had cribs at each corner with a common roof and intersecting aisles forming a cross. The transverse-frame barn evolved from the four-crib barn, but is of frame construction and has a closed-off cross aisle with stalls or cribs built along the wall. The transverse-frame barn entrances are located at each gable end so that wagons could be driven through the barn. Each side of the barn was lined by storage cribs or stables.

Granaries and corn cribs were constructed on the farmstead to hold agricultural produce and feed. The farmstead's drive-through corncrib barn, topped by a cupola, is a typical and late example of this form as is the metal grain bin. Granaries and corn cribs were constructed on farmsteads to hold agricultural produce and feed. Corn cribs were typically constructed of wire mesh or slatted wood cribs to allow air to circulate around the corn. The cupola provides

headroom for the interior mechanized elevator. Granaries typically took the form of a metal grain bin and were airtight structures raised above the ground on piers to protect it from moisture and vermin.

Post-World War II, barn building techniques dramatically changed and traditional building techniques were abandoned in favor of the construction of pole barns and prefabricated structures, which were more cost-effective for farmers. These were commonly constructed of treated wood posts and corrugated steel, and clad in corrugated sheet metal. Pole barns were popular due to their durability, modular construction, and low maintenance. The farmstead's pole barns are basic examples that represent an economical and practical choice for farmers constructing new agricultural buildings during this period.

NRHP STATUS DATE LISTED Recommended Eligible N/A

NRHP CRITERIA N/A

NRHP CRITERIA CONSIDERATIONS N/A

NRHP EVALUATION/JUSTIFICATION

The Weber Farmstead was evaluated for the NRHP under Criteria A, B, and C using guidelines set forth in the NRHP Bulletin "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation."

The Weber Farmstead's extant buildings were constructed in the late 1920s and into the midtwentieth century on a farm previously settled in 1851. Although no remnants remain of the original 1851 dairy farm or the subsequent dairy farms in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the farmstead continues to convey its association with early-to-mid-twentieth century cattle and dairy farming in Geneva. The division of the farmstead from its overall farm acreage in the last seventeen years for the Prairie Green Preserve and the new elevated intersection of Peck and Keslinger Roads, diminishes its ability to convey its historical significance as a farm, but the overall integrity of the farmstead buildings, their layout within the farmstead, and their relationships between each other are retained and convey its historical association as a dairy or cattle farm. Therefore, the Weber Farmstead is recommended eligible under Criterion A.

The Weber Farmstead is associated with early prominent settler Samuel C. Everts; however no buildings remain from his ownership and it is no longer a representative example of his productive life. Research did not reveal any historically significant associations with the farmstead's subsequent owners, including the Nelson or Lovett families, one of whom built the 1929 buildings. Therefore, the Weber Farmstead is recommended not eligible under Criterion B.

The Weber Farmstead's 1929 house and agricultural buildings, as well as its mid-twentieth century agricultural buildings, are largely intact and still convey their general historic building forms and original use; they are a good example of an intact farmstead. The Colonial Revivalstyle house retains its overall appearance and form, though its integrity of design and materials is slightly diminished by replacement windows. It is a modest example of a pre-World War II Colonial Revival house. The agricultural buildings also generally retain their original forms and overall appearance; replacement standing seam metal cladding and infilled openings slightly diminish their integrity of design and materials, but do not detract from their ability to convey their historical significance or diminish their character-defining features. The overall farmstead retains its original 1929 buildings and overall layout of buildings, in spite of changes to the farmstead over time, including the removal of stockyards south of the English barn, several tree lines along the north and east portions of the farmstead, reconfiguration of the driveway, and the loss of original farm acreage. These changes, however, do not diminish its ability to convey its association as a farmstead associated with dairy or cattle farming. Therefore, the Weber Farmstead is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

The Weber Farmstead was not evaluated for eligibility under Criterion D as part of this evaluation.

The Weber Farmstead retains integrity of location, feeling, and association. It retains moderate integrity of design, workmanship, and materials due to material changes over time to its extant buildings. It retains moderate integrity of setting. It no longer retains integrity of setting to the southeast due to the realignment of Peck and Keslinger Roads, though it retains its setting to the north and west. The period of significance is 1929 to 1967, which encompasses the construction of the Colonial Revival house, extant agricultural buildings, and the period when the farm was used as a dairy or livestock farm.

NRHP BOUNDARY

The proposed NRHP boundary is the legal parcel 12-06-400-013, which includes the extant farmstead buildings.

SOURCES

Biographical Record of Kane County, Illinois. Chicago, IL: S.J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1898.

- City of Geneva. *Historic Preservation Plan*. November 17, 2008. http://www.geneva.il.us/DocumentCenter/View/188.
- Durant, Pliny A., Henry C. Bradsby, and Samuel W. Durant. *Commemorative Biographical and Historical Record of Kane County, Illinois*. Chicago, IL: Beers, Leggett & Co., 1888.
- Heinzmann, David. "Homestead At A Crossroads." Chicago Tribune, February 21, 2000. <u>http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2000-02-21/news/0002210053_1_webers-bridge-project-intersection</u>.
- Historic Map Works. Kane County Historical Maps and Atlases. 1871, 1872, 1892, 1904, 1928, 1954, 1966, 1978. http://www.historicmapworks.com/Browse/United States/Illinois/Page/17/.
- History of Cattaraugus Co., New York with Illustrations and Biographical Sketches of Some of Its Prominent Men and Pioneers. Philadelphia, PA: L.H. Everts, 1879.
- Lambert, Michael A. Evolution and Preliminary Historic Significance Evaluation of the Former Mill Race Inn Property, 4 East State Street, Geneva, Illinois. Geneva Historic Preservation Commission, January 15, 2014.
- Moak, Jefferson M. "Louis H. Everts: American Atlas Publisher and Entrepreneur." ALA Map and Geography Roundtable, June 8, 2009. <u>http://purl.oclc.org/coordinates/b11.htm</u>.

Nationwide Environmental Title Research, LLC. "Historic Aerials." 2016. http://www.historicaerials.com.

- Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission. "Basement Barn." *Pennsylvania Agricultural History Project*, August 26, 2015. <u>http://www.phmc.state.pa.us/portal/communities/agriculture/field-guide/basement-barn.html.</u>
- Pierce, Henry B., Arthur Merrill, William Henry Perrin, and W. Le Bar, Jr. & Co. *The Past and Present of Kane County, Illinois*. Chicago, IL: Wm. Le Baron, Jr. & Co., 1878.
- Sanborn Map Company. *Geneva, Kane County, Illinois 1885-1951*. New York: Sanborn Map Company.
- Vaisvilas, Frank. "Farmer looking to sell land hits snag with city." *Geneva Republican*, August 26, 2010. <u>http://www.mysuburbanlife.com/2010/08/26/farmer-looking-to-sell-land-hits-snag-with-city/zfrt3rm/</u>.

Photo 1 – Weber Farmstead



Facing southwest to the Weber Farmstead from driveway at Peck Road. House located at left behind evergreen trees and agricultural buildings located at right





Facing west to the Colonial Revival house's east-facing facade from the driveway


Facing southwest to the Colonial Revival house's east-facing facade and north side elevation. Gambrel-roof raised barn at right.

Photo 4 – Weber Farmstead



Facing southeast to the Colonial Revival house's north side and west rear elevations

Photo 5 – Weber Farmstead



Facing northwest to the Colonial Revival house's east-facing facade and south side elevation from Peck Road

Photo 6 – Weber Farmstead



Facing northwest to agricultural buildings from driveway just west of the house. From left to right: one-story gable-roof barn, gambrel-roof raised barn with attached silo, drive-through corncrib barn, and two transverse-frame barns.



Facing southwest to the gambrel-roof raised barn's north and east elevations

Photo 8 – Weber Farmstead



Facing southwest to non-historic Morton Building pole barn and silo



Facing northeast to the west and south elevations of the two transverse-frame barns

Map – Weber Farmstead



NRHP Boundary

Appendix D

SHPO and Consulting Parties Coordination

Appendix D Table of Contents

SHPO and Consulting Parties Coordination

FTA Section 106 Historic Review Initiation and Area of Potential Effects Concurrence Letter October 20, 2016 Illinois State Historic Preservation Officer......Appendix D – Page 1

Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation and Responses	
December 12, 2016 Chicago & North Western Historical Society	Appendix D – Page 17
December 12, 2016 City of Geneva	Appendix D – Page 19
December 29, 2016 City of Geneva Response	Appendix D – Page 21
December 12, 2016 City of West Chicago	Appendix D – Page 23
December 12, 2016 DuPage County Historical Society	Appendix D – Page 25
December 12, 2016 Geneva Historic Preservation Commission	Appendix D – Page 27
January 24, 2017 Geneva Preservation Commission Response	Appendix D – Page 29
December 12, 2016 Geneva History Museum	Appendix D – Page 31
January 11, 2017 Geneva History Museum Response	Appendix D – Page 33
December 12, 2016 Landmarks Illinois	Appendix D – Page 35
January 18, 2017 Landmarks Illinois Response	Appendix D – Page 37
January 19, 2017 Preservation Partners of Fox Valley	Appendix D – Page 39
December 12, 2016 West Chicago Historical Preservation Commis	sionAppendix D – Page 41
January 26, 2017 West Chicago Historical Preservation Commissio	on
Response	Appendix D – Page 43
December 12, 2016 West Chicago Historical Society	Appendix D – Page 46
December 20, 2016 Citizen Potawatomi Nation	Appendix D – Page 48
December 20, 2016 Sac and Fox Nation of Mississippi and Iowa	Appendix D – Page 50
December 20, 2016 Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation	Appendix D – Page 52
December 20, 2016 Peoria Band of Indians in Oklahoma	Appendix D – Page 54
December 20, 2016 Sac and Fox Nation of Oklahoma	Appendix D – Page 56
December 20, 2016 Potawatomi Nation – Hannahville Indian	
Community	Appendix D – Page 58
December 20, 2016 Ho-Chunk Nation	Appendix D – Page 60
December 20, 2016 Forest County Potawatomi	Appendix D – Page 62
January 23, 2017 Forest County Potawatomi Response	Appendix D – Page 64
December 20, 2016 Miami Tribe of Oklahoma	Appendix D – Page 66
January 18, 2017 Miami Tribe of Oklahoma Response	Appendix D – Page 68
December 20, 2016 Sac and Fox Nation of Missouri	Appendix D – Page 70
December 20, 2016 Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Nations	Appendix D – Page 72



0CT 2 4 2016 09102416

IHPA REVIEW

H/A _ AC_

AR ____

200 West Adams Street

Chicago, IL 60606-5253

Suite 320

312-353-2789

312-886-0351 (fax)

FION SERVICES



U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration

October 20, 2016

Dr. Rachel Leibowitz Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer Illinois Historic Preservation Agency 1 Old State Capital Plaza Springfield, IL 62701

RE: FTA Section 106 Historic Review Initiation and Area of Potential Effects Concurrence Metra Union Pacific-West Line Third Mainline Western Section Track Project, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

REGION V

Illinois, Indiana,

Ohio, Wisconsin

Michigan, Minnesota,

Dear Dr. Leibowitz,

As part of its responsibilities under 36 C.F.R. § 800 – Protection of Historic Properties and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is initiating a Section 106 Consultation Process for the Metra Union Pacific-West Line Third Mainline Western Section Track Project (the "Project) through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois. As part of its responsibilities under 36 C.F.R. § 800 – Protection of Historic Properties and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has determined that the proposed project will be a Federal undertaking as defined in 36 CFR § 800.16(y), and that it is a type of activity that has the potential to cause effects on historic properties. Therefore, FTA is initiating a Section 106 Consultation Process for the Project and requesting Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) concurrence on the Project's Area of Potential Effects (APE). Please note, on August 22, 2016 FTA received IHPA concurrence on project 041030716 that had a similar project name. The project addressed in this letter and accompanying documentation is in a part of the same rail line but in a different location and distinguished by the "Western Section" descriptor in the project name.

The undertaking, proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. The existing UP right-of-way for this section ranges from approximately 100 to 125 feet wide. The third track would be added primarily on the south side of the existing two mainline tracks, with the exception of an approximately 1.8 mile section from 0.7 miles east of the bridge at Kirk Road to the bridge at Crissey Avenue (Illinois Route 25), where the third track would be located on the north side of the existing tracks. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

The project includes the crossing of the Fox River. The existing structure at the crossing was constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. A new bridge span would be constructed on the existing piers and abutments that cross the Fox River to accommodate a third mainline track.

Page 1 of 2

FTA Section 106 Historic Review Initiation and Area of Potential Effects Concurrence Metra Union Pacific-West Line Third Mainline Western Section Track Project, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Improvements to railroad crossings are proposed in Geneva at IL Route 31 (1st Street), 3rd Street, and Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track. The reconstruction of Illinois Route 31 under the railroad would extend approximately 300 feet from the tracks in both directions. The reconstruction of the 3rd Street and Western Avenue at-grade roadway/railroad crossings would extend approximately 150 feet south of the railroad tracks. The existing Geneva station would remain in its current location, though some station improvements would be necessary to accommodate the addition of a third track. The existing shelters on the south side would be removed and replaced with new shelters. The existing depot on the north side of the tracks would remain with no changes. The existing commuter parking lots on the south side of the station would be reconfigured.

FTA has determined the APE for the Project, based on the scope and nature, to include the railroad rightof-way, cross streets with planned improvements, the Fox River Bridge, the Geneva Station, parking lots, and generally one tax parcel adjacent to the railroad right-of-way and planned improvements. In some instances, where the tax parcel extends well beyond the planned improvements and the area within which potential effects may occur to historic properties, the APE boundary was delineated to go through these tax parcels and no more than approximately 600 feet away from the planned improvements. In other areas, the APE was expanded by more than one tax parcel, to accommodate potential indirect visual effects to historic properties along the railroad corridor. The APE boundary is irregularly shaped because it follows this methodology and the tax parcel boundaries provided by DuPage and Kane Counties. Enclosed for your review are the proposed Section 106 Methodology and APE maps.

Pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 800, FTA is seeking State Historic Preservation Officer concurrence with the above APE determination within 30 days of receipt of this letter. As the environmental review process for the Project moves forward, FTA will continue to consult with your office on eligibility determinations and findings of effect. If FTA can provide any assistance or additional information that would aid in your prompt reply, please feel free to contact Tony Greep of the FTA Region 5 Office at (312) 353-1646 or anthony.greep@dot.gov. Thank you for your assistance on this Project.

Sincerely,

leptoo

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator FTA Region 5



cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5

Enclosures: UP-W Third Mainline Western Section - APE Maps and Section 106 Methodology

UP-West Third Mainline – Western Section Section 106 Methodology October 2016

Introduction

This technical memorandum describes the proposed Section 106 methodology that will be followed for the UP-West Third Mainline – Western Section project. The project proposes to construct a third mainline track along the Union Pacific West (UP-W) line through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois for approximately 6.4 miles.

Because the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) may provide funding for this proposed project, the project is a federal undertaking subject to compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended (16 USC 470 et seq.) and its implementing regulations (36 CFR 800). Specifically, Section 106 of the NHPA requires that the responsible federal agency consider the effects of its actions on historic properties, which are properties listed in or determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and consulting parties a reasonable opportunity to comment on the undertaking. Historic properties are defined in 36 CFR Part 800.16(I)(1) as "any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP."

All Section 106 work will be conducted by professional architectural historians who meet or exceed the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards.

Project Description

The UP-West Third Mainline – Western Section project proposes the addition of a third mainline track within the UP Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. The existing UP right-of-way for this section ranges from approximately 100 to 125 feet wide. The third track would be added primarily on the south side of the existing two mainline tracks, with the exception of an approximately 1.8 mile section from 0.7 miles east of the bridge at Kirk Road to the bridge at Crissey Avenue (Illinois Route 25), where the third track would be located on the north side of the existing tracks. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

Additionally, the project includes the crossing of the Fox River. The existing structure at the crossing was constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. A new bridge span would be constructed on the existing piers and abutments that cross the Fox River to accommodate a third mainline track. Minor in-water work may occur at the existing piers, portions of which would be rehabilitated with crack sealing and structure repair of concrete. The work would include drilled shafts and caps at each of the existing abutments to accommodate new bridge span. The existing abutments would also be extended to accommodate new retaining walls, a new deck, and the third mainline track. The existing piecestrian walkway on the east and west sides of the bridge would be maintained. The existing bicycle and pedestrian path under the bridge would remain as-is.

The proposed third mainline track would address UP-W Line rail traffic congestion issues and remove bottlenecks along the corridor. It would also help create a more fluid railroad operation, decrease commuter and freight train delays, reduce motorist wait times at grade crossings, decrease the number of idling freight trains, preserve Metra performance times, and eliminate commuter curfews for freight trains. The proposed improvements would also allow Metra to relieve high levels of congestion and better serve commuters.

Improvements to railroad crossings are proposed in Geneva at IL Route 31 (1st Street), 3rd Street, and Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track. Minor temporary construction easements would be required for grading purposes. The reconstruction of the crossings at IL Route 31, 3rd Street, and Western Avenue would occur completely within the railroad and roadway right-of-way. The reconstruction of Illinois Route 31 under the railroad would extend approximately 300 feet from the tracks in both directions. The reconstruction of the 3rd Street and Western Avenue at-grade roadway/railroad crossings would extend approximately 150 feet south of the railroad tracks. The reconstruction of these at-grade street/railroad crossings would require temporary road closures and detours.

The existing Geneva station would remain in its current location. However, some station improvements would be necessary to accommodate the addition of a third track. The existing shelters on the south side would be removed and replaced with new shelters. The existing depot on the north side of the tracks would remain with no changes. The existing commuter parking lots on the south side of the station would be reconfigured.

The Third Street Parking Garage addition was completed in 2015, in anticipation of the parking lot reconfiguration on the south side of the tracks (Parking Lots 1, 3, and 5). When factoring in the additional Third Street Parking Garage spaces, there will be no net loss of parking spaces associated with this Project.

No additional right-of-way would be acquired for these station improvements. Temporary construction and permit easements would be acquired for improvements to Parking Lot 3.

Agency Coordination

Per Section 106 requirements, FTA will identify organizations with an interest in cultural resources in the project vicinity, and invite them to participate as consulting parties during the project study. These include the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), representatives of municipal and county governments, and cultural resources and historic preservation organizations. Consulting parties can provide comments on eligibility, effects, and mitigation as part of the Section 106 process. Table 1 provides a list of the consulting parties identified for the UP-West Third Mainline – Western Section project.

FTA will also identify federally recognized Indian tribes with potential interests in the project area and seek government-to-government consultation to identify the tribes' interests in the proposed project and to participate in the Section 106 process. All consultation with the Indian tribes will be undertaken by FTA.

As the project progresses, a consulting parties meeting may be held to address common concerns or discuss project effects should the FTA determine that one is necessary, based on the scope of the project and the responses received from the consulting parties.

Area of Potential Effects

Per Section 106 requirements, the lead federal agency, in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), develops the Area of Potential Effects (APE), identifies historic properties (i.e., NRHP-listed and NRHP-eligible) in the APE, and makes determinations of the proposed project's effect on historic properties in the APE. The APE is defined in Section 106 of the NHPA as "the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties if any such properties exist. The APE is influenced by the scale and nature of an undertaking and may be different for different kinds of effects caused by the undertaking."

Based on the scope and nature of the project, the proposed APE for the UP-W Third Mainline – Western Section project includes the railroad right-of-way, cross streets with planned improvements, the Fox River Bridge, the Geneva Station, parking lots, and generally one tax parcel adjacent to the railroad right-of-way and planned improvements. In some instances, where the tax parcel extends well beyond the planned improvements and the area within which potential effects may occur to historic properties, the APE boundary was delineated to go through these tax parcels and no more than approximately 600 feet away from the planned improvements. In other areas, the APE was expanded by more than one tax parcel, to accommodate potential indirect visual effects to historic properties along the railroad corridor. The APE boundary is irregularly shaped because it follows this methodology and the tax parcel boundaries provided by DuPage and Kane Counties. Maps depicting the proposed APE are attached to this memorandum.

Identification of Historic Properties

Although this project will be completed as a Documented Categorical Exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires standard eligibility and effects assessments for all undertakings, regardless of project size or anticipated impacts.

Literature Review

Prior to initiating the field survey, the project architectural historians will conduct research to review the published literature and to identify and obtain sources of information pertinent to the history and architecture of DuPage and Kane counties, and specifically, West Chicago and Geneva. A variety of databases and sources will be consulted to inform the documentation and evaluation of previously and newly surveyed properties. This may include, but will not be limited to, a review of the NRHP, local landmarks and districts, HABS/HAER, NHL, properties previously surveyed through historic survey reports and survey forms, assessor data, published county and city histories, and Sanborn Fire Insurance maps. Project architectural historic Architectural Resources Geographic Information System (HARGIS). The information gathered from these sources will be used to develop historic contexts and individual resource histories for evaluating a resource's historical and architectural significance, for evaluation of NRHP eligibility.

Field Survey

Project architectural historians will visit the project area and utilize public property records to identify all properties within the APE older than 50 years of age. The cut-off date for surveyed properties is 1966.

A field survey will be completed of the entire APE to identify, photograph, and record field notes for all properties within the APE meeting the age criteria. Project architectural historians will take

photographs of individual properties, as well as representative viewscape and streetscape photographs. At least one photograph of each building will be taken; where possible, multiple photographs of each building will document all accessible elevations. Observations regarding the physical characteristics of properties in the APE will be recorded. Any NRHP-listed or previously determined NRHP-eligible properties, including individually listed properties and historic districts in the APE, will be field reviewed to determine if existing documentation remains adequate and/or valid and will be photographed to document their state at the time of review. Based on research and field review, properties may be documented individually or in groups (i.e., districts).

Following the completion of the survey, project architectural historians will evaluate the potential of each resource to meet one or more of the NRHP Criteria for Evaluation and will conduct an appropriate level of research to determine the NRHP eligibility of each resource.

NRHP Determinations of Eligibility

The most recent NRHP listings will be consulted and the status of NRHP-listed properties and districts located within the APE will be reviewed, using previous NRHP documentation to determine if any properties have changed to the extent that they are no longer eligible for the NRHP or that NRHP boundaries should be altered.

All identified properties in the APE will be evaluated for NRHP eligibility, using established professional criteria and considerations set forth in *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2002).* Properties that are not listed in, but appear to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, will be documented and recommended as such; this includes properties that appear unique and/or exhibit moderate to high architectural integrity and/or significance. These properties will be documented using a historic resources survey form based on the Ruskin field form. The form will include an architectural description, property history and context, NRHP evaluation, sources consulted, relevant photographs, and mapping. For NRHP-eligible properties, an assessment of integrity, periods of significance, and proposed historic boundaries will be determined. For any potential historic districts with boundaries extending beyond the APE, only resources within the APE will be evaluated for NRHP eligibility.

Properties that appear to be typical or mundane examples of their type and/or have been altered by unsympathetic additions or replacement materials will be considered not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. These properties will be documented in a property table in the Section 106 Technical Report and an individual determination of NRHP eligibility form will not be completed for them.

Section 106 Technical Report

A Section 106 Technical Report will be completed to document the project methodology, project description, APE, identified historic properties, NRHP Determinations of Eligibility, and assessment of effects. A final report will be submitted to the SHPO and consulting parties for review. Each property identified or documented in the APE and its NRHP status will be listed in a property table. NRHP-listed and eligible properties will be described. Potential project effects to each NRHP-listed and NRHP-eligible property, or the lack thereof, will be documented. The report will include historic context on the UP-W Line corridor and surrounding villages as appropriate; relevant architectural styles and building types; significant people; and associated historic events. The report will include relevant mapping and photography, as well as supporting materials. Appendices will be attached, as necessary.

One (1) hard copy and one (1) electronic copy will be submitted to the SHPO for review and one (1) electronic copy will be submitted to each Section 106 consulting party.

Determination of Effect

Effects assessments are based on the Criteria of Adverse Effect as defined in 36 CFR 800.5 "Assessment of adverse effects." According to this portion of the Section 106 regulations, an adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the NRHP in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Examples of adverse effects include physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property, alteration of a property not consistent with the Secretary's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR 68), a change in the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contributes to its historic significance, and an introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features.

To determine if any historic properties will be affected by the project, architectural historians will review project plans and documentation for all NRHP-listed and eligible properties within the APE, as well as make additional field visits, if needed. Using the criteria of adverse effect established in 36 CFR 800.5(a)(1) and guidance found in *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, each historic property will be evaluated to determine if implementation of the project will alter any historically significant characteristics or features by diminishing relevant aspects of that property's historic integrity.

For each historic property, a recommended finding will be made regarding the project's potential to affect its aspects of integrity. The recommended findings will correspond to the guidelines set forth in 36 CFR 800 and are supported by information on integrity in the National Register Bulletin: *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. If no aspect of integrity for an individual historic property is altered, the finding indicates that the historic property is not affected by the undertaking. If implementation of the project would alter one or more aspects of integrity for an individual historic property, but the effect would not alter a characteristic that qualifies that property for inclusion in the NRHP, then the finding for the property is "No Adverse Effect." If implementation of the UP-W Third Mainline Project would alter a characteristic that aspect(s) of integrity, then the finding for that property would be "Adverse Effect." Indirect and cumulative effects to historic properties will also be considered; such effects may include reasonably foreseeable land use changes.

Identification of Archaeological Resources

The proposed project is located in an urban environment within or adjacent to existing railroad and roadway right-of-ways. So the potential for a major disturbance or damage to archaeological resources in the existing railroad and roadway right-of-ways, where the project is proposed, is not assumed.

Table 1UP-West Third Mainline – Western SectionSection 106 Consulting Parties1

Name/Title	Organization	Address	Phone/Email
Dr. Rachel	Illinois Historic	1 Old State Capitol	217-785-5031
Leibowitz,	Preservation	Springfield, IL 62701	rachel.leibowitz@illinois.gov
Deputy State Historic	Agency		
Preservation			
Officer			
Mike Lenzen,	Chicago & North	PO Box 1068	president@cnwhs.org
President	Western Historical Society	North Riverside, IL 60546	
Kevin R. Burns,	City of Geneva	22 S. First Street	630-742-8916
Mayor		Geneva, IL 60134	mayorburns@geneva.il.us
Ruben Pineda,	City of West	West Chicago City	630-293-2200 x123
Mayor	Chicago	Hall 475 Main Street	rpineda@westchicago.org
		West Chicago, IL	
		60185	
Carol Marcus and	DuPage County	P.O. Box 1460	dupagehistory@vahoo.com
Margaret Franson	Historical Society	Wheaton, IL 60187	
Pruter,			
Co-Presidents Michael Lambert,	Geneva Historic	22 S. First Street	630-938-4541
Preservation	Preservation	Geneva, IL 60134	mlambert@geneva.il.us
Planner	Commission		miambert@geneva.ii.us
Terry Emma,	Geneva History	113 S. Third Street	630-232-4951
Executive Director	Museum (Geneva	Geneva, IL 60134	director@genevahistorymuseum.org
	Historical Society)		
Lisa DiChiera,	Landmarks Illinois	30 N. Michigan	312-922-1742
Director of		Avenue, Suite 2020	DiChieraL@lpci.org
Advocacy John D. Said,	West Chicago	Chicago, IL 60602 West Chicago City	630-293-2200 x141
Community	Historical	Hall	communitydev@westchicago.org
Development	Preservation	475 Main Street	
Director	Commission	West Chicago, IL	
		60185	
Lance Conkright,	West Chicago	527 Main Street	630-231-2329
President	Historical Society	West Chicago, IL	lance@krusehousemuseum.org
		60185	

¹ The FTA is to initiate consultation with the federally recognized Indian tribes.





600'



*NRHP: National Register of Historic Places

SCALE: 1" = 300'

Appendix D - Page 9

UP-W THIRD MAINLINE PROJECT - WESTERN SECTION AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS MAP

PECK TO KRESS WEST CHICAGO, IL (MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41) Contract No. K51524 Project No. HG-4846

Exhibit 1 of 8







SCALE: 1" = 300'

Appendix D - Page 10

UP-W THIRD MAINLINE PROJECT - WESTERN SECTION AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS MAP

PECK TO KRESS WEST CHICAGO, IL (MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41) Contract No. K51524 Project No. HG-4846

Exhibit 2 of 8







*NRHP: National Register of Historic Places

SCALE: 1" = 300'

UP-W THIRD MAINLINE PROJECT - WESTERN SECTION AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS MAP

PECK TO KRESS WEST CHICAGO, IL (MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41) Contract No. K51524 Project No. HG-4846

Exhibit 3 of 8





SCALE: 1" = 300'

Appendix D - Page 12

UP-W THIRD MAINLINE PROJECT - WESTERN SECTION AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS MAP

PECK TO KRESS WEST CHICAGO, IL (MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41) Contract No. K51524 Project No. HG-4846

Exhibit 4 of 8





600'



*NRHP: National Register of Historic Places

SCALE: 1" = 300'

Appendix D - Page 13

UP-W THIRD MAINLINE PROJECT - WESTERN SECTION AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS MAP

PECK TO KRESS WEST CHICAGO, IL (MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41) Contract No. K51524 Project No. HG-4846

Exhibit 5 of 8





600'



*NRHP: National Register of Historic Places

SCALE: 1" = 300'

Appendix D - Page 14

UP-W THIRD MAINLINE PROJECT - WESTERN SECTION AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS MAP

PECK TO KRESS WEST CHICAGO, IL (MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41) Contract No. K51524 Project No. HG-4846

Exhibit 6 of 8





SCALE: 1" = 300'

UP-W THIRD MAINLINE PROJECT - WESTERN SECTION AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS MAP

PECK TO KRESS WEST CHICAGO, IL (MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41) Contract No. K51524 Project No. HG-4846

Exhibit 7 of 8





Appendix D - Page 16

UP-W THIRD MAINLINE PROJECT - WESTERN SECTION AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS MAP

PECK TO KRESS WEST CHICAGO, IL (MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41) Contract No. K51524 Project No. HG-4846

Exhibit 8 of 8



U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration

December 12, 2016

Mike Lenzen President, Chicago & North Western Historical Society PO Box 1068 North Riverside, IL 60546

REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Mr. Lenzen:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

The project includes the crossing of the Fox River. The existing structure at the crossing was constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. A new bridge span would be constructed on the existing piers and abutments that cross the Fox River to accommodate a third mainline track. Improvements to railroad crossings are proposed in Geneva at IL Route 31 (1st Street), 3rd Street, and Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track. The existing Geneva station would remain in its current location, though some station improvements would be necessary to accommodate the addition of a third track. The existing shelters on the south side would be removed and replaced with new shelters. The existing depot on the north side of the tracks would remain with no changes. The existing commuter parking lots on the south side of the station would be reconfigured. No additional commuter train service would be added as part of this project.

FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. Enclosed is a map of the project area showing the area of potential effect, as well as a more detailed project description and methodology for identifying historic resources and determining effect.

Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act* requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. This process involves efforts to identify historic properties potentially affected by the undertaking, assess its effects, and seek ways to avoid, minimize or

mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties. In accordance with 36 CFR § 800.2(c), you are invited to participate in the Section 106 process as a Consulting Party. As part of the process, the project team will work through a three-step process with consulting parties to:

- 1. Identify historic properties that could be potentially affected by the project,
- 2. Assess project effects on these resources, and
- 3. If there are adverse effects, develop ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties.

Participation in this process is voluntary and open to anyone "with a demonstrated interest in the effect of the undertaking on properties listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places." This may include property owners, business owners, historic preservation groups, neighborhood associations, or others who are interested in historic resources and preservation. Additional information about the consultation process is available online at http://www.achp.gov/citizensguide.html.

Please respond in writing or by email within *30 days* of receipt of this letter indicating whether or not you would like to participate as a Section 106 Consulting Party. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

Please include contact information for a single point-of-contact within your organization for future coordination efforts. If you indicate that you do not desire to be a Consulting Party or if you do not reply at all, you will not be included on further Section 106 coordination efforts for this project.

Thank you for your cooperation and interest in the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during the preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Again, thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator FTA Region 5

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra

Enclosure: Project Location Map and Section 106 Methodology



U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration

December 12, 2016

Kevin R. Burns Mayor, City of Geneva 22 S. First Street Geneva, IL 60134 REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Mr. Burns:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

The project includes the crossing of the Fox River. The existing structure at the crossing was constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. A new bridge span would be constructed on the existing piers and abutments that cross the Fox River to accommodate a third mainline track. Improvements to railroad crossings are proposed in Geneva at IL Route 31 (1st Street), 3rd Street, and Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track. The existing Geneva station would remain in its current location, though some station improvements would be necessary to accommodate the addition of a third track. The existing shelters on the south side would be removed and replaced with new shelters. The existing depot on the north side of the tracks would remain with no changes. The existing commuter parking lots on the south side of the station would be reconfigured. No additional commuter train service would be added as part of this project.

FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. Enclosed is a map of the project area showing the area of potential effect, as well as a more detailed project description and methodology for identifying historic resources and determining effect.

Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act* requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. This process involves efforts to identify historic properties potentially affected by the undertaking, assess its effects, and seek ways to avoid, minimize or

mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties. In accordance with 36 CFR § 800.2(c), you are invited to participate in the Section 106 process as a Consulting Party. As part of the process, the project team will work through a three-step process with consulting parties to:

- 1. Identify historic properties that could be potentially affected by the project,
- 2. Assess project effects on these resources, and
- 3. If there are adverse effects, develop ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties.

Participation in this process is voluntary and open to anyone "with a demonstrated interest in the effect of the undertaking on properties listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places." This may include property owners, business owners, historic preservation groups, neighborhood associations, or others who are interested in historic resources and preservation. Additional information about the consultation process is available online at http://www.achp.gov/citizensguide.html.

Please respond in writing or by email within *30 days* of receipt of this letter indicating whether or not you would like to participate as a Section 106 Consulting Party. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

Please include contact information for a single point-of-contact within your organization for future coordination efforts. If you indicate that you do not desire to be a Consulting Party or if you do not reply at all, you will not be included on further Section 106 coordination efforts for this project.

Thank you for your cooperation and interest in the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during the preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Again, thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator FTA Region 5

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra

Enclosure: Project Location Map and Section 106 Methodology

Paquin, Aimee

From: Sent: To: Subject: Selover, Timothy Tuesday, January 03, 2017 11:44 AM Hamilton, Meghan; Paquin, Aimee; Colin Fleming FW: Section 106 Consulting Party

From: Brian Stepp [mailto:BStepp@METRARR.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 10:43 AM
To: Selover, Timothy <Selover@pbworld.com>; Sainath Reddivari <SReddivari@METRARR.COM>; Andrew Roth
<ARoth@METRARR.COM>
Subject: FW: Section 106 Consulting Party

Please see below

Brian T. Stepp Manager, Grant Applications Metra P: (312) 322-2805 | <u>bstepp@metrarr.com</u> 547 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60661



Like us on Facebook: <u>Metra</u> Follow us on Twitter: <u>@Metra</u> Visit us at <u>www.metrarail.com</u>

From: Greep, Anthony (FTA) [mailto:anthony.greep@dot.gov] Sent: Thursday, December 29, 2016 2:52 PM To: Brian Stepp Cc: Daniel Thomas Subject: FW: Section 106 Consulting Party

FYI

From: Dawkins, Stephanie [mailto:sdawkins@geneva.il.us] Sent: Thursday, December 29, 2016 2:41 PM To: Greep, Anthony (FTA) Cc: Burns, Kevin; Lambert, Michael; Fornari, Jeanne Subject: Section 106 Consulting Party

Mr. Greep,

Please be advised that the City of Geneva would like to participate in the Section 106 consulting party regarding the Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois. As requested, I will be the single point-of-contact for the City of Geneva organization (contact information listed below).

We look forward to providing input and comments regarding the project and effects on historic properties within our community.

Stephanie K. Dawkins

City Administrator City of Geneva, Illinois Phone: 630.262.8495 Fax: 630.262.0867 sdawkins@geneva.il.us



The City of Geneva, Illinois Since 1835

This message and any files or text attached to it are intended only for the recipients named above, and contain information that may be confidential or privileged.

If you are not an intended recipient, you must not read, copy, use or disclose this communication. Please also notify the sender by replying to this message, and then delete all copies of it from your system.

If you have a FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) request please send that request via email to <u>FOIA@geneva.il.us</u>. There is no expectation of privacy for any messages sent to or received from the City of Geneva.

Follow Geneva on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and YouTube or visit our website.



Please do not print this email unless it is absolutely necessary.



U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration

December 12, 2016

Ruben Pineda Mayor, City of West Chicago West Chicago City Hall, 475 Main Street West Chicago, IL 60185 REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Mr. Pineda:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

The project includes the crossing of the Fox River. The existing structure at the crossing was constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. A new bridge span would be constructed on the existing piers and abutments that cross the Fox River to accommodate a third mainline track. Improvements to railroad crossings are proposed in Geneva at IL Route 31 (1st Street), 3rd Street, and Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track. The existing Geneva station would remain in its current location, though some station improvements would be necessary to accommodate the addition of a third track. The existing shelters on the south side would be removed and replaced with new shelters. The existing depot on the north side of the tracks would remain with no changes. The existing commuter parking lots on the south side of the station would be reconfigured. No additional commuter train service would be added as part of this project.

FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. Enclosed is a map of the project area showing the area of potential effect, as well as a more detailed project description and methodology for identifying historic resources and determining effect.

Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act* requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. This process involves efforts to identify historic properties potentially affected by the undertaking, assess its effects, and seek ways to avoid, minimize or

mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties. In accordance with 36 CFR § 800.2(c), you are invited to participate in the Section 106 process as a Consulting Party. As part of the process, the project team will work through a three-step process with consulting parties to:

- 1. Identify historic properties that could be potentially affected by the project,
- 2. Assess project effects on these resources, and
- 3. If there are adverse effects, develop ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties.

Participation in this process is voluntary and open to anyone "with a demonstrated interest in the effect of the undertaking on properties listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places." This may include property owners, business owners, historic preservation groups, neighborhood associations, or others who are interested in historic resources and preservation. Additional information about the consultation process is available online at http://www.achp.gov/citizensguide.html.

Please respond in writing or by email within *30 days* of receipt of this letter indicating whether or not you would like to participate as a Section 106 Consulting Party. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

Please include contact information for a single point-of-contact within your organization for future coordination efforts. If you indicate that you do not desire to be a Consulting Party or if you do not reply at all, you will not be included on further Section 106 coordination efforts for this project.

Thank you for your cooperation and interest in the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during the preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Again, thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator FTA Region 5

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra

Enclosure: Project Location Map and Section 106 Methodology



U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration

December 12, 2016

Carol Marcus and Margaret Franson Co-Presidents, DuPage County Historical Society P.O. Box 1460 Wheaton, IL 60187 REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Ms. Marcus and Ms. Franson:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

The project includes the crossing of the Fox River. The existing structure at the crossing was constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. A new bridge span would be constructed on the existing piers and abutments that cross the Fox River to accommodate a third mainline track. Improvements to railroad crossings are proposed in Geneva at IL Route 31 (1st Street), 3rd Street, and Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track. The existing Geneva station would remain in its current location, though some station improvements would be necessary to accommodate the addition of a third track. The existing shelters on the south side would be removed and replaced with new shelters. The existing depot on the north side of the tracks would remain with no changes. The existing commuter parking lots on the south side of the station would be reconfigured. No additional commuter train service would be added as part of this project.

FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. Enclosed is a map of the project area showing the area of potential effect, as well as a more detailed project description and methodology for identifying historic resources and determining effect.

Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act* requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. This process involves efforts to identify historic properties potentially affected by the undertaking, assess its effects, and seek ways to avoid, minimize or

mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties. In accordance with 36 CFR § 800.2(c), you are invited to participate in the Section 106 process as a Consulting Party. As part of the process, the project team will work through a three-step process with consulting parties to:

- 1. Identify historic properties that could be potentially affected by the project,
- 2. Assess project effects on these resources, and
- 3. If there are adverse effects, develop ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties.

Participation in this process is voluntary and open to anyone "with a demonstrated interest in the effect of the undertaking on properties listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places." This may include property owners, business owners, historic preservation groups, neighborhood associations, or others who are interested in historic resources and preservation. Additional information about the consultation process is available online at http://www.achp.gov/citizensguide.html.

Please respond in writing or by email within *30 days* of receipt of this letter indicating whether or not you would like to participate as a Section 106 Consulting Party. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

Please include contact information for a single point-of-contact within your organization for future coordination efforts. If you indicate that you do not desire to be a Consulting Party or if you do not reply at all, you will not be included on further Section 106 coordination efforts for this project.

Thank you for your cooperation and interest in the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during the preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Again, thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator FTA Region 5

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra

Enclosure: Project Location Map and Section 106 Methodology


December 12, 2016

Michael Lambert Preservation Planner, Geneva Historic Preservation Commission 22 S. First Street Geneva, IL 60134

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

REGION V

Illinois, Indiana,

Ohio, Wisconsin

Michigan, Minnesota,

Mr. Lambert:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

The project includes the crossing of the Fox River. The existing structure at the crossing was constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. A new bridge span would be constructed on the existing piers and abutments that cross the Fox River to accommodate a third mainline track. Improvements to railroad crossings are proposed in Geneva at IL Route 31 (1st Street), 3rd Street, and Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track. The existing Geneva station would remain in its current location, though some station improvements would be necessary to accommodate the addition of a third track. The existing shelters on the south side would be removed and replaced with new shelters. The existing depot on the north side of the tracks would remain with no changes. The existing commuter parking lots on the south side of the station would be reconfigured. No additional commuter train service would be added as part of this project.

FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. Enclosed is a map of the project area showing the area of potential effect, as well as a more detailed project description and methodology for identifying historic resources and determining effect.

Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act* requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. This process involves efforts to identify historic properties potentially affected by the undertaking, assess its effects, and seek ways to avoid, minimize or

200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax) mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties. In accordance with 36 CFR § 800.2(c), you are invited to participate in the Section 106 process as a Consulting Party. As part of the process, the project team will work through a three-step process with consulting parties to:

- 1. Identify historic properties that could be potentially affected by the project,
- 2. Assess project effects on these resources, and
- 3. If there are adverse effects, develop ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties.

Participation in this process is voluntary and open to anyone "with a demonstrated interest in the effect of the undertaking on properties listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places." This may include property owners, business owners, historic preservation groups, neighborhood associations, or others who are interested in historic resources and preservation. Additional information about the consultation process is available online at http://www.achp.gov/citizensguide.html.

Please respond in writing or by email within *30 days* of receipt of this letter indicating whether or not you would like to participate as a Section 106 Consulting Party. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

Please include contact information for a single point-of-contact within your organization for future coordination efforts. If you indicate that you do not desire to be a Consulting Party or if you do not reply at all, you will not be included on further Section 106 coordination efforts for this project.

Thank you for your cooperation and interest in the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during the preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Again, thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator FTA Region 5

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra

Paquin, Aimee

From: Sent:	Lambert, Michael <mlambert@geneva.il.us> Tuesday, January 24, 2017 11:31 AM</mlambert@geneva.il.us>
То:	Paquin, Aimee
Cc:	Brian Stepp; Andrew Roth; Sainath Reddivari; Selover, Timothy; Dawkins, Stephanie
Subject:	RE: Metra UP-W Third Mainline (Western Section) Section 106 Consulting Party Letter

Aimee,

On behalf of the Geneva HPC, I did receive the 12 December 2016 invitation and notice of the Section 106 Review for the Metra UP-W Third Mainline Project, Western Section in DuPage and Kane Counties.

The Geneva Historic Preservation Commission will provide review and appropriate commentary for the project; however, our comments will be delivered through City of Geneva Administrator, Stephanie Dawkins. Per her previous email of 29 December 2016, Stephanie will serve as the "the single point-of-contact for the City of Geneva organization."

Thank you for confirming our participation.

Michael A. Lambert

Preservation Planner City of Geneva, Illinois 22 South First Street Geneva, Illinois 60134 Phone: 630.938.4541 Fax: 630.232.1494 Email: <u>mlambert@geneva.il.us</u> **Office Hours: Tu 8-5, We 8-5, Fr 8-5**

From: Paquin, Aimee [mailto:PaquinA@pbworld.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 9:52 AM
To: Lambert, Michael <mlambert@geneva.il.us>
Cc: Brian Stepp <BStepp@METRARR.COM>; Andrew Roth <ARoth@METRARR.COM>; Sainath Reddivari <SReddivari@METRARR.COM>; Selover, Timothy <Selover@pbworld.com>
Subject: Metra UP-W Third Mainline (Western Section) Section 106 Consulting Party Letter

Mr. Lambert,

On behalf of the Federal Transit Administration and Metra, I'm following up with the Geneva Historic Preservation Commission to confirm your organization has received the Section 106 Consulting Party invitation letter dated December 12, 2016 for the Metra UP-W Third Mainline Project, Western Section in DuPage and Kane Counties. The letter and its enclosures are attached to this email for your information.

Does the Geneva Historic Preservation Commission plan to participate as a Section 106 Consulting Party for this project?

Thank you,

Aimee D. Paquin Senior Architectural Historian

WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff

500 Griswold Street, Suite 2900 Detroit, MI 48226 Tel: 313.963.4921 Fax: 313.963.6910

www.wspgroup.com www.pbworld.com

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.



The City of Geneva, Illinois Since 1835

This message and any files or text attached to it are intended only for the recipients named above, and contain information that may be confidential or privileged. If you are not an intended recipient, you must not read, copy, use or disclose this communication.

Please also notify the sender by replying to this message, and then delete all copies of it from your system.

If you have a FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) request please send that request via email to <u>FOIA@geneva.il.us</u>. There is no expectation of privacy for any messages sent to or received from the City of Geneva.

Follow Geneva on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and YouTube or visit our website.



Please do not print this email unless it is absolutely necessary.



December 12, 2016

Terry Emma Executive Director, Geneva History Museum 113 S. Third Street Geneva, IL 60134 REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Ms. Emma:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

The project includes the crossing of the Fox River. The existing structure at the crossing was constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. A new bridge span would be constructed on the existing piers and abutments that cross the Fox River to accommodate a third mainline track. Improvements to railroad crossings are proposed in Geneva at IL Route 31 (1st Street), 3rd Street, and Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track. The existing Geneva station would remain in its current location, though some station improvements would be necessary to accommodate the addition of a third track. The existing shelters on the south side would be removed and replaced with new shelters. The existing depot on the north side of the tracks would remain with no changes. The existing commuter parking lots on the south side of the station would be reconfigured. No additional commuter train service would be added as part of this project.

FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. Enclosed is a map of the project area showing the area of potential effect, as well as a more detailed project description and methodology for identifying historic resources and determining effect.

Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act* requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. This process involves efforts to identify historic properties potentially affected by the undertaking, assess its effects, and seek ways to avoid, minimize or

mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties. In accordance with 36 CFR § 800.2(c), you are invited to participate in the Section 106 process as a Consulting Party. As part of the process, the project team will work through a three-step process with consulting parties to:

- 1. Identify historic properties that could be potentially affected by the project,
- 2. Assess project effects on these resources, and
- 3. If there are adverse effects, develop ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties.

Participation in this process is voluntary and open to anyone "with a demonstrated interest in the effect of the undertaking on properties listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places." This may include property owners, business owners, historic preservation groups, neighborhood associations, or others who are interested in historic resources and preservation. Additional information about the consultation process is available online at http://www.achp.gov/citizensguide.html.

Please respond in writing or by email within *30 days* of receipt of this letter indicating whether or not you would like to participate as a Section 106 Consulting Party. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

Please include contact information for a single point-of-contact within your organization for future coordination efforts. If you indicate that you do not desire to be a Consulting Party or if you do not reply at all, you will not be included on further Section 106 coordination efforts for this project.

Thank you for your cooperation and interest in the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during the preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Again, thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator FTA Region 5

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra

Paquin, Aimee

From: Sent: To: Subject: Selover, Timothy Tuesday, January 17, 2017 9:56 AM Paquin, Aimee; Hamilton, Meghan; Colin Fleming FW: Section 106 Consulting Party

From: Brian Stepp [mailto:BStepp@METRARR.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 8:25 AM
To: Selover, Timothy <Selover@pbworld.com>; Sainath Reddivari <SReddivari@METRARR.COM>; Andrew Roth
<ARoth@METRARR.COM>
Subject: FW: Section 106 Consulting Party

Brian T. Stepp Manager, Grant Applications Metra P: (312) 322-2805 | <u>bstepp@metrarr.com</u> 547 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60661



Like us on Facebook: Metra Follow us on Twitter: @Metra Visit us at www.metrarail.com

From: Greep, Anthony (FTA) [mailto:anthony.greep@dot.gov] Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 10:45 AM To: Brian Stepp; Daniel Thomas Subject: FW: Section 106 Consulting Party

FYI

From: Terry Emma [mailto:Director@GenevaHistoryMuseum.org] Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2017 9:17 AM To: Greep, Anthony (FTA) Subject: Section 106 Consulting Party

Anthony

I would like to participate in the Section 106 Consulting Party for the UP-West Their Mainline - Western Section

Thank you for the invitation.

TERRY EMMA Executive Director Director@genevahistorymuseum.org 113 S. 3rd St. • Geneva IL 60134 630-232-4951



December 12, 2016

Lisa DiChiera Director of Advocacy, Landmarks Illinois 30 N. Michigan Ave, Suite 2020 Chicago, IL 60602 REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Ms. DiChiera:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

The project includes the crossing of the Fox River. The existing structure at the crossing was constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. A new bridge span would be constructed on the existing piers and abutments that cross the Fox River to accommodate a third mainline track. Improvements to railroad crossings are proposed in Geneva at IL Route 31 (1st Street), 3rd Street, and Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track. The existing Geneva station would remain in its current location, though some station improvements would be necessary to accommodate the addition of a third track. The existing shelters on the south side would be removed and replaced with new shelters. The existing depot on the north side of the tracks would remain with no changes. The existing commuter parking lots on the south side of the station would be reconfigured. No additional commuter train service would be added as part of this project.

FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. Enclosed is a map of the project area showing the area of potential effect, as well as a more detailed project description and methodology for identifying historic resources and determining effect.

Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act* requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. This process involves efforts to identify historic properties potentially affected by the undertaking, assess its effects, and seek ways to avoid, minimize or

mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties. In accordance with 36 CFR § 800.2(c), you are invited to participate in the Section 106 process as a Consulting Party. As part of the process, the project team will work through a three-step process with consulting parties to:

- 1. Identify historic properties that could be potentially affected by the project,
- 2. Assess project effects on these resources, and
- 3. If there are adverse effects, develop ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties.

Participation in this process is voluntary and open to anyone "with a demonstrated interest in the effect of the undertaking on properties listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places." This may include property owners, business owners, historic preservation groups, neighborhood associations, or others who are interested in historic resources and preservation. Additional information about the consultation process is available online at http://www.achp.gov/citizensguide.html.

Please respond in writing or by email within *30 days* of receipt of this letter indicating whether or not you would like to participate as a Section 106 Consulting Party. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

Please include contact information for a single point-of-contact within your organization for future coordination efforts. If you indicate that you do not desire to be a Consulting Party or if you do not reply at all, you will not be included on further Section 106 coordination efforts for this project.

Thank you for your cooperation and interest in the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during the preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Again, thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator FTA Region 5

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra

Paquin, Aimee

From: Sent: To: Subject: Selover, Timothy Thursday, January 19, 2017 9:47 AM Paquin, Aimee; 'Colin Fleming'; Hamilton, Meghan FW: Metra UP-W Section 106 consulting party invitation

From: Brian Stepp [mailto:BStepp@METRARR.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 2:29 PM
To: Selover, Timothy <Selover@pbworld.com>; Sainath Reddivari <SReddivari@METRARR.COM>; Andrew Roth
<ARoth@METRARR.COM>
Subject: FW: Metra UP-W Section 106 consulting party invitation

Brian T. Stepp Manager, Grant Applications Metra P: (312) 322-2805 | <u>bstepp@metrarr.com</u> 547 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60661



Like us on Facebook: Metra Follow us on Twitter: @Metra Visit us at www.metrarail.com

From: Greep, Anthony (FTA) [mailto:anthony.greep@dot.gov] Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 2:12 PM To: Brian Stepp; Daniel Thomas Subject: FW: Metra UP-W Section 106 consulting party invitation

From: Lisa DiChiera [mailto:DiChieraL@lpci.org]
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 1:29 PM
To: Greep, Anthony (FTA)
Cc: Elizabeth Safanda; Halpin, David (<u>David.Halpin@Illinois.gov</u>); Leibowitz, Rachel (<u>Rachel.Leibowitz@illinois.gov</u>); Lambert, Michael (<u>mlambert@geneva.il.us</u>)
Subject: Metra UP-W Section 106 consulting party invitation

Mr. Greep,

We received the FTA's invitation to participate in the Section 106 process as a consulting party regarding the Metra UP-W Third Mainline project in DuPage and Kane Counties. At this time Landmarks Illinois is declining participation. However, I have shared the invitation letter with Liz Safanda of Preservation Partners of Fox Valley who would like to participate. She is cc'd here. She is very knowledgeable about the potential impact area of the project in Kane County. Here is a link to their website. <u>https://ppfv.org/</u> Thank you for inviting us to participate and I hope that Preservation Partners of Fox Valley may be added as a participating organization.

Lisa DiChiera Director of Advocacy Landmarks Illinois

30 N. Michigan Avenue, Suite 2020, Chicago, IL 60602
O: 312-922-1742 / C:312-515-1545 Landmarks.org Facebook Twitter LinkedIn People saving places. Join us today.
Please remember Landmarks Illinois in your year-end giving by donating to our <u>Annual Fund</u>.

Hamilton, Meghan

From: Sent: To: Subject: Selover, Timothy Monday, April 10, 2017 9:23 AM Hamilton, Meghan FW: Metra UP-W Section 106 consulting party invitation

From: Brian Stepp [mailto:BStepp@METRARR.COM] Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 8:51 AM To: Selover, Timothy <Selover@pbworld.com>; Paquin, Aimee <PaquinA@pbworld.com> Cc: Kate Sullivan <KSullivan@METRARR.COM>; Andrew Roth <ARoth@METRARR.COM> Subject: FW: Metra UP-W Section 106 consulting party invitation

Brian T. Stepp Manager, Grant Applications Metra P: (312) 322-2805 | <u>bstepp@metrarr.com</u> 547 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60661



<u>Like</u> us on Facebook: <u>Metra</u> <u>Follow</u> us on Twitter: <u>@Metra</u> <u>Visit</u> us at <u>www.metrarail.com</u>

From: Greep, Anthony (FTA) [mailto:anthony.greep@dot.gov] Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2017 9:11 AM To: Lisa DiChiera; Elizabeth Safanda Cc: Halpin, David (David.Halpin@Illinois.gov); Leibowitz, Rachel (Rachel.Leibowitz@illinois.gov); Lambert, Michael (mlambert@geneva.il.us); Brian Stepp Subject: RE: Metra UP-W Section 106 consulting party invitation

Ms. DiChiera, Thank you for your reply and recommendation to include Preservation Partners of Fox Valley.

Ms. Safanda, We thank you for your interest in this project and look forward to working with you as a consulting party.

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov



Please consider the environment before printing this email. Thank you.

From: Lisa DiChiera [mailto:DiChieraL@lpci.org]
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 1:29 PM
To: Greep, Anthony (FTA)
Cc: Elizabeth Safanda; Halpin, David (David.Halpin@Illinois.gov); Leibowitz, Rachel (Rachel.Leibowitz@illinois.gov); Lambert, Michael (mlambert@geneva.il.us)
Subject: Metra UP-W Section 106 consulting party invitation

Mr. Greep,

We received the FTA's invitation to participate in the Section 106 process as a consulting party regarding the Metra UP-W Third Mainline project in DuPage and Kane Counties. At this time Landmarks Illinois is declining participation. However, I have shared the invitation letter with Liz Safanda of Preservation Partners of Fox Valley who would like to participate. She is cc'd here. She is very knowledgeable about the potential impact area of the project in Kane County. Here is a link to their website. <u>https://ppfv.org/</u>

Thank you for inviting us to participate and I hope that Preservation Partners of Fox Valley may be added as a participating organization.

Lisa DiChiera Director of Advocacy Landmarks Illinois

30 N. Michigan Avenue, Suite 2020, Chicago, IL 60602
O: 312-922-1742 / C:312-515-1545 Landmarks.org Facebook Twitter LinkedIn People saving places. Join us today.
Please remember Landmarks Illinois in your year-end giving by donating to our <u>Annual Fund</u>.



December 12, 2016

John D. Said Community Development Director West Chicago Historical Preservation Commission West Chicago City Hall, 475 Main Street West Chicago, IL 60185 REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Mr. Said:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

The project includes the crossing of the Fox River. The existing structure at the crossing was constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. A new bridge span would be constructed on the existing piers and abutments that cross the Fox River to accommodate a third mainline track. Improvements to railroad crossings are proposed in Geneva at IL Route 31 (1st Street), 3rd Street, and Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track. The existing Geneva station would remain in its current location, though some station improvements would be necessary to accommodate the addition of a third track. The existing shelters on the south side would be removed and replaced with new shelters. The existing depot on the north side of the tracks would remain with no changes. The existing commuter parking lots on the south side of the station would be reconfigured. No additional commuter train service would be added as part of this project.

FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. Enclosed is a map of the project area showing the area of potential effect, as well as a more detailed project description and methodology for identifying historic resources and determining effect.

Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act* requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. This process involves efforts to identify historic properties potentially affected by the undertaking, assess its effects, and seek ways to avoid, minimize or

mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties. In accordance with 36 CFR § 800.2(c), you are invited to participate in the Section 106 process as a Consulting Party. As part of the process, the project team will work through a three-step process with consulting parties to:

- 1. Identify historic properties that could be potentially affected by the project,
- 2. Assess project effects on these resources, and
- 3. If there are adverse effects, develop ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties.

Participation in this process is voluntary and open to anyone "with a demonstrated interest in the effect of the undertaking on properties listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places." This may include property owners, business owners, historic preservation groups, neighborhood associations, or others who are interested in historic resources and preservation. Additional information about the consultation process is available online at http://www.achp.gov/citizensguide.html.

Please respond in writing or by email within *30 days* of receipt of this letter indicating whether or not you would like to participate as a Section 106 Consulting Party. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

Please include contact information for a single point-of-contact within your organization for future coordination efforts. If you indicate that you do not desire to be a Consulting Party or if you do not reply at all, you will not be included on further Section 106 coordination efforts for this project.

Thank you for your cooperation and interest in the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during the preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Again, thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator FTA Region 5

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra

Paquin, Aimee

From:	John Said <jsaid@westchicago.org></jsaid@westchicago.org>
Sent:	Thursday, January 26, 2017 2:14 PM
То:	Paquin, Aimee; anthony.greep@dot.gov
Cc:	Brian Stepp; Andrew Roth; Sainath Reddivari; Selover, Timothy
Subject:	RE: Metra UP-W Third Mainline (Western Section) Section 106 Consulting Party Letter
Attachments:	Metra UP Third Mainline.pdf

Anthony:

This note is to inform you that the City of West Chicago will not participate as a Section 106 Consulting Party for this project. As there are no historical resources within the section of railroad r.o.w., or adjacent to the railroad r.o.w., within the City of West Chicago, such participation does not appear to be necessary.

If you have any questions or need to discuss this further, please let me know.

Thanks very much,

John D. Said, AICP Director, Department of Community Development jsaid@westchicago.org 630.293.2200, ext. 140 City of West Chicago 475 Main Street West Chicago, Illinois 60185



From: John Said Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:34 PM To: 'Paquin, Aimee'; Community Dev Cc: Brian Stepp; Andrew Roth; Sainath Reddivari; Selover, Timothy Subject: RE: Metra UP-W Third Mainline (Western Section) Section 106 Consulting Party Letter

Aimee:

I received this letter on Dec. 28, and anticipate providing a final response to you prior to the 30-days-from receipt (i.e. Jan. 28) deadline. Having said that, the appropriate responding agency would not be the West Chicago Historical Preservation Commission as the proposed improvements appear to fall completely within the railroad right-of-way, which of course does not include any historical structures. Please correct me if that understanding is not accurate. On a preliminary basis, I do not anticipate any further review or involvement as a consulting party because of that. However, I will certainly confirm that before Jan. 28.

Feel free to contact me with any further comments or questions. Thank you.

John D. Said, AICP Director, Department of Community Development <u>isaid@westchicago.org</u> 630.293.2200, ext. 140 City of West Chicago 475 Main Street West Chicago, Illinois 60185



From: Paquin, Aimee [mailto:PaquinA@pbworld.com] Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 9:41 AM To: Community Dev Cc: Brian Stepp; Andrew Roth; Sainath Reddivari; Selover, Timothy Subject: Metra UP-W Third Mainline (Western Section) Section 106 Consulting Party Letter

Mr. Said,

On behalf of the Federal Transit Administration and Metra, I'm following up with the West Chicago Historical Preservation Commission to confirm your organization has received the Section 106 Consulting Party invitation letter dated December 12, 2016 for the Metra UP-W Third Mainline Project, Western Section in DuPage and Kane Counties. The letter and its enclosures are attached to this email for your information.

Does the West Chicago Historical Preservation Commission plan to participate as a Section 106 Consulting Party for this project?

Thank you,

Aimee D. Paquin Senior Architectural Historian

WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff

500 Griswold Street, Suite 2900 Detroit, MI 48226 Tel: 313.963.4921 Fax: 313.963.6910

www.wspgroup.com www.pbworld.com NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.



December 12, 2016

Lance Conkright President, West Chicago Historical Society 527 Main Street West Chicago, IL 60185 REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Mr. Conkright:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

The project includes the crossing of the Fox River. The existing structure at the crossing was constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. A new bridge span would be constructed on the existing piers and abutments that cross the Fox River to accommodate a third mainline track. Improvements to railroad crossings are proposed in Geneva at IL Route 31 (1st Street), 3rd Street, and Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track. The existing Geneva station would remain in its current location, though some station improvements would be necessary to accommodate the addition of a third track. The existing shelters on the south side would be removed and replaced with new shelters. The existing depot on the north side of the tracks would remain with no changes. The existing commuter parking lots on the south side of the station would be reconfigured. No additional commuter train service would be added as part of this project.

FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. Enclosed is a map of the project area showing the area of potential effect, as well as a more detailed project description and methodology for identifying historic resources and determining effect.

Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act* requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. This process involves efforts to identify historic properties potentially affected by the undertaking, assess its effects, and seek ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties. In accordance with 36 CFR § 800.2(c), you are invited

to participate in the Section 106 process as a Consulting Party. As part of the process, the project team will work through a three-step process with consulting parties to:

- 1. Identify historic properties that could be potentially affected by the project,
- 2. Assess project effects on these resources, and
- 3. If there are adverse effects, develop ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties.

Participation in this process is voluntary and open to anyone "with a demonstrated interest in the effect of the undertaking on properties listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places." This may include property owners, business owners, historic preservation groups, neighborhood associations, or others who are interested in historic resources and preservation. Additional information about the consultation process is available online at http://www.achp.gov/citizensguide.html.

Please respond in writing or by email within *30 days* of receipt of this letter indicating whether or not you would like to participate as a Section 106 Consulting Party. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

Please include contact information for a single point-of-contact within your organization for future coordination efforts. If you indicate that you do not desire to be a Consulting Party or if you do not reply at all, you will not be included on further Section 106 coordination efforts for this project.

Thank you for your cooperation and interest in the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during the preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Again, thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator FTA Region 5

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra



REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

December 20, 2016

Mr. John A. Barrett Chairperson 1601 S. Gordon Cooper Drive Shawnee, OK 74801

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Dear Mr. Barrett:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois. This letter is to initiate consultation with your tribal government under the regulations for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. A map of the project area and additional information is enclosed.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

We are requesting your assistance in identifying any areas with potential cultural and/or religious significance to your tribe which may be impacted by this proposed project, and any treaties with provisions that may cover the area affected by the project.

We would appreciate your response to this invitation within *30 days* of receipt. If we do not hear from you within this time period, we will conclude that you have not identified any significant issues related to your tribe for this project. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

We look forward to working with you on this project if it affects tribal interests. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra



REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

December 20, 2016

Jonathan Buffalo NAGPRA Representative 349 Meskwaki Road Tama, IA 52339

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Dear Mr. Buffalo:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois. This letter is to initiate consultation with your tribal government under the regulations for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. A map of the project area and additional information is enclosed.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

We are requesting your assistance in identifying any areas with potential cultural and/or religious significance to your tribe which may be impacted by this proposed project, and any treaties with provisions that may cover the area affected by the project.

We would appreciate your response to this invitation within *30 days* of receipt. If we do not hear from you within this time period, we will conclude that you have not identified any significant issues related to your tribe for this project. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

We look forward to working with you on this project if it affects tribal interests. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra



REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

December 20, 2016

Chago Hale NAGPRA Representative 16281 Q Road Mayetta, KS 66509

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Dear Mr. Hale:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois. This letter is to initiate consultation with your tribal government under the regulations for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. A map of the project area and additional information is enclosed.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

We are requesting your assistance in identifying any areas with potential cultural and/or religious significance to your tribe which may be impacted by this proposed project, and any treaties with provisions that may cover the area affected by the project.

We would appreciate your response to this invitation within *30 days* of receipt. If we do not hear from you within this time period, we will conclude that you have not identified any significant issues related to your tribe for this project. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

We look forward to working with you on this project if it affects tribal interests. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra



REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

December 20, 2016

Mr. Frank Hecksher Special Projects Manager NAGPRA Representative 118 S. Eight Tribes Trails Miami, OK 74335

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Dear Mr. Hecksher:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois. This letter is to initiate consultation with your tribal government under the regulations for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. A map of the project area and additional information is enclosed.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

We are requesting your assistance in identifying any areas with potential cultural and/or religious significance to your tribe which may be impacted by this proposed project, and any treaties with provisions that may cover the area affected by the project.

We would appreciate your response to this invitation within *30 days* of receipt. If we do not hear from you within this time period, we will conclude that you have not identified any significant issues related to your tribe for this project. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

We look forward to working with you on this project if it affects tribal interests. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra



REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

December 20, 2016

Sandra Massey Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Route 2, Box 246 Stroud, OK 74079

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Dear Ms. Massey:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois. This letter is to initiate consultation with your tribal government under the regulations for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. A map of the project area and additional information is enclosed.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

We are requesting your assistance in identifying any areas with potential cultural and/or religious significance to your tribe which may be impacted by this proposed project, and any treaties with provisions that may cover the area affected by the project.

We would appreciate your response to this invitation within *30 days* of receipt. If we do not hear from you within this time period, we will conclude that you have not identified any significant issues related to your tribe for this project. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

We look forward to working with you on this project if it affects tribal interests. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra



REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

December 20, 2016

Mr. Earl Meshiguad N14911 Hannahville Blvd. Wilson, MI 49896

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Dear Mr. Meshiguad:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois. This letter is to initiate consultation with your tribal government under the regulations for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. A map of the project area and additional information is enclosed.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

We are requesting your assistance in identifying any areas with potential cultural and/or religious significance to your tribe which may be impacted by this proposed project, and any treaties with provisions that may cover the area affected by the project.

We would appreciate your response to this invitation within *30 days* of receipt. If we do not hear from you within this time period, we will conclude that you have not identified any significant issues related to your tribe for this project. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

We look forward to working with you on this project if it affects tribal interests. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra



REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

December 20, 2016

Bill Quackenbush Tribal Historic Preservation Officer PO Box 667 Black River Falls, WI 54815

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Dear Mr. Quackenbush:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois. This letter is to initiate consultation with your tribal government under the regulations for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. A map of the project area and additional information is enclosed.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

We are requesting your assistance in identifying any areas with potential cultural and/or religious significance to your tribe which may be impacted by this proposed project, and any treaties with provisions that may cover the area affected by the project.

We would appreciate your response to this invitation within *30 days* of receipt. If we do not hear from you within this time period, we will conclude that you have not identified any significant issues related to your tribe for this project. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

We look forward to working with you on this project if it affects tribal interests. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra



REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

December 20, 2016

Mr. Phillip Shopodock Chairperson PO Box 340 Crandon, WI 54520

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Dear Mr. Shopodock:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois. This letter is to initiate consultation with your tribal government under the regulations for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. A map of the project area and additional information is enclosed.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.
We are requesting your assistance in identifying any areas with potential cultural and/or religious significance to your tribe which may be impacted by this proposed project, and any treaties with provisions that may cover the area affected by the project.

We would appreciate your response to this invitation within *30 days* of receipt. If we do not hear from you within this time period, we will conclude that you have not identified any significant issues related to your tribe for this project. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

We look forward to working with you on this project if it affects tribal interests. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra

Enclosure: Project Location Map and Section 106 Methodology

Paquin, Aimee

From:	Selover, Timothy
Sent:	Monday, January 23, 2017 4:54 PM
То:	Paquin, Aimee; Hamilton, Meghan; 'Colin Fleming'
Subject:	FW: Proposed Metra UP-W Third Mainline , Western Section, DuPage and Kane
	counties, Illinois.

From: Brian Stepp [mailto:BStepp@METRARR.COM]
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 12:54 PM
To: Selover, Timothy <Selover@pbworld.com>; Sainath Reddivari <SReddivari@METRARR.COM>; Andrew Roth <ARoth@METRARR.COM>
Subject: FW: Proposed Metra UP-W Third Mainline , Western Section, DuPage and Kane counties, Illinois.

Please see below.

Brian T. Stepp
Manager, Grant Applications
Metra
P: (312) 322-2805 | <u>bstepp@metrarr.com</u>
547 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60661



Like us on Facebook: Metra Follow us on Twitter: @Metra Visit us at www.metrarail.com

From: Greep, Anthony (FTA) [mailto:anthony.greep@dot.gov] Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 9:20 AM To: Michael LaRonge Cc: Brian Stepp; Daniel Thomas Subject: RE: Proposed Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage and Kane counties, Illinois.

Mr. LaRonge,

Thank you for your interest in the proposed Metra project and for the detailed reply. We will note your response in our project record. We value the relationship we have with our tribal partners and thank you for your time.

Tony Greep

Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov





From: Michael LaRonge [mailto:Michael.LaRonge@fcpotawatomi-nsn.gov] Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 8:30 AM To: Greep, Anthony (FTA) Subject: Proposed Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage and Kane counties, Illinois.

Re: Proposed Metra UP-W Third Mainline , Western Section, DuPage and Kane counties, Illinois.

Dear Mr. Greep,

Pursuant to consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (1966 as amended) the Forest County Potawatomi as a Federally Recognized Native American Tribe reserves the right to comment on Federal undertakings, as defined under the act. Thank you for your participation in the process.

I have reviewed the project area maps included in your letter and compared it to our database of recorded Potawatomi sites in Illinois and have found no issues with this project. Therefore the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer on Behalf of the Forest County Potawatomi Community has determined that there will be NO AFFECT ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES of concern to the Tribe under the current project plan.

Your interest in protecting Illinois' cultural and historic properties is appreciated. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at the email or number listed below.

Respectfully,

Michael LaRonge Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Natural Resources Department Forest County Potawatomi Community 5320 Wensaut Lane P.O. Box 340 Crandon, Wisconsin 54520 Phone: 715-478-7354 Fax: 715-478-7225 Email: <u>Michael.LaRonge@FCPotawatomi-nsn.gov</u>



U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

December 20, 2016

George Strack Tribal Historic Preservation Officer 202 S. Eight Tribes Trail Miami, OK 74354

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Dear Mr. Strack:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois. This letter is to initiate consultation with your tribal government under the regulations for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. A map of the project area and additional information is enclosed.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

The project includes the crossing of the Fox River. The existing structure at the crossing was constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. A new bridge span would be constructed on the existing piers and abutments that cross the Fox River to accommodate a third mainline track. Improvements to railroad crossings are proposed in Geneva at IL Route 31 (1st Street), 3rd Street, and Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track. The existing Geneva station would remain in its current location, though some station improvements would be necessary to accommodate the addition of a third track. The existing shelters on the south side would be removed and replaced with new shelters. The existing depot on the north side of the tracks would remain with no changes. The existing commuter parking lots on the south side of the station would be reconfigured. No additional commuter train service would be added as part of this project.

We are requesting your assistance in identifying any areas with potential cultural and/or religious significance to your tribe which may be impacted by this proposed project, and any treaties with provisions that may cover the area affected by the project.

We would appreciate your response to this invitation within *30 days* of receipt. If we do not hear from you within this time period, we will conclude that you have not identified any significant issues related to your tribe for this project. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

We look forward to working with you on this project if it affects tribal interests. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra

Enclosure: Project Location Map and Section 106 Methodology

Paquin, Aimee

From:	Selover, Timothy
Sent:	Thursday, January 19, 2017 9:47 AM
То:	Paquin, Aimee; Hamilton, Meghan; 'Colin Fleming'
Subject:	FW: Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County,
-	Illinois

From: Brian Stepp [mailto:BStepp@METRARR.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 11:32 AM
To: Selover, Timothy <Selover@pbworld.com>; Sainath Reddivari <SReddivari@METRARR.COM>; Andrew Roth <ARoth@METRARR.COM>
Subject: FW: Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Brian T. Stepp Manager, Grant Applications Metra P: (312) 322-2805 | <u>bstepp@metrarr.com</u> 547 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60661



Like us on Facebook: Metra Follow us on Twitter: @Metra Visit us at www.metrarail.com

From: Greep, Anthony (FTA) [mailto:anthony.greep@dot.gov] Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 11:03 AM To: Brian Stepp; Daniel Thomas Subject: FW: Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

From: Diane Hunter [mailto:dhunter@miamination.com] Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 10:01 AM To: Greep, Anthony (FTA) Subject: Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Dear Mr. Greep:

Aya, kikwehsitoole – I show you respect. My name is Diane Hunter, and I am the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for the Federally Recognized Miami Tribe of Oklahoma. In this capacity, I am the Miami Tribe's point of contact for all Section 106 issues.

The Miami Tribe offers no objection to the above-mentioned project at this time, as we are not currently aware of existing documentation directly linking a specific Miami cultural or historic site to the project site. However, as this site is within the aboriginal homelands of the Miami Tribe, if any human remains or Native American cultural items falling under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) or archaeological evidence is discovered during any phase of this project, the Miami Tribe requests immediate consultation with the entity of jurisdiction for the location of discovery. In such a case, please contact me at 918-541-8966, or by email at <u>dhunter@miamination.com</u> to initiate consultation.

The Miami Tribe requests to serve as a consulting party to the proposed project. In my capacity as Tribal Historic Preservation Officer I am the point of contact for consultation.

Respectfully,

Diane Hunter Tribal Historic Preservation Officer Miami Tribe of Oklahoma P.O. Box 1326 Miami, OK 74355



U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

December 20, 2016

Diana Weeks NAGPRA Representative 305 N. Main Street Reserve, KS 66465

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Dear Ms. Weeks:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois. This letter is to initiate consultation with your tribal government under the regulations for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. A map of the project area and additional information is enclosed.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

The project includes the crossing of the Fox River. The existing structure at the crossing was constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. A new bridge span would be constructed on the existing piers and abutments that cross the Fox River to accommodate a third mainline track. Improvements to railroad crossings are proposed in Geneva at IL Route 31 (1st Street), 3rd Street, and Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track. The existing Geneva station would remain in its current location, though some station improvements would be necessary to accommodate the addition of a third track. The existing shelters on the south side would be removed and replaced with new shelters. The existing depot on the north side of the tracks would remain with no changes. The existing commuter parking lots on the south side of the station would be reconfigured. No additional commuter train service would be added as part of this project.

We are requesting your assistance in identifying any areas with potential cultural and/or religious significance to your tribe which may be impacted by this proposed project, and any treaties with provisions that may cover the area affected by the project.

We would appreciate your response to this invitation within *30 days* of receipt. If we do not hear from you within this time period, we will conclude that you have not identified any significant issues related to your tribe for this project. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

We look forward to working with you on this project if it affects tribal interests. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra

Enclosure: Project Location Map and Section 106 Methodology



U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration REGION V Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin 200 West Adams Street Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606-5253 312-353-2789 312-886-0351 (fax)

December 20, 2016

Mr. Michael Zimmerman Tribal Historic Preservation Officer 58620 Sink Road Dowagiac, MI 49047

RE: FTA Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation – Metra UP-W Third Mainline, Western Section, DuPage County and Kane County, Illinois

Dear Mr. Zimmerman:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in cooperation with Metra is proposing the Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Western Section Track project (the "Project") through the City of West Chicago in DuPage County, Illinois and the City of Geneva in Kane County, Illinois. This letter is to initiate consultation with your tribal government under the regulations for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. FTA and Metra will be preparing a Categorical Exclusion to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project. A map of the project area and additional information is enclosed.

The undertaking proposed by Metra would add a third mainline track within the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad's existing right-of-way between Kress Road in West Chicago on the east end and approximately 0.3 miles west of Peck Road in Geneva on the west end. A majority of the third mainline track addition would occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.0 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permanent easements located directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required, to accommodate the third mainline track.

The project includes the crossing of the Fox River. The existing structure at the crossing was constructed wide enough to accommodate a third mainline track. A new bridge span would be constructed on the existing piers and abutments that cross the Fox River to accommodate a third mainline track. Improvements to railroad crossings are proposed in Geneva at IL Route 31 (1st Street), 3rd Street, and Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track. The existing Geneva station would remain in its current location, though some station improvements would be necessary to accommodate the addition of a third track. The existing shelters on the south side would be removed and replaced with new shelters. The existing depot on the north side of the tracks would remain with no changes. The existing commuter parking lots on the south side of the station would be reconfigured. No additional commuter train service would be added as part of this project.

We are requesting your assistance in identifying any areas with potential cultural and/or religious significance to your tribe which may be impacted by this proposed project, and any treaties with provisions that may cover the area affected by the project.

We would appreciate your response to this invitation within *30 days* of receipt. If we do not hear from you within this time period, we will conclude that you have not identified any significant issues related to your tribe for this project. Please direct your response to:

Tony Greep Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov

We look forward to working with you on this project if it affects tribal interests. If you have any questions or would like to discuss in more detail the project or our agencies' respective roles and responsibilities during preparation of the Categorical Exclusion, please contact either of the following: Brian T. Stepp, Metra Manager, Grant Applications, 312-322-2805, bstepp@metrarr.com or Tony Greep at the contact information listed above. Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Kelley Brookins Deputy Regional Administrator

cc: Tony Greep, FTA Region 5 Brian Stepp, Metra

Enclosure: Project Location Map and Section 106 Methodology

Appendix B-3

City of Geneva and Forest Preserve District of Kane County Coordination with Property Owners of Section 4(f) Resources

TO:	Brian Stepp, Metra
FROM:	Tim Selover, WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff
DATE:	March 21, 2017
SUBJECT:	Union Pacific West Third Mainline Project – Western Section
	Metra Project Number: HG-4846
	Evaluation of Section 4(f) Considerations for Temporary Occupancy

I. Introduction

This memorandum describes construction access proposed by the Metra Union Pacific West (UP-W) Third Mainline Project – Western Section (Project) as it may effect certain public parklands. The Project consists of constructing a third mainline track on the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad from Kress Road in West Chicago, IL to Peck Road in Geneva, IL (Figure 1). The project would require construction activities on property owned or managed by the Geneva Park District and the Forest Preserve District of Kane County (FPDKC). Following is a summary of each property's qualification as parkland consistent with Section 4(f) of the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) Act of 1966, an evaluation of whether project-related activities constitute a use, and a discussion of avoidance and minimization measures.

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide Metra and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) information regarding the determination that project activities constitute a temporary occupancy and not a use of public parkland under the jurisdiction of the Geneva Park District and the FPDKC.

II. Properties Eligible for Protection as Public Parkland

The Project corridor was screened to identify properties that would qualify as public parkland for purposes of Section 4(f) evaluation. Several properties owned by the City of Geneva, Geneva Park District, Kane County, and FPDKC were identified as land officially designated as a public park, recreation area, or a contributing element to a public park or facility. Meetings with officials from the Geneva Park District and FPDKC were held on October 8, 2015 to verify the limits, facilities and uses of these parklands and to identify potential impacts to properties owned by these agencies in the vicinity of the Project. Information obtained from these meetings was subsequently considered in the screening.



Figure 1: Project Location Map

Based on verification of property limits, it was determined that three public parkland properties are present within the project area: Sunset Park, Dryden Park, and Fox River Access Trail. Each property was evaluated as public parkland consistent with Section 4(f) of the USDOT Act of 1966. The evaluation also considered the Federal Highway Administration's Section 4(f) Policy Paper (2012) accessed on their website at:

https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/4f/4fpolicy.asp#iden .

A description of each property and its qualification as a public parkland follows:

Sunset Park

Sunset Park is located directly west of Western Avenue on the south side of the tracks, directly adjacent to the UP-W Line right-of-way. The Sunset Park property is approximately 17.2 acres and is owned and managed by the Geneva Park District. Sunset Park is open to the public during normal operation hours. Sunset Park contains the Geneva Park District administration building, an aquatic center, racquetball courts, fitness center, and baseball fields. In addition, there is a 67-foot wide parcel owned by the City of Geneva situated between the property owned by the Geneva Park District and the UP Railroad that serves as parking and as open space for Sunset Park.

Dryden Park

Dryden Park is located directly east of Western Avenue on the south side of the tracks, directly adjacent to the UP-W Line right-of-way. The Dryden Park property is approximately 5.8 acres and is owned and managed by the Geneva Park District. Dryden Park is open to the public during normal operation hours. Dryden Park contains a baseball diamond, two tennis courts, a basketball court, and playground area. The park is visually buffered from the UP-W Line by a row of trees and shrubbery.

Fox River Access Trail

The Fox River Trail, an approximately 38-mile multi-use trail along the Fox River, has several access points in the vicinity of the UP Railroad bridge over the Fox River (Figure 2). The Fox River Trail is maintained by the FPDKC. Access to the Fox River Trail is maintained by various property owners, both private and public. The Fox River Trail is open to the public during normal operation hours. North of the UP Railroad along the east side of the Fox River, the Fox River Trail is on FPDKC property and extends across a bridge to Island Park. South of the UP Railroad, the Fox River Trail can be accessed by a path from both the east and west side of the Fox River and is referred to as the Fox River Access Trail.

The UP Railroad bridge over the Fox River includes a bicycle and pedestrian bridge separated from and located below the railroad deck and tracks to provide access between the Fox River Trail on the east and the City of Geneva Central Business District, the Gunnar Anderson Forest Preserve, and the Kane County Government Center on the west (Figure 3). The Fox River Access Trail (west of the river) is located on City of Geneva property and is maintained by the FPDKC. The Fox River Access Trail (east of the river) provides access from the Fox Run Trail through property owned by the City of Geneva that includes the Water Treatment Facility. The

Fox River Access Trail (east of the river) is located along the south side of the UP Railroad property.



See Attachment A for maps of the Geneva Park District parks and the Fox River Access Trail.

Figure 2: Access to the Fox River Trail



Figure 3: Looking southwest at the Fox River Trail from Island Park. The trail is below the bridge deck.

III. Section 4(f) Eligibility Screening and Temporary Occupancy Considerations

Section 4(f) of the USDOT Act of 1966 (49 U.S.C. Section 303 and 23 U.S.C. 138) was enacted to preserve publicly-owned land used for recreation, wildlife, and waterfowl refuges. Section 4(f) stipulates that USDOT agencies cannot approve the use of land from publicly owned parks, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuge areas, or public and private historic sites unless the following conditions apply:

- There is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of the land; and
- The action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property resulting from the use.

The Project requires the temporary use of three public parklands to meet the overall purpose and need to relieve commuter and freight train traffic congestion and delays. No avoidance options are available at the three properties since the project involves upgrades to an existing railroad corridor; however, minimization measures were coordinated with the property owners and incorporated into the current design. Temporary construction easements would allow for the necessary work zones, staging areas, and construction access areas required for construction of the third mainline track.

When a proposed project may use a Section 4(f) property, the use may be nevertheless approved if the Secretary of Transportation determines, after public notice and opportunity for public review and comment, that the use of the property, including any measure(s) to minimize harm committed to by the applicant, would have a *de minimis* impact as defined in 23 CFR 774.17. The officials with jurisdiction (OWJ) over the Section 4(f) property must concur in writing that the project would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes that make the property eligible for Section 4(f) protection.

Types of "uses" include:

- Permanent incorporation of land into a transportation facility (Direct Use).
- Temporary occupancy of land that is adverse in terms of the statute's preservation purpose, unless an exception is available according to 23 CFR 774.13(d) (Temporary Use).
- Constructive use, as determined by the criteria in 23 CFR 774.15, meaning the transportation project does not incorporate land from a Section 4(f) property, but the project's proximity impacts are so severe that the protected features, attributes, or activities that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired.

Project-related activities were evaluated using the above framework to determine if a use as defined under Section 4(f) would occur as a result of the project at any of the following locations:

Sunset Park

The Project would require approximately 0.11 acres of temporary construction easement within Sunset Park along the UP-W Line right-of-way (Figure 4). The easement would be no more than 10 feet in width. Access and recreational use of the property would not be affected during

construction. There would be no conflicts between park activities and the construction equipment. The associated temporary work zone would be restored to pre-construction conditions as the construction project is completed and the contractor is done working in the temporary work zone.

Full restoration would include permanent fencing or a substantial landscape barrier to be constructed to the north of the parking lot at Sunset Park. Installation and maintenance of fencing or a landscape barrier would be determined as agreed between the Geneva Park District and the UP. Restoration at Sunset Park is the responsibility of UP.

The Geneva Park District concurred on January 26, 2017 that there are no anticipated permanent impacts to Geneva Park District property and that the land being used, once fully restored by the UP as part of a temporary construction easement agreement, would not impact the activities, features, or attributes that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f). See Attachment A for maps showing the easement location at Sunset Park. See Attachment B for correspondence between the Geneva Park District and the UP for Sunset Park.



Figure 4: Looking east at the Sunset Park property where the 0.11 acre easement would be required. The park facilities are located to the south (off the photograph).

Dryden Park

Construction of the Project would require approximately 0.13 acres of temporary construction easement within Dryden Park along the UP-W Line right-of-way (Figure 5). The easement would be no more than 10 feet in width. Access and use of the property would not be affected. There would be no conflicts between park activities and the construction equipment. The associated temporary work zone would be restored to pre-construction conditions as the construction project is completed and the contractor is done working in the temporary work zone.

Full restoration at Dryden Park shall include additional landscape barriers and replacement trees to be planted in areas where removal of vegetation creates gaps in the existing landscape barriers. Installation and maintenance of the landscape barriers and replacement trees are the responsibility of the Geneva Park District.

The Geneva Park District concurred on January 26, 2017 that there are no anticipated permanent impacts to Geneva Park District property and that the land being used, once fully restored by the UP as part of a temporary construction easement agreement, would not impact the activities, features, or attributes that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f). See Attachment A for maps showing the easement location at Dryden Park. See Attachment B for correspondence between the Geneva Park District and the UP for Dryden Park.



Figure 5: Looking at the Dryden Park property where the 0.13 acre easement would occur

Fox River Access Trail

The Fox River bicycle and pedestrian bridge would remain open during construction. The Fox Run Trail and the Fox River Access Trail (east of the river) would remain open during construction. Minor temporary disruptions may occur periodically as construction equipment would need to cross the trail at times. A construction flagger would be present in these instances to direct trail users and to ensure trail user safety.

The Fox River Access Trail on the south side of the bridge (west of the river) would be closed for approximately 12 months for construction access and staging. The temporary use of a portion of the trail and closing of the trail access is needed for construction access/staging. Approximately 0.31 acres of trail would be used for construction staging. The trail surface and temporary work zone associated with the western access would be fully restored to preconstruction conditions as the construction project is completed and the contractor is done working in the temporary work zone.

The public would still be able to access the bicycle and pedestrian bridge crossing via the existing north access point. A signed detour route for the public would be posted. The detour route would cross IL Route 31 and continue along Third Street, South Street, and River Lane (Figure 6). The detour is approximately 0.6 miles in length. Detour information and timelines would be provided to FPDKC and the City of Geneva in advance of closings.

No permanent use of the trail is required. No constructive use would occur as no impairment of the activities, features or attributes that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f) property would result from activities associated with the proposed project.

The FPDKC concurred that there are no anticipated permanent impacts to this property and that the land being used would be restored after construction. See Attachment A for maps showing the easement location on the City of Geneva property. See Attachment B for correspondence between the FPDKC and the UP for the Fox River Access Trail.



Figure 6: Fox River Access Trail

Section 4(f) Temporary Occupancy Considerations

Since the scope of the activities is temporary in nature and limited in duration, the use meets the exceptions for "temporary occupancy". It is assessed below in the context of the five conditions referenced in 23 CFR 774.13(d) which qualify such use as "Temporary occupancies of land that are so minimal as to not constitute a use within the meaning of Section 4(f)":

(1) Duration must be temporary, i.e., less than the time needed for construction of the project and there should be no change in ownership of the land;

Response: There would be no change in ownership of the land. The duration of the use of the properties is temporary and limited to the period of construction. The Fox River Access Trail would have the longest period of disruption, closed for approximately 12 months for construction access and staging. See Attachment A for maps showing proposed right-of-way and easements in the vicinity of the Geneva Park District parks and the Fox River Access Trail.

(2) Scope of work must be minor, i.e., both the nature and the magnitude of the changes to the 4(f) property are minimal:

Response: The proposed activities for the three properties would be confined to isolated work areas. Work along Sunset and Dryden Parks would be limited to no more than 10-foot wide strips of temporary construction easement along the park boundary that is adjoining to the railroad. The easements are needed for temporary work zones and temporary use of both parklands would continue through construction. The property would be restored to preconstruction conditions. The required easement is less than 1 percent of the property at Sunset Park and 2 percent of the property at Dryden Park.

Activities at the Fox River Access Trail are limited to construction staging and access. The Access Trail provides access to the Fox River Trail, but does not physically impact any of the 38 miles of designated trail. Detour information and timelines would be provided to FPDKC and the City of Geneva in advance of closings.

(3) There are no anticipated permanent adverse physical impacts, nor will there be interference with the protected activities, features, or attributes of the property, on either a temporary or permanent basis;

Response: The Geneva Park District and FPDKC concurred in written correspondence that there are no anticipated permanent adverse physical impacts. There would be no interference with the activities, features, or attributes of the three properties. A detour for the Fox River Access Trail would be signed for the trail users.

(4) The land being used must be fully restored, i.e., the property must be returned to a condition which is at least as good as that which existed prior to the project;

Response: Physical impacts would be confined to the temporary work zones in Geneva Park District property, which would be fully restored to pre-construction conditions. Coordination with the Geneva Park District has outlined definitions for full restoration of their property.

(5) There must be documented agreement of the official(s) with jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) resource regarding above conditions:

Response: See Attachment B for correspondence between UP and the respective property owners/operators (Geneva Park District and FPDKC).

IV. Summary

For the Metra UP-W Third Mainline Project, three properties would require "temporary occupancy" of public parkland: Sunset Park, Dryden Park, and Fox River Access Trail. Each property was evaluated as public parkland consistent with Section 4(f) of the USDOT Act of 1966. The evaluation also considered the Federal Highway Administration's Section 4(f) Policy Paper (2012).

The proposed improvements are needed to support the overall purpose and need of the UP-W Third Mainline project, which is to relieve commuter and freight train traffic congestion and delays. The temporary occupancy described above would provide Metra the necessary work zones, staging areas, and construction access areas required for construction of the third

mainline track. The third mainline track would help create more fluid railroad operations, decrease commuter and freight train delays, reduce motorist wait time at grade crossings, decrease the number of idling freight trains, and preserve Metra performance times.

Enclosures:

Attachment A – Section 4(f) Evaluation Exhibits Attachment B – Coordination with Property Owners Attachment A: Section 4(f) Evaluation Exhibits

UP-W Third Mainline - Western Section Attachment A: Sunset Park and Dryden Park



MARCH 13, 2017

UP-W Third Mainline - Western Section Attachment A: Fox River Access Trail (East of the River)



March 13, 2017





UP-W Third Mainline - Western Section Attachment A: Fox River Access Trail (West of the River)

LEGEND

	DETOUR SIGNS, NUMBER DENOTES TYPE
н	TYPE II BARRICADE
Т	TYPE III BARRICADE
•	POST MOUNTED SIGN
	DETOUR ROUTE
	WORK ZONE

SCHEDULE OF SIGNS

SIGN NUMBER SIGN TYPE FOX RIVER TRAIL SPECIAL (12"x12") 1 R11-I101 SPECIAL TRAIL 2 CLOSED (24"X18") M6-3 (12"x9") 3 M6-1R (12"x9") M6-1L (12"x9") 5 M3-2 (12"x6") EAST 6 WEST M3-4 (12"x6") 8 DETOUR M4-8 (12"x6")



DETOUR NOTES:

UNIO PACIFI

1. ALL SIGN, SUPPORTS AND POSITIONING MUST BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MANUAL ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES, LATEST EDITION

2. SIGNAGE SHALL BE PLACED AT LOCATIONS THAT WILL BE COMPATIBLE WITH EXISTING SIGNAGE

3. ALL EXISTING SIGNS THAT CONFLICT WITH THE DETOUR MUST BE COVERED

DRAWN BY: BJW CHECKED BY:	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD Office of Assistant Vice President Engineering Design
MJK DATE: 05/12/2016 SHEET NUMBER	LOCATION & DESCRIPTION: WEST CHICAGO, IL - KRESS TO PECK GENEVA SUBDIVISION MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41 CONSTRUCT THIRD MAIN TRACK
R507 of 512	SHEET TITLE: Fox River Trail West Detour Plan Sheet 3 of 3

Attachment B: Coordination with Property Owners



1996 South Kirk Road, Suite 320, Geneva, Illinois 60134

Michael J. Kenyon, President Monica A. Meyers, Executive Director (630) 232-5980 Fax: (630) 232-5924 www.kaneforest.com

January 31, 2017

Liisa Stark Union Pacific Railroad 101 North Wacker Dr., Suite 1910 Chicago, IL 60606

Subject: UP-W Third Mainline – Western Section Kress Road to Peck Road (MP 32.00 to MP 38.41) Forest Preserve District of Kane County Section 4(f) Properties Metra Project Number: HG-4846

Dear Ms. Stark:

We have reviewed the proposed work related to improvements associated with the UP-W Third Mainline – Western Section project in relation to the Fox River Trail, a Forest Preserve District of Kane County property.

We understand that the proposed project will include a minor, temporary construction occupancy of the access trail on the west side of the Fox River Bridge, which connects to the Fox River Trail. We concur that there are no anticipated permanent impacts to this property and that the land being used will be restored after construction.

We also understand that the Fox River Trail on the eastern side of the river will remain open throughout construction. We understand there may be limited, brief closures when construction equipment is crossing the trail and that the contractor will provide a flagger during these instances to ensure trail user safety.

Sincerely,

IVM~ (V

Monica Meyers Executive Director

cc/ Mike Rowe, Metra

To preserve and restore the nature of Kane County

Chicago, Illinois 60606

P 312 777 2002
F 312 777 2020

August 3, 2016

Ms. Monica Meyers Forest Preserve District of Kane County 1996 Kirk Road Geneva, IL 60134

Subject: UP-W Third Mainline – Western Section Kress Road to Peck Road (MP 32.00 to MP 38.41) Forest Preserve District of Kane County Section 4(f) Property Metra Project Number: HG-4846

Dear Ms. Meyers:

Metra and Union Pacific (UP) Railroad are proposing the installation of a third mainline track along the UP-West Line from Kress Road in West Chicago, IL, to Peck Road in Geneva, IL. The project is one of only two remaining double track sections along the UP-W Line between the Ogilvie Transportation Center in downtown Chicago and Elburn. As a result, this section often becomes a bottleneck for both commuter and freight trains, causing congestion and delays on the UP-W Line. The proposed third mainline track will address UP-W Line rail traffic congestion issues and remove bottlenecks along the corridor.

The third mainline track will be added primarily on the south side of the existing tracks with the exception of an approximate 1.8 mile section from 0.7 miles east of the bridge at Kirk Road to the bridge at Crissey Avenue (Illinois Route 25), where the third track will be located on the north side. A majority of the third mainline track addition will occur within the UP's existing right-of-way. However, some additional right-of-way involving either temporary construction or permanent easements will be required to accommodate the third mainline track.

The project requires the temporary occupancy of one Forest Preserve District of Kane County (FPDKC) property, which qualifies as a Section 4(f) resource. The Fox River Trail will be temporarily occupied during construction. No permanent physical impacts are anticipated and any disturbance will be fully restored after construction is complete. A description of the proposed work at this resource is as follows.

Fox River Trail

The Fox River Trail on the east side of the Fox River will remain open during construction. Minor disruptions may occur as construction equipment will need to cross the trail at times. A construction flagger will be present in these instances to direct trail users and to ensure trail user safety. See enclosed Exhibit A.



On the west side of the river, the trail access point on the south side of the Fox River Bridge will be closed for approximately 12 months in order to accommodate construction access and staging. The temporary use of a portion of the trail and closing of the trail access is needed for construction access/staging. Approximately 0.31 acres of trail will be temporarily used for construction staging. The trail and associated temporary work zone will be fully restored to preconstruction conditions. See enclosed Exhibit B.

The public will still be able to access the bridge crossing via the existing north access point. A signed detour route for the public will be posted. The detour route will be via Illinois Route 31, 3rd Street, South Street, and River Lane, a length of approximately 0.6 miles. Closure information and timelines will be provided to the FPDKC and the City of Geneva in advance of the closings.

Metra and the UP recognize the importance of this recreational facility and have worked throughout the design process to avoid and minimize Section 4(f) use where feasible. For this reason, an initial coordination meeting with the FPDKC was held on October 8, 2015. As a result of that meeting, Metra and UP's design team substantially reduced potential impacts to FPDKC properties. A second meeting was held on May 13, 2016 to discuss the revised design.

At this time, Metra and UP, in conjunction with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), are requesting your written understanding of, and concurrence with, the temporary use of the Section 4(f) resource described above. For this purpose, a draft letter and exhibits are enclosed.

Should you have any questions, or if you would like to discuss this request in further detail, please contact me, Claire Anderson, UP - Construction Manager (312) 496-4724 or Mike Rowe, Metra – Engineering at (312) 322-6623. Your assistance in providing a timely response is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely. Liisa Stark

Enclosures

CC:

Mike Rowe, Metra Jerry Culp, Forest Preserve District of Kane County



January 26, 2017

Liisa Stark Union Pacific Railroad – Public Affairs 101 North Wacker Dr, Suite 1910 Chicago, IL 60606

Subject: UP-W Third Mainline – Western Section Kress Road to Peck Road (MP 32.00 to MP 38.41) Geneva Park District Section 4(f) Properties Metra Project Number: HG-4846

Dear Ms. Stark:

We have reviewed the proposed work related to the improvements associated with the UP-W Third Mainline – Western Section project in relation to Dryden and Sunset Parks, one of which is a Geneva Park District property (Dryden) and one of which is leased to the Geneva Park District by the City of Geneva (Sunset). Our representations described below are made in reliance on your 4(f) letter dated August 16, 2016, and the exhibits attached thereto which I have included in this correspondence. Any changes to the proposed work that affect your representations described in said letter would result in the Geneva Park District needing to reassess the impacts on the property.

We understand that the proposed project will include a minor, temporary occupancy of Dryden and Sunset Parks. We understand that the proposed project will require 0.11 acres of temporary construction easement at Sunset Park and 0.13 acres of temporary construction easement at Dryden Park.

We concur that there are no anticipated permanent impacts to Geneva Park District property and that the land being used once fully restored by the UP as part of a temporary construction easement agreement, would not impact the activities, features or attributes that qualify the property for protection under Section 4 (f).

Full restoration shall include permanent fencing or a substantial landscape barrier be constructed to the north of the parking lot at Sunset Park for safety reasons due to the third rail's proximity to the park and park patrons. Installation and maintenance of fencing or a landscape barrier will be determined as agreed upon between the Geneva Park District and Union Pacific. Cost of this restoration shall be covered by the UP.

Full restoration at Dryden Park shall include additional landscape barriers and replacement trees to be planted in areas where removal of vegetation creates gaps in the existing landscape barriers. This is necessary for safety reasons due to the third rail's proximity to the park and park patrons. Geneva Park district will assume responsibility for installation and maintenance of the landscape barriers and replacement trees and have received a \$5,000 donation from the UP to cover these costs.

We would further ask that consideration be given to the construction timeline as it relates to the Western Avenue crossing. We would ask that construction of this crossing not occur between June-August while the adjacent aquatic facility is operational. Construction at either park during the summer

Geneva Park District

710 Western Avenue ~ Geneva, IL 60134 ~ (630) 232-4542 ~ www.genevaparks.org

months while park and pool usage is extremely high could result in additional exposures in liability for eneva the UP. Finally, we would defer to the City of Geneva for any comments regarding any impacts of storm, water management on both sites.

Sincerely,

Sheavoun Lambillotte Executive Director Geneva Park District

710 Western Avenue ~ Geneva, IL 60134 ~ (630) 232-4542 ~ www.genevaparks.org

Liisa Lawson Stark Assistant Vice President - Public Affairs

P 312 777 2002F 312 777 2020

August 4, 2016

Ms. Sheavoun Lambillotte Geneva Park District 710 Western Avenue Geneva, IL 60134

Subject: UP-W Third Mainline – Western Section Kress Road to Peck Road (MP 32.00 to MP 38.41) Geneva Park District Section 4(f) Properties Metra Project Number: HG-4846

Dear Ms. Lambillotte:

Metra and Union Pacific (UP) Railroad are proposing the installation of a third mainline track along the UP-West Line from Kress Road in West Chicago, IL, to Peck Road in Geneva, IL. The project is one of only two remaining double track sections along the UP-W Line between the Ogilvie Transportation Center in downtown Chicago and Elburn. As a result, this section often becomes a bottleneck for both commuter and freight trains, causing congestion and delays on the UP-W Line. The proposed third mainline track will address UP-W Line rail traffic congestion issues and remove bottlenecks along the corridor.

The third mainline track will be added primarily on the south side of the existing tracks with the exception of an approximate 1.8 mile section from 0.7 miles east of the bridge at Kirk Road to the bridge at Crissey Avenue (Illinois Route 25), where the third track will be located on the north side. A majority of the third mainline track addition will occur within UP's existing right-of-way. However, some additional right-of-way involving either temporary construction or permanent easements will be required to accommodate the third mainline track.

The project will require the temporary occupancy of two Geneva Park District properties, which qualify as Section 4(f) resources. Dryden Park and Sunset Park will each be temporarily occupied during construction. No permanent physical impacts are anticipated and any disturbances will be fully restored after construction is complete. A description of the proposed work at each of these locations follows.

Sunset Park

Construction of the project will require approximately 0.11 acres of temporary construction easement adjacent to Sunset Park. Access and use of the property will not be affected and the easement will occur behind the location of the existing parking barriers. The associated temporary work zone will be fully restored to pre-construction conditions. (See enclosed Exhibit A, Sheet 3.)



In addition, fencing or another barrier will be provided around the easement site to separate it from the Sunset Park parking lot area along UP right-of-way.

Dryden Park

Construction of the project will require approximately 0.13 acres of temporary construction easement within Dryden Park. Access and use of the property will not be affected. The associated temporary work zone will be fully restored to pre-construction conditions. (See enclosed Exhibit A, Sheet 3.)

In addition, I have enclosed plans for the project section along Dryden Park and associated improvements, including plans related to a retaining wall structure.

Work in the Area of the Fox River Trail

Union Pacific and Metra would also like to provide the following information regarding the Fox River Trail, a Forest Preserve District of Kane County (FPDKC) property. The Fox River Trail will remain open during construction. Minor disruptions may occur as construction equipment will need to cross the trail at times. A construction flagger will be present in these instances to direct trail users and to ensure trail user safety.

On the west side of the river, the trail access point on the south side of the Fox River Bridge will be closed for approximately 12 months in order to accommodate construction access and staging. (See enclosed Exhibit B.) The public will still be able to access the bridge crossing via the existing north access point. A signed detour route for the public will be posted. The detour route will be via Illinois Route 31, 3rd Street, South Street, and River Lane; a length of approximately 0.6 miles. Closure information and timelines will be provided to the FPDKC and the City of Geneva in advance of the closings.

The access trail and emergency/maintenance vehicle road located on the north side of the City of Geneva's Wastewater Treatment Facility adjoining the existing UP right-of-way will be closed for approximately 12 months. The project requires work on the south side of the existing tracks, adjacent to the access trail, in order to replace the existing retaining wall. (See enclosed Exhibit A, Sheet 2.) The project team has developed a potential detour route utilizing the existing Wastewater Treatment Facility driveway just to the south of the access road/trail. See enclosed (Exhibit B.) Pending discussions with staff from the Treatment Facility, a temporary fence will be installed, as well as separate temporary gates to the Fox River Trail for access by emergency/maintenance vehicles and pedestrians/bicycles. After construction, the access road/trail will be replaced/restored in approximately the same footprint where it currently exists, with a new retaining wall constructed adjacent to the access trail.

The project will also include the reconstruction of Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track, which would require a temporary closure and detour route for approximately six (6) weeks. The proposed detour route would be via South Street, IL Route 31 (1st Street), and Fargo Boulevard. The Geneva Park District will be notified in advance of the closure and appropriate signage and detour route information will be provided by the contractor. (See enclosed Exhibit C.)

In addition, in previous discussions with the Park District regarding the footbridge over the Fox River, the Park District will inspect this structure prior to the commencement of construction on the UP-Metra project, and will provide a copy of that report to the project team. Once construction is complete, the project team will conduct another inspection of the footbridge structure and will provide that report to the Park District. However, at this time we do not anticipate any impacts to the footbridge, as all construction activity is scheduled to occur outside of that area.

Union Pacific and Metra recognize the importance of recreational facilities and have worked throughout the design process to avoid and minimize potential Section 4(f) use where feasible. For this reason, an initial coordination meeting with the Geneva Park District was held on October 8, 2015. As a result of that meeting, Metra and the UP's design team substantially reduced potential impacts to the Geneva Park District properties. A second coordination meeting was held on May 13, 2016 to discuss the revised design reduced impacts. A site visit was conducted May 24, 2016 to stake the areas of the proposed temporary right-of-way for Dryden and Sunset Parks.

At this time, Metra and UP, in conjunction with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), are requesting your written understanding of, and concurrence with, the temporary use of Dryden and Sunset Parks, which qualify as Section 4(f) resources as described above. For this purpose, a draft letter and exhibits are enclosed.

Should you have any questions, or if you would like to discuss this request in further detail, please contact me at (916) 792-9160, Claire Anderson, UP - Construction Manager at (312) 496-4724 or Mike Rowe, Metra – Engineering at (312) 322-6623. Your assistance in providing a timely response is greatly appreciated.

Sincerel Triba GA

Enclosures

cc/ Mike Rowe, Metra

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD 101 North Wacker Drive, Room 1910 Chicago, Illinois 60606

P 312.777.2002 F 312.777.2020

August 16, 2016

Ms. Sheavoun Lambillotte Geneva Park District 710 Western Avenue Geneva, IL 60134

Subject: UP-W Third Mainline – Western Section Kress Road to Peck Road (MP 32.00 to MP 38.41) Geneva Park District Section 4(f) Properties Metra Project Number: HG-4846

Dear Ms. Lambillotte:

As noted in a letter to you dated August 4, 2016, Metra and Union Pacific (UP) Railroad are proposing the installation of a third mainline track along the UP-West Line from Kress Road in West Chicago, IL, to Peck Road in Geneva, IL. The project is one of only two remaining double track sections along the UP-W Line between the Ogilvie Transportation Center in downtown Chicago and Elburn. As a result, this section often becomes a bottleneck for both commuter and freight trains, causing congestion and delays on the UP-W Line. The proposed third mainline track will address UP-W Line rail traffic congestion issues and remove bottlenecks along the corridor.

The third mainline track will be added primarily on the south side of the existing tracks with the exception of an approximate 1.8 mile section from 0.7 miles east of the bridge at Kirk Road to the bridge at Crissey Avenue (Illinois Route 25), where the third track will be located on the north side. A majority of the third mainline track addition will occur within UP's existing right-of-way. However, some additional right-of-way involving either temporary construction or permanent easements will be required to accommodate the third mainline track.

The project will require the temporary occupancy of two Geneva Park District properties, which qualify as Section 4(f) resources. Dryden Park and Sunset Park will each be temporarily occupied during construction. No permanent physical impacts are anticipated and any disturbances will be fully restored after construction is complete. A description of the proposed work at each of these locations follows.

Sunset Park

Construction of the project will require approximately 0.11 acres of temporary construction easement adjacent to Sunset Park. Access and use of the property will not be affected and the easement will occur behind the location of the existing parking barriers. The associated temporary work zone will be fully restored to pre-construction conditions. (See enclosed Exhibit A, Sheet 3.)


In addition, fencing or another barrier will be provided around the easement site to separate it from the Sunset Park parking lot area along UP right-of-way.

Dryden Park

Construction of the project will require approximately 0.13 acres of temporary construction easement within Dryden Park. This will include minor vegetation-related work that is required as part of the project. It is anticipated that approximately five feet of vegetation will need to be cut back, with slightly more potentially cut back near the culvert area as we have discussed. Also as we have discussed, Park District staff will be on-site during all landscape and brush removal.

Access and use of the Dryden Park property will not be affected. The associated temporary work zone will be fully restored to pre-construction conditions. (See enclosed Exhibit A, Sheet 3.)

In addition, I have enclosed plans for the project section along Dryden Park and associated improvements, including plans related to a retaining wall structure.

Work in the Area of the Fox River Trail

Union Pacific and Metra would also like to provide the following information regarding the Fox River Trail, a Forest Preserve District of Kane County (FPDKC) property. The Fox River Trail will remain open during construction. Minor disruptions may occur as construction equipment will need to cross the trail at times. A construction flagger will be present in these instances to direct trail users and to ensure trail user safety.

On the west side of the river, the trail access point on the south side of the Fox River Bridge will be closed for approximately 12 months in order to accommodate construction access and staging. (See enclosed Exhibit B.) The public will still be able to access the bridge crossing via the existing north access point. A signed detour route for the public will be posted. The detour route will be via Illinois Route 31, 3rd Street, South Street, and River Lane; a length of approximately 0.6 miles. Closure information and timelines will be provided to the FPDKC and the City of Geneva in advance of the closings.

The access trail and emergency/maintenance vehicle road located on the north side of the City of Geneva's Wastewater Treatment Facility adjoining the existing UP right-of-way will be closed for approximately 12 months. The project requires work on the south side of the existing tracks, adjacent to the access trail, in order to replace the existing retaining wall. (See enclosed Exhibit A, Sheet 2.) The project team has developed a potential detour route utilizing the existing Wastewater Treatment Facility driveway just to the south of the access road/trail. See enclosed (Exhibit B.) Pending discussions with staff from the Treatment Facility, a temporary fence will be installed, as well as separate temporary gates to the Fox River Trail for access by emergency/maintenance vehicles and pedestrians/bicycles. After construction, the access road/trail will be replaced/restored in approximately the same footprint where it currently exists, with a new retaining wall constructed adjacent to the access trail.

The project will also include the reconstruction of Western Avenue to accommodate the third mainline track, which would require a temporary closure and detour route for approximately six (6) weeks. The proposed detour route would be via South Street, IL Route 31 (1st Street), and Fargo Boulevard. The Geneva Park District will be notified in advance of the closure and

appropriate signage and detour route information will be provided by the contractor. (See enclosed Exhibit C.)

In addition, in previous discussions with the Park District regarding the footbridge over the Fox River, the Park District will inspect this structure prior to the commencement of construction on the UP-Metra project, and will provide a copy of that report to the project team. Once construction is complete, the project team will conduct another inspection of the footbridge structure and will provide that report to the Park District. However, at this time we do not anticipate any impacts to the footbridge, as all construction activity is scheduled to occur outside of that area.

Union Pacific and Metra recognize the importance of recreational facilities and have worked throughout the design process to avoid and minimize potential Section 4(f) use where feasible. For this reason, an initial coordination meeting with the Geneva Park District was held on October 8, 2015. As a result of that meeting, Metra and the UP's design team substantially reduced potential impacts to the Geneva Park District properties. A second coordination meeting was held on May 13, 2016 to discuss the revised design reduced impacts. A site visit was conducted May 24, 2016 to stake the areas of the proposed temporary right-of-way for Dryden and Sunset Parks.

At this time, Metra and UP, in conjunction with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), are requesting your written understanding of, and concurrence with, the temporary use of Dryden and Sunset Parks, which qualify as Section 4(f) resources as described above. For this purpose, a draft letter and exhibits are enclosed.

Should you have any questions, or if you would like to discuss this request in further detail, please contact me at (916) 792-9160, Claire Anderson, UP - Construction Manager at (312) 496-4724 or Mike Rowe, Metra – Engineering at (312) 322-6623. Your assistance in providing a timely response is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Lusi a At

Enclosures

cc/ Mike Rowe, Metra



July 13, 2016



July 13, 2016

UP-W Third Mainline - Western Section Exhibit A



July 13, 2016



NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

UP-W Third Mainline - Western Section

4846 / 0599 pw://beneschpwisel.benesch.local:Benesch_Projects/Documents/10400s/10473.00/Project Filing/40 - Quality Records/10 - Drawings/Track/Sheets/40-10-160510-DWG-W_R507

ROJECT #

ENGINEERING DEPARTMEN

K42018

100% Desigr

Alfred Benesch & Company 205 Nor.h Michigan Ave, Sulle 2∔00 Chicago Illinois 63631 312-565-0450 ⊾ob No. 10473.00

LEGEND

	DETOUR SIGNS, NUMBER DENOTES TYPE
н	TYPE II BARRICADE
T	TYPE III BARRICADE
•	POST MOUNTED SIGN
	DETOUR ROUTE
	WORKZONE

SCHEDULE OF SIGNS

SIGN NUMBER SIGN TYPE FOX RIVER TRAIL SPECIAL (12"x12") R11-I101 SPECIAL TRAIL 2 CLOSED (24''X18'') M6-3 (12"x9") 3 *M6-1R (12"x9")* M6-1L (12"x9") 5 M3-2 (12"x6") EAST 6 M3-4 (12"x6") WEST 8 DETOUR M4-8 (12"x6")



DETOUR NOTES:

UNIO PACIFI

1. ALL SIGN, SUPPORTS AND POSITIONING MUST BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MANUAL ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES, LATEST EDITION

SIGNAGE SHALL BE PLACED AT LOCATIONS THAT WILL BE COMPATIBLE WITH EXISTING SIGNAGE

3. ALL EXISTING SIGNS THAT CONFLICT WITH THE DETOUR MUST BE COVERED

DRAWN BY: BJW CHECKED B ^V :	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD Office of Assistant Vice President Engineering Design
MJK DATE: 05/12/2016 SHEET NUMBER	LOCATION & DESCRIPTION: WEST CHICAGO, IL - KRESS TO PECK GENEVA SUBDIVISION MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41 CONSTRUCT THIRD MAIN TRACK
	SHEET TITLE: Fox River Trail West Detour Plan



pw://beneschpwisel.benesch.local:Benesch_Projects/Documents/10400s/10473.00/Project Filing/40 - Quality Records/10 - Drawings/Track/Sheets/40-10-160510-DWG-W_R500

	DRAWN BY HRC CHECKED BY	UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD Office of Assistant Vice President Engineering Design
c 	MJK DATE: 05/12/2016 SHEET NUMBER	LOCATION & DESCRIPTION: WEST CHICAGO, IL - KRESS TO PECK GENEVA SUBDIVISION MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41 CONSTRUCT THIRD MAIN TRACK
	R500 of 512	SHEET TITLE: Fox River Trail East Detour Plan



	SC	HEDULE OF	SIGNS
	SIGN NUMBER	\sim	SIGN TYPE
	1	DETOUR	W20-2 (0)
	2	ROAD CLOSED AHEAD	W20-3 (0)
	3	ROAD CLOSED To Thru traffic	M1-7
	4		M1-7
OUR	5		M5-1R
RTH NAVE	6	\blacksquare	M6-1R
L SIGN	7		M5-1L
	8		M6-1L
	9	END DETOUR	M4-8a (0)
	10	WESTERN AVE	M1-I100 (0)
	11	NORTH	M3-2 (0)
IN AFFIC	12	SOUTH	M3-4 (0)
	13	DETOUR	M1-7
LL BE	14		R3-2
TRAFFIC	15		R3-2
EOF	16	ROAD CLOSED	R11-4
	NC	T TO SCALE	
	NION PACIFIC		e of Assistant Vice President Engineering Design
RDC LOC/ DATE: 05/12/2016		EST CHICAGO VA SUBDIVISIÓ CONSTRUCT 1	, IL - KRESS TO PECK ON MP 32.00 TO MP 38.41 HIRD MAIN TRACK
R201 of 207	ET TITLE:	WESTERN AVE	DETOUR PLAN

Appendix B-4 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District Coordination Pre-Application Meeting Minutes



Project N	Project Name: UP-W 3 rd Mainline, Engineering Design Services						
Project #: HG-4846 & HG-0599 Contract #: K42018 Task #: NA							
USACOE Pre-Application Meeting							
Date	Start	End	Next Meeting	Next Time	1 2	Company	
12/09/15	10:30 am	12:30 pm	N/A	N/A	R. Conrath	Benesch	
Purpose Location Next Location					Next Location		
USACOE Pre-Application Meeting USACOE Chicago District TBD Offices							
USACOE - UPRR - CI UPRR - K UPRR - M UPRR - Li UPRR - B Metra - Sa Metra - Mi Huff & Huf PB - Tim S TY Lin - A TY Lin - J Benesch -	if – Evan Mark	ris n phone) none) (phone) ari cowitz ski					

Discussion Notes

The exhibits that were presented at the meeting are available for download from the Benesch ftp site.

www.benesch.com/ftp Password: Metra-USACOE

General Discussion and Requirements

- 1. The meeting opened with introductions of everyone in attendance and on the conference line, and a brief description of their roles on the project.
- 2. Benesch presented an overview of Project 1: Vale to 25th Avenue. Huff & Huff then presented the environmental findings within the Project 1 limits.
- 3. The USACOE wanted to understand:
 - i. Project basics and if the project segments are being considered as one project or two;
 - ii. What agencies/companies are working on the projects; and,
 - iii. Ensuring open lines of communication as permit applications are submitted for review.
- 4. The design team explained that 25th to Vale and Kress to Peck are stand-alone projects with separate utility, separate NEPA documents, and can (and will be) constructed independently.



- 5. The permit application will need to thoroughly explain why the two projects are separate, given that the projects are scheduled for construction within a relatively short window along the same rail corridor.
- 6. The USACOE will provide a letter regarding the project, which will initiate the project environmental review by the North Cook County Soil and Water Conservation District. The USACOE has delegated the responsibility of the review to NCCSWCD for projects in this area. The main contact (Rick McCanilis) will do all of the inspections during the project for the waterway and the erosion and sediment control. This will help in getting the review moving forward.
- 7. The railroads must decide if the UPRR will be the permit applicant, with Metra as co-applicant, or vice-versa. (Metra has some governmental waivers on the percentage of area that needs to be mitigated. So this needs to be investigated and it may be determined to be in the best interest of the project that Metra be listed as the applicant and the UPRR as the co-applicant.
- 8. Regional permits can be issued relatively quickly (60 to 90 days after the submittal of a complete and correct application package). The time for permit approval is extended significantly for Individual permits because significant coordination and clearance is required from other agencies, including the Illinois EPA (IEPA) and the US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS). Sign-off from the IEPA will typically take one year.
- 9. The USACOE advised that for a project to be eligible for a Regional Permit (RP 3 or RP 7), the total impact (temporary or permanent) needs to be limited to 0.25 acres.
- 10. Benesch presented an overview of Project 2: Kress to Peck. Huff & Huff then presented their environmental findings in the Project 2 limits.
- 11. Specific to Project 2 (Kress to Peck), the project currently impacts four (4) ADID wetlands, a FEN, Waters of the U.S., and potentially a significant number of trees.
- 12. The USACOE requested that water flow be shown as continuous on our exhibits.
- 13. The different environmental sites (Sites 1-20) have varying plant life and water qualities and thus can't be combined. But showing that they do connect will help to show how each can be affected by any sediment or water quality issues from the project as a whole. (This would be showing the waterways through the area as a continuous stream and not as individual streams).
- 14. The project team inquired why a FEN is such a big deal and what impacts it has on a project. The USACOE responded that it rarely receives applications that impact a FEN wetland, so the review will be looked at based on the level of impact and how much acreage is affected. The USACOE level of review is going to be high based on the nature of impacts to ecological resources.
- 15. The Project Team inquired about potential solutions to impacting the FEN area. The USACOE is not able to comment at this time as they have not reviewed the wetland delineation reports and have not made a field investigation. So it is still premature for them to try and fully understand the impacts at this time.



- 16. The USACOE expressed concerns regarding the following potential impacts:
 - i. The bridge over the Fox River (based on previous experience);
 - ii. Tree impacts (This will involve the USFWS); and
 - iii. The FEN area.
- 17. The USACOE recommended that permit applications should be submitted sooner rather than later. Also, applications should be submitted to all agencies now rather than one by one, which should help expedite review, or at least avoid lengthy delays. The project team should also request pre-application meetings with the other agencies involved (i.e., IEPA, IDNR, and USFWS). The USACOE will assist in setting those meetings up.
- 18. Benesch advised that the applications will not be submitted until sometime in January.
- 19. The USACOE advised that they understand that railroad projects are linear and that some impacts just may not be avoidable. They suggested that information should be included in the project narrative and alternatives analysis.
- 20. The submitted mitigation package will drive the USACOE's decision on impacts to environmental wetlands. However, the design team should explore reducing impacts where we can, such as through the construction of retaining walls.
- 21. The USACOE also stated that another form of mitigation could be required. This may include off-site mitigation, if it can't be accomplished on-site due to the linear nature of the project. Depending on what the wetland impacts and mitigations are, if we are impacting ADID and FEN areas, then there is a high likelihood that we will need off-site mitigation. The USACOE mentioned that this is very common with linear projects. There may also be credits available for this, which we will explore further with the USACOE.
- 22. The USACOE suggested that we should propose what we believe is appropriate for mitigation in the mitigation package, and the USACOE will either accept or reject our proposal. However, we should consider off-site mitigation within the same watershed. Forest Preserves may have some projects that could be proposed for off-site mitigation. [Note: In the past people have worked with Forest Preserves and either purchased property to create a wetland mitigation area or given them money to do it for them on their property.] The USACOE advised that they anticipate such mitigation would be required for this project. Alternatively, local jurisdictions may have property that could be used for the same purpose.
- 23. Thirty (30) days after the permit application is submitted, it will go out for public notice. The Project Team commented that the application will be submitted sometime in January.
- 24. Next Steps with the USACOE:
 - i. Submit permit applications;
 - ii. The Project Team will work on scheduling a project site visit with the USACOE, IDNR, USFWS, DuPage County, and the North Cook County Soil and Water Conservation District.
- iii. We can request that the USACOE participate in a corridor tour.
- iv. The need for an additional meeting with the USACOE will be determined once the permit application is submitted.
- v. The USFWS should participate in the next meeting as well.



- 25. The USACOE has seen mitigation ratios start at 3:1 and go as high as 20:1, for the types of ADID and FEN areas being impacted on Project 2. The project team will propose what they believe is appropriate, but the USACOE will specify what is actually required.
- 26. If the project would like to have a jurisdictional determination done, Benesch will have to formally request one.
- 27. There are also 3 to 4 wetland sites and a stream in DuPage County that will be affected. They are separate from the USACOE and will require all of these same meetings.



Action Items List:

ltem	Description	Resp. Party	Status	Entry Date Due Date Compl'd
01.000	Schedule			
02.000	Budget & Scope			
03.000	Submittals			
03.001	Benesch to submit permit applications for Projects 1 and 2 sometime in January.	Benesch	Open	<mark>12/9/2015</mark> 1/29/2016
04.000	Quality			
05.000	Permits / Agreements			
06.000	Environmental			
07.000	Operations / Coordination			
08.000	Safety			
09.000	Other Issues & Concerns			
09.001	The USACOE shall provide a letter regarding the project, which will initiate the environmental review by the North Cook County Soil and Water Conservation District.	USACOE	Open	<mark>12/9/2015</mark> 1/29/2016
09.002	The project team should request pre-application meetings with the other agencies involved (i.e., IEPA, IDNR, and USFWS).	Benesch/PB	Open	<mark>12/9/2015</mark> 2/26/2016
09.003	Schedule a project site visit with all interested agencies (walking and/or hi-rail tour).	Benesch/PB	Open	<mark>12/9/2015</mark> 3/31/2016
10.000	Design Criteria			
11.000	Data Collection			
12.000	Land Acquisition			

Any comments, additions, or corrections shall be made, in writing, within five (5) business days of the issue date of these minutes. If no comments, additions, or corrections are received within the five (5) business days period, these minutes shall be deemed approved and shall be binding on all parties.



Project #: Consultant:	Project #: HG-4846 & HG-0599 Consultant: Alfred Benesch & Company	Project #: HG-4846 & HG-0599 Contract #: K42018 Consultant: Alfred Benesch & Company Consultant: Alfred Benesch & Company	: K42018		AN
Date	Start	Location	Purpose		
12/9/2015	10:30 AM	USACOE	Pre-Application Meeting		
Name (print) / initial	Company	Title	Email Address	Voice	Fax
Kathy Chernich	USACOE		Kathy.G.Chernich@usace.army.mil		
Melyssa Navis	USACOE		Melyssa.r.navis@usace.army.mil	312-846-5533	312-353-4110
Sainath Reddivari	Metra	Consultant PM	sreddivari@metrarr.com	312-322-6629	
Mike Rowe	Metra		mrowe@metrarr.com	312-322-6623	
Claire Anderson	UPRR	MCD	ceanders@up.com	312-496-4724	
Ken Freimuth (by phone)	UPRR	Snr Project Manager	kafreimuth @ up.com	402-544-5167	
Mike Gilliam (by phone)	UPRR	OTM	mgilliam@up.com	312-496-4752	
Liisa Stark (by phone)	UPRR		llstark@up.com		2
Bryon Thiesse (phone)	UPRR	MSP	bthiesse@up.com	312-496-4729	
Anna Dukes	TYLin	Senior Engineer	anna.dukes@tylin.com	312-777-2900	312-705-0305
Joseph Lorenzini	TYLin	Principal Engineer	joseph.lorenzini@tylin.com	312-777-2900	312-705-0305
Richard Conrath	Benesch	VP, Director Railroad Services	rconrath@benesch.com	630-577-9100	630-577-9199
William Schmanski	Benesch	Proejct Manager	wschmanski@benesch.com	312-565-0450	
Tim Selover	Parsons Brinkerhoff		Selover@pbworld.com	312-803-6656	
Evan Markowitz	Huff & Huff	Project Manager/Senior Scientist	evan.markowitz@gza.com	630-684-4416	

<u>UP-W 3rd Mainline Project</u> Benesch - Contract No. K42018

US Army Corps of Engineers - Pre-application Meeting - Agenda December 9, 2015 10:30 am

- 1. Introductions
- 2. Project 1 Vale to 25th Avenue
 - A. NEPA Classification Documented Categorical Exclusion
 - B. Project Overview Benesch
 - C. Wetland & Waters of the US Overview Huff & Huff
 - D. Anticipated Impacts
 - E. Anticipated Permit Processing Regional Permit 3 or 7
- 3. Project 2 Kress to Peck
 - A. NEPA Classification Documented Categorical Exclusion
 - B. Project Overview Benesch
 - C. Wetland & Waters of the US Overview Huff & Huff
 - D. Anticipated Impacts
 - E. Anticipated Permit Processing Individual Permit
- 4. USACOE Process Going Forward
 - A. Submittal requirements
 - B. "Things to Avoid"
 - C. Typical Process Durations
 - i. Regional Permit
 - ii. Individual Permit
- 5. Site Visit
- 6. Next Meeting





Appendix B-5 Illinois Department of Natural Resource Coordination EcoCAT Tool Consultation under 17 III. Adm. Code Part 1075 Termination





Applicant:Huff & Huff, Inc.Contact:Evan MarkowitzAddress:915 Harger RoadSuite 330Oak Brook, IL 60523

IDNR Project Number: 1602648 Date: 09/02/2015

Project:METRA UP West 3rd Main LineAddress:West Chicago and Geneva, West Chicago and Geneva

Description: The Union Pacific (UP) Railroad and METRA are proposing the install a 3rd Main Line rail along the METRA UP West line in the in the Cities of West Chicago and Geneva, Unincorporated Kane and DuPage counties, Illinois. The proposed project consists of installing a 3rd Main Line railroad track south of the existing two main line railroad tracks. In-stream work may be required for the work on the existing Fox River bridge and piers.

Natural Resource Review Results

The Illinois Natural Heritage Database shows the following protected resources may be in the vicinity of the project location:

West Chicago Prairie INAI Site Truitt-Hoff Nature Preserve Black-Billed Cuckoo (Coccyzus erythropthalmus) Black-Crowned Night Heron (Nycticorax nycticorax) Black-Crowned Night-Heron (Nycticorax nycticorax) Blanding's Turtle (Emydoidea blandingii) Tube Beard Tongue (Penstemon tubaeflorus)

An IDNR staff member will evaluate this information and contact you to request additional information or to terminate consultation if adverse effects are unlikely.

Location

The applicant is responsible for the accuracy of the location submitted for the project.

County: DuPage	County: Kane
Township, Range, Section:	Township, Range, Section:
39N, 9E, 5	, ,
39N, 9E, 6	, ,
39N, 9E, 7	, ,
39N, 9E, 8	
3 3	39N, 8E, 5
, ,	39N, 8E, 6
, ,	39N, 8E, 7
, ,	39N, 8E, 8
, ,	39N, 8E, 9
, ,	39N, 8E, 10
, ,	39N, 8E, 11
, ,	39N, 8E, 12



IDNR Project Number: 1602648

IL Department of Natural Resources Contact Nathan Grider 217-785-5500 Division of Ecosystems & Environment **Government Jurisdiction** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Disclaimer

The Illinois Natural Heritage Database cannot provide a conclusive statement on the presence, absence, or condition of natural resources in Illinois. This review reflects the information existing in the Database at the time of this inquiry, and should not be regarded as a final statement on the site being considered, nor should it be a substitute for detailed site surveys or field surveys required for environmental assessments. If additional protected resources are encountered during the project's implementation, compliance with applicable statutes and regulations is required.

Terms of Use

By using this website, you acknowledge that you have read and agree to these terms. These terms may be revised by IDNR as necessary. If you continue to use the EcoCAT application after we post changes to these terms, it will mean that you accept such changes. If at any time you do not accept the Terms of Use, you may not continue to use the website.

1. The IDNR EcoCAT website was developed so that units of local government, state agencies and the public could request information or begin natural resource consultations on-line for the Illinois Endangered Species Protection Act, Illinois Natural Areas Preservation Act, and Illinois Interagency Wetland Policy Act. EcoCAT uses databases, Geographic Information System mapping, and a set of programmed decision rules to determine if proposed actions are in the vicinity of protected natural resources. By indicating your agreement to the Terms of Use for this application, you warrant that you will not use this web site for any other purpose.

2. Unauthorized attempts to upload, download, or change information on this website are strictly prohibited and may be punishable under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act of 1986 and/or the National Information Infrastructure Protection Act.

3. IDNR reserves the right to enhance, modify, alter, or suspend the website at any time without notice, or to terminate or restrict access.

Security

EcoCAT operates on a state of Illinois computer system. We may use software to monitor traffic and to identify unauthorized attempts to upload, download, or change information, to cause harm or otherwise to damage this site. Unauthorized attempts to upload, download, or change information on this server is strictly prohibited by law.

Unauthorized use, tampering with or modification of this system, including supporting hardware or software, may subject the violator to criminal and civil penalties. In the event of unauthorized intrusion, all relevant information regarding possible violation of law may be provided to law enforcement officials.

Privacy

EcoCAT generates a public record subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. Otherwise, IDNR uses the information submitted to EcoCAT solely for internal tracking purposes.



Illinois Department of **Natural Resources**

One Natural Resources Way Springfield, Illinois 62702-1271 www.dnr.illinois.gov Bruce Rauner, Governor Wayne A. Rosenthal, Director

March 17, 2017

Evan Markowitz Huff & Huff, Inc. 915 Harger Road Suite 330 Oak Brook, IL 60523

RE: METRA UP West 3rd Main Line – Kress Rd. to Peck Rd. & Fox River Crossing Project Number(s): 1602648 (LRC-2015-00937) County: DuPage, Kane

Dear Mr. Markowitz:

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources has reviewed the above-mentioned project proposed by the Union Pacific (UP) Railroad and METRA to install a 3rd Main Line rail along the METRA UP west line. This review includes the section from Kress Road. to Peck Road. and the Fox River crossing in Geneva, IL. Instream work in the Fox River includes a causeway from both banks and concrete repairs on the piers as necessary. The track will be installed on the existing piers.

A mussel survey was conducted on August 27, 2015. Only 29 native mussels were found representing six common species. No state or federally listed species were found. Given the low density $(0.037m^2)$ the Department has determined that further salvage efforts are not necessary.

No records for state listed fishes occur in the vicinity of the project. However, state-listed fishes, such as greater redhorse (*Moxostoma valenciennesi*) and river redhorse (*Moxostoma carinatum*), do occur in the Fox River in upstream and downstream habitats. To avoid potential impacts to listed and non-listed fishes, the Department requests no instream work during the primary spawning season, from April 1st through June 15th. The Department also acknowledges the inclusion of culverts in the causeway design and recommends this be maintained as a commitment to facilitate fish passage and help reduce adverse impacts to upstream and downstream substrates, such as scour and sediment deposition. Further review and changes to the causeway and culvert design may occur during the permitting process with our Office of Water Resources (OWR). The instream work restriction dates will likely be made a condition of permits issued by the OWR for work in the Public Water.

The Truitt-Hoff Nature Preserve occurs approximately 0.5 miles east of Kress Road. Multiple state-listed species also occur in this Nature Preserve. Impacts to these protected natural resources are unlikely given the project terminates at Kress Road.

If state or state pass through funding will be involved, the project will be required to meet guidelines under the Interagency Wetland Policy Act of 1989 (IWPA). Mitigation ratios can differ from regulations under US Army Corps of Engineers jurisdiction. A review by this office pursuant to the IWPA should be requested if state funding is involved. No state funding is known to the Department at this time.

Consultation under 17 Ill. Adm. Code Part 1075 is terminated. This consultation is valid for two years unless new information becomes available that was not previously considered; the proposed action is modified; or additional species, essential habitat, or Natural Areas are identified in the vicinity. If the project has not been implemented within two years of the date of this letter, or any of the above listed conditions develop, a new consultation is necessary.

The natural resource review reflects the information existing in the Illinois Natural Heritage Database at the time of the project submittal, and should not be regarded as a final statement on the site being considered, nor should it be a substitute for detailed site surveys or field surveys required for environmental assessments. If additional protected resources are encountered during the project's implementation, you must comply with the applicable statutes and regulations. Also, note that termination does not imply IDNR's authorization or endorsement of the proposed action.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this review.

hoten Side

Nathan Grider Impact Assessment Section 217-785-5500

cc: Dan Stephenson – IDNR, Fisheries Gary Jereb – IDNR, OWR Melyssa Navis – USACE, Chicago District Shawn Cirton - USFWS Appendix B-6 US Fish and Wildlife Service Coordination Section 7 Consultation Letter 547 W. Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60661

June 29, 2017

Mr. Shawn Cirton U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 250 S Grove Ave #103 Barrington, IL 60010

Re: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Section 7 Consultation Addendum Metra Union Pacific West Line – 3rd Main Line Western Segment - Kress Road to Peck Road (M.P. 32.00 to M.P. 38.41) Unincorporated Kane County and DuPage County, Illinois T39N, R8E, Sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, & 12; T39N, R9E, Sections 7 & 8 41.883218° lat./-87.366563° long. to 41.882959° lat./-87.239230° long.

Dear Mr. Cirton:

The Union Pacific (UP) Railroad and Metra are proposing the installation of a third main line track along the UP West line in the Cities of West Chicago and Geneva, and Unincorporated Kane and DuPage Counties, Illinois (T39N, R8E, Sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, & 12; T39N, R9E, Sections 7 & 8). Existing land use adjacent to the project area includes agricultural, residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, and undeveloped land. This project lies within the Fox River Watershed (HUC #07120007) and Des Plaines River Watershed (HUC #07120004).

The third main line track would be added primarily on the south side of the existing tracks with the exception of an approximately 1.8 mile section from 0.7 miles east of the bridge at Kirk Road to the bridge at Crissey Avenue (Illinois Route 25 [IL 25]), where the third main line track would be located on the north side in order to reduce impacts to wetland resources. A majority of the third main line track would occur within UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.02 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permit easements directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required to accommodate the third main line track.

A Section 7 Consultation and endangered species review for the proposed project was completed by Metra's project team consultant, Huff & Huff, Inc. (H&H) on May 20, 2016, and previously submitted to you on December 20, 2016. Since the submittal of the original Section 7 Consultation letter, the rusty patched bumble bee (*Bombus affinis*) was listed as federally endangered. In summary, the project will not affect the rusty patched bumble bee as the project is not located within a "High Potential Zone." Enclosed please find the revised Section 7 Consultation Addendum letter completed by H&H to document the findings for the rusty patched bumble bee. Section 7 Consultation Metra Union Pacific West Line – 3rd Main Line Western Segment - Kress Road to Peck Road (M.P. 32.00 to M.P. 38.41) Kane and DuPage Counties, Illinois Page 2 of 2

At this time Metra is requesting the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) review of the project for the rusty patched bumble bee. As the proposed project will not affect critical habitat of the rusty patched bumble bee, and the FWS does not issue concurrence on findings of no effect, it will be assumed the FWS does not object to findings of no effect if no response is received within 30 days.

Sincerely,

ANJ ..)

David Simmons Director, Grant Development

Enclosures



A Subsidiary of GZA

GEOTECHNICAL ENVIRONMENTAL ECOLOGICAL WATER CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

915 Harger Road Suite 330 Oak Brook, IL 60523 T: 630.684.9100 F: 630.684.9120 www.huffnhuff.com www.gza.com June 28, 2017

Mr. Andrew Roth Director, Design, Stations & Parking METRA 547 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60661

Re: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Section 7 Consultation Addendum METRA Union Pacific West Line – 3rd Main Line Western Segment - Kress Road to Peck Road (M.P. 32.00 to M.P. 38.41) Kane County and DuPage County, Illinois T39N, R8E, Sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, & 12 T39N, R9E, Sections 7 & 8 41.883218°lat./ -87.366563°long. To 41.882959°lat./ -87.239230°long

Dear Mr. Roth:

The Union Pacific (UP) Railroad and METRA are proposing the installation of a third Main Line rail along the UP West line in the Cities of West Chicago and Geneva, Unincorporated Kane County and DuPage Counties, Illinois (T39N, R8E, Sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, & 12; T39N, R9E, Sections 7 & 8). Existing land use adjacent to the project area includes agricultural, residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, and undeveloped land. This project lies within the Fox River Watershed (Hydrologic Unit Code [HUC] #07120007) and Des Plaines River Watershed (HUC #07120004).

A Section 7 Consultation and endangered species review for the proposed project was previously completed in a letter dated May 20, 2016. This addendum updates the Section 7 consultation letter with information relating to the Rusty patched bumble bee (*Bombus affinis*), which was listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) on March 21, 2017. Information and effect finding for the rusty patched bumble bee is presented below.

Rusty Patched Bumble Bee

This project will *not affect* the rusty patched bumble bee. Suitable habitat of grasslands with flowering plants from April through October, underground and abandoned rodent cavities or clumps of grasses above ground as nesting sites, and undisturbed soil for hibernating queens to overwinter is present within the project limits. Based on The Rusty Patched Bumble Bee (*Bombus affinis*) Interagency Cooperation under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act Voluntary Implementation Guidance Version 1.1 (Guidance) dated March 21, 2017, the project is not located within a "High Potential Zone." Therefore, the rusty patched bumble bee is unlikely to be present.





Section 404 Individual Permit Request – June 28, 2017 Metra Union Pacific West Line 3rd Main Line (Kress Road to Peck Road) Page | 2

Detailed surveys were not conducted. This determination is based on information provided by the FWS through their Section 7 Consultation website as well as recent aerial and site photographs. In addition, the FWS does not provide concurrence on findings of no effect; instead the FWS will review the documentation.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at (630)-684-4416 should you need additional information, have any questions.

Very Truly Yours, HUFF & HUFF, INC. (A SUBSIDIARY OF GZA)

Evan Manhowitz

ZZL

Consultant Reviewer

Nikki Pisula

Evan Markowitz Senior Project Manager

0

Jim Novak Associate Principal

cc: Timothy Selover, PB (Electronic)



547 W. Jackson Boulevard Chicago, IL 60661 312.322.6900 TTY: 1 312.322.6774

December 20, 2016

Mr. Shawn Cirton U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 250 S Grove Ave #103 Barrington, IL 60010

Re: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Section 7 Consultation METRA Union Pacific West Line – 3rd Main Line Western Segment - Kress Road to Peck Road (M.P. 32.00 to M.P. 38.41) Unincorporated Kane County and DuPage County, Illinois T39N, R8E, Sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, & 12; T39N, R9E, Sections 7 & 8 41.883218° lat./-87.366563° long. to 41.882959° lat./-87.239230° long.

Dear Mr. Cirton:

The Union Pacific (UP) Railroad and Metra are proposing the installation of a third main line track along the UP West line in the Cities of West Chicago and Geneva, and Unincorporated Kane and DuPage County, Illinois (T39N, R8E, Sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, & 12; T39N, R9E, Sections 7 & 8). Existing land use adjacent to the project area includes agricultural, residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, and undeveloped land. This project lies within the Fox River Watershed (HUC #07120007) and Des Plaines River Watershed (HUC #07120004).

The third main line track would be added primarily on the south side of the existing tracks with the exception of an approximately 1.8 mile section from 0.7 miles east of the bridge at Kirk Road to the bridge at Crissey Avenue (Illinois Route 25 [IL 25]), where the third main line track would be located on the north side. A majority of the third main line track would occur within UP's existing right-of-way. However, approximately 7.02 acres of additional right-of-way and 8.4 acres of temporary construction and permit easements directly adjacent to the existing UP right-of-way would also be required to accommodate the third main line track.

A Section 7 Consultation and endangered species review for the proposed project was completed by Metra's project team consultant, Huff & Huff, Inc. (H&H) on May 20, 2016. Enclosed please find the Section 7 Consultation letter completed by H&H. In summary, H&H has made the following determinations regarding the presence of critical habitat or the following species which have been identified by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) as potentially occurring in DuPage and Kane counties.

Not affect

- Hine's emerald dragonfly (Somatochlora hineana)
- Leafy-prairie clover (Dalea foliosa)
- Northern long-eared bat (Myotis septentrionalis, NLEB)
- Eastern prairie-fringed orchid (Platanthera leucophaea),

Section 7 Consultation METRA Union Pacific West Line – 3rd Main Line Western Segment - Kress Road to Peck Road (M.P. 32.00 to M.P. 38.41) Kane and DuPage Counties, Illinois

- Prairie bush clover (Lespedeza leptostachya)
- Mead's milkweed (Asclepias meadii)

For the NLEB, as the lead Federal Agency, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has reviewed the determinations and the documentation prepared per the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), FTA, and FWS informal programmatic consultation agreement. The scoping worksheet, project submittal form, and bridge inspection forms are attached as required for consultation under the informal programmatic consultation agreement.

At this time METRA is requesting FWS review of the project. As the proposed project will not affect critical habitat or the above listed species and the FWS does issue concurrence on findings of no effect, it will be assumed the FWS does not object to findings of no effect if no response is received within 30 days.

Sincerely,

David F. Simmons Director, Grant Administration

Enclosures

Brian Stepp

From:	Greep, Anthony (FTA) <anthony.greep@dot.gov></anthony.greep@dot.gov>
Sent:	Monday, December 19, 2016 2:52 PM
To:	Brian Stepp
Subject:	RE: UP-W Third Main Western Section: Section 7 Documentation
Attachments:	image002.jpg; image003.png; image004.png; image005.jpg
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Flagged

Brian,

FTA has reviewed the Section 7 documentation and letter prepared by Metra's consultant for the UP-W Third Main Western Section and finds the materials to be acceptable. Please proceed with sending them to USFWS as noted.

Thank you,

Tony Greep

Community Planner US DOT – FTA Region 5 200 W. Adams, Suite 320 Chicago, IL 60606 (312) 353-1646 anthony.greep@dot.gov



Please consider the environment before printing this email. Thank you.

From: bstepp metrarr.com
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2016 10:44 AM
To: Greep, Anthony (FTA)
Subject: UP-W Third Main Western Section: Section 7 Documentation

The email message contained a ZIP attachment. The file was removed, as all ZIP files are temporarily blocked at this time. Other file types (e.g. Word, PowerPoint, PDF, etc.) can be received. If you recognize the sender and would like to view the attachment, please ask the sender to resend the message with a different file type, if possible. Tony,

Attached please find the documentation that has been prepared for the Section 7 consultation process with the USFWS for the UP-W Third Main Western Section NEPA process.

As was the case with the Eastern Section, a consultant has performed the research and analysis pursuant to USFWS guidelines, and has prepared documentation of their findings. We are providing this to FTA for your review and concurrence to be able to send it on to USFWS. I have also attached the email chain from the Eastern Section for your reference.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you, Brian

Brian T. Stepp Manager, Grant Applications Metra P: (312) 322-2805 | <u>bstepp@metrarr.com</u> 547 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60661



<u>Like</u> us on Facebook: <u>Metra</u> <u>Follow</u> us on Twitter: <u>@Metra</u> <u>Visit</u> us at <u>www.metrarail.com</u>



May 20, 2016

Mr. Andrew Roth Director, Design, Stations & Parking METRA 547 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60661

Re: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Section 7 Consultation METRA Union Pacific West Line – 3rd Main Line Western Section: Kress Road to Peck Road Kane County and DuPage County, Illinois T39N, R8E, Sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, & 12 T39N, R9E, Sections 7 & 8 41.883218°lat./ -87.366563°long. To 41.882959°lat./ -87.239230°long

Dear Mr. Roth:

The Union Pacific (UP) Railroad and METRA are proposing the installation of a third Main Line rail along the UP West line in the Cities of West Chicago and Geneva, Unincorporated Kane County and DuPage County, Illinois (T39N, R8E, Sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, & 12; T39N, R9E, Sections 7 & 8). Existing land use adjacent to the project area includes agricultural, residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, and undeveloped land. This project lies within the Fox River Watershed (HUC #07120007) and Des Plaines River Watershed (HUC #07120004).

Enclosed please find a site location map and wetland and "Waters of the U.S." (WOUS) location map as well as representative photographs from the field investigations.

This letter serves as the Section 7 Consultation and endangered species review for the proposed project. Based on the review of information provided by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS) website on May 20, 2016, as well as conditions observed in the field during the site visit, Huff & Huff, Inc. (H&H) has made the following determinations regarding the presence of critical habitat or the following species which have been identified by the FWS as potentially occurring in Kane and DuPage counties (Table 1).

Species	County ¹	Status	Habitat	Habitat Present within Project Limits?	Determination
Hine's emerald dragonfly (Somatochlora hineana)	D	Endangered	Spring fed wetlands, wet meadows and marshes	No	No effect
Leafy-prairie clover (Dalea foliosa)	D	Endangered	Prairie remnants on thin soil over limestone	No	No effect
Northern long-eared bat (Myotis septentrionalis)	D, K	Threatened ²	Caves, mines (hibernacula); wooded areas surrounding hibernacula; upland forests (foraging)	Yes	No effect
Eastern prairie fringed orchid (Platanthera leucophaea)	D, K	Threatened	Moderate to high quality wetlands, sedge meadow, marsh, and mesic to wet prairie	No	No effect
Mead's milkweed (<i>Asclepias meadii</i>)	D	Threatened	Late successional tallgrass prairie, tallgrass prairie converted to hay meadow, and glades or barrens with thin soil	No	No effect
Prairie bush clover (Lespedeza leptostachya)	D	Threatened	Dry to mesic prairies with gravelly soil	No	No effect

Table 1. FWS Federally Listed Species in DuPage and Kane Counties

 1 D = DuPage County, K = Kane County

¹ On January 15, 2016 the FWS issued the Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for the Northern Long-Eared Bat With 4(d) Rule; Final Rule. The final rule designates the northern longeared bat as federally threatened and the species-specific 4(d) rule exempts certain activities from the Endangered Species Act (ESA) prohibitions. The Final 4(d) Rule went into effect February 16, 2016.

The following summarizes the determinations of the review. Detailed surveys for the above listed species have not been conducted for this project.

Hine's Emerald Dragonfly

This project will *not affect* the Hine's emerald dragonfly as its suitable habitat of spring fed wetlands, wet meadows, and marshes are present in limited quantity within the project limits in DuPage County. Site 8 is a fen (groundwater fed wetland), however Site 8 is located within Kane County. The closest Hine's emerald dragonfly critical habitats (Critical Habitat Units 5 & 6; 50 CFR 17, September 5, 2007, Volume 72, No. 171/Wednesday) are located approximately 12.9 miles southwest of the proposed project limits. Larval habitat in the form of groundwater fed, shallow water slowly flowing through vegetation is not present within the project limits (USFWS, 2001 Hine's Emerald Dragonfly Recovery Plan). As the critical habitat is located approximately 13 miles from the project limits, outside the known adult dispersal range of up to 3.4 miles, foraging adults are not likely to be present. Therefore, due to the distance from known larval habitat direct impacts to the Hine's emerald dragonfly are not expected.

Leafy-prairie Clover

This project will *not affect* the leafy-prairie clover, as its suitable habitat of prairie remnants on thin soil over limestone, is not present within the project limits in DuPage County. Critical habitat rules have not been published for the leafy-prairie clover.

Northern-long Eared Bat

This project will *not affect* the northern long-eared bat (NLEB). The proposed project is located within the NLEB white nose buffer zone as defined by the FWS. Suitable winter habitat of caves and mines are not present within the project limits. However, suitable summer habitat, which includes live trees and snags with cavities and crevices, as well as bridges and culverts greater than four feet in diameter are present within the project limits. At this time no habitat surveys have been completed and tree removal has not been determined. As of January 2016 the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is part of the informal programmatic consultation agreement between the FWS, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)¹.

The 2016 Range-wide Indiana Bat Summer Survey Guidelines (FWS, 2016), which may be used for the NLEB, states that suitable habitat for this species includes "a wide variety of forested/wooded habitats where they roost, forage, and travel and may also include some adjacent and interspersed non-forested habitats such as emergent wetlands and adjacent edges of agricultural fields, old fields and pastures. This includes forests and woodlots containing potential roosts (i.e., live trees and/or snags \geq 3 inches [diameter at breast height; DBH] that have exfoliating bark, cracks, crevices, and/or cavities), as well as linear features such as fencerows, riparian forests, and other wooded corridors. These wooded areas may be dense or loose aggregates of trees with variable amounts of canopy closure. Individual trees may be considered suitable habitat when they exhibit characteristics of suitable roost trees and are within 1,000 feet of other forested/wooded habitat. NLEB has also been observed roosting in human-made structures, such as buildings, barns, bridges, and bat houses".

The project limits consist of a riparian corridor associated with two unnamed tributaries to Mill Creek, an unnamed tributary to Geneva Creek, Geneva Creek, the Fox River, three unnamed tributaries to the Fox River, Kress Creek South Canal, Kress Creek, and upland wooded areas. However, the project limits mostly encompass existing railroad right-of-way. Surveys were not performed to examine the trees for crack, holes, crevices, or other potentially suitable habitat, however they were noted during the site investigation.

Based on the 2016 Range-wide Indiana Bat Summer Survey Guidelines, which may be used for the NLEB, the FWS requires an assessment of the potential for adverse effects to the NLEB when the suitable habitat is present. If the project is not anticipated to result in adverse effects to the NLEB or adverse impacts can be adequately assessed and conservation measures can be designed to minimize those effects without additional presence/absence information, then no further summer surveys are necessary. Otherwise, if trees identified as potential habitat for the

¹ User's Guide for the Range-wide Programmatic Informal Consultation for Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat. Version 2.0, January 2016
NLEB within the project limits would need to be removed, the following restrictions apply to avoid direct impacts to the bat:

- If the project receives funding from the FHWA, FTA, or FRA the project must comply with the FHWA, FTA, and FRA programmatic agreement with the FWS. In addition, FHWA has agreed to restrict tree removal to between October 15 and March 31.
- If the project receives federal funding (except from the FHWA, FTA, or FRA) and does not remove a known occupied maternity roost tree, any tree within 150 feet of a known occupied maternity roost tree, or trees within 0.25 mile of a NLEB hibernacula during the pup rearing season which is a two-month period from June through July (50 CFR Part 17), incidental take is not prohibited and the findings of the programmatic biological opinion for the final 4(d) rule can be used.
- If the project does not utilize federal funds and does not remove a known occupied maternity roost tree, any tree within 150 feet of a known occupied maternity roost tree, or trees within 0.25 mile of a NLEB hibernacula during the pup rearing season which is a two-month period from June through July (50 CFR Part 17), the project qualifies for exemption under the Final 4(d) rule.

The project *will not affect* the northern long-eared bat if suitable roosting habitat is removed between the dates listed above depending on project funding. As of March 15, 2016 the USFWS has indicated no information of known occupied maternity roost trees are available within Kane and DuPage County. It is anticipated that the project will adhere to the tree clearing restriction dates (June through July). Coordination with agencies is recommended prior to tree removal to confirm the determination of affect, location of known occupied maternity roost trees, and whether tree clearing will be allowed. Attached please find the Project Submittal Form and Scoping Worksheet to be submitted to the FWS.

On January 5, 2016, the USFWS issued the *Programmatic Biological Opinion on Final* 4(d) *Rule for the Northern Long-Eared Bat and Activities Excepted from Take Prohibitions* (PBO) on their action of issuing the final 4(d) rule for the NLEB. The final 4(d) rule went into effect on February 16, 2016.

Bridge Habitat Assessment

For those projects with bridges, culverts, or any other structure over four feet tall that can serve as a roosting site, a preliminary inspection of the structure is required to confirm the presence or absence of bats. The methodology of the inspection follows the guidelines from *Appendix B*: *Bridge Inspection Guidance* of the *User's Guide for the Range-wide Programmatic Informal Consultation for Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat.*

Bridges and structures located along large bodies of water associated with wide floodplains generally provide suitable habitat for the NLEB and other bat species by providing areas to roost, a source of food, and mating opportunities. The NLEB find suitable roosting areas in cracks in concrete, expansion joints, and can congregate in areas where a cave-like environment is present. These areas are mostly associated with the substructure or lower portion of a bridge.

The bridge/structure guidelines focus on four indicators of bats, which include:

- Visual bats flying or roosting
- Audible chirping or high pitched squeaking.
- Physical droppings referred to as guano consisting of black or brown pellets, which accumulate underneath roosting location. Older guano appears grey in color. Guano can adhere to support beams and walls.
- Staining "wet" and dark looking stains may be visible on the walls, support beams, beneath joints and on the ceiling of bridge. Stains are typically in dark places. Stains are approximately four to six inches wide.

The identification of any of the above listed indicators is sufficient documentation to confirm recent bat usage. All indicators and observations of live or dead bats and their approximate location on the bridge or structure are recorded on a bridge/structure inspection form which attached to this letter. Photos and bridge inspection form from the inspection are also attached to this letter

Eastern Prairie Fringed Orchid

This project will *not affect* the eastern prairie fringed orchid. FWS guidance on determination of whether the eastern prairie fringed orchid may be present in the action area of the proposed project was followed and is described below.

The action area defined by the FWS includes all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the proposed construction, not just the immediate area involved in the action.

The action area within the project limits includes unnamed tributaries to Mill Creek, the Fox River, an unnamed tributary to Whites Creek, Kress Creek, and several wetlands as delineated by H&H on August 17, 18, 19, and 21, 2015 for this project. The action area located outside, but immediately adjacent to the project limits includes undeveloped forested area, commercial, residential, recreational, and agricultural land.

The action area does not support moderate to high quality wetlands, sedge meadow, and mesic to wet prairie; however the action area does support marshes.

The Wetland Location Map and representative photographs are attached with this letter. A summary of the dominant vegetation and floristic quality assessment (FQA) for wetlands within the project limits is provided in Table 2.

Site #	Wetland Type	Dominant Vegetation (All Strata)	Native FQI/ Native Mean C-Value	Number of EPFO Associate Species
1	Wet Meadow & Open Water Channel	Eastern cottonwood Elderberry Cherry sp. Reed canary grass Riverbank grape Virginia creeper	6.3/1.5	1
2	Wet Meadow	Silver maple Reed canary grass	1.4/1.0	0
3	Marsh & Unnamed Tributary to Mill Creek (WOUS)	Pale persicaria	6.3/1.9	0
4	Wet Meadow & Unnamed Tributary Mill Creek (WOUS)	Pale persicaria Common spikerush	1.7/1.0	0
5	Unnamed Tributary to Geneva Creek (WOUS)	Box elder	3.5/1.8	0
6	Scrub-shrub, Marsh, & Unnamed Tributary to the Fox River (WOUS)	Hackberry Common buckthorn Sandbar willow Narrow-leaved cattail Elderberry Reed canary grass Purple loosestrife Prairie cordgrass Dudley's rush Common spikerush Riverbank grape	13.3/2.3	3
7	Wet Meadow & Unnamed Tributary to the Fox River (WOUS)	White mulberry Sandbar willow Reed canary grass Purple loosestrife	5.8/1.7	2
8	Wet Meadow & Unnamed Tributary to the Fox River (WOUS)	Green ash Common reed Orange jewelweed Reed canary grass Sedge sp.	11.0/2.9	3
9	Marsh	Small duckweed	9.4/2.5	0
10	Wet Meadow	Silver maple Elderberry Gray dogwood Reed canary grass	10.2/2.2	3
11	Wet Meadow	Box elder Amur honeysuckle Reed canary grass	3.6/1.6	0

Table 2.	Wetland and	"Waters	of the U.S.	"Summary

F				4,
12	Marsh	Cockspur hawthorn Common reed	14.7/2.8	2
13	Forested	Eastern cottonwood Multiflora rose Common reed	Multiflora rose 2.5/1.3	
14	Wet Meadow	Reed canary grass Common spikerush	8.9/2.8	2
15	Wet Meadow	Blunt spike-rush Common reed	7.2/2.2	3
16	Marsh, Forested, Scrub-shrub, & Kress Creek South Canal (WOUS)	Sandbar willow Canada goldenrod Sawtooth sunflower Tall goldenrod Amur honeysuckle Common reed Riverbank grape	13.1/2.9	7
17	Forested	Silver maple Box elder Common buckthorn Reed canary grass Violet species	1.5/0.8	0
18	Fox River	None	4.5/1.8	0
19	Marsh	Peach-leaved willow Gray dogwood Narrow-leaved cattail	10.3/2.9	2
20	Kress Creek (WOUS)	Eastern cottonwood Reed canary grass 11.2/3.0 Common duckweed		1
21	Geneva Creek	Silver maple Box elder Common buckthorn Tatarian honeysuckle Common hackberry	3.3/1.3	0
22	Wet meadow	Eastern cottonwood Box elder Common buckthorn Reed canary grass	1.4/1.0	0

Wetlands with a native floristic quality index of 20 or greater and/or a native mean C-value of 3.5 or greater are not present. Species listed on the "Associate Plant Species List for the Eastern Prairie Fringed Orchid in Northeastern Illinois" are present within the project limits. As no wetland with the project limits are marshes, have a native floristic quality index of 20 or greater and/or a native mean C-value of 3.5 or greater, and have four or more associate species present, it was determined that wetlands within the project limits would not support the eastern prairie fringed orchid. Critical habitat rules have not been published for this species.

Mead's Milkweed

This project will *not affect* Mead's milkweed, as its suitable habitat, which includes late successional tallgrass prairies, tallgrass prairies converted to hay meadows, and glades or

barrens with thin soil, are not present within the project limits. Critical habitat rules have not been published for Mead's milkweed.

Prairie Bush Clover

This project will *not affect* the prairie bush clover, as its suitable habitat, which includes dry to mesic prairies with gravelly soil, are not present within the project limits. Critical habitat rules have not been published for the prairie bush clover.

In summary, the proposed project will *not affect* the Hine's emerald dragonfly, NLEB, leafyprairie clover, eastern prairie-fringed orchid, Mead's milkweed, and prairie bush clover. Additional coordination with the FWS is necessary to make a final NLEB effect determination. Additional coordination with the FWS is necessary to make a final NLEB effect determination. The scoping worksheet, project submittal form, and bridge inspection form is attached and should be submitted to the USFWS for the NLEB effect determination under the informal programmatic consultation agreement.

Detailed surveys were not conducted. This determination is based on information provided by the FWS through their Section 7 Consultation website as well as recent aerial and site photographs. If you have questions or require additional information, please contact me at 630-684-4416 or Evan.Markowitz@gza.com.

Sincerely,

Evan Machowitz

Evan Markowitz Project Manager/Senior Scientist

Enclosures



































Photo 1: Facing east at Wetland Site 1, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Randall Road.



Photo 3: Facing east at Wetland Site 1, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Randall Road.



Photo 2: Facing south at Wetland Site 1, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Randall Road.



Photo 4: Facing east at Wetland Site 1, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Randall Road.



Photo 5: Facing north from Wetland Site 2, north of the Metra UP West Line, west of Randall Road.



Photo 7: Facing east from Wetland Site 2, north of the Metra UP West Line, west of Randall Road.



Photo 6: Facing west towards Wetland Site 3, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Randall Road.



Photo 8: Facing west towards Wetland Site 3, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Randall Road.



Photo 9: Facing east towards Wetland Site 3, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Randall Road.



Photo 11: Facing south towards Wetland Site 3, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Randall Road.



Photo 10: Facing north towards Wetland Site 4, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Western Avenue.



Photo 12: Facing west at Wetland Site 4, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Western Avenue.



Photo 13: Facing west at Wetland Site 4, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Western Avenue.



Photo 15: Facing north towards Wetland Site 5, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Western Avenue.



Photo 14: Facing north towards Wetland Site 5, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Western Avenue.



Photo 16: Facing west towards Wetland Site 5, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Western Avenue.



Photo 17: Facing north towards Wetland Site 6, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kirk Road.



Photo 19: Facing south towards Wetland Site 6, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kirk Road.



Photo 18: Facing north towards Wetland Site 6, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kirk Road.



Photo 20: Facing north towards Wetland Site 6, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kirk Road.



Photo 21: Facing west towards Wetland Site 6, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kirk Road.



Photo 23: Facing south towards Wetland Site 7, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kirk Road.



Photo 22: Facing south towards Wetland Site 7, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kirk Road.



Photo 24: Facing west towards Wetland Site 7, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kirk Road.



Photo 25: Facing west towards Wetland Site 8, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kirk Road.



Photo 27: Facing west towards Wetland Site 8, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kirk Road.



Photo 26: Facing west towards Wetland Site 8, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kirk Road.



Photo 28: Facing southeast towards Wetland Site 8, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kirk Road.



Photo 29: Facing east towards Wetland Site 9, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Kirk Road.



Photo 31: Facing south towards Wetland Site 9, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Kirk Road.



Photo 30: Facing south towards Wetland Site 9, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Kirk Road.



Photo 32: Facing east towards Wetland Site 10, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Roosevelt Road.



Photo 33: Facing west towards Wetland Site 10, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Roosevelt Road.



Photo 35: Facing north towards Wetland Site 10, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Roosevelt Road.



Photo 34: Facing northwest towards Wetland Site 11, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Roosevelt Road.



Photo 36: Facing northwest towards Wetland Site 11, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Roosevelt Road.



Photo 37: Facing west towards Wetland Site 12, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 39: Facing east towards Wetland Site 12, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 38: Facing west towards Wetland Site 12, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 40: Facing north towards Wetland Site 12, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 41: Facing north towards Wetland Site 13, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 43: Facing east towards Wetland Site 13, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 42: Facing west towards Wetland Site 13, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 44: Facing north towards Wetland Site 14, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 45: Facing south towards Wetland Site 14, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 47: Facing west towards Wetland Site 14, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 46: Facing north towards Wetland Site 15, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Roosevelt Road.



Photo 48: Facing north towards Wetland Site 15, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Roosevelt Road.



Photo 49: Facing east towards Wetland Site 15, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Roosevelt Road.



Photo 51: Facing north towards Wetland Site 16, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 50: Facing west towards Wetland Site 16, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 52: Facing north towards Wetland Site 16, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 53: Facing south towards Wetland Site 16, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 55: Facing north towards Wetland Site 16, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 54: Facing south towards Wetland Site 16, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 56: Facing west towards Wetland Site 17, on the south side of the Metra UP West line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 57: Facing north towards Wetland Site 18, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Crissey Avenue.



Photo 59: Facing east towards Wetland Site 18, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Crissey Avenue.



Photo 58: Facing south towards Wetland Site 18, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Crissey Avenue.



Photo 60: Facing north towards Wetland Site 18, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Crissey Avenue.
METRA Union Pacific West Line (Kress Road to Peck Road M.P. 32.00 to M.P. 38.41) Cities of Geneva and West Chicago, Unincorporated Kane County, and DuPage County, Illinois Wetland and "Waters of the U.S." Investigation – August 17, 18, 19, and 21, 2015.



Photo 61: Facing east towards Wetland Site 19, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 63: Facing south towards Wetland Site 19, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 62: Facing east towards Wetland Site 19, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 64: Facing east towards Wetland Site 20, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Kress Road.

METRA Union Pacific West Line (Kress Road to Peck Road M.P. 32.00 to M.P. 38.41) Cities of Geneva and West Chicago, Unincorporated Kane County, and DuPage County, Illinois Wetland and "Waters of the U.S." Investigation – August 17, 18, 19, and 21, 2015.



Photo 65: Facing north towards Wetland Site 20, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Kress Road.



Photo 67: Facing north towards Wetland Site 20, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Kress Road.



Photo 66: Facing south towards Wetland Site 20, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Kress Road.



Photo 68: Facing north towards Wetland Site 20, on the north side of the Metra UP West Line, east of Kress Road.

METRA Union Pacific West Line (Kress Road to Peck Road M.P. 32.00 to M.P. 38.41) Cities of Geneva and West Chicago, Unincorporated Kane County, and DuPage County, Illinois Wetland and "Waters of the U.S." Investigation – August 17, 18, 19, and 21, 2015.



Photo 69: Facing north towards Wetland Site 21, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of S. 3rd Street.



Photo 71: Facing south towards Wetland Site 22, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of Kress Road.



Photo 70: Facing south towards Wetland Site 21, on the south side of the Metra UP West Line, west of S. 3rd Street.

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Range-wide Programmatic Informal Consultation for Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat

Project Submittal Form for FHWA, FRA, FTA, and Transportation Agencies *Updated February 2016*

In order to use the programmatic informal consultation to fulfill Endangered Species Act consultation requirements, transportation agencies must use this submittal form to submit project-level information for all may affect, not likely to adversely affect (NLAA) determinations to the appropriate U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) field office prior to project commencement. For more information, see the Standard Operating Procedure for Site Specific Project(s) Submission in the User's Guide.

In submitting this form, the transportation agency ensures that the proposed project(s) adhere to the criteria of the range-wide programmatic informal BA. Upon submittal of this form, the appropriate Service field office may review the site-specific information provided and request additional information. If the applying transportation agency is not notified within 14 calendar days of emailing the Project Submittal Form to the Service field office, it may proceed under the range-wide programmatic informal consultation.

Further instructions on completing the submittal form can be found by hovering your cursor over each text box.

- 1. Date: March 25, 2016
- 2. Lead Agency: FTA

This refers to the Federal governmental lead action agency initiating consultation; select FHWA or FRA as appropriate

- 3. Requesting Agency: FTA
 - a. Name: Anthony Greep
 - b. Title: Community Planner
 - c. Phone: (312) 353-1646
 - d. Email: anthony.greep@dot.gov
- 4. Consultation Code¹: N/A
- 5. Project Name(s): Union Pacific West Line 3rd Main Line Western Section: Kress Road to Peck Road

¹ Available through IPaC System Official Species List: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/</u>

6. Project Description:

Please attach additional documentation or explanatory text if necessary

The Union Pacific (UP) Railroad and METRA are proposing the installation of a third Main Line rail along the UP West line in the Cities of West Chicagc and Geneva, Unincorporated Kane County and DuPage County, Illinois. Existing land use adjacent to the project area includes agricultural, residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, and undeveloped land. All work will be conducted within or immediately adjacent (less then 100 feet) tc the existing track and UP right-of-way. A portion of the project involves the maintenance/rehabilitation of the UP bridge over the Fox River. Tree removal may be required for the installation of the third main line. If tree removal is required it will be conducted outside of the pup season (June 1 through July 31).

- 7. Other species from Official Species List:
 - ✓ No effect project(s) are inside the range, but no suitable habitat see additional information attached

May Affect – see additional information provided for those species (either attached or forthcoming

8. For Ibat/NLEB, if Applicable, Explain Your No Effect Determination

No effect – project(s) are outside the species' range (submittal form complete)

No effect – project(s) are inside the range but no suitable summer habitat (submittal form complete)

No effect – project(s) are completely within existing road/rail surface and <u>do not</u> <u>involve</u> percussive or other activities that increase noise above existing traffic/background levels (submittal form complete)

No effect – project(s) includes maintenance, alteration, or demolition of bridge(s)/structure(s) and indicate(s) no signs of bats <u>from results of a</u> <u>bridge/structure assessment</u> (submittal form complete)

No effect – project(s) do not involve construction activities (e.g., bridge assessments, property inspections, development of planning and technical studies, property sales, property easements, and equipment purchases) (submittal form complete)

Otherwise, please continue below.

9. For Ibat/NLEB, if Applicable, Explain Your May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect Determination (without implementation of AMMs)

NLAA – project(s) are inside the range but negative bat presence/absence (P/A) surveys (submittal form complete)

✓ NLAA – project(s) conducted completely within existing road/rail surface and involve percussive activities (submittal form complete)

NLAA – project(s) are within areas that contain suitable forested habitat but do not remove or alter trees (e.g., landscaping rest areas, mowing, brush removal, sign or guiderail replacement, and stormwater management) (submittal form complete)

NLAA – project(s) of slash pile burning (submittal form complete)

NLAA –wetland or stream protection activities are associated with wetland mitigation and do not clear suitable habitat (submittal form complete)

Otherwise, please continue below.

For Ibat/NLEB, if applicable, continue to complete the submittal form to explain your may affect, not likely to adversely affect determination (**with implementation of AMMs**)

10. Affected Resource/Habitat Type



Bridge

Other Non-Tree Roosting Structure (e.g., building)

Other (please explain):

11. For Tree Removal Projects:

- a. Please verify that no documented roosts or foraging habitat will be impacted and that project is within 100 feet of existing road surface:
- b. Please verify that all tree removal will occur during the inactive season²:
- c. Timing of clearing: August 1 through May 31.
- d. Amount of clearing: Undetermined at this time.

² Coordinate with local Service field office for appropriate dates.

12. For Bridge/Structure Work Projects:

- a. Proposed work:
- b. Timing of work:
- c. Evidence of bat activity on bridge/structure:
- d. If applicable, verify that superstructure work will not bother roosting bats in any way:
- e. If applicable, verify that bridge/structure work will occur only in the winter months:
- 13. Please confirm the following:

Proposed project(s) adhere to the criteria of the range-wide programmatic informal BA (see Section 2.0).

All applicable AMMs will be implemented, including³:

Tree Removal AMM 1:

Tree Removal AMM 2:

Tree Removal AMM 3:

Tree Removal AMM 4:

Bridge AMM 1:

Bridge AMM 2:

Bridge AMM 3:

Bridge AMM 4:

Structure AMM 1:

Structure AMM 2:

Structure AMM 3:

Structure AMM 4:

Lighting AMM 1:

Lighting AMM 2:

³ See AMMs Fact Sheet (Appendix C) for more information on the following AMMs.

SCOPING WORKSHEET

INDIANA BAT AND NORTHERN LONG-EARED BAT RANGE-WIDE PROGRAMMATIC INFORMAL CONSULTATION

Complete the following steps to determine whether a project is within the scope of the range-wide programmatic informal consultation and to identify potential project effects on either the Indiana bat or Northern long-eared bat. The following information is needed to complete this form: project scope (including any construction methods to be used), project location, habitat characterization, completed survey results, and Avoidance and Minimization Measures (AMMs) to be included in the project.

STEP 1: PROGRAMMATIC SCOPE (Users Guide p. 3)

If answers to any of these questions are "yes", the project is NOT covered by the range-wide programmatic informal consultation. Proceed no further in completing this worksheet. Separate consultation with the appropriate Service field office is necessary. If answers to all of the questions are "no", proceed with Step 2 of this Worksheet.

		Yes	No
1.	Will the project construct a new road corridor (new alignment, not minor realignments)?		Х
2.	Will project activities impact suitable forest habitat for bats > 100 feet from existing road/rail surfaces at any time of year (unless summer bat Presence/Probable Absence (P/A) surveys are negative)?	x	
3.	Will the project raise the road profile above the tree canopy within 1,000 feet of known summer habitat (based on documented roosts and/or captures)?		Х
4.	Is the project within 0.5 mile of hibernacula (including Indiana bat critical habitat) and 1) include construction activities extending outside the existing road/rail surface or 2) include construction activities wholly within the existing road/rail service but include percussive or other activities that increase noise above existing traffic/background levels?	х	
5.	Will the project clear suitable forest habitat at any distance from a road during the active season ¹ for bats (unless summer bat P/A surveys are negative)?	х	
6.	Will the project remove documented roosts or foraging areas/travel corridors (based on radio telemetry) <i>at any time of year</i> or remove trees within 0.25 miles of documented roosts <i>at any time of year</i> ?		х
7.	 Bridge Projects at any time of year: (a) Will the project remove a bridge with bat colonies known to be roosting under the bridge? (b) Will the project modify a bridge with bat colonies known to be roosting under the bridge so that it is no longer suitable for roosting? 		Х
8.	Will bridge or structure maintenance activities likely disturb bats while bats are documented to be present?		Х

STEP 2: POTENTIAL PROJECT EFFECTS

No Effect (NE) (User's Guide p. 4)

If answers to any of the criteria below are "yes" the project will have "No Effect" on the Indiana bat and/or NLEB. Stop here. Document "no effect" on the Project Submittal Form (Appendix B of the User Guide) and retain for your files. No coordination with the Service is required. If answers to any of the criteria below are "no", proceed with this Worksheet.

Check "NA" if the project will not involve the listed activity or condition.	Yes	No	N/A
1. Is the project(s) outside the species range, based on USFWS IPaC database?		Х	

¹ Coordinate with the local Service field office for active season dates.

2.	Is the project inside the range and outside 0.5 mile of hibernacula, but no suitable summer habitat is present (e.g., high-density urban area or non-forested areas)?		x	
3.	Are all project activities (anywhere, including within 0.5 miles of hibernacula) conducted completely within the existing road/rail surface and <u>do not involve</u> percussive or other activities that increase noise above existing traffic/background levels, such as blasting, use of pile drivers, rock drills, or hoe rams?		x	
4.	Does the project involve maintenance, alteration, or demolition of bridge/structures and the results of a bridge assessment indicate no signs of bats?	х		
5.	Does the project consist of non-construction activities (e.g., bridge assessment, property inspections, property sales, property easements, and equipment purchases?		x	

May Affect (MA) (User's Guide page 4)

If the answer to each of the criteria below is "true", assume the presence of Indiana bat and/or NLEB. Proceed with this Worksheet.

		True	False
1.	Project is in range of species, and	Х	
2.	Suitable habitat is present (for foraging, roosting, traveling, hibernating, swarming, nursing or other bat activities), and	Х	
3.	No bat surveys have been conducted or surveys are positive for presence of Indiana bat or NLEB.	Х	

If the answers to any of the criteria below are "yes" the project "May Affect" the Indiana bat and/or NLEB. Proceed with Step 3 of this Worksheet.

Do	es the project action involve any of the following activities?	Yes	No	Unknown
1.	Tree removal within suitable habitat	Х		
2.	Percussive activities that will increase noise above existing traffic/background levels (e.g., blasting, use of pile drivers, rock drills, or hoe rams)	х		
3.	Increased lighting, either temporary or permanent (e.g., construction lighting or permanent lighting installation as part of project)		х	
4.	Smoke/heat associated with burning brush piles		Х	
5.	Impacts to water bodies/wetlands where suitable bat habitat is present (e.g., piping a section of stream)	Х		
6.	Bridge or structure maintenance, repair or replacement at sites with bat activity			x

STEP 3: AVOIDANCE AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES (User's Guide page 5-6)

The next sets of questions will step through the process for determining whether a project "May Affect, but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect" the Indiana bat and/or NLEB. Avoidance and Minimization Measures (AMM's) may be required.

May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect (NLAA)

If answers to any of the questions below are "Yes", the project "May Affect, but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect" the Indiana bat and/or NLEB, and <u>IS</u> covered by the range-wide programmatic informal consultation. AMM's are <u>not</u> required for these activities. Document on the Project Submittal Form (Appendix B of the User Guide). If answers to any of these questions are "No" or "Unknown", proceed with this worksheet.

Do any of the conditions below describe the project?	Yes	No	Unknown
--	-----	----	---------

1.	Project is inside the range and in or near suitable habitat, but with negative bat P/A surveys. *If no bat surveys have been performed check "no" - presence of bats is to be assumed and AMM's will be required.		X	
2.	Work activities will be conducted completely within the existing road/rail surface and <u>involve percussive activities such as blasting</u> and use of pile drivers, rock drills, or hoe rams.	х		
3.	Work activities will take place in areas that contain suitable forested habitat, but no tree removal or habitat alteration will occur (e.g., landscaping rest areas, mowing, brush removal, sign or guardrail replacement, storm water management).		х	
4.	No slash pile burning will occur.	Х		
5.	Wetland or stream protection activities associated with mitigation that do not clear suitable habitat.		х	

May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect - AMMs Required

For the actions below, site-specific AMM(s) may be required to make the project NLAA for either bat species. If there is an applicable AMM, it MUST be implemented for the project to be eligible for use within the range-wide programmatic informal consultation. If an AMM listed below is not applicable (based on the type of action/effect), document why it is not applicable. For some projects, additional project-specific AMM(s) not listed below may be needed. If such additional AMM(s) are implemented, document them.

	Yes	No
TREE REMOVAL		
Will the project remove trees that are suitable maternity, roosting, foraging, or traveling habitat for Indiana Bat or NLEB? If "No", proceed to next activity.		
 Will tree removal at any time of year occur <u>entirely</u> within 100 feet of existing road surface? (Note: If "no", this action is not covered under the range-wide programmatic Informal consultation. Proceed no further with worksheet. Separate consultation with the appropriate Service field office is necessary.) 		
 Will documented roosts or foraging habitat (based on radio telemetry) be removed at any time of year? (Note: If "yes", this action is not covered under the range-wide programmatic informal consultation. Proceed no further with worksheet. Separate consultation with the appropriate Service field office is necessary.) 		
3. Will trees be removed within 0.25 miles of documented roosts <i>at any time of year</i> ? (Note: If "yes", this action is not covered under the range-wide programmatic informal consultation. Proceed no further with worksheet. Separate consultation with the appropriate Service field office is necessary.)		
Unless current surveys document that the species are not present, all of the AMMs listed below will be applied, unless not relevant (e.g., no bridge work will occur). Indicate on the project submittal form which of the following tree removal AMMs will be implemented.		
TREE REMOVAL AMM 1: Modify all phases/aspects of project (e.g. temporary work areas, alignments) to avoid tree removal in excess of what is required to implement project safely. (Note: If this cannot be applied, project can still be MANLAA as long as removal is in winter and avoids known roosts.)		
TREE REMOVAL AMM 2: Apply time of year restrictions for tree removal when bats are not likely to be present.		
TREE REMOVAL AMM 3 : Ensure tree removal is limited to that specified in project plans. Install bright orange flagging/fencing prior to any tree clearing		

to ensure contractors stay within clearing limits. Ensure that contractors understand the clearing limits and how they are marked in the field.	
TREE REMOVAL AMM 4: Avoid cutting down documented bat roosts that are still suitable for roosting or documented foraging habitat <i>at any time of year.</i>	
Avoid cutting down trees within 0.25 miles of documented roosts at any time	
of year. Ensure that suitable roosts remain on the landscape rather than	
focusing on general forest loss.	

*Note: "Trees" refers to trees that are suitable habitat for each species.

LIGHTING	Yes	No
1. Will the project involve the use of lighting during construction? <i>If "No", proceed to</i>		
next activity.		
2. Will the project action install permanent lighting? <i>If "No", proceed to next activity.</i>		
If the answer to either of above is "yes", indicate on the project submittal form which		
lighting AMM's will be implemented.		
LIGHTING AMM 1: Direct temporary lighting away from suitable habitat during		
construction.		
LIGHTING AMM 2: Use downward-facing, full cut-off lens lights, and direct lighting away		
from suitable habitat when installing new or replacing existing permanent lights.		

BRIDGE MAINTENANCE, ALTERATION OR REMOVAL	Yes	No
Does the project involve bridge maintenance, removal or other alteration? If "No", proceed to next activity.		
Unless current surveys or inspections document that the species are not present, the AMMs listed below will be applied, as appropriate. Indicate on the project submittal form which of the following AMMs will be implemented.		
BRIDGE AMM 1: Perform any bridge repair, retrofit, maintenance, and/or rehabilitation work outside of the active season. ²		
BRIDGE AMM 2: Bridge repair, retrofit, maintenance, and/or rehabilitation work outside of pup season (June 1 – July 31) will occur in the evening while the bats are feeding, starting one hour after sunset, and ending one hour before daylight excluding the hours between 10 pm and midnight. Lighting must be kept localized (See lighting AMM).		
BRIDGE AMM 3: If bridge repair, retrofit, maintenance, and/or rehabilitation work alters the bridge during the inactive season, then ensure suitable roosting sites remain after any bridge work. Suitable roosting sites may be incorporated into the design of a new bridge.		

STRUCTURE (ARTIFICIAL ROOSTS) MAINTENANCE, ALTERATION OR REMOVAL	Yes	No
Does the project involving any artificial roost such as a building, barn, shed, mobile		
home, telephone poles or other structure?		
Unless current surveys or inspections document that the species are not present, the		
AMMs listed below will be applied, as appropriate. Indicate on the project submittal		
form which of the following AMMs will be implemented.		
STRUCTURE AMM 1: If the goal of the project is to exclude bats, coordinate with the		
local Service field office.		

² Coordinate with the local Service field office for active season dates.

STRUCTURE AMM 2: Perform any maintenance and/or repair work outside of the		
active season.		
STRUCTURE AMM 3: If maintenance and/or repair work will be performed during the		
active season, determine if work will occur in an area with roosting bats. If so,		
coordinate with the local Service field office. If bat activity or signs of frequent bat		
activity are observed, avoid work or install bat exclusions or similar structure		
alteration during the active season, unless there are concerns about human		
health/safety/property and coordinate with the local USFWS Field Office and a		
nuisance wildlife control officer.		
STRUCTURE AMM 4: If bat activity or signs of frequent bat activity are observed, avoid		
structure removal unless there are concerns about human health/safety/property		
and coordinate with the local Service field office and a nuisance wildlife control	ļ	ĺ
officer.	ļ	ĺ

A project that involves these activities and implements all applicable AMMs "May Affect, but is not likely to Adversely Affect" the Indiana bat and/or NLEB. With the implementation of the applicable AMMs, the project <u>IS</u> covered by the range-wide programmatic informal consultation. Document on the Project Submittal Form (Appendix B of the User Guide).

Worksheet Prepared By:	_ Evan Markowitz	Huff & Huff, Inc	March 8, 2016_
	Name (Please print)	Firm/Organization	Date
Worksheet Reviewed By:			
	Name (Please print)	Firm/Organization	Date

om struc ir any sp(iquired. /	This form will be completed and submitted to the District Er either from the underside, from activities above that bore d from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worke for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT	Jbmitte tivities Ige/stru ved fror e under	d to the L above th: icture to t m work sc rtaken by	District Env at bore do be worked chedules u the DOT to	rironmenta wn to the on must h ntil such ti o determir	al Manager underside, lave a curre ime that th te what spi	 by the Colling that colling the bound of the colling the colling	This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing structures prior to allowing any work to proceed.	Jelow the dec removal on t cted of provi nd Wildlife 56 any work to	ck surrace oridges, or ding habita ervice, if proceed.	
DOT Project #		Water Body Kress Creek	ek ek			Date/Time 04/21/2016	Date/Time of Inspection 34/21/2016 9:35 am	spection am			
Route:	County:	Federal	Federal Structure ID:	Bat Indicators Check all that	cators I that apply	. Presence	of one or n	Bat Indicators Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.	at bats may b	e using the	structure.
UPRR				Visual	Sound	Droppings	Staining	Notes: (e.g.,number & species of bats, if known)	bats, if knov	(un	
IP 32.05	MP 32.05 DuPage			None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present within the Kress Creek culvert under the Metra UP West Line.	thin the Kres	ss Creek cu	livert und
eas Insp	Areas Inspected (Check all that apply)	(Ala									
	Bridges			Culve	rts/Othe	Culverts/Other Structures	res	Summary Info (circle all that apply)	apply)		
All vertic and 0.5-1	All vertical crevices sealed at the top and 0.5-1.25" wide & ≥4" deep		N/A	Crevice	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	urfaces or concrete	<u>`</u>	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Low	None
All crevic	All crevices >12" deep & not sealed		N/A	Spaces b	etween wall:	between walls, ceiling joists	2	Possible corridors for netting N	None/poor	Marginal	xcellent
All guardrails	Irails	Z	N/A				_	Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	ON	
All expar	All expansion joints	Z	N/A								

ŝ
0
2
~ ~
-
9
<

Spaces between concrete end walls N/A and the bridge deck	
Vertical surfaces on concrete I- N/A beams	
Inspection Conducted By: L. Herrera (H&H)	Signature(s): An Man
District Environmental Use Only:	Date Received by District Environmental Manager:

Г

T

- the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of whether inventories have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, Inventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in a negative result in one year does not guarantee that ba's will not use that structure in subsequent years. ÷
- Contractors must complete this form no more than seven (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/structure location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environmental Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit this information will result in that structure being removed from the planned work schedule. N
 - obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing each Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing any work to proceed. m.
 - Estimates of numbers of bats observed should be place in the Notes column. 4. 10
 - Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager.

Bridge Inspection Form

from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing structures prior to allowing any work to proceed.

Project #	Water Body	Date/Time of Inspection
Z	IA	04/21/2016 9:40 am

Route:	Route: County:	Federal	Bat Indic	Indicators			
		Structure ID:	Check all	that apply	. Presence (of one or m	Structure ID: Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.
UPRR			Visual	Sound	Droppings	Staining	Notes: (e.g.,number & species of bats, if known)
MP 32.08	MP 32.08 DuPage		None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present at the service/access road bridge adjacent to Kress Road.

Bridges		Culverts/Other Structures	Summary Info (circle all that apply)	at apply)		
All vertical crevices sealed at the top and 0.5-1.25″ wide & ≥4″ deep	2	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Low	None
All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	2	Spaces between walls, ceiling joists	Possible corridors for netting	None/poor Marginal	Marginal	excellent
All guardrails	>		Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	ON	
All expansion joints	7					

	Spaces between concrete end walls and the bridge deck	2		
Ver	Vertical surfaces on concrete I- beams	>		
l ns	Inspection Conducted By: L. Herrera & E. Markowitz (H&H	& E. Markowitz (H&H	Signature(s): Ar 12	the way
Dis	District Environmental Use Only:		Date Received by District Environmental Manager:	il Manager:
	 Inventories must be completed prior to conduct the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regard a negative result in one year does not guarantities. Contractors must complete this form no more this document must be provided to the District 	Inducto conducting any work pero- litation, regardless of whether in s not guarantee that ba ts will n d orm no more than seven (7) busi to the District Environmental Ma	Inventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all prioges that meet the physical characteristics described in the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of whether inventories have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, a negative result in one year does not guarantee that bars will not use that structure in subsequent years. Contractors must complete this form no more than seven (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/structure location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environmental Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit	ysical characteristics described in the transitory nature of bat use, ucture location. Legible copies of he inspection. Failure to submit
	this information will result in that structure being remove J from the planned work schedule. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for any species of bat will be removed fr obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by th 	structure being remove J from t f providing habitat for any specie NS, if required. Additional studie	this information will result in that structure being remove J from the planned work schedule. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing each	l such time that the DOT has at species may be utilizing each
	 Estimates of numbers of bats observed should be place in the Notes column. 	uats prior to anowing any work to proceed erved should be place in the Notes column.	to proceed. es column.	
_	5 Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager	to the District Environmental M	nager	

Bridge Inspection Form

from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing structures prior to allowing any work to proceed.

	e/Time of Inspection
N/A 04/2	l/21/2016 9:40 am

Route:	Route: County:	Federal	Bat Indica	Indicators			
		Structure ID:	Check all	that apply.	Presence c	of one or m	Structure ID: Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.
UPRR			Visual	Sound	Droppings	Staining	Notes: (e.g.,number & species of bats, if known)
MP 32.10	MP 32.10 DuPage		None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present at the Kress Road Bridge over the Metra UP West Line.

Bridges		Culverts/Other Structures	Summary Info (circle all that apply)	at apply)		
All vertical crevices sealed at the top and 0.S-1.2S" wide & ≥4" deep	2	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Low	None
All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	2	Spaces between walls, ceiling joists	Possible corridors for netting	None/poor Marginal	Marginal	excellent
All guardrails	2		Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	ON	
All expansion joints	2					4

S
0
N
H
a
Ā

Spaces between concrete end walls and the bridge deck	>	
Vertical surfaces on concrete I- beams	2	
Inspection Conducted By: L. Herrera & E. Markowitz (H&H)	t E. Markowitz (H&H)	Signature(s): An Ahr
		Even philitic
District Environmental Use Only:		Date Received by District Environmental Manager:

1

- the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of whether inventories have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, Inventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in a negative result in one year does not guarantee that bais will not use that structure in subsequent years. ц,
- Contractors must complete this form no more than seven (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/structure location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environmental Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit this information will result in that structure being removed from the planned work schedule. in
 - obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to deterrnine what species may be utilizing each Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for ary species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing ar y work to proceed. m
 - Estimates of numbers of bats observed should be place in the Notes column.
 - Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager. 4. 10

Bridge Inspection Form

from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing structures prior to allowing any work to proceed. DOT Project # Water Body for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, if

nul Project #		water body		Date/ Lime of Inspection
	×	Kress Creek South Canal	Canal	04/20/2016 9:15 am
Route:	Route: County:	Federal	Bat Indicators	
		Structure ID:	Check all that apply. P	Structure ID: Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.

Route:	Route: County:	Federal	Bat Indicators	ators			
		Structure ID:	Check all	that apply	Presence (of one or m	Structure ID: Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.
UPRR			Visual	Sound	Droppings	Staining	Notes: (e.g.,number & species of bats, if known)
MP 32.30	MP 32.30 DuPage		None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present within the Kress Creek South Canal culvert under the Metra UP West Line.

Bridges		Culverts/Other Structures		Summary Info (circle all that apply)	at apply)		
All vertical crevices sealed at the top N/A and 0.S-1.25" wide & ≥4" deep	N/A	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	2	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	TOW	None
All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	N/A	Spaces between walls, celling joists	>	Possible corridors for netting	None/poor Marginal	Marginal	excellent
All guardrails	N/A			Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	NO	
All expansion joints	N/A						

April 17, 2015

Spaces between concrete end walls	NIA	
and the bridge deck		
Vertical surfaces on concrete I-	N/A	
beams		
		de Ma
Inspection Conducted By: L. Herrera & E. Markowitz (H&H)	era & E. Markowitz (H&H)	Signature(s):
		Evan 12 alura
District Environmental Use Only:		Date Received by District Environmental Manager:

- the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of whether inventories have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, Inventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in a negative result in one year does not guarantee that ba's will not use that structure in subsequent years. H
- Contractors must complete this form no more than seven (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/structure location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environmental Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit this information will result in that structure being removed from the planned work schedule. 3
 - obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing each Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for a ny species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing any work to proceed. 'n
- Estimates of numbers of bats observed should be place in the Notes column.
- Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager. 4. 10.

Bridge Inspection Form

from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing structures prior to allowing any work to proceed.

00T Project #	Water Body	Date/Time of Inspection
	N/A	04/21/2016 9:40 am

Route: County:	County:	Federal	Bat Indic	dicators			
		Structure ID: Check		that apply.	Presence (of one or m	all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.
UPRR			Visual	Sound	Droppings	Staining	Notes: (e.g.,number & species of bats, if known)
MP 33.15 Kane	Kane		None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present at the Roosevelt Road Bridge over the Metra UP West Line.

Bridges		Culverts/Other Structures	Summary Info (circle all that apply)	at apply)		
All vertical crevices sealed at the top and 0.5-1.25" wide & ≥4" deep	2	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Low	None
All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	2	Spaces between walls, ceiling joists	Possible corridors for netting	None/poor Marginal	Marginal	excellent
All guardrails	>		Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	ON	
All expansion joints	7					

S,
C
0
N
~
_
Ξ.
0
A

Spaces between concrete end walls and the bridge deck	>	
Vertical surfaces on concrete I- beams	2	
Inspection Conducted By: L. Herrera & E. Markowitz (H&H	a & E. Markowitz (H&H	Signature(s) a Alfan
		Even Illatran
District Environmental Use Only:		Date Received by District Environmental Manager:

- the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of whether inventories have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, Inventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in a negative result in one year does not guarantee that bars will not use that structure in subsequent years. ÷
- Contractors must complete this form no more than seven (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/structure location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environmental Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit this information will result in that structure being removed from the planned work schedule. ц.
- obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing each Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing any work to proceed. 'n
 - Estimates of numbers of bats observed should be place in the Notes column.
 - Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager. 4. r.

Bridge Inspection Form

from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing structures prior to allowing any work to proceed. for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, if

DOT Project #	Water Body	Date/Time of Inspection
	N/A	04/21/2016 10:53 am

Route: County:	County:	Federal	Bat Indic	Indicators			
		Structure ID:	Check all	that apply	Presence (of one or m	Structure ID: Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.
UPRR			Visual	Sound	Droppings	Staining	Notes: (e.g.,number & species of bats, if known)
MP 33.90 Kane	Kane		None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present at the Kirk Road Bridge over the Metra UP West Line.

Bridges		Culverts/Other Structures	Summary Info (circle all that apply)	at apply)		
All vertical crevices sealed at the top and 0.5-1.25" wide & ≥4" deep	2	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Low	None
All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	2	Spaces between walls, ceiling joists	Possible corridors for netting	None/poor Marginal	Marginal	excellent
All guardrails	2		Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	ON	
All expansion joints	7					

S.
-
0
2
~
~
-
Ξ.
Q
<

Spaces between concrete end walls and the bridge deck	>	
Vertical surfaces on concrete I- beams	2	
Inspection Conducted By: L. Herrera & E. Markowitz (H&H	a & E. Markowitz (H&H	Signature(s): An Blun
		Even What
District Environmental Use Only:		Date Received by District Environmental Manager:

- the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of whether inventories have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, Inventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in a negative result in one year does not guarantee that bars will not use that structure in subsequent years. ÷
- Contractors must complete this form ro more than seven (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/structure location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environmental Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit this information will result in that structure being removed from the planned work schedule. 2 i
 - obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing each Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing any work to proceed. m;
- Estimates of numbers of bats observed should be place in the Notes column. 4 10
 - Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager.

Bridge Inspection Form

from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing structures prior to allowing any work to proceed. for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, if

DOT Project #	Water Body	Date/Time of Inspection
	Unnamed tributary to the Fox River	04/21/2016 11:00 am

Route:	Route: County:	Federal	Bat Indic	ndicators			
		Structure ID:	Check all	that apply.	Presence c	one or m	Structure ID: Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.
UPRR			Visual	Sound	Droppings	Staining	Notes: (e.g.,number & species of bats, if known)
MP 34.07 Kane	Kane		None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present within the unnamed tributary to the Fox River culvert under the Metra UP West Line.

Bridges		Culverts/Other Structures	10	Summary Info (circle all that apply)	at apply)		
All vertical crevices sealed at the top N/A and 0.5-1.25" wide & ≥4" deep	V/N	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	2	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Low	None
All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	N/A	Spaces between walls, ceiling joists	2	Possible corridors for netting	None/poor	Marginal	excellent
All guardrails	N/A			Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	NO	
All expansion joints	N/A						

ŝ
E
0
2
5
Ξ
Ξ.
•
<

	and a state of the	
Spaces between concrete end walls and the bridge deck	N/A	
Vertical surfaces on concrete I- beams	N/A	
Inspection Conducted By: <u>L. Herr</u> era & E. Markowitz (H&H)	era & E. Markowitz (H&H)	Signature(s): An Min Evan Mahoon
District Environmental Use Only:		Date Received by District Environmental Manager:

T

- the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of wr ether inventories have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, Inventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in a negative result in one year does not guarantee that ba's will not use that structure in subsequent years. ÷
- Contractors must complete this form no more than seven (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/structure location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environmental Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit this information will result in that structure being remove 1 from the planned work schedule. ц.
 - obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing each Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing any work to proceed. m.
 - Estimates of numbers of bats observec should be place in the Notes column. 4 5
 - Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager.

Bridge Inspection Form

from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing structures prior to allowing any work to proceed.

The set of the Fox Binst redeated and A M A M A M A Set of the A Set o	DOT Project #	Water Body	Date/Time of Inspection
		I lanomod tributony to the Fex Diver under sour	÷

Route:	Route: County:	Federal	Bat Indic	ndicators			
		Structure ID:	Check all	that apply	Presence c	of one or m	Structure ID: Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.
UPRR			Visual	Sound	Droppings	Staining	Notes: (e.g.,number & species of bats, if known)
MP 34.07 Kane	Kane		None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present within the unnamed tributary to the Fox River culvert under the Metra UP West Line.

Bridges		Culverts/Other Structures		Summary Info (circle all that apply)	at apply)		
All vertical crevices sealed at the top N/A and 0.5-1.25" wide & ≥4" deep	N/A	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	7	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Low	None
All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	N/A	Spaces between walls, ceiling joists	2	Possible corridors for netting	None/poor	Marginal	excellent
All guardrails	N/A			Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	No	
All expansion joints	N/A						



Spaces between concrete end walls and the bridge deck	N/A	
Vertical surfaces on concrete I- beams	N/A	
Inspection Conducted By: L. Herrera & E. Markowitz (H&H	era & E. Markowitz (H&H)	Signature(s): Nan Afra- Evan Mahad
		1

Date Received by District Environmental Manager:

DOT Bat Inspection Form Instructions

District Environmental Use Only:

- the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of whether inventories have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, Inventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in a negative result in one year does not guarantee that bais will not use that structure in subsequent years. ij.
 - Contractors must complete this form no more than seven (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/structure location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environmental Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit this information will result in that structure being removed from the planned work schedule. 3
 - obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing each Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for ary species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing ary work to proceed. m.
 - Estimates of numbers of bats observed should be place in the Notes column. 4. 10
 - Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager.

Bridge Inspection Form

from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing structures prior to allowing any work to proceed. Date/Time of Inspection Water Body DOT Project #

	5	Jnnamed tributary to	to the Fox River	04/21/2016 11:40 am
Route:	Route: County:	Federal	Bat Indicators	
		Structure ID: C	Check all that apply. F	check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.

Route:	Route: County:	Federal	Bat Indic:	Indicators			
		Structure ID:	Check all	that apply.	Presence c	of one or m	Structure ID: Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.
UPRR			Visual	Sound	Droppings Staining	Staining	Notes: (e.g.,number & species of bats, if known)
MP 34.54 Kane	Kane		None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present within the unnamed tributary to the Fox River culvert under the Metra UP West Line.

Bridges		Culverts/Other Structures		Summary Info (circle all that apply)	at apply)		
All vertical crevices sealed at the top N/A and 0.5-1.25" wide & ≥4" deep	A/A	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	2	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Low	None
All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	N/A	Spaces between walls, ceiling joists	2	Possible corridors for netting	None/poor Marginal	Marginal	excellent
All guardrails	N/A			Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	No	
All expansion joints	N/A						

ŝ
-
0
N
~
-
-
Ξ.
Q
4

Spaces between concrete end walls and the bridge deck	N/A	
Vertical surfaces on concrete I- beams	NA	
Inspection Conducted By: L. Herrera & E. Markowitz (H&H	ara & E. Markowitz (H&H	Signature(s):
		Evan Marlow PE
District Environmental Use Only:		Date Received by District Environmental Manager:

Date Received by District Environmental Manager:

- the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of wh ether inventories have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, Inventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in a negative result in one year does not guarantee that bars will not use that structure in subsequent years. ÷
 - Contractors must complete this form no more than seven (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/structure location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environmental Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit this information will result in that structure being removed from the planned work schedule. сi
 - obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing each Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing any work to proceed. m
 - Estimates of numbers of bats observed should be place in the Notes column. 4 10
 - Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager.

Bridge Inspection Form

from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing structures prior to allowing any work to proceed.

DOT Project #	Water Body	Date/Time of Inspection
	NA	04/21/2016 12:50 pm

Route:	Route: County:	Federal	Bat Indici	ndicators			
		Structure ID:	Check all	that apply.	. Presence c	of one or m	Structure ID: Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.
UPRR			Visual	Sound	Droppings	Staining	Notes: (e.g., number & species of bats, if known)
MP 35.00 Kane	Kane		None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present at the Crissey Avenue (IL 25) Bridge over the Metra UP West Line.

Bridges		Culverts/Other Structures	Summary Info (circle all that apply)	at apply)		
All vertical crevices sealed at the top and 0.5-1.25" wide & ≥4" deep	N/A	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Low	None
All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	N/A	Spaces between walls, ceiling joists	Possible corridors for netting	None/poor	Marginal	excellent
All guardrails	2		Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	No	
All expansion joints	2					

S
Η
0
2
2
17
il 17
ril 17
pril 17

Spaces between concrete end walls	>		
and the bridge deck			
Vertical surfaces on concrete I-			
beams	2		
		Ham Man	
Inspection Conducted By: L. Herrera & E. Markowitz (H&H	a & E. Markowitz (H&H)	Signature(s): (2)	

District Environmental Use Only:

Date Received by District Environmental Manager:

- the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of whether inventories have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, Inventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in a negative result in one year does not guarantee that bats will not use that structure in subsequent years. ÷
- Contractors must complete this form no more than seven (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/struct. I location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environmental Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit this information will result in that structure being removed from the planned work schedule. N
 - obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Addition: I studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing each Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for ary species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing ary work to proceed. 'n
- Estimates of numbers of bats observed should be place in the Notes column.
- Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager. 4 10

Bridge Inspection Form

from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing structures prior to allowing any work to proceed.

DOT Project #	Water Body	Date/Time of Inspection	
	Fox River	04/21/2016 2:30 pm	

Route:	Route: County:	Federal	Bat Indic	ndicators			
		Structure ID:	Check all	that apply	. Presence	of one or m	Structure ID: Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.
UPRR			Visual	Sound	Droppings	Staining	Notes: (e.g., number & species of bats, if known)
MP 35.20 Kane	0 Kane		None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present at the Metra UP West Line Bridge over the Fox River.

Bridges		Culverts/Other Structures	Summary Info (circle all that apply)	at apply)		
All vertical crevices sealed at the top and 0.S-1.2S" wide & ≥4" deep	2	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Low	None
All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	2	Spaces between walls, ceiling joists	Possible corridors for netting	None/poor Marginal	Marginal	excellent
All guardrails	>		Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	ON	
All expansion joints	7					

S
-
0
N
2
-
Ē
a
A

Spaces between concrete end walls and the bridge deck	>	
Vertical surfaces on concrete I- beams	>	
Inspection Conducted By: L. Herrera & E. Markowitz (H&H)	a & E. Markowitz (H&H)	Signature(s): Ann Mahm
District Environmental Use Only:		Date Received by District Environmental Manager:

- the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of whether inventories have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, Inventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in a negative result in one year does not guarantee that bats will not use that structure in subsequent years. ÷
- Contractors must complete this form no more than sever (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/structure location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environmental Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit this information will result in that structure being removed from the planned work schedule. ц.
 - obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing each Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing any work to proceed. m
 - Estimates of numbers of bats observed should be place in the Notes column.
 - Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager. 4 5

Bridge Inspection Form

from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing structures prior to allowing any work to proceed.

N/A 04/21/2016 2:40 pm	N/A 04/21/2016 2:40 pm	Water Body	Date/Time of Inspection
		N/A	04/21/2016 2:40 pm

Route:	Route: County:	Federal	Bat Indica	ndicators			
		Structure ID:	Check all	that apply.	Presence c	of one o r m	Structure ID: Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.
UPRR			Visual	Sound	Droppings	Staining	Notes: (e.g.,number & species of bats, if known)
MP 35.30 Kane	Kane		None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present at the Metra UP West Line Bridge over S. 1st Street.

Bridges		Culverts/Other Structures	Summary Info (circle all that apply)	at apply)		
All vertical crevices sealed at the top and 0.5-1.2S" wide & ≥4" deep	2	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Low	None
All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	7	Spaces between walls, ceiling joists	Possible corridors for netting	None/poor Marginal	Marginal	excellent
All guardrails	2		Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	ON	
All expansion joints	7					

April 17, 2015

Spaces between concrete end walls	Vertical surfaces on concrete I-	Inspection Conducted By: L. Herrera & E. Markowitz (H&H	District Environmental Use Only:
		Signature(s):	Date Received by District Environmental Manager:

- the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of whether inventories have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, Inventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in a negative result in one year does not guarantee that ba's will not use that structure in subsequent years. ÷
- Contractors must complete this form no more than seven (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/structure location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environmental Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit this information will result in that structure being removed from the planned work schedule. N
 - obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing each Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing any work to proceed. m
 - Estimates of numbers of bats observed should be place in the Notes column.
 - Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager. 4. 10
Bridge Inspection Form

from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing structures prior to allowing any work to proceed. for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, if

nul Project #	# 1	water body		Date/ Lime of Inspection
	0	Geneva Creek		04/20/2016 4:00 pm
Route: Col	County:	Federal	Bat Indicators	

Route:	Route: County:	Federal	Bat Indicators	ators			
		Structure ID:	Check all	that apply.	Presence (of one or m	Structure ID: Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.
UPRR			Visual	Sound	Droppings	Staining	Notes: (e.g.,number & species of bats, if known)
MP 35.60 Kane	Kane		None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present within the Geneva Creek culvert under the Metra UP West Line.

Bridges		Culverts/Other Structures	5	Summary Info (circle all that apply)	at apply)		
All vertical crevices sealed at the top N/A and 0.5-1.25″ wide & ≥4″ deep	N/A	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	>	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Low	None
All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	N/A	Spaces between walls, ceiling joists	2	Possible corridors for netting	None/poor	Margina	excellent
All guardrails	N/A			Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	ON	
All expansion joints	N/A						

April 17, 2015

Vertical surfaces on concrete I- N/A beams Inspection Conducted By: <u>L. Herrera & N. Pisula (H&H)</u> Signature(s): ²	
	ignature(s): And And
Distaints Environmental I lea Ombre	Data Bacalvad hu Nictrict Environmental Manager

T

- the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of whether inventories have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, Inventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in a negative result in one year does not guarantee that ba's will not use that structure in subsequent years. ÷
- Contractors must complete this form no more than seven (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/structure location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environmental Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit this information will result in that structure being removed from the planned work schedule. 2
 - obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing each Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for a 1y species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing any work to proceed. m.
 - Estimates of numbers of bats observed should be place in the Notes column.
 - Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager. 4 10

his form ither fron om struct or any spe	DI This form will be completed and submitted to the District Enviro either from the underside, from activities above that bore down from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until corning Additional studies much undershow with DOT to d	nd submitt m activitie bridge/st emoved fr	ted to the [es above th ructure to] om work su	District Env at bore dov be worked chedules u	Bridge I ironmental wn to the u on must ha ntil such tir	idge Inspection Form mental Manager by the Cont to the underside, or that coul must have a current bridge in such time that the DOT has of	on Forn by the Con or that cou nt bridge i	This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the U5 Fish and Wildlife Service, if	k below the dec ck removal on b spected of provi of and Wildlife Se	:k surface oridges, or ding habitat ervice, if	
DOT Project #	ject #	Water Body None	Sody			Date/1	Date/Time of Inspection 04/21/2016 1:10 pm	DOT Project # Water Body Date/Time of Inspection None 04/21/2016 1:10 pm		procesa.	
Route:	County:	Fed	Federal Structure ID:	Bat Indicators Check all that	ators that apply.	Presence	of one or n	Bat Indicators Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.	that bats may b	e using the s	structure.
UPRR				Visual	Sound	Droppings	Staining	Notes: (e.g., number & species of bats, if known)	of bats, if knov	vn)	
MP 36.35 Kane	Kane			None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present within the culvert under the Metra UP West Line.	t within the culv	ert under th	ne Metra
reas Insp	Areas Inspected (Check all that apply)	t apply)									
	Bridges	S		Culverts/	ts/Other	Other Structures	es	Summary Info (circle all that apply)	at apply)		
All vertic and 0.5-1	All vertical crevices sealed at the top and 0.5-1.25" wide & ≥4" deep		N/A	Crevice imperf	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	Irfaces or oncrete	>	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Tow	None
All crevic	All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	sealed	N/A	Spaces be	Spaces between walls, ceiling joists	ceiling joists	2	Possible corridors for netting	None/poor	Marginal	excellent
All guardrails	rails		N/A					Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	ON)	
All expan	All expansion joints		N/A								

ഹ
-
0
2
-
=
_
d

Spaces between concrete end walls and the bridge deck	N/A	
Vertical surfaces on concrete I- beams	N/A	
Inspection Conducted By: L. Herrera & E. Markowitz (H&H	a & E. Markowitz (H&H	Signature(s): A - April 5
District Environmental Use Only:		Date Received by District Environmental Manager:

- the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of whether inventories have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, Inventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in a negative result in one year does not guarantee that bars will not use that structure in subsequent years. ÷,
- Contractors must complete this form no more than seven (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/structure location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environmuntal Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit this information will result in that structure being removed from the planned work schedule. 2
 - obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing each Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing any work to proceed. m
- Estimates of numbers of bats observed should be place in the Notes column.
- Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager. 4 5

Bridge Inspection Form

from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, if

		Water boury		
	<u>5</u>	Unnamed tributary to Mill Creek	to Mill Creek	04/21/2016 1:40 pm
	-			
Route:	Route: County:	Federal	Bat Indicators	
		Structure ID:	Check all that apply.	Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.

Koute:	Koute: County:	Federal	Bat Indicators	tors			
		Structure ID:	Check all t	hat apply.	. Presence (of one or m	Structure ID: Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.
UPRR			Visual	Sound	Droppings Staining	Staining	Notes: (e.g.,number & species of bats, if known)
MP 36.80 Kane	Kane		None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present within the unnamed tributary to Mill Creek culvert under the Metra UP West Line.

Bridges		Culverts/Other Structures	10	Summary Info (circle all that apply)	at apply)		
All vertical crevices sealed at the top N/A and 0.5-1.25" wide & ≥4" deep	N/A	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	>	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Low	None
All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	N/A	Spaces between walls, ceiling joists	2	Possible corridors for netting	None/poor	Marginal	excellent
All guardrails	N/A			Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	ON	
All expansion joints	N/A						

S
-
0
2
-
=
a
A

Spaces between concrete end walls and the bridge deck	N/A	
Vertical surfaces on concrete I- beams	N/A	
Inspection Conducted By: L. Herrera & E. Markowitz (H&H)	era & E. Markowitz (H&H)	Signature(s): An Maharith

Date Received by District Environmental Manager:

DOT Bat Inspection Form Instructions

District Environmental Use Only:

- the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of whether inventories have beeh conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, Irventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in a negative result in one year does not guarantee that bais will not use that structure in subsequent years. ÷.
 - Contractors must complete this form no more than seven (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/structure location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environmental Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit this information will result in that structure being remove I from the planned work schedule. ц.
- ootained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Addition al studies may be undertaken by the DOT to deterrnine what species may be utilizing each Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitar for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing ar y work to proceed. 'n
- Estimates of numbers of bats observed should be place in the Notes column.
- Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager. 4. 10

Bridge Inspection Form

from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing structures prior to allowing any work to proceed.

DOT Project #	Water Body	Date/Time of Inspection
	NA	04/21/2016 1:45 pm

Route:	Route: County:	Federal	Bat Indic	ndicators			
		Structure ID:	Check all	that apply.	Presence c	of one or m	Structure ID: Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.
UPRR			Visual	Sound	Droppings	Staining	Notes: (e.g., number & species of bats, if known)
MP 37.05 Kane	Kane		None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present at Randall Road Bridge over the Metra UP West Line

Bridges		Culverts/Other Structures	Summary Info (circle all that apply)	at apply)		
All vertical crevices sealed at the top and 0.S-1.2S" wide & ≥4" deep	2	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Low	None
All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	2	Spaces between walls, ceiling joists	Possible corridors for netting	None/poor Marginal	Marginal	excellent
All guardrails	7		Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	ON	
All expansion joints	>					

S
-
0
2
5
5
-
SL.

Inspection Conducted By: L. Herrera & E. Markowitz (H&H) Signature(s): Dr // U / C	1. 1.	Vertical surfaces on concrete I-	Spaces between concrete end walls	Signature(s): 2
--	-------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------

- the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of whether inventories have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, Inventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in a negative result in one year does not guarantee that bai's will not use that structure in subsequent years. ÷
- Contractors must complete this form no more than seven (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/structure location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environmental Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit this information will result in that structure being remove I from the planned work schedule. N
 - obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing each Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing any work to proceed. m
- Estimates of numbers of bats observed should be place in the Notes column. 4. 10
 - Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager.

Bridge Inspection Form

from structure demolish. Each bridge/structure to be worked on must have a current bridge inspection. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat either from the underside, from activities above that bore down to the underside, or that could impact expansion joints, from deck removal on bridges, or This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has obtained clearance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, if required. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing structures prior to allowing any work to proceed.

DOT Project # Wai	Nater Body	Date/Time of Inspection
N/A	T	04/21/2016 2:10 pm

Route:	Route: County:	Federal	Bat Indic	ndicators			
		Structure ID:	Check all	that apply.	Presence c	of one or m	Structure ID: Check all that apply. Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.
UPRR			Visual	Sound	Droppings	Staining	Notes: (e.g.,number & species of bats, if known)
MP 38.05 Kane	Kane		None	None	None	None	Evidence of bats was not present at the Peck Road Bridge over the Metra UP West Line.

Bridges		Culverts/Other Structures	Summary Info (circle all that apply)	iat apply)		
All vertical crevices sealed at the top and 0.S-1.2S" wide & ≥4" deep	2	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete	Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Low	None
All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	N/A	Spaces between walls, ceiling joists	Possible corridors for netting	None/poor Marginal	Marginal	excellent
All guardrails	7		Evidence of bats using bird nests, if present?	Yes	ON	
All expansion joints	>					

15
20
1
Ŧ
đ
◄

Spaces between concrete end walls and the bridge deck	2	
Vertical surfaces on concrete I- beams	>	
Inspection Conducted By: L. Herrera & E. Markowitz (H&H)	& E. Markowitz (H&H)	Signature(s): Signature
District Environmental Use Only:		Date Received by District Environmental Manager:

- the Programmatic Informal Consultation, regardless of whether inventories have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, Inventories must be completed prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in a negative result in one year does not guarantee that bats will not use that structure in subsequent years. ÷
- Contractors must complete this form no more than sever (7) business days prior to initiating work at each bridge/structure location. Legible copies of this document must be provided to the District Environm antal Manager within two (2) business days of completing the inspection. Failure to submit this information will result in that structure being removed from the planned work schedule. ц.
 - obtained clearance from the USFWS, if required. Additior al studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing each Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitet for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing a ny work to proceed. m
- Estimates of numbers of bats observed should be place in the Notes column.
- Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager. 4. 10



Photo 1: Facing north towards the Kress Creek culvert (Mile Post [MP] 32.05) under the Metra Union Pacific (UP) West Line, approximately 200 feet east of Kress Road.



Photo 3: Facing south towards the access road bridge (MP 32.08) over the Metra UP West Line.



Photo 2: Facing north towards the Kress Creek culvert (MP 32.05) under the Metra UP West Line, approximately 200 feet east of Kress Road.



Photo 4: Facing north towards the access road bridge (MP 32.08) over the Metra UP West Line.



Photo 5: Facing north towards the access road bridge (MP 32.08) over the Metra UP West Line.



Photo 7: Facing up towards the Kress Road Bridge (MP 32.10) over the Metra UP West Line.



Photo 6: Facing south towards the Kress Road Bridge (MP 32.10) over the Metra UP West Line.



Photo 8: Facing north towards the Kress Creek South Canal culvert (MP 32.10) under the Metra UP West Line, approximately 0.15 mile west of Kress Road.

J:\81.0220288.05 PB Metra UP-West 3rd Mainline\Wetland\Bat inspection forms\BatBridge_Photolog.docx

Photographic Log for the Metra UP West Line (Kress Road to Peck Road M.P. 32.00 to M.P. 38.41) Cities of Geneva and West Chicago, Unincorporated Kane County, and DuPage County, Illinois Northern Long-Eared Bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) Bridge/Structure Inspection – April 20 and 21, 2016



Photo 9: Facing south towards the Kress Creek South Canal culvert (MP 32.10) under the Metra UP West Line, approximately 0.15 mile west of Kress Road.



Photo 11: Facing up towards the Roosevelt Road Bridge (MP 33.15) over the Metra UP West Line.



Photo 10: Facing west towards the Roosevelt Road Bridge (MP 33.15) over the Metra UP West Line.



Photo 12: Facing south towards the Kirk Road Bridge (MP 33.90) over the Metra UP West Line.



Photo 13: Facing up towards the Kirk Road Bridge (MP 33.90) over the Metra UP West Line.



Photo 15: Facing north towards the unnamed tributary to the Fox River culvert (MP 34.07), approximately 0.2 mile west of Kirk Road.



Photo 14: Facing north towards the unnamed tributary to the Fox River culvert (MP 34.07), approximately 0.2 mile west of Kirk Road.



Photo 16: Facing west towards the unnamed tributary to the Fox River culvert under the railroad spur (MP 34.07), approximately 0.2 mile west of Kirk Road.

J:\81.0220288.05 PB Metra UP-West 3rd Mainline\Wetland\Bat inspection forms\BatBridge_Photolog.docx



Photo 17: Facing east towards the unnamed tributary to the Fox River culvert under the railroad spur (MP 34.07), approximately 0.2 mile west of Kirk Road.



Photo 19: Facing south towards the unnamed tributary to the Fox River culvert (MP 34.07), approximately 0.65 mile west of Kirk Road.



Photo 18: Facing south towards the unnamed tributary to the Fox River culvert (MP 34.07), approximately 0.65 mile west of Kirk Road.



Photo 20: Facing south towards a pedestrian bridge over the unnamed tributary to the Fox River (MP 34.07), approximately 0.65 mile west of Kirk Road.

Photographic Log for the Metra UP West Line (Kress Road to Peck Road M.P. 32.00 to M.P. 38.41) Cities of Geneva and West Chicago, Unincorporated Kane County, and DuPage County, Illinois Northern Long-Eared Bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) Bridge/Structure Inspection – April 20 and 21, 2016



Photo 21: Facing north towards the Crissey Avenue Bridge (Illinois Route 25, MP 35.00) over the Metra UP West Line.



Photo 23: Facing north towards a culvert (MP 36.35) under the Metra UP West Line, approximately 0.30 mile west of Western Avenue.



Photo 22: Facing up towards the Crissey Avenue Bridge (Illinois Route 25, MP 35.00) over the Metra UP West Line.



Photo 24: Facing north towards a culvert (36.35) under the Metra UP West Line, approximately 0.30 mile west of Western Avenue.

Photographic Log for the Metra UP West Line (Kress Road to Peck Road M.P. 32.00 to M.P. 38.41) Cities of Geneva and West Chicago, Unincorporated Kane County, and DuPage County, Illinois Northern Long-Eared Bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) Bridge/Structure Inspection – April 20 and 21, 2016



Photo 25: Facing south towards the unnamed tributary to Mill Creek culvert (MP 36.80), approximately 0.23 mile east of Randall Road.



Photo 27: Facing up towards the Randall Road Bridge (MP 37.05) over the Metra UP West Line.



Photo 26: Facing south towards the unnamed tributary to Mill Creek culvert (MP 36.80), approximately 0.23 mile east of Randall Road



Photo 28: Facing wests towards the Randall Road Bridge (MP 37.05) over the Metra UP West Line.

Photographic Log for the Metra UP West Line (Kress Road to Peck Road M.P. 32.00 to M.P. 38.41) Cities of Geneva and West Chicago, Unincorporated Kane County, and DuPage County, Illinois Northern Long-Eared Bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) Bridge/Structure Inspection – April 20 and 21, 2016



Photo 29: Facing west towards the Peck Road Bridge (MP 38.05) over the Metra UP West Line.



Photo 31: Facing up towards the Metra UP West Line Bridge (MP 35.20) over the Fox River.



Photo 30: Facing south towards the Peck Road Bridge (38.05) over the Metra UP West Line.



Photo 32: Facing up towards the Metra UP West Line Bridge (MP 35.20) over the Fox River.



Photo 33: Facing west towards the Metra UP West Line Bridge (MP 35.30) over S. 1st Street (Illinois Route 31).



Photo 35: Facing west towards the Geneva Creek culvert (MP 35.60) under the Metra UP West Line, approximately 0.10 mile west of S 3rd Street.



Photo 34: Facing up towards the Metra UP West Line Bridge (MP 35.30) over S. 1^{st} Street.



Photo 36: Facing north towards the Geneva Creek culvert (MP 35.60) under the Metra UP West Line, approximately 0.10 mile west of S 3rd Street.

Appendix B-8 Public Outreach